

SUPREMACY OF THE  
APOSTOLIC SEE

*ARCHBISHOP PORTER*











THE SUPREMACY  
OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE  
IN THE CHURCH

BY

THE VERY REV. FRANZ HETTINGER,

PH. ET THEOL. DOCTOR  
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WURZBURG.  
DOMESTIC PRELATE OF HIS HOLINESS.

*Translated from the German.*

WITH PREFACE

BY

THE MOST REVEREND GEORGE PORTER, S.J.  
ARCHBISHOP OF BOMBAY.

---

LONDON : BURNS & OATES, LIMITED.  
NEW YORK : CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY Co.





# CONTENTS.

## BOOK THE FIRST.

### THE EPISCOPATE AND THE PRIMACY.

	Pages.
Preface ... ..	i—xi
Chapter I. Christ the Foundation-stone of His Church Peter the Foundation-stone through Him ... ..	1
II. The limits of the authority of the Church in general ... ..	2
III. The work of the Church ... ..	3
IV. The authority of the Apostles ... ..	4
V. The successors of the Apostles ... ..	6
VI. The Episcopate ... ..	9
VII. The authority of the Episcopate is limited by the Primacy ... ..	12
VIII. The relation of the Episcopate to the Primacy ... ..	15
IX. The establishment of the Primacy ..	17
X. Peter the Foundation-stone of the Church and the Bearer of the Keys ... ..	19
XI. Peter the Confirmer of the faith of his brethren ... ..	22
XII. Peter the Shepherd of the whole flock.	24
XIII. The authority of the Apostles subordinate to that of Peter ... ..	25
XIV. The authority of Peter was conferred immediately by our Lord and not by the Church ... ..	28
XV. The permanency of the Primacy in the Church ... ..	29

II

Chapter XVI.	The Bishop of Rome is the successor of Peter	...	...	...	...	35
XVII.	Tradition	...	...	..	...	38
XVIII.	The Testimony of St Irenaeus	...				40
XIX.	How the Popes and the faithful understood the Primacy practically	...	...			42
XX.	The law of the development of the Papacy	...	..	...	...	44
XXI.	The essence and significancy of the Primacy	...	...	...	...	45
XXII.	It includes Episcopal authority over the whole Church	...	...	...	...	46
XXIII.	Its plenary authority in the Church	...				47
XXIV.	It does not exclude the authority of the Bishops...	...	..	...	...	48
XXV.	The Pope and a Council	..		...		50
XXVI.	Appeals to the Pope	...	...	...		54
XXVII.	The Papal authority not Absolutism	...				57
XXVIII.	The character of the Papal authority,					61
XXIX.	The significancy of the Papal authority.					62

---

**BOOK THE SECOND.**

**THE PRIMACY OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE  
AS INFALLIBLE TEACHER.**

Chapter I.	The supernatural character of the Church					63
II.	Authority the principle of unity in the Church	...	...	...	...	64
III.	The teaching office in the Church an instrument in the hands of Christ	...				65
IV.	The teaching Church and the taught Church...	...	...	...	...	66

Chapter V.	The fundamental reason for the teaching office in the Church ... ..	67
VI.	Inspiration and Infallibility ... ..	67
VII.	The Pope an Infallible Teacher of the Church... ..	70
VIII.	The Infallible Episcopate and the Infallible Primacy in their mutual relations ... ..	71
IX.	The meaning of personal Infallibility..	73
X.	Definitio "ex cathedra" ... ..	74
XI.	The proof from Scripture ... ..	77
XII.	The proof from the Fathers ... ..	81
XIII.	How the Councils and the Popes understood this doctrine practically ...	87
XIV.	The Bishops are true Judges in matters of faith... ..	89
XV.	The Pope and the Council ... ..	90
XVI.	A Council is not absolutely, but only relatively, necessary ... ..	92
XVII.	The question of Pope Honorius ..	93
XVIII.	The Infallibility of the Primacy follows from the very essence of the Church ..	97
XIX.	The modern origin of the dogma of the Infallibility of the Primacy ... ..	104
XX.	The Canon of Vincent of Lerins ...	107
XXI.	The Infallibility and the Fallibility of the Pope are not theological opinions of equal probability ... ..	109
XXII.	The significancy of the definition of the Infallibility of the Pope. ... ..	111

IV

Appendix I	..	...	...	...	...	...	117
Appendix II	...	...	...	...	...	...	120
Notes on the First Book...		...	...	...	...	...	125
Notes on the Second Book		...	...	...	...	...	159
Notes on Appendix II	...	...	...	...	...	...	185
Index of Subjects	...	...	...	...	...	...	191
Index of Names	...	...	...	...	...	...	192

---

## PREFACE.

“ THE SUPREMACY OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE IN THE CHURCH ” is a translation of the 18th and 19th Lectures of Hettinger’s *Apologie des Christenthums*: these two lectures have been published separately in German under the title, *Die Kirchliche Vollgewalt des Apostolischen Stuhles*, and reached a 2nd edition.

The subject has been treated by many writers; yet there seems to be room left for a popular exposition which addresses itself to the general public and deals with the most recent phases of the question and the position created by the definition of the Vatican Council.

Professor Hettinger insists much on three fundamental ideas of Christ’s kingdom, viz.: the idea of a Church, the idea of the unity of the Church, and the idea of Church government.

Holy Scripture describes the Church in magnificent language. She is ‘the city of our God,’ ‘the city of the great King,’ ‘the city of the Lord of Hosts,’ ‘God hath founded it for ever,’ (Ps. 47). She is the mountain of God, ‘a mountain in which God is pleased to dwell; for there the Lord shall dwell unto the end,’ (Ps. 67); ‘the mountain of the house of the Lord, prepared on the top of the mountains, exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it,’ (Isaias 2, 2). She is the city of truth, ‘Jerusalem shall be called the city of Truth and the mountain of the Lord of Hosts, the sanctified Mountain,’ (Zach. 8, 3.) With Jeremias she is ‘the chosen vineyard,’ (2, 21), ‘the throne of God,’ (3, 17). In the Canticle of Canticles ‘she is all fair and there is not a spot in her,’ (4, 7). The earth and its inhabitants shall belong to her; ‘Ask of me and I will give thee gentiles for thy inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession,’ (Ps. 2, 8); and she ‘shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth,’ (Ps. 71, 8). Terrible as an army set in array (Canticles 6, 3), she is invincible, ‘often have they fought against me from my youth; but they could

not prevail over me,' (Ps. 128, 2.) For God set her up 'a Kingdom that shall never be destroyed, that shall stand for ever,' (Dan 2, 44.)

In the New Testament Christ founds His Church. 'Thou art Peter and on this rock I will build My Church' (Matt. 16, 18.) He himself is the foundation on which the Church is built: 'for other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus' (1 Cor. 3, 11). She preserves the truth, being the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, 'the pillar and the ground of the truth.' (1 Tim. 3, 15.) She is the fold in which the lambs and sheep will feed, 'there shall be one fold and one shepherd' (John 10, 16). Christ is the door 'by Me if any man shall enter in he shall be saved; and he shall go in and go out and shall find pastures' (John 10, 9.) St. Paul again calls the Church the body of Christ, 'now you are the body of Christ and members of member' (1 Cor. 12, 27.); in the same context he calls the Church simply 'Christ.' (ibid v. 12) and to the Ephesians 'He gave some apostles, and some prophets and other some evangelists and other some pastors and doctors...for the edifying of the body of Christ.' (Ephes 4, 11. 12). The holiness of the Church he describes in the following chapter: 'As Christ also loved the Church and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life. That He might present it to himself a glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish,' (Ephes. 5, 26-27.)

Christ promised to abide in His Church: 'And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.' (Matt. 28, 20.) For 'he will reign in the house of Jacob for ever and of his kingdom there shall be no end' (Luke 1, 32, 33). J. M. Capes counted in the New Testament about seventy passages in which mention is made of "the Church" of Christ.

The texts taken from the Old Testament may be found in the Christian tradition of all ages as referring to the Church.

The teaching of both Testaments may be fairly summed up in the statement that Christ founded His Church, that in it and through it men might receive the graces and blessings of the Redemption; the Church has been well called the continuation of the Incarnation to the end of time.

The second idea is that of the unity of the Church. This blessing of unity the High Priest prayed for on the eve of His passion "And not for them only do I pray, but for those also who through their word shall believe in Me: That they all may be one; as Thou Father in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe Thou hast sent Me." (John 17, 20. 21.)

The Church must be one, numerically; she must be one there may not be many churches. She must be one within herself; she must be one in faith, one in worship and one in corporate life. St. Paul describes the unity of the Church. "Careful to keep the *unity* of the Spirit in the bond of peace: One *body* and one *Spirit* as you are called in *one* hope of your vocation. One Lord, *one faith*, one baptism . . . unto the edification of the body of Christ. Till we all meet in the *unit of faith*... That we may not now be children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine... But we may in all things grow up in Him Who is the Head, Christ." (Ephes. 4, 3—16.) All, whatever differences in nationality, language, circumstance may separate them, must be one in faith, must reject doctrines opposed to the faith and must grow up in Him Who is the Head.

The unity in worship follows from the unity of faith: no act of worship may contradict the faith or fail to express it.

The corporate unity, the unity of Government was established by Jesus Christ in order to preserve the unity of faith. Without corporate organic unity the unity of faith would soon perish, and the unity of worship would soon be lost. The figures under which the Church is represented in the New Testament all imply this corporate unity. She is the kingdom

of heaven, a flock under one shepherd, the vine from which every branch grows, a temple, a house, above all she is the mystical body of Christ.

The unity of Government exists sometimes in sects, a mere outward material unity, as in the Church of England by law established, and in the Russian Church where the members form one body under the headship of the Reigning Sovereign. Such outward accidental unity differs widely from the essential visible unity which comes from within, from the formal principle of faith, from the Holy Ghost ever abiding in the Church and uniting its members in one faith. External unity alone is a mere fact which may disappear. External unity proceeding from the internal principle forms a positive mark of the Church of Christ: "That the world may *believe* Thou hast sent Me," (John 17, 21.) The evidence for this mark should convince the world of the divinity of the mission of Jesus Christ. In the Church of Christ external unity rests on the internal unity which must be referred to the indwelling of the Holy Ghost and the abiding presence of Jesus Christ. The promises of Christ assure the continuance of His presence to the end of time and the endurance of the fact of external unity.

The third idea is that of the government of the Church.

The Providence of God established the Supremacy of St. Peter and his successors in the Church as the means for the maintenance of the internal unity of faith and the external unity of creed, of worship, of communion, and of corporate cohesion.

The place of St. Peter in the Gospels cannot escape the observation of a careful reader. "In the whole New Testament, John, who is yet mentioned oftener than the rest occurs only thirty-eight times; but in the Gospels alone Peter is mentioned twenty-three times by Matthew, eighteen by Mark, twenty by Luke, and thirty by John." (Allies' "St. Peter, his Name and Office" p. 93.)



In each of the four catalogues of the Apostles Peter is placed first. (Matt. 10, 2-5; Mark 3, 6-19; Luke 6, 14-17; Acts 1, 13). St. Matthew calls him simply the first "the first Simon, who is called Peter;" and first is not used as a mere numeral: for if it were so used, second, third, &c., would have followed.

When the Evangelists mention some of the Apostles, Peter being one, he is always placed first: thus at the raising of Jairus' daughter to life, "And he admitted not any man to follow him, but Peter and James and John the brother of James." (Mark 5, 37). Again at the Transfiguration: "Jesus taketh unto him Peter and James and John his brother" (Matt. 17, 1). Again at the Agony of the Garden: "And he taketh Peter and James and John with him and he began to fear and to be heavy." (Mark 14, 33).

St. Peter often appears as the chief or head: "And Simon and they who were with him followed after him." (Mark 1, 36). "Peter and they that were with him said." (Luke 8, 45). At the Transfiguration: "but Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep." (Luke 9, 32). So after the Resurrection "Peter standing up with the eleven," (Acts 2, 14); "They said to Peter and the rest of the Apostles" (v 37); "Peter and the Apostles answering said" (v 29); "Go tell His disciples and Peter." (Mark 16, 7). The form *those with him* is never used of any other of the Apostles; it is used of David and his followers and still more frequently of Our Lord and His disciples.

The questions of St. Peter to Our Lord preserved in the Gospels are numerous and of deep meaning: "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him? Until seven times?" (Matt. 18, 21.) "Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Thou shalt never wash my feet... Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." (John 13, 6, 8.) "Behold we have left all things; what therefore shall we have." (Matt 19, 27.) "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." (John 6, 67.) "Lord, dost thou speak this parable to us or to all." (Luke 12, 41). "And Peter, taking him began to rebuke him,

saying : Lord, be it far from thee ; this shall not be unto thee. But he turning, said to Peter : Go after me, Satan, thou art a scandal to me : because thou dost not relish the things that are of God, but the things that are of men. Then Jesus said to his disciples : if any man will come after me let him deny himself." (Matt. 16, 22-24).

In how many mysterious incidents is Peter prominent ?

" And when they were come to Capharnaum, they that received the didrachmas came to Peter and said to him : Doth not your master pay the didrachma. He said : Yes. . . . And when thou hast opened its mouth then shalt find a stater ; take that and give it to them *for me and thee*" (Matt. 17, 23. 26.) Peter is the only Apostle into whose house our Lord is recorded to have entered. " And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, He saw his mother-in-law lying and sick of a fever. And He touched her hand and the fever left her ; and she arose and ministered to them." (Matt. 8, 13-15). " And going up into one of the ships that was Simon's He desired him to thrust out a little from the land. And sitting down He taught the multitudes out of the ship. Now when He had ceased to speak, He said to Simon, launch out into the deep and let down your nets for a draught. And Simon answering said to him : Master, we have laboured all night, and have taken nothing ; but at thy word I will let down the net. And when they had done this they enclosed a very great multitude of fishes and their net was breaking, and they beckoned to their partners that were in the other ship that they should come and help them : and they came and filled both the ships, so that they were almost sinking, which when Simon Peter saw he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord... And Jesus saith to Simon : Fear not ; from henceforth thou shalt be taking men." (Luke 5, 3-10).

During the Passion Peter distinguishes himself by his too rash and too self-reliant zeal. His fall is specially foretold, though the others were equally brave and all fled in the hour

of danger. For him Jesus Christ prayed by name. "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren" (Luke 22, 32). To Peter he addresses a personal reproof. "What, could you not watch one hour with me?" (Matt. 26, 40). "And the Lord, turning, looked on Peter and Peter remembered the word of the Lord... And Peter went out and wept bitterly." (Luke 22, 61, 62).

During the 40 days which followed the Resurrection, the Angel directed the holy women: "Go tell His disciples and Peter, that He goeth before you into Galilee." And St. Paul records that Christ risen "was seen by Cephas and after that by the eleven." (1 Cor. 15, 5.) Peter leads the mysterious fishing in the Lake of Tiberias and on the beach afterwards receives the commission to feed the lambs and the sheep of Christ's flock and hears the manner of his death on the cross foretold. (John 21).

To sum up. Peter alone received a new name from his divine Master and this at the first moment when Andrew led his brother to Jesus. (John 1, 42): as Abraham received a new name when God called him to be the father of many nations (Gen. 17,) 5; and as Jacob received the name of Israel: "for if thou hast been strong against God, how much more shalt thou prevail against men." (Gen. 32, 28.) Peter alone is the Rock on which Christ builds His Church. To Peter alone was given the power of the keys. In the first instance to Peter alone is promised the power of loosing and binding, which was afterwards conferred on him and on all the other Apostles, (John 20, 23). To Peter alone was committed the charge of strengthening or confirming his brethren, (Luke 22, 32). To Peter alone was entrusted the care of the whole flock, sheep and lambs, (John, 21 15-17). To Peter alone was addressed the mysterious command: "follow thou Me" (John 21, 22).

Such is the place held by Peter while our Lord remained on earth. Let us turn to the history of the infant Church contained in the first twelve chapters of the Acts of the Apostles

He ordains the election of an apostle in the place of Judas (Acts 1, 15.) He first preaches the Gospel to the Jews. But Peter, *standing up with the eleven* lifted up his voice (Acts 2, 14.) He founds the Church of Samaria (Acts 18, 14.). He admits the Gentiles into the Church (Acts 10.) He passed through visiting all (Acts 9, 32). He cuts off from the Church the first heresiarch, Simon Magus (Acts 8, 20.21). He decides the dissension about circumcision (Acts 15, 10). Publicly and with authority Peter reproves Annanias and Saphira, who had lied to him and to the Holy Ghost (Acts 5, 3-10). Peter announced Christ before the Sanhedrim "for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4, 12). And after the miraculous deliverance of the Apostles from the common prison, *Peter then answering and the Apostles* said, "we ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5, 29). When Peter was kept in prison, prayer was made without ceasing by the Church to God for him (Acts 12, 5), which was not done when St. Paul was cast into prison in the same city, because the Church without Peter was without her head. He performs the first miracle bidding the lame man at the Beautiful Gate: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." (Acts 3, 6). He raised Eneas, lying on his bed for eight years, ill of the palsy: "Eneas, the Lord Jesus Christ healeth thee, arise and make thy bed. And immediately he arose" (Acts. 9, 34). He called back to life Tabitha, who was dead "Tabitha arise. And she opened her eyes and having seen Peter sat up" (Acts 9, 40). And such confidence did the believers feel in the power of St. Peter, people "brought out the sick into the streets and laid them on beds and couches, that when Peter came his shadow at the least might overshadow any of them and they might be delivered from their infirmities" (Acts 5, 15). Lastly, St. Paul testifies "then, three years after, I came to Jerusalem to see Peter and stayed with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles I saw none, except James the brother of the Lord." (Gal, 1, 18. 19.)

This prominence of St. Peter in the Gospels and in the Acts is not drawn out here with a view of establishing his Primacy and Supremacy or that of his successors : that Mons. Hettinger will do in his two books. A more general consideration presents itself.

The position given to St. Peter during the life-time of his divine Master is to say the least a singular one; he towers above the other Apostles and he stands on a relation of intimacy and unity with Our Lord to which no one else is admitted. He receives a new name; he is proclaimed as the foundation of the future Church; he may be described as acting with his Master and for him, almost as one with him. In the Acts he steps into the place of the leader of the Apostolic band and of the Church. During the subsequent history of the Church Peter survives ; he and the successors to his See exercise a decisive influence in the Church ; on the one hand they have been looked up to and obeyed as the Vicars of Christ by the overwhelming majority of those who believe in Jesus Christ; on the other hand, those who have torn themselves away from the communion of Peter's See have forgotten him ; his name is a mere memory to them, no living reality; he is almost disliked and the annals of his successors form a tale of unceasing persecution.

In the Catholic Church to this day St. Peter holds a place not unworthy of the distinction assigned to him in the Gospels and the Acts. Our adversaries reproach us even for giving to his successors more than Holy Scripture wants. The reproach we reject ; we contend that the Catholic tradition keeps closely within Scriptural limits. What is a clear fact, called into question by no one, the sects who have separated from the Catholic Church, not only do not pay an exaggerated honour to St. Peter, they almost ignore him ; the least bitter denounce his successors as usurpers : we look in vain among them for a Peter who even faintly corresponds to the Peter of the Gospels and the Acts. "Save me, O Lord, for there is now no Saint : truths are decayed from among the children of men."

(Ps. 11, 2). The truth about Peter has decayed among the children of men outside the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Church glories in her unity. She does not fear to take to herself the description given by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians. Nay her enemies taunt her because her Unity becomes more perfect every day. The union between the bishops of the Catholic world and the successor of St. Peter becomes more intimate ; the press, the post, the telegraph, the railway, the ocean steamers, render communication between the Head and the members more easy and it has become more frequent. The desire for closer union grows stronger, as the war against Christ and his Church becomes more bitter.

Outside the Church what a spectacle of disunion and discord ! Sects multiplied without number : the more important sects with difficulty preserved in some semblance of unity by the bonds of State authority, State funds and State penalties ; the others a very Babel of profanity and blasphemy. A few years ago an Anglican Dean maintained in a sermon that when Christ prayed that those who believed in him might be one, he meant that they might be many. More recently an Anglican writer defended a unity, not of *subordination* but of *co-ordination*, which really means the same thing, not unity but multiplicity. The latest theory proposes a *primary* unity of charity or faith but the author nowhere explains his *secondary* unity and if it means any thing he champions only an invisible unity of an invisible Church. A visible mark of unity which can lead men to believe in Jesus Christ is still wanting outside the Catholic Church ; it is sadly wanting in the Church by law established in England.

Truths are decayed from among the children of men and the truth about Church unity has decayed from among the children of men outside the Catholic Church.

Nay the very idea of a Church seems to survive only in the Catholic Church. To her children the prophecies, the

descriptions, the attributes, the sufferings, the triumphs and the glories of the Church, of Holy Scripture are very real and actual. Catholics eagerly and fearlessly claim for her and for her alone all that Scripture and Tradition say of the Bride of Christ.

What sectarians do as much? Where do we find amongst them a definition of a visible Church? Any claim to a supernatural origin? to any assistance of the Holy Ghost? to any promise of indefectibility? to a final triumph over Hell? Are not all feverishly hastening on the decay which began from the moment they separated from the Rock of Peter?

Earnest and sincere inquirers who do not belong to the Catholic Church may put this plain question to themselves. The Gospels and the Acts are filled with three ideas or facts; the fact of a Church, the fact of a Church one in body, one in spirit and the fact of Peter as the leader of the Apostles. These three ideas and facts are prominent in the Catholic Church; as prominent as they are in the Gospels and the Acts. These three ideas or facts are absent in all the religious bodies, which are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church: these truths have decayed from the minds of their adherents.

Which religious body would Christ claim as his Church? Which would St. Peter recognise as the Church founded on him? Which would the Evangelists confess to be the realisation of their pages?

In which can I best secure the eternal salvation of my soul? Shall I follow Peter? Or remain with those who have revolted against him? To whom shall we go? Shall we not hear the words of eternal life from the successors of Peter, who gathered them from the lips of his divine Master and received the commission to confirm the Church in her faith?

---





## FIRST BOOK.

### THE EPISCOPATE AND THE PRIMACY.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

CHRIST THE FOUNDATION-STONE OF HIS CHURCH.  
PETER THE FOUNDATION-STONE THROUGH HIM.

The Church is the visible kingdom of Christ on earth, in which the truth and grace revealed in Him are imparted to all mankind. He founded the Church: He alone is her head in the fullest sense. For from His Humanity, inseparably united with His Divinity, flow those mysterious, supernatural influences of grace, which silently and gently, yet mightily and irresistibly take hold of souls, turn them from the world, cleanse and sanctify them, protect and strengthen them. He is the heavenly vine, from which the living sap rises and runs into the branches and enables them to put forth leaves and blossoms and bear fruit for all eternity.<sup>1</sup> Hence He is the true and real foundation-stone on which the Church is built; through this foundation-stone and on this foundation-stone, the redeemed are unceasingly being laid as living stones of the eternal temple, which God was pleased to erect for Himself out of the human race, embracing all times and the whole world; for no one can lay another foundation.<sup>2</sup> He has called all who have formed part of this house of God; through Him they have received the grace of faith, redemption and sanctification: He has purchased them by His sufferings and blood; therefore He is their king and they are His subjects.<sup>3</sup> He holds the keys of the house of David,<sup>4</sup> the keys of the kingdom of heaven;<sup>5</sup> the several powers which are confided to the Church, were previously conferred on Him and in an infinitely higher degree; He is the King,<sup>6</sup> the great Prophet,<sup>7</sup> the Teacher,<sup>8</sup> the High Priest for ever.<sup>9</sup>

It is true He does not die, as earthly kings do; He abides with His Church till the end of time,<sup>10</sup> ever the head of the mystical body, from whom all supernatural life flows into the members.

As He operates interiorly in the souls of individuals, in whose hearts He plants the grace of faith, whom He converts from sin, in whom He enkindles love, whom He instructs, consoles, strengthens, beatifies, so He rules as the head of the Church shielding her and guiding her, upholding her with His almighty hand amidst the storms of the world, the assaults of her enemies, and the vicissitudes of succeeding ages. He abides with her however only by this mystical and invisible influence, chiefly of grace and of the Blessed Sacrament: as visible head He has ascended to his Father and will not be seen again till He comes to judge the living and the dead.<sup>11</sup> Till that day the Church will remain a visible kingdom, affected by the conditions of time and place, ever expanding and perfecting herself.

For this reason He appointed men to be the visible, conscious and free *instruments* of His invisible guidance—the Apostles and their successors in the Church, in union with Peter and his successors on the Chair of Peter.<sup>12</sup>

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE LIMITS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH IN GENERAL.

Yet He did not entrust to them *His whole power as Head of the Church*: he did not confide the interior guidance of souls by the direct communication of grace, for this is His exclusively personal privilege as mystical Head.<sup>13</sup> And the visible guidance He gave them only in dependence on Himself, grounded on His commission, resting on His authority and for that very reason limited by that authority. In this way Peter governs the Church in a true sense; but through him Christ the supreme, invisible shepherd governs it.<sup>14</sup> Christ is the foundation-stone, but through Him Peter is also the foundation-stone;<sup>15</sup> and because from Him and through Him, he with the collective Episcopate of the

Catholic Church has received the form and measure of the plenitude of their powers. He cannot teach save what he has heard from Christ; he cannot dispense grace, save through the channels of grace ordained by Christ;<sup>16</sup> he can issue no order, except for the sake and for the preservation of what Christ commanded should be observed<sup>17</sup> for the salvation of souls and the building up of the body of Christ.<sup>18</sup>

Had Christ been nothing more than the founder of a Religion, as many have been before and after Him, He might have left it to his followers to fix the manner and form of their religious life. But this He was not. His plan in defining his doctrine coincides with His plan in the foundation of His Church. Many have been founders of religions, Christ alone founded a Church. He alone could found a Church, because He is the God-Man, head and king of regenerated humanity.<sup>19</sup> And when He founded his Church, He prescribed its essential laws in their main lines, He gave the necessary elements of her constitution and at the same time the rule and standard for her government in all time, What was this Constitution?

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE WORK OF THE CHURCH.

Before Jesus Christ ascended in glory, we are taught by the Vatican Council, He prayed to His Father, not only for the Apostles, but for all those also, who through their preaching were in after time to believe in Him, that they might be one, as He the Son, and the Father were one. As He sent the Apostles, whom He had chosen out of the world, as He Himself had been sent by the Father so He wished the pastors and teachers in the Church to the end of time to be sent. Therefore to them He assigned a mission and power which is a communication of the mission and power He had received from the Father, and this He confided to them to remain in the Church for ever. Before His passion, He said in a few words to his Apostles:<sup>20</sup> "Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth

shall be bound also in heaven and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." By these words He confided to his Apostles the power to make laws and to sit as judges. And when about to withdraw His visible presence from the world, He said:<sup>21</sup> "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth: Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptising them...Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The transfer of this spiritual power to the Apostles in His stead was the last, the final act of our Lord: the work of redemption was completed, the disciples were formed and instructed in the knowledge of His kingdom, for during the forty days which followed His resurrection He spoke to them of its mysteries.<sup>22</sup> The end of this power was above all to establish and maintain unity and constancy in faith, that we might not be like those "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive,"<sup>23</sup> but rather that we might "all meet in the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ."<sup>24</sup> He sends them forth, ever considering this power, in the likeness of the mission He had from His Father, with the promise of His special protection, to preach the Gospel, to found churches, to admit into His kingdom and to exclude from it, to make laws and to sit in judgment in such manner that those who received them should be as though they received Him,<sup>25</sup> those who listened to them as though they listened to Him, those who despised them as though they despised Him;<sup>26</sup> those who refused to hear them were to be accounted as heathens and publicans.<sup>27</sup>

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE AUTHORITY OF THE APOSTLES.

In this way the three-fold sacred power which our Lord had held Himself while on earth, the prophetic, priestly and kingly power; the power to teach, to consecrate and to govern was given to the body of the Apostles as His vicegerents. What Christ spoke the Apostles were bound to speak, You have

not chosen Me; but I have chosen you; the congregation did not choose an Apostle to be its head, but an Apostle gathered individuals, Jews and gentiles, as building stones which the spirit of God shaped into an ecclesiastical community under his superintendence. The Apostles begat them through the Gospel and were their fathers in Christ. The great family of the faithful no more chose their leaders, teachers and pastors, than the Apostles sent Him Who was sent by the Father alone and Himself sends all others, or than a human family chooses its head.<sup>28</sup> As in the beginning, so ever after every call and every mission proceeds from Him to Whom all power is given, Who is the Lord Himself, Who imparts His spirit to those He sends, Who rules from age to age.

If the ministration of the old law, says St. Paul, was glory, much more the ministration of justice of the new law aboundeth in glory:<sup>29</sup> for the latter is the fulfilment of the former, whose priesthood was only a shadow of what was to come.<sup>30</sup> What is there said of the priesthood: "neither doth any man take the honour to himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was," surely must have its application in a much higher sense to the priesthood of the new Testament. Hence the holy Scriptures represent the Apostles as stewards whom the Lord has placed to dispense His mysteries in His house, which is the Church.<sup>31</sup> As every member has its own office, so that of the Apostles differs from that of the faithful:<sup>32</sup> their power, they declare, our Lord has given them:<sup>33</sup> they have power to chastise disobedience.<sup>34</sup> The very name of Apostle, one sent, points to Him Who sent them, from Whom alone they receive their mission, their consecration, their power.

Consider the Apostles in the exercise of the power given to them. They found churches and assign them superintendents:<sup>35</sup> they lay down regulations for Church discipline<sup>36</sup> and insist that these laws should be observed in all the churches.<sup>37</sup> St. Paul expressly distinguishes between the precepts which he publishes in the name and with the authority of Christ and those which he publishes of the plenitude of his own authority,<sup>38</sup> he exercises the power of punishing, for he excludes from the Church and readmits into the Church.<sup>39</sup>

## CHAPTER V.

## THE SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES.

If we consider the end for which this three-fold power was given to the Apostles, we must say, it was necessary that the visible Church should be invested with this power and that it should continue as long as the Church herself. The extraordinary gifts which we recognize in the Apostles, the gifts of healing and performing miracles, their personal holiness and infallibility, seem due to their office as founders of the Church and inspired instruments through which the revelation of Christ was conveyed to the world. But as revelation came only once into the world in Christ, whereas the Church has to preserve it for all ages, but not to proclaim any new revelation, so the Apostolate in its special task only existed once in the world, it has no successor and can have none in that task. To teach, to baptise, to lead the faithful is a work which the Church can never lay aside.

How can she accomplish this work? Who take the place of the Apostles. Since Protestantism has declared ecclesiastical authority to be the creation of ambitious usurpers, of whom history knows nothing; or (in recent times) to be the mere result of historical development, a temporary device of merely human wisdom,<sup>40</sup> among Protestants the princes of this world took possession of Church authority and this step is justified on the score of their zeal for the Gospel and as an interposition of divine providence.<sup>41</sup>

Most assuredly the princes of the world were not destined to take the place of the Apostles; and yet at the close of the Apostolic age we find everywhere the office of Superintendents in the Church. It appears without the least opposition on the part of the congregations, as belonging to the very essence of the Church, preserving the existence of the Church, willed by Christ and established by the Apostles.

And such it was: when our Lord chose the Apostles and sent them in His stead, He chose and sent them and in them their successors to represent Him in his prophetic, priestly and kingly character. For this reason, He promised to be with them "all days to the end of the world," when they

preach, administer the Sacraments and rule the Church. The Apostolic office survives in their successors, in so far as they are sent to the three-fold office of teaching, administering the Sacraments and ruling the Church. The power exists in the Church for salvation and edification,<sup>42</sup> and therefore is never withdrawn; when those who wield it die, it survives in their successors with the strength and the blessing of the promise. Hence the Apostle requires in those who are to succeed in the office, on whom the duty devolves "to guard the deposit of faith,"<sup>43</sup> but not to proclaim new revelations, no extraordinary gifts, such as the Apostles possessed, but only a blameless vocation, sound doctrine and above all an irreproachable life.

When St. Paul chose his disciple Timothy to succeed him in the government of the Church of Ephesus and Titus in that of Crete, he confided to them for the territory of those churches the same power which he himself exercised over the churches he had founded; they were to govern the churches, to administer the Sacraments, to teach,<sup>44</sup> to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to receive and investigate complaints, to order punishments,<sup>45</sup> to ordain priests and ministers (deacons).<sup>46</sup> This instruction and the instruction to Timothy to keep the commandment of the Apostles without spot,<sup>47</sup> blameless, unto the coming of the Lord, show that St. Paul considered the office of Superintendent in the Church to be a permanent institution. The appointment of successors and the transmission of the power were not the work of mere human arrangement; with the transmission of the office were transmitted the grace of the spirit and authority to him who received it. Hence St. Paul exhorts Timothy not to neglect the grace which was given to him with the imposition of hands,<sup>48</sup> but to stir it up and to quicken it. Hence when leaving Ephesus he warns the elders of the Church, precisely because they wielded such high powers,<sup>49</sup> "take heed to yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops to rule the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His blood."

The name which this authority, possessed by the Apostles of divine right and transmitted by them to their successors, has borne from the remotest times in the Church—the

hierarchy—tells its nature and distinguishes it from every other authority in the world. It is a sacred power; it is sacred in its author Christ; in its end the building up of the body of Christ;<sup>50</sup> in its means, the divine word, the Sacraments and the discipline of the Church. As He to Whom all power in heaven and earth was given, demeaned Himself and became the servant of all; so they who hold the power conferred by Him, must not rule like the kings of the gentiles selfishly and arbitrarily;<sup>51</sup> but despise themselves in humility and self-abasement as mere instruments for the salvation and building up of the faithful, a pattern of the flock from the heart.<sup>52</sup> This is the Apostolic form, says St. Bernard,<sup>53</sup> lording it is forbidden: ministering is enjoined.

As long as the Apostles lived, their interest and vigilance were constantly directed to the congregations they had founded and their Superintendents. They send instructions, they console, they encourage, they warn, sometimes visiting them in person, sometimes by letters which they addressed to the churches and their Superintendents. The more numerous the congregations became, the greater became the authority of the individual Superintendents, and on this account other holders of Church authority were given to them, but subordinate to them, as they themselves were under the higher authority of the Apostles.

The Church on earth is a copy of the Church in heaven, with its various gradations and choirs of holy spirits. Hence the Apostles handed down to their successors their power in the Church in regulated gradation, in the orders of the Episcopate, the Priesthood and the Diaconate.<sup>54</sup> The Apostles, says Tertullian, assure us that what they established was no arbitrary creation of theirs, and that they faithfully gave to the people the order they had received.<sup>55</sup> The institution of deacons, to whom the care of the poor of the congregation and the service at holy Communion specially belong,<sup>56</sup> is narrated in the Acts of the Apostles;<sup>57</sup> side by side with them and over them we find priests and bishops.<sup>58</sup> In the latest epistles of St. Paul, viz., in the pastoral ones, the constitution of the Church may be seen already perfectly established, as it must have been shortly before the death of the Apostle and the very circumstance



that a consistent distinction of the names corresponding to the distinction of office had not been introduced, for the ruler of the congregation was sometimes called priest, (presbyter), sometimes bishop, is an irrefragable proof of their reality ; a proof, viz., that we stand on the border-line between the Apostolic and post-Apostolic ages and that, though the names were not yet definitely fixed, the new officers whom the Apostles wished to establish already occupied their places.<sup>59</sup> The names, priest and bishop, were used indifferently, but there was no confusion in the offices : indeed the sharper the line of separation in the thing itself, the less careful is language at the beginning in the selection of names, as we may see in other matters of Church dogmatic discipline, v. g., in the doctrine of the Sacraments. "What is the meaning of co-bishops and deacons," asks St. Chrysostom ?<sup>60</sup> "Were there many bishops in the same city ? By no means : but priests were called bishops : for up to that time, the names were used indifferently ; what is more, bishops were called deacons. Later each rank was distinguished by its own name." Even women were called Apostles,<sup>61</sup> priests and bishops and the apostles themselves were called deacons,<sup>62</sup> priests and fellow-priests ;<sup>63</sup> Christ Himself is called bishop and apostle.<sup>64</sup>

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE EPISCOPATE.

The office of the bishop holds a conspicuous place in the Apocalypse of St. John ; the bishops are the Angels of their several churches, sent by God :<sup>65</sup> the divine warnings are addressed to the Superintendents of the seven churches of Asia though priests and deacons stand at their side.<sup>66</sup> Timothy and Titus are the successors of St Paul in Ephesus and Crete ; Epaphroditus appears as bishop in Philippi.<sup>67</sup> They are placed over the priests and deacons of these churches ; they choose them, they test them, they ordain them and exercise jurisdiction over them.<sup>68</sup> The Bishop thus appears as the true, only successor of the Apostles, the origin and

source of the priesthood, the father of all the faithful and of the priests too whom he spiritually begets by ordination.<sup>69</sup>

In this manner the hierarchical gradation established by Christ in the Apostles, remains a permanent institution through all ages of the Church. Before any Christian communities came into existence the Apostles had received their mission and authority from God the Father, through Jesus Christ <sup>70</sup> They established the communities, appointed their rulers, and their authority passed from them to their successors, but it was never taken over by the community. If the hierarchical gradation was the creation of chance, or the result of the circumstances of the time or of human calculation, we have the insoluble mystery to explain, how it could have been introduced at the same time in every Church and even during the life-time of the Apostles. Still less can we suppose that ambition usurped the hierarchical rank as such an attempt could not have been thought of or carried out without opposition, in all the Churches, at so early a date. Even if we were without the express testimony of the holy Scriptures and the oldest Fathers, this original and essential ordering of the hierarchy would have to be regarded as a divine institution: for "what the universal Church observes, not introduced by any Council, yet still firmly held, must have come from the Apostles."<sup>71</sup>

We possess, however, most distinct testimony from the Apostolic Fathers. "Without a hierarchy there can be no Church," St. Ignatius of Antioch,<sup>72</sup> who died a martyr in the Colosseum in Rome, A.D 114, lays down as a Catholic axiom. "All who are of God and of Jesus Christ, are with the bishop."<sup>73</sup> "Where the bishop is, there are the faithful, as where Christ is there also is the Catholic Church."<sup>74</sup> "The bishop is ruler in the place of God."<sup>75</sup> "All ought to show reverence in the presence of deacons, as an institution of God, in the presence of the bishop as in the presence of Jesus Christ, and in the presence of the priests as in the presence of the council of God."<sup>76</sup> Polycarp, who was closely united in friendship with Ignatius, Bishop of Smyrna (\*618) says in his letter to the Philippians: "Deacons should be without blame as the servants of God, priests should be compassionate and merciful towards all."<sup>77</sup>

Clement, bishop of Rome, in all probability the fellow-labourer of St. Paul mentioned in Phil. 4, 3, before the close of the first century addressed a letter of advice to Corinth, to heal the division which had broken out there, about the office of ruler in the Church. "Rulers in the Church," he declares,<sup>78</sup> "are of divine institution and therefore they ought not to be arbitrarily deposed." He distinguishes three offices in the Church; the Apostles and their successors, the priests or overseers and the deacons.<sup>79</sup> The High-priest has his own special position, to the priests their proper place is assigned and the levites have their duties.<sup>80</sup>

St. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, by birth an Oriental, lived in the last half of the 2nd century. "The tradition of the Apostles we can distinguish," he says,<sup>81</sup> "for we are in a position to number those who were placed as bishops, in their churches by the Apostles and their successors down to our time." They are the channels of tradition from the Apostles down to us: in the Church, God placed apostles, prophets and teachers and he endowed her with the virtue of the Holy Ghost; in this those have no share who fly not to the Church but defraud themselves of life by wicked thoughts and unruly conduct. For where the Church is, there is the spirit of God, where the spirit of God is there is the Church and every grace.<sup>82</sup> "Therefore every one must listen to the priests (bishops), who are in the Church, to those who in the way pointed out enjoy the succession of the Apostles, who with the succession to the Episcopal dignity, by the will of God the Father possess the sure gift of the truth."<sup>83</sup>

Tertullian (towards the end of the second century) writes in Africa: "The right to administer baptism belongs to the chief priest who is the bishop: after him to the priests and deacons, but not without the authorization of the bishop."<sup>84</sup> The distinguishing test of a true Apostolic Church is the succession of the bishops from the Apostles; the bishops are the transmitters of the Apostolic seed.<sup>85</sup> To them it belongs to attest the apostolic character of the holy Scriptures,<sup>86</sup> as it is their chief duty to hand down the tradition of the Church.<sup>87</sup>

"The bishop," asserts St. Cyprian, (†258) "is in the Church and the Church is in the bishop."<sup>88</sup> The Church

is built on the bishops and all the action of the Church is directed by these rulers,<sup>89</sup> and this by divine institution.<sup>90</sup> To set up an anti-bishop is to go against the constitution of the Church, against the law of the Gospel, against the unity of the Catholic hierarchy, is the same as setting up another Church, as tearing asunder the members of Christ."<sup>91</sup> Hence Novatian does not belong to the Church, he cannot be a true bishop; for, in contempt of the evangelical and Apostolic tradition he succeeds no one, but begins from himself.<sup>92</sup> Priests and deacons are inferior to bishops.<sup>93</sup> The power of ordination belongs exclusively to the bishop,<sup>94</sup> hence he is the father of the priests and deacons.<sup>95</sup>

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE AUTHORITY OF THE EPISCOPATE IS LIMITED BY THE PRIMACY.

The college of Bishops therefore succeeds to the college of the Apostles in the government of the Church throughout the whole world. Has every individual bishop this unlimited authority? It is plain, if every individual bishop had the right everywhere to found churches, to ordain priests, to exercise jurisdiction indescribable confusion would ensue. For this reason the Apostles assigned a limited diocese to each bishop.<sup>96</sup> "Feed the flock which is entrusted to you," says St. Peter.<sup>97</sup> From the commencement it was the usage and law of the Church that a bishop should only exercise jurisdiction in his own diocese. But the authority of the bishop was not only confined to certain limits of space, but was also limited in itself. How was this?

In the Episcopate we behold the successor to the Apostolate intended by God. The Episcopate therefore cannot receive or hold authority in the Church in a higher and more exalted degree than the Apostles received it by the foundation words of our Lord. How did they receive it?

In answer to this question we will quote a celebrated theologian.<sup>98</sup> "Look, said the Lord to Moses, and make it according to the pattern, that was shown thee in the mount."<sup>99</sup> This was addressed to Moses when he was about to construct the tabernacle. But St. Paul teaches us that

these words of the Lord not only referred to the temple constructed by hand of man, but also to the true temple of God amongst men, the Holy Catholic Church, in which God dwells, the essential outlines of which were determined in heaven. "Holy Father," said our Lord, "keep them in thy name...that they may be one, as we also are<sup>100</sup> one in us."<sup>101</sup> O my divine Saviour, I comprehend thee: Thy Church shall be beautiful and therefore *before everything she must be one*. Nothing is so beautiful as the divine nature: in it the number itself by which we distinguish the relations of the three divine Persons is comprised in perfect unity. After the divine nature nothing is beautiful as the Church, the copy of divine unity.

Let us descend and compare the unity and beauty of the choirs of Angels. The Angels do not strive against submission to the Archangels, nor the Archangels against submission to the higher Powers. "If the beauty of order alone," says St. Gregory the Great,<sup>102</sup> "demands so much obedience where no sin exists, with how much more reason ought we to practice obedience and subjection, for without them sin would soon throw everything into confusion. But sin is in our midst: pride rules over us, and arms one man against another. The Church carries in her womb the imperishable seed of division, the pride which she never ceases to combat in her children: how could she preserve her undying beauty or true unity, if she did not possess the means to strengthen her unity when threatened by schisms?"

The unity of the Church is a great mystery. Within united by the Holy Ghost, for her external unity she possesses a point of union and is held united by a government which represents the authority of Jesus Christ. *Unity preserves unity*, under the seal of the Church government the unity of the spirit is preserved. What manner of government is this? What is its form?

When Jesus began to found the mystery of unity in his Church, from the body of his disciples he chose twelve: when he completed it, from the twelve he chose one. When he began to found it, he said to many: "Go and teach. I send you:"<sup>103</sup> but when he completed the mystery

he spoke no longer to many: he singled out Peter personally by the new name he had given him. *One alone spoke to one alone*: Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to Simon, the Son of Jonas: Jesus Christ the true rock, strong with His own strength, to Simon who is the rock, but strong only with the strength which Jesus gave him. To him Christ spoke and as He spoke to him, He stamped upon him the character of His strength. And I, He said, say to thee thou art Peter, that is, *rock* and upon this rock, He added, I will build My Church; and He continues, the gates of hell shall never prevail against her.<sup>104</sup>

And to prepare him for this high office, Christ, Who knew that faith in Himself was the foundation of the Church, inspired him with a faith worthy to be the foundation of this wonderful edifice. "Thou art Christ the Son of the living God."<sup>105</sup> The word of Christ which is mighty to create what He wills out of nothing bestowed this strength on a mortal man. And his office does not die with him; the foundation of a Church which is to last for ever can never know an end. Peter will live for ever in his successors, Peter will always teach from his chair.

Jesus Christ continued: "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"<sup>106</sup> the keys which symbolize the authority of a ruler. "What thou shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and what thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." All are subject to thy keys, kings, and nations, the shepherds and their flocks. To Peter was first given the command 'to love more than the other Apostles' and then to be the shepherd and rule all 'the lambs and the sheep'<sup>107</sup> the little ones and their dams and the shepherds; shepherds to their flocks, but sheep in presence of Peter: they honour Jesus Christ in him and thus confess that with justice a greater love is required from him, because he bears a greater dignity and burden.

We have seen unity in the chair of Peter. Now let us see it in the entire ordering and in the College of the Bishops. This too appears in Peter: and in the words, "whatsoever thou shalt bind shall be bound, whatsoever thou shalt loose shall be loosed." These sublime words, which so clearly contain the primacy of St. Peter, established the Episcopate, because the virtue of their office lies in the right

to loose those who yield belief to their words or to bind those who refuse belief. Thus the power to bind and to loose is a necessary appendage and the last seal on the office of preaching which Christ entrusted to them; and we may see here the entire ordering of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Hence He Who had said to Peter "whatsoever thou shalt bind shall be bound and whatsoever thou shalt loose shall be loosed" had said the same to the Apostles, and further He said to them: "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven and whose sins you shall retain they are retained." He breathed on all alike and by this breathing communicated to all the Holy Ghost "Receive ye the Holy Ghost,"<sup>108</sup>

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE RELATION OF THE EPISCOPATE TO THE PRIMACY.

The plan of our Lord is plain: He *would give to one* what He intended in the sequel to give to many; but the after-gift does not annul the first and the first gift remains in force. The word "whatsoever thou shalt bind" spoken to one had already made subjects of His authority each of those to whom He was to say "whose sins you shall forgive." For God no more repents of His promises than of His gifts; and independently, the authority which is common to many is limited by this very participation, whereas the authority given to one and over all *knows no other limits than those which the law prescribes*. Hence the plenitude of Apostolic authority belongs to St. Peter.

Now we are in a position to understand the mystery. All receive the same authority, but not all in the *same degree* or to the *same extent*. For Jesus Christ imparts Himself in what measure it pleases Him and in the way best adapted to secure the unity of the Church. For this reason He begins with the highest and in the highest He constructs the whole and He Himself develops in a well-ordered way what He had placed in *one alone*. St. Peter, says St. Augustine, who by reason of his primacy represents the whole Church, on that account first and singly receives the keys which were to be given to the other Apostles later.

From the above it follows :

1. Bishops are not the successors of the Apostles, in as far as the Apostles were extraordinary instruments of Christ and His revelation, and as such adorned with special charismata. In this capacity they had no successors and could have none. But they are the successors of the Apostles, in as much as they were the first pastors, teachers and preachers in the Church.

2. The College of Bishops, which includes in itself the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, succeeds the College of the Apostles, to which St. Peter belonged, in the full authority of the apostolical office. Individual Bishops however do not succeed to the authority of individual Apostles over the universal Church, but only over some particular church which some individual Apostle may have selected to rule.

3. Individual Bishops succeed the Apostles in the government of particular churches, but the bishop of Rome succeeds him to whose rule our Lord confided all, that is, to St. Peter, in the government of the universal Church. Individual bishops succeed the Apostles as far as the latter were the foundation of particular churches; the Bishop of Rome succeeds St. Peter who is the foundation of the universal Church.

4. Individual Bishops succeed the Apostles, in their dependence on the Bishop of Rome, as the Apostles held their authority with dependence on St. Peter.

5. Individual Bishops succeed the Apostles as branches, which if separated from the trunk, wither; as members which, if separated from the head, die. The Bishop of Rome succeeds the Apostle St. Peter as the root from which the unity of priestly authority has grown; which therefore cannot wither; as the head, which is essential to the life of the members and therefore cannot die.<sup>109</sup>

In this manner was authority in the Church established by Jesus Christ; the Episcopate in the Apostolate; and as the Apostolate gathered round its centre of unity, Peter: so the Episcopate maintains communion with the principle of its unity, the Chair of St.



Peter. The multitude of those who hold office looks up to the centre of unity and submits to him: unity develops itself and acts in a multitude of instruments. The strength and beauty of the Church, the mystical body of Christ lie in this symmetry, in the well-balanced relations of the head to the members and of the members to the head. The Vatican Council says: 'that the Episcopate might be united and undivided, and that the body of the faithful might be preserved in unity of faith and communion by the bishops, mutually bound together amongst themselves, Christ placed St. Peter over the other apostles and constituted him the enduring principle and the visible foundation of this two-fold unity, that the eternal temple might rise on its strength, and the glorious edifice of the Church might reach to heaven on the firmness of this faith.' This leads us to a closer examination of the Primacy of the Roman Pope, its object, and its essential conditions. We raise three questions.

*Did St. Peter receive from our Lord a Primacy among the Apostles?*

*Must we consider the Primacy of St. Peter as a merely personal privilege, or a permanent office in the Church?*

*Wherein lies the essence and the significancy of the Primacy?*

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PRIMACY.

Did Peter receive a Primacy among the Apostles from our Lord? Let us examine the Gospel narrative. And Jesus came into the confines of Cæsarea Philippi and He asked His disciples saying: Whom do men say that the Son of Man is? And they said: Some say that Thou art John the Baptist, and others Elias, and others Jeremias or one of the prophets. He saith to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answering said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering, said to him: Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but My Father Who is in heaven. And I say to thee: *That thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell*

*shall not prevail against it.* And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven : And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.<sup>110</sup>

In this text Christ speaks for the first time of His Church ; for the first time of the authority which is to be exercised in the Church when He shall have gone. To distinguish clearly and plainly the place of St. Peter in the Church and the relation of the Church to St. Peter, St. Peter is represented as the foundation of the Church, the bearer of its keys, in close and immediate connection with the establishment, the stability and the continuance of the Church. Observe, remarks St. John Chrysostom,<sup>111</sup> explaining this passage, how Christ manifests Himself and by these two promises shows Himself to be the Son of God. For He promises what God alone could give, power to remit sins, to preserve the Church amidst the fury of the waves ; and to grant to a fisherman in spite of the pressure of the world greater firmness than that of the rocks. When our Lord founded the Church, says St. Cyrill of Alexandria,<sup>112</sup> and promised her indefectibility, He revealed Himself as the Lord of the powers. And this He did, when He placed St. Peter over her.

When at the turning point of the close of the public life of our Lord and His approaching passion, St. Peter made his confession, that Christ was the Son of the living God, Christ rewarded Him by four promises closely connected with each other, of an authority to be confided to him hereafter and of a pre-eminence in the Church. In the first place he was to be the rock on which Christ would build His Church : secondly, the Church built on this rock was never to be prevailed against : thirdly, He promised to give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven : and lastly, whatever he bound or loosed upon earth was to be bound or loosed in heaven.

---

## CHAPTER X.

PETER THE FOUNDATION-STONE OF THE CHURCH  
AND THE BEARER OF THE KEYS.

What meaning are we to attach to the words, Peter, Rock, Power of the keys?

When Simon, the son of Jonas, was taken by St. Andrew to our Lord He looked upon him and said: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas, thou shalt be called Cephas, that is, Rock."<sup>113</sup> In ancient times names had their signification and pointed to realities: a change of name implied a new rank, a new dignity.<sup>114</sup> It was the will of our Lord to call Simon by the name *Petra*, *Petrus*, for He intended to build His Church upon him.<sup>115</sup> He was called Peter and the foundation of the Church was confided to him.<sup>116</sup> "Through the pre-eminence granted to him by Christ he is a firm and immovable rock on which our Saviour built His Church."<sup>117</sup> On this occasion Jesus bestowed on Simon the name of Peter, because he had destined him the ardent rock-like man to be the corner-stone of His Church, the prince of the Apostles and the father of the faithful. And in consequence of this appointment Peter is seen at the head of the disciples throughout the whole Gospel. There is no question here of a *primus inter pares*, the first amongst equals: he is the first, as Iscariot was the last. His special pre-eminence above the others is expressed in Scripture by referring to the twelve with a nominal distinction of one from the others in the expression "Peter and the Apostles." In the same way St. Mathew (10, 2) distinctly calls him "the first, Simon the first."<sup>118</sup> We shall appreciate the full importance of these quotations if we remember what Origen<sup>119</sup> impresses upon us, viz, that every word in holy Scripture, which is generally so concise, is literally true and of the greatest significance.

Peter was destined to be the foundation and protector of the Church of the new Testament. Unity is the fundamental law of Christianity and cannot be separated from it. As the unity of God requires unity of faith and of the Sacraments, so provision had to be made for the unity of the hierarchy in the visible kingdom of God on Earth, in order to maintain unity of dogma, unity of the

Sacraments and unity of worship. For this object Jesus appointed Simon Peter to be the head and His Vicar.<sup>120</sup>

“Peter alone spoke on this occasion ; the other Apostles had not given him any commission to speak : he rose above them by the faith granted to him by the heavenly Father. On account of this rock-like faith he became the foundation of the Church, which Christ had previously compared to an edifice. And now Simon Barjona came to understand why our Lord at the beginning had given him the name of Cephas, Rock. Not upon his confession, but on the man himself, with his rock-like character on account of his confession, the Church was built : being made up of persons, living beings, she required and will ever require a living foundation, a personality. As the edifice of the Church was to last for all time, this privilege of Peter, in virtue of which everything in the Church was to depend on him as its foundation, naturally passed to others after him by succession. To the Church so sustained Christ granted indefectibility ; in consequence of her foundation on Peter the powers of death and hell cannot prevail against her.”<sup>121</sup>

On Peter therefore the Church is founded ;<sup>122</sup> on Peter alone Christ built His Church ;<sup>123</sup> by the institution of Christ and the special protection of His spirit Peter is the corner-stone on which the Church rests, into whom all the faithful, pastors and flocks, are built ; if he fails not, the Church can never fail. Does he who separates himself from the Chair of Peter, on whom the Church is built, flatter himself that he is in the Church?<sup>124</sup> Where Peter, the corner-stone, is, there is the Church built on this corner-stone.<sup>125</sup>

“The temple of the Old Testament,” says the Protestant Olshausen,<sup>126</sup> “was modelled as a copy of the Church. The Church, a spiritual structure, can naturally only rest on a spiritual foundation. Peter in his interior, new, spiritual personality appears amongst men as the supporter of the great work of Christ. . . . The ordinary interpretation of this text, as opposed by Protestants to the Catholic one, viz, that the faith and confession of St. Peter are the rock, is quite correct : only we must not separate the faith and confession of St. Peter from his person : he is one with them, only not with the old Simon, but with the new Peter.” These words of Christ, Schelling<sup>127</sup> acknowledges, are decisive in

favour of the Primacy of St. Peter among the Apostles : the blindness of party spirit is required to reject the evidence of these words or to attach any other meaning to them.

If some of the holy Fathers understood the words "on this rock, &c." of the confession of the divinity of Christ, or of the person of Christ, or of the Apostles in general, they did so under special circumstances and in a wider, oratorical, moralistic application, but not to the exclusion of the natural and literal sense. The confession and the faith of St. Peter are in truth the corner-stone of the Church, but not taken apart from the person of Peter who makes the confession : for the confession and the faith have no existence except in the person who makes the confession and the act of faith.<sup>128</sup> Christ is the invisible corner-stone of the Church,<sup>129</sup> through Whom Peter is made the corner-stone, precisely because of his confession of Christ. The Apostles too are corner-stones of the Church<sup>130</sup> by their preaching of the faith ; but not independently, only in union with St. Peter.

*And the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.*

In the patriarchal age judgment was given at the gates of the city, hence the gates came to signify power, authority. Hades, the dwelling-place of the powers of darkness and destruction is often represented as a palace with strong bars to show their exclusiveness and the strength of their might : this war-palace stood over against the holy Temple of God,<sup>131</sup> and is represented as assailing it with its forces yet never prevailing : for against Hell Heaven contends. By the gates of hell the Fathers understand heresies and all powers hostile to the Church : for death comes by sin and Satan is the lord of death,<sup>132</sup>

*And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven.*

"Continuing the same metaphor, the Lord of the Temple names Peter its guardian. He received the keys of the Temple with authority to use them, to admit into it, or to exclude from it. The keys are the symbol of the high priesthood."<sup>133</sup> These words after those of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament are among the most significant and striking, spoken by Jesus during His whole

public life. In the keys is contained the whole legislative authority of the head of the Church, the right to decide in matters of faith and to bind and oblige the faithful on earth in conscience by his decrees, or to release them from the same: in one word, the whole plenitude of the power to command and to absolve is expressed in the keys. In the keys is founded the authority of the head of the Church to admit any one into the temple of the Church, to cut any one off from its communion, the plenitude of power as regards communion or excommunication and interdict. They are the keys of the house of David; from them the unlimited judicial and administrative authority of the Church flows of itself. This event took place, as St. Luke tells us (9, 18), "as He was alone praying, His disciples also were with Him," that is, after He had invoked the grace of His heavenly Father on His Apostles. Whenever our divine Saviour is about to decide something of importance for the establishment of God's kingdom on earth, we observe He turns to His heavenly Father in prayer.<sup>134</sup> He is the highest bearer of the keys;<sup>135</sup> from Him St. Peter receives them: the authority belongs to Him, but it becomes the authority of St. Peter when transferred to him.

With the power of the keys the administration of the riches and treasures of the house is made over to him; in virtue of this power in the guardianship or withdrawal of these riches, the means of salvation in the Church, he may loose or bind on earth so that his acts are recognised in heaven.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

PETER THE CONFIRMER OF THE FAITH OF HIS BRETHREN.

Let us proceed to the second text in our proof.

Before our Lord was separated from His disciples He foretold them the dangers which threatened them and their faith. In the presence of all He turned to St. Peter and said: *Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not. And thou on the contrary<sup>136</sup> confirm thy*

*brethren.* St. Leo<sup>137</sup> explains, "The danger of being tempted by fear hung over all the Apostles and all alike stood in need of the help of the divine protection, because the devil wanted to tempt all of them and to ruin them : still our Lord shows a particular concern for St. Peter and prays especially for the faith of Peter, as though the condition of the others would be more secure, if the soul of the Prince of the Apostles were unconquered. In Peter therefore the strength of all was strengthened, and the aid of divine grace was so assigned that the strength which was granted to St. Peter through Christ was conveyed through Peter to the Apostles."<sup>138</sup> "He first," writes St. Chrysostom,<sup>139</sup> "exercised his authority, for to him Christ said and do thou once again confirm thy brethren."

St. Peter on this occasion was declared to be the guardian of the faith, his voice the seal of doctrine : "From him all the disciples, all the communities of Christendom received the faith and whatever higher revealed truth they possess they derived from him : to his Chair, all how far so-ever they may have wandered in their religious instructions must turn to ask at his hands the renewal of their faith."<sup>140</sup> The Chair of St. Peter must ever remain the abode of truth, the strong fortress of faith capable of protecting all ; for the words of our Lord no less than His precepts were not for an individual person, intended for the actual moment only, they were intended to lay a foundation, to erect an edifice, they were intended above all for the Church and all her future needs as He foresaw them. On that occasion, with His foreknowledge stretching to the end of time He prayed for the unity of the members of the Church, that their unity might be an ever speaking witness of His divine mission.<sup>141</sup>

When our Lord prayed that His disciples might be one,<sup>142</sup> He prayed for the unity of the Church : when He promised to be with His Apostles by His special assistance, He promised this assistance to their successors to the end of time :<sup>143</sup> when He pointed out St. Peter as the confirmer of the faith of his brethren, He pointed out not merely St. Peter personally, but his successors also, to whom He entrusted the same duty. "St. Peter," says Bossuet,<sup>144</sup> "received the charge to confirm his brethren :

who were these brethren? The Apostles, the pillars of the Church: how much more the centuries which followed." Here then the order for the Church of ages was drawn out and firmly established: the prayer of our Lord is always heard.<sup>145</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### PETER THE SHEPHERD OF THE WHOLE FLOCK.

What our Lord promised to St. Peter after his confession of faith, He actually conferred upon him after His resurrection. 'When therefore they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter: Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these. He saith to Him: Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him: *Feed My lambs*. He saith to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? He saith to Him: Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith to him: *Feed My lambs*. He saith to him the third time: Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved because He said to him the third time, Lovest thou Me? And he said to Him: Lord, Thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love Thee. He said to him: *Feed my sheep!*<sup>146</sup>

As he stood above the other disciples by his faith, and thus was to be the foundation of the Church rather than any one of them, so it was fitting that he should be distinguished by a very special love for his Lord and on that account receive a special commission and a very special office. As on the occasion of the promise of the Primacy, so when He actually conferred it our Lord addressed St. Peter in solemn words, distinguishing him from the others. By his triple assertion of love St. Peter was to atone for his triple denial. Twice the lambs were confided to his care; the third time the sheep too were confided to him: that is, the high and the low, the faithful and their rulers. 'To the whole Church, to the Apostles, was given a supreme pastor, one taking the place of our Lord, a head to rule all.'<sup>147</sup> 'Why,' asks St. John Chrysostom, 'does He address him and pass over the others?'



He was distinguished among the Apostles, the mouth-piece of the disciples: for this reason St. Paul went to see him rather than the others.<sup>148</sup> He showed him at the same time that He could now trust him and overlooking his denial, He gave him the headship over his brothers. He says: If thou lovest Me undertake the office of ruler and preserve that ardent love, thou hast ever shown. Thrice He puts the question, and thrice He gives him the same charge, in order to show, how much He esteemed the care of His sheep." "Our Lord set up St. Peter to be the teacher of the whole world, He entrusted to him the care of the whole world (He did not name him like St. James to be the bishop of a single city)."<sup>149</sup> St. Peter therefore received the world as his charge, as a shepherd might take a flock, when he heard the words, Feed My sheep: and our Lord gave him in place of Himself to be the father, shepherd and teacher of all who were to believe in Him.<sup>150</sup> 'To whom amongst the Apostles,' asks St. Bernard,<sup>151</sup> 'are all the sheep entrusted without exception or distinction?' Feed My sheep. What sheep? Those of such a city, or nation, or kingdom? My sheep, He says. None are excepted, where no distinction is made.<sup>152</sup>

---

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### THE AUTHORITY OF THE APOSTLES SUBORDINATE TO THAT OF PETER.

After the Ascension of our Lord, St. Peter steps forward at once, fills up the number of the Apostles, preaches to the people,<sup>153</sup> works the first miracle,<sup>154</sup> first appears before the Sanhedrim,<sup>155</sup> holds the first visitation of the churches<sup>156</sup> and, after a special revelation, first carries the Gospel to the Gentile.<sup>157</sup> He presides in the Council of Jerusalem,<sup>158</sup> excommunicates Simon the first heretic,<sup>159</sup> always stands first in the list of the Apostles<sup>160</sup> and is expressly styled the first.<sup>161</sup> He approved the writings of St. Paul,<sup>162</sup> St. Paul hastens to him to receive from him the seal of Church communion.<sup>163</sup> To Jerusalem the great St. Paul, returned from the third heaven, went to see St. Peter not St. James the great Apostle, brother of our Lord, bishop of Jerusalem,

surnamed the Just, honoured by Jews and Gentiles alike ; not St. James, but St. Peter he went to see, to see according to the forcible expression of Scripture, as one goes to see something wonderful, something worthy of a visit : to *see* him, not to be taught by him, for he had been taught by Jesus Christ Himself in an extraordinary revelation : but to give an example to after ages, that all might understand however holy, however learned a man may be, even were he a second St. Paul, he must see St. Peter.<sup>164</sup> Peter is uniformly described in the Gospels, as close to the side of Jesus, as the one who speaks for the others to Him, in a way no other Apostle did. All the important moments in the life of Jesus appear in a certain relation to him and to him alone. By the command of our Lord to him the Resurrection was especially announced;<sup>165</sup> only his failings and humiliations are recounted in the history of the New Testament ; and while it recounts the strength of his faith and his love, it carefully depicts the depth of his fall. To no other did Jesus devote so much care in instruction and formation, to no other did He first of all communicate<sup>166</sup> so many matters of importance, to no other did He foretell his martyrdom, at the very time He raised him to the highest dignity. Even in the manner of his death St. Peter resembled his divine Master.<sup>167</sup>

We may consider it established : that St. Peter is the foundation, the chief pastor, and teacher of the Church of Christ. The objections to this conclusion are not of consequence. The dispute between the disciples, as to who amongst them was the greater, pre-supposes some order of precedence among them ; the very example of our Lord Who though their Master takes the place of their servant, is a reminder of the nature of ecclesiastical authority and its higher ends.<sup>168</sup> If St. Paul<sup>169</sup> blames St. Peter for the manner and way in which he had spared the prejudices of the Jewish Christians, his conduct is no denial of the Primacy of St. Peter ; it is rather a fraternal correction (of one Apostle by another) and to oppose a superior under certain circumstances is not only a right, it may become a duty.<sup>170</sup> This fact is rather a proof of the Primacy of St. Peter ; precisely on account of his high position such a compromise was dangerous. "Though St. Peter was

imitated in his conduct by St. James, St. Paul did not blame St. James, but he blamed St. Peter, because the government of the Church was confided to him."<sup>171</sup> The mission of St. Peter and St. John to Samaria is no objection either; it rather proves his place in the Church. The churches in Asia sent their bishops,<sup>172</sup> the Jews their high priests.<sup>173</sup>

The authority which our Lord conferred on St. Peter includes a true jurisdiction over the Universal Church and cannot be restricted to a mere precedence of rank or the right of inspection.<sup>174</sup> St. Peter is for the spiritual Temple of the visible Church, what the foundation is to a material edifice: it *rests on him*, and he *maintains it* in its position: he is not merely the crowning piece, the keystone, he is the basis, the corner-stone.<sup>175</sup> The symbol of the keys has no meaning, unless he is the supreme guardian of the temple of God, who shuts and no one opens, with the highest, truest authority, dependent on none save Christ. The authority of pastor in its full sense requires that St. Peter should wield the highest power in the kingdom of God and all, high and low, owe him obedience.

It is true our Lord said to the other Apostles 'whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven.'<sup>176</sup> But He spoke these words to them associated with St. Peter, they receive this power therefore only *in unity* with St. Peter; they cannot bind what he looses, they cannot loose what he binds. They hold their authority therefore with dependence on him, to whom singly the keys were given. St. Peter alone received the keys of the Church; to him the Universal Church as a well-guarded, closed house was entrusted; to him alone in the last resort was confided the authority to admit into the house or to exclude from it, as the keys of a house or a city must always be left in the keeping of one, though others may have keys of portions of the house.<sup>177</sup> St. Peter on the contrary exercises the authority of the keys from himself alone, and not with dependence on the others; no one can loose what he binds, no one can bind what he looses. 'For the establishment of unity St. Peter was found worthy to be placed over the other Apostles, he alone received the keys of the kingdom, to share them with the others,'<sup>178</sup> because

he alone, and the first answered, Thou art Christ,<sup>179</sup> the Son of the living God.'

Considered from this point of view the constitution of the Church established by Jesus Christ was *monarchical*.<sup>180</sup> But this monarchy is distinguished from the monarchies of the world in three respects. It is not a monarchy in the sense that the authority of the head of the Church is the only one in the Church, which absorbs every other : his is the *highest* authority, but it is not the *only* one, for bishops too were instituted by the Holy Ghost, to rule the Church in union with the Pope and in subordination to him.<sup>181</sup> Secondly, the authority of the head determined by the limits which Christ had laid down by His words, His laws and His institutions was exercised as became 'ministers and dispensers.'<sup>182</sup> Lastly, this authority was not exercised after the fashion of worldly power, but in humility<sup>183</sup> and love, chiefly by the word and by the example of the pastors themselves.<sup>184</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

THE AUTHORITY OF PETER WAS CONFERRED IMMEDIATELY BY OUR LORD AND NOT BY THE CHURCH.

What is true of office in the Church generally is true in a higher degree of the plenitude of authority in St. Peter. Christ did not commit the keys to the congregation,<sup>185</sup> not to the Universal Church, in order that they might exercise their authority through the Apostle St. Peter and his successors : on the contrary they were handed immediately, directly, and formally to St. Peter: they were given to St. Peter for the Church and for the benefit of the Church.<sup>186</sup> Our Lord addresses him alone, to him alone He gives a new name, him alone He pronounces blessed because of the revelation vouchsafed to him by the Father, him alone He questions whether he loves Him and whether he loves Him more than the others, him He singles out from the other Apostles to confirm their faith.<sup>187</sup> St. Peter did not make his confession of Christ in the name or by the commission of the Apostles : he did not deny Him in the name of the others ; neither did he receive the keys in the name of the Apostles. To be sure he does in

a certain sense represent the Church; but it is as the head represents the body, the father the family, the king his kingdom, but not as the plenipotentiary or agent of the Apostles or the faithful.<sup>188</sup> The Church was not yet founded, when St. Peter was named its head: it was to be built by him and on him. The Church received the power to bind and to loose in the person of St. Peter;<sup>189</sup> to St. Peter the keys were given and through St. Peter to the Church.<sup>190</sup>

To the apostle St. Peter then the stronghold of the priesthood was entrusted by the word of the Lord, in him the Apostolate and the Episcopate had their origin. As there is only one God, one Christ, one Church, so is there only one Chair raised on St. Peter by the word of our Lord.<sup>191</sup> Our Lord certainly intended to confide their sacred office to all the Apostles, but in such a manner and way that He confided it principally to St. Peter, the highest of the Apostles,<sup>192</sup> so that though all received the same vocation, to one it was given to hold precedence over the others.<sup>193</sup> Hence all, individually and collectively, are subject to his jurisdiction.

“If any one therefore shall say that Blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed the Prince of all the Apostles and the visible Head of the whole Church Militant, or that he directly and immediately received from Our Lord Jesus Christ a Primacy of honour only and not of true and proper jurisdiction; let him be anathema.” (Conc. Vatic. Sess. 4. c. 1.)

---

## CHAPTER XV.

### THE PERMANENCY OF THE PRIMACY IN THE CHURCH.

We proceed now to the second question.

*Is the primacy of St. Peter a merely personal privilege, or is it a permanent office in the Church?*

St. Leo shall answer. What was established by the Eternal Truth remains and St. Peter constant in the rock-like firmness granted to him, has never abandoned the rudder of the Church which he took in hand,<sup>194</sup> and he will never cease to occupy his chair. So that in his successors he still lives, and rules and governs the Church.<sup>195</sup>

Christ came on earth to gather what was scattered, to unite what was divided that all might be one as He is one with the Father. 'Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one as We also are....And not for them only do I pray but for those also who through their word shall believe in Me that they all may be one....and the glory which Thou hast given Me, I have given to them that they may be one as We also are one.'<sup>196</sup> The model therefore of our unity is God Himself and Christ, who is one with His Father: all who are born again by holy Baptism, are citizens of the one kingdom, children of the one head of the family, members of the one mystical body of Christ.<sup>197</sup> The very name *Church* St. Chrysostom<sup>198</sup> says points to unity and concord.

This prayer of our Lord decides the nature and the future of the Church; it will avail not only the Apostles whose days were numbered but all others who are to believe in Him through the course of centuries: for the Church will abide to the end and gather children to herself from every nation. These words therefore contain, establish and preserve the fundamental constitution of the Church, her unity, which is the mark of the divine mission of Jesus Christ.<sup>199</sup> "On St. Peter," says St. Cyprian, "our Lord built His Church. For this reason there is only one Baptism, one spirit, one Church, built by Christ our Lord on St. Peter, according to its origin and constitution." Our Lord said to St. Peter: Thou art Peter, that is, rock, and on this rock I will build My Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven. Again: after His resurrection He said to him: Feed my sheep. On that one apostle he builds His Church and charges him to feed His sheep. And though after His Resurrection He gives His Apostles equal authority and says 'as the Father hath sent Me, so I send you': still to show clearly the unity He appointed one chair and by His authority so determined the origin of this unity that it should proceed from one. Certainly the other Apostles were what St. Peter was, adorned with an equal share in honour and power, but the beginning dates from a unity, that the Church may be seen as one.

He who does not preserve this unity, does he think that he preserves the faith?..... In the same way the Episcopate is only one (by its subordination to the origin of unity): individuals possess it in solidarity with the whole body.<sup>200</sup> In the same way the Church is one and she in ever increasing fruitfulness extends her sway. As the sun sends out many rays but there is only one light, as the tree puts forth many branches, but there is only one trunk which springs from the strong root, as many streams flow from one source, so is unity preserved in the origin; so in the Church there is only one head, one origin, and one mother of a numerous posterity.<sup>201</sup> This Primacy descends to St. Peter's successors; the Church of Rome is therefore 'locus Petri,' 'Cathedra Petri,' the seat of Peter, the Chair of Peter.<sup>202</sup>

St. Optatus of Miletus<sup>203</sup> (†371) speaks the same language as St. Cyprian: "For the sake of unity St. Peter was found worthy to be preferred to all the Apostles: he alone received the keys to hold them in communion with the others." "You cannot deny," he urged against Parmenian, the Donatist, "that to Peter as the first, the bishop's chair in the city of Rome was reserved. Through this one Chair unity was to be maintained above all and the other Apostles did not each for himself pretend to set up a separate chair, for it would have been already a schism and a crime to have erected another chair in opposition to this one existing Chair." St. Jerome, (†420)<sup>204</sup> repeats the same language. "From the twelve one was chosen that by the appointment of a head every occasion to schism might be removed." According to St. Augustine St. Peter was the principle of unity in the Church, and hence what he received the whole Church received in him and through him.<sup>205</sup> St. Gregory of Nyssa;<sup>206</sup> "Our Lord gave to bishops the keys of the kingdom of heaven through St. Peter." The Fathers of the Council of Aquileia confess: "The rights of venerable communion are derived from that Chair."<sup>207</sup> "Here we have the origin of the dignity and all the importance of the name of Bishop."<sup>208</sup> Thus the Chair of St. Peter as the visible instrumental cause and vivifying principle produces and maintains the visible unity of the Church: invisibly Christ by His grace causes this unity.<sup>209</sup> Whoever separates

himself from that Chair, separates himself from Christ and His Church.<sup>210</sup> Individual churches did not in the course of ages one after the other enter the Universal Church; no, the Church extended herself from a visible centre and principle of unity established by Jesus Christ Himself, in unbroken communion with the centre, one therefore in all times and places, because always held in unity by the centre. The plan and the work of Christ in the foundation and development of the Church were precisely the contrary of what the modern Protestant school imagines.<sup>211</sup> Whereas Protestantism in its early days saw in the Papacy the work of the devil and Antichrist,<sup>212</sup> or at least an insufferable usurpation, latterly it allows it a certain justification, inasmuch as it recognizes it to be the result of an evolution of many centuries. But this is not the fact. The Primacy of St. Peter is the foundation and the corner-stone on which the visible Church of the New Testament was raised, which upholds it, keeps it standing and supports it, not merely as we have already said its key-stone or coping-stone. The outward visible unity of the Chair of St. Peter it is which shapes and keeps together the outward visible Church, one grand united whole: all authority in the Church exists only in unity with his Chair. ‘Heretics,’ says St. Optatus of Miletus, ‘have not the keys: only St. Peter received them.’<sup>213</sup> Before the Church was founded, nay, before the bloody sacrifice on the cross was offered up, the corner-stone for the one Church was already chosen, the bearer of the keys, the visible head of the kingdom of Christ was already designated: before the faithful were gathered from the nations, to be entrusted to his care, the supreme pastor had been appointed. ‘Christ shed His blood,’ says St. Chrysostom,<sup>214</sup> ‘to purchase those sheep, the care of whom He confided to St. Peter as His successor.’ From that time the teachers and the pastors as well as the lay faithful were bound in unity in St. Peter: the Church extended herself in ever widening circles, from the centre and the centre of gravity which reaches every point, sustains all and holds all together, the root in which the tree of the Church is firmly fixed, still the body of the faithful is seen as one people, united to the Priesthood, one flock depending on its pastor.<sup>215</sup>



The authority 'which Christ first gave to St. Peter, on whom He built His Church and in whom He established and represented the origin of its unity'<sup>216</sup> must endure as long as its end and object endure, viz, the establishment and preservation of unity in the Church and through this unity the preservation of the Church itself. The authority and the Church must both last to the end of time. Hence by necessity follows the *permanence of the Primacy* for all time. The authority of St. Peter like that of the Apostles, was given to him in and for the Church, it was not given to him merely for himself, but in him to the Church and to the Church through him; so that it did not expire at his death.<sup>217</sup> If the pre-eminence of St. Peter is the foundation of the Church, it must endure as long as the Church endures; if St. Peter is the bearer of the power of the keys, that power must endure as long as the Church stands. If St. Peter is the pastor of the Universal Church of Christ, his pastoral office must extend to all succeeding time and to all the faithful of Christ. By the institution of the Episcopate, a strong principle of unity was given to individual churches: the Universal Church stood much more in need of 'a Bishop of the bishops,'<sup>218</sup> if the visible Church of Our Lord was to be preserved from divisions, if the post-Apostolic age was not to be deprived of what the Apostolic age possessed and the later Church could not do without. For this reason the Primacy cannot be a mere precedence of rank, the head of the Church cannot be merely a *primus inter pares*, the first among equals: he must be *furnished with all the authority* which is necessary for the maintenance of union in the Church, above all he must hold the supreme legislative and judicial authority. For 'the holiness of the Church depends on the dignity of the high-priest, if he does not possess a very special authority, exceeding that of all the others, then we shall see in the Church as many divisions as there are priests.'<sup>219</sup>

The necessity of the Primacy follows therefore from the notion of a One Visible Church, which is ruled by the Episcopate: in it we behold the abiding, living, one *personal* exhibition of the great principle of authority which alone is able to preserve unity in Faith and to guide with a strong

and sure hand the energies of the several orders and members of the vast organization to the one supreme end. Hugo Grotius<sup>220</sup> confesses that without the authority of the Primacy in the Church there can be no end to controversies: and long before, St. Thomas More had justly observed that 'every enemy of Christianity hates the Holy See profoundly and every enemy of Rome sooner or later becomes a traitor to the Christian religion.'<sup>221</sup> The position, says a modern Protestant writer,<sup>222</sup> which our Lord gives to St. Peter is not an arbitrary or merely personal one, it rests on a vital law of the kingdom of God. Every community must be ruled by one person. The Church is subject to this law, like all other human institutions; if she is to be a real community, a living body, she must present a numerical unity and she must have a mouth-piece of that unity.

What the well being of the Church demands and what is a condition of her very existence, our Lord has given her in St. Peter. The word 'thou art Peter,' is a mighty, creative word.<sup>223</sup> Neither the mind of man nor the protection of princes, nor the personal superiority of the successor of St. Peter, nor the force, nor the favour of circumstances gave the Church her foundation, her constitution, her strength. The word of our Lord alone conferred it all.

Hence St. Peter has a successor in the Primacy by *divine right* and by the ordination of Jesus Christ: through his successors, and in his successors 'he sits on his Chair, he continues to live, he presides over the Church, to distribute the truth of faith to those who ask it.'<sup>224</sup> In his successor he is ever present "as the root and womb of Church unity:"<sup>225</sup> "for as that continues which St. Peter believed in Christ, so that continues which Christ established in St. Peter."<sup>226</sup> All that our Lord promised, entrusted or gave to St. Peter, He has promised, entrusted and given to his successors: the plenitude of authority entrusted to St. Peter is by the ordination of Christ in him given immediately to his successors, so that the line of his successors may be considered as the single person of St. Peter, to whom it was said: Feed My sheep.

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

## THE BISHOP OF ROME IS THE SUCCESSOR OF PETER.

Who is the successor of St. Peter ?

The Primacy was inseparably united to his office of Bishop, in the person of St. Peter : his successor therefore as Bishop, would be his heir and would be his successor in the Primacy connected with his office as Bishop. Had St. Peter died Bishop of the Church of Antioch, which he ruled for many years, his successor on the episcopal Chair of Antioch would have been his successor in the Primacy. But that was not to be. St. Peter went to Rome, established and ruled the Church there a certain time and in the end died there a martyr's death. The successor, therefore, of St. Peter on the episcopal Chair at Rome was his lawful successor and through the ordination of Christ possesses the authority of the Primacy.

The presence of St. Peter at Rome is proved from his first Epistle which is written from 'Babylon,'<sup>227</sup> the symbolical name for heathen Rome amongst the Jews and early Christians.<sup>228</sup> St. John points to his martyrdom there :<sup>229</sup> the fact was so well known to the Christians, that the Apostle had only to remind them. St. Clement, the successor of St. Peter on the Chair of Rome, St. Ignatius his successor on that of Antioch, state the fact as previously known to their readers.<sup>230</sup> Papias testifies that St. Mark composed his Gospel at Rome under the direction of St. Peter and that St. Peter wrote his first epistle at Rome.<sup>231</sup> Dionysius of Corinth in the year 170 narrates the death of the two Apostles at Rome and in the year 200 the priest Caius points out the notable monuments at the Vatican and on the road to Ostia.<sup>232</sup> His contemporary Tertullian esteems the Roman Church happy, because the Apostles with their blood had also left to it all their doctrine.<sup>233</sup> That St. Peter laboured in Rome is a fact so perfectly witnessed to, so deeply fixed in the earliest Christian history, that he who rejects it as poetry may reject all ancient history as poetry. No city except Rome has ever made good a claim to the grave of St. Peter.

The Bishop of Rome then, as the one legitimate successor of St. Peter (*ratione Petri*) by *the ordination of Christ and by divine right possesses the Primacy in the Church.*

‘The extraordinary mission of St. Paul expired with him at Rome. For ever connected with the supreme Chair of St. Peter, to which it was from the commencement subordinated, it was destined to lend to the Church of Rome the highest authority and splendour.’<sup>234</sup> The Primacy was not secured to the episcopal Chair of Rome by the greatness and importance of the city, nor by the laws of the Church, nor by the decrees of Councils, nor by the concurrence of favourable circumstances; ‘what St. Peter received from our Lord he handed down to his successors’<sup>235</sup> ‘planted and deeply rooted by God, the privileges of holy Chair cannot be lost: they may be called in question, they cannot be taken away: they may be invaded, they cannot be destroyed.’<sup>236</sup> Perhaps St. Peter was free to choose the Chair on which he was to die; but it was not he who decided that his successor should receive the dignity which had been his: this was regulated by the ordination of Christ which fixed the succession to the Primacy.<sup>237</sup> Rome became the centre of Christian unity, not by force or violence, not by the infamous arts of a selfish and crafty policy, as the world-ruling Rome had brought the nations under her iron rule; the voluntary acknowledgment of the higher precedence, granted by the Lord of the Church Himself gathered Rome and the individual churches within the indissoluble bond of charity and united them all in the visible unity of the Catholic Church.

The choice of Rome as the Primatial Church was providential: ‘St. Peter,’ says St. Leo,<sup>238</sup> ‘the Prince of the Apostolic body, was sent to the stronghold of the Roman Empire, that the light of the truth which had been revealed for the salvation of all nations, might overflow with greater vigour from the head to the whole body.’ Philosophic Greece and its Athens were not chosen to be the centre of the Church: rather practical Rome with its experience of many centuries, the unconquerable energy of the race in play with the development of its history, creating a practical instinct such as never had been seen before. To this purely earthly instinct a higher consecration was communicated by the Paraclete and when it found itself Christianized the government of the Church was confided to it.<sup>239</sup> Rome shared with the individual churches

of the first centuries their noblest and best qualities without their peculiarities and fatal extravagances: she possessed the stern earnestness of the African Church and the churches of Lesser Asia, without falling into their gloomy sectarian fanaticism; like the churches of Lesser Asia she held firmly to the principle of tradition, without carrying it to the length of a rigidity and fixedness which killed the living spirit: with the Church of Alexandria she shared the intellectual activity and the zeal for plunging again and again into the inexhaustible matter of revelation, but from the giddy heights of speculation where the historical realities of Christianity are lost in misty fancies she held aloof and maintained her stand on firm ground. Whatever superiority or remarkable quality was possessed by any individual Church, that was united to the Church of Rome in the bond of union and to this blending of various qualities she was indebted for the happy wedding of the natural character of the Roman and a special gift of grace from the Holy Ghost. The ecclesiastical superiority of Rome is not the work of art, it is nothing fictitious, not the creation of dominion, or of crafty calculation: it is her very being, called into existence by God, her innermost life, and hence the individual churches in voluntary obedience bowed to her. We distinguish in her a wonderful combination of qualities, unmoveable firmness and wise moderation, unconquerable determination and a merciful indulgence, obstinate holding fast to tradition and constant progress, the prudence of the serpent and the simplicity of the dove. She was in this manner qualified to imbue the whole Church with her spirit, and to perfect her on the fundamental principle of unity, as on the other side the separate churches must have felt themselves irresistibly carried along by her power of attraction. We admire the iron endurance with which old Rome with her crafty policy and the bravery of her armies created her world-wide empire: yet Christian Rome presents a far more magnificent spectacle, for she not only overcame old Rome by the heroism of her faith but she established her world-wide empire on the superiority of her Church spirit and the voluntary submission of those who believed.<sup>240</sup>

‘If the Church scattered over the world,’ says St. Gelasius,<sup>241</sup> ‘is the one bride-chamber of the Lord, at the same time the Church of Rome is placed above the other churches not by decrees of Synods; she received the Primacy through the evangelical word of our Lord and Saviour.’ ‘These privileges of the Roman Church,’ writes Nicholas I.<sup>242</sup> ‘are confirmed in St. Peter by the words of Christ and are respected in the Church: they cannot be cut down, they cannot be done away with: they were given by Christ Himself and not by Synods, which acknowledged and honoured them.’

‘By divine ordination,’ the fourth Council of Lateran (1215) declares, ‘did the Roman Church receive the principality of ordinary authority over the others, as Mother and Teacher of all who believe.’ And the second Council of Lyons (1274): ‘The Church of Rome possesses the highest and most perfect primacy and principality over the whole Catholic Church; in truth and humility she confesses she received it from our Lord Himself in St. Peter, the prince or chief of the Apostles whose successor is the Bishop of Rome.’ That of Florence (1439) declares ‘that the holy Apostolic Chair and the Pope of Rome possesses the primacy over the whole world and that this Pope of Rome is the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles and the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church and the Father and Teacher of all Christians and that our Lord Jesus Christ confided to him in St. Peter full authority to be the pastor of the whole Church, to guide and to rule it: as has often been repeated in the proceedings of Œcumenical Councils and the holy Canons.’<sup>243</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### TRADITION.

Tradition to which the last words of the Council of Florence appeal has always claimed this position for the Apostolic Chair at Rome. Still we will allow ourselves an observation on this point. St. Augustine in his dispute with the Donatists called attention to the fact that on the occasion of the appearance of heretical propositions certain

dogmatic questions were examined more closely and received a development. This occurred in the teaching regarding the constitution and authority of the Church. Who does not know that the doctrine regarding the Church has been much more thoroughly sifted since the days of the Reformation than before; this was a natural consequence, for all the points disputed between Catholics and Protestants come back to the doctrine on the Church. In the first ages of Christianity the Church was brought home to the faithful much more directly: her authority, her central position, her infallible teaching, her power reached their consciences more immediately and there was less occasion for reflection and for the separation of the different arguments, especially as the errors of the Novatians, Donatists, &c, did not deny the Church as a visible authoritative institution, as Protestantism afterwards did. We must not be surprised therefore if we do not meet with a perfectly definite and complete account of the constitution of the Church, particularly as the great mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation absorbed all the attention of the Greeks far into the 7th century.

And yet notwithstanding scarcely any other dogma of the Church appears so surely and so clearly founded on tradition as the Primatial authority of the Holy See. In those times when secular authority did not support the Popes, but often in many ways opposed them, they claim to be the head of the collective Episcopate,<sup>244</sup> to whom the charge of the Universal Church was committed as the successors of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles. And the heads of the other Apostolic churches recognise them in this dignity. St. Ignatius of Antioch<sup>245</sup> calls them 'presidents of the communion.' 'The Roman bishop,' according to Tertullian,<sup>246</sup> 'is the Bishop of bishops, in whom all the other bishops are one.' 'The Church of Rome is,' says St. Cyprian,<sup>247</sup> 'the chief, from which the unity of the bishops depends.' To be in communion with the Bishop of Rome implies in St. Cyprian's teaching, to be in communion with the Catholic Church. In the consciousness that he was in union with the Apostolic See, Optatus of Miletus<sup>248</sup> had felt sure that he was in the true faith and the true Church. St. Jerom<sup>249</sup> remains in

communion with the Church of Rome, because he wishes to be with Christ. The precedence (*principatus*) of the Apostolic See in Rome existed from the beginning, says St. Augustine;<sup>250</sup> communion with Rome according to St. Ambrose is the proof that we are in Catholic unity.<sup>251</sup> St. Gregory of Nazianzen († 390) styles Rome the ‘president of the whole body;’<sup>252</sup> whence (St. Ambrose teaches) the rights of the venerable communion are communicated to the other churches.<sup>253</sup>

The Acacians on their return to the Church from schism promised to erase from the diptychs all who were separated from the Church, that is, all those who *refused to follow the Apostolic See in everything.*<sup>254</sup> Roman means *Catholic*, the African bishops banished to Sardinia proclaim in their letter to John and Venerus.<sup>255</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### THE TESTIMONY OF ST. IRENAEUS.

Long before, St. Irenaeus had expressed the same thought with convincing clearness : and he on account of his origin and his being afterwards Bishop of Lyons may be taken to represent both the Greek and the Latin churches. His testimony is the crux of Protestants<sup>256</sup> and of all theologians opposed to Rome. In the presence of Gnosticism and a false system of prophecy, which threatened to break up the Church into fantastic sects it was important to direct the faithful to a reliable and unchangeable *authority*. Such were the Bishops, the successors of the Apostles, from whom they had received their office and with it the deposit of Christian revelation. The handing down of the faith from Bishop to Bishop continues to our day and thus we are able to trace back the true teaching of Christ to its origin, to Christ and the Apostles. And then St. Irenaeus continues : “ But as it would be tedious to enumerate the succession of the Bishops of all the churches, we will mention only the Apostolic tradition of the greatest, the oldest, universally known Church of Rome founded by the Apostles, Saints Peter and Paul, and the faith announced by them to men as it has come down to us through the



succession of her Bishops and in this way put to shame all whoever they may be who think wrongly. For with this Church, on account of her pre-eminent authority, all churches, that is, all the faithful in all places agree, for in it the Apostolic tradition is preserved by the faithful in all parts.'<sup>257</sup> St. Irenaeus maintains 'He who knows the faith of the Church of Rome knows the faith of the Universal Church; for it is the duty of the Universal Church to agree with the Church of Rome.' The pre-eminent authority (*principalitas*) of the Church of Rome is the cause of the unity of faith in the Universal Church, because the faithful everywhere preserve the Apostolic tradition in her, that is, through communion with her, as the centre of unity. The interpretation lately advanced and long since refuted, that the question here is not of agreement between the churches and the Primatial Church of Rome but of the concourse of the faithful to Rome on account of the 'power and pre-eminence of this city, the centre of the civilized world' obviously contradicts the text and the context.<sup>258</sup> Irenaeus does not speak of the city of Rome, but of the *Church* of Rome, not of the faithful who flock there but of the agreement of the churches: if the visitors from afar preserved this Church from error, then she had no 'potior principalitas.' Besides, it is quite inconceivable that strangers flocking from all parts of the world, if they had not already been one in faith, could have established one faith and that Rome which had maintained her tradition regarding the Easter controversy and the re-baptism of heretics so vigorously, would have allowed herself to be instructed by strangers. Or, could St. Irenaeus be ignorant that the heretics against whom he quoted Rome as the rule of faith had their followers in Rome too?<sup>259</sup>

St. Irenaeus is not speaking of an authority over the Western Church only. He himself was an Eastern, he had been a disciple of St. Polycarp, he wrote in Greek and against sects which arose in the East and counted the greatest number of their followers there, and for this reason he appeals to the churches of Smyrna and Ephesus. The liturgical books of the Nestorians and Jacobites who separated from the Church of Rome as early as the fifth century contained the proof of their earlier faith in 'Peter

and his throne the immoveable rock'; they compare St. Peter with Moses : the Primacy is given to him, that his disciples may build up the confession of the true faith without division. 'At Rome,' they say, 'St. Peter dwells as in a stronghold.' In the ancient so-called Arabic Canons of Nicœa which to this day have a legal force amongst them, it is written : 'As the Patriarch can do what he wills with his subjects, so the Patriarch of Rome has jurisdiction over all Patriarchs, as St. Peter had over all Christendom.' This principle is repeated in the later Canons of Bar Hebrœus and Ben Attib (11th cent.)<sup>260</sup> 'Rejoice,' exclaims the Armenian historian Moses of Chorene (5th cent.) 'thou capital of the world, crowned with the light which shines from the face of thy Apostle, the light with whose rays thou enlightenest the whole world.'<sup>261</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

### HOW THE POPES AND THE FAITHFUL UNDERSTOOD THE PRIMACY PRACTICALLY.

The Popes and with them all Christendom acted according to their faith. We recognise the voice of the chief pastor of the Church in the letter of Pope Clement, the third successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome, to the Corinthians, deciding as judge in the controversies of that Church. He lays down in the form of a law what the constitution of the Church requires, he makes the application of it to the special case and in accordance with it decides what must be done for the maintenance of order. Throughout his letter there prevails a tone of ecclesiastical superiority which could only come from one who is conscious that his decisions must turn the balance.<sup>262</sup> The bishops of Rome are seen as the masters of the whole Church, exhorting and warning in every direction, binding and loosing, passing laws and pronouncing judgment. Not unfrequently complaints were heard of the use they had made of their authority in particular instances; opposition was shown, on the ground that the Pope had been deceived; appeals were made to the Pope, better informed, but his power was not disputed. Victor I. decided

in the question about the celebration of Easter, and St. Cyprian himself bowed to the superiority of Rome. Dionysius of Alexandria was obliged to clear himself from the suspicion of Sabellianism before Pope Dionysius.<sup>263</sup> Paul of Samosata, Patriarch of Antioch, was deposed from his dignity by the Pope of Rome on account of heresy.<sup>264</sup>

During the fourth century, amidst the storms of Arianism, the See of Rome was a stronghold of the Faith, the refuge and the defender of those who were persecuted on account of their confession of the Faith : Damasus in the presence of the Appollinarists, Celestine of the Nestorians, St. Leo the Great of the Monophysites are the highest authorities and judges in the Church; to them accuser and accused appealed; their sentence decided the question. Long before the Gnostic Marcion had betaken himself to Rome to the Pope,<sup>265</sup> the Novatians Felix and Felicissimus applied to Pope Cornelius to be received back into the Church;<sup>266</sup> the Eusebians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Eutyches and the Monophysites, all endeavoured to gain the See of Rome to their heresies. The Pope proclaims his right to have all important affairs referred to him and to have his decisions faithfully observed.<sup>267</sup> Innocent I. in his letter to the Patriarch of Antioch lays down regulations about episcopal ordinations, the division of the Metropolitan province and the conduct to be followed in the case of clerics who had come over from Arianism.<sup>268</sup> The legality of the choice of the Patriarch depends on the recognition of the Holy See;<sup>269</sup> the Pope repeatedly annulled the choice of persons not qualified;<sup>270</sup> summoned the Patriarchs before their synods to answer for themselves,<sup>271</sup> deposed them on account of neglect of their duty and cut them off from the Church.<sup>272</sup> They are the guardians of the observance of the Canons and they alone can on sufficient grounds permit any deviation from them.<sup>273</sup> Pope Hormisdas shows it to be an old tradition that the choice of a Patriarch should be conveyed to him by a special mission.<sup>274</sup> No bishop can refuse the judgment of the See of Rome, Pope Gelasius declares.<sup>275</sup>

Under Valentinian III. († 445) this pre-eminence of the See of Rome received the sanction of the civil law. "Nothing must be done without the sanction of the Bishop of Rome; or peace can only be preserved everywhere in the Church

when the whole body recognizes its rulers. Up to the present this has not been disturbed. The decision of the Bishop of Rome will have force without any confirmation from the Emperor, in acknowledgment of the merits of St. Peter who is the head of the body of the Bishops. However our peremptory decree is required, that it may be known it is allowed to no one to oppose the orders of the Roman prelate.<sup>276</sup> The pagan Emperor Aurelian, before that, when the deposed Paul of Samosata showed some resistance, had declared: 'He must be bishop of Antioch whom the bishops of Italy, especially the Bishop of Rome, recognise;' <sup>277</sup> and the pagan historian Ammianus Marcellinus calls Pope Liberius "the President of the Christian religion."<sup>278</sup> The Emperor Justinian styles the Roman Pontiff "the head of all the priests," "of all the churches;" the Roman Church "the summit of the priesthood" by which all heresies are overcome.<sup>279</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XX.

### THE LAW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PAPACY.

Indeed the more the Church extended her sphere, the more the nations flocked to her, the greater became the power of the central authority and the uniting influence of the Popes found more frequent exercise. The continued development of the Papacy proves to us clearly its divine origin: it is a vital law and the seal of God's works, especially of His Church, that from small and insignificant beginnings, from the mustard-seed, she has grown into a vast, world-wide institution. Like all other living bodies, like the Church, the Papacy has passed through an historical development, presenting most varied and most wonderful vicissitudes. It grew in silence, in the earliest ages only occasional features are seen, but these features of her authority with time grow more distinct and definite. The more violent the storms which threatened to shake the Church to her very foundations, the greater the danger of division from arrogance in the great, and from insubordination in inferiors, from the powerful re-action of national selfishness and false patriotism, the stronger

became the longing with which the faithful turned to Rome, to hear the voice of St. Peter, the voice of truth and justice. If Christendom did not withdraw as a sect to some corner of Asia or Africa,<sup>280</sup> if it did not crumble into a chaos of philosophical opinions, if it did not settle into rigid forms like the religion of the Hindoo, if the strength of Europe did not cripple her amid the passions and slavery of the West, we owe this to the purifying, uniting, watchful influence of the Church which stood a solid compact body under the guidance of one Head, whose eye surveyed the whole, whose words all listened to, who is the Father and Teacher of all Christendom, to whom Jesus Christ in St. Peter gave the charge to guard, to lead and to rule the whole Church.<sup>281</sup>

What we have said on the right of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter has been compressed into a few words by the Vatican Council : Whosoever says it is not in the ordination of Christ our Lord, or it is not of divine right that St. Peter should always have a successor in his Primacy over the Universal Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of St. Peter in this Primacy, let him be anathema.<sup>282</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XXI.

### THE ESSENCE AND SIGNIFICANCY OF THE PRIMACY.

Let us pass now to the third question :

*What is the essence and what is the significancy of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff ?*

Bossuet writes : " When Christ chose St. Peter to be the foundation of His Church, He created for him a superiority in the Church, and conferred on him the fullest plenitude of authority and majesty, that he might keep all bound together in unity."<sup>283</sup> Hence his charge extends to all the churches, for this our Lord commanded when He gave to the Apostle St. Peter the Primacy of the Apostolical dignity as a reward of his faith, and so founded the whole Church on his stability, the stability of the foundation;<sup>284</sup> hence matters go best when the priests (bishops) in all the provinces send in their reports to the See of St. Peter.<sup>285</sup> The

Church, says Boniface, had her origin in St. Peter; her government reposes on him; from him as from its source flows the whole ordering of the Church. As therefore the authority of the bishop extends to the whole flock entrusted to him, so the authority of the Pope extends to the whole Church, for the whole Church is entrusted to him. As each bishop has his own flock entrusted to him, so are all entrusted to him: to one pastor, the one flock. And he is the pastor, not only of all the sheep, but he is also the one pastor of all the pastors.<sup>286</sup> Nor could it be otherwise. For when different governments are co-ordinated into one great whole, one single government must preside over the separate governments, if there is to be unity. The Church is to be one body: hence if this unity is to be preserved, there must be one authority superior to the authority of the bishops. This authority is the authority of the Pope.<sup>287</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XXII.

### IT INCLUDES EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY OVER THE WHOLE CHURCH.

The authority of the Pope is therefore an *episcopal* authority over the Universal Church: what the bishop is for his diocese, that is the Pope for the whole Church and for its pastors, and this the Council of Florence expresses when it ascribes to the Pope the authority to pasture, to rule and to guide the whole Church. "The Pope," says the "Greek Maximus, has received authority and power over all the churches on the earth to loose and to bind in every thing."<sup>288</sup> If this were not so, then the bishops themselves would have no shepherd, no bishop; the Church of Christ would not be one fold, the faithful would not be one flock, there would not be one Church government as Christ wished and established. The Pope is therefore the 'Bishop of the bishops,'<sup>289</sup> 'the Head of the heads,'<sup>290</sup> 'the Father of the fathers.'<sup>291</sup> On this account his authority is an *ordinary* authority in the Church; that is, he holds it in his own right, conferred on him by God; it is not exercised in virtue of any commission from the bishops or from the faithful; it not only confers a right to interfere in extraordinary cases,

such as belongs for instance to Metropolitans, in certain cases specified in the Canons when other representatives of Church government do not fulfil their duty: he holds the principality of ordinary authority over the other churches.<sup>292</sup> His authority is *immediate*,<sup>293</sup> because conferred by Christ Himself on St. Peter over the Universal Church, sheep and shepherds; it was not received in the way of ecclesiastical development by commission which would suppose the intervention and consent of the other rulers in the Church. The See of Rome possesses *unlimited* authority in the Church, such as the Council of Florence attributes to it. Whatever authority Christ entrusted to the Church is first of all and completely in it: that is, the See of Rome can order and decree what is to the welfare of the Church, whereas other bishops hold only a portion of the authority given to it.<sup>294</sup> Finally its authority is *supreme* because it depends solely from God and from the institution of Christ; hence the Pope is only responsible to God and his conscience.<sup>295</sup> The right of the Apostolic See to reserve certain cases to itself for decision, is nothing more than the exercise of this supreme and immediate power of the Pope over the Universal Church. It is the highest but not the only authority in the Church; for according to the divine ordination the Pope must govern the Church together with the bishops:<sup>296</sup> they are appointed by the Holy Ghost, to rule the Church with him and under him. The Pope is Universal Bishop, was an axiom of the school of Paris.<sup>297</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XXIII.

### ITS PLENARY AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH.

St. Leo<sup>298</sup> long ago declared this significancy of the authority of the Pope. 'Though in the people of God there are many priests and many shepherds, yet St. Peter is the true shepherd of all (*proprie pascit*), whom Christ as the supreme (*principaliter*) shepherd guards.' As Christ rules all immediately, though invisibly, so St. Peter rules all immediately and visibly: and as individual bishops are the true pastors of their own dioceses, so St. Peter is equally the true pastor of all dioceses and of their bishops. So if we

compare the Pope with other bishops, the plenitude of authority is justly attributed to him; other bishops rule a defined, limited territory and they possess a defined, limited authority; the Pope rules the whole world with that full authority which Christ bequeathed to him on earth.<sup>299</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XXIV.

IT DOES NOT EXCLUDE THE AUTHORITY OF THE BISHOPS.

Though the Pope possesses full, immediate, and real episcopal authority over the Universal Church and consequently in every diocese, it by no means follows as some in recent times following Febronius, Tamburine and others have maintained that the other bishops are only mandataries and representatives of the Pope, whose authority the Pope can limit or entirely set aside.<sup>300</sup>

If the Vatican Council had not expressly rejected this inference, it falls to the ground from the simple consideration that though the Pope possesses supreme and unlimited authority in the Church, he does not possess power alone or exclusively.<sup>301</sup> The Episcopate as well as the Papacy exists in the Church by divine right, was ordained by Christ and established by the Apostles.<sup>302</sup> The Apostles likewise had jurisdiction over the Universal Church: and yet the bishops appointed by them were true bishops 'placed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God.'<sup>303</sup> Thus St. Timothy in Ephesus and St. Titus in Crete were bishops in the fullest and strictest sense and still St. Paul never ceased to exercise a true and real authority over those churches, as is plain from the instructions and orders he issued for those churches and their bishops. The same may be said of St. John and the churches of Lesser Asia. Two bishops in the same diocese holding ordinary and direct authority would only mutually exclude each other if both enjoyed equal power, but not if the authority of one were exercised in dependence of the authority of the other as that of the bishops is exercised in dependence on that of the Pope.<sup>304</sup> In the same way, to borrow an analogy from another subject,



a good work is entirely the work of human freedom and entirely the work of divine grace; the two causes do not exclude each other, but the human one is subordinated to the divine and directed to it. As the conception of a good work which ascribes it partly to the free-will, partly to grace is a false one, because a mechanical one; so, in considering the working of the organism of the Church, we must reject the notion which conceives the several authorities of the Church as quite external to each other and exercised side by side. Bishops by the institution of Christ are provided with divine authority and for this very reason they are under the Pope; they are the foundations of their several churches which are built upon them, as St. Ignatius has told us, but only because they rest upon and are supported by the foundation on which the Universal Church rests, the Pope.<sup>305</sup> Hence bishops are not merely "officials," "delegates," "mandataries," "commissaries" of the Pope, "they are placed by the Holy Ghost;" and the Pope, though truly Bishop in every diocese is not the one or the only Bishop in the Church. He must exercise his authority in such a way, that neither the rights of individual bishops nor the rights of his Primacy nor the claims of ecclesiastical unity which rest on him are allowed to suffer. Even Maret allows this. "A celebrated and respectable school," he says, "admits that Bishops are not merely Vicars of the Pope, that they are truly Princes in the Church who possess an authority truly their own and divine in its origin." The theologians of this school allow that the Pope cannot do away with the Episcopacy or govern the Church by Vicars Apostolic. They allow that bishops take part in the general government of the Church in the measure which the Pope determines.<sup>306</sup>

The constitution of the Church is therefore monarchical, with the Episcopacy an aristocratical element blended with it, if we must make use of terms borrowed from earthly kingdoms.<sup>307</sup> But most assuredly we may not understand this constitution in the sense of modern constitutionalism which attributes sovereignty to the body of the nation and considers legislation as the product of a truly mechanical balance of the several factors.<sup>308</sup>

## CHAPTER XXV.

## THE POPE AND A COUNCIL.

If the Apostolic See possesses unlimited power over the whole Church in the sense explained, the bishops of the Catholic Church are equally subject to him whether considered individually, or in a Council. 'Those,' says the Protestant Mosheim,<sup>309</sup> 'who grant to the Pope of Rome authority over individual dioceses, but deny it to him over the whole Church are as illogical as one who should contend that the several limbs of the body are moved by the head, but deny that the whole body which is made up of those limbs is moved by it; or allow that all the cities, villages, and hamlets are subject, but maintain that the Province which consist of them is not subject.'

And so the proposition of the *Superiority of a Council over the Pope* falls to the ground; for any assembly, however numerous and brilliant, cannot be more than a representative of the whole Church, if its head the Pope of Rome is represented in it: for the Church is made up of head and members.<sup>310</sup> The Pope, to use the expression of the Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, presides 'as the head of the members.'<sup>311</sup> All the promises made to the College of the Apostles, the predecessor of the episcopate, were made to it in its unity with St. Peter and in its subordination to him; distinct from him or opposed to him it received no promises: but what was given in the first instance to St. Peter and to him alone was not recalled or diminished by all the promises made to the Apostles. As regards the resolutions of the 4th and 5th sessions of the Council of Constance, if a proof of the superiority of the Council over the Pope is to be drawn from them, three propositions must be previously established. *First*: that the Council at the time the said resolutions were passed was Œcumenical. Now that it was not: for only the obedience of the irregularly elected Pope John XXIII took part in these sessions and the resolutions were drawn up in opposition to him, whom his party had acknowledged as the legitimate Pope.<sup>312</sup> The obedience of Benedict XIII and that of the lawfully elected Gregory XII were not represented: the Council only acquired a foundation of legitimacy

after the convocation by the lawful Pope Gregory XII and his abdication, when the third obedience at the same time joined it. *Secondly*, it must be shown that these resolutions were sanctioned by later legitimate Popes; but this assertion cannot be maintained. Pope Martin V. only confirmed what had been decided in matter of faith against Wickliffe and Hus and regularly by the Council, (conciliariter):<sup>313</sup> at the same time he forbade all appeal from the Pope to the Council, so that Gerson the true author of the resolutions acknowledged they could not stand with this prohibition.<sup>314</sup>

It must be proved, *thirdly*, that these resolutions possess absolute force in the case of an undisputed, lawful, living Pope and were not as the text of the decree reads,<sup>315</sup> passed for the termination of the schism; for only 'the agony and confusion of Christendom had decided the Council to reject the hitherto received teaching of the pre-eminence of the Papal authority.'<sup>316</sup>

Still less force have the resolutions of the Synod of Basle, as the See of Rome in all the acts by which it allowed the continuance of the Synod 'declared null all the decrees already passed or which might hereafter be passed against the person of the Pope and the dignity of the See of Rome'.<sup>317</sup>

Very different was the judgment of St. Leo the Great of his position in relation to councils of bishops. He rejected the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, as he had opposed the earlier decrees of the Synod of Nicea and by the authority of the Apostolic See declared it to be null.<sup>318</sup> *Prima Sedes a nemine judicatur*, the first See is judged by none, was a principle in the early Church; God gave the Primacy to the See of Rome: God only can take it away.<sup>319</sup> If then by the word Council we understand the bishops assembled for Synodal consultation, then the Pope is above them: but if we take the Council to be the representative of the whole Church, of the head and of the members, the Pope is neither above it nor subject to it (he himself is part of it, its chief factor); he belongs to the Council as its Head and Centre.

And so he alone has the right to summon the bishops to a Council,<sup>320</sup> for he by divine right presides over those who are gathered in the Council.<sup>321</sup> He alone has the right to preside in the Council, either personally or by his legates;<sup>322</sup> for he is the shepherd of the flock. His authority it is which

confers a sanction on the decrees of the Council ; the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon and the Robber Synod of Ephesus (449) were rejected by St. Leo the Great and could never obtain recognition in the Church ;<sup>323</sup> for it is the right of the See of Rome to confirm the Synods.<sup>324</sup>

The supreme and incontestable authority of decrees on matters of faith drawn up by the representatives of the whole Catholic Church rests on the agreement of the bishops assembled in a General Council with the decisions of the Holy See of Rome. Nor is it superfluous that the Pope alone should confirm the decrees of a Synod, when he has taken part in drawing them. The Emperor Marcian<sup>325</sup> asked this confirmation for the Council of Chalcedon from St. Leo the Great that all doubt might be removed by his approval. The deacon Ferrandus says the decrees of Chalcedon first acquired irresistible force by the approval of the Pope.<sup>326</sup> The Roman Synod under Damasus declared that the Council of Rimini was of no force notwithstanding the great number of bishops assembled, because neither the Bishop of Rome whose decision should first of all have been waited for nor Vincent of Capua and others adhered to it.<sup>327</sup> Pope Damasus was the first who condemned the heresy of Appollinaris,<sup>328</sup> though it sprang up in the East ; and according to the testimony of Sozomen<sup>329</sup> by his decisions the controversy of the Orientals on the divinity of the Holy Ghost was brought to an end. The Synod held at Constantinople in 381 shortly after, though it was only a council of Oriental bishops was ranked as an Œcumenical one on account of the confirmation granted to it by the Pope. And St. Augustine declared that the Pelagian controversy was finished as soon as the decrees of the two African Synods had received the Pope's approbation.<sup>330</sup> A decree of the See of Rome usually preceded a definition of faith in the General Councils and this served as a model and model for the Synods. And so the Synod of Ephesus said that they passed sentence on Nestorians compelled by the Canons and by the letter of the Pope.<sup>331</sup> The Pope's condemnation of Pelagianism was enough without any further inquiry. At Chalcedon in drawing up the decree on the disputed point of dogma the Bishops appealed not to the decree of the previous Council of

Constantinople held under Flavian but only to the decision of the Pope. The sixth Council too declared it subscribed to the dogmatic letter of Pope Agatho and has thus overcome the heresy.

Decrees drawn up by Councils have no co-active force as against the Popes, precisely because Councils are not above the Pope. Never for a moment have the Popes forgotten that it is their duty to rule the Church according to the decrees and laws which have been recognized as part of Church discipline in past centuries :<sup>332</sup> they form a direction for his conduct but impose no command which he is bound to obey by divine or human law : as he is the highest authority in the Church he can accept no rule from any higher except God. 'The Pope,' says Walter,<sup>333</sup> 'is the highest authority in the Church and as such he has no judge externally over him ; for the use he makes of his power he in the same manner as worldly monarchs for theirs is only answerable to God and his conscience.' Church discipline therefore in all those points which do not rest on positively divine or natural law, or which are not inseparably connected with them has no such absolute force that it may not be changed according to times or circumstances : we cannot refuse to admit the divine guidance of the Church when alterations and dispensations are granted in its domain. For this reason the Council Trent<sup>334</sup> declared, all decrees are so drawn up that the authority of the Apostolic See remains untouched : and in 1479 the proposition of P. von Osma (the members of the Congress of Ems defended the same doctrine later) that the Pope has no power to dispense in general laws of the Church was condemned.

'What is done outside the rule,' writes Pope Symmachus, 'is not against the rule, if it is only done on a sufficient motive.'<sup>335</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XXVI.

## APPEALS TO THE POPE.

The Pope wields the highest legislative authority and he also wields the highest judicial authority. Hence appeals are addressed to him from the whole Church and from him there lies no appeal. From the time of Popes Zozimus,<sup>336</sup> Boniface,<sup>337</sup> Gelasius<sup>338</sup> and others this was admitted as a principle in the Early Church. St. Bernard wrote to Pope Eugenius:<sup>339</sup> 'The whole world appeals to you, a proof of your very special primacy.' When the Council of Trent<sup>340</sup> expressly reserved certain cases to the decision of the Holy See, it only re-affirmed a right which had been recognised by the Fathers, by Councils and even by heretics and which had been applied numberless times. Boniface I.<sup>341</sup> says the Holy See enjoys precedence in the Church in order that it may decide on all points of controversy,<sup>342</sup> as on its decision everything depends, and 'none can resist the supreme Apostolical authority.'<sup>343</sup> and 'for this reason the greatest churches of the East in important matters always sought the counsel of the See of Rome.'<sup>344</sup> St. Leo the Great speaks of appeals as an ancient usage.<sup>345</sup> Pope Innocent I. writes:<sup>346</sup> the holy Fathers led not by human reasoning but by divine wisdom held it for certain, that difficulties, even in the remotest provinces, could not be considered as put an end to unless the Apostolic See had examined them and pronounced its definite judgment with authority; and St. Cyril of Alexandria († 444) wrote to Pope Celestine I.:<sup>347</sup> 'The whole question must be submitted to the examination of your Holiness.' He will take no steps, before the decision is pronounced on this case (the heresy of Nestorius)<sup>348</sup> and he appeals to the long established practice of the Church in this respect.

Schulte himself, in his work against the Vatican Council,<sup>349</sup> allows that from the time of Pope Julius<sup>350</sup> († 352) the claim was made by the Popes that in all extraordinary circumstances reference should be made to the Apostolic See:<sup>351</sup> that no important question, especially in matters of faith, was considered to be decided without the Pope's sentence; the *principatus* is everywhere attributed to the Church of Rome; bishops who have been condemned were

free to appeal to the Pope: the decisions given by him on appeal were considered binding and final: deviation from the Canons of the ancient Synods required his sanction; he exercised the right of confirming Patriarchs; he had the right to summon Patriarchs who were accused before his Synods: the Pope no one could judge. 'These and all other imaginable rights may be summed up in the proposition, that the Pope possesses unlimited and immediate jurisdiction over all the churches, bishops, and believers of the whole world.'

Hence the unlimited authority of the Church, precisely because granted to the See of Rome for the preservation of unity amongst the faithful, is of its own nature unconditioned and unlimited save by the divine and the natural law. The distinction between *essential and non-essential* rights of the See of Rome<sup>362</sup> in the sense of Gallicanism, Febronianism and Josephinism with the avowed wish to deprive him of the latter, is utterly untenable.<sup>353</sup> Every right which belongs to the See of Rome, is but a means to the preservation of unity in the Church: all its rights are subordinate to that end, always however within the limits of the divine and natural law. Hence for the extension and application of these rights no definite period in the history of the Church can be assigned,<sup>354</sup> no precise law can be prescribed, no hard and fast line drawn. A right not exercised at one period may become of the highest importance at another: everything depends on the circumstances of the time; its one rule, its highest standard is the supreme rule of all Church authority, the salvation of souls. The limits of the Primacy and of all ecclesiastical authority are contained in the fundamental constitution of the Church; in the *jus divinum*, in divine right. The particular rights the Pope possesses are the result of historical growth. No distinction of his rights into essential and non-essential can be admitted: the right which to-day is not invoked for want of an object, at some future time may become highly essential. The Pope possesses a radical authority which extends to the domain and also to that of faith and doctrine. A right in the Church is not an end; it is a means: the unity of the Church cannot be maintained in one domain, unless it be maintained in

another.<sup>355</sup> The divine Founder defined the rights of his Vicar on earth only in general terms and did not descend to details. The Primacy in the designs of Providence took its place in history: it could not be circumscribed in sharp and rigidly defined limits beforehand; a freedom of action and development was granted which rendered it possible to exert its divine power in every direction, according to the wants of different periods. "The so-called accidental rights are not accidents," says Walter,<sup>356</sup> "but are more or less connected with the needs of Church discipline and with the constitution of the Primacy: nay, rights which at one period appear to be of minor importance, may at another be essential for the unity of the Church."<sup>357</sup> Some writers who maintain this distinction have contended further that the accidental rights as resting on a mere commission of the Church for the restoration of the primitive pure discipline or for cases where the welfare of the Church required them may be withdrawn even against the will of the Pope. Such commission or delegation is a mere fiction: history knows nothing of it, and the restoration of primitive discipline in an entirely new surrounding, is as honest historians acknowledge, an idle pretext, in which the spirit is abandoned for the form. Such violent action cannot be justified by the pretext of the welfare of the Church, if only because it is not for the members of the Church to decide against its head whether this or that is for the welfare of the Church. Even Protestant writers have warned governments against favouring principles, which might with equal reason be turned against themselves."<sup>358</sup>

The authority of the Pope is therefore really sovereign and free; by its very nature and constitution it must be invested with extraordinary power to meet extraordinary emergencies and needs, to over-rule any mere human law, to permit or order exceptions to the rule. Difficult combinations, new situations may arise for the Church for which the existing Church legislation does not provide and in which the solution can only be attained by the violation of principles actually in force. In case of necessity, Bossuet says,<sup>359</sup> the Pope can do anything—always excepting what is against divine law.



A striking example of an extraordinary use of the supreme authority of the Church (the welfare of the Church imperatively demanded it) was the step taken by Pope Pius VII. on the conclusion of the Concordat of 1801. By a stroke of his pen (by the Bull of Nov. 29, 1801) he deprived of their dignity 37 French bishops who had refused to resign; he did away for ever with all episcopal churches, their chapters and their rights and erected ten new Metropolitan churches and 50 bishoprics. This unprecedented proceeding, the annulling long established rights could only be justified on the plea of extreme necessity; on the obligation of creating a new order of things in the Church of France, shaken to its very foundations.<sup>300</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XXVII.

### THE PAPAL AUTHORITY NOT ABSOLUTISM.

Must we say then that the authority of the Holy See is *absolute*? The term is borrowed from the conditions of secular political life and can only find an imperfect application to the government of the Church whose object and origin, whose means and whose ends all have a certain supernatural character. 'The one absolute free ruler in the Church,' says Bellarmin, 'is Christ. There can be no question in the Church of absolute monarchy, or of aristocracy, or of democracy: the form of government is that which beseems ministers and dispensers. If we compare the Pope with Christ he does not possess the plenitude of authority, but only a portion of it and such a portion as Christ gave him. The Pope cannot change the laws of Christ: he cannot institute Sacraments: he cannot forgive sins without the Sacraments.' On the other side we must bear in mind that the Church belongs to a higher order than the State; her wealth and her treasures are of more worth than those of civil life, the danger of injury to them is greater, their loss can be less easily made good. The Church requires a strong hand to rule

her. That monarch is absolute in the true sense who is not controlled in his government by contract, by usage, by right and recognises as the rule of his administration the end and the welfare of his political community. In this sense the Pope is *not absolute*. A Memorial of the Pope Pius VII. says: In the nature and institution of the Catholic Church the Pope recognises certain limits which he cannot transgress without betraying his conscience and without abusing the supreme authority confided to him by Jesus Christ to use for the building up of the Church, not for its destruction. The dogmas of faith are inviolable limits which the head of the Church may not pass: and although in the Church it is held the faith cannot be changed, but discipline may be changed, yet even in discipline the Popes have always observed certain limits and recognised the obligation not to admit innovations in certain matters at all and in other matters only when most weighty and imperative reasons required it. Hence the Popes never imagined they could introduce any change in points of discipline directly established by Jesus Christ himself or in points by their nature inseparably connected with dogma, or in points disputed by heretics to make good their innovations, or in other matters in which the Popes held themselves obliged never to allow an alteration on account of the consequences to the prejudice of religion or of Catholic principles, whatever advantages were offered them, or whatever punishments they were threatened with.

In other parts of Church discipline not included in this enumeration, the Popes of Rome never hesitated on many occasions to make changes: but always guided by the principles on which every well ordered society rests they consented to such changes only when necessity or the welfare of the Church required it.

The authority of the Popes is the most fettered that can be imagined: they themselves on occasions without number have declared that their duty is to guard the laws and ordinations of the Church and to prevent they being transgressed. Now the Church has long for ages since possessed her definite constitution worked out to the minutest details. The Papal See is thus specially obliged

to proceed with the most careful observance of Church principles. On this condition it may reckon on the obedience of individual churches and on the confidence and reverence of the faithful. In most cases one thoroughly versed in the legislation of the Church can know with certainty what the Pope's decision will be. Besides a notable portion of Ecclesiastical law in the Catholic point of view rests on the commandments of God and on such points the authority of the Popes is incontestable.<sup>361</sup>

But if the Pope has no limits, where will he stop? asks de Maistre.<sup>362</sup> History is there to tell us what use he can make of his authority: what guarantees have we that the same circumstances will not recur.

To this objection, which assuredly will be raised, I answer first of all in general that the instances adduced from history against the Popes prove nothing, because they belong to a different state of things from that which we see. The authority of the Popes, considered from one point of view, was excessive; but it was necessarily what it was, and there existed no authority in the world to take its place.

When persons, strangers to the Catholic Church by their birth or by some theory ask me the same question: What can restrain the Pope? I answer them: everything, the canons, laws, the high tribunals, national assemblies, prescriptions, representations, negotiations, duty, anxiety, prudence and above all public opinion, the mistress of the world.

The very spirit of his office dictates to the Pope the rule that he must exercise his power for the welfare of Christendom. Hence a becoming remonstrance against his decision is lawful, and a plain injustice may be resisted by main force.<sup>363</sup> Give it what name you will, the Papal Primacy in fact is by no means absolute and uncontrolled; it is checked and restrained by the spirit and the praxis of the Church, by the remembrance of duties which are inseparable from rights, by the dread of Œcumenical Councils, by the consideration of old principles and usages, by the mild character of the government, by the acknowledged rights of the episcopal office, by its relations with secular States and above all by the spirit of the nations.<sup>364</sup>

The highest standard however for the holder of Papal authority is the example of Christ and the form by which he was named ruler, feed My lambs: feed My sheep. By these words the stamp of the most loving gentleness is marked on this plenitude of authority; though raised to the highest dignity in the world, the Pope must be as the least.<sup>365</sup>

The Vatican Council has briefly summed up the doctrine on the nature and significance of the Primacy of the Pope of Rome. 'If any one says that the Pope of Rome has only an office of inspection or direction but not full and supreme authority of jurisdiction over the whole Church, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also in matters in discipline and the government of the Church spread over the whole world; or that he possesses only the chief part but not the whole plenitude of this supreme authority, both over all and every church and over all and every bishop and layman let him be anathema.'<sup>366</sup>

According then to the ordination of Christ the bond of unity was tied strongly and firmly in this pre-eminence of the Apostolic See: in it the Church spreading through the whole world grew by the union of all, however far removed from each other to the same body: and in this way it happened that the weight of this authority did not serve so much to elevate the first See, but much rather in a special way to secure the inviolability and existence of the whole body. Hence we must not be surprised if all those who were inspired by the enemy of mankind in the early ages with hatred of the Church directed their attacks against this Apostolic See in which the strength of unity lies; trusting if the foundation stone were destroyed (supposing such a contingency possible) and the connexion between the churches and their head broken, that they could oppress and rend the Church, rob her of the freedom granted her by Christ and deliver her over to an ignoble slavery.<sup>367</sup>

The significance of the Primacy must be understood in this way. No Church, no Christendom; no authority, no Church; no Pope, no living ever present, the one and therefore strong authority. The authority of the Church *culminates* in the Papacy; in it is her deepest foundation: in it she has the unity which binds her together: a centre

rull of energy, in it she finds her highest and most perfect expression. For this reason the struggle against Christianity is necessarily and above all a struggle against the Papacy : and if any one can overcome the Papacy, he will destroy and bury the Christian religion.

And with the Christian religion, social order. ‘The Papacy,’ says one witness who cannot be suspected of partiality, ‘is the flower, the original type not only of Christianity but also of the faith in authority and of the very essence of authority in all Europe . . . . When the Papacy falls the great battle which is waging in the civilised States will be decided through all Europe.’<sup>368</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

### THE CHARACTER OF THE PAPAL AUTHORITY.

Now we are in a position to understand the complete magnificent constitution of the Church, which was copied from no secular State, which no secular State can reproduce. The Church is essentially a *monarchy*, for there is one who holds the plenitude of authority in the Church, who gives law to all, whom all are bound to obey.<sup>369</sup> The Church is in a certain sense an *aristocracy*, for side by side with the one stands the Episcopate, a senate composed of many members, worthy of veneration, distinguished for intelligence and learning, a senate the like of which the world has not seen and this senate with the Pope and under the Pope has its share in the government of the Church. The Church is in a certain sense a *democracy*, for all without exception may be raised to the highest dignities in this kingdom, even to the triple tiara which adorns the head of the supreme pastor, priest and teacher.<sup>370</sup> Thus the Church combines in her constitution the advantages of the three possible forms of government which civil society in the course of ages has devised for itself.

---

## CHAPTER XXIX.

## THE SIGNIFICANCY OF THE PAPAL AUTHORITY.

In the Primacy she possesses the strength of unity,<sup>371</sup> "the one authority preserves the unity of the Church" which as an indissoluble band holds together the different nations and individual churches and thus truly has founded and still preserves a world-wide Church, as Christianity is a world-wide religion. In the illustrious body of the bishops we find profound wisdom and mature experience: the equal rights of all convey to the Church a perennial source of ever fresh, ever young vital energy. But her monarchy does not bear the stamp of a cramping, despotic Absolutism: its aristocracy knows nothing of the exclusiveness of an hereditary caste: the equal rights of all lead neither to an ochlocracy or to anarchy.

And thus she is strong enough to enfold in her arms all nations with their different languages, customs, circumstances and wants, a firm impregnable bulwark,<sup>372</sup> in which Christ has placed His doctrine and His grace. The waves of time roar and they wash away the works of man; but the Church stands, for the hand of God has marked her with His indestructible seal. In some nations centrifugal forces and tendencies come into play; in the consciousness of their mighty natural strength, dazzled by the glory of their princes, misguided by ambitious and evil minded priests, they tear themselves away from the great Mother-Church and strive to erect themselves into churches according to their own dreams and fancies.

The Church however continues her course. The greater number remain true to her and with her and through her preserve unity and in unity the faith: those who have separated break up into a chaos of sects. And the Church, slowly but surely, though suffering great losses, ever recruiting her strength and progressing, advances to her end.

---

## SECOND BOOK.

# THE PRIMACY OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE AS INFALLIBLE TEACHER.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### THE SUPERNATURAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH.

The Church is the kingdom of Christ upon earth : hence her foundation, her end, her existence, her whole character are *supernatural*, she differs from all earthly kingdoms and therefore any comparison between her constitution and form of government and those of earthly kingdoms must necessarily be very imperfect. Hence *invisible and divine influences* act upon her through the whole course of her existence and activity : for Christ sustains her and abides in her : once wedded to the Church, He never abandons His bride.

Ecclesiastical authority, therefore, especially in its chief depositary, the Pope of Rome, is only *an instrument in the hands of Christ* ; invisibly present by it He guides the Church, protects her, teaches her and so withstanding the gates of hell preserves her from destruction. The sacred humanity of Christ it is true is only a finite, created being ; but through the hypostatic union with the divinity it becomes the organ of the divinity ; through it every influx of grace reaches the Church and the world, in the sacraments or outside of them : for in Him is the fullness of all grace.<sup>1</sup> If we compare the lesser with the greater, the Pope, the bishops and the priests are weak men, liable to error and to sin ; but Christ by His gracious union with the Church, in which He always abides, has granted them out of His own overflowing fullness of grace as Head of the Church such

high graces of office and such authority, that at their word sin takes flight, the heavens are opened and the Son of Man Himself descends into their hands as He did of yore into those of Mary.

To one He has assigned a special task in His Church and has given a dignity conspicuous above all. One He the invisible pastor has appointed Pastor of the pastors, Head of the heads, the Father and Teacher of all Christendom. Will He not bestow on him graces of a very special character, on account of the dignity of his office, as He has done to bishops and priests, to enable them to discharge their duties? He has done so. To him whom He commanded to feed the universal flock He has given the graces corresponding to this charge. The grace of the Primacy is attached to the authority of the Primacy. And we see this grace in a particular manner in the *infallible teaching Primacy*.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### AUTHORITY THE PRINCIPLE OF UNITY IN THE CHURCH.

We have remarked that the differences between Catholics and the bodies which separated from them have their chief point of divergence, and their deepest root in the doctrine on the Church and her *authority*. Without the Church there can be no Christendom; without authority there can be no Church; this is the vital principle of unity without which anarchy will take the place of order and division will take the place of union. Unity in the Church is twofold; unity in faith and unity in charity, by ecclesiastical communion. <sup>2</sup> Unity of faith, first of all; for it is the element of life in the Church; Christ prayed for unity in faith, <sup>3</sup> it is the object of the completed work of redemption, it is the seal of the divinity of the Church.

Hence the whole Church cannot fall into error and lose unity of faith: <sup>4</sup> now the Church receives her faith through the teaching body of the Church; this body therefore cannot err, when speaking in the name of Christ and guided by His assistance it propounds the truths of revelation to the faithful and when the individual receives the infallible



rule and standard of his belief.<sup>5</sup> We have the true religion, says St. Augustine,<sup>6</sup> when we believe on the word of a decisive authority, invested with supreme power. As the lessons of faith passed from the lips of Christ to the crowd who followed Him, so now they pass from the lips of the teaching body in the Church and whilst this body announces the truth, the Holy Ghost infuses the grace of faith into the hearts of the listeners.<sup>7</sup>

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE TEACHING OFFICE IN THE CHURCH AN INSTRUMENT IN THE HANDS OF CHRIST.

In this way the faith is planted : it grows and develops always and everywhere the work of Christ in souls, produced by the teaching body of the Church, his visible *organ* and *instrument*. Thus the faithful have always substantially the same faith : but as the Church must meet the wants of each age, as she must answer the questions of her children, as she must stand on her guard against the ever shifting forms of error, as she must reject heresies, as she develops and explains the fullness of the deposit of faith more clearly, more in detail, more completely from every point of view, her children progress in the knowledge of Christ and His teaching, possessing the original treasure of the faith in new forms, consequences and applications. And thus because all who are members of the Church give themselves up with confidence to the teaching body of the Church, as the disciples of old gave themselves up to the word of our Lord, the same faith is held by all, always, everywhere : for it is built on a strong foundation, laid by the hand of our Lord Himself, and therefore on Himself Who guards it and gives His assistance to the end of time. And thus the bishops in union with the Pope, when they in Council or outside of it exercise the office of teaching confided to them by God, are the appointed *witnesses* of Catholic truth, which explicitly or implicitly was contained in the deposit ; hence they are *judges* in questions of faith, to decide the true sense

and meaning of holy Scripture and of the records of tradition :<sup>8</sup> and because they are infallible judges and witnesses, therefore they must be infallible *teachers*, capable of becoming the foundation on which the kingdom of supernatural faith in souls may be constructed, to see the light in public confession.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE TEACHING CHURCH AND THE TAUGHT CHURCH.

This is the manner in which the Catholic process of faith presents itself to us. The bishops do not take their place in a Council as the mandatories of their diocesans : the bishops are the *teachers*, the diocesans the scholars ; the former are *judges*, the latter must accept their decisions. The bishops do not testify to the actual belief in their dioceses, for it may be modified by many influences (as at a time of clearing up doubts) : it may be weakened, distorted, falsified not merely in the minds of the simple faithful but also of priests and theologians. They testify to the teaching of the pastors, of their predecessors, of the *holy Fathers* ‘that by their word the ancient holy faith may receive a solemn confirmation.’<sup>9</sup> The weight of their words does not depend on the magnitude of their dioceses, nor on the brilliancy of their prominent position, but on the testimony of the traditions especially of the Apostolic churches which they bring ;<sup>10</sup> for the bishops hand down the Apostolic seed.<sup>11</sup> The Apostolic tradition, says Irenaeus,<sup>12</sup> is preserved by the succession of the bishops in the Church : what they bring as tradition is true because handed down by those whose duty it was to hand down.<sup>13</sup>

---

## CHAPTER V.

THE FUNDAMENTAL REASON FOR THE TEACHING OFFICE  
IN THE CHURCH.

The significancy of the office of judge in matters of faith does not depend on their learning, or their mature experience, or on their acuteness or on any personal gifts whatever. Human helps are not excluded, but its significancy in the Church and for the faithful, who are bound to submit to it, comes not from them but from a supernatural element, the plenitude of authority given by Christ to the office of teaching and the promise which assures it infallibility.

This infallibility of the teaching office in the Church we must try to understand.

## CHAPTER VI.

## INSPIRATION AND INFALLIBILITY.

It must not be conceived as an effect of inspiration. Inspiration can be claimed only for the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. Of them the Vatican Council says : "The Church holds them to be holy, not because they were put together by mere human industry and afterwards approved by her authority and not merely because they contain revelation without error ; but because having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God for their author and have as such been delivered to the Church herself."<sup>14</sup> Hence God is primarily and truly the author of the inspired book : not in the sense that He wrote it Himself, but that He moved others to write what He wished and nothing beyond what He wished ; the supernatural impulse and the assistance in the composition of the book come from Him.

Here the Church draws the lines which we cannot pass without destroying or injuring the essence of inspiration :<sup>15</sup> within the lines drawn she includes the various ways in which the Holy Ghost works according to the diversity of the contents of the sacred books, in some especially the prophetic and didactic books imparting to the inspired writer

supernatural and immediate revelations, in others especially the historical books besides the impulse to write granting him assistance to preserve him from error, for the rest leaving the composition to his own powers.<sup>16</sup>

If we look for the last element of infallibility we may say in general it must be the action of the Holy Ghost: if we consider the effect of infallibility it must be the preservation from all error of him who is infallible in certain matters. Under this twofold point of view the infallibility of the teaching office of the Church coincides with inspiration but no further. The inspired books are strictly and primarily the work of the Holy Ghost: God is their author: the utterances of the teaching office of the Church are not the work of the Holy Ghost, they are man's work, spoken under the assistance of the Holy Ghost. The influence of the Holy Ghost in the inspired books is *positive*; so that according to the common teaching of theologians their contents as far as regards the events they record and the expressions they contain are due to the impulse of the Holy Ghost and are penned under His assistance. In the utterances however of the teaching office of the Church His influence is *negative*; inasmuch as he leaves its members to their own reflexion, examination and inquiry and only prevents error in anything which as teacher of faith and morals and generally of what is necessary to salvation it decides and declares officially to be binding. Hence infallibility follows as a consequence of inspiration in all the inspired books in the above named sense: it follows the assistance of the Holy Ghost which excludes error only in matters of the teaching regarding faith and morals. As to the teaching office in the Church was committed the task of preserving and making known the deposit of faith left to her by Christ through His Apostles and this only, the assistance of the Holy Ghost watching over man's powers gives a sufficient guarantee for the execution of the task. The Prophets and Apostles, however, were the organs of a divine revelation which they had to publish to the world: hence by an immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost they received new information and knowledge, they saw in the spirit what by their own human meditation they never could have thought or imagined.<sup>17</sup>

From this may be inferred a further determination of the character of the infallibility of the teaching office of the Church. 'He,' says Bellarmin,<sup>18</sup> 'who promises an end is understood to promise the means.' Among these we place first of all a careful investigation and examination of the records of revelation and tradition. The charisma of revelation does not dispense with the human powers of the teaching office of the Church, it on the contrary presupposes them. We are certain that the promise of our Lord will be fulfilled; we are also certain that those conditions will be observed which must precede the fulfilment of the promise. When did the Church ever allow heretics to contradict the dogmatic decisions of General Councils, under the plea that the judges of the faith were not free, or that they had given their judgment without the necessary previous investigation?<sup>19</sup> The Catholic believes the infallibility of the teaching office of the Church, on account of the promise of Christ; but divine Providence, which watches over the Church in a special manner, *in whose hands are the hearts of kings, as the division of waters,*<sup>20</sup> gives security for the fulfilment of this promise. In many and hidden ways it can turn the hearts of men, by interior lights, by external dispositions, not only not taking away their liberty but with their liberty and through it leading them to the end, which is truth. 'If the Providence of God,' says St. Augustine, 'does not control the things of earth, then it is useless to talk further about religion.'<sup>21</sup>

So far we have studied the organ of the infallible teaching ministry in general. It is the collective episcopate of the Catholic Church as the successor of the Apostles to whom the commission was given to teach all nations,<sup>22</sup> to the building up of the mystical body of the Church; <sup>23</sup> the *ecclesia docens*, the *teaching Church*: this we must now examine more closely.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

## THE POPE AN INFALLIBLE TEACHER OF THE CHURCH.

The powers, the authority, the promises granted to the Apostles supposed them, as we have already said, to be in harmony with St. Peter and therefore in subordination to him, hence it follows that the Catholic episcopate is the organ of the infallible teaching office of the Church when it is in harmony with St. Peter and subject to him, that is, to the Apostolic See of Rome. On this condition only are they the teachers of the whole Church, on this condition are they partakers of the promise. But the Apostolic See holds supreme authority in the Church, to it therefore the teaching office of the whole Church was confided, as to it belongs jurisdiction over the whole Church: it is the Father and Teacher of all the faithful. Hence infallibility is the charisma of its teaching office, because its teaching office is the organ, the way by which the truth is announced to the whole Church, defended, explained and protected against error.

For this reason, our Lord, when He announced to St. Peter his work and his office in the Church, not only distinguished him from the other Apostles<sup>24</sup> but contrasted him with them; he was to confirm them in the faith, they were to be confirmed:<sup>25</sup> he was to be the supreme shepherd, they were to be pastured by him.<sup>26</sup> Therefore the Pope as the successor of St. Peter is the organ of dogmatic infallibility, with the assistance of the Holy Ghost which has been promised to him in his office of teacher of the whole Church. Hence his decisions in questions of faith, being infallible by the assistance of God, are (*ex sese*) of themselves binding on the faithful and they do not begin to bind only when the adhesion of the Episcopate has been given. For the bishops too are members of the Church which is built on the rock, they are among the brethren who require to be confirmed, among the sheep who are to be pastured, though as contrasted with their diocesans they are teachers, pastors and judges, placed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God, to announce the faith, to defend it and to demand obedience in virtue of their office.

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE INFALLIBLE EPISCOPATE AND THE INFALLIBLE  
PRIMACY IN THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS.

According to this statement the collective Catholic Episcopate is the organ of the infallible teaching office of the Church and so is the Primate of the whole Church. *In what relation do they stand to each other?* It is of the utmost importance to establish the true stand-point and to eliminate false ideas and misunderstandings.

The infallibility of the Pope in dogmatic decisions cannot be held to be inconsistent with the infallibility of the collective Episcopate of the Church; the less so as it forms part of the infallibility of the teaching body of the bishops and its relation to their infallibility is merely an external and accidental one. We should arrive only at a one-sided, dead and therefore false abstraction if we were to divide the living body of our Lord, separate the members from the head or the head from the members, animated by one spirit, pervaded by the one breath of life, which according to the promise of our Lord, who had established the unity of the Church as the seal of her divinity, can never be separated, because the Church would then be a trunk, no longer a living body, and consequently no longer the body of Christ. We must conceive the union of the bishops as an organic one, not a mechanical one: they are not merely in juxtaposition, they are united together, that is to say, the Pope as head in organic union of faith with the bishops, the members, thus presenting the whole Church; the bishops, as members united with their head, the Pope, and vivified by the same spirit; separated from the head they would be dead. According to this, it is one and the same charisma of infallibility which Christ promised to the collective teaching body of the Church, which is vouchsafed to a definition of the Apostolic See in union with the Bishops, either in a Council, or out of one; or to a definition of faith by the Pope as 'Father, Teacher and supreme Judge in matters of faith,' even before the assembly of a Council and before the utterance of the other bishops and which preserves from all error the dogma proclaimed by him to the whole Church and binding on the faithful: this infallibility in both forms in which it is

manifested flows from the one principle; it rests on one foundation, the supernatural guidance by Christ and His spirit of the Church and chiefly of its head and His visible Vicar.<sup>27</sup>

We may, if we will, draw a distinction between the infallibility of the Pope and that of a Council; but the distinction would not be an adequate one, because a universal Council without the Pope would not be a universal Council. The infallibility of the Pope is no other than the infallibility of the Church: the Pope enjoys infallibility because the Church enjoys it and no further. And the infallibility of the Church is that of the Pope, the Head of the Church; the body of the faithful if they obey him will ever be preserved from error. Our Lord did not promise two infallibilities, but one; the bearer of it is now the Head alone, now the Head with the members, the bishops united with him, in or out of a Council. The same divine Providence which preserves the Church from error, preserves too the Head, the supreme pastor whose duty it is to feed all with the food of pure doctrine. As the different functions of our bodily life proceed from one and the same soul, so one spirit animates the mystical body of Christ, the Church, and now through the Head alone, now through the Head in union with its chief members, the bishops, elicits the fundamental act of Church life, the proclamation of the faith, the condemnation of error. The infallibility of the Pope therefore does not exclude the infallibility of the collective teaching ministry of the Church, it rather includes it: the two are not in juxta-position, they are one in the other. As the whole Church, teachers and disciples, Bishops and laity 'forms one pillar and ground of truth'<sup>28</sup> and cannot fall into error, therefore infallibility was promised to the collective Teaching ministry, by which the truth was to be preserved in its purity. And as the collective Teaching ministry was to be the infallible guardian of the deposit of faith, it is directed to him who confirms the brethren, the supreme pastor and teacher, from whom the teachers of individual churches must themselves learn, the foundation-stone on which the pillars of their churches must rest. Thus the whole Church, the collective Episcopate and the Primacy are each infallible but in a different way.



## CHAPTER IX.

## THE MEANING OF PERSONAL INFALLIBILITY.

Individual believers do not represent the whole Church; individual bishops do not represent the Catholic Episcopate: but the Pope is the sole gerent and occupant of the Papacy; the Primacy resides in his person. Hence the infallibility, which was conferred on the Primacy, is personal to him, it is called into exercise by him. To him personally was confided the supreme office of teacher, he personally therefore was adorned with the charisma of infallibility; to individual bishops the office of teaching the Universal Church and with it infallibility was given only in union with the collective Episcopate. We may talk therefore of personal infallibility, in so far as the office of supreme Teacher, to which the charisma of infallibility is attached, belongs to the Pope, not in partnership with others, or in dependence on others, as is the case with bishops to whom it is not given, taken singly, but taken as a collective body with the Pope. The charisma of infallibility was not given to the Pope for his own personal use and benefit, but for the benefit of the Church: hence the Church teaches infallibility to be a charisma,<sup>29</sup> a grace granted for the advantage of others, independent of personal holiness, like the priestly power: hence it does not preserve the Pope as a private individual from error, still less does it render him impeccable. The person of the Pope is not absolutely infallible; for as he always and everywhere retains his personality, he would be always and everywhere infallible: whereas Canon Law<sup>30</sup> seems to admit the possibility of the Pope as a private individual falling into heresy.<sup>31</sup> So far the gift of infallibility is not a personal gift. It was promised to the office with which the person of the Pope is invested, to the official person, not to the private individual,<sup>32</sup> and to him under certain conditions and suppositions, viz., in the exercise of the office of supreme Judge in questions of faith to the whole Church: it must not therefore in any way be looked upon as a permanent state, as an inherent, abiding quality of the Pope. Still less is it a *miracle* in the true sense, as theologians teach the supernatural action of the sacraments is not supernatural,

A miracle is an extraordinary occurrence, whilst the action of divine grace in faith and in the sacraments belongs to the supernatural order established by Christ.<sup>33</sup>

In this sense the Vatican Council ascribes infallibility to the Pope when he speaks *ex-cathedra*, that is, when in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of Christendom, in virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority he defines some doctrine regarding faith or morals to be believed by the whole Church.<sup>34</sup>

---

## CHAPTER X.

### DEFINITIO "EX CATHEDRA."

The 'definition *ex cathedra*' is only the concrete expression for the exercise of the supreme teaching office, whose decision in matters of faith and morals commands the acceptance of the whole Church. The Church has adopted this expression in common use among theologians, because it states in precise terms a right and a fact, as old as the Church herself, in the same manner as she has adopted other expressions and given them dogmatic sanction. Even the expression itself is not modern. St. Cyprian repeatedly refers to the Chair of St. Peter (*cathedra Petri*),<sup>35</sup> the one Chair which teaches; <sup>36</sup> so do St. Optatus of Miletus,<sup>37</sup> St. Jerome,<sup>38</sup> St. Augustine,<sup>39</sup> Prudentius;<sup>40</sup> expressions which with the See of St. Peter (*sedes Petri*), the post of St. Peter (*locus Petri*) occur frequently in the Fathers, as the reader has seen from quotations already given and others to follow. Now when they speak of a "teaching Chair," what can they mean if not that teaching was given from it (*loqui ex cathedra*)? And when the holy Fathers so often insist on agreement with the *cathedra Petri*, how can this agreement have place unless we accept the utterance which reaches us from this teaching Chair? With this explanation the meaning of *locutio ex cathedra* becomes plain.

A *Locutio* or *Definitio dogmatica ex cathedra* is the free, in no way extorted, decision of the Pope of Rome in questions which belong to the domain of faith or morals

and is intended to bind the body of the faithful to yield an interior assent. If it is certain that only dogmatic decisions binding on the whole Church have the character of a *locutio ex cathedra*, it is also certain that the absence of certain external formalities, such as the threat of excommunication against all who refuse to accept, &c., cannot deprive it of this character, if in another way the intention of the Pope has been expressed clearly and unmistakeably.<sup>41</sup> It is not the form of the obligation which decides the point, but the clear and unmistakeably expressed will to bind the whole Church in virtue of the office of supreme Pastor of the Church.

Hence the common teaching of theologians does not consider to be a *locutio ex cathedra*: 1—simple commands of the Pope which refer to special cases or circumstances; 2—judgments on persons; 3—explanations and answers of the Popes to questions addressed to them by bishops or other persons;<sup>42</sup> 4—disciplinary decrees, which only affect the external order of the Church; 5—still less any opinion expressed by the Pope in his capacity of a private person or theologian; 6—plainly there is no question of a *locutio ex cathedra*, though under the circumstances it might have been spoken, if the Head of the Church imposes silence on the contending parties.<sup>43</sup>

What is required in the case of a Council is likewise required in the case of definitions of faith by the Pope. An examination of the tradition of the Church must precede: this examination and proof are binding in conscience on the teaching ministry of the Church; they are a guide in the discharge of their office and are pre-supposed; but they cannot be made matter of examination themselves and they can form no criterion of the truth of a dogmatic decision either in the case of Council or Pope. The Popes therefore will always proceed as they have done. 'Guided by the times and by circumstances they have sometimes convened Oecumenical Councils, sometimes (in one way or other) they have inquired what was the faith of the Church spread over the whole world, sometimes they have availed themselves of local Synods, or other means provided by divine Providence and then determined to hold fast what with the help of God

they had seen to be in accordance with holy Scripture and Apostolic tradition.<sup>44</sup> A definite rule which must be followed no more exists for the Pope than for a Council; divine Providence in different ways may give the means to distinguish what is to be believed and acknowledged. For the Church it is enough to know simply that he has spoken freely and with consideration: this is necessary for a human act and for an obligation to be laid on the whole Church; definite external standards and conditions she cannot prescribe for him in the discharge of his office and she has no right to do so, because infallibility was promised to St. Peter, free from any condition to be imposed by the Church.<sup>45</sup> He Who promised the end, promised the means too, and it would avail us little to know that the Pope is infallible, if we were not convinced that in virtue of the divine promise, Providence will not allow the Pope to pronounce a decision without consideration.<sup>46</sup> We estimate and recognise the supernatural truth of every doctrinal decision, whether of Council or Pope on the sole ground of the divine *causality* from which it precedes: the human cause is only an *instrumental* one, which obeys the first and highest cause and is guided and moved by it. Neither the longer or shorter consultation, neither the greater or lesser number of judges give to the definitions of faith by a Council their supernatural value or the dogmatic significance which obliges the whole Church to accept them. And this holds true in the definition "*ex cathedra*." All the difficulties, brought from human influences, inclinations, passions and even sicknesses which might influence the Apostolic See and disturb and pervert its judgments are traceable to the forgetfulness of the influence of divine grace, of which the Church says 'it can compel our rebellious wills to turn to God.'<sup>47</sup> The might of the grace of God overcoming all obstacles, leads the predestined infallibly<sup>48</sup> to eternal salvation; and the grace of God leads the supreme pastor of the Church with and through his freedom, by external influences and by interior inspirations to the truth,<sup>49</sup> according to the promises made. For, says St. Augustine, when our Lord prayed for St. Peter, He prayed that he might have a will perfectly free, most firm, invincible and ever constant.<sup>50</sup>

Not all that is contained in the dogmatic explanations given by a Council, nor all that is contained in the dogmatic constitutions of the Apostolic See is an article of faith in the strict sense or binding on the Church. Only the definitions of faith in the strict sense are binding; the motives and the proofs are not binding.<sup>51</sup> In Papal decisions, says Melchior Canus, we must carefully distinguish two things, the sense and the meaning of the decree and then the grounds on which it is made. In his decisions the Pope is preserved from error when he defines *ex-cathedra* truths of faith. If the arguments he adduces are not convincing or not to the point or not clear, we are not to occupy ourselves with them. We do not contend for their arguments, but for their definitions. The holy Fathers in the Council do not always bring forward convincing proofs, often they rest on probable arguments. Even should the Popes err at times in their argumentation, the authority of their office is not thereby impaired. We possess many writings from Popes which in matter of faith and morals, exhort, warn, blame, counsel without wishing to give a definite decision on faith which shall bind the whole Church.<sup>52</sup>

It cannot be denied that in the case of some Papal decisions there is reason to doubt whether they are binding at all or how far. Such doubts are not limited to the *locutio ex-cathedra*, they exist in regard of the decisions of Councils.<sup>53</sup> Such controversies are decided by the agreement of the Church, the common teaching of theologians and especially by the practical action of the Church herself.<sup>54</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XI.

### THE PROOF FROM SCRIPTURE.

Having now accurately defined and clearly explained the point in question it will not be difficult to establish the Vatican dogma of the infallibility of the Apostolic teaching Primacy.

It follows as a necessary consequence from the promises made to St. Peter and his successors. Those we examined minutely when speaking of the Primacy in general. In

the infallible teaching ministry the plenary authority of the Apostolic See is seen as a plenary authority in matter of *doctrine*; for the Primacy in doctrine flows from an essential part of the Primatial authority in general:<sup>56</sup> the Church is built on the truth of her teaching in faith. St. Peter is the foundation of the Church; therefore he cannot totter, that is, err in faith, otherwise the whole edifice of the Church would fall.

Faith is the vital principle of the Church: to guard the purity of faith is her first, her chief duty: for she is the pillar and ground of truth. The Church is unconquerable because she is infallible; she is unconquerable on account of the foundation on which she is built, which is St. Peter. St. Peter is the intermediary, the visible instrument appointed by the invisible Head and protector of the Church for the preservation of the infallibility of His Church, and therefore He Himself is infallible. "Thou art blessed,"<sup>56</sup> says our Lord,<sup>57</sup> "because My Father hath taught you, and the opinions of men have not deceived you, but a revelation from heaven has instructed you; not flesh and blood, but He, Whose only begotten Son I am, has been your teacher. And I say to thee, that is to say, as My Father has revealed to thee My divinity, so I reveal to thee thy pre-eminence: Thou art Peter, that is, as I am an immovable rock, and the foundation, out of which no one builds, so art thou a rock, because strengthened by My power and what naturally belongs to Me by My might shall be shared by thee through communion with Me. On this strength," He said, "I will build an eternal temple, and My lofty Church reaching to Heaven shall rise on the strength of thy faith. . . . And the Church shall be girt with such strength that neither the craft of heresy nor the incredulity of paganism shall prevail against her."<sup>58</sup> "This constancy in faith rewarded in St. Peter by our Lord St. Peter has transmitted to his successors; as that which St. Peter believed still endures, so shall that which Christ established in St. Peter."<sup>59</sup> The decree of eternal truth is still in force, and St. Peter, unailing in the rock-like strength, which he received from our Lord, has never quitted the helm of the Church.<sup>60</sup> In St. Peter therefore the firmness of all is strengthened and the assistance of divine grace is so

administered that the firmness which Christ granted to St. Peter, through him was given to the Apostles.<sup>61</sup> The confession of St. Peter is therefore the foundation and his firmness is that of a rock which no shock can shatter.<sup>62</sup> On him alone the Church is built; from this foundation no one must detach himself: for heresies can only arise, when obedience is withheld from the Bishop:<sup>63</sup> only in communion with him can unity of faith be preserved by all.<sup>64</sup>

St. Peter is the supreme pastor, to whom the whole flock in its various degrees and classes, lambs and sheep, was confided. There were many Apostles, says St. Augustine,<sup>65</sup> but to one only was it said, feed My sheep. Our Lord established unity in St. Peter alone. It was his duty to feed them with the food of the whole Gospel, to guard them against the poison of error; the sheep over whom by the appointment of Christ St. Peter was named shepherd, must hear his voice, follow his guidance, under the penalty of being shut out from the sheep-fold.<sup>66</sup> Hence all must be one with St. Peter in faith; hence the faith of St. Peter must be infallible; he has otherwise not the right to pasture them, nor have the sheep any obligation of obedience to him.

Our Lord prayed for the faith of St. Peter; to him the brethren are directed to receive from him the confirmation of their faith.<sup>67</sup> But St. Peter cannot confirm the faith of the brethren, unless his own never wavers, unless it abides in him with undiminished strength and purity. 'The danger of temptation threatened all the Apostles; but Our Lord showed a special anxiety for St. Peter and prayed in a special manner for the faith of St. Peter, as though the condition of the others was secured if the soul of the Prince of the Apostles were unconquered.'<sup>68</sup> 'Who can doubt,' says Bossuet,<sup>69</sup> 'that through the efficacy of the prayer of Christ, whom the Father hears always,<sup>70</sup> St. Peter received an unshaken, an invincible faith, strong enough to confirm not only the simple laity, but also his brethren the Apostles, the shepherds of the flock, so to rescue them from being sifted by Satan.' These words coincide mysteriously with those others of Our Lord. 'Thou art Peter, &c.;' that is to say, I have changed thy name Simon into that

of Peter, to make known the strength that I will impart to thee, not only for these, but also for My whole Church, which it is My will to build on this rock. I will make thee the herald of the faith in a special and prominent manner, that thou mayest become the foundation of the Church, so that the gates of hell may not prevail against her. This is no more than what Christ said : behold Satan hath sought you. For St. Peter in a special manner and by name Our Lord prays ; not as if He overlooked the others, but because, as the Fathers explain the text, whilst praying for the confirmation of the Head He secured the members. Hence He says, I have prayed for *thee*, not I have prayed for *you*. St. Peter must for ever live in the Church, to confirm the brethren in the faith. And his authority was all the more indispensable among the successors of the Apostles, as their faith is less strong than that of the Apostles.<sup>71</sup> ‘Because thou art the Prince of the Apostles,’ Theophylactus<sup>72</sup> explains the words of Our Lord, ‘confirm the others : this task becomes thee, as thou art after Me the rock and foundation of the Church.’ Become the strength and the teacher of those who by faith come to Me, explains St. Cyril of Alexandria.<sup>73</sup> And St. Bernard writes to Pope Innocent II : “We must inform your Apostolical authority of the dangers and crimes which appear in the kingdom of God, especially of those which concern the faith. For it is fitting that the wounds of faith should be there healed where the faith can suffer no diminution. That is the prerogative of your See. For to what other was it said, ‘I have prayed for thee, &c.’ Hence we cry to the successor of St. Peter : confirm they brethren.”

Only an infallible teacher of the faith can confirm in faith : only to an infallible teacher can the brethren turn to be confirmed in the faith.

---



## CHAPTER XII.

## THE PROOF FROM THE FATHERS.

The testimonies of the Holy Fathers rest on the words of Holy Scripture. St. Irenaeus, in a passage already quoted,<sup>74</sup> however much its interpretation has been disputed for centuries, points to agreement with the Church founded at Rome by SS. Peter and Paul as the criterion of Catholic faith. Origen declares :<sup>75</sup> ‘St Peter is the foundation of the Church and the immoveable rock on which Christ has built His Church.’ On St. Peter, says St. Cyprian,<sup>76</sup> Christ has built His Church; from him is derived the unity of the priesthood,<sup>77</sup> the Church of Rome is therefore the root, the womb of the Catholic Church :<sup>78</sup> with her error in faith can find no entrance.<sup>79</sup> To be in agreement with the Apostolic See, is for him the same thing as to be in agreement with the whole Catholic Church ;<sup>80</sup> for as there is only one God and one Christ, so there can only be one Church and one Chair of doctrine, set up by the word of our Lord on St. Peter.<sup>81</sup> On the contrary, to be cut off from Rome, is with the Fathers the same as to be cut off from the purity of Catholic and Apostolic teaching.<sup>82</sup>

The Episcopal Chair in the city of Rome was assigned to St. Peter, says St. Optatus of Miletus,<sup>83</sup> that in one Chair of doctrine the unity of all might be preserved, that each Apostle might not set up a chair of doctrine for himself, and therefore he who sets up another chair against this one renders himself a schismatic and an offender. This one Chair of doctrine is the chief gift which the Church possesses.<sup>84</sup> In Pope Siricius, therefore, who is with us, the whole world is united in one communion.<sup>85</sup> ‘This See of Rome is unique in its way.’<sup>86</sup> What does, what can this mean, except that he who occupies this unique See, by communion with whom Catholic communion is maintained, possesses a teaching authority unique in a way and therefore infallible, to which all submit, because in this way only the whole Church secures unity of faith ?

Thus according to St. Cyprian and Optatus there is only one Chair, the ‘*Cathedra Petri*,’ in which resides the ministry of teaching all, as there is only one bishop the authoritative teacher for each individual Church. By this

Chair, the unity of the whole Church is established and guaranteed, as unity of faith in individual churches is maintained by the teaching authority of the bishop.<sup>87</sup> In this Chair is the summit of all authority in faith:<sup>88</sup> whoever separates from it separates from the Christian religion:<sup>89</sup> therefore in it and through it the unity and purity of faith are preserved. Leaning on this authority in faith as on a sure support<sup>90</sup> we mount up to God: it is so sure, that through it we first attain certainty as to the Gospels.<sup>91</sup> St Epiphanius<sup>92</sup> describes St. Peter as the 'Prince of the Apostles,'<sup>93</sup> the firm rock<sup>94</sup> against which the gates of hell, that is, heresies and heresiarchs can never prevail: in him all difficult questions about faith have their answer.<sup>95</sup>

St. Gregory of Nazianzen sings of old Rome in contrast with new Rome (Constantinople):

The faith of old was ever true,  
The faith of old remains still true;  
For Rome, as Queen of all the world,  
In one unites the Western world.

For him St. Peter is the indestructible rock on which the Church is built.<sup>96</sup> Whoever is in agreement with the Bishop of Rome, is in agreement with the Catholic bishops everywhere.<sup>97</sup> His ground for saying this is the axiom, where Peter is there is the Church: for to St. Peter it was said, on thee I will build My Church. Thus union with St. Peter is the criterion of Catholic communion. For this reason he writes to the Emperor in the name of the Council of Aquileia, they could not suffer the faith of the Church of Rome to be destroyed, because from it flow all the rights of venerable communion,<sup>98</sup> that is to say, he who is not in communion with her is not in communion with the Catholic Church.

The declarations of St. Jerome on the Primacy of the Apostolic See have been already quoted. For him the faith of Pope Innocent is the standard of true faith.<sup>99</sup> On the occasion of a dogmatic controversy he appeals to the See of St. Peter and declares to St. Damasus:<sup>100</sup> As I am resolved to follow only Christ, I attach myself to your Holiness, that is, to "communion with the See of St. Peter; for I know the Church is built on that rock; whoever partakes of the lamb outside this house is profane. All outside the ark of

Noë must sink. I know not Vitalis; I reject Miletus, I know nothing of Paulinus. He who does not gather with me scatters; that is, he who is not with Christ is with Antichrist ... I am with him who is in union with the See of Peter ... I beseech your Holiness to inform me with whom I am to enter into ecclesiastical communion in Syria." Therefore according to him the See of St Peter confirms the doctrine of the See of the Evangelist St. Mark.<sup>101</sup>

We have to some extent quoted the words of St. Augustine. He invites the Donatists to unite themselves again to the true vine; this they must do by resuming communion with the See of Rome, because the Church is built on this rock against which the proud gates of hell shall not prevail and therefore the fullness of the Catholic faith is in the successors of St. Peter.<sup>102</sup> Of this See of Rome Prudentius sings:<sup>103</sup>

One only faith we hold, in Moses law prepared,  
The same St. Paul preserves and Peter's Chair.

'To this Chair of unity God has confided the teaching of the truth.'<sup>104</sup> 'In this ancient and firmly established Chair therefore is found the certain pure faith, so that no Christian can have a doubt on the matter.'<sup>105</sup> So St. Augustine with the bishops assembled at Carthage and Miletus begged Innocent I. to give a decision against the heresy of the Pelagians, because agreement with the See of Rome is for him a proof of agreement with the Catholic Church.<sup>106</sup> Celestius and Pelagius had professed themselves ready to accept the judgment of the Pope.<sup>107</sup> When the decision came, he exclaimed: 'The documents have come from Rome, the controversy is an end, would we could say the same of the error.'<sup>108</sup>

The leader of the Catholics in the East, the great Patriarch St. Cyril, addressed himself to Pope Celestine, begging him to declare whether he should hold communion with Nestorius, the patriarch of Constantinople, or openly preach that no one should enter into communion with those who believed and taught as Nestorius did. He professed to follow his decision that 'he might not be cut off from the communion of the whole Western Church.'

We exhort you, writes St. Peter Chrysologus to Eutyches, an Abbot at Constantinople, to accept what the Pope of the city of Rome has written. For St. Peter who lives in the See which was his offers to those who ask for it the boon of faith. The saint only repeated what St. Leo the Great before him and Philip the legate had said at the Council of Ephesus.

Why, inquires Julius I. (342), has no one written to us from the Church of Alexandria? Are you not aware that it is the *usage* to write to us and that here we decide what is right?<sup>109</sup>

The holy Apostle St. Peter, writes Pope Sixtus III, delivered in the person of his successor what he had received. 'Who will separate himself from his teaching whom the Master Himself first instructed among the Apostles.'<sup>110</sup> 'We must persevere in his faith, that we may follow the Apostles with an upright mind and deserve to have a place among the Apostolicals.' 'An injury is inflicted on the Holy See if its decision is treated as doubtful,' writes Innocent I.<sup>111</sup> Other churches should receive their doctrinal decrees from it in the spirit of tradition and Church discipline, as streams rise from their sources and flow pure outlets of an untroubled fountain. If therefore a question about faith arises, all bishops should betake themselves to St. Peter, the origin of their name and dignity.<sup>112</sup> 'Our authority is such,' writes Pope Zosimus to the Bishops of Africa,<sup>113</sup> 'that no one can appeal against our judgment.' He is willing to communicate the matter to the bishops, not as if he did not know what would follow (in the heresy of the Pelagians) or as if he could adopt ill-judged measures, but simply that he might take counsel with them. In proclaiming the truth, writes Xystus III. to St. Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>114</sup> the Church has ever firmly held one and the same faith. 'For,' observes Pope Gelasius,<sup>115</sup> 'the promise of Christ that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the confession of St. Peter, was not made in vain. Hence we do not fear that an Apostolic decision will have to be recalled, supported as it is by the promise of Christ, the tradition of our predecessors and the authority of the Canons: nay rather, she sits in judgment on the whole Church.' If the Church of Rome could fall away, he remarks elsewhere,<sup>116</sup> how can we withstand any

error, or how can those who go astray be directed back to the right way.<sup>117</sup> Hence an irregularly assembled Council, that is, assembled in defiance of holy Scripture, of the teaching of the Fathers, of the rules of the Church, which the Universal Church with reason refuses to receive, and *which the Apostolic See in particular has not confirmed* may be properly and rightly corrected by a lawfully assembled Council, that is, by a Council called according to the rules of Holy Scripture, the teaching of the Fathers, the rules of the Church in matters of faith and of Church Communion which the whole Church receives and which the Holy See has approved.<sup>118</sup> For in what concerns religion, the final judgment according to the Canons, belongs to the Apostolic See.<sup>119</sup> Hence bishops who have fallen away from the true faith ought to be denounced to the Apostolic See.<sup>120</sup> The followers of Acacia's schism excused themselves on the ground that they did not know what was the teaching of the Apostolic See.<sup>121</sup>

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, condemned on a false charge of heresy, betook himself to Pope Leo the Great: he himself states the grounds of his appeal:<sup>122</sup> 'The Church of Rome, above all the churches in the world, holds precedence on many grounds, but especially because she is free from all taint of heresy and has never admitted doctrines opposed to the faith: nay, she has ever preserved the Apostolic faith in its purity.' Theodoret of Studium says of the Iconoclasts:<sup>123</sup> 'They have detached themselves from the body of Christ and the chief See, to which Christ entrusted the keys of the faith, against which the gates of hell, that is, the words of heresy, have never prevailed and never can prevail, as He has promised, Who cannot deceive.' And Maximus of Constantinople writes:<sup>124</sup> 'All look to Rome, as to the sun, to receive the holy faith from there: there is the foundation of the whole Church, against which according to words of our Lord the gates of hell shall not prevail, which holds the keys of a righteous faith and confession, which imparts the true religion to all who come to her, which closes and stops the blasphemous lips of every heresy.' 'To secure the faith,' remarks Victor of Vita, 'the bishops must come together, especially those of the Church of Rome, which is the head of all.'<sup>125</sup>

Of transcendent importance is the Confession of Pope Hormisdas.<sup>126</sup> The Vatican Council introduces from it the following words : Salvation must be had first of all in preserving the rule of Faith. And whereas the words of Christ cannot be made void, Who said thou art Peter and on this rock I will build My Church, what He promised has been confirmed by history, because religion has ever been preserved undefiled and the truths of salvation have ever been announced by the Apostolic See. As we would on no account be separated from its faith and teaching, we hope to be worthy to belong to the one communion which the Apostolic See proclaims, in which the perfect and true firmness of the Catholic religion is found.<sup>127</sup> This confession was drawn up by Pope Hormisdas in the year 517, subscription to it was imposed as a condition of re-admission into ecclesiastical communion on the bishops who left the schism of Acacia and it was signed by John the Patriarch of Constantinople and 2500 bishops ; only those bishops were admitted to the eighth General Council (869) who had signed it.

Stephen of Dora addressed to the See of Rome a letter read at the Lateran Synod under Martin I, in which he implores the Pope for protection against the heresy of the Monothelites.<sup>128</sup> " We wish we could take the wings of the dove and fly and lay all this matter before that Chair, which is set above all others, yours, the highest, the supreme, where every wound finds healing. This it has been wont to do in virtue of its position, from ancient times, through its apostolical and canonical authority. It first received the commission to feed the sheep of the Catholic Church, when our Lord said, ' Peter lovest thou Me ? Feed My sheep.' It too, since it has more than all a specially firm faith in God our Lord, was promoted to convert and to confirm its wavering companions and spiritual brethren, and from our Lord Who was made flesh for us by His gracious dispensation received power and priestly authority over all." ' For this reason,' he goes on to say, ' Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, has sent him to Rome, *where the foundations of orthodox doctrine exist.*'<sup>129</sup>

‘My faith,’ writes Pope Felix II. to the Emperor Zeno,<sup>130</sup> ‘is that which our Lord Himself delivered as the one, true, never to be perverted faith when He promised the gates of hell should never prevail against His Church founded on me.’ It is fitting and profitable, writes Bishop Possessor during his stay at Constantinople to Pope Hormisdas,<sup>131</sup> that when the members suffer, they should seek healing from the head. For who can feel greater care for his subjects, or to whom can we rather look for support to a wavering faith, than to the occupant of that Chair, whose first teacher heard from Christ ‘thou art Peter and on this rock, I will build My Church.’ ‘By the faith of this rock’, says Pope Hormisdas in his letter to the Archbishop of Constantinople, ‘that is, by the firmness of the Prince of the Apostles, the foundations of the Church of the East will be strengthened.’<sup>132</sup>

---

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### HOW THE COUNCILS AND THE POPES UNDERSTOOD

##### THIS DOCTRINE PRACTICALLY.

This prerogative of the Pope of Rome was recognised by the Councils. St. Leo the Great in his dogmatic letter to Flavian, the Patriarch of Constantinople, had already condemned the errors of Eutyches :<sup>133</sup> he refused to allow the subject to be discussed again.<sup>134</sup> And the Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon (451) in their letter to the Pope declare:<sup>135</sup> ‘Thou hast preserved the faith which has come down to us by the words of the law giver, thou who hast been placed over all of us to proclaim the voice of Peter.’ They go on to say, he presided over them as the head over the members : Christ had prepared for them a spiritual feast in the Pope’s letter. They denounce the crime of Dioscorus who had not only dared to reinstate Eutyches in his dignity after the Pope had deprived him of his office, but had gone the length of excommunicating from the Church the Pope himself, to whom the guardianship of the vineyard had been entrusted by our Lord and whose duty it is to maintain the unity of the body of the Church.<sup>136</sup> The proposal to draw up a new formula of faith was rejected by them : those who do not agree with Leo, they declare, are heretics.<sup>137</sup> In conclusion, they beg the Pope to ratify their proceedings.<sup>138</sup>

For the information of the Bishops of Illyria and Palestine, the letter of St. Leo was compared with the Nicene Creed and that of Constantinople and with the letter of St. Cyril approved by the Council of Ephesus : this was done in the 4th session, not with the intention of calling into doubt the decision of the Pope or submitting it to any test, but for the instruction of the ignorant : thus by the splendid proof of unity, the truth was shown forth more clearly and it received a deeper stamp, the authority of superiors was maintained, the liberty of the subject was not infringed, opposition was overcome, so that what was objectionable could not appear to have been crushed under the prejudice of an imposed silence.<sup>139</sup> The Pope had given his consent to the meeting of the Council only on the condition that there should not be even the appearance of opposition to his sacred decision and that if any controverted question were moved, all disputes should be suppressed and postponed to the unity of peace and faith.<sup>140</sup> The Fathers were not to discuss his letter as an open question,<sup>141</sup> nor consider what faith was to be adopted, but what petitions were to be received and how they were to be answered.<sup>142</sup>

At the Council of Ephesus (431) the Papal Legate Philip who presided laid down the same principles and they were received with assent by the Fathers. The instruction of Pope Celestine to the legates directed them to maintain the authority of the Apostolic See, to confine themselves to their instructions, to decide the points in dispute and to avoid being drawn into controversy. In his letter to the Council the Pope says:<sup>143</sup> ‘In our solicitude we have sent our fellow priests to you that they may assist at the proceedings and see carried out what we have previously determined.’<sup>144</sup> We doubt not your Holiness will give your support, as that which is under consideration will be concluded to the security of the whole Church. The Fathers, compelled to do so, as they affirm, by the Canons and the letter of Pope Celestine condemned Nestorius. The Pope’s letter was greeted as an expression of faith coming from the chief of the Apostles.<sup>145</sup>

Pope Agatho<sup>146</sup> referring to Luke 22, 32 declared to the Sixth Council which likewise assented to him : ‘That the Church of Rome by the grace of God in virtue of the



promise of our Saviour had never deviated from the path of Apostolical traditions or yielded to heretical innovations ; as she received the faith in the beginning, she will remain untainted till the end.' Therefore there was to be no discussion on the Confession which would be placed before them by his legates ; it was to be accepted as certain. His letter determined the decision of the Council. Peter has spoken through Agatho, the Fathers exclaimed. Agatho's successor Leo II. said he had examined the decrees and found them in agreement with the explanations of faith given by his predecessor Agatho and the Roman Synods and he therefore confirmed them.<sup>147</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

### THE BISHOPS ARE TRUE JUDGES IN MATTERS OF FAITH.

This supreme, defining and infallible judicial office of the Apostolic See in no way excludes the rights of Bishops as teachers and judges in matters of faith : the Bishops assembled in Council with the Pope teach and judge as well as he does.<sup>148</sup> If they had merely a consultative voice a Council would not be formed by the meeting of the Bishops as successors of the Apostles and divinely placed pastors : in that case the theologians and learned men present would have equal rights with them, a claim unknown in the Church.<sup>149</sup> The Bishops only can bind and loose, command and forbid. The adhesion of the Bishops and their decision delivered in communion with the Pope is not a mere act of submission and obedience, such as is the acceptance by the body of the faithful, but a judicial sentence which they proclaim in their unity with the supreme judge.<sup>150</sup> As the head and members form one body, observes Melchior Cano,<sup>151</sup> so the Pope and Bishops in Council constitute one single authority, as all declared at the Council of Jerusalem ; it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us ; all therefore are authors of the conciliary decision. The personal infallibility of the Apostles in the way of inspiration did not affect the truly judicial utterance of the Apostle St. James and the other Church dignitaries at the Council of Jerusalem

neither does the supreme judicial authority of the Apostolic See exclude the official judicial action of the other judges of faith placed by the Holy Ghost. A judge in matters of faith is one who, in virtue of the commission and office he holds, pronounces what is true and what is false, what is contained in the deposit of faith and what is contrary to it. Hence the Bishops speak as judges when they declare anew some doctrine to be of faith and revealed which had already been acknowledged to be contained in revelation either by a Council, or by the universal teaching of the Church or by the express words of Holy Scripture. When, therefore, they declare their adhesion to the decision pronounced by the supreme judge, do they cease to be truly judges?

It forms no part of the essence of a judicial sentence that he who pronounces it should be able at his will and pleasure to decide the contrary; on that supposition the Councils which repeated the decisions of earlier Councils and published them again under a new form or supported them by new arguments would not have defined judicially. Even Provincial Synods have accepted the decrees of General Councils, after a judicial examination. The Fathers of the 14th Synod of Toledo declare 'First we have with unanimous judgment compared the Acts (of the Sixth General Council) with those of the older Councils. . . And as we found them in agreement with them on all points we confirmed them.'

---

## CHAPTER XV.

### THE POPE AND THE COUNCIL.

Bishops exercise judicial authority in three ways and are thus distinguished from the other faithful who only perform an act of obedience. By the light of the Scriptures and Traditions they examine the decrees of previous Councils and of the Apostolic See, not that they may decide arbitrarily, but in order to investigate the grounds on which decrees were framed, to go deeper into them, to develop them more clearly and fully; for they are placed by God as *Teachers, Judges, Guardians* and *Defenders* of the Faith. 'The truth shines forth more brightly, and is held more

firmly, when examination afterwards confirms what faith (by the decree of the Apostolic See) had taught. The dignity of the episcopal office then becomes most conspicuous when the authority of the highest is preserved in such a way that the liberty of the inferior suffers no diminution. And the investigation turns to the greater glory of God when it is set on foot with the object of overcoming the enemy, and error does not seem to be put down by the forestalled judgment of imposed silence.<sup>152</sup>

Secondly : in the general deliberations they give to the truths already announced by the Apostolic See that expression, not unfrequently brought to a point in a few words, which is most appropriate to represent the true and full meaning of the decree and to guard it against any misinterpretation by sophistical heretics. For the expression, the form which exactly renders the truth is no less an object of dogmatic decision than the truth itself.<sup>153</sup>

Thirdly ; they pronounce authoritatively as judges on the truths of faith and on error ; for it is their office and duty *to carry out the decree which has been pronounced* and to oblige their subjects to accept it : and this cannot be said of those who take part in the Council with only a consultative voice.

The judicial authority of the Bishops is exercised in their judgment in communion with the authority of the Apostolic See and in subordination to it, just as their pastoral authority in the Church is only given to them in communion with him and in subordination to him who possesses plenary authority. The exercise of authority on the part of the Bishops thus becomes at the same time an act of obedience : and while they obey and think one and the same as members with the Head, they at the same time exercise their authority.

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

A COUNCIL IS NOT ABSOLUTELY, BUT ONLY  
RELATIVELY, NECESSARY.

From the infallibility therefore of the Pope's teaching Primacy it follows that the summoning of a General Council to decide questions of faith *is not absolutely necessary*. Many heresies, the Pelagian in former times, Jansenism and Quietism in modern times were condemned and rejected by the sole authority of the Apostolic See.<sup>154</sup> But in many cases it is useful and imperative to call a General Council or to respond to the general desire of Christendom for one, as St. Leo the Great did in the case of that of Chalcedon, *if for the rest it is possible to assemble it*. A Council is certainly one of the ways marked out by Providence to establish the truth in controversies of faith though not the only one; on this account the Council of Trent expressed a hope to the Apostolic See that among other means of deciding questions which might arise regarding its decrees it would adopt that of convening a General Council, if it should appear to be adapted to that end.<sup>155</sup> The case may arise of a dogmatic question presenting such difficulties, that the Pope himself may judge it to be necessary to submit it for examination not only to the representatives of the Roman Church, the college of Cardinals and the Congregations, but further to a General Council: for God has left various ways and means open to His Church for the investigation of the truth.<sup>156</sup> 'Thus,' remarks Bellarmine,<sup>157</sup> 'Pope Stephen would not pronounce a definitive decision on the question of baptism by heretics: later councils did it afterwards. In the interval after laborious and wide inquiries many principles were clearly developed, which threw a strong light on this and several other questions.' So Pope Celestine allowed that the Council of Ephesus should be held, not as though it were absolutely necessary, which neither he nor St. Cyril of Alexandria would have conceded,<sup>158</sup> (the Pope had previously directed his legates to decide and not to discuss), but the powerful influence of Nestorius, Archbishop of Constantinople who had gained over to his side the Emperor and many bishops could only be counteracted by the imposing authority of a General

Council.<sup>159</sup> In this Council as well as in that of Chalcedon according to the decision of St. Leo the Great, the truth was not called in question by a fresh investigation, but by the authority of so many bishops and the weight of their arguments the faith was announced more impressively, opposition was more quickly put down, those who had gone astray were instructed, and the most obstinate were put to shame. Still more necessary would seem to be the assembling of the Bishops in Council, when questions of discipline come under consideration. At such times the counsel and the opinions of the Bishops is of the highest importance; for power is given to the Church for edification.<sup>160</sup>

In a certain sense therefore the authority of a Council is greater than that of the Apostolic See taken by itself, because the whole Episcopate united with the Pope presents a longer series of witnesses for Catholic truth and judges of error than the Pope alone. But this greater authority is only such externally, in extension, materially,<sup>161</sup> not internally, in intensity or formally.<sup>162</sup> For till such time as the Popes confirm the decisions of a Synod however numerous, those decisions do not carry the weight of those of a General Council. Such a Synod apart from the Pope is not possible.<sup>163</sup>

However the Council is not an absolutely necessary institution, without which the organism of the Church cannot act in a normal way: it cannot possibly be of such necessity, for the opportunity of holding it is seldom afforded, and the most glorious centuries of the life of the Church, the three first, did not witness a General Council.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### THE QUESTION OF POPE HONORIUS.

The conduct of Pope Honorius and his condemnation seem to cast a melancholy shadow on the bright picture which history exhibits to us of the position and action of the Apostolic See of Rome. Did he not adopt the error of the Monothelites? Was he not condemned by the Sixth Synod as a heretic for doing so?

The question of Honorius has for a long time, especially during the last ten years been the subject of many controversies. How about it?

Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, had addressed himself in a clever, well considered letter to Pope Honorius, holding out to him a picture of the long wished-for favourable issue of the union of the Monophysites with the Catholic Church. He besought him to oppose with his authority those (amongst them was Sophronius, Patriarch of Constantinople) who reject the formula used as far back as Dionysius the Areopagite<sup>164</sup> asserting one divine-human power in which the union was expressed. The Monothelites abused this expression, which in itself has a true meaning, viz, the unity of the divine Person which possesses a divine and a human mode of action,<sup>165</sup> so that God in His assumed humanity did nothing divine without the co-operation of His humanity and the humanity did nothing human without the co-operation of the divinity. There should be no word of two wills in Christ, Sergius observed, as if there were two opposite wills and the Word wished to accomplish the work of salvation, but the human will opposed it.<sup>166</sup> Honorius understood the controversy in this sense and in this sense said there could not be two wills in Christ, viz, one which obeyed God and another which resisted the divine will, that is, concupiscence which in a certain sense is the will of the flesh, a second will.

This is the explanation given to the letter of Honorius by his secretary the Abbot John, who drew it up and answered in the Pope's name,<sup>167</sup> by Pope John IV. his immediate successor and by the Abbot Maximus.<sup>168</sup> 'Which,' asks Maximus 'is the more reliable interpreter of the letter, the able surviving Abbot who wrote it in the name of Honorius, or the people of Constantinople who speak out what comes into their mouths?'

The letter of the Pope itself puts us in a position perfectly to demonstrate its Catholic meaning. Proceeding to the representation of Sergius, the Pope says, 'We confess one will in our Lord Jesus Christ, because in truth our nature was assumed by the divinity not our guilt: such in truth as it came from the Creator before sin, not that which was

destroyed by sin...conceived without sin He contracted nothing of the taint of our corrupted nature. Hence our corrupted nature which strives against the law of the spirit was not assumed by the Saviour...He has no opposite and hostile will, because He is born above the law of human conditions. And if it is written : I came not to do My will, but the will of Him Who sent Me, the Father, He does not manifest a different will but the life-giving economy of His assumed humanity.<sup>169</sup> This one will, is, therefore, the one human will agreeing with the divine will, the one divine-human mode of action in the sense of the Council of Lateran. And if with reference to Matthew 26,39, Luke 22, 42 he continues : 'For our sakes was this written that we might follow His footsteps ; as a good teacher He instructs His disciples that we should not do our own will but prefer in all things the will of our Lord,' it by no means follows that in the opinion of Honorius Christ said these words for appearance's sake, that is to say, did not truly submit His human will to God.

In his second letter the Pope says : We must confess two natures in one Christ . . . which act and work in mutual sympathy, the divine will doing what is divine, the human will what belongs to man . . . Instead of a single action, as some say, we must confess one Christ acting in both natures and omitting the phrase two actions, we must confess in the person of the only begotten Son two natures, that is, the nature of God and the nature of our assumed humanity, not blended, not divided, not changeable 'each of which has its own proper action.'<sup>170</sup> 'In these words,' says Hefele,<sup>171</sup> 'Honorius professed the orthodox doctrine and it would be quite unjust to condemn him of heresy. He only professed what Leo in his dogmatic letter to Flavian had prescribed as the Catholic confession of the Synod of Chalcedon.'<sup>172</sup> These words which acknowledge a twofold activity were adopted by the Sixth Council which condemned Monothelitism. Honorius therefore professed two activities both substantially and in words.

He went so far with Sergius that he declared we ought not to use the expression one will or two wills lest in the eyes of the weak we should appear to favour the error of Nestorius or Eutyches.<sup>173</sup> The question whether on account

of the works of the divinity and humanity we should confess and admit one or two activities ought not to occupy us ; that We may leave to the grammarians who sell verbal subtleties to boys. 'We do not wish,' we read in another fragment of the second letter 'to define one or two activities.' (definire).

From all this we infer : Honorius by reason of his authority as Pope was asked by Sergius to give a decision : he uses language correct in form and substance, but refuses to give a dogmatic decision on the form of expression. In neglecting the express declaration of two wills, he failed in his duty, and in the given circumstances the Catholics felt themselves hampered in the defence of the truth and the heretics obtained an advantage.

For this reason Honorius was condemned by the Sixth Synod, *not as though he himself had fallen into error and had taught it*, but as Pope Leo II. explained in his letter to Constantine Pognatus, when confirming the judgment, 'because he neglected to enlighten the Apostolic Church by the doctrine of Apostolic tradition, and permitted the unstained tradition to be stained by profane treachery.' And to King Erwin of Spain he writes : <sup>174</sup> 'Because he allowed the unstained rule of Apostolical translation to be stained.' And in a letter to the Bishops of Spain : <sup>175</sup> 'Because he did not extinguish the flame of heretical dogma, as it became his Apostolical authority, in the commencement, but rather fed it by his negligence.'

For the rest this view is confirmed by the very terms of the condemnation. There it is said : 'We anathematize Theodore....(others follow) and with them Honorius.' <sup>176</sup> In the same document the Emperor informs the Pope : 'We anathematize...and besides Honorius who favoured the heresy, and contradicted himself.' <sup>177</sup> So again in the 13th Session in which he was condemned 'because in his letter to Sergius he followed his suggestions throughout and confirmed his pernicious teaching,' <sup>178</sup> and there too Honorius is distinguished from the others. By these passages we may judge the value of the assertions which give Honorius a place among heretics. <sup>179</sup>



Hence the Abbot Maximus, one of the most zealous champions of Monothelism, reckoned Pope Honorius among the enemies of that heresy.<sup>180</sup> If the letter of the Pope had been considered as a dogmatic decision by the Council, the statement of Pope Agatho that the See of Rome had never erred would not have been accepted by it : and the Papal legates would not have subscribed the condemnation of Honorius, if it were understood otherwise than in the sense of Leo II. For the rest Honorius may claim as any other theologian that his letter should be taken in an orthodox sense, unless the words and the context exclude such a sense.

The question of Honorius suggests two observations. The severe judgment passed on him shows to evidence that the whole Church from the first looked to the Pope as the supreme pastor and the guardian of the faith against every heresy. Another reflection forces itself upon us. The proceeding of Honorius towards the Monothelites is the one instance which can be brought with any show of reason as an argument against the infallibility. And this out of a series of two hundred and fifty Popes who during nigh two thousand years have given innumerable definitions in matters of faith and morals. May we not be permitted with every reason to conclude from this uniformly recurring fact to a general and necessary *law*, revealing itself in the fact and being the one explanation of it ?

---

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE PRIMACY FOLLOWS FROM THE VERY ESSENCE OF THE CHURCH.

The ideas and the manner of proceeding in the ancient Church from which we infer its faith in the infallibility of the Apostolic See arise necessarily from the *nature of the Primacy* and its *relations to the Church*.

The nature and state of the visible Church is conditioned by the visible unity of all the members with each other and with their head. This unity consists principally in unity of faith, for this is the foundation of the Church and of salvation.<sup>181</sup> Christ our Lord established a Primate for the maintenance of this unity ; to this end He was obliged to

confer upon him an authority by which he would be enabled by himself to preserve all the members of the Church in the unity of faith and to prevent divisions. *By himself*: for if his decisions in faith only begin to bind the members of the Church when the acceptance by the whole Church, or by the Episcopate has been accomplished, then the authority of the Pope will not be able to maintain unity in the Church. If the Pope's doctrinal decisions were only to come into force then, what pre-eminence would the Apostolic See, the *cathedra Petri*, possess, above any other bishop of the Church? If such a condition must be pre-supposed before Papal decisions become binding, its necessity must be proved by the strongest and most evident arguments: because Christ when He conferred this high prerogative on St. Peter, and appointed him to be the foundation of His Church, the shepherd of His flock, the confirmer of the faith of his brethren, never mentioned such a condition limiting his authority; nor did the Councils and Confessions of faith which style the Pope the Father and teacher of all Christians, and the Church of Rome the Mother and Mistress of all churches ever attach this condition.

Can we maintain that the plenary authority which the Councils attribute to the Pope, became really plenary by the subsequent consent of the Church?<sup>182</sup> But precisely is not this very universal agreement, this "silent consent" of all, which we are to suppose first conferred on the Papal decisions their value and their binding force, itself a subject of controversy regarding which the individual seeks clear ideas and that certainty which is necessary for an act of faith, and which he cannot obtain? Does not the Apostolic See to which he turns by its authoritative declaration complete and confirm the universal agreement? If his decision were made dependent on the adhesion of the Universal Church, then in the case of heresies arising it would not be possible for the faithful to arrive at certainty as to the obligation of faith in the controverted question. For at all times heresies from Arianism to Jansenism have contended that their opinions were held by the Universal Church, or at least by the more intelligent and better part and refused obedience to the Pope. It is quite true, the universal acceptance in the Church sets the last seal on

true doctrine, but *it is not for us the immediate principle from which we derive our knowledge.* The immediate principle is the Apostolic Primacy in teaching; this it is on which rests the universal agreement of the members uniting themselves with the head, of the sheep listening to the supreme pastor. Hence it is the 'first' and, in its way, 'the only' teaching See in the Church. And hence too the utterance of the Pope must possess an authority which excludes all doubt, he must be infallible from himself, in virtue of the prerogative granted to the teaching Primacy, and not become infallible through the adhesion of the Universal Church.<sup>183</sup>

Let us look at the matter from another point of view.

According to Febronius<sup>184</sup> and the Gallicans themselves the Papal See takes a leading part in all questions of faith; but they say the Pope's doctrinal utterances are so far binding, that we must accept them provisionally, until the Church protests against them. What does this mean? To believe provisionally may be understood to believe "for a while," till we are better informed. But this notion contains a contradiction in itself; for the act of faith rests and is grounded on a certainty which excludes all doubt. It contradicts the motive on which we lean in our faith, the infallible authority of God: it contradicts the Holy Ghost, the active principle, in Whom and through Whom we believe; it contradicts the whole supernatural character of Catholic faith. Shall we understand this provisional obedience of a merely external confession, with which the interior conviction is not in harmony? The French bishops themselves rejected this idea<sup>185</sup> and at the request of the most prominent Gallican bishops, of Bossuet amongst the others, the Apostolic See declared that it is not lawful to pronounce a confession of faith, when the interior assent is wanting and this decision was accepted by the Gallican Church and published in all the dioceses of France.<sup>186</sup>

The reason for this condemnation is plain. Faith itself is an act of obedience, "obedience to the faith,"<sup>187</sup> the captivity of every understanding to the obedience of Christ,<sup>188</sup> or as St. Chrysostom calls it<sup>189</sup> "a conviction in obedience." "To believe the Logos," says Clement of Alexandria,<sup>190</sup> "means

to obey the Logos." "To obey the Logos," remarks St. Gregory of Nazianzen, "is Logos, reason." "I believe," says Theophilus, "when I obey God." "Faith," says St. Augustine, "is the first virtue which subjects the soul to God." The duty of subjecting and submitting human reason, which is absolutely dependent on God and much exposed to err, to the infallible divine truth and truthfulness, which reveals itself in the teaching office of the Church, is the first and fundamental duty of all religion,<sup>191</sup> the foundation therefore of our justification. Thus faith is the fulfilment of a divine precept;<sup>192</sup> but "with the heart, we believe unto justice; with the mouth confession is made to salvation."<sup>193</sup> The will moves the understanding to assent; by the will faith becomes a free, meritorious act:<sup>194</sup> faith is formally an act of the understanding.<sup>195</sup> This very precept of faith, with which the Church meets us, drove St. Augustine in his youth into the arms of the Manicheans,<sup>196</sup> who represented the faith of Catholics as an oppressive yoke and promised to prove their doctrines by arguments. Under the impulse of grace the will decides the understanding to yield its assent, though there is no absolute necessity of assenting to a truth which is not evident in itself; here lies the merit of faith.<sup>197</sup>

Hence a mere external confession, a 'respectful silence' is neither an act of faith or of obedience; it is a lie, an act of hypocrisy. To be sure where the merely external act of obeying the law suffices as in the relations of civil life and social intercourse, the authorities must confine themselves to it alone and can require nothing beyond; the interior dispositions do not come before the tribunal of the judge. In matters of faith what is external has all its value as a confession and declaration of what is interior; therefore the ecclesiastical authorities in questions of faith require the external on account and by reason of the interior.

The whole idea contains in itself a contradiction. If all are bound to believe provisionally and to remain silent, till the Church protests, the Church will never protest; she cannot both protest and remain silent.<sup>198</sup> On one side plenary authority in the Church remains with the Pope: on the other he is dependent on the bishops and

his teaching will be undecided till they approve of it. Even in the case that some dogma of faith is proclaimed under the penalty of excommunication, we must doubt and wait till some protest is heard, that then we may not believe, or a 'respectful silence' is observed in order to be able to believe. But who is to verify this respectful silence? Being silent it is not easily verified. In virtue of his office the Pope commands, we obey; but it is not easy for him to command, nor for us to obey. A contradiction suffices to shake the certainty of faith: what is to be done? Are we to contradict? We may not. Are we to believe? We cannot. No more untenable system was ever devised.<sup>199</sup>

We will now gather into one conspectus the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope's teaching Primacy.

It rests on the very *nature* of the Church. Our Lord promised His Church an endless life: she shall remain till the end of time. Outward forms may change; all that belongs to her essence, all that makes the Church the true Church of Christ, the faith and the constituent elements of the constitution given to her by God are to remain unchanged. The Church cannot be the true Church of Christ without the true faith; she cannot be the Church founded by Christ without her visible head, the Pope; she cannot be that Church without the college of bishops who are united with him, as members with the head. Therefore the true Church of Christ can never be without the foundation laid by Him, never without the supreme pastor appointed by Him, never without the one strong in faith who will confirm the brethren in the faith. At the same time the foundation will never be without the Temple resting on it; the supreme pastor will never be without the flock hearing his voice; he strong in faith will never be without brethren who receive confirmation in the faith from him. If the living head, the true, lawful Pope could separate himself from the body of the Church and its principal members the bishops, if the bishops could separate themselves from their head, then the Church, Christ's mystical body, in which the Holy Ghost abides and rules, which the Apostle therefore on account of the intimacy of his union with her calls Christ<sup>200</sup> would be destroyed; the gates of hell would have prevailed, the promises would have been made void.

That never can be ; what our Lord has once given to His Church that He never takes back ; He abides with her with His protection and His spirit to the end. Hence it never can be that the Pope, whilst exercising his office as foundation, as supreme shepherd and teacher of the Church shall find himself without any who build upon him, who hear his voice, who are taught by him, who are united to him in the living unity of faith and Church communion. Those who are in communion with him, are the members united with their head, the successors of the Apostles united with St. Peter, the members of the true Church of Christ, who are one with their head and therefore one with each other ; where they are, there is the true Catholic Church, whose chief mark is Unity.

It has been said, the Pope is infallible when he speaks with the consciousness of the Church. *This condition is always fulfilled.* No dogmatic utterance of the Apostolic See ever can, ever will propose a decision to the whole Church, and oblige her to believe the same, against which the bishops of the Church are obliged to remonstrate as not contained in the deposit of faith and injurious to the faith. The Apostolic See has pronounced many dogmatic decisions ; such a remonstrance never has been made and never will be made, because it would break and destroy the communion of the members with the head, and the promises of Christ would be made void. A fraction of the Episcopate may protest against dogmatic decisions pronounced by the Pope and firmly believed in by the members united with him, just as a fraction may stand aloof from a General Council and has actually done so, v. g. at Ephesus, Chalcedon and elsewhere. But it is not difficult to decide where the true Church is. *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*, where the head is with the members, there is the true Church ; the others are dead, because separated from the living body of the Church. They may wish to found a human church,<sup>301</sup> beside the divinely instituted Church and opposed to it : but they are undertaking what is impossible. The branch which is separated from the trunk withers and these people add a new instance to the long series of troubles and trials of faith which the Church has had to bear in every century ; Our Lord prophesied such separations : and the Church with renewed life goes on her way.

The Pope would not be infallible, if the Church were not infallible :<sup>292</sup> but the very idea of a living head implies that the members are organically united with him. Hence the Pope would not be infallible if he were not the head of the Church, who has received from Christ an authority over the Episcopate and over the whole Church which obliges them to be united with him in unity of faith and communion ; in fact as the promises of our Lord must always be fulfilled, they will always be united with him in this twofold communion and therefore will always recognise their own faith in the decisions he pronounces. Thus the Pope in his dogmatic decisions depends only on the *idea and nature of the Primacy itself*, as the living head of a living body, which therefore always remains united to it. With the same certainty with which we believe the divine institution of the Church and her lasting indefectibility, we believe in the enduring unity of the Church which manifests itself in the communion in faith of the members with the head. And therefore we are not obliged to wait for the adhesion of the members in order to be able ourselves to accept the dogmatic decisions of the Apostolic See. The members will always join because they must join, as the members owe obedience to the head, and the promise of our Lord of lasting indefectibility to His Church cannot be made void by human craft or violence.<sup>293</sup>

Hence the doctrinal teaching of the Pope can only come from the general consciousness of the Church. Let it not be said : we cannot conceal from ourselves that the Pope may fall into a personal error and then proclaim this error *ex-cathedra*. The latter he cannot do after the promise of our Lord and on account of it. In the same way it is possible in itself that any individual bishop may err, and therefore all the bishops may err and then publish their error in Council and so separate themselves from their head, for they are free : but in virtue of the promise of lasting unity to the Church this is not possible. In itself it is possible that any believer, that all believers may fall away from the faith and the Church may cease to exist, for the faith of every individual is free : but after our Lord's promise of lasting indefectibility to the Church that is not possible. For without interfering with human liberty, God

conducts all things infallibly to the end He has prefixed, <sup>204</sup> nay the free will of the creature is the instrument (not a lifeless one) by which He carries out His decrees.

The true Church can never be divided in faith and therefore the case can never arise that the Catholic Episcopate will undertake the defence of a heresy and so act in opposition to the head of the Church.<sup>205</sup> In this sense we must attribute infallibility to the Catholic Episcopate, but never as separated from the infallibility of the head or opposed to it, as the effect of one and the same spirit of Christ, who ever acts and teaches the truth in His Church. We know where to find the Catholic Episcopate, the Episcopate of the true Church of Christ by the approbation its teaching receives from the Apostolic See: for where the members are in communion with their head, there is the unity appointed by God, the Catholic Church. Those who place themselves in opposition to the Apostolic See, are members separated from their head, branches torn from their trunk; they no longer belong to the Catholic Church, they are no longer lawful members of the Catholic Episcopate.<sup>206</sup> The Primacy and the Episcopacy are both therefore holders of the teaching office of the Church, but not *ex æquo*, on a par. The head must teach the members and oblige them to accept his teaching; but the converse does not hold. For this reason we speak of the infallibility of the Primacy and not of the infallibility of the Episcopacy.

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

### THE MODERN ORIGIN OF THE DOGMA OF THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE PRIMACY.

In the last place, let us inquire in what sense the dogma of the infallibility of the Apostolic See may be called new. As the Vatican Council observes at the outset: the object of Councils, and especially of the Council of Trent, was to define more clearly and explain more fully the dogmas of faith, to condemn errors and to check their progress.<sup>207</sup> These words which state the object of a Council in the sphere of its doctrinal office tell us at the same time how far an addition to the Catholic faith is possible and in what sense a dogma may be called new.



Before all it must be admitted beyond question that no teacher in the Catholic Church at any time had, or ever will have a deeper, fuller, more perfect knowledge of the Christian faith than the Apostles.<sup>208</sup> For they received the faith immediately by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and knew its truth perfectly: through them God willed to make it known to the world. So much so that nothing is contained in the deposit of faith which Christ and His Apostles did not preach. In the third place it is certain that these revealed truths were not from the first proclaimed in the Church with all the forms, explanations, arguments and applications which they received in consequence of the errors which appeared in the course of time.<sup>209</sup> Thus from the beginning many truths which help to a more exact understanding and a fuller explanation of the dogmas of faith were only contained like seeds (*implicite*) in the Apostolic tradition; many less *clear and plain*, many less *developed*; compelled by the circumstances of the times, obliged to oppose heresy, the teaching office of the Church undertook under the guidance of divine Providence to develop what was only revealed *implicitly*, to explain more clearly and to establish what was *obscure*, to *emphasise* what was less fully made known and to bring out more completely the relations, connexions and applications. So far an addition may be made to Christian knowledge, and the deep inexhaustible meaning of the divine deposit is more and more unfolded to us.<sup>210</sup> The doctrines of the Church have not become *truer*, they have become more *clear*.

Vincent of Lerins admitted a progress in faith under the three points of view named. "Religion," he says,<sup>211</sup> "may be compared to the growth of the body; the body during many years grows and fills out, but it remains the same body. The Christian doctrine is like a grain of wheat, it grows, we eat the fruit, but its nature as a grain of wheat remains. The Church, like a careful and prudent guardian of the deposit of faith changes nothing, takes away, adds nothing, but with great diligence strives to keep and perfect what of old was given in outline and less perfectly and to preserve what has been confirmed and defined. What previously was dimly believed will be better understood by her explanation; later generations understand what those before

honoured without this more intimate knowledge ; but teach what you have learnt, so that though you speak a new language, you say nothing new. What before was simply believed, will now be believed with greater earnestness, what was less insisted on in preaching will be more zealously announced.”<sup>212</sup>

The more profound and mysterious the dogma, the greater is the treasure it contains, the more numerous its relations to the wants of the day and to the confutation of the errors which human pride sets up against divine truth. It is plain that all these relations could not be contained explicitly in the Church tradition from the beginning. And it was less necessary that they should be explicitly contained, because to the Church was promised the spirit of Truth, which shall lead her into all truth.<sup>213</sup>

That any proposition may be a Catholic dogma, Veronius says,<sup>214</sup> two conditions are requisite. It must express a truth contained in revelation and this expression must come from the authoritative teaching office of the Church. A truth may be contained in revelation, but obscurely ; that is, it may not have been proposed as such by the Church, to which it belongs to explain the meaning of the written and handed-down word of God. Hence new decisions in matters of faith are given in the Church : for instance that baptism conferred by heretics is valid. All theologians are agreed that such propositions are not *de fide catholica* before the definition of the Church : if however an individual knows beyond a doubt that a truth is contained in the records of revelation, even though it has not been explicitly proposed by the Church, he is bound in conscience to believe it *fide divina* : by the definition of the Church the divine truth of faith is only authoritatively proposed as such and error rendered impossible.

To this extent there is *growth* in the Church, a progress in faith, but no change.<sup>215</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XX.

## THE CANON OF VINCENT OF LERINS.

From this we may gather the true meaning of the Canon of Vincent of Lerins so much abused in modern times. That is Catholic which has been believed in all places, at all times and by all. Vincent wanted to give the faithful a plain, easily understood criterion which they might safely follow on the appearance of a new heresy, which separates itself from the Catholic communion, threatens to defile the whole Church and rests on antiquated and obscure expressions. He is not speaking of the principles by which Popes and Councils are guided in their dogmatic decisions. He is speaking only of the faith of the *teaching* Church as the standard of faith, not of the faith of all the faithful. Thirdly, he is speaking of those doctrines of faith which are clearly and explicitly taught by the Church, not of those doctrines which are for the first time to be developed explicitly by the teaching office of the Church (*fides explicita*). In this sense his Canon is perfectly true; whatever is in opposition to the universal agreement regarding such truths is not Catholic. But how regarding those truths which are still obscure and contained implicitly in tradition? Precisely on account of these truths Vincent declares there must be progress, the seed must grow, that which is obscure must be cleared up, that which is known in a general way must be analysed. The above named Canon is of no use in the case of truths contained only in this manner in the Church tradition: precisely because contained implicitly in the deposit of faith, they cannot be explicitly the object of faith. If the Canon of Vincent held good for this domain of truths of faith, all growth, all progress in faith, all dogmatic definition would be an impossibility. For no definition is needed for what all, everywhere and at all times explicitly believe. That other domain of faith which is only implicitly contained in tradition cannot be explicitly believed by all, everywhere and at all times; therefore there could be no definition.

Therefore the Canon of Vincent is only verified in the *positive, affirmative* sense : that which is believed by all, everywhere and at all times is Catholic. But if these three marks are not all there, their absence is no proof that the truth is not contained in *principle or implicitly* in the deposit of faith ; it is only a proof that the teaching office of the Church has not as yet expressly defined it as a truth. Dogmatic definitions are necessary not to proclaim that which has been believed and professed by all, always and everywhere, but precisely to decide whether any truth is contained under further development in what has been simply believed, to define it more exactly and through the teaching office of the Church, to raise it to the class of truths which clearly bind all, to point out plainly and to condemn the error which contradicts it.

Vincent therefore is far from laying down the actual agreement amongst believers as the highest authoritative rule of faith. He himself says that the poison of Arianism was widely diffused and that the question on baptism by heretics had misled many.<sup>216</sup> With him the rule of faith is the teaching office in the Church, speaking either in the decrees of a General Synod or in the utterances of the See of Rome :<sup>217</sup> where such definitions do not exist, as in the case of new heresies, the faithful must turn to the Fathers and to the recognised Catholic teachers,<sup>218</sup> or as we should say now to the general opinion of Theologians.<sup>219</sup>

From all this the contention, that a dogmatic definition only has force when a moral agreement is found amongst the judges of faith, falls to the ground.<sup>220</sup> Though perhaps such unanimity is generally desirable, it never has been, it never would be required in any Council, because an opposition party, at least a weak one, will always arise and as fact almost always has arisen. The carrying out of this contention would render a definition impossible and peace would never be established in the Church.<sup>221</sup>

---

## CHAPTER XXI.

THE INFALLIBILITY AND THE FALLIBILITY OF THE  
POPE ARE NOT THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS OF  
EQUAL PROBABILITY.

The doctrine of the infallibility of the See of Rome is therefore *not a new one*. What is new in the definition of the Vatican Council does not touch the substance of Catholic belief, it only reaches its exposition and declaration as an explicit dogma of the Church; before the definition every Catholic was bound in conscience to accept the decisions of the Pope, after the definition he is bound to do so under the penalty of excommunication. As Pichler<sup>222</sup> testifies "Bellarmine only repeated the doctrine (on the infallibility of the Primacy of teaching) taught by the majority of the Scholastics." In the Middle Ages that doctrine was so generally held, that the opposite one in the judgment of Gerson<sup>223</sup> should have been condemned as heretical: and when Martin V., resting on the principle of the ancient Church forbade appeals from the Pope to a General Council, Gerson's own teaching on the subject was condemned. For if the Pope is not infallible, then a Council must finally decide upon his doctrine.

The unanimous teaching of theologians is of great significance in the Church; to go against it is not indeed heresy, but it comes near to heresy, for their agreement shows that the doctrine comes down from tradition. Were it not so, and were the doctrine false, then the Church herself would be led into error by her theologians, for the theologians necessarily enter into the exercise of the teaching office: the Church would appear as a partisan of error, as she does not oppose it and by her silence seems to sanction it. If we consider how definitions of faith are framed, we find it is done with the aid of theology; it is not possible therefore that all theologians should agree in teaching an error.<sup>224</sup> Hence Pius IX points out that we should accept the common teaching of theologians as well as the decisions of Councils and the decrees of Popes.<sup>225</sup>

The doctrine of the fallibility of the Papal See was first broached at the Gallican Assembly of 1682; but as we have already stated the four Gallican Articles were not the result of free, unfettered science, but the work of

Court theologians, the servants of State Absolutism and Bureaucracy.<sup>226</sup> Louis XIV was bent on setting up a masterful, absolute system against the Church and her Supreme Head: and the Four Articles in the hands of a Parliament infected with Jansenism became an instrument for the oppression of Church liberty and the advancement of schismatic tendencies.<sup>227</sup> Fenelon, himself an example of the most frank and sincere submission to the decisions of the Holy See, raised his warning voice against 'the encroachments of the secular power;' and recently the Protestant Pressensé has written:<sup>228</sup> 'Gallicanism made the Church the bond-maid of Princes and her boasted liberties were only the liberty of the King to control the government of the Church as well as that of the State. The appeals to a future Council, the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, schism and the overthrow of religion were the bitter fruits of a doctrine false in principle. However despite the tyranny of the State the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope found many defenders and out of France it was maintained with few exceptions till the middle of the last century.'<sup>229</sup> From that time State-Absolutism and Jansenism strove to spread the opposite teaching beyond France and Nicholas von Hontheim (Febronius) and the Court theologians of Joseph II. lent themselves as willing tools. Also under the mistaken prospect of conciliating Protestants the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was kept in the back-ground. The former were soon swept away by the rationalistic flood of the Enlightenment Period, so much so that even the fundamental dogmas of Christianity were denied and rejected. Still if we could bring together the writings of the theologians of all countries, the Gallicans would only be as three per cent of the number.

The majority of theologians always taught the Papal Infallibility.<sup>230</sup> The opposite opinion could never claim to have received the same support; it was merely tolerated by the Church, that is to say, it was never branded as a heresy, but it was never recognised as true, or in harmony with the teaching of the Church, it was often censured,<sup>231</sup> whereas the doctrine of infallibility was always accepted as the standard and rule of practical life in the Church.

---

## CHAPTER XXII.

THE SIGNIFICANCY OF THE DEFINITION OF THE  
INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

The Protestant Frommann<sup>232</sup> observes 'that the Vatican Council is an organic link in the unbroken chain of the Roman Catholic system, Papal infallibility is a natural conclusion of the Catholic doctrine of the Primacy of Rome, a consequence of the Catholic doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church and of the divine institution of the Papal Primacy.' He acknowledges 'that all the charges brought against the Vatican Council are inadmissible, that the Council was legitimately convened and held and must be considered to have been free, that the claim for moral unanimity in dogmatic definitions cannot be maintained.' Papal Infallibility, writes von Hartmann,<sup>233</sup> is the long wished for crowning of the unity of faith in Catholicism, and all talk to the contrary is without meaning in the mouths of those who accept the Pope as the successor of St. Peter and St. Peter as the author of infallibly inspired Epistles. Even Ranke<sup>234</sup> points out the decrees of the Vatican Council as the natural outcome of the development of the Papacy and cannot see in the declaration of Infallibility any falling away from the principles of the Church, or any arbitrary proceeding. And A. Comte<sup>235</sup> says 'Papal Infallibility, which is made the subject of such bitter reproach to Catholicism formed a high advance of progress in the intellectual and social order, independently of its obvious necessity for a system of theological government, in which according to the rational theory of De Maistre it only built up the religious side of the supreme jurisdiction and without it ceaseless strife would have destroyed the Society.'

Orthodox Protestantism should least of all condemn as contrary to Scripture and to reason the doctrine of the special assistance given by the Holy Ghost to the Head of the whole Church; for by its doctrine of the *spiritus privatus*, of enlightenment of the Holy Ghost given to each individual, it claims this prerogative for every individual.<sup>236</sup>

Among the evils caused in the Church herself by the influence of Protestantism and Rationalism, which the Vatican Council<sup>27</sup> deplored and sought to remedy must be numbered 'that many of the children of the Catholic Church had wandered from the path of true believing piety and had weakened their Catholic spirit by the manifold obscuring of certain truths.' Wherefore the Church compelled by the errors of Gallicanism, Febronianism and Josephinism which have sprung into existence since the Council of Trent has now raised into a formal dogma what was previously contained substantially in her faith and known and acted on in her practical life, though it had never been formally declared to be an article of faith. In this more exact development and clearer definition lies the progress of Catholic faith which Vincent extolled in such eloquent words and which it is the work of Councils to carry on. When the systems spoken of had sought to shake faith in the infallibility of the Apostolic See as unfounded in Scripture and tradition and when the controversy had descended into the market-place, the minds of the faithful were disturbed and it was necessary that it should be definitively settled. We see that for centuries the faithful with the Priests and Bishops at their head humbly, with complete confidence, and not unfrequently giving up their own convictions, without opposition, without waiting to see whether a protest would be entered, without waiting to see whether 'a respectful silence' would be observed, submitted to the decision on faith of the See of Rome, with the fullest adhesion of their faith and belief. But if these decisions of doctrine were fallible, on what did their submission rest? Could they, ought they look on the Pope as the teacher and judge of faith without appeal? Men eminent by their learning and position in the Church have with much expenditure of erudition and acumen striven to prove that many Popes have erred, that the infallibility of the Apostolic See was unknown to Scripture, to the Councils, and to the holy Fathers, to the great Doctors of the Church, that the claim that we should submit our faith to the decisions of the Pope was an unjustifiable usurpation of a right belonging to God alone and the General Councils and a burden on consciences.



*Some decision there must be.* If these men are right, then we must cast away the obedience of faith we have paid to the Apostolic See as unfounded, unlawful, incompatible with the nature of faith, injurious to the Church, hurtful to the salvation of the souls of the faithful and the fallibility of Papal decisions must be proclaimed. But if such is not the case, if the teaching Primacy of the Church is in fact infallible, it was opportune that the Council should declare this faith of the Church by a formal solemn decision and confirm it anew on unassailable grounds. Consideration for the weakness of some individuals was not a sufficient reason for holding back, under penalty of incurring the reproach of St. Jerome: 'many holy persons are pained you should think those who aim at the life of the Church will be taught better by your gentleness; for while you hesitate in order to secure the repentance of a few, you give encouragement to the audacity of the wicked.'<sup>228</sup>

And so it fell out. The definition was given: the entire Episcopate of the Catholic world, without a single exception, gave its adhesion. - Divine Providence visibly ruled and guided the hearts of men wonderfully; it renewed in those who were at first opposed the power of Catholic faith which consists in the surrender of our understanding to Christ and His spirit, Who rules in the Church and has spoken through her.<sup>229</sup> Every new definition of a Catholic dogma is a blessing for the Church, a source of light and strength, which comes from on high and ever leads us to know more intimately Him Who is Truth itself. Scarcely two years have elapsed since the Vatican Council was held<sup>230</sup> and the dim-sighted must see that the Holy Ghost has given fresh strength to the Church to meet without injury the weary days which were so nigh and which no mortal had anticipated.

Other furious storms wilder than those of any previous age are gathering round the Church: we are already in the thick of the strife. United in faith under an infallible Pope, bound closely together by the bond of Church communion, our Church is an unconquerable stronghold,<sup>241</sup> which guards Catholic truth, genuine Christianity, and with it all that is highest and loftiest in good in this life and will protect it amidst the shocks of the most violent persecutions.

In truth an infallible teaching authority is not that oppressive yoke, it is not that bond unworthy of the soul, which the folly of the world represents it to be. The theologian who is worthy of his name and his calling stands between freedom and restraint, partly free, partly restrained, and free though, nay, because restrained. He does not count it freedom, that his mind in unchecked licence should roam without compass or rudder over the boundless sea of opinions and interpretations and so surrender all settled convictions and the power to convince others. Rather he feels himself free, because, once and for ever, by a decisive act of election proceeding from his free will and deliberation he submitted himself to the guidance and teaching authority of the Church which he confesses to be the divinely appointed and divinely enlightened guardian of the truths of religion and the teacher of the nations. In the Church and through the Church he is free, for she has freed him from the slavery of torturing uncertainty, from the painful wilfulness of thought and conscience, from gnawing doubt, from the feeling of hesitation as to the very principles and starting points of his inquiry. He knows himself delivered from the depressing prospect that after ten or twenty years he may be obliged to recognise as a delusion and to abandon what now appears to him so certain and positive: for he has espoused authority and his whole spiritual life and inquiry has become one with her in ever increasing intimacy, so that were she to disappear for him or become dumb he would believe, confess and teach only as she does. He is a part and he knows he is in perfect harmony with the whole, he is a member of the body, and as such receives his light through his organic connexion with it. <sup>242</sup>

It is undeniable, says Goethe, <sup>243</sup> that no teaching rids us of prejudices except that which knows how first to humble our pride: and what is the teaching which builds on humility if not that which comes from on high? Therefore he makes Iphigenia say: Afterwards I felt myself for the first time truly free. But true humility and in her train release from doubt and torturing uncertainty can only be found if we surrender ourselves to a living authority, external to us and above us. Protestantism knows it not; for the faith which it forms to itself out of the Scripture is

its own work. The enemies of the infallible teaching Primacy know it not; for the authority to which they are willing to submit is not the dead letter of the Bible alone, but also the tradition of the Church, but such as they admit it, limit it, subjectively explain it, and apply it, not as the living word confirms and explains it, the word from the *Cathedra Petri*, before which St. Cyprian, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Augustine, St. Optatus, St. Jerome long ago bowed down in reverence and with which the entire teaching office of the Church has agreed. The Bishop was for the great martyr St. Ignatius the centre, the father of his individual Church, to whom all submitted, whom all obeyed with love and confidence. The Bishop of Bishops in the See of St. Peter is the centre of the entire Church, the Father of Christendom, who unites all in himself and by himself; for he who is united with him is united with the entire Catholic Church.<sup>24</sup> Without him, the first link in the chain, the members of the hierarchy fall away from each other, with the hierarchy falls the priesthood, the Church as a visible institution of Christ falls, the body of Christ falls and Christendom falls. For if the Church falls, then Christendom falls.

The war which has been carried on for three hundred years against the Catholic Church, wages twofold, threefold more furiously against the Papacy. The Pope is not the Church, but the Church is founded on him, he is the visible instrument appointed by God, through which unity in the Church and the Church herself is to be preserved: without him the vast, universal, world-wide Church embracing all nations would be broken up in national churches, which would become tools in the hands of secular rulers, would be despised by the nations, would be abandoned by the spirit of Christ, would be without dignity or power. If the Apostolic See of Rome could be upset then the unity of the Church would be destroyed, the Church herself would perish. Then Christianity would become the domain of history: its ruins would form the object of learned researches about which men would dispute: but its place in the world, its power to redeem, to consecrate, to make individuals and society good and happy would have passed for ever.

---



## APPENDIX I.

### THE FIRST DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

#### CONCERNING THE INFALLIBLE TEACHING OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

##### CHAPTER IV.

Moreover that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic Primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church confirms, and also Œcumenical Councils have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, Who said: Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church (Matth. XVI, 18), these things which have been said are approved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion and her holy and well-known doctrine has always been kept undefiled. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion (from the Formula of S. Hormisdas, subscribed by the Fathers of the Eighth General Council, Fourth of Constantinople, A.D. 869. Labbé's Councils, vol. v, pp. 583, 622). And with the approval of the Second Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed that the Holy Roman Church enjoys supreme and full Primacy and pre-eminence over the whole Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the plenitude of power from our Lord Himself in the person of blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is: and as the Apostolic See is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith so also if any questions regarding faith shall arise, they must be defined by its judgment (from the Acts of the Fourteenth General Council, Second of Lyons, A.D. 1274. Labbé, vol. XIV, p. 512).

Finally, the Council of Florence defined (from the Acts of the Seventeenth General Council of Florence, A.D. 1438. Labbé, vol. XVIII, p. 526) : That the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians ; and that to him in blessed Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church (John XXI, 15, 17).

To satisfy this pastoral duty our predecessors ever made unwearied efforts that the salutary doctrine of Christ might be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care watched that it might be preserved genuine and pure where it had been received. Therefore the Bishops of the whole world, now singly, now assembled in Synod, following the long-established custom of Churches (from a letter of S. Cyril of Alexandria to Pope S. Celestine I, A.D. 422, vol. vi, part 2, p. 36, Paris edition of 1638), and the form of the ancient rule (from a Rescript of S. Innocent I, to the Council of Milevis, A. D. 402. Labbé, vol. iii, p. 47), sent word to this Apostolic See of those dangers especially which sprang up in matters of faith, that there the losses of faith might be most effectually repaired where the faith cannot fail (from a letter of S. Bernard to Pope Innocent II, A. D. 1130. Epist. 191, vol. iv, p. 433, Paris edition of 1742.) And the Roman Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling Œcumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognized as conformable with the Sacred Scriptures and Apostolic Traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that by His revelation they might make known new doctrine, but that by His assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And indeed all the venerable Fathers have embraced and the holy orthodox Doctors have venerated and followed their Apostolic doctrine ; knowing most fully that this See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of His disciples : I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren (Luke XXII, 32. See also the Acts of the Sixth General Council, A.D. 680. Labbé, vol. vii, p. 659).

This gift, then of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by Heaven upon Peter and his successors in this Chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all ; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine ; that the occasion of schism being removed the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell.

But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority, We judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouchsafed to join with the supreme pastoral office.

Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God Our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic Religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the Sacred Council approving, We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed : that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals ; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable (*i.e.* in the words used by Pope Nicolas I, note 13, and in the Synod of Quedlinburg, A. D. 1085, "it is allowed to none to revise its judgment, and to sit in judgment upon what it has judged." Labbé, vol. xii, p. 679) of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church.

But if anyone—which may God avert—presume to contradict this Our definition ; let him be anathema.

---

## APPENDIX II.

### THE DOMAIN OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

1. The Vatican Council has declared itself on this point. It defined definitively that the infallibility of the Pope coincides in extent with the infallibility of the Church. <sup>1</sup> The infallibility of the Church extends to all those truths which Christ revealed either explicitly or implicitly, to mankind for their salvation, as their rule of faith and conduct. <sup>2</sup> It is plain that we can believe with divine faith (*fide divina*), on the authority of God revealing only those truths which God has revealed and which are sufficiently made known to us.

2. The infallibility of the teaching office of the Church extends itself not only to the truths themselves, but also to the expressions, the formulas, the words in which the revealed truth is expressed. <sup>3</sup> Keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane novelties of words, exclaims St. Paul.

3. Are these the limits of the infallibility of the Church and that of the Apostolic See? No. For there are many other truths, not revealed in themselves, so connected with revealed truth, that without them the Church cannot under certain circumstances either teach the revealed truth or sufficiently explain it or defend it against attacks. <sup>4</sup> Besides, many truths of reason are involved, some explicitly, some implicitly, in the truths of faith: partly by reason of the truths of natural religion, which faith comprises, though not as its adequate object, partly in the mysteries of religion which suppose a series of the truths of reason. <sup>5</sup> Obviously the Church must decide infallibly on these truths of reason which enter within the domain of faith directly or indirectly, immediately or mediately, with the same right as she defines articles of faith. She decides upon them following the principles of revelation, under the guidance of the light of faith. Hence the decree of the fifth Council of Lateran, which the Vatican Council repeats, is only the natural outcome of the true notion of faith. <sup>6</sup> The Church has not only the right to define, she is under the strictest obligation to do so, for her duty is to watch over the purity of faith and the salvation of souls. Take the case of the Council of Florence: the pseudo-Aristotelian error of the unity of intellect in all men, which would necessarily involve the denial of individual immortality, made a definition necessary. Ought the Church



to have waited till science had corrected its error and looked on while this fundamental error was preparing a grave for all religion and morality? Her decision on the contrary became a point of orientation <sup>7</sup> and a guide to the result which science was to obtain, an anticipation of the scientific solution; but by no means an interior principle of knowledge, or a scientific norm. It is the solution of the problem in another way, with other means than those scientific inquiry offers; it is no invasion of the progress of inquiry, no denial of the autonomy of science and its right to arrive at knowledge through and by its own principles; still less any blending of the two territories, the spheres of faith and science. <sup>8</sup> Science herself corrects her own errors and *so she is bound to do*. But Christ is the Redeemer of the whole world and of science too. What misleads and fetters science and takes her along wrong roads in her efforts to extend knowledge is not true genuine science: its enemies are the illusions of fancy, the masterfulness of the senses, the weakness of man's intellect, the prejudices and passions of the heart. <sup>9</sup> Hence Christ redeemed us, for He has given the solution of questions in the natural order, which science with her weapons must now conquer.

4. As regards this last series of truths, which are not expressly contained in the deposit of faith, errors against them are not heresies; (for a heresy is the direct contradiction of a truth expressly revealed and proposed by the Church); and yet the theological censures pronounced upon them by the supreme teacher are infallible and we are bound to accept the censured proposition, without doubting, *in the sense in which it was condemned*. <sup>10</sup> The motive for which we yield our assent to such judgments is the authority of the infallible teaching office, which we believe to be such on the infallible authority of God. The act of faith by which we submit in any given instance of a decision from the teaching office for that reason is not an act of immediate divine Faith, though proceeding from it and grounded in it. <sup>11</sup>

5. If the infallible teaching office has to decide what we are to believe and not to believe, it must be infallible in determining the extent of its own teaching claims. Her prerogative of pronouncing infallible decisions with the help of the Holy Ghost, because guided by the Holy Ghost, she cannot extend to matters and questions, to which the authority given by God does not extend.

6. The teaching office of the church decides infallibly on theological facts, that is on the objective, orthodox or erroneous

sense of a dogmatic proposition, whether announced orally or in writing.<sup>12</sup> The meaning of an author is not the meaning which *can* be extracted from a book, but the meaning which is gathered from the plan and the connexion of the whole work. The object to which the exercise of the teaching office of the church directs itself is not the person of the writer as such, (*sensus subjectivus*), but the writer as he manifests himself in his book, (*sensus objectivus*).<sup>13</sup>

The reason is plain. Thoughts and language are the twin offspring of the mind: if the doctrine of the church is infallible, then the Church must be infallible in choosing the right expression, the characteristic terms in which she proclaims the truth she wishes to inculcate; on no other condition can she fulfil her task as teacher of the nations. She must be infallible likewise in her condemnation of terms, propositions and books which are in contradiction with revealed truth: and so the Council of Trent taught the Catholic faith when it framed the Canons against the propositions of the Reformers. The line of conduct adopted by the Church at all times, proves the same. From the Scriptures and the voice of Tradition she took the truths which had been revealed and proclaimed them infallibly: and on the other hand she condemned heresies and the writings in which they were contained.<sup>14</sup> If the infallibility of the Church were not to extend so far, she could not distinguish the herald of her true doctrine from the preacher of heresy: for the teaching office of the Church is carried on by and through the collective body of teachers. She would be unable to protect the faithful from the poison of false teachers; she might command them and order them to receive erroneous teaching and to reject the orthodox doctrine. At the same time the meaning of a book is not revealed to the Church directly, immediately, in itself, but only mediately and indirectly: the truth which the writing under examination affirms or denies has been revealed to her and she has received the promise of the assistance of the Holy Ghost in the exercise of her teaching office.

7. The teaching office of the Church is infallible in all decisions on questions of Moral doctrine which are binding on the whole Church.<sup>15</sup> Hence the discipline of the Church as far as it is a rule for the whole Church can contain nothing against faith or morals.<sup>16</sup> On the other hand, she is not infallible in regulations which do not bind the whole Church and therefore we are not bound to approve every measure taken by the Pope<sup>17</sup>; but we must maintain that certain points of Church discipline

are not without their utility even under totally altered circumstances. During the lapse of centuries the Church herself has admitted many changes in Church discipline. Again it does not follow from the infallibility of the authorities of the Church in the statement of general principles of morality, that she is infallible in the application of them to particular times, persons, and circumstances.<sup>18</sup> In the approbation of religious orders we must distinguish the substance of the rule, the conformity of the proposed mode of life with the Gospel, and the circumstances under which such a mode of life is introduced. In such cases a *speculative* judgment decides on certain principles, in the closest connexion with the teaching regarding faith and morals; at the same time a *practical* judgment is delivered, which constitutes an act of executive power and rests on the application of the speculative principles and on the estimate of the circumstances of the times and which consequently is not infallible.<sup>19</sup>

8. The decisions of the Roman Congregations, of the Holy Office and the Index especially, *as such* can lay no claim to infallibility but we are bound to receive them with respect on account of the authority of the teaching office, from which they emanate.<sup>20</sup>

9. Were any one to deny the holiness of a canonized saint, he would not be a heretic on that account; yet it is not allowed to doubt in this matter and it is perilous to do so. For if the Church can invite the faithful to honour with public religious veneration persons who are reprobate and lost, can order their festivals to be kept, and can propose them as models to be imitated,<sup>21</sup> such an error would be in the highest degree subversive of morality, it would be in contradiction with the Church which is holy<sup>22</sup> and it would as a necessary consequence render the veneration of the Saints an impossibility.

---



## NOTES ON THE FIRST BOOK.

CHAP. I.—<sup>1</sup> For whereas Jesus Christ Himself continually infuses His virtue into the justified as the head into the members and the vine into the branches—and this virtue always precedes and accompanies and follows their good works, which without it could not in any way be pleasing and meritorious before God. Council of Trent. Sess. 6. c 16.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. 3, 11. <sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. 6, 20. <sup>4</sup> Apoc. 3, 7. <sup>5</sup> Matt. 16, 19. <sup>6</sup> Luke 1, 32, 33. <sup>7</sup> Luke 7, 16. <sup>8</sup> John 13, 13. <sup>9</sup> Heb. 6, 20. <sup>10</sup> Matt. 28, 20. <sup>11</sup> Acts 1, 11.

<sup>12</sup> *Cyprian*. Ep. 59. c 14. To the See of Peter and to the sovereign Church from which priestly unity has sprung.

CHAP. II.—<sup>13</sup> The interior infusion of grace is from no other than Christ alone, whose humanity, because it is united to the divinity, has the power of justifying; but infusion into the members of the Church as regards external government may come from others, 3tia. 9. 8. a 6.

<sup>14</sup> Peter truly governs those whom Christ too governs as Sovereign. *Leo M.* Serm 4.

<sup>15</sup> *Leo M.* Serm 4. 2: Though I am, he says, the immovable rock, the corner-stone, the foundation except which none can place another, yet thou art also the rock, because thou art strengthened by my firmness, so that what belongs to me, thou sharest with me by participation—*Jerom.* in Jerem c 16, 16. Not only is Christ the rock, but He granted to Peter that he should be called the rock—*August Tr.* 124. 5 in Joan. The rock (petra) is not called from Peter, but Peter from the rock; as Christ is not called from Christian, but Christian from Christ.

<sup>16</sup> Matt. 28, 20. <sup>17</sup> Christ on the contrary confers his grace without the outward signs of the Sacraments, (occultissima et efficacissima potestate) by most hidden and most mighty power, as *Augustine* says. (Contr. duas Ep. Pelag. I. 20). <sup>18</sup> Matt. 28, 20, Teach them to observe all things I have commanded you. Ephes. 4. 12.

<sup>19</sup> Vatican Council 1st Dogmatic Constit. The Church of Christ. The eternal pastor and the bishop of our souls, in order to continue for all time the life-giving work of His redemption determined to build His holy Church, wherein as in the house of the living God all who believe might be united in the bond of one faith and one charity.

CHAP. III.—<sup>20</sup> Matt. 18, 18. <sup>21</sup> Matt. 28, 19. 20.

<sup>22</sup> Acts 1, 3. <sup>23</sup> Ephes. 4, 14. <sup>24</sup> Ephes. 4, 13. <sup>25</sup> Matt 10, 40. <sup>26</sup> Luke 10, 16. *Cyprian*. Ep. 66, 4. Thou makest thyself judge of God and of Christ, who said to his Apostles and *in them to all prelates* who are the successors of the apostles, being ordained to replace them: he who hears you hears Me, and he who rejects you, rejects Me and Him who sent Me. <sup>27</sup> Matt. 18, 17.

CHAP. IV.—<sup>28</sup> John. 15, 16. 1 Cor. 4, 15. Philemon. 10. John 17, 18. As thou hast sent me into the world, I have also sent them. From this it by no means follows, as *Thomasius* infers, that the parish in the Catholic Church is a mere accident of the hierarchy; it is not an accident of our invisible head Christ, *but his body*. According to *Thomasius* who conceives the work of Christ and faith in him *before* and *without* the Church, the Church would seem to be (what cannot be admitted) an accident in the work of salvation. <sup>29</sup> 2 Cor 3, 9. <sup>30</sup> Hebr 5, 4 : 10, 1.

<sup>31</sup> 1 Cor. 4, 2 : Tit. 1. 7 : 1 Pet. 4. 10. <sup>32</sup> 1 Cor 12, 20 &c., <sup>33</sup> 2 Cor. 10, 8. <sup>34</sup> 1 Cor. 5, 21 ; 6, 12 ; 2 Cor. 10, 6. <sup>35</sup> Acts 14, 22. <sup>36</sup> Acts. 15, 28. <sup>37</sup> Acts. 15, 41. <sup>38</sup> 1 Cor. 7, 10 ; 11, 34 <sup>39</sup> 1 Cor. 5, 3 ; 2 Cor. 2, 3.

CHAP. V.—<sup>40</sup> *Rothe*. Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche, I. p. 311. <sup>41</sup> *Hengstenberg*. Evang. Kirchenzeitung 1863. p. 72. 'The territorial system' (*Thomasius*, *Böhmer*) handed over to the secular prince as such supreme authority in the Church : the episcopal system (*B. Carpzov*) claims it for him as a special authority among the rights of sovereignty ; the 'collegial system' (*Pfaff*) represents it as given to the prince by the people. All these systems are without any historical basis : they were devised to justify the existing Caesaropapacy which set up its claims in the several Protestant Confessions. In America, however, where the principle of Protestantism was free to develop itself, uncontrolled by the power of the Prince, the preacher is in reality the mere delegate of the sovereign parish which often engages his services for a limited time only and allows him to preach only what pleases it and as far as it pleases it. Compare *Hengstenberg*, Kirchenzeitung 1847. p. 300. Protestantische Kirchenzeitung, 10th June 1854. *Reuter's* Repertorium. Pt. 74. p. 93. *Busch* Wanderungen zwischen Hudson und Mississippi. Stuttgart. 1854. I. p. 119. *Jörg*, Geschichte des Protestantismus II. Pp. 417. 425. Luther had found himself compelled, in order to maintain his sect, to call

in the secular power and to hand over to it the government of the Church; and thus in the opinion of *Menzel* (*Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen*, V. p. 5) he launched Lutheranism into an entirely new phase. John the Constant († 1532) at Luther's request appointed a commission, consisting of clerical and lay members, and entrusted them with a Church visitation. In fact the princes first usurped episcopal authority within their territories in external jurisdiction and later in matters of doctrine; in this respect Henry VIII had led the way; and the principles of the theologians who at the meeting of Naumberg (1554) with Melancthon at their head proved their right from Ps. 23, 7 and Isaiah 49, 23 might have been alleged as their justification.

<sup>42</sup> *Augustine* Enarr in Ps. 108. 1, *Petavius* de hierarch. eccles. III. 16 <sup>43</sup> 1 Tim. 6, 10.

<sup>44</sup> 1 Tim. 3, 7; Tit. 1, 7. <sup>45</sup> 1 Tim. 4, 11. <sup>46</sup> 1 Tim. 5, 17: 19, 21, <sup>47</sup> 1 Tim. 4, 11: 1, 3; 2 Tim. 2, 2. Tit. 1, 5. <sup>48</sup> 1 Tim. 6, 14. <sup>49</sup> 1 Tim. 4, 14; 2 Tim. 1, 6: <sup>50</sup> Acts. 20, 27.

<sup>51</sup> Ephes. 4, 12. <sup>52</sup> Luke 22, 25. <sup>53</sup> 1 Pet. 5, 3. <sup>54</sup> De Consider. II. 6 Forma Apostolica haec est: Dominatio interdicitur, indicitur ministratio.

<sup>55</sup> Council of Trent. Sess 23, can. 6. If any one says that in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by divine ordinance instituted, consisting of bishops, priests and ministers let him be anathema, *ibid.* c 4. Wherefore the holy Synod declares that, besides the other ecclesiastical degrees, bishops who have succeeded to the place of the apostles principally belong to this hierarchical order; that they are placed, as the same Apostle says, *by the Holy Ghost, to rule the Church of God.* <sup>56</sup> Praescript. c 6. <sup>57</sup> *Ignat.* ad Trall. c 2; ad Magnes. c. 6. Constit. Apost. VIII. 28. <sup>58</sup> Acts 6, 2. <sup>59</sup> Phil. 1, 1; Acts 14, 23; 20, 28; Tit. 1, 5. <sup>60</sup> Compare *Hagemann*, *Die Römische Kirche*. 1864 p 678.

<sup>61</sup> In Ep. ad Phil: Hom. I init. <sup>62</sup> Rom. 16, 7. <sup>63</sup> 1 Cor. 3, 5; 2 Cor. 3, 6; 1 Thess. 3, 2. 2 John 1; 3 John 1; 1 Pet. 5, 1. Heb. 3, 1; 5, 1. Probably the names elder, ancient, presbyter, were in use in the Hebrew-Christian communities according to the analogy of the Jewish institution (Peter and James use it); with the Gentile Christians, the name bishop was in use, already applied in the Greek translation of the Old Testament to clerical and lay officials.

CHAP. VI.—<sup>64</sup> Apoc. 1, 16, 20: 2, 1 &c. Matt. 11, 10: Malach. 2, 7. <sup>65</sup> Acts 20, 17. <sup>66</sup> Phil. 2, 25. <sup>67</sup> 1 Tim. 5, 22; Tit. 1, 5.

<sup>68</sup> 1 Tim. 5, 17-19. <sup>69</sup> *Epiphan.* Haeres 75. Council of Trent Sess. 23 can. 7. If any one saith that bishops are not superior to priests, or that they have not the power of confirming or ordaining ; or that the power which they possess is common to them and to priests ... let him be anathema. <sup>70</sup> Vatican Council. l.c. As then he sent the Apostles whom he had chosen to himself from the world, as he himself had been sent by his Father ; so he willed there should be pastors and doctors in his Church till the end of the world.

<sup>71</sup> *Augustine* de Baptism IV. 25. <sup>72</sup> Ad Trall. c 3. <sup>73</sup> Philad. c 2. <sup>74</sup> Smyrn. c 8. <sup>75</sup> Magn. c 6. <sup>76</sup> Trall. c 3. Magn. c 13. Smyrn. c 8. Philad c 1. Polyc. c. 6 *Kellner* (*Verfassung, Lehramt, und Unfehlbarkeit der Kirche.* 1873. p 17) has reduced the doctrine of St. Ignatius to the following twelve points and proved them by apposite passages from the letters :

(1) In all countries there exist Christian communities which form individual churches. (2) The individual churches together constitute a united whole, the *Catholic Church* first so called by St. Ignatius. (3) Bishops preside over the individual churches, one bishop over each individual church. (4) Every one of the faithful must belong to some individual church and hence follows the necessity of external membership for Ecclesiastical communion. To be cut off from church communion is to be cut off from Christ and from God. (5) The bishop for the time is the representative of the church ; he is the connecting member of fellowship with the whole church for each of the faithful. (6) Priests and deacons are usually mentioned in connexion with the Bishop. (7) The whole hierarchy was instituted by God and is an institution of the church appointed by God. (8) All, the priests included, must be subordinate to the bishop, must follow him and obey him. (9) The correctness, validity and legality of all Church rites are dependent on the concurrence and approval of the Bishop and nothing should be done in Church matters without him : vg Baptism, the Eucharist, the Agape, Marriage. (10) There are divergent and false doctrines which are injurious to the salvation of souls and lead to perdition. (11) As regards doctrines which claim our faith every one must stand with his bishop and agree with him. (12) The Church of Rome is the first of all the Churches and takes precedence of all the rest.

<sup>77</sup> C. 5, 6. <sup>78</sup> 1 Cor. 1, 39 ; c. 44.

<sup>79</sup> 1 Cor. c. 40, 44. 45. 47. <sup>80</sup> L. c. c. 40. <sup>81</sup> C. Hær.



<sup>82</sup> L. c. III. 24. <sup>83</sup> L. c. IV. 26. <sup>84</sup> De baptism. c. 17. <sup>85</sup> L. c. c. 32. Let them then produce the origins of their churches; let them unroll the series of their bishops descending by succession from the beginning and show that the first bishop had for his father and predecessor one of the Apostles, or some Apostolic man, who however remained with the Apostles. In this manner the Apostolic Churches show their catalogues, as that of the Smyrneans points to Polycarp, appointed by John and as the Church of the Romans points to Clement ordained by Peter; as the other Churches everywhere show the men placed in the Episcopate by the Apostles, the transmitters of the Apostolic seed.

<sup>86</sup> Adv. Marc. IV. 5. Though Marcion rejected his Apocalypse, the series of bishops followed up to the origin will begin in John as its author. <sup>87</sup> De carn. Chr. c. 2. That was true, which was handed down by those whose business it was to hand down. <sup>88</sup> Ep. 69: You must know that the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop and if any one is not with the bishop, he is not in the Church. <sup>89</sup> Ep. 27. 1. <sup>90</sup> L. c. Our Lord providing for the honour of the bishop and the structure of his Church. <sup>91</sup> Ep. 44. <sup>92</sup> Ep. 69, 4. Succeeding no one and beginning with himself he is an outcast and profane. <sup>93</sup> Ep. 5. <sup>94</sup> *Cbrysost* in 1 Tim. Hom. 11. n 1. *Jerom.* Ep. 146. ad Evang. <sup>95</sup> *Jerom* Ep. 105.

CHAP. VII.—<sup>96</sup> Ephesus, Crete; compare Tit. 1, 5. <sup>97</sup> 1 Pet. 5, 2. *Augustine* Ep. 34. ad Euseb. It is ridiculous to say this, as if any special charge belongs to me beyond the Church of Hippo. In other cities, in what concerns church matters, I only do what the bishops of those cities permit or ask of me. <sup>98</sup> *Bossuet.* Sermons sur l'unité de l'Eglise. <sup>99</sup> Exod, 25; 40.

<sup>100</sup> John 17, 11. <sup>101</sup> John 17, 21. <sup>102</sup> Ep v. 154.

<sup>103</sup> Matt. 10, 6. 7. 16. <sup>104</sup> Matt. 16 18. <sup>105</sup> Matt. 16, 16. <sup>106</sup> Matt. 16, 19.

<sup>107</sup> John 21, 15, 16. 17. <sup>108</sup> John 20, 22. 23.

CHAP. VIII.—<sup>109</sup> *Cypr.* De unit. c. 4. That he might make unity manifest, by his authority he disposed the origin of that unity should begin from one.....The beginning starts from unity, that one church may appear. Ep. 59. 14. The sovereign church, from which the unity of the priesthood is derived. Ep. 48. The church of Rome is matrix et radix, the womb and the root of the Catholic Church.

CHAP. IX.—<sup>110</sup> Matt. 16, 13. <sup>111</sup> In Matt. hom. 54. 2.  
<sup>112</sup> Ap. Mign. tom 5. p. 423.  
*Döllinger* Christenthum und Kirche 1st ed. p. 30.

CHAP. X.—<sup>113</sup> John 1, 42. <sup>114</sup> The Greek translator of the Gospel of St. Matthew, originally written in Aramaic, was obliged to change from Petrus to Petra: in the original it was Kephias without any change of gender! Thou art Rock and on this rock. Kephias in Hebrew and Chaldaic is the name both of a person and a thing. <sup>115</sup> *Cyrrill. Alex.* ap. Migne tom 6. p. 219  
<sup>116</sup> *Gregor. Naz. orat.* 26. p. 453 *Comp. Aster. Amas.* hom. 8. in S. Peter et Paul (Migne. t. 40. p. 267).

<sup>117</sup> *Gregor. Nyss.* Alter. laudatio S. Stephen, ap. Migne tom 46. p. 734. <sup>118</sup> The last is Iscariot. Matt. 10, 4. <sup>119</sup> Also *Cyprian, Tertullian* (De idololatria c. 19), *Jerom* in Ep. ad Ephes. 3, 7: Every phrase in the holy Scriptures is full of meanings. *S. John Chrysost.* in Genes. hom 21, 1. The holy Scriptures present a wealth of meaning: every syllable contains a great treasure.

<sup>120</sup> *Sepp.* Das Leben Jesu 2 Band. p. 112. <sup>121</sup> *Döllinger.* L. c. p. 32. <sup>122</sup> The church is built on him, that is by him. *Tertull.* de Pudic. c. 2. <sup>123</sup> On him alone he builds his church. *Cyprian* de unit. Eccles. c. 5. God is one and Christ is one and the Church is one and the chair is one, founded on Peter by the voice of our Lord. *Cyprian.* Ep. 43.5.

<sup>124</sup> He who has not unity with the church, does he think that he has the faith? *Cyprian.* l. c. <sup>125</sup> Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia: where Peter is, there is the church. *Ambros* in Ps. 40 n. 30. For the texts of the Fathers which describe Peter as the Rock, see *Ballerini*, De vi et ratione primatus, ed. Verona 1766. p. 74 &c. <sup>126</sup> *Biblischer Commentar.* I. p. 512. <sup>127</sup> *Philosophie der Offenb.* II. p. 301. So the Protestant *E. B. Meyer* (*Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Matthäus* 3 Aufl. 1853 in loc) If we wish to be impartial, the Primacy must be conceded. *Holtzmann* (*Ztschr. für wissenschaftliche Theologie.* 1878. p. 115) says, with reason does *Weiss* reject entirely the old and new Protestant partisan exegesis and refer the promise to the person of Peter, in whom the stability of the church (compare Matt. 7, 24. 25) in its human side appears to be assured.

<sup>128</sup> *Ambros* de Sacram. V. 34. It was said not of the body of Peter, but of his faith. *August.* De Baptism. II. 1: In that confession Peter was called the rock, on which the church was to be built. *Leo. M.* Serm. 62. On account of the

firmness of the faith which he was to preach, he heard : and upon this rock. <sup>129</sup> 1 Cor. 3, 11 : compare *August* *Retract.* 1 21. <sup>130</sup> Ephes. 2, 20.

<sup>131</sup> Job 38, 11; Ps. 9, 14. *Isaiah* 38, 19. <sup>132</sup> Luke 11, 21.22. *Olsbhausen.* l. c. <sup>133</sup> Osee 13, 14, 1 Cor. 15,57. Heb. 2, 14. *Ferom* in loc. The gates of hell I take to be vices and sins, or at least the teaching of heretics by which men are drawn into hell. *Greg.* in Ps. prenit. Ps. 5, 26. The gates of hell are heresies...The gates of hell are the powers of this world too. *Epiph.* *Ancor.* 9 : the gates of hell are heresies. *Comp. John Chrysost.* *Quod Christus sit Deus,* n. 12. Every one of those, says *Origen,* (*opp. tom. 3 p. 527*) who like Marcion, Basilides, and Valentinus has set up another teaching in opposition to the faith of the Church, has built a gate of hell. *Augustine* (Ps. *contr. part. Donat*) refers *eam* to *portam*. *Ipsa est petra quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ.* *Olsbhausen* loc. cit. *Isaiah* 22, 19 &c. Go, get thee into him that dwelleth in the tabernacle, to Sobna who is over the temple : and thou shalt say to him : . . . I will drive thee from thy station and depose thee from thy ministry. And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will call my servant Eliacim the son of Helcias. And, I will give thy power into his hand and he shall be as a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Juda. And I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder ; and he shall open and none shall shut and he shall shut and none shall open. *Comp. Isaiah* 9, 16 : *Apoc.* 3, 7 : These things saith the Holy One and the True One, who hath the key of David : He that openeth and no one shutteth ; shutteth and no man openeth.

<sup>134</sup> *Sepp.* l. c. p 277. <sup>135</sup> *Apoc* 3, 7.

CHAP. XI.—<sup>136</sup> *Döhlinger,* l. c. p 32. I have given thee the keys of my kingdom, says Christ by the Syrian Ephrem (in the fourth of the lately discovered six sermons) and I have placed all my treasures in thy hands. <sup>137</sup> Another reading : and thou being once converted. *Luke* 22, 32. *Serm.* 4. 2. <sup>138</sup> *Comp. Cyril* in loc. that is : become the foundation and teacher of those who come to me by faith. (*Migne Pat. Gr. t. 72. p 916.*) <sup>139</sup> In *Act. Hom.* 3. 2. *Comp. Ambros. de fid.* IV. 3.

<sup>140</sup> *Sepp.* l. c. III. p. 438. <sup>141</sup> *Döhlinger.* l. c. p 32. <sup>142</sup> *John* 17, 20. <sup>143</sup> *Matt.* 28, 20. <sup>144</sup> L. c. <sup>145</sup> *John* 11, 42.

CHAP. XII.—<sup>146</sup> *John* 21, 15. <sup>147</sup> *Döhlinger,* l. c. <sup>148</sup> In *Joan. hom.* 88. 1.

<sup>149</sup> Gal. 1, 18; 2, 2. <sup>150</sup> Id. l. c. <sup>151</sup> *Aster. Amas.* l. c. p. 281. L. c. II. 8. <sup>152</sup> "To feed" in the sense of governing is an expression common in holy Scripture (Jerem. 23, 24; Isaiah 44, 28; Ezech, 34, 23) and in profane writers (Iliad II. 85. 243). The expressions *Poimanein* and *Boskein* include the whole spiritual action of the church, the teaching, as well as the government. Comp. Acts 20, 28. 1 Pet. 5. 2.

CHAP. XIII.—<sup>153</sup> Acts 1, 15; 2, 14. <sup>154</sup> Acts. 3, 1. <sup>155</sup> Acts 4, 1 &c. <sup>156</sup> Id. 9, 32 &c. <sup>157</sup> Id. 10, 5 &c. <sup>158</sup> Id. 15, 17 &c. <sup>159</sup> Id. 8, 20. <sup>160</sup> Mark 1, 36. Luke, 6, 14. Acts 1, 13. <sup>161</sup> Matt 10, 2: in the order of calling Andrew was the first. <sup>162</sup> 2 Pet 3, 15. <sup>163</sup> Gal. 1, 18. 19: 2, 2. After staying fifteen days with Peter Paul entered on his calling. <sup>164</sup> *Bossuet*, l. c.

<sup>165</sup> Mark 16, 7; 1 Cor. 15, 5. <sup>166</sup> Mark 5, 37: Matt, 13, 11 17, 24: Luke 22, 24: compare *Döllinger* l. c. <sup>167</sup> John 21, 18 <sup>168</sup> Luke 22, 25, &c. <sup>169</sup> Gal. 2, 14. <sup>170</sup> *St. Thomas* in Ep. ad Gal. 2, 11: We must say that the Apostle was equal to Peter in the exercise of authority, but not in the authority of jurisdiction. In the above incident we have an example; prelates, of humility, that they may not refuse to be corrected by their inferiors and subjects; subjects of zeal and courage, that they may not shrink from correcting their prelates, especially where the fault is public and may prove dangerous to the multitude.

<sup>171</sup> *Bossuet*. l. c. The Jewish Christians, even Barnabas who lived in such intimacy with Paul, followed his example and from his conduct it seemed as though the observance of the Mosaic law was to be prescribed to the gentile converts. In order to show that he possessed full Apostolic power, Paul puts forward, that he withstood Peter himself to the face. The Protestant *Wieseler* is of the opinion that from Gal. 2 the most perfect agreement in essentials is proved to have existed between Paul and the chief of the Apostles. *Liter. Centralbl.* 1881, p. 241. <sup>172</sup> *Ignat.* ad Philad. c. 10. <sup>173</sup> *Josephus* *Archaeol.* XX. 7. <sup>174</sup> This was the opinion of *Febronius*, *M. A. de Dominis*, *Van Espen.*, and the Protestants. (*Febronius* *De statu Ecclesiae et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis.* Francof. et Lips. 1763, Tom. I c. 1 § 2: Comp. his *Retract. Pos.* I. II.)

<sup>175</sup> Comp. *Cyprian.* ib p. 512. <sup>176</sup> Matt. 18, 18: <sup>177</sup> *Döllinger* l. c. p. 32.

<sup>178</sup> *Optat. Milev.* c *Parmen.* VII. 3: comp. I. 10. Peter alone received the keys. *Leo* ad E. Vienn. Ep. 10, Our Lord wished the mystery of this gift to belong to the office of all the Apostles in such a way that he placed it *primarily* in B.

Peter, the chief of all the Apostles ; from him as from the head he wished his gifts to be conveyed to the whole body, so that any one might know he was cut off from the divine mystery, if he dared to withdraw himself from Peter's firmness. <sup>179</sup> *Huar.* in Matt. 16,17 ; *Chrysost.* in Matt. 54,2. <sup>180</sup> Comp. *Benettis*, Privilegia S. Petri vindic. Vol. I. p 80: *Zaccaria*. Antifebron. vindic I. p. 342. <sup>181</sup> Acts 20,23. *Bernard* l. c. III. 4. <sup>182</sup> 1 Cor. 4,1. 1 Pet. 4,10. <sup>183</sup> Luke 22,25-29. <sup>184</sup> 1 Pet. 5,3-5.

CHAP. XIV.—<sup>185</sup> Confess. August. p. 345 (Christ) gave the keys primarily and immediately to the Church. The same taught *C. Richer* (De potestate ecclesiastica. 1611), *Launoy*, *Dupin*, *Van Espen*, *Febronius* (tom 1. cap. 1. § 6. Auct. fid. Prop. II. III.) {*Quésnel* (Prop. 90). <sup>186</sup> *Augustin.* tr. 124 in Joan. Enarrat in Ps. 108, *Petav.* De Hierarch. Eccl. III. 16.

<sup>187</sup> Comp. *Asterius Amas.* hom. 8 in SS. Patr. et Paul ed Migne, tom 40. p 280. <sup>188</sup> *Augustin.* tr. 124 5. in Joan : Peter the Apostle on account of the Primacy of his Apostleship bore the person of the Church and represented the whole. Serm. 295. The superiority of Peter may be extolled from this that he represented the totality and the unity of the Church.

<sup>189</sup> *Fulgent.* (467) de fid. ad Petr. c. 10, Repentance avails the sinner, if he repents in the Catholic Church, on which God conferred in the person of B. Peter the power of binding and loosing. <sup>190</sup> *Tertull.* Scorp. n. 10 Bear in mind that our Lord left the keys to Peter and through Peter to the Church. <sup>191</sup> The stronghold of the priesthood was entrusted by the words of our Lord. *Boniface* I † 422 Ep. 4. ad Ruf. Thessal. <sup>192</sup> *Innoc* I. 417 ad Victr. Rathom. Ep 2. 2. *Cypr.* Ep. 43. <sup>193</sup> *Leo M.* † 461 Ep. 10 ad Ep. Vienn. Our Lord wished the mystery of this gift to belong to the office of all the Apostles in such a way that he placed it *primarily* in B. Peter, the chief of all the Apostles. Id. Ep. 14. Though all were equally chosen, to one it was given, that he should be above the others.

The Vatican Council, l. c. cap. 1. The following is a translation of the entire chapter, omitting the Canon with which it is concluded :—

We, therefore, teach and declare that, according to the testimony of the Gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God was immediately and directly promised and given to Blessed Peter the Apostle by Christ the Lord. For it was to Simon alone, to whom He had already said : Thou shalt be called Cephias (John i, 42), that the Lord after the confession made by him saying : Thou art the Christ, the Son of

the living God, addressed these solemn words : Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in Heaven. And I say to thee that thou art Peter ; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed also in heaven (Matt. xvi, 16-19). And it was upon Simon alone that Jesus after His resurrection bestowed the jurisdiction of Chief Pastor and Ruler over all His fold in the words : Feed my lambs : feed my sheep (John XXI, 15-17). At open variance with this clear doctrine of Holy Scripture as it has been ever understood by the Catholic Church are the perverse opinions of those who, while they distort the form of government established by Christ the Lord in His Church, deny that Peter in his single person, preferably to all the other Apostles, whether taken separately or together, was endowed by Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction ; or of those who assert that the same primacy was not bestowed immediately and directly upon Blessed Peter himself, but upon the Church, and through the Church on Peter as her minister.

CHAP. XV.—<sup>194</sup> Serm. 3. 3. Serm. 4. 22.

Philipp. Leg. in Conc. Ephes. Act III (Mansi t. 4. 295)

<sup>195</sup> John 17, 11, &c. <sup>196</sup> John 5, 19 ; 11, 52. 1 Cor. 12, 12 &c ; 10, 17. Ephes 4, 4 &c. <sup>197</sup> Hom. 1. 1 in 1 Ep. ad Cor.

<sup>198</sup> John 17, 22. <sup>199</sup> Ep. 70. c 3, 7.

<sup>200</sup> The Episcopate is one, a portion is held by each *in solidum* (that is, without division of the whole.)

<sup>201</sup> *Cypr. de unit. Eccl. c 4. 5.* <sup>202</sup> Stephen glories in the rank of his Episcopate and contends that he has the succession of St. Peter on whom the foundations of the Church were laid. Ep. 75, 17 ; 70, 3 ; 66, 8 ; 59, 5 (ed. Hart.) <sup>203</sup> Contr. Parmen VII. 3. II. 2. Adv. Jovinian. I. 26. <sup>204</sup> In Joan. tr. 118. n. 4. Therefore one for all, because unity is in all.

<sup>205</sup> Migne tom. 46. p. 812.

<sup>206</sup> ap *Ambros. † 397* Ep. 150. 1 : Ep. 11. 4. <sup>207</sup> *Innocent* I. Ep. 29 ad Episcop. Conc. Carthag : the fontal fulness of priestly authority, according to *Gerson* (de stat Eccl Cons. 3.)

<sup>208</sup> The Catechism of the Council of Trent p. 1. 9. 10. c. 10. Christ though invisible is the one ruler and governor of the Church. <sup>209</sup> *Cypr. l. c. 6. c.* <sup>210</sup> *Planck Engelhardt, Marheineke.*

<sup>211</sup> Art. smalc. p. 314. The Pope is the true Antichrist ! ‘The

Reformers possessed in this confession, the justification of their work of Reformation.' *Herzog*. Real Encyclop. XVII. 511: X. 583. On the contrary *Hase* maintains: This was a piece of narrow-mindedness, to be explained by the roughness of the times and the fanaticism on both sides. (Polemik, 4 Aufl. p. 150).

<sup>212</sup> c. Parmen. I. 19 No heretics have the keys. Peter alone received them. <sup>213</sup> De Sacerdot. II. 1. <sup>214</sup> *Cypr.* Ep. 66. c. 8. <sup>215</sup> Id. Ep. 73.

<sup>216</sup> As the Montanists, Novatians and Donatists maintained *Tertull.* de pudicit. c. 21: Because our Lord said to Peter: on this rock... Who are you, upsetting and changing the manifest intention of our Lord who confers the gift on Peter personally? <sup>217</sup> *Tertull.* De pudicit. c. 1.

<sup>218</sup> *Jerom.* Adv. Lucif. Calar. n. 9. <sup>219</sup> Pro pace Eccl. tit. 7. <sup>220</sup> Resp. ad Luth. c. 10. <sup>221</sup> *Lechler.* Dei Lehre vom heiligen Amte. Stuttgart. 1857, p. 139 &c. Luther in the year 1519 (W. W. Jenaer Ausgabe. tom. 1. p. 169: comp p.p. 47, 144.) Let come what will, I will know nothing else but that the voice of your Holiness is the voice of Christ, who acts and speaks in you. I declare in the presence of God and all his creatures, that I never have proposed nor do wish to propose to myself to attack the authority of the Church of Rome and your Holiness or by any craft to curtail it. Yea, I acknowledge freely that the authority of the Church is above all and you care for nothing, in heaven or in earth, save Jesus Christ, the Lord of all.

<sup>222</sup> In these words Christ, Who above all wished that his Church should be one, called into existence a ruler endowed with power and dignity above the others, who should draw all into unity, *Bossuet.* Defens. Cler. Gallic. XI. 1. <sup>223</sup> *Petr. Chrysolog.* (†450) Ad Eutychn. presb n. 2. Concil Ephes. Acts III. <sup>224</sup> *Cypr.* Ep. 48. <sup>225</sup> *Leo M.* Serm 3. 2 de annivers.

<sup>226</sup> Hence the Bishop of Rome as the successor of Peter is named '*Vicarius Petri,*' the vicar of Peter, *Vicarius Christi,* the vicar of Christ (*Geias* [+ 496] Ep. 30 ap. *Tbiel* p. 447), his see, *cathedra Petri, locus Petri,* the chair of Peter, the place of Peter, and simply *Petrus,* Peter. Peter has spoken through Leo. Conc. Chalced. Act. II. Peter has spoken through Agatho. Conc. Constant. III. Act 18. (Comp. *Ballerini.* De vi et rat. Primat. p. 3. *Constant.* Ep. Rom. Pontif. p. 1X).

CHAP. XVI.—<sup>227</sup> 1 Pet. 5. 13. Mark was with him. comp. 1 Cor. 4, 10. Philem. 24. <sup>228</sup> Apoc. 14, 18; 16, 29: 17, 5; 18, 2. <sup>229</sup> John 21, 19.

<sup>230</sup> Peter and Paul have suffered death 'in our midst. 1 Cor. 6. *Ignat.* Ep. ad Rom. n. 5. I do not command you as did Peter and Paul. <sup>231</sup> Ap. *Euseb.* H. E. II. 15. L. c. II. 25. <sup>232</sup> De praescript. c. 38. His arrival in Rome took place in the early part of the reign of the Emperor Claudius, probably in the year 42 (others put it 41 or 44). His death was in 67 under Nero. Nearly 25 years elapsed from the time he became the true founder and bishop of Rome to his death. But we do not contend that Peter spent the whole time in Rome.

<sup>233</sup> *Bossuet.* l. c. <sup>234</sup> On the idea that the worldly splendour of a state could give it any ecclesiastical pre-eminence Pope *Gelasius* observes (Ep. 26, 10 ap. *Thiel* p. 405). It provoked a smile that they should seek to obtain the prerogative for Acacius, on the ground that he was bishop of an imperial city... One thing is the power of a secular kingdom, another the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities. <sup>235</sup> *Xyst.* III (†400) ad Joan. Antioch (ap. *Constant* p. 1260.) <sup>236</sup> *Nicol.* I (†867) Ep. 8. ad Mich. Imper. <sup>237</sup> *Bellarmin.* De Rom. Pontif. II. 10. *Melch. Can.* Loci theol. Ed. Venet. II. 6. p. 168. He adduces a parallel. It is not handed down in Scripture that the priests of our age were validly ordained by true Bishops... From the supposition therefore, which we hold with human certainty, namely that these priests were validly ordained necessarily depends whether the true sacrament of the Eucharist exists in the Church. If any one were to deny this, the Church would account him a heretic... If you add to this inference from the Gospel (that the successors of Peter enjoy the same superiority as Peter) that the bishop of Rome is the successor of Peter and this we learn from history, it may be evidently concluded, that the bishop of Rome is superior to the others and wields the same power and authority in the Church which Peter held. *Gerdil.* Animadvers in Comment a Febron. edit. in suam Retract. in posit. 9. The one thing which seems to make against it, that the connexion of the Primacy with the See of Rome depends on the facts of Peter's history, is of small moment. There are many things which presuppose a human fact for their existence, but which as soon as the fact is established have the sanction of divine right. Nuptial unions depend on a human fact: but who will deny they who contract these unions are joined by God? We must not confound fact with right, which by divine institution comes into existence when the fact is established. The fact and a human fact enters in; but when the fact has taken place, by the previous institution of Christ the divine right arises and is developed. In the connexion of



the primacy with the See of Rome, the human fact is that Peter chose Rome for his own definite See and we believe he did so under divine guidance and direction. That the primacy should be attached to that see which Peter chose in this manner we must refer back to the divine institution by which Christ was pleased to confer the primacy for all time on Peter and his successors in his see.

<sup>238</sup> De App. Petr. et Paul. serm 1.

<sup>239</sup> Görres, Triarier. 1838. p. 93.

<sup>240</sup> Hagemann Die Römische kirche, p. 691. <sup>241</sup> Ep. 42 ap. *Tbiel.* p. 455 ; comp. Ep. 11 ad Anast. Imperat. (ap. *Tbiel.* p. 252.) Submission must be yielded to the prelate of that See which the supreme divinity decreed should enjoy pre-eminence over all priests and which the piety of the whole Church has ever since honoured.

<sup>242</sup> L. c. In reference to these personal testimonies of the Popes, the author of the *Defensio declarat. Cler. Gallican* (III. 10. 6) says : I confess that I believe the teaching and tradition of the Popes regarding the majesty of the Apostolic See, as they say nothing more in reference to their see, than the other Bishops and the whole Church say, Eastern and Western. For with equal reason it might be urged that Bishops and priests are not to be believed when they speak regarding the dignity of the Priesthood. <sup>243</sup> The Gallicans down to *Febronius* and since then *Döllinger* Janus p. 347 contended that these words were a forgery and must be translated in a restricted sense. In eum modum, quo et gestis et in sacris canonibus instead of : *Quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur* (in a *stronger* sense by the testimony of tradition). On the other hand, *Schelstrate*, *Zaccaria*, and quite recently *Cecconi* and *Frommann* (*Zur Kritik des Florentiner unions decret.* Leipsig. 1870) maintain the genuineness of the Latin text from the original documents. 'It is much to be regretted,' says *Frommann* (p. 53) 'that what *Döllinger* mainly rests on, unfortunately exists only in his imagination. For in all the MSS of the decree which we have examined, the "etiam" is found. The Latins drew up the document and the Greeks translated it and there is not the faintest imputation against the Latins of any intentional partisan misrepresentation.

CHAP. XVII.—<sup>244</sup> *Leo M.* serm. 3. 3. In whose (Peter's) See power resides and authority excels. III. 4, whom they knew to be not only the prelate of this see but also the primate of all

bishops. Ep. V. 2 : And whereas our charge extends to all the churches, according to the requisition of our Lord, who entrusted the primacy of the Apostolic dignity to the Apostle B. Peter in reward of his faith, establishing the whole Church on the firmness of his foundation, we share the burden of our solicitude with those who are bound to us in the love of the body.<sup>245</sup> Ep. ad Rom. init : presidents of the Agape. Agape in ecclesiastical language signifies the communion of Christians in the Church. Comp. *Hagemann* p. 686. *Schneemann* (Der Papst als Oberhaupt der Gesamtkirche p. 16 &c). What the Bishop does for each individual Church, that according to *Ignatius* the Church of Rome and its bishop do for the whole Church ; they prevent divisions and schisms. *Philad.* c. 2. To preside (ad Magn. c. 6) is distinctive of episcopal authority.

<sup>246</sup> De pudicit. c. 1. <sup>247</sup> The first Church Ep. 59. In order of time the Church of Rome is not the 'first.' <sup>248</sup> Ep. 55. He would know you are in communion with him, that is, with the Catholic Church. Ep. 48 communion with you, that is, *the unity of the Catholic Church.* <sup>249</sup> C. Parmen. II. 1.3. Siricius, who is in communion with me. <sup>250</sup> Ep. 25 ad Damas : I, following no leader except Christ, am united in communion with your Blessedness, that is, the See of Peter. Ep. 43. <sup>251</sup> *Ambros.* De ob. frat. Satyr. n. 47. <sup>252</sup> De vita sua Opp. II. p. 571. <sup>253</sup> Conc. Aquil. ap. *Ambros.* Ep. 150. Ep. 11. 4. <sup>254</sup> *Hormisdas* Ep. 61 (ap. *Tbiel.* p. 854).

<sup>255</sup> What the *Roman, that is, the Catholic* Church follows and observes. Mansi VIII. p. 599. The author of the letter was probably *Fulgentius*.

CHAP. XVIII.—<sup>256</sup> This is the name given to it by *Friedrich Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* I. p. 409.

<sup>257</sup> *Iren.* adv. Haer. III. 3. 2. For to this Church on account of its *superior chiefship* (potiorem al. potentiorem principalitatem) it is necessary that every Church should come together, that is, the faithful, who are everywhere ; for in this Church the tradition which is from the Apostles has been ever preserved by those who are everywhere. Principalitas (Proteia, al. authentia) and principatus are employed in the Latin translation in 21 places for authority, sovereignty : to III. 38 : principalitatem habebit in omnibus Deus. *Cypr.* Ep. 55. Ecclesia principalis. *Augustin.* de baptism. II. 1 : Petri principatus cuilibet episcopatu præferendus. Ep. 43. Apostolicæ cathedræ principatus (of the church of Rome). *Tertull.* de anim. c. 13. Principalitas, i. e.

qui cui præest. *Leo M. II.* serm. in annivers. Elect. Dominus episcopalis officii me voluit habere principium. *Ammianus Marcellinus* (Histor. XV, 7) explains potior principalitas : auctoritas qua potiores sunt æternæ urbis episcopi. Convenire : *Optatus* (lc. II. 3) has the same thought as Irenæus : in this single see unity was to be preserved by all. <sup>258</sup> They trifle who think that the vastness of the city was meant by the words potentioris principalitatis : for Irenæus is speaking not of the city which is to be visited on account of its imperial rank, but of the Church founded by the Apostles, to which all the faithful must betake themselves from all parts in order to preserve the original, Apostolical tradition. *Bossuet.* Defens. Declar. cl. Gall. II. 15, 6. "This argument is instructive. We understand, that no pains have been spared for 300 years to escape the telling force of these words by distorting their natural meaning." *Dörlinger.* Kirchengesch. I. p 365, &c.

<sup>259</sup> If Rome is no longer the centre of the civilized world, what then ? and if there are many centres in the civilized world, what then ? And if the Christians no longer come to Rome from Asia, Egypt and Palestine, what then ? *Kellner,* Verfassung der Kirche. 1873. p 24.

<sup>260</sup> Comp. Jos. *Bar David* Antiqua Ecclesiae Syro-Chaldaicæ traditio circa Petri ejusque successorum Romanorum Pontificum divinum primatum. Romæ, 1872 <sup>261</sup> *Anzarian,* Ecclesiae Armenicæ traditio de Rom. Pontificis primatu. Romæ, 1870.

CHAP. XIX.—<sup>262</sup> *Hagemann* p. 683. <sup>263</sup> *Athanas.* De sentent. *Dionys.* c. 14. <sup>264</sup> *Euseb.* H. F. VII. 30. <sup>265</sup> *Socrat.* H. E. II. 15. The accused and those who were driven from their Churches repaired to the imperial city. And when they had stated their cause to Julius the bishop of Rome, he using the prerogative of the Church of Rome, provided them with gracious letters and sent them back to the East. Comp. *Sozomen.* III. 8. <sup>266</sup> *Epiphan.* Haer. 42. <sup>267</sup> *Cypr.* Ep. 37.

<sup>268</sup> *Damas.* († 384) Ep. 3 (ap. *Constant* p. 486) : it is plain the Bishop of Rome whose decision they ought especially to have waited for. *Siricius* († 398) Ep. I ad Himer (*Constant* p. 625). We bear the burdens of all who are laden, or rather B. Peter bears them in us, for in all cases he guards and protects us, the inheritors of his government... Now we urge your Fraternity... to bring these matters to the knowledge of all your fellow bishops. *Zosim.* († 418) Ep. 7. ad Hesyeh (*Constant* p. 869.) Let him know that whoever sets aside the authority of the Fathers and the Apostolic

See will be severely punished by Us. To *Innocent I.* (Ep. 27. *Constant* p. 875) the African Bishops write: We are of opinion... that they (the Pelagians) will more readily yield to the authority of your Holiness, which is established by the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Ep. 28 (*Constant* p. 878) He (Pelagius) should either be summoned to Rome by your Venerability or the matter should be dealt with by letter. *Innocent I.* answers Ep. 29 (*Constant* p. 888). Imitating the examples of *ancient tradition* and respecting ecclesiastical discipline you approve the appeal to our judgment, knowing what is due... to the Apostolic See, from which the Episcopate and the authority due to its dignity are derived. *Gelas.* Ep. 5 ad Honor. (ap. *Thiel.* p. 321.) The vigilance of the Apostolic See according to the usage of our Fathers is due to all Churches in the world. *Caesarius*, Bishop of Arles, writes to Pope Symmachus († 514) (Labbe IV. ed. Par. p. 1244): as the Episcopate derives its origin from the person of B. Peter the Apostle, it is necessary that your Holiness by suitable instructions should plainly show to each Church what is to be observed. Flavius, recently chosen Patriarch of Constantinople, prays that he may be supported by him through whom from Christ the full grace of all bishops flows abundantly (Ep. 15), for according to rule he addresses himself to the Holy See, by which through the bounty of Christ the dignity of all priests is secured. (ap. *Thiel.* p. 267, 270.)

<sup>269</sup> Ap. *Constant* p. 851. *Döllinger.* Kirchengeschichte p. 199. <sup>270</sup> *Simplicius* († 483) Ep. 18 ad Acac. (ap. *Thiel.* p. 210): Nothing seemed to remain, except that... without disturbance as a Catholic bishop had succeeded to the office of him who was dead, he should receive the confirmation he wished for by the assent of our Apostolical indulgence. Comp. *Jul.* Ep. 1. 22. <sup>271</sup> *Simplic.* l. c. he may not ascend to the summit of the priestly dignity (Peter Mongus in Alexandria). Ep. 19 (ap. *Thiel.* 212): the grant of forgiveness, but not of power is permissible. Comp. *Felix II.* Ep. 11. (ap. *Thiel.* p. 256) on Peter the Fuller of Antioch: *Simplic.* Ep. 1 (ap. *Thiel.*, p. 177) on Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria. Ep. 15 (ap. *Thiel.*, p. 204) on the ordination of Calendia of Antioch. Ep. 17 (ap. *Thiel.* p. 206): embraced by the Apostolic See. <sup>272</sup> *Felix II.*, (†492) Ep. 3 ad Acacium Constantinopol. libell citationis (ap. *Thiel.* p. 239): Make haste to answer in an assembly of our brothers and fellow bishops before B. Peter the Apostle, to whom in us you know the petition has been presented, and who, you cannot deny, received from our Lord the power to bind and to loose. <sup>273</sup> *Felix II* Ep. 6 (ap. *Thiel.* p. 243) ad Acacium Constantin.

You are found guilty of many transgressions . . . know that you are cut off from priestly rank, from Catholic communion and from the body of the faithful, you are stripped of the title and dignity of your office, condemned by the sentence of the Holy Ghost and by Apostolic authority through Us. Comp. Ep. 7. 8. 11. *Gelasius* (†496) ad Episcop. Dardaniæ Ep. 26 (ap. *Thiel.* 412): this sentence directed against *Acacius* though given in the name of the Apostolic bishop only, to whose competency it belonged is proved to have been pronounced according to law...a synod of many Catholic priests in Italy found that the sentence against *Acacius* had been pronounced on good grounds. Comp. Ep. 1. Tract II. 8. (ap. *Thiel.* p. 528): No one could or ought to expel or call back the bishop of the second See without the consent of the first See. Ep. 27, 4 (ap. *Thiel.* p. 427). It is plain that such persons were always examined or acquitted by the authority of the Apostolic See, or acquitted by other bishops who enjoyed the right to judge but so that their acquittal depended on the consent of the Apostolic See.

<sup>274</sup> *Gelas.* Ep. 26, 3 (ap. *Thiel.* 305): the first See before any other is bound to follow the decree of a Council. Comp. *Simplic.* Ep. 16 ad *Acac.* (ap. *Thiel.* 206) so that what was done by necessity may suffice. Comp. Ep. 15 ad *Zenon.* August. *Gelas.* Ep. 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 24. <sup>275</sup> Ep. 113 (ap. *Thiel.* p. 914): the regular usage. Comp. *Theodoret.* H. E. II. 23. *Sozomen.* VIII. 3, *Chrysostom* after his election sent a deputation to Rome, as his biographer *Palladius* narrates; so did *Anatolius* of Constantinople (*Leo.* Ep. 80); comp. *Döllinger* Kirchengesch, p. 200. Antioch and Alexandria obtained the Patriarchal dignity, the former through Peter, who was bishop of Antioch, the latter through his disciple Mark, who was bishop of Alexandria. Comp. *Gregor. M.* Ep. 7, 40: *Thomassin.* Vet. et nov. Eccles. discip. p. 1., l 1. c 9. <sup>276</sup> *Gelas.* Ep. 26, 3 (ap. *Thiel.* p. 396): so that no bishop should refuse the judgment of the first See.

<sup>277</sup> Inter Oper. *Leon.* ed. Baller. I. p. 642. <sup>278</sup> *Euseb.* H. E. VII. 30. <sup>279</sup> *Rer. gest.* I. 15. *Codex Justin.* I. Tit. I. 1. 7. 8. Comp. *Hergenröther.* Photius. I. p. 1554.

CHAP. XX.—<sup>280</sup> The Donatist schism already showed this tendency in the fourth century. <sup>281</sup> Comp. *Leo.* Universalgesch. IV. p. 102. *Gregorovius.* Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter I. p. 18. <sup>282</sup> The whole chapter on the Perpetuity of the Primacy of B. Peter in the Roman Pontiffs runs thus:

That which the Prince of Shepherds and great Shepherd of the sheep, Jesus Christ our Lord, established in the person

of the Blessed Apostle Peter to secure the perpetual welfare and lasting good of the Church, must, by the same institution, necessarily remain unceasingly in the Church; which, being founded upon the Rock, will stand firm to the end of the world. For none can doubt, and it is known to all ages, that the holy and Blessed Peter, the Prince and Chief of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind, and lives, presides, and judges, to this day and always, in his successors the Bishops of the Holy See of Rome, which was founded by him, and consecrated by his blood (from the Acts, session third, of the Third General Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, Labbé's Councils, vol. iii, p. 1154, Venice edition of 1728. See also letter of S. Peter Chrysologus to Eutyches, in life prefixed to his works, p. 13, Venice, 1750). Whence, whosoever succeeds to Peter in this See, does by the institution of Christ Himself obtain the Primacy of Peter over the whole Church. The disposition made by Incarnate Truth therefore remains, and Blessed Peter, abiding through the strength of the Rock in the power that he received, has not abandoned the direction of the Church (from Sermon iii, chap. 3, of *S. Leo the Great*, vol. i., p. 12) Wherefore it has at all times been necessary that every particular Church—that is to say, the faithful throughout the world—should agree with the Roman Church, on account of the greater authority of the principedom which this has received; that all being associated in the unity of that See whence the rights of communion spread to all, might grow together as members of one Head in the compact unity of the body (from *S. Irenaeus* against Heresies, book iii., cap. 3, p. 175. Benedictine edition, Venice, 1734; and Acts of Synod of Aquileia, A. D. 381, Labbé's Councils, vol. ii., p. 1185, Venice, 1728).

CHAP. XXI.—<sup>283</sup> Defens. declar, Cler. 1 Gall. XXI.  
<sup>284</sup> *Leo M.* Ep. V. 2.

<sup>285</sup> So the Synod of Sardica (346) to Pope Julius I. (ap. *Mansi* III. 40). Comp. *Hilar.* Fragm II. p. 1290. Comp. *Hefele* Conc. Gesch. 2 Aufl. I. Bd. p. 611. <sup>286</sup> ad Rufum Thessal, ap. *Constant.* p. 1037. <sup>287</sup> *Bernard.* 1. c. II. 8. *Thomas* in IV. Dist. 24. q. 4. a. 2.

CHAP. XXII.—<sup>288</sup> Ed. Combef. II. 76.

<sup>289</sup> *Tertul.* De pudicit. c. 1. <sup>290</sup> *Theodor.* *Studit.* I. 34  
 The head of all heads (to Leo III). <sup>291</sup> So the Bishops

of Dardania to *Gelasius* (Ep. 11 ap. *Thiel.* p. 348); at the Roman Synod under Martin I. (649) a letter from three African Councils was read: it begins (ap. *Mansi* X. p. 919). To our most blessed Lord, raised to the apostolic summit, to the holy *father of fathers*, to Pope Theodore, the *high-priest of all prelates*. They say: by ancient rule it was fixed that no matter should be treated or taken up even in remote or distant provinces unless it had been brought to the knowledge of your well-beloved See, that by its authority the just decree might be confirmed, and other churches might thence derive as from *the native spring* the beginning of their preaching and the salutary sacraments of faith may remain in uncorrupted purity throughout the different parts of the world! The pictures in the Catacombs and the glass-paintings frequently represent Peter under the type of Moses striking the rock, an unmistakable and clear testimony to the Primacy of Peter. *Kraus.* Roma Sotteranea 1873. p. 299. <sup>292</sup> Lat. IV. cap. V. *Schulte.* Kirchenrecht. 1868. p. 193.

<sup>293</sup> *Zallinger.* Instit. jur. eccl. I § 508. 'That the Pope possesses only a *mediate* authority over our Lord's flock and can only supply the defects of inferior pastors is a most patent error derived from authors who have been condemned, namely, *M. A. ae Dominis, Richer, Febronius* and *Eybel*. This error is in plain contradiction to the words and teaching of Christ, in contradiction to tradition, and perpetual usage. Con. Œcum. Later. IV. To Peter the direction was given to feed the lambs and sheep...I ask what did bishops receive before this, or more immediately, or more directly.' <sup>294</sup> Conc. Lugdun. II: If (the Roman Church) admits other churches to share its solicitude. *Thomas.* 3tia. q 7. a 9. That is held *fully* (plene.) which is held *perfectly* and *completely* (perfecte et totaliter). *Bonaventure* (Quare frat. minor. prædicent init.) explains the point more minutely. The plenitude of this power is threefold (1) the Sovereign Pontiff alone possesses the plenitude of the power which Christ conferred on the Church. (2) He possesses it in every church as he does in his own particular See of Rome. (3) From him all authority flows to all inferiors throughout the whole church, in that measure in which it ought to be communicated to each one. *Albertus M.* in Matt. c 16. In the unity of the hierarchy of the Church there is one who receives (the keys) in the plenitude of power, and he is the successor of Peter and he is Peter in authority. Others however in the same unity receive them in a share of the power because they are called to a share of the solicitude, *Leo M.* in his

letter to Bp. Anastasius of Thessalonica says. "We have entrusted our place to your charity, so that you are called to a share of the plenitude, not to the plenitude of power." The objection of *P. de Marca* (De Concord. Sacerdot et Imper. V. 26) and some moderns, that this phrase applies (to Anastasius) only because he was Vicar of the Holy See in Illyria is answered by the principle laid down at the end of the letter. A distinction was created among the bishops, that *all might not claim everything to themselves...* on the See of Peter alone *the care of the whole church devolved*, that none might separate from their head. *Acacius* of Constantinople writes in this sense to Pope Simplicius Ep. 8 (ap. *Thiel*. p. 192). "Bearing the solicitude of all the churches according to the Apostle you do not cease to exhort us."

<sup>295</sup> Syllab. 34. The doctrine of those who compare the Roman Pontiff to a Prince who is free and acts in the whole church is a doctrine which was current in the Middle Ages. <sup>296</sup> Council of Trent. Sess. 14. c. 7. The Sovereign Pontiffs in virtue of the supreme power delivered to them in the universal church, were deservedly able to reserve for their special judgment certain more grievous cases of crimes. <sup>297</sup> *Ballerini*, *Vindiciae auctoritatis Pontific.* c. 3. p. 180. Ed. Veron. Since Christ for the government of the Church immediately appointed not only the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, but also that of bishops, his power though supreme and plenary is not the only one and he is bound to acknowledge that bishops are called to a share of his solicitude. *Du Plessis*. Collect. Judicior. I. 2, pp. 85. 86. 164.

CHAP. XXIII.—<sup>298</sup> Serm. III de annivers. <sup>299</sup> *Bellarmin.* De Rom. Pontif. III. 19. 21. The Faculty of Paris in 1413 condemned Hus because he denied the Pope to be episcopus universalis, universal bishop. *Nat. Alex.* H. E. t 17. p. 167. On this expression see *Bolgeni* Episcopato I. 4. This view of the Pope's place in the church coincides with that of *C. Richer*, *M. A. de Dominis*, *Tamburini*, *Febronius* and some moderns 'that he is to watch over the whole organization, to guide it and to put down disturbances when they arise.' *Febron.* l. c. t 2. p. 273, As the Primacy of B. Peter was only one of inspection and direction... which excludes jurisdiction properly so called (that is obligatory and coactive) *Tamburini*, *Vera idea della santa Sede.* P. II. § 5: The spiritual authority and jurisdiction of the Primacy of the Holy See must not be confounded with episcopal authority; episcopal authority and the primacy are two distinct



things. *Eybel* in his well known essay, *Was ist der Papst*, denies all authority to the Pope, because he was a servant and an administrator; he does not even understand the distinction between *potestas dominii* and *proprietas*, the rights of sovereignty and ownership. Gregory the Great refused the title of *episcopus universalis*, though offered to him by the Council of Chalcedon (*Com. Hefele. 2 Aufl. II Bd. p. 544*); not because he did not believe in his plenary power in the church, for in the same letter he expressly asserts it. 'To all who know the Gospel it is plain that by the words of our Lord the charge of the whole church was committed to the holy Apostle Peter, the Prince of all the Apostles.' He objects to the new title, which John of Constantinople had assumed in defiance of the canons and to the prejudice of the other Patriarchs, though in ancient law his see had not even the Patriarchal dignity. (*Gelas. Ep. 26, 10*); he rejected the new title on account of its novelty and because it might have the appearance of wishing to exclude the other bishops from their pastoral dignity; rather than assume this high title he called himself 'servus sacerdotum,' 'the servant of the priests.' *Comp. ad Eulog. V. 43*; *ad Joan. Coustant. V. 18*. At the same time he asserts his place in the church. He is 'caput fidei,' the head of the faith, by which the body of the members is preserved whole (*Ep. 13, 37*); the four Patriarchs are subject to his jurisdiction (*Ep. 2, 42*); the Easterns must submit to his (written decisions) condemnations of books (*Ep. 6, 66*); he pronounces final decisions in questions of faith (*Ep. 5, 54*). 'Inasmuch as the question may be terminated by us with certainty; all bishops are subject to the Apostolic See (*Ep. 9, 12*.) The monks of Syria address Pope Hormisdas 'the patriarch of the whole world' and call him 'the head of all.' (*Ep. 39 ap. Thiel. pp 814. 816. Ep. 69. 70.*) The Greeks called their Empire the inhabited world: in the mouth of John of Constantinople the title was equal to 'bishop of the Empire.'

CHAP. XXIV.—<sup>200</sup> *Tamburini* l. c. P. II, § 5 'Vicars and Lieutenants of the Pope.'

<sup>201</sup> Vatican Council. l. c. But so far is this power of the Supreme Pontiff from being any prejudice to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which Bishops, who have been set by the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles, (from chap. 4 of xxiii Session of Council of Trent, of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy) feed and govern, each his own flock, as true Pastors, that this their episcopal authority is really asserted, strengthened, and protected by the supreme

and universal Pastor; in accordance with the words of S. Gregory the Great: My honour is the honour of the whole Church. My honour is the firm strength of my Brethren. I am truly honoured, when the honour due to each and all is not withheld (from the letters of S. Gregory the Great. Book viii, 30, vol. ii. p. 919, Benedictine edit. Paris, 1705).

<sup>302</sup> Bernard l. c. III. 4. The highest but not the only one.  
<sup>303</sup> Acts 20, 28. <sup>304</sup> Thomas. Suppl. q 8, a 5 ad 3. It would be out of place if two were appointed with equal power over the same people; but not out of place, if with unequal power; and according to this the parish priest and the bishops and the Pope possess immediate authority over the same people. Zaccaria. Antifeb, Vindic, Dissert 4. c. 4. Bishops possess immediate power over their dioceses and each parish priest immediate power over his parish. To use the language of Febronius the authority of the bishop and that of the parish priest clash. Tell me are the rights of parish priests therefore injured by the bishop. You say, no: and yet the bishop may not only see that the parish priest discharges his office faithfully, he may govern his subjects himself, he may hear their confessions or depute another to hear them, he may supply for the negligence of the parish priest ... he may perform every parochial duty. You will say all this may be done by the bishop, but, it is not right that it should be done, except in case of necessity; if it is done the rights of the parish priest are encroached upon not with the *want* of power but with its *abuse*. What may happen to bishops in their government points not to a *want* of power, but to its *abuse*.

<sup>305</sup> Council of Trent. Sess. 23 can. 8.: Bishops who are assumed by authority of the Roman Pontiff... Even the school which derives the jurisdiction of bishops immediately from Christ allows that its *exercise* is dependent on the Pope.

<sup>306</sup> Du Concile Général I. 130. <sup>307</sup> Comp *Ballerini* l. c. Though he can in the plenitude of his power limit their faculties in the *exercise* and *use* of them, as he shall judge to be for the welfare of the Church, he cannot take to himself all their faculties, nor make them his vicars, nor treat all dioceses as his own. <sup>308</sup> *Ballerini*, l. c. The form of government in the Church is not merely monarchical, as it is in the kingdoms of the world; it is mixed, monarchical and aristocratic.

With this the 3rd article of the Gallicans falls to the ground. The exercise of the Papal authority must be confined within the limits of the Canons of the General Councils, and also of the Customs, Usages and Ordinances which exist in

France and the Church of this kingdom. The other three are as follows. "(1) To St. Peter and his successors as Vicars of Christ and to the Church in general power is only given over spiritual matters and what concern the salvation of souls ; no power is given over worldly and civil matters and therefore Kings cannot be deposed directly or indirectly by the power of the Keys and their subjects cannot be released from their oath of allegiance. (2) Plenary ecclesiastical power belongs to the Popes as Vicars of Christ, but so that the decrees of the Council of Constance (the superiority of a General Council above the Pope) have universal force and application and not for the case of a schism only. (3) Even in matters of faith the decision of the Pope is not infallible or irreformable ; the acceptance by the whole Church is necessary." The Gallican 'liberties,' the creation of court theologians, erected into politico-ecclesiastical dogmas by pressure of the State, as *Bossuet* himself allowed 'in practice were always turned against the Church :' according to *Fénélon's* saying they were liberties as far as the Pope was concerned ; they were slavery as far as the king was concerned ; and *Fleury* says with equal reason we may speak of the liberties and of the servitudes of the Gallican Church. What were their consequences ? In France the King took the place of the Pope ; his axiom 'l'état c'est moi' he so applied that the bishops ruled freely and independently *within the limits of his laws* (*Schulte Kirchenrecht* 2 Aufl. p. 128.) Prohibition to the bishops to meet without a formal permission from the King, prohibition to correspond with the Pope, except in extraordinary cases ; frequent appeals *comme d'abus*, to place the Church back in the right path of the Gallican liberties ; compulsory registration of Papal bulls by the Council of State and suppression of whatever they contained contrary to the laws of the Kingdom ; control of episcopal pastorals, frequent encroachments of the royal power on the government and inner life of the Church ; atheistic ministers and courtisans distributed bishoprics and abbeys, dignities and benefices, at their pleasure. *Le Correspondant*. L'ancienne Eglise Gallicane. tom 78. p. 992. The Four Articles were repudiated by Innocent XI., 11 Apr. 1682, Alexander VIII. 4 Aug. 1690. Pius VI in constit. *Auctor fia.* Prop. 85. The French bishops themselves retracted them in a letter to Innocent XII in 1692 (*Roscoffany*, t 2. p. 248), and Louis XIV himself recalled them at the end of his life. The 'Defensio declar. Cler. Gallic.' was never formally censured, out of consideration for the author, famous for his services to

the Church. Comp. *Scavini*, Theol. Moral, t. 4. p. 287. ed. Mediolan. 1865. *Benedict*. XIV. Bullarium ed. Mechlin. tom. suppl. p. 105.

CHAP. XXV.—<sup>300</sup> Dissert. ad hist. Eccles. t. 1. p. 577. Comp. S. Pufendorf (De habit. Christian relig. ad. vit. civil. § 58) : The thesis is that a General Council is above the Pope. That they should assert this proposition who acknowledge the See of Rome as the centre of all churches and the Pope as Oecumenical bishop is not a little absurd, as the government of the Roman Church is monarchical and this thesis savours of a mere aristocracy.

<sup>310</sup> *Gerson* (De potest. Eccles. Consid. 8): If the Papacy is imagined to be separated from the other powers, what remains is not the church... If a General Council represents the universal Church adequately and completely, it is necessary that it should include the Papal authority. <sup>311</sup> Inter Epp. *Leon*. Ep. 48. n. 120. <sup>312</sup> Comp. Concil. Provinc. Vindobon. p. 61. Bellarmine (de Concil. II. 17) describes the doctrine of the superiority of the Pope above the bishops assembled in council as *ferè de fide*. Prop. 29 damn. ab Alex VIII. The assertion of the authority of the Roman Pontiff over an oecumenical Council and of his infallibility in deciding questions of faith is vain and has often been refuted. <sup>313</sup> His obedience acknowledged him as Pope but endeavoured to persuade him to abdicate : he escaped by flight. *Aschbach*. Geschichte Kaiser Sigismunds. II. p. 713.

<sup>314</sup> *Phillips*, Kirchenrecht II. p. 287. *Hefele*, Conciliengeschichte VII. p. 104 : Posterity cannot grant the character of an oecumenical Council to the Council of Constance except for its latter Sessions, in which the Council and Pope worked in harmony. *Schulte* (System. p. 183) says of this decree "it upsets all historically necessary development and all church government." No real value attaches to this formally invalid decree, never admitted by the Pope. <sup>315</sup> Bull. In eminentis 1418. In matter of faith by the present Council... it approves and ratifies what was done *concilialiter*, Council-wise, not what was done otherwise or in any other manner. The decree in question of the 4th Session was not passed *concilialiter* but by a majority of votes of the nations, excluding the Cardinals. *Gerson* opp. II. p. 940. According to the explanation given by him and *P. a' Ailly* only those decrees were voted *concilialiter* on which the Cardinals voted. *Hefele*. l. c. p. 99. <sup>316</sup> Dialog. apologet. opp. II. 390.

<sup>317</sup> For the termination of the present schism,... whom every one... is bound to obey in all that concerns faith and the

termination of the schism. <sup>318</sup> Comp. *Gerson*. de potest. eccles. Consid X. XII. <sup>319</sup> *Döllinger*, Kirchengesch. II. p. 325. A swarm of clerks attempted to frame articles of faith at Basle. Hence the Council never obtained any authority in the church as did those of Lateran V, Florence and Trent. <sup>320</sup> Ep. 105 ad Pulcher. Aug. The conclusions of the bishops... We declare to be null and with the authority of Blessed Peter the Apostle by a general sentence we abrogate them. <sup>321</sup> Constit. Synod de Symmachi absolut., ap. *Thiel*, (p. 658) : "The Prelate of the said See is not subject to the judgment of his inferiors (p. 676) ; to him (the Pope) the appeals of all Bishops are entrusted ; and when he appeals, what is to be done?...The case is a novel one ; and we have no example of the See of the Popes being tried by us." The Bishops conclude "that the cause is to be left to the judgment of God," (p. 663). But the Pope explained, "I have submitted my privileges to the will of the King and I have given authority to the Council," (p. 676). Comp. *Phillips* Kirchenrecht, I., p. 246. *Walter* Kirchenrecht, § 19, § 126. *Avitus* of Vienne says on this occasion (*Mansi*, viii., p. 293) : "Though the judge of heaven bid us be subject to the powers of earth... it is not easy to see how or by what law the superior is to be judged by the inferior." "The question, (whether the Pope is over or under the Council) is of itself a mistaken one." *Hefele* l. c., 2 Aufl., i., p. 55 ; *Walter*, l. c., II. Aufl., p. 276.

<sup>322</sup> *Febronius*, on the contrary holds, l. c., cap. 9, § 1—3. "By no law divine or human but only by the tacit consent of Princes and Churches is the convocation of a General Council reserved to the Sovereign Pontiff. Conc. Later. V., Sess. XI. The Roman Pontiff has unlimited right and power to call, to transfer, to dissolve Councils. <sup>323</sup> Constit. Synodal de Symmachi absol. (ap. *Thiel*. 658) ; he ought to convene the Council, because to his See belongs the chief merit of the Apostle Peter or the principality..The Bishop of that See ought not to be subjected to the judgment of lesser Sees. <sup>324</sup> *Bellarmin.* l. c. i. 19 *Bolgeni*. Fatti dommatici, t. iii. n. 336. But this presidentship must not be limited as our adversaries seem to wish to the mere distinction of sitting in the first place, of speaking first, of voting, &c. ; it must mean a presidentship of control and authority.

<sup>325</sup> Far from any authority redounding to the Apostolic See from them (the Councils), they derive all their power and force from the Apostolic See and their decrees never obtain the force of law in the Church till they are confirmed by the approval of the Apostolic See. *Gerdil*. de Sacr. regim.

et Pontif. Primat. jure. *Melch. Canus. Loc. Theol. v. 5.* The importance and authority of the Sovereign Pontiff gives weight to the Councils: if that is given, a hundred Fathers are enough, if it is wanting, no number, however, considerable will suffice. *Socrates* (H. E., ii., 8) informs us the Synods of the Eusebians at Antioch were rejected because Julius the Bishop was not present, or represented by his legates. "Though the law of the church forbids that anything should be decided in the Church without the consent of the Roman Pontiff." And *Sozomen* (H. E. III. 10): 'It is a pontifical law that every thing done without the sentence of the Bishop of Rome shall be held to be null.' The Council of Chalcedon would not allow Dioscorus to take his seat among the Bishops because he had dared to hold a Synod, without the permission of the Apostolic chair. *Comp. Hefele l. c. II, 409.* In the year 485 a Synod of more than forty Bishops from different parts of Italy declared very positively that the three hundred and eighteen Bishops at Nice laid the confirmation and authority of their proceedings before the Holy Church of Rome. *Mansi VII. (p. 1140); Comp. Hefele l. c. p. 5.* <sup>326</sup> *Gelas. Ep. 26 ad Dardan* (ap. *Tbiel. p. 394*): the first See confirms every Council by its authority and guards it by continued government.

<sup>327</sup> *Comp. Hefele Conciliengesch. I. p. 107. Leo Ep. 89 ad Marc. Ep. 98. Ep. 110.* <sup>328</sup> *Döllinger Kirchengesch. p. 180.* General Councils, those especially which have received the approbation of the Church of Rome, come next in authority after the canonical books. *Ep. VI. 7 (Migne. I. LXVII. p. 926).* He insists on the significance of the Council of Chalcedon, 'the Apostolic See' possessing the primacy of the whole church was present by its legates (l. c. p. 924). Hence *Facundus* of Hermiane calls the power of the Pope 'the first and the highest power' *Pro defens. trium. capit. II. 6 (Migne l. c. p. 577)* <sup>329</sup> *Constant p. 485* <sup>330</sup> *In Synod Rom. a. 378.* <sup>331</sup> *VI 25 comp. Constant p. 489.*

<sup>332</sup> *Döllinger p. 177.* Augustine and the African Bishops had appealed to the (auctoritas) authority of Pope Innocent I in the heresy of Pelagius: therefore by his decision 'causa finita' the cause was terminated, (*Id. serm 131. 10*), and (*tota dubitatio sublata est*) all doubt was cleared away. (*Ad. Bonifac. II. 3*) <sup>333</sup> *Ap. Mansi IV. 1211* <sup>334</sup> *Döllinger l. c. pp. 130. 132. Mansi XI. 233...336...684...*

<sup>335</sup> *Jul I ad Euseb. (Constant p. 363)* we have acted throughout according to the canons. *Zosim Ep 5 (Constant p.*

961) Not even the authority of this See can make or change a law against the laws of our fathers. *Bossuet* Unité de l'Eglise. It has no limits save those of the law (natural and divine), *Ballerini* De Potest Summ. Pontiff III. I. The Fathers of the Council as they are subject to the Sovereign Pontiff can have no jurisdiction over him. The Sovereign Pontiffs are bound by those canons to which they have given their approbation as they are bound by their own laws and the laws of their predecessors, which they promised to keep as well as the sacred canons. This must not be referred to any compulsory law; it has a *directive force* as they say, that is, it must be referred to the higher natural and divine law which requires that the superior should lead the way by his example. Comp 1. 2æ. q 96. a 5. As far as a *directive force*, the prince is subject to the law by his own will. Kirchenrecht § 126.

Sess. 25. c 21. de Reformat. Ep 4 (ap. *Thiel*. 657) ad Avit. Comp *Suarez*. de Leg. VI. 18 : 1. 2æ q 97 a 4. With this falls the second Article of the Gallicans which *Febronius* (l. c. II. p 220) attempted afterwards to defend, as also the contention that laws passed by the Popes require the acceptance of the bishops and indeed of the whole church (II. p. 480.) Pope *Leo* (Ep. 159) speaks in quite another sense! "This our letter, which we send for the opinion of your Fraternity, cause to be forwarded to all your brotherly and fellow-provincial bishops, in order that submitted to the examination of all the letter (*auctoritas*,) may be of use." Comp *Zallinger* l. c. Isagog. § 90. What weight antiquity allowed to the decretal letters of the Pontiffs, the word *auctoritas* by which they were designated, shows. Comp. *Zosimus* Ep. 1 Episcop. Gall: It is plain we have sent this decretal letter (*auctoritatem*) in every quarter, that in all countries what we have appointed to be observed may be known (ap. *Constant* p. q 35). *Tertull.* de pudicit. I. I hear that an Edict and a peremptory one has been issued.

CHAP. XXVI.—<sup>365</sup> Ep. 12 (ap. *Constant*. 974). Though the tradition of the fathers has conceded such authority to the Apostolic See that no one may venture to dispute its judgment and though it has guarded it by canons and laws and the actual discipline of the church in its code pays to the name of Peter, from which it too descends, the reverence which it owes, for the ancient canons by the opinions of all attributed such power to this Apostle from the very promise of our Lord ... since we wield such an authority, that no one can appeal from our sentence, &c.

<sup>337</sup>Ep. 13 (ap. *Constant* p. 1035): Let all the brethren understand there is no appeal from our sentence <sup>338</sup>Commonitor. ad Faust. (ap. *Thiel*. p. 344). The canons require that appeals from the whole church should be submitted to the judgment of this See: and they enacted that no appeal should lie from it. And thus they decided it should be the judge for the whole church, that it should be subject to no tribunal; they commanded that no sentence, should ever be passed on its sentence: they determined that none of its sentences should be set aside and they ordered that its decrees should be observed. Ep. 26. ad Episc. Dardan (ap. *Thiel*. p. 399): The whole church throughout the world knows that the See of Peter has the right to loose whatever has been bound by the sentence of any prelate, because it has the right of judging the whole church, seeing that the canons allow appeals to that See from any part of the world, whereas no one is allowed to appeal from its sentence. *Febronius* (l. c. V. § 5.) maintains with the Gallicans that the right to receive appeals was first conceded to the Pope by the Council of Sardica in 347. But the Synod only put into form what follows as a necessary consequence from the primacy and what *de facto* was already in use and only denied by the Eusebians. Comp. *Hefele* I. p. 570. *Ballerini* in *Opp. S. Leonis II.* p. 558. ed Migne. *Gelasius* l. c. continues. 'Nor must we omit to say that the Apostolic See frequently, as has been remarked, according to ancient usage, even without any council intervening, exercised the power of absolving those whom the Council had unjustly condemned and condemning without a Council those who deserved it.' Referring to the acquittal of Athanasius, John and Flavian of Constantinople and the condemnation of Dioscorus he adds: 'as that which the first See had approved could not be put in evidence, the whole church accepted what it thought should be the sentence.' <sup>339</sup>L.c. III.32.

<sup>340</sup>Sess. 24. De Reform. c. 20. Sess. 14 c. 7. <sup>341</sup>Ep. 14 ap. *Constant* p. 1037. <sup>342</sup>Ib. Ep. 15 ap. *Constant*. 1039. <sup>343</sup>Ib. *Constant* 1041. No one ever audaciously resisted the Apostolic summity, whose sentence cannot be reformed. <sup>344</sup>Id. l. c. p. 1042. He refers to the affair of St. Athanasius as a proof. <sup>345</sup>*Opp. I.* p. 634. Ep. X. 2. The Apostolic See, for its reverence, was consulted in innumerable memorials. <sup>346</sup>Ep. 29 ad. Episc. Carthag. ap. *Constant*. p. 889. <sup>347</sup>Ep. 8. ap. *Constant* p. 1086.

<sup>348</sup>'The ancient practice of the Churches requires that such matters (where the *true faith* has been corrupted and put in danger by some) should be communicated with your Holiness.' *Febronius*, *Eybel*, *Tamburini* and the members of the Ems



Congress wanted appeals to the See of Rome to be done away with or limited as much as possible. *Stigl*, Der Emser Congress, 1867. Comp. *Münch. Geschichte des Emser Congresses* 1840. The appeal from the Pope to a future council is still less defensible: an appeal to a judge who is not in existence at the time the appeal is made has a poor appearance; and if the Council were in existence, separated from the Pope (as is presupposed) it would not be superior to him. Hence Pius II, following his predecessor in former centuries condemned such appeals as offences against the law (Bulla 'execrabilis') at the Synod of Mantua in 1459; and his successors Sixtus IV, Calixtus III, Julius II and Martin V confirmed this sentence. <sup>349</sup> *Die Stellung der Concilien, Päpste und Bischöfe* p. 149. <sup>350</sup> *Mansi*. II. 211.

<sup>351</sup> Those are called essential which follow immediately from the idea of the Primacy; those accidental which can only show historical possession. The distinction may be admitted as a mere abstraction, but nothing can follow from it either adding to our knowledge or available for practical conduct and it induces into its terminology a false juxta position of names. *Walter* l. c. p. § 128. <sup>352</sup> *Febronius*, l. II. p. 310.480. According to him the more recent unessential rights have their origin in the Decretals of Isidore, 'The false decretals introduced no essential change into Church discipline; they were the expression of an age and that age would have pursued its way without them. *Walter* § 98. Much the same, says *Luden* *Geschichte des Mittelalters* II. c. 10 p 208 and *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* V. p 473: "This collection is a testimony of the age and its product...rather than a fabrication for the age, intended to influence it... It did not inaugurate any new Church law; it only made public what was rooted in the hearts of men. It may be maintained that no important change was introduced by this fraud.

<sup>353</sup> The constant use and discipline of the church as it is proved to have flourished in the first six or seven centuries.

<sup>354</sup> *Schulte* *Lehrb. des Kirchenr*, Aufl, 1868, p 163. System p. 191. If the Primacy for the first thousand years and afterwards did not appear outwardly so prominent as the Head of the Church, no conclusion can be drawn from the fact, if we only look at history objectively and reasonably, not because a definite line of conduct, or the exercise of definite rights were drawn out by Christ, but because a head was appointed with the power to bind and loose in heaven and on earth, to govern the church, to represent her invisible head and because

all the authority required for this purpose according to circumstances is the necessary outcome of such a position.

<sup>355</sup> l. c. §. 128. <sup>356</sup> Where would unity be now, if the Pope had not the right of confirming the election of bishops? <sup>357</sup> *Walter* l. c. *Lessing* said (*Jacobi's W. W. II.*, p. 334): the propositions of Febronius and his followers were unblushing flattery to princes: for all their arguments against the Pope... would tell twice, nay thrice as much against princes.

<sup>358</sup> *Defens decl. II.* 20 <sup>359</sup> *Döllinger*, Kirche und Kirchen. p. 39. <sup>360</sup>

CHAP. XXVII.—<sup>361</sup> *De Roman. Pontif. III.* 19. 21. of *Thom. Aquin Sent. l. 4. d 17. q 3. a 1 ad 4.* It is not in the province of the ministers of the Church to put out new articles of faith or to take away those already put out, or to institute new sacraments, or to do away with sacraments already instituted; this is the sovereign power (*potestas excellentiæ*) which belongs to Christ alone, the foundation of the Church. And therefore as the Pope cannot grant a dispensation that any one may be saved without baptism, so neither can he that he may be saved without confession, when it is obligatory (*vi sacramenti*) as a sacrament. <sup>362</sup> *Döllinger l. c.* p. 41.

<sup>363</sup> *Du Pape I.* 18.

<sup>364</sup> *Bellarmin. l. c. II.* 29. By not doing what he orders and preventing the execution of his will. <sup>365</sup> *Walter l. c.* <sup>366</sup> *Luke 22. 26.* *Ballerini*, *Vindiciæ auctorit. Pontif. c. 3. 11.* Nor does this sovereign and plenary authority of the Roman Pontiffs which was established for the edification of the Church assign to them a domineering, arbitrary sway. No one will deny that the government of the Church is founded on charity and humility, if he considers that Christ instructed his disciples, that he who was greater among them should be as the lesser, and that Peter the prince of the Apostles explaining the mind of Christ commanded that none should domineer over the clergy. For this reason St. Paul when describing the authority entrusted to him by God preferred to make use of lowly words "the solicitude of all the Churches" and in the same way the Sovereign Pontiffs refrained from titles which breathe the pomp and air of secular authority. *Greg. M. (Ep. 8. 30)* writes: I beg you will not let me hear the word of ordering, for I know who I am and who you are... I did not order: I only pointed out what would be useful. In the same letter he declined the title of Universal Bishop, a haughty appellation... How much the full

power of the primacy over the whole Church, kept within the limits of what may redound to the welfare and edification of the Church differs from the Kingly assumption of the secular power, which claims all it can get. It is not true therefore that the Pope's power has no limits. In the end for which the Church exists—the salvation of souls—lies the reason of the plenary power given to her by Christ and at the same time the reason of its limits. The Pope's power may often clash with the power of the State : it will never absorb it.

<sup>267</sup> Wherefore, resting on plain testimonies of the Sacred Writings, and adhering to the plain and express decrees both of our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, and of the General Councils, We renew the definition of the Œcumenical Council of Florence, in virtue of which all the faithful of Christ must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff possesses the Primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and is true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and Father and Teacher of all Christians ; and that full power was given to him in Blessed Peter to rule, feed, and govern the Universal Church by Jesus Christ our Lord : as is also contained in the acts of the General Councils and in the Sacred Canons.

Hence we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other Churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor through the preservation of unity both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff. This is the teaching of the Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation.

But so far is this power of the Supreme Pontiff from being any prejudice to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which Bishops, who have been set by the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles, (from chap. 4 of xxiii Session of Council of Trent, of the Ecclesiastical

Hierarchy) feed and govern, each his own flock, as true Pastors, that this their episcopal authority is really asserted, strengthened, and protected by the supreme and universal Pastor; in accordance with the words of S. Gregory the Great: My honour is the honour of the whole Church. My honour is the firm strength of my Brethren. I am truly honoured, when the honour due to each and all is not withheld (from the letters of S. Gregory the Great, Book viii. 30, vol. ii, p. 919, Benedictine edit. Paris, 1705).

Further, from this supreme power possessed by the Roman Pontiff of governing the Universal Church, it follows that he has the right of free communication with the Pastors of the whole Church, and with their flocks, that these may be taught and ruled by him in the way of salvation. Wherefore we condemn and reject the opinions of those who hold that the communication between this supreme Head and the Pastors and their flocks can lawfully be impeded; or who make this communication subject to the will of the secular power, so as to maintain that whatever is done by the Apostolic Sec, or by its authority, for the government of the Church cannot have force or value unless it be confirmed by the assent of the secular power. And since by the divine right of Apostolic primacy, the Roman Pontiff is placed over the Universal Church, we further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful (from a Brief of Pius VI. *Super soliditate* of Nov. 28, 1786), and that in all causes, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal (from the Acts of the Fourteenth General Council of Lyons, A. D. 1274. Labbé's Councils, vol. xiv, p. 512): and that none may re-open the judgment of the Apostolic Sec, the authority of which is greater than all other, nor can any lawfully review its judgment, (from Letter viii of Pope Nicolas I, A. D. 858, to the Emperor Michael in Labbé's Councils, vol. ix, pp. 1339 and 1570). Wherefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiffs to an Œcumenical Council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff.

<sup>208</sup> Der 'Social democrat' in den Kölnischen Blättern. 1865. n. 10.

CHAP. XXVIII.—<sup>209</sup> The characteristic mode of election to the supreme spiritual dignity must always be considered as a *chef d'œuvre* of political wisdom: the general guarantees of real stability and of suitable preparation are better secured than they would have been by the empirical expedient of heredity,

whilst virtue and maturity are naturally favoured, as well by the high wisdom of the best fitted electors, as by the opportunity carefully provided of allowing the talent best suited to preside over the government of the church to rise from all the ranks of the hierarchy after an indispensable novitiate passed in service. *A. Comte. Cours de philosophie positive, tom. 5. 54 Lec.*

<sup>370</sup> *Beilarm. l. c. I. 3.* It will be proved that there exists (in the church) the *monarchy* of the Sovereign Pontiff: the *aristocracy* of the bishops (who are truly princes and pastors and not vicars of the Supreme Pontiff); and lastly that *democracy* in a way has its place in it, because any one may be chosen out of the body of the faithful to the episcopate, if he is worthy of the office. The Catholic organization has on one side by degrees granted an extension to the elective element previously unknown; for the choice in the ancient republics always limited to a certain caste has now embraced the whole community, down to the lowest ranks from which Cardinals and even Popes have been taken! *A Comte. l. c.*

CHAP. XXIX.—<sup>371</sup> Unity preserves unity. *Bossuet.*

<sup>372</sup> The episcopal dignity in the "Hochkirche" is a privilege of the upper ten thousand, *Riehl. die burgerliche Gesellschaft p. 235.*

The citadel of authority. *Aug. Ep. 118, c. 9.*

---



## NOTES ON THE SECOND BOOK.

CHAP. I.—<sup>1</sup> *Thom. Aquin.* de vero. q. 29, a. 5, ad. 3 : q. 4, 4. The interior infusion of grace is from none save Christ, whose humanity, because it is united to the divinity, has the power to justify. Art. 5 : According to his humanity, he is the principle of all grace, as God is the principle of all being.

CHAP. II.—<sup>2</sup> *Ambros.* Offic. III., 3. The congregation which forms one body connected and held together by the unity of faith and charity. <sup>3</sup> John 17, 20. <sup>4</sup> Infallibilitas passiva, *mediate* et quoad *finem*. <sup>5</sup> Infallibilitas activa *immediate* et quoad *subjectum*.

<sup>6</sup> De utilit. credendi c. 9. <sup>7</sup> John 2, 20-27. Comp. 1. 1-5. *Augustine* in 1 John tr. 3. 13. External teaching is a help and a reminder ; he who teaches hearts, has his seat in heaven.

CHAP. III.—<sup>8</sup> Council of Trent, Sess. 4. Vatican, De fid., c. 2.

CHAP. IV.—<sup>9</sup> *Vincent Lerin*, c. 30, 33. <sup>10</sup> *Tertull.* de præscrip., c. 20. <sup>11</sup> *Id.* c. 32. <sup>12</sup> Adv. hæreses III., 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Tertull.* de carne Chr., c. 2.

CHAP. VI.—<sup>14</sup> L. c. 2. <sup>15</sup> So *Jahn* Einleitung I., § 19.

<sup>16</sup> *Thom. Aquin.* 2, 2 æ. q. 85, a. 2. Of those who have written sacred books many often spoke of matters which could be known by human reason, not as from God, but as from themselves, with the aid however of divine light. *Bellarmin.* de Verb. Dei I. 15. I answer God is the author of all the divine scriptures, but he assisted the prophets in one way, others especially the annalists in another way. For to the prophets he revealed the future and at the same time assisted them that they might not mix up what was false in their writing : God did not always reveal to other writers what they were to write, but he *impelled* them to write what they had seen, or heard, or remembered and at the same time he *assisted* them that they should not write anything false and this assistance did not exempt them from the labour of thinking and considering what and how they should write.

*Jerom.* Præf. in Ep. ad Philem. It is rather worthy of thy power not to withhold in lesser matters the thought you bestowed on greater ones.

*Augustine Ep. 32.* I have been taught so to reverence and honor those books of scripture only which are called canonical, as to believe firmly that none of their authors erred at all in writing them and if I stumble at anything in these books, I do not doubt either that the codex is faulty, or that the translator has not caught the meaning or that I cannot understand the passage. Comp. c Faust II. 5. *Thom. Aquin. 2. 2æ. q 1. a 1.* Of all that is written in holy scripture it must be said that it belongs to the domain of faith.

<sup>17</sup> 1 Cor. 2, 9.10 : but God has revealed to us through his spirit. *Melchior Canus. Loc theolog. V. p. 132. ed. Venet.* The sacred writers write Catholic dogmas by an immediate revelation or inspiration of God. For they neither require external inducements to write, nor do they with human reason argue, inquire and put together from other writings. But a Council or Pope must proceed in a *human way* and follow the guidance of reason ; and by reasoning they must distinguish truth from falsehood. For we must not easily believe that the Sovereign Pontiff possesses the faculty which the Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists had, of being able as soon as a question of faith is proposed to distinguish at once what is true and what is false ; but *he must first take counsel* and weigh the arguments on both sides ; then follows the assistance of God which is necessary that the Pope may not depart from the true faith...From this it is clear that the Holy Ghost does not assist *sleeping and lazy Fathers* but those who diligently like men by the light search out the truth of the matter under consideration. Another difference is that the Spirit of God assists the holy writers in all they write : but the spirit of truth is not with the Fathers of a Council in all things, but in those only which appertain to salvation. <sup>18</sup> De Roman. Pontif. IV. 2.

<sup>19</sup> What *Hase* (Handbuch der Protestant Polemik. 3 Aufl. p. 1981,) says of the opposition in the Vatican Council is true of the heretics who resisted the decisions in most of the earlier councils : if the dogma had been withdrawn or rejected by the majority, the opposition would at least have thought of calling in question the œcumenical character of the Council. <sup>20</sup> Prov. 21, 1. <sup>21</sup> De utilit. credendi c. 15. <sup>22</sup> Matt. 28, 18.

<sup>23</sup> Ephes. 3, 11. 12 ; John 14, 16. 26.

CHAP. VII.—<sup>24</sup> Matt. 16, 18. <sup>25</sup> Luke 22, 32. <sup>26</sup> John 21.

CHAP. VIII.—<sup>27</sup> Vatican Council. De eccles. Chr. c. 4. The Roman Pontiff.....by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the



Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable.

<sup>28</sup> 1 Tim. 3, 15.

CHAP. IX.—<sup>29</sup> Comp Vatican. Constit. de Eccles. c. 4. 1 Pet. 4. 10; 1 Cor. 12, 4. <sup>30</sup> Cap. 'Si Papa' dist. 40. Comp. *Suarez* de fid. disp. 10. sec 6. *Ferraris*, Biblioth. art. Papa. II. n. 62 &c. <sup>31</sup> On this point *Tanner* (de fid. Disp I. q 4, dub. 6) says. (The heresy) is either notorious or secret: if the former, by the very fact, the Pontiff has forfeited his authority even before the declaration of a Council; if the latter, by the very fact, it inflicts no injury on the Church. <sup>32</sup> *Melchior Can.* l. c. VI. 8. The interior faith of the Roman Pontiff is not necessary to the Church, and his secret personal error cannot injure the Church. Hence it is not necessary that God should always assist the Roman Pontiffs by the preservation of their interior faith.

<sup>33</sup> *Greg. de Valentia.* Disp 1. q. 1. p. 7. Nor must we call such providence on the part of God miraculous; it should be called rather an effect of the ordinary law, under which God by promise bound himself on his truthfulness to the Church. <sup>34</sup> *Vatican.* l. c. cap. 4.

CHAP. X.—<sup>35</sup> So Homoousios 'transsubstantiatio,' 'forma corporis.' Ep. 43. c. 5; Ep. 59 c. 14; Ep. 55. c. 8; Ep. 75 c. 71. <sup>36</sup> Ep. 43, c. 5. <sup>37</sup> C. Parmen. II. 23, 5. 6. <sup>38</sup> Ep. 15 ad Damas. Ep. 97 ad Pamach. <sup>39</sup> Ep 53 ad Generos. Psalm c. Donat. <sup>40</sup> Peristeph. XI. 31. <sup>41</sup> Comp. *Bellarmin.* De vi et rat. primat. c. 15. n. 24: Definitions of faith must be free and voluntary acts ...When therefore the Roman Pontiffs free from all external compulsion, to vindicate the unity of the Catholic faith assailed by certain dissensions, propose and lay down a dogma of faith to be believed, or condemn some error contrary to faith, in such language as to make it clear they are not putting forward a private opinion, but propounding a Catholic doctrine, or condemning some error opposed to it, so that they declare those who think otherwise aliens to the Catholic or Roman faith and cut off from the communion and unity of the Roman Church and strike them with anathemas and brand the propositions which they condemn with the note of heresy or other equivalent censures, then you have a properly called definition of faith.

Id l. c. p. 290: If there is question of definitions of faith, as the definitions of General Councils may with certainty be known from the very words and the marks

which distinguished a definition ; in the same way the definitions of the Roman Pontiffs pronounced *ex-cathedra* are easily known, if they are put out in such terms as declare that unity of faith is to be preserved in the Church and maintained by all Catholics, in virtue of the office and rights of the Primacy. <sup>42</sup> *Melch. Can. Summ. theol. VI. 8.* The Popes often send answers to the private questions of this or that bishop, giving their *opinion* on the matter submitted, not pronouncing a sentence, by which they mean the faithful to be bound to believe. *Bellarmin. l. c. IV. 14.* Even when questions of faith are touched upon in such cases the answers do not on that account constitute a *locutio ex cathedra*.

<sup>43</sup> *Comp. Gutachten des theolog. facultat. des Julius-Maximil.-Univeristät Würzburg, 1869. p. 46 &c. Ballerini l. c. 15.* <sup>44</sup> *Vatican. l. c.*

<sup>45</sup> It is sometimes asked, what would happen, if the Pontiff were to define without previous inquiry : some say, the Pontiff in that case could err and the Church could not then give her assent : but this is dangerous teaching ; because it never could be clear to the Church whether the Pontiff had made sufficient inquiry or not ; and therefore I think it better to answer by denying the supposition, for the Holy Ghost who guides the Church will not allow the Pontiff to define rashly and therefore whenever he does positively define we must suppose that he has made sufficient inquiry. *Suarez. De fide. Disp. V. Sec. 1. n. 11.* Hence we may not lay down the criterion, that the Pope when he intends to define *ex cathedra* must previously hear a Roman Synod, or the College of Cardinals, or at least the theologians who are near the head of the Church. (*Benettis, Privileg. d. Petr. vindic. Vol. I. p 3 &c.*) If the Pope takes the Roman Church into his counsel, this distinction is shown her, because she is the Church of the Successor of St. Peter. But the infallibility of the decision does not derive from their counsel or that of any other adviser, but from the promise made to the Primacy. *Comp. Pbillips Kirchenrecht II. p 839.* From the letter of Gelasius to the Bishops of Dardania (Ep. 26, 14. *Tbiel. p 400*) and from the Roman Synod (*Mansi VII. p. 1140*) it is clear the authority of their decisions rests on the authority of the Pope 'in the solicitude of all the Churches which falls on him who is the head of all,' to whom Christ our Lord confided the Primacy, which was acknowledged at the Council of Nice.

<sup>46</sup> *Bellarmin. l. c. IV. 2. Comp. Ballerini. l. c. cap. 15.* Hence we may disregard the apprehensions of those who say it is dangerous to attribute infallibility in defining controversies of

faith to the person of the Pontiff alone, who may through prejudice or feeling some day define to be a dogma of faith some false opinion which he had formed in his own mind. Those who admit such apprehensions, thinking only of the person of the Pope measure dogmatic definitions by a *human standard*; they do not reflect that dogmas of faith are a divine matter and that the infallibility of the Roman Pontiffs rests on the divine promises made to Peter and as tradition witnesses continued to Peter and his successors together with the Primacy, and that divine providence by *various and hidden* means can secure and (that the divine promises may not be made void) will certainly take care, that if the Pontiffs through any prejudice or feeling were to think of defining something which is false, either that they should not define or should not go beyond the limits of a decree which is not a definition.

<sup>47</sup> *Secr. misæ. Dom. 4. p. Pentec.* <sup>48</sup> The effect of God's mercy cannot be in man's power, so that he shall have mercy in vain, if man refuses...because he can call in such a way as is suited to them, so that they shall be moved and understand and follow grace. *Augustine. ad Simplic. I. 2. Comp. De correptione et gratia XIV. 45* : It is certain that the will of man cannot resist the will of God and prevent him from doing what he wishes, because he does with the will of man what he wishes, when he wishes...Wielding beyond doubt the *irresistible power of turning the hearts of men as he wills*. *Ib. XII, 38*. A help is provided for the weakness of the human will; because divine grace can act *invincibly and unconquerably* and therefore, though weak the will need not fail or be overcome by any adversity. <sup>49</sup> *John 16, 13.* <sup>50</sup> *L. c. VIII. 17* : Will you dare to say, even though Christ prays that the faith of Peter may not fail, that it would fail, if Peter wished it to fail, that is, if he had been unwilling to persevere unto the end? As if Peter could in any way wish for other than that which *Christ had prayed for him that he should wish*. For who is ignorant that the faith of Peter would fail, if the will by which he believed were to fail; and would endure if his will endure? But since *the will is prepared by God*, therefore the *prayer of Christ could not be in vain*. When he prayed that his faith might not fail, what else did he pray for, but that he might retain in his faith a will perfectly free, invincible and constant?

<sup>51</sup> *Melch. Can. l. c. V. p. 133*. God disposes all things sweetly and at the same time foresees the end and the means necessary to attain the end. For if he were to promise anyone **eternal life**, he would confer on him afterwards grace for those

good actions by which he was to gain that life... And so when he promised firmness of faith to the Church, he could not fail to grant to the Church the prayers and helps by which this firmness is preserved. Nor can we doubt, that what is true in the natural is also true in the supernatural order, namely, that he who assigns the end will provide the means... As if Christ had said to Peter : I have prayed for thee that thy charity may not fail, we should most certainly understand that he would obtain for him the diligence, the zeal, the watchings, the prayers and other opportune helps which are necessary for the preservation of charity; so when He said, I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not fail, we must understand without doubting that He obtained from His Father that whatever was necessary for a right judgment in faith should be given to Peter, whether it was to come from God or man. And from these words we infer, that as Christ promised the Spirit of Truth to his Apostles and their successors for their judgments in faith, they would want for nothing necessary to the termination of controversies of faith. *And if we once concede to heretics liberty to call in question whether the judges of the Church have shown the diligence and zeal necessary to settle the question by reason and argument ;* who does not see that all the decrees of Pontiffs and Councils will soon be set aside ? <sup>52</sup> *Veronius*, Reg. fid. §4. n 5. We say in general, that of the matters contained in the chapters, that only and all that is of faith, which is defined : or to use a legal phrase the *dispositivum arresti* or the contents of the chapter or canon are of faith ; but the *motivum arresti*, or the arguments are not of faith. The reason is ; the former only is proposed to be believed and is properly defined : the *motivum* or argument is not. Hence there are many things even in general Councils which are not of faith, for instance the *obiter dicta*, *Melch. Can.* l. c. v. 5. What is introduced into the decrees of Councils or Pontiffs, either for the sake of explanation, or to answer objections, or incidentally, and in passing, outside the main point, on which controversy chiefly turned, does not belong to faith, that is, is not a definition of Catholic faith. *Comp. Bossuet*, Defens. declarat. Cler. Gall. I, 3. 1.

<sup>53</sup> Id l. c. VI, 8. p 165.

<sup>54</sup> For instance the controversy whether the " *Instructio pro Armenis*" of Pope Eugenius IV, at the Council of Florence, in what he says of the matter and form of the Sacraments, is a dogmatic definition or merely a rule for practice. *Tanner*. De fid. IV. dub 6.

primacy...the supreme authority of teaching is included. *Schulte* l. c. p. 193: *Quellen Des Kirchenrechts* p. 85 &c. 95 &c.

<sup>56</sup> *Leo M.* Serm. 4. 2. <sup>58</sup> III. 3. <sup>59</sup> III 2 <sup>60</sup> III. 3.

<sup>61</sup> IV. 3 <sup>62</sup> III. 3. <sup>63</sup> *Cypr.* Ep. 55. 73. <sup>64</sup> *Iren.* l. c. III. 2 <sup>65</sup> Serm. 46. 13. <sup>66</sup> *Bernard*, de considerat. IV. 3. To evangelize is to feed. <sup>67</sup> *Luke* 22, 32.

<sup>68</sup> *Leo M.*, Serm. 4, 2. <sup>69</sup> *Meditat. sur l'Evang.* Medit. 70. *John* II, 42. <sup>70</sup> *Medit.* 72.

<sup>71</sup> I, h. 1. <sup>72</sup> *Ap. Migne.* I., 72, 916. <sup>73</sup> *Ep.* 191.

CHAP. XII.—<sup>74</sup> *Adv. Heres.* iii. 2. <sup>75</sup> *Hom. v. in Exod.*, p. 145. <sup>76</sup> *Ep.* 73, 79. *Comp. Ep.* 70. The Church founded by Christ our Lord on Peter is one in its origin and character. <sup>77</sup> *Ep.* 55. <sup>78</sup> *Ep.* 45.

<sup>79</sup> *Ep.* 59: Nor think they are Romans...to whom perfidy can have no access. <sup>80</sup> *Ep.* 52. <sup>81</sup> *Ep.* 43. <sup>82</sup> Lest the Apostolic See through him should be polluted by the contact of perfidious persons and he should deserve to be cut off from Catholic and Apostolic oneness and communion. *Gelas.* Ep. 26 Ed. *Tbiel.*, 320. If Cyprian maintained his error regarding the necessity of the baptism of heretics against Pope Stephen, it does not follow that he denied the authority of the See of Rome which he had often defended, and to which he had often appealed. He treated the whole question as a disciplinary one. *Ep.* 73, he says, "he will not prevent any one from thinking what he believes to be true or from doing what he thinks to be right." In this line he could support himself by the usage of the Churches of Africa and Asia Minor, and by the declarations of the Councils of Africa, Synnada and Iconium. Pope Stephen held up the practice of the Church of Rome as a standard, but he had not published any decisive judgment under the penalty of excommunication. Cyprian was in communion with Sixtus II., the successor of Stephen. It would seem the controversy was allowed to drop. In regard of teachings of faith handed down Cyprian knew no toleration. Therefore he writes *Ep.* 59, 20. The Apostle says we charge you to withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly and not according to the tradition which they have received of us (2. *Thess.* 3, 6.) There can be no alliance between faith and perfidy. *Perfidia* is here the same as *irreligiositas*, the opposite of *fides*, faith; *Comp. Opp. Cyprian* ed Hartel iii. p. 442. <sup>83</sup> C. *Parmen.* ii., 2.

<sup>84</sup> ii., 2. <sup>85</sup> ii., 3. <sup>86</sup> Singular See. C. ii., 2. Unique See. ii., 3. <sup>87</sup> *Comp. Ignatius.* <sup>88</sup> The summit of authority. *Augustine*, de utilit. creded., n. 17. The Apostolic Summit. *Boniface*

I., Ep. 15. (*ap. Coust.*, p. 1042.) The Citadel of the Priesthood. *Boniface* I., Ep., 4, (*ap. Coust.* 1319). <sup>89</sup> He beomes an exile from the Christian religion. *Id.* Ep., 14 (*Ap. Coust.* 1027). <sup>90</sup> *Augustin.* l. c. <sup>91</sup> *Id.* C. Epist. fundam. c. 5.

<sup>92</sup> *Ancorat.* 9, 9. <sup>93</sup> The chief of the Apostles. <sup>94</sup> The solid rock. <sup>95</sup> In him all the problems of faith are answered, v., 571. <sup>96</sup> In laudibus *Virgin* ii., p. 224, Ed. *Caillau.* <sup>97</sup> *De obitu frat.* Satyr i. 47. And he asked him (the Bishop) whether he was in communion with the Catholic Bishops, that is with the Church of Rome. *De poenit.* I. 7, 33. They do not possess the inheritance of Peter, who do not possess the See of Peter. With him Peter is 'the Vicar of Christ.' In *Luc.* X. 175. In *Ps.* 40.30 *Ubi Petrus, Ecclesia*: where Peter is there is the Church; and he continues: there death is not, but life eternal, and therefore he adds, the gates of hell shall not prevail against him and to thee I will give the keys of the Kingdom of heaven.

<sup>98</sup> Ep. 11, 4. <sup>99</sup> Ep. 130, 16. <sup>100</sup> Ep. 15. *Comp. Apolog.* adv. *Rufin* I. 4. <sup>101</sup> Ep. 94 ad *Pammach.*

<sup>102</sup> *Psalm* c. *Donat.* Number the priests of the See of Peter alone, and see the order of succession in that series; that See is the Rock against which the proud powers of hell shall not prevail; if such a one come to you, filled with the Catholic faith, such as we are accustomed to hear from all those holy men, &c. *Comp. Ep.* 53 ad *Generos.* <sup>103</sup> *Peristeph.* XI. 31. <sup>104</sup> *Augustin.* Ep. 105, 16. <sup>105</sup> *Id.* Ep. 190, 23. <sup>106</sup> You will not be thought to hold the faith of the Catholic Church, if you do not teach that the faith of Rome is to be held. *Serm.* 30. *De accedent.* ad grat. *ap. Mai* N. *Bibl.* P.P. I. p 273. <sup>107</sup> *Augustin.* *De pecc. orig.* II. 7 C. duas Ep. *Pelag.* ad *Bonif.* II. 6. <sup>108</sup> *Serm.* 131. n. 10. The rescripts have arrived from there; the cause is at an end: would the error were at an end! *Comp.* ad *Boniface.* II. 3: All doubt is removed (by the Papal decision.) I think that part of the world should suffice (for a definite decision) in which God was pleased to crown the chief of his Apostles with the glorious crown of martyrdom. *Augustin.* *Contra Julian* I. 13, *Prosper* *Carm de ingrat.* v. 39: speaks the same language. Rome the See of Peter first cut down the growing evil. *Comp. Ep.* 140. 23 ad *Optat.* In the words of the Apostolic See (here the See of Rome is called *the* Apostolic See) the Catholic faith is so ancient and established, so certain and clear that no room for doubt is left to Christian Catholics. If Augustine excuses St. Cyprian for his opposition to Stephen

(de baptism. II. 4. III. 4. I. 18) on the ground that 'the question had not been cleared up by a General Council,' he no more denies the authority of the Apostolic See than he meant to deny the authority of the more ancient General Councils by the remark that later Councils have thrown light on older ones (de baptism. c. Donat. II. 3). Comp. *Hefele C. G.* 2nd Ed. I. p 57. Stephen had not pronounced a definitive judgment, he had only threatened the Africans and the bishops of Asia Minor with excommunication; the whole question was looked upon as a disciplinary one (so too by Firmilian in *Cypr. Ep.* 75. Comp. *Basil. Ep.* 188. 296) Augustine with reason therefore admitted in such an important question the necessity of an inquiry into the practice of all the Churches. Comp. *Baluerini* l.c. XIII. 53.

<sup>109</sup> Serm III. 3. B. Peter persevering in the granted firmness of the rock did not abandon the rule of the Church which he had assumed. *Conc. Ephes.* art III. ap *Mansi* IV. p 1295: Holy and most Blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, the pillar of faith and foundation of the Catholic Church...survives till now and will ever survive in his predecessors and presides and passes judgment.<sup>110</sup> Ep. 1. ad *Euseb.* ap. *Constant* p. 385. Ep. 17 ad Joan Antioch, ap. *Const.* p. 1260.<sup>111</sup> Ep. 17 ap *Const.* p. 829.

<sup>112</sup> Ep. 29 ad *Conc. Carthag.* ap. *Const.* 889. Knowing what is due to the Apostolic See, from which the episcopate and all the authority of that dignity have flowed...The Fathers with no human but divine sentence decreed that nothing should be decided even regarding remote and distant provinces unless it were brought to the cognizance of this See, so that every just sentence should be confirmed by all its authority. Ep. 30 ad *Conc. Milev.* ap. *Const.* p. 896. Diligently and becomingly you consult the oracle of Apostolic dignity (that dignity, which bears the solicitude of all the Churches) what opinion is to be formed on these doubtful points; following in this the old rule, which, you know as well as I, has been observed throughout the world...being aware that answers always go to those who ask for them from the Apostolic source. Especially *when a question of faith is under discussion* I think all my brethren and fellow-bishops should refer to Peter, that is to the author of their name and dignity, whatever may be useful to all the churches throughout the world. Comp. Ep. 2 ap. *Constant* p. 943. We must pray without ceasing that by the continued grace and unfailing help of God the *peace of faith* and of Catholic communion may be imparted to the whole world undimmed

by any cloud. <sup>113</sup> Ep. 12 ap. *Coust.* p. 975 <sup>114</sup> Ep. 1 ap. *Coust.* p. 1234. <sup>115</sup> Commonitor, ad Faust. ap. *Tbiel*, Ep. 10. p. 347.

<sup>116</sup> Ep. 12 ad *Anastas.* ap *Tbiel*, p, 152. <sup>117</sup> This is what the Apostolic See chiefly guards against that as the glorious confession of the Apostle is the healthy root, it may not be infected by any rent of wickedness, or any poison. For if, what *we trust never can happen*, this should take place, how shall we be able to resist any error, or to lead back the wanderer? <sup>118</sup> Ep. 24 ap. *Tbiel* p. 400. Comp *ibid.* p. 288. <sup>119</sup> Ep. 10 ap. *Tbiel.* 4,347. According to the Canons the final judgment of the whole belongs only to the Apostolic Sec.<sup>120</sup> Ep. ap. *Tbiel.* p. 431. <sup>121</sup> *Ibid.* p. 433 'that he did not know what the Apostolic See had decided.'

<sup>122</sup> Inter Epp. *Leon.* ed. Ball. Ep. 52. <sup>123</sup> Ep II. 63 ap. Migne T. 99. p. 1281 : the writer in the same sense to Pope *Paschal* (Migne 1155), *Leo III* (Migne 1019) and the Emperor (Migne 1331). <sup>124</sup> Opusc. theolog. II. p. 72. Ed. Combefis. <sup>125</sup> De persecut. Vandal. II. 15. <sup>126</sup> Ap. *Mansi* VIII. 441.452. Comp. *Döllinger*, Lehrbuchber K. G. p. 196. Similarly Pope *Gelasius* (Ep. 42 a p. *Tbiel.* p. 455.) The Church of Rome, the chief Sec of the Apostle Peter, not having spot or wrinkle, nor any such thing.

<sup>127</sup> At the end we read 'Therefore we follow in all things the Apostolic See and make known what has decided by it.' <sup>128</sup> On this point *Bossuet* says : 'Therefore all the Churches in a subscribed document professed that the Roman faith of the Apostolic See and the faith of the Roman Church stood with unbroken and perfect firmness, established by the clear promise of our Lord that it should never fail. This profession of faith was to be made by the Bishops to their Metropolitan, by the Metropolitans to the Patriarchs, by the Patriarchs to the Pope, so that he might receive the one confession of all and in return for their confession of faith might give to all communion and unity. We know that this profession with the same introduction and the same ending, with the insertion afterwards of heresies and heretics who in their day troubled the Church, was in use in after ages. This profession all the bishops pronounced before Agapetus and Nicholas I. as had been done before the holy Pope Hormisdas ; and we read that it was pronounced in the same words before Hadrian II. in the eighth General Council. What Christian can refuse this profession, every where in use, preserved through ages and consecrated by an œcumenical Council? Comp. *Fenelon* Deuxième Mandement sur la Constitution Unigenitus.



We are not surprised then to find *Tourneley* (De Ecclesia II. 134) writing: 'We cannot hide from ourselves that it is difficult in the presence of such a mass of testimony...not to admit the certain and infallible authority of the Apostolic See of the Church of Rome; and still more difficult to reconcile this with the Gallican declaration, *which we are not allowed to refuse.*'

Bossuet himself felt the weight of the argument. And so he claims infallibility for the *whole series of Popes*, for the *Papacy*, but not for individual Popes, (Def. declar. X. 6.) In individuals the faith may waver or yield, but not in the whole and it will quickly revive. 'But if only one Pope fall and fall only once, is not the series broken?' And if individuals can fall; may we not always dread such a possibility for each one and does not this infallibility of the Papacy (in abstract) become illusory in every practical case? The fact that the series never had been broken Augustine brings as an unanswerable argument against the Donatists (Ps. c. Donat). In the order of this succession no Donatist bishop is found. And if infallibility rests on the divine power and it can only rest on it, why should we shorten the arm of God, whom it becomes to protect individuals before their fall rather than to raise them up after their fall? Nor does the distinction made by Pope Leo between the See and its occupants (Ep 106: 'Aliud sunt Sedes, aliud Presidentes,') come in here. For Leo only maintained that the faults of a bishop (Acacius) should not prejudice the rights of the bishop's See; that the privileges of the bishop's See are given to the office which the person holds and not to the private person as to a person, and that therefore they must not be forfeited by his crimes. But the See (the Chair) only comes into action in the person of its occupant. Hence in Christian antiquity the See of Rome is identified with the Pope of Rome. 'I am united in communion with your Blessedness, that is, the See of Peter, writes *Jerome* to Pope Damasus. The See of Peter speaks to the whole world by the mouth of Pope Zozimus, says *Prosper* (C. Collat. nr. 15). The opposite view distinguishes the Papacy, the Hierarchy and the Church in their ideal and in their concrete manifestation and leads to the Protestant doctrine of the difference between the true, ideal and invisible Church and its concrete, imperfect and empirical manifestation.

<sup>129</sup> *Mansi* 893. <sup>130</sup> *Mansi* 896. Ep. 1 ap. *Thiel*. p. 224.

<sup>131</sup> Ep. 115 ap. *Thiel*. p. 916.

<sup>132</sup> Ep. 80 ap. *Thiel*. p. 880.

CHAP. XIII.—<sup>133</sup> Ep. 14. Ep. 120, which (the Lord) had before defined by our ministry. <sup>134</sup> Ep. 93. Laying aside altogether the rashness of disputing against a faith divinely inspired, let the vain unbelief of the erring be hushed and let that no longer be defended, which it is unlawful to believe. <sup>135</sup> Inter Ep. *Leon.* Ep. 98. *Mansi* VI. 148, which... derived from the precept of the lawgiver you have preserved even to our day, holding the place of interpreter of the voice of Peter to all.

<sup>136</sup> *Mansi* l. c. 149. <sup>137</sup> *Mansi* VI. 953. 972. <sup>138</sup> We ask therefore, do you sanction our judgment by your decrees, and as we have adhered to our head in all good so let Your Highness carry out for your children what is fitting. Inter *Leon.* Ep. 98, ed Baller. And the Emperor Marcian writes to him (Ep. 110) on this account (because some doubted the Pope's confirmation and thence the Eutychians had conceived new hopes) Your Piety will deign to send letters by which it may be made known to all the churches and nations, that what was done in the holy Synod has the approbation of your Blessedness. <sup>139</sup> *Leon.* Ep. 20 ad Theodor : God has not permitted us to suffer any loss in our brethren ; but what he had defined by our ministry, he has confirmed by the irrevocable acceptance of the whole brotherhood ; that he might show what had been drawn up by the first See and afterwards accepted by the voice of the whole Christian world truly came from him and that the members in this too might agree with the head. The truth shines forth more clearly and is more firmly held, when subsequent study confirms *what faith had previously taught*. The merit of the priestly office derives much splendour, when the authority of the highest is preserved and the liberty of the inferior is in no way considered to be diminished, and the end of the study contributes much to the glory of God when the work is trustfully undertaken, that opposition may be overcome, lest what is shown by itself to be wicked should seem to be put down by the prejudice of silence.

<sup>140</sup> Ep. 59. <sup>141</sup> 'Quasi de incerto' Ep. 8. <sup>142</sup> L. c. <sup>143</sup> *Cælestine* Ep. 14. ap. *Coüst* p. 1152. <sup>144</sup> Ep. 18 ap. *Coüst.* p. 1161. <sup>145</sup> Let them carry out what we had previously decreed.

*Mansi* IV. p. 1211. <sup>146</sup> *Mansi* XI. p. 684. <sup>147</sup> Ep. ad. *Coüstant Pogon Mansi* XI. 249.

CHAP. XIV.—<sup>148</sup> With the approbation of the Holy Council ... The bishops of the whole world sitting and judging with us. Vatican Council Constit. de Fid. Cath. Prooem. So in Council Lateran VI. V. Viennense.

<sup>149</sup> *Meub Canus*. l. c. V. p. 130. The bishops in a Council on matters of faith, are not only counsellors, they are judges too. Otherwise learned theologians and wise men in the church would be invited to give a synodal vote. This is unheard of and against the form prescribed in Act 15 where the Apostles and the ancients only decided on the point of faith. As therefore according to the unvarying usage of the church only the Pastors sit in council, it follows that they are judges and not mere counsellors. For if they were summoned only to give their opinion there would be no place in the Council for those bishops who are not versed in Theology, when theological questions are under discussion. Besides the Bishops, not less than the Bishop of Rome, hold the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven and therefore the power of binding and loosing in causes of faith! 'It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things, &c.' All the bishops therefore impose the burden and precept and all are Authors of the synodal decree. <sup>150</sup> Hence the formula used in the subscriptions in the ancient Councils. *Definiens subscripsi Hefele* I. p. 18.

<sup>151</sup> *Mansi* XI. p. 1187.

CHAP. XV.—<sup>152</sup> *Leo M.* Ep. 120. <sup>153</sup> *Tertullian.* De carne Chr. c. 13. Exactness in terms preserves realities. *Augustin* de Trinit. VII. 4. We must confess, these terms were created by the necessity of speaking, when a full discussion was called for against the tricks and the errors of heretics. Civ. Dei X. 23. We are bound to speak according to a certain formula, lest laxity in language may give rise to false opinions regarding the truth expressed by it. *Ambros.* De Fid. III. 3. The Fathers of Nice therefore employed the word Homoousios in the formula of faith, because they saw that their opponents dreaded lest with the sword they had drawn from its sheath they should cut off the head of their wicked heresy. *Athanas.* de decr. Nic. Syn II. 19. *Summa* I. q 29. a 3 ad 1. The necessity of disputing with heretics compelled them to discover new words to express the old faith. *Auctor fid.* prop. 29. The knowledge of a word consecrated by the Church to defend the profession of its faith against heretics is suppressed.

CHAP. XVI.—<sup>154</sup> *Augustin.* ad Bonifac I. cap. ult. Was it necessary to call a Synod in order to condemn what was plainly wrong! As if no heresy had ever been condemned without the calling of a Synod, whereas there have been few, for whose condemnation any such necessity existed.

<sup>155</sup> Sess. 25. Cap. ult. de Reform. in fine. And should any difficulty arise in regard of receiving these decrees, or should anything be met with, which it does not believe, requiring explanation or definition, the holy Synod trusts that besides the other remedies appointed in this Council, the most blessed Roman Pontiff will make it his care that, for the glory of God and the tranquillity of the Church, the necessities of the provinces be provided for, either by summoning particularly out of the provinces where the difficulties shall have arisen those persons whom he shall deem it expedient (to employ) in the treatment of the said matters; or even by *the celebration of a General Council*, if he judge it necessary; or in such other way as shall seem to him most suitable. And so the Vatican Council l. c. cap. 4. The Roman Pontiffs according to the exigences of times and circumstances suggested, sometimes assembling a General Council...defined as to be held, &c.

<sup>156</sup> Orsi. De Roman Pontific. auctorit. Tom I. 2. 2. *Meich Canus*. l. c. V in fin. The Roman Pontiff is bound to define controversies of faith, not lightly and thoughtlessly, but with consideration and prudence, summoning a greater or lesser number of Counsellors, according to the importance of the case under consideration. For the Fathers of the Council assist the faith and the learning of the Supreme Pontiff. A Council also recommends the faith in the eyes of the people, by reason of the testimonies and judgments of many which are more easily accepted. For even laws which are passed at the request and by the vote of the nobles are more readily received by the people than if they were passed by the King alone.

<sup>157</sup> De Roman. Pontif. IV. 7. <sup>158</sup> Deign therefore to declare to us what seems good to you and whether we should hold communion with him, or openly publish that none must hold communion with him who professes and teaches such doctrines. It will be necessary that the decision of your Picty on this matter should be made known by letter to the devout bishops of Macedonia and all the bishops of the East. We shall thus give them the opportunity which they desire of persevering with one mind in the same belief and assisting the true faith which is attacked. *Cyrelli. ad Cœlestin. ap. Const. p. 1093.* <sup>159</sup> *Bossuet*. Defens. Declar. Cler. Gallic. III. 7, 10. We freely confess the decree of Caelestine would have been sufficient for the suppression of the new heresy, as Cyrill had hoped, if serious disturbances had not broken out and the matter become such as seemed to require a General Council. Nestorius, bishop of the imperial city, enjoyed so much influence, he had so deceived

public opinion by an appearance of piety, he had won over so many bishops, lastly he stood so high in the favour of the Emperor Theodosius, the younger, and the nobility, that he found no difficulty in creating great confusion.

<sup>160</sup> *Ballerin*. *Vindic. Auctor.* Pontif. VIII. 8. <sup>161</sup> In this matter the proverb "orbis major est Urbe, the world is larger than the city" holds good. *Leo M.* (Ep. 33) styles the decision of the Council *plenius judicium*; which *Thomassin* (*Dissert. XII. 14* in *Conc. Chalced.*) explains 'his own identical profession of faith and unchangeable belief promulgated by a larger number of judges and with greater solemnity.' <sup>162</sup> *Bellarmin.* *De Conc. II. 19*: If we take the Church with the Pope, then the authority of the Church is greater, *extensive*, in extension, than that of the Pope alone but it is equal *intensive*, in intension.

<sup>163</sup> *Hefele* C. G. I. 47. The Protestant *Bötticher* (*Beweis des Glaubens*, 1872 p. 541) says: If Infallibility does not receive the support of Christian opinion, it is no divine gift. But it is plainly more reasonable to claim it for the mind of one who is at the head than to attribute it to all the heads of a Council. According to *Bötticher* the infallibility of the Pope is the logical consequence of the doctrine of a visible Church of Christ whose visible head is the Pope. The consequence can only be escaped by denying both propositions, he thinks (and justly). *Froschammer* (*Die politische Bedeutung der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes und der Kirche*, 1871) maintains that to attack the infallibility of the Pope and allow the infallibility of the church is to stop half-way and attempt an untenable mid-way point. The latest assailants of Papal Infallibility have laid down conditions for the ecumenicity of a Council which never would be accepted because they never could be accepted—the unanimous acceptance of its decisions by the communities. By this expedient an infallible teaching office would be done away with. *Pichler* too (*Die wahren Hindernisse einer Reform der Katholischen Kirche*, 1869) found himself obliged to destroy the idea of a church in order to be able to combat the Pope's Infallibility successfully.

CHAP. XVII.—<sup>164</sup>Ep. 4 ad Caj. <sup>165</sup>Conc. Lateran (649) under Martin I. Act V. an 15. If any one foolishly understands the human operation of God, which the Greeks call theandric to be one operation and does not confess it to be a twofold operation according to the Holy Fathers, that is divine and human, or says, the new term *Dei virilis* which is introduced designates only one and does not indicate the wonderful and glorious union

of both, let him be condemned. Comp. the explanation of the Abbot Maximus. *Mansi*. X. p. 754. <sup>166</sup> *Mansi* X. 534.

<sup>167</sup> *Mansi* X. p. 689. 739. <sup>168</sup> *Mansi* X. 683 &c. 739. <sup>169</sup> *Disp.* c. Pyrrh. *Mansi* l. c. 740. <sup>170</sup> *Mansi* XI. p. 539. The economy, the mystery of the Incarnation, was distinguished by the Fathers from the theology, the mystery of the Trinity. Comp. *Mansi* l. c. p. 765. And so is upset the interpretation of *Döllinger!* (*Papstfabeln* p. 132) that Honorius explained the decisive passages of Scripture as a mere 'economy' in Christ's way of speaking, that is for an accommodation only to be taken in its true sense in which Christ merely intended to exhort us to keep our self-will in subjection to the divine.

*Mansi* XI. p. 579. 582. <sup>171</sup> *Conciliengesch.* III. p. 147.

<sup>172</sup> Each form in communion with the other does what is proper to it, the Word doing what is proper to the Word, and the body doing what is proper to the body.

<sup>173</sup> L. c. p. 731. 733. <sup>174</sup> L. c. p. 1050 <sup>175</sup> L. c. p. 152. <sup>176</sup> l. c. p. 665. <sup>177</sup> L. c. p. 711. <sup>178</sup> L. c. p. 554 <sup>179</sup> Let us conclude, says the Gallican *Natalis Alexander*, (*H. E.* tom 10. p. 419, &c.) that Honorius was not condemned by the sixth Synod as a heretic, but as a favourer of heresy and heretics and as guilty of negligence in checking them ... Honorius employed the terms of the Monothelites, but in a Catholic sense and in a sense quite removed from their error, as he did not absolutely deny two wills in Christ, but two wills opposed to each other.

<sup>180</sup> *Mansi* X. 740.

CHAP. XVIII.—<sup>181</sup> John 17. Ephes. 2, 4 &c.

<sup>182</sup> The Pope possesses a sovereign authority not only in the domain of law, but in an equal degree in the domain of faith and doctrine. *Schulte Kirchenrecht.* 1868. p. 193.

<sup>183</sup> Vatican Council. The definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable by their own force, not from the acceptance of the Church. <sup>184</sup> L. c. II. 4. Art 4. Decl. Gallic. In questions of faith the chief part belongs to the Sovereign Pontiff, and his decrees are for all and each of the Churches, but his decree is not irreformable, unless the acceptance of the Church follows. *Maret*, Du concile general et de la paix religieuse. II. 63 &c. 399. <sup>185</sup> They write to Innocent X on July 15, 1653. They declare the Papal definitions of the faith rest on the divine, highest authority in the whole Church and all Christians are bound in conscience to yield submission even of the understanding. They appeal to the ancient decisions of Popes,

those against the Pelagians, and against Apollinaris and Macedonius even before the decisions of the Councils were given.

<sup>186</sup> In the Constitution 'Vineam Domini' by Clement XI July 14 1705. That every occasion of error hereafter may be cut off, and all children of the Catholic Church may learn to hear her, not only keeping silence, for the wicked too are silent in darkness, but by yielding an interior assent, for this is the obedience of an orthodox man, by this our constitution which is to have force for ever, we declare that this respectful silence does not satisfy the obedience which is due to the above cited Apostolic Constitutions ... that (the condemned sense) is to be received not in word only but with the heart also and that the aforesaid cannot be lawfully subscribed with any other thought, intention or belief <sup>187</sup> *Ballerini*. L. c. XIII. 75. <sup>188</sup> Rom. 1, 5. <sup>189</sup> 2. Cor. 10, 5; 1 John 3, 23. <sup>190</sup> in Rom 16, 19 Hom. 32, 1 <sup>191</sup> Strom. II 4.

Vatican Council de fid. cath. Can I. de fid. If any one should say that human reason is so independent that faith cannot be required from it by God, let him be anathema. <sup>192</sup> A great number of priests obeyed the Gospel. Acts 6. 7. Rom 7. 15; 16, 26; 10, 16. Gal 3, 1; 5, 7. 1 Tim. 6, 3. 2 Thess. 1, 18. The unbelievers are disobedient, Tit. 1, 10. <sup>193</sup> Rom. 10. 10; Comp. August. de fid. et symb. c. 1. <sup>194</sup> Mark 16, 16; Rom. 10, 16. Council of Trent. Sess. VI cap. 6. <sup>195</sup> The very believing is an act of the understanding assenting to the truth under the sway of the will, 2. 2ae. q. 2. a 9. <sup>196</sup> De utilit. cred. n. 1. Retract. I. 14. <sup>197</sup> Some things are apprehended which do not so far compel the understanding, but that it may assent or dissent, or at least suspend assent or dissent and in such cases assent or dissent is in our power and falls under the sway of the will, 1. 2ae. q 17. a 6. And therefore the act of faith is meritorious under both respects (quoad *exercitium*, et quoad *specificationem*). Comp. 2. 2ae. q 9. a 9.

<sup>198</sup> According to *Febronius* and the modern Gallicans (comp. *Maret* Le Pape et les eveques. p. 55) an individual bishop must oppose the Papal decision (non dogmatizando contrarium, quamdiu non reclamatur Ecclesia), that is, the faithful must wait till the controversy is settled by a Council or a clear majority has sided with the Pope. In this way the evil will increase, till it is past cure. Again in order that acceptance may be given, there must be liberty to vote against it. This however is not allowed. *Febronius*, though he contradicts himself, is consistent in claiming (II. 8) for

individual churches the right of opposition, in case they do not recognise their tradition of faith in the Papal decision. This means revolution in the Church.

<sup>199</sup> *Schulte* (Quellen des Kirchenrechts. p. 85): 'The Primacy was given to the Pope that he might preserve union, prevent dissensions and always guide the Church on the right path. The power of making laws belongs to him as a means to this end. And hence follows necessarily that he has the power to enact regulations, not for discipline only, but also for faith... The Church does not create articles of faith, she only declares what is Dogma. As such declarations when doubts arise, or when a doctrine is contested, or when controversies are raised on the meaning of a dogma, become necessary: as it is impossible that a General Council can always be called in these circumstances; and as on the other hand such an authority must intervene according to the spirit of the constitution of the church; it follows this right must belong to the Pope. When he has given a decision in matters concerning faith, that decision from the character of his legislative rights is as binding as any other law made by him.' (p 98). Such an influxus (on the part of the bishops) cannot be thought of in dogmatic constitutions. These have for their object truths which cannot be received except in one way or be subject to change in the church as disciplinary enactments may be. Now as a Papal enactment regarding such truths cannot be submitted to the judgment of the individual bishop, it follows that the publication and execution of them is absolutely obligatory. *Bened. XIV* (IX 4. 3) says on the subject: "Much less is there question of Papal dogmatic constitutions which relate to faith; for in such the judgment of the Roman Pontiff is irreformable. If the possibility of a suspension is allowed, then the possibility of a change cannot be denied: and that is to grant the possibility of error. Now though it is not a defined dogma that the Pope is infallible by himself, it is evident that the contention or what was supposed in the previous case even the silent profession by the church that he could pronounce false decisions in matters of faith is from the nature of things impossible.

For the rest a reformation of a Papal doctrinal definition by the Bishops is in contradiction with the decree of the 2nd *Council of Lyons*: as the Roman Pontiff is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so when questions on faith arise *they must be settled by his definition*, *Comp. Vatican I. c. cap 4.* The word to define, to settle definitively excludes the supplementary acceptance or the reformation of the decree by



the bishops. On the opposite supposition the Pope would not be the teacher, but the learner, not the guide but the person guided.

<sup>200</sup> 1 Cor. 12, 12.

<sup>201</sup> Strives to make the Church a *human* institution. *Cypr.* ep. 52. <sup>202</sup> The Roman Pontiff is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith and morals, Vatican council l. c.

<sup>203</sup> *Melch. Canus* l. c. 5 : I call the authority of the Church, that which belongs to General Councils and to the Sovereign Pontiff. These are the same things absolutely and there is not much difference between the decrees of the church, of General Councils and the Apostolic See: because they are connected and united together as *the head and body of a man*. *Thomassin* Dissert in Conc. Gener et Partic. Colon 1784 Dissert IV, n. 3. The sympathy and inseparable union of the head and body are perfect. *For the same spirit of Christ and of truth animates both.*

<sup>204</sup> *August.* Enchirid. c. 97. The will of the almighty is not overcome by the weakness of man. *De Spir. lit.* c. 33 : The will of God which is always invincible is not overcome, *Thomas Aquin* 1. q 83, a 1, when God... moves voluntary causes he does not deprive the actions of their voluntary character, he rather gives them that character. <sup>205</sup> *Melch Canus.* l. c. V. The authority of the Sovereign Pontiff adds weight to the Councils ; if it is wanting, no number however great is great enough. Nor if the majority of the Fathers think rightly will the Sovereign Pontiff go against them. For it belongs and always has belonged to the special watchfulness of Christ that the Church should not be divided into two factions. The same says *Stattler* (*Loc. theol.* § 130) wherever the Primate of the Church stands and has a certain number of bishops built in with him, there is the true Church.

<sup>206</sup> The definition of Papal infallibility in the Vatican Council cannot be called 'an ecclesiastical revolution, and one the more thorough in as much as there is question of the foundation which must be strong enough to carry and support the religious belief of man and in as much as a single man, the Pope, takes the place of the church universal in time and space'. The church is not the motive of our faith, but the authority of God revealing himself ; the church is only the *proxima regula fidei*, the immediate rule of faith which presents the divine revelation to our belief ; and that is not the universal church,

but the *ecclesia docens*, the teaching church, consisting of the Pope and the Bishops. These are never divided and so we are ever guided by the united church teaching body, the authority of the Catholic Episcopate united with the Pope. For the Pope, as Pope, not as a private individual, in virtue of his supreme authority and of his apostolic power to teach will never speak except from the collective consciousness of the Church, the Church *docens* and the Church *discens*, the teaching Church and the taught Church. No man, no individual man, not even the multitude of all the men in the Church (can constitute the foundation of our faith but God alone); God alone who leads the Church into the truth either through the head alone, or through the head and the bishops.

CHAP. XIX.—<sup>207</sup> The Vatican Council. de fid. cath. init. By these means the dogmas of our most holy religion were defined with more precision and exposed with greater fulness and errors were condemned and arrested. <sup>208</sup> *Lugo*. De fid. Disp. III. Sect. V. n. 67. We must admit that faith was never more explicit than in the Apostles and the first chiefs of the Catholic religion.

<sup>209</sup> *Atbanasius* justifies the term Homoousios (De decr. Conc. Nic. n 19, 23) in this way and *Gregory of Nyssa* the more exact definitions of the divinity of the Holy Ghost (Orat 31. n. 24): the terms which are not found in Scripture they might have understood from the Scripture. <sup>210</sup> *Com. Thomas Aquin* 2. 2æ. q 1. a 10 ad 1. The truths of faith are sufficiently explicit in the teaching of Christ and his Apostles. But whereas wicked men distort the teaching of the Apostles and other teachings and the scripture, an explanation of the faith became necessary against the errors which showed themselves. *Suarez*. De fid. II. See 6. We must state simply that the Church delivers no new faith; she always maintains and explains the old faith. It is true that some propositions are now *explicitly* believed of faith, which previously were not *explicitly* believed in the church, though *implicitly* held in the ancient church. *Kilber* De fid. p. 230. The articles of faith have not become mere numerous since the time of Christ and his Apostles *simpliciter*, simply, but *secundum quid*, in part. We know from history and the constant practice of the church that ever since the days of the Apostles the Church on the occasion of some heresy or other emergency has more clearly defined many articles of faith and traditions or has extended to particular objects what was implicitly revealed, the Holy Ghost ever assisting her that she might not err in such definitions. *Greg. de Valentia*, Tom. III.

Disp. I. q. 1. Perhaps some truths are still hidden in the Church, i. b. p. 6. The 'Church with her infallible authority has dragged some truths as *it were out of the darkness* in which they were wrapped up either through human negligence, or boldness or perversity of mind.' This last observation touches those who quote the theologians of Febronianism or Josephism as authorities against the Vatican Council. If it is a fact of experience that without the assistance of God from on high all religions through the sins of men degenerate either into unbelief or into superstition, who can fail to see the finger of God in the institution of an infallible authority which is always and everywhere present in the Church and watches over the purity of doctrine; by this institution he preserves his work from the fate of those religious communities which he has not founded.

<sup>211</sup> *Suarez* l.c. The Church makes no new article of faith: she only declares them. *Thom.* l.c. ad 2: Councils cannot make another faith, they can explain the old one more clearly. *Communit.* n. 27.

<sup>212</sup> L. c. 32 <sup>213</sup> *John* 14. 26. *Augustin.* C. Crescent. I. 32: After this question was discussed among the bishops of a former age and had received different answers among the brethren, without any loss of unity, what we now hold was accepted by the whole Church. *Comp. de baptism.* II. 5. In *Ps.* 54, 22: many truths lay hidden in the scriptures and when the heretics were cut off, what had been hidden...was made public. <sup>214</sup> *Regul. fid.* § 2. *Lugo.* De fid. Disp I. Sect. 13 § 1: The Church can define in two ways what before there was no obligation to believe: first, if from two revealed premisses she draws a conclusion and defines it. Secondly, if from one revealed principle and from another not revealed she makes an inference and defines it...Previously to the definition of the Church this matter was implicitly and indistinctly revealed by God and with the definition of the Church it begins to appear explicitly...We confess the Church never defines a proposition as *de fide*, (of faith) which was not revealed by God either definitely or in a general way; but the definition of the Church makes it clear to us and then the obligation of a determinate faith comes in. *Comp. Melch Canus* l.c. c. VI. in fin. That also is part of Catholic faith which by syllogism and clear inference is inferred from one proposition revealed and another proposition certain by the light of reason. *-Benettis,* Privileg. S. Petri vindic. P. II. 15. art 12. Many truths are accepted and believed with divine faith which were not

revealed explicitly, directly or immediately, but only implicitly, mediately and indirectly. This may happen with (a) a particular proposition contained in a general one ; (b) with a proposition which follows from premisses ; (c.) with a part contained in the whole ; (d) with an indistinct and obscure proposition comprehended in another distinct and clear one. Comp. *Suarez*. De fid. DispII Sect 6. Many truths were in the beginning proposed by the Church in her practical life and afterwards were formally proclaimed when the need arose. Comp. *Suarez* l. c. *St. Augustine* thus speaks of the dogma of the grace of final perseverance. (De don. persev. n. 63): On this matter, which we are forced not only to name, but openly to defend and maintain against recent heretics, the Church was never silent in her liturgy, though she did not insist on its being preached, when none denied it. And regarding certain less exact expressions of the Fathers (C. Julian. I. 6): they expressed themselves with less circumspection, as you had not commenced your disputes. Comp. *Melch. Canus*. l. c. XII. 14.

<sup>215</sup> *Vincent Lir*. l. c. 38. Yet so that there was a real progress in faith, though no change. For it is of the essence of progress that the thing in itself be amplified: but it is the essence of change, that one thing be converted into another, Knowledge, science and wisdom must grow and advance much and strenuously in each and in all, in every one and in the whole Church, in the progress of ages and generations, but within its own lines, viz. in the same dogma, in the same sense and meaning.

CHAP. XX.—<sup>216</sup> L. c. 2: We must strive much to hold that which has been believed everywhere, always and by all: for this is truly and strictly Catholic, as the meaning and force of the word express... This finally will be done if we follow universality, antiquity and agreement.

<sup>217</sup> What must a Catholic do, if a portion of the Church separates itself from the communion of the universal faith?... if some new contagion were to seize not on a part only, but on the whole Church at once ; c. 4. More commonly they lay hold of the writings of some ancient author, carelessly edited, which by their obscurity lend themselves to his dogma, c. 7.

<sup>218</sup> If in antiquity itself we follow the decisions and teachings of all or almost all (the priests and masters) c. 2. *Melch Canus*. l. c. IV. 6: Two classes of truths are believed by the Church: one class, which concerns all alike: and

it is not very difficult to ascertain the faith and belief of all. ...The other class of truths concerns superiors and learned men rather than simple and uninstructed people. To inquire into the faith of the crowd on this class is much the same as to look for the faculty of sight in a blind man...With regard to the faith in matters which concern doctors and learned men, their testimony must be sought : that of the common people is not to be asked...In the decisions and laws on both classes of truths, neither the crowd, nor all learned men have a voice : only those who are pastors in the Church.

<sup>219</sup> It is possible that the ancient dogmas of heavenly philosophy in the course of time may be studied, polished and completed. They may receive evidence, light and clearness c. 30.

<sup>220</sup> C. 38. 42. The Apostolic See of Rome according to Vincent is the guardian of this antiquity. c. 9. The tradition of the Church has always been that the more religious one was, the *more promptly he opposed recent innovations*. History is full of examples. But not to be too long let us select one and that in preference from the Apostolic See, in order that all may see as clearly as the light of day *with what energy, with what zeal, with what efforts the blessed successors of the blessed Apostles have defended the integrity of the faith received of old...* When therefore from all sides cries arose against the novelty of the teaching (in the question of baptism by heretics) and priests in every direction contended for their view, then Stephen of blessed memory the bishop of the Apostolic See, together with his fellow-bishops, *but more than they*, resisted, conceiving it to be right, as I think, *that he should surpass the others in devotedness to the faith*, as he stood above them by the authority of his rank...what was the outcome of the whole matter? Why the usual one : *antiquity was retained, the innovation was exploded.* b. 4. 39. Comp. *Melch. Canus* l. c. VI. b. This was demanded by the Gallicans (*Defens. Declar. Cler. Gallic. VII. 1*) and by the Jansenists.

<sup>221</sup> At the Council of Nice more than twenty Arian bishops were present ; some refused to subscribe (*Hefele Concilgesch. I. p. 272. 282.*); at the first Council of Constantinople twenty Macedonian bishops left under protest (*Id. II. p. 8*); in the face of the opposition of John of Antioch with his forty three bishops the Council of Ephesus excommunicated Nestorius (*Id. II. pp. 166, 174*). At the Council of Chalcedon, the opposing bishops

were told their opposition would have no effect (Id. II. p. 437). And similarly in the later Councils.

CHAP. XXI.—<sup>222</sup> The Arians at the first Council of Nice urged the same objection of innovation of doctrine, while they said they were the defenders of the ancient Catholic teaching. Comp. *Hefele*, Conciliengesch., 2nd Ed I. p. 455. Hilarius says of them (in Matt. X. 9) they falsely asserted that they held the Catholic truth. In the same way the Nestorians protested that the decrees of the Council of Ephesus were new doctrine. *Hefele* II. p. 228; and they did the same in the Council of Chalcedon. <sup>223</sup> *Geschichte der Kirchlichen Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident* II. p. 690.

<sup>224</sup> To contradict the unanimous opinion of all the theologians of the school on a point of faith or morals is, if not heretical, at least *proximum hæresi*, next to it... There is no opinion of the school however peculiar to it, which unmistakably has not its origin either in Holy Scripture, or in the tradition of the Apostles or in the definitions of Councils or Popes... Besides, if all theologians were to err on a point regarding which they all agreed, they would expose the Church to the danger of error. For those who hear confessions and those who preach to the people give the instruction they receive from the theologians. And so it might happen that the Church, taking no notice of their common error in faith, would by her silence deceive the faithful of Christ... Whenever the Church has condemned heresies, or promulgated decrees regarding faith or morals, she has derived very great assistance from the labours and zeal of the scholastics... So long as the body of Christ, that is, the Church exists it must be a concern of divine providence that those who are held to be teachers of divine doctrine in the Church should retain the faith, as men given by God, lest the people be carried hither and thither like children.

<sup>225</sup> *Pius IX.* 21 Dec. 1863: To the Archbishop of Munich: wise Catholics are not satisfied merely to receive the aforesaid dogmas... they extend their submission to those which Catholic theologians hold to belong to the faith by the universal and constant agreement of the Church scattered through the world... which are held by the general and constant agreement of Catholics as theological truths and conclusions, so certain that opinions at variance with the points of such teaching, though they may not be called heretical certainly merit theological censure. *Syllab.* Prop. xxii. The obligation by which Catholic teachers and writers are certainly bound, is drawn close only

in those points which have been proposed by the infallible judgment of the Church as dogmas to be believed by all.  
<sup>226</sup> *Gérin*. Recherches historiques sur l'assemblée du Clergé de France de 1862. Paris, 1869, *Lacretelle* Histoire de France au siècle XVIII *Deutsch*, Berlin, 1810. <sup>227</sup> The majority of the bishops, the Procureur General Harlay testified, would change their opinion to-morrow, if they were allowed to do so, *Gérin* p. 355. The same official said: we must work at the reformation of the theological faculty, if we are to keep them in dependence, *Gérin* p. 359.

<sup>228</sup> Le Concile du Vatican, 1871. <sup>229</sup> *Ep. Bened. xiv.*, Ad Inquis, Hispan. d. d. 1748. Comp. *Petr. de Marca*, Observationes super theses claramontanas, n. 17. De Marca declared before the King in 1662. Mémoire no. 32, 34 in *Guéranger*, De la Monarchie Pontific. p. 11. : The majority of the Doctors of Theology and of Law follows the *common opinion*. The French Episcopate has declared in favour of Papal Infallibility in several Provincial Councils of this century : so have the Episcopates of Holland, England, Belgium, and America. Comp. *Schneemann*, Stimmen aus Maria Laach, x., p. 138, &c. *Gratry* says (*Connaissance de Dieu*, Paris, 1856, ii., p. 412) : Almost all Catholics believe, and all admit in practice that the Sovereign Pontiff when speaking solemnly (*ex cathedra*) on matters of faith and morals is Infallible. And even *Sarpi*, (*Consolazione della mente nell' interdetto di Paola V.* ; Comp. *Les droits des Souverains défendus*, à la Haye, 1721) : Every Christian Prince is bound to obey the Pope, that is, in faith and dogma...because the oracle of faith comes from the lips of the Pope...who on account of the privilege received in the person of Peter cannot through ignorance mislead the Christian flock.

<sup>230</sup> *Rump*. Die Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes und die Stellung der in Deutschen Verbreiteten Theologischen Lehrbücher zu dieser Lehre. 1870. Even *Gunther* and *Veith* admitted as much. The former (*Süd-und Nordlichter*, p. 245) the so much hated Infallibility of the holder of the Primacy forms an integral part under the action of the Holy Ghost in the direction of the well understood interests of faith. The latter (*Welt-leben und Christenth*, p. 163.): It is of the very essence of the organism of the Church that such infallibility should be claimed for the supreme and apostolic Pastor in matters of faith and morals. For Bavaria, *Hist-pol. Blätter* LXXI. p. 116 &c.  
<sup>231</sup> So Prop. 7 of Peter of Osma 1479 : *Ecclesia urbis Romae errare potest*. Prop. 27, 28 Luth. Prop. 85. Auctor. Fid. in which the condemnation of the four Gallican articles is repeated.

CHAP. XXII.—<sup>222</sup> Geschichte des Vatic. Concils. 1873. p. 474. <sup>223</sup> Die Selbstzersetzung des Christenthums. 1874. <sup>224</sup> Geschichte der Päpste. 6 Aufl. III. Bd. am Schlusse. <sup>225</sup> Cours de philosophie positive, ton V. LX. Leçon. <sup>226</sup> Comp. II 1. p 76.

<sup>227</sup> Sess III. Constit. De fid. Cathol. Prooem.

<sup>228</sup> Ep. 63. 3 ad Theoph. As regards this wicked heresy, many of the Saints are not satisfied that you show so much patience and imagine that those who attack the life of the Church can be corrected by your gentleness: (they fear) that whilst waiting for the conversion of a few you encourage the boldness of the reprobate and the faction grows stronger. <sup>229</sup> As much as one loves the Church of God, so much has he the Holy Ghost. *Agustin*. Tract. 32, 8. in Joan. *Hinschius* (K-R. III. p. 634) Though only eleven years have passed since the Vatican Council was published, there can be no doubt its acceptance has been complete: the universal consciousness of the Catholic Church of to-day sees in its decrees the logical development of the ancient Catholic faith in the Papal Primacy. This is admitted throughout the entire Catholic world, not one out of the large number of Catholic bishops has declared against it and even the very bishops who formed the opposition party in the Council have submitted to its decrees. In the presence of such facts the old Catholic movement cannot be recognised as a factor which invalidates the acceptance; for its adherents who are not one-hundred thousand in number disappear before the many millions of Catholics who have either accepted the new dogma or have foreborne to protest against it. Indeed if real doubts as to the legality of the Vatican Council could have been raised, they would have been answered by the acceptance of the Council.

<sup>240</sup> Written in the winter of 1872-73. <sup>241</sup> 'The stronghold of the priesthood.' *Bonifac* I. Ep. 4. 'The stronghold of authority, *Augustin* Ep. 118, c. 9.

<sup>242</sup> *Döllinger*. Verhandlungen der Versammlung kath. Gelehrten in München, Regensburg, 1863, p. 53. <sup>243</sup> W. W. XIV, p. 253.

<sup>244</sup> What faith does he call his? That which the *Roman Church* holds?...If he answers *Roman*, then we are *Catholic*. *Jerom*. adv. *Rufin*, I. 4. Id. Ep. 63. Know that no object is dearer to us than to maintain the rights of Christ, to observe the limits of the Fathers and ever to bear in mind the Roman faith praised by Apostolic lips.



## NOTES ON APPENDIX II.

<sup>1</sup> (The Roman Pontiff) is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals. Vatican Council, c. 4. <sup>2</sup> Matt. 28, 19. <sup>3</sup> 1 Tim. 6, 20. <sup>4</sup> *Suarez. de fid. Disp. 5. sect. 6, 8. Lugo de fid. Disp. 20. Comp. Vatican. c. 4.* that by his (the Holy Ghost's) assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles.

<sup>5</sup> 'If we take the divine doctrine the dogma of the most blessed Trinity, it is clear that it cannot fit in with any arbitrary notion of God, whether pantheistic or dualistic, it is only possible with monotheism. If we take the dogma of creation, it cannot be reconciled with any arbitrary materialistic or pantheistic conception, it is only possible for those who see in the universe the realisation of the idea of a creative spirit. In the same way the doctrine of man's original state and his fall implies a very definite teaching on the nature of man...the doctrine of the person of Christ implies a very definite teaching on human nature; the doctrine of justification implies a very definite teaching on human free-will; the doctrine of the Sacraments implies a very definite teaching on the visible world and its relation to man and the doctrine of the four last things supposes a definite natural and moral order in the world. The doctrine of the Church only harmonises with these suppositions. ...Thus a Christian rational science has grown up side by side with dogma; it stands in closest relation with it and cannot be separated from it without destroying the substance of dogma.' *Hagemann. Vernunft und Offenbarung. 1869 p. 63.* And *Gunther (Peregrins Gastmahl. p. 365):* 'Your veto reaches the church not only in reference to theology, it reaches her in reference to all science, for on account of the organic connection of all sciences, there exists no branch of knowledge to which we can attribute absolute independence.'

<sup>6</sup> Ap. Hard. IX. p. 1719 Whereas truth can never contradict itself, we define every assertion opposed to the truth of enlightened faith to be utterly false. Vatican. Constit. of the Cath. faith c. 4. The Church which has received, together with the Apostolic mission of teaching, the command to guard the deposit of faith, receives from God the right and the obligation of pro-

scribing false science, lest any be deceived by philosophy and false deceits (Colon. 2, 8). Can 2. If any one shall say, that human sciences should be prosecuted with such freedom, that their assertions, even when opposed to revealed doctrine, may still be held as true and cannot be proscribed by the church : let him be anathema. <sup>7</sup>The guiding star, stella rectrix, *Pius IX.* ad Archiep. Monach. 21 Dec. 1863.

<sup>8</sup> So that (philosophy) ought to admit only what it has acquired by it through its own means or what is not foreign to it. *Pius IX.* ad Archiep. Monach. Dec. 1862. Vatican Council. On Cath. faith c. 4. Neither truly does she (the Church) forbid that each of these sciences in its own sphere should employ its own principles and peculiar method.<sup>9</sup> On error as a consequence of the power of the will : see 2. 2. æ q 154. a 2 : Qu 3. de malo. a 13 : on the influence of sensuality 1. 2æ. q 33. a 3 : of pride 1. 2æ. q 77. a 4. of hatred and anger 1. 2æ. q 28 a 3 : of self-sufficiency 1. 2æ. q 6. a 5 : 2 Metaphys, lect 1. From this we gather the ground for rejecting Prop. 10 of the Syllabus. Whereas the philosopher is one thing and philosophy another, he is bound to submit to the authority which he himself has proved to be genuine ; but philosophy cannot and ought not to bow to authority. (So *Froschammer* Einleitung in die Philosophic. 1858 p. 272). St. *Thomas Aquinas*, super. Boeth. Trin. Prooem. q 2. a 3. As sacred knowledge is built on the light of faith, so philosophy is built on the natural light of reason. Hence it cannot be that the teaching of philosophy should contradict the teaching of faith ; it is less perfect...If anything occurs in the sayings of the philosophers contrary to faith, it is not philosophy, but rather an abuse of philosophy arising from want of reason. Id. lect 4 in 1 Cor. 11. A proposition may belong to the doctrine of faith in two ways ; either *directly*, as the articles of faith which are proposed to be believed, or *indirectly* when from its denial would follow a contradiction of the faith.

*Bañez* in II. q 11. a 2. It is an error or next to an error (error vel proximum errori) to maintain that the Church can err in these censures. *Lugo*. l. c. n. 106 : There can exist no doubt when the Church defines and declares a proposition to be heretical ; for then she implicitly defines its contradictory to be of faith : now the Church cannot err and propose something as of faith which is not of faith. The difficulty is greater with regard to the other censures. Theologians generally are agreed that the decisions of the Church in affixing

its censures are certainly true. In my opinion it is an error or next to an error to say that the Pontiff can err in deciding these censures : *because the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to the Church ought not to be limited to those dogmas which are proposed as of faith and are believed in the Church, nay, it ought to extend to whatever the faithful are bound to believe by the precept of the Church.* The infallible decision of the Church extends itself directly, immediately and *per se* to the domain of revealed faith ; indirectly and mediately to the truths of the natural order, *Lugo*. l. c. n. 111 ; we say, the Pope has the authority and the assistance to decide directly regarding revealed doctrines, and indirectly about doctrines of the natural order, attainable by the natural light of reason, when *the knowledge of such doctrines serves to establish and to determine the doctrine of salvation and sound theology.* On this ground, in obedience to the bulls of Martian V 'Inter cunctas' and 'In eminentis' of 1418 those suspected of heresy were questioned whether they *believed* the decrees of the Council on the 45 articles of John Wicliff and the 30 articles of Hus : and yet all of them were not heretical. In an authoritative declaration of an opinion as 'more probable' (the Council of Vienne used this form regarding the infusion of supernatural grace and virtues into baptised infants) *per se* error is possible : yet *Lugo*, l. c. n. 129 says: we may piously believe that God, though there exists no divine promise which meets the case, would not allow any doctrine to be proposed to the faithful on such matters as 'more probable,' if it was really false. And his reason is : because God would give the faithful a great opportunity of clinging to false doctrine with greater obstinacy on account of their reverence for the common teacher and would render the discovery of the falsehood the opinion might contain more difficult.

<sup>10</sup> For this reason it is called *fides ecclesiastica*, or *mediate divina* : *Lugo*. l. c. D. 1. n. 275. *Suarez*. l. c. D. 2. sect 6.

<sup>11</sup> *Sensus ab auctore intentus*, the meaning intended by the author, <sup>12</sup> *I. Huber* *Der Jesuitenorden*, 1873, p. 457 is therefore wrong when he says : the stand-point of the Curia required an infallibility which could pronounce with certainty what a man thinks or may have thought on any subject, so that if he were to declare he had thought otherwise than his thoughts had been interpreted, the Pope could know the truth better and more certainly than the thinker himself. <sup>13</sup> In this way the Fathers at Nice condemned the Thaleia of Arius, and those of Ephesus the writings of Nestorius. *Hefele*. *Concilien-gesch*, I, p. 285 ; II, p. 167. *Mansi* V, p. 413.

<sup>14</sup> *Melch Canus* l. c. V. 5. The Church cannot define that to be a sin which is good, or that to be good which is wicked.

<sup>15</sup> *Augustin*, Ep. 119 ad Januar. c. 19. The Church of God, living amidst straw and tares, bears with much; yet still she never approves or connives at or does what is against faith or good morals. Ep. 54. When the whole Church follows a usage throughout the world, it is the highest madness to question whether such usage ought to be followed. *Auctor. Fid.* prop. 78. To say that the Church can enforce a discipline at once useless and too heavy for Christian liberty to endure, and dangerous and hurtful and leading to superstition and materialism...is insulting to the Church and to the spirit of God, by which she is guided and at least erroneous.

<sup>16</sup> *Melch Canus* l. c. I do not approve all the laws of the Church: I do not praise every penalty, censure, excommunication, suspension, irregularity and interdict. I have before my mind certain laws, in which you will certainly not find prudence or moderation, to say nothing else...I may say in a few words that those who rashly and indiscriminately defend the utterances of the Sovereign Pontiff on every subject, weaken and do not strengthen the authority of the Pope, overturn it and do not confirm it. Peter does not stand in need of our lies or of our flattery. <sup>17</sup> *Suarez*. l. c. sect 8. This must be understood of what is substantial and touches morality, because it would not be against the sanctity of the Church if some human imperfection were to appear in what is circumstantial such as multiplying precepts, or showing severity, or enforcing excessive punishments.

<sup>18</sup> *Greg. de Valent.* l. c. p. 7, 96. The approbation of an institute partakes of the character of a definition; the judgment as to its opportuneness belongs to administration. *Suarez*. de fid. D. 5. sect 8. This must be understood of its substance, taking no account of the circumstances. And when I say the substance, I mean that the order approved must be not only not dangerous or useless, it must be really a way to perfection. *Tanner*. de fid. D 1. 94. dub. 7. A distinction must be drawn between the quasi speculative judgment...and the quasi practical judgment by which the Roman Pontiff allows, decrees and commands the establishment of the order *hic et nunc*. <sup>19</sup> *Pius IX.* ad Archiep. Monach. 21 Dec. 1863: Catholics are bound to submit to the doctrinal decisions published by the Pontifical Congregations. <sup>20</sup> The Bishops should teach them that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them (the Saints)... that

they may order their own lives and manners in imitation of the Saints. *Council of Trent, 25th Sess.*

<sup>21</sup> *Melch. Canus* l. c. (on this hypothesis) it would not be very absurd to banish the veneration of the Saints from the Church...It is much the same to honour the devil and to honour a reprobate soul... We must believe those who refuse to believe the Church in these matters to be heretics, rash, bold and irreligious men. *St. Thomas Aquinas. Quodlib. Art. v 16* : Since the honour we pay the Saints is a kind of profession of faith by which we declare our belief in the glory of the Saints, we may piously believe that the Church cannot err in this point. <sup>22</sup> *Suarez* l. c. sec. 8. *Benedict XIV* de servorum Dei beatificatione et canonizatione. Patavii. 1743.

---



## INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

*The numbers refer to the pages.*

- ABSOLUTISM**, Papal Supremacy not 2, 57.
- APOSTLES**, their authority 4; their successors 6; their relation to Peter 14.
- APPEAL**, to the Pope 54; to a Council 50.
- AUTHORITY**, of the Pope 50, 51.
- AUTHORITY**, in the Church 2.
- BISHOPS**, the successors of the Apostles 9; their relation to the Pope 13; are judges in questions of faith 89.
- CHURCH**, the, its supernatural character 1; the principle of its unity 13, 34; the infallibility of the Pope follows from its essence 97.
- COLLEGIAL SYSTEM**, the, 126.
- COUNCIL**, its relation to the Pope 50, 70, 92; is not absolutely necessary 92.
- DEFINITIO EX CATHEDRA** 74, 101; expression not new 74.
- DEFINITION**, the, of Infallibility, its significancy 77; proved from tradition 81.
- EPISCOPAL SYSTEM**, the, 126.
- EPISCOPATE**, the, successor of the Apostles 6; limited by the Primacy 39; its infallibility 68; the relation of its infallibility to that of the Pope 104.
- FAITH**, essence of, 99.
- GALLICANISM**, 49.
- HIERARCHY**, the, 8.
- INFALLIBILITY**, the, of the collective teaching body 69, 103; of the Pope 70, 77; the relation of the latter to the former 71; how far personal 73; domain of infallibility 120.
- INSPIRATION**, its relation to infallibility 68.
- PETER**, the foundation of the church 14, 18; the bearer of the Keys 21; the confirmer of the faith 22, the shepherd of the whole flock 24; his relation to the other Apostles 27; his authority not derived from the church 28; it is of divine right 35; the Bishop of Rome his successor 35.
- POPES**, the, successors of Peter 35; their mode of acting 42; significancy of their infallibility 72; the Pope and a Council 50, 70; the Pope as a private individual 73.
- PRIMACY**, the, its permanency in the church 29; its

- significancy 45, 60; wield  
sovereign and supreme  
authority 46, 47, 53.
- PROGRESS, in the church 104.
- SILENCE, respectful 100.
- SUPREME AUTHORITY, in the  
church 4; does not extin-  
guish the authority of the  
Bishops 48; is not absolute  
2, 57.
- TEACHING Office, the, in the  
church 67; is infallible 67;  
the foundation of infallibili-  
ty 68, 97.
- TERRITORIAL SYSTEM, the, 126.
- UNITY, the principle of 12, 34.
- VINCENT OF LERINS, his canon  
107.

---

### INDEX OF NAMES.

- AGATHO, Pope 53, 88.
- AMBROSE 40, 130, 134, 138,  
171.
- AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS 138.
- ANZARIAN 139.
- ARTICLES OF SMALKALD 134.
- ASTERIUS AMASEN 130, 131,  
133.
- ATHANASIUS 171.
- AUCTOR. FIDEI 147, 188.
- AUGUSTINE 15, 31, 38, 40, 52,  
65, 69, 74, 76, 79, 83, 100,  
125, 127, 128, 129, 130,  
133, 138, 160, 163, 166,  
171, 179, 180, 188.
- AVITUS OF VIENNE 149.
- BALLARINI 130, 135, 144, 146,  
151, 162.
- BÁÑEZ 186.
- BAR DAVID 139.
- BELLARMINE 57, 69, 92, 136,  
148, 157, 159, 161.
- BENEDICT XIV 176.
- BENETTIS 133, 179.
- BERNARD, 8, 25, 54, 80,  
133.
- BÖTTICHER 173.
- BOLGENI 149.
- BONAVENTURE, 143.
- BONIFACE I, Pope 46, 54, 133.
- BOSSUET 23, 45, 56, 79, 99,  
129, 132, 135, 136, 138,  
168.
- CAESARIUS OF ARLES 140.
- CANUS MELCH. 77, 89, 136,  
160, 161, 168, 171, 177,  
179, 188, 189.
- CATECHISMUS ROMANUS 134.
- CHRYSOSTOM, 9, 18, 23, 24,  
30, 32, 99, 129, 130.
- CLEMENT XI, Pope 175.
- CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA 99.
- CLEMENT OF ROME II, 35, 42.
- CELESTINE, Pope 118.
- COMTE, III; COUNCIL. CON-  
STANCE, III 50; FLORENCE,  
38, 117; LATERAN IV, 38,  
117; LYONS II, 38, 117;  
TRENT, 53, 54, 125, 127;



- 128, 144, 146; VATICAN, 17, 29, 45, 60, 67, 74, 86, 104, 112, 118, 125, 128, 133, 141, 145, 160, 174, 175, 178.
- CYPRIAN 11, 30, 39, 74, 81, 125, 126, 129, 130, 133, 134, 135.
- CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA 18, 54, 80, 83, 84, 118, 130.
- DAMASUS, POPE 52, 82, 139.
- DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH 35.
- DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA 43.
- DÖLLINGER 130, 131, 132, 137, 138, 140, 150.
- EPIPHANIUS 82, 128.
- EUSEBIUS 135, 139.
- EYBEL 143, 145.
- FACUNDUS 150.
- FEBRONIUS 48, 99, 110, 132, 137, 144, 149, 152.
- FELIX II, POPE 87, 140.
- FERRANDUS 52.
- FLAVITAS 140.
- FRIEDRICH 138.
- FROHSCHAMMER 173, 186.
- FROMMANN III, 137.
- FULGENTIUS 133, 138.
- GELASIUS, POPE 38, 43, 84, 140, 141, 152.
- GERDIL 136, 149.
- GERIN 183.
- GERSON 109, 134, 148.
- GOERRES 137.
- GOETHE 114.
- GRATRY 183.
- GREGORY THE GREAT 13, 131, 154.
- GREGORY NAZIANZEN 40, 82, 100, 130.
- GREGORY OF NYSSA 31, 130.
- GREGORY OF VALENTIA 161, 178, 188.
- GROTIUS, HUGO 34.
- GUNTHER 185.
- GUERANGER 183.
- HAGEMANN 127, 137, 138, 139.
- HARTMANN III.
- HASE 134, 160.
- HEFELE 148.
- HENGSTENBERG 126.
- HERZOG 134.
- HILARIUS 132.
- HINSCHIUS 184.
- HOLTZMANN 130.
- HONORIUS, POPE 93.
- HORMISDAS, POPE 43, 86, 87, 138.
- HUBER 187.
- IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH 10, 35, 39, 49, 127, 135, 138.
- INNOCENT I, POPE 83, 84, 118, 134, 139.
- IRENAEUS 11, 40, 66, 81.
- JEROM, 31, 39, 74, 82, 113, 125, 129, 130, 131, 135.
- JOSEPHUS 132.
- JULIUS I, POPE 84.
- KELLNER 128, 139.
- KILBER 178.
- KRAUS 143.

- LECHLER 135.  
 LEO THE GREAT 23, 29, 36,  
 47, 51, 52, 54, 84, 87, 92,  
 125, 130, 132, 133, 135,  
 137, 138, 151.  
 LEO II, Pope 89, 96.  
 LESSING 154.  
 LUDEN 153.  
 LUGO 178, 179, 187.  
 LUTHER 135.  
 MAISTRE, de, 59, 111.  
 MARCIAN 52.  
 MARET 49, 175.  
 MAXIMUS 46, 85, 94, 97.  
 MENZEL 127.  
 MEYER 130.  
 MORE, THOMAS, 34.  
 MOSHEIM 50.  
 NATALIS ALEXANDER 174.  
 NICOLAS I, Pope 38, 119, 136.  
 OLSHAUSEN 20, 131.  
 OPTATUS *of Milevis* (Numidia)  
 22, 31, 39, 74, 81, 132,  
 138.  
 ORIGEN 19, 131.  
 PAPIAS 35.  
 PAUL OF SAMOSATA 43, 44.  
 PETAVIUS 127, 133.  
 PETER CHRYSOLOGUS 84.  
 PICHLER 109, 173.  
 PIUS IX, Pope 109, 182, 186,  
 188.  
 POLYCARP 10.  
 PROSPER 166.  
 PRUDENTIUS 74, 83.  
 RANKE III.  
 RIEHL 157.  
 ROTHE 125.  
 SARPI 183.  
 SCHELLING 20.  
 SCHULTE 54, 148, 174, 176.  
 SEPP 130, 131.  
 SIMPLICIUS, Pope 140,  
 SIRICIUS, 81, 139.  
 SIXTUS III, Pope 84, 136.  
 SOCRATES 150.  
 SOZOMEN 52, 150.  
 STATTLER 177.  
 SUAREZ 162, 178, 179, 180, 188.  
 SYLLABUS ERRORUM 144, 186.  
 TAMBURINI 48, 144.  
 TANNER 188.  
 TERTULLIAN 8, 11, 35, 39, 130,  
 133, 135, 138.  
 THEODORE THE STUDITE 85.  
 THEODORET 85.  
 THEOPHILUS 100.  
 THEOPHYLACT 80.  
 THOMAS AQUINAS 154, 159, 160,  
 177, 186, 189.  
 THOMASIIUS 126.  
 THOMASSINUS 173, 177.  
 TOURNELY 169.  
 VERONIUS 106, 164.  
 VINCENT OF LERINS' 105, 107,  
 180.  
 VICTOR OF VITA 85.  
 WALTER 53, 56, 153.  
 ZACCARIA 133.  
 ZALLINGER 143, 151.  
 ZOSIMUS, Pope 84, 139.



85-







