

Apostles. It will be sufficient here to record the words of St. Clement of Rome, a friend and disciple of St. Peter, and the third to occupy his throne as Supreme Pontiff. In his Letter to the Corinthians, St. Clement says: "Our Apostles also through our Lord Jesus Christ . . . appointed the first rulers in the church at Corinth, and ordained that after their death other approved men should succeed to the ministry."⁵ Here we find a complete description of the manner in which power and authority are transmitted in the Church. By the authority of Christ, SS. Peter and Paul appoint the first ministers at Corinth and ordain that the line of succession be continued by other approved men at the death of those whom they had appointed.

ART. III. THE SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES

In the strict sense of the term, the successors of the Apostles are those in the Church who obtain by *right of succession* the *full* powers of Orders and jurisdiction enjoyed by the Apostles. Other ministers of the Church, who participate more or less in the power of Orders and exercise a delegated jurisdiction, may also be called successors in a less proper sense of the term.

§ 1. *True Successors of the Apostles*

Thesis.—The bishops of the Church are the true successors of the Apostles

It is a doctrine of faith, defined by the Council of

⁵ "Epist. ad Corinth.," 44; Funk, Vol. I, p. 155.

Trent, that the bishops of the Church are the true and legitimate successors of the Apostles: "Wherefore the holy Synod declares that besides the other ecclesiastical grades, bishops in particular belong to the hierarchical order, since they succeed to the place of the Apostles and were placed, as the Apostle says, by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God."¹

PROOFS. It has just been proved that the Apostles must have successors to perpetuate their powers of teaching, governing, and sanctifying until the end of time; but it is a well-known fact that the bishops, and the bishops alone, have ever claimed and exercised these powers in their fullness, and they alone have ever been recognized as the legitimate successors to these powers. Before the so-called Reformation of the sixteenth century, the right of the bishops to rule as successors of the Apostles was never questioned, except by a few individuals swayed by political or private interests. Even today, all parties admit that the bishops were the recognized successors of the Apostles, at least from the second century until the time of the pseudo-Reformation. Testimony from the Apostles and early Fathers prove that they were recognized as such from the earliest years of the Church. Now, it is manifestly impossible for any body of men to obtain recognition as successors of the Apostles from the very beginning of the Church, and maintain that position undisputed for sixteen centuries, unless they were in fact what they claimed to be,—true successors. Any other hy-

¹ Denzinger, n. 960.

pothesis would mean that the Church, as Christ founded it, ceased to exist with the death of the Apostles, and that the world has since been without the means of salvation; it would mean that Christ failed in His promise to be with the Church all days, even to the consummation of the world. If the bishops of the Church are not the successors of the Apostles, then there are no successors, for no one else has even claimed this distinction; in that case the power and authority committed to the Apostles have lapsed, and cannot be renewed, except by a direct intervention of Christ in conferring them anew and reëstablishing His Church. Such an act on the part of Christ would have to be confirmed by the performance of miracles as the only means by which we could be assured of its reality.

The following testimonies are sufficient to prove that bishops were recognized as the successors of the Apostles from the very beginning of the Church:

a) ST. PAUL plainly intimates that Timothy was to carry forward the work which he himself had begun: "*Be thou vigilant, labour in all things, do the work of an evangelist, fulfil thy ministry . . . for I am even now ready to be sacrificed; and the time of my dissolution is at hand.*"² When addressing the leaders of the church of Ephesus, he says: "*Take heed to yourselves and the whole flock in which the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the Church of God.*"³ These words of the Apostle show that St. Timothy and

² 2 Tim. iv, 5-6.

³ Acts xx, 28.

the other ministers of Ephesus, known as *bishops*, ruled the Church there, and were expected to continue in that work after the death of St. Paul. In a word, they were his successors in the Church.

b) ST. JOHN THE APOSTLE. In the Apocalypse St. John narrates that he was ordered to write to the *angels* of the seven churches in Asia. In each church there is a single minister (*angel*) held responsible for doctrine and morals. This presupposes that he was also charged with the government of that particular church.⁴ From other sources we know that ministers thus charged with the care and government of a church were called *bishops*, and held precisely the same position as bishops in every age of the Church.⁵ This is evident from the following testimonies of the Fathers.

c) ST. IGNATIUS MARTYR. In his letter to the Christians of Smyrna, St. Ignatius says: "Let all be subject to the bishop, as Jesus Christ was to the Father; . . . apart from the bishop let no one do any of those things which pertain to the Church. . . . It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or celebrate a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve, that is also pleasing to God."⁶

d) ST. IRENÆUS. The testimony of St. Irenæus is especially valuable, because he was a disciple of St. Polycarp, who in turn had been a disciple of St. John the Apostle. He says that he had heard Polycarp tell

⁴ Apoc. ii, 1 sq.

⁵ Cf. Testimony of St. Clement, above, pp. 274.

⁶ "Epist. ad Smyrneos," viii, 9; Funk, Vol. I, p. 283.

of his relations with John the Apostle and with others who had seen the Lord, and that he had learned much from them concerning the Lord, His miracles and teaching.⁷ With such opportunities for knowing the teachings of Christ and the Apostles, St. Irenæus wrote: "We are in position to reckon up those who were by the Apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and to demonstrate the succession of these men to our own times. . . . The Apostles were desirous that these men should be very perfect and blameless in all things, whom also they were leaving behind as their successors, delivering up their own place of government to them."⁸

e) TERTULLIAN. A few years after St. Irenæus wrote the above words, Tertullian challenged the heretics of his day to prove the soundness of their position by tracing their succession back to an Apostle: "Let them unfold the roll of their bishops, running back in due succession from the beginning in such manner that their first bishop shall be able to show for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the Apostles or of Apostolic men; . . . as the Church of Smyrna, which records that Polycarp was placed therein by John; as also the church of Rome, which makes Clement to have been ordained in like manner by Peter. In exactly the same way the other churches likewise exhibit those whom they regard as transmitters of the Apostolic seed,

⁷ "Epist. ad Florin.," in Eusebius, "Church History," P. G., v, 20.

⁸ "Adversus Hæreses," III, 3; P. G., 7, 848.

having been appointed to their episcopal places by the Apostles."⁹

§ 2. *Other Ministers of the Church*

Several orders of ministers are mentioned in Holy Scripture, especially by St. Paul, who enumerates apostles, prophets, doctors, evangelists, deacons, presbyters, bishops, and several others, whose duties are little understood. Most of these orders served a temporary need in the Church and then disappeared. The most important of these seem to have been the evangelists, doctors, and prophets. The evangelists most probably assisted in spreading the Gospel among unbelievers, much the same as catechists do today in missionary countries. The doctors and prophets seem to have been charged with further instruction for those who had been received into the Church; the doctors being permanently attached to particular churches, whereas the prophets travelled from place to place. St. Paul intimates that the members of these various orders were endowed with special miraculous gifts (*charismata*),¹ but they exercised no jurisdiction in the Church and, therefore, did not belong to the hierarchy. They were subject to the Apostles even in the exercise of their miraculous powers.²

Deacons, presbyters, and bishops constituted the rul-

⁹ "De Præscriptione," n. 32; P. L., 2, 44.

¹ 1 Cor. xii, 28; Eph. iv, 11.

² 1 Cor. xiii, xiv.

ing body or hierarchy. They are the permanent orders of the Church, constituted to teach and govern, and to perform the offices of the priesthood. The powers and duties of bishops will be considered elsewhere,³ but some consideration of deacons and priests is necessary, since they participate more or less in the powers of the priesthood and exercise a delegated jurisdiction in the Church; to this extent they also are successors of the Apostles.

DEACONS. Shortly after the ascension of Our Lord, the Apostles associated with themselves a number of assistants, known as *deacons*, a Greek word signifying *ministers*. A temporal need in the Church at Jerusalem gave occasion for the introduction of deacons,⁴ but they also exercised certain spiritual functions, such as preaching the Gospel, baptizing and assisting other ministers in their sacred functions; *e. g.*, Philip preached the Gospel in Samaria and baptized many: "*Philip going down to the city of Samaria, preached Christ unto them . . . but when they had believed Philip preaching the kingdom of God, in the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.*"⁵ St. Ignatius distinctly mentions deacons as of divine institution: "Reverence the deacons as being the institution of God."⁶

In the first centuries, the deacons administered the

³ Cf. below, pp. 406 sq.

⁴ Acts vi, 1 sq.

⁵ Acts viii, 5, 12.

⁶ "Epist. ad Smyrneos," viii; Funk, Vol. I, 283.

temporalities of the Church, cared for the cemeteries, and directed the various works of charity. These duties were gradually taken over by other agencies in the Church, and the deacons then gave themselves entirely to the spiritual work of baptizing and assisting at divine services. Even these duties were finally performed by other ministers, and the order of deacons ceased to have any utility. Today the order scarcely exists in the Church except as a preparatory step to the priesthood.

PRIESTS. From the very earliest times priests have formed an important part of the ministry of the Church, and since they share in large measure the power of Orders conferred upon the Apostles, they constitute an order of divine institution, as the Council of Trent solemnly declared: "If anyone says that there is no hierarchy in the Catholic Church of divine institution, consisting of bishops, priests, and ministers, let him be anathema."⁷ Yet it is a matter of dispute whether simple priests, *i. e.*, priests as distinguished from bishops, existed in the days of the Apostles, or whether they were introduced later, as the needs of the Church demanded. Sacred Scripture mentions both bishops (*episcopi*) and priests (*presbyteri*), but it seems that these terms were not used in the same distinctive sense in which we use them today.

The word *presbyter* is simply the Greek *πρεσβύτερος* (an elderly man) used in a special sense. It is rendered *an ancient* in the Douay version and *an elder* in

⁷ Denzinger, n. 966.

the King James. *Episcopus* is also a Greek word meaning *overseer* and is so translated in the King James version. It is practically certain that in the first years of the Church, all ministers above the order of deacon were known indiscriminately as *presbyteri* or *episcopi*. St. Paul commands Titus to "ordain *presbyters* in every city." He then enumerates the qualities necessary in the candidates for, as he says, "a *bishop* (*episcopus*) must be without crime."⁸ When at Miletus, the same Apostle, sending to Ephesus, "called the *presbyters* of the Church," but in his address to them he calls them *episcopi*: "Take heed to the whole flock in which the Holy Ghost hath placed you *bishops* (*episcopos*)." ⁹ In his letter to the Philippians, St. Paul enumerates *bishops* and *deacons*, but makes no mention of *presbyters*.¹⁰ On the other hand, St. Peter mentions *presbyters* without any reference to *bishops*.¹¹ The *Didache*, a work written toward the end of the first century, says: "Elect to yourselves *bishops* and *deacons* worthy of God."¹² St. Clement of Rome likewise says: "The Apostles constituted *bishops* and *deacons* for those who were to believe."¹³ If the words *episcopus* and *presbyter* were used as they are today, to denote two separate orders, no reason can be assigned why St. Peter should omit the *bishops*, or why St. Paul

⁸ Titus i, 5-7.

⁹ Acts xx, 17-20.

¹⁰ Phil. i, 1.

¹¹ 1 Pet. v, 1.

¹² *Didache*, ch. xv; Funk, Vol. I, 33.

¹³ "Epist. ad Corinth.," 42; Funk, Vol. I, 153.

and the other writers mentioned should omit the *presbyters*.

The above considerations leave no room for doubt that *presbyter* and *episcopus* were used as synonymous terms and the reason for this is not far to seek. Among the Jews every synogogue was ruled by a committee composed originally of the older men of the congregation. For this reason they soon came to be known officially as *elders* (*presbyteri*),—a name applied even to those who were not advanced in years. Christian converts from Judaism would naturally employ the same terms of respect to designate the rulers in the Church. On the other hand, converts coming from paganism would use the term *episcopus*, which they had been accustomed to apply to anyone holding authority. In a short time both terms were used indiscriminately by all, whether of Jewish or pagan origin.

MATTER IN DISPUTE. It seems that in the earliest years particular churches were ruled by a council of ministers variously known as *bishops* or *presbyters*, but the exact status of these ministers is a matter of dispute. Some maintain that all were priests in the present meaning of the term, but those acting as chairmen or presidents of these committees, soon acquired greater power and influence and thus became what we know as *bishops*. This opinion is rejected by practically all Catholic scholars, and rightly so, since it can scarcely be reconciled with the divine origin of the episcopate. Others hold that each church was ruled by a bishop, assisted by a number of priests, who, with the bishop,

constituted the *presbyterium* in much the same way as a bishop and his *canons* now form a *cathedral chapter* for the government of the diocese. This opinion fits in well with the fact that a monarchical form of government for each church is known to have prevailed from very early times. Nevertheless, several eminent Catholic scholars believe that all ministers above the grade of deacons were originally bishops, strictly so-called, and that simple priests were not introduced until some years later. In favor of this opinion they cite the fact that in the Church of Alexandria, and perhaps in other churches also, those known as *presbyters*, not only elected the bishops, but also consecrated them. This, of course, presupposes that the presbyters were really bishops.¹⁴

MONARCHICAL GOVERNMENT. Whatever may be said of the Government of the various churches in the first years of Christianity, it is certain that the monarchical form of government, *i. e.*, the rule of one bishop in each church, is of Apostolic origin. It is evident from the first chapters of the Apocalypse that in the days of St. John the Apostle the churches of Asia were each ruled by a single bishop. St. Ignatius also speaks of a single bishop in each church. He says: "There is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and there is one chalice in the unity of His blood; there is one altar, as there is one bishop with the presbytery and

¹⁴ Cf. Duchesne, "Histoire ancienne de l'Église" vol. I, c. 8; Cabrol, "Dictionnaire d'Archéologie" t. I, col. 1204.

the deacons my fellow-servants."¹⁵ In almost every epistle he warns the faithful to obey the bishop and the deacons. St. Paul likewise intimates that there should be but one bishop in charge of each church; he always speaks of the bishop in the singular and of the deacons in the plural, *e. g.*, "*It behooveth a bishop to be blameless . . . deacons in like manner chaste.*"¹⁶ The Council of Nicaea (325) mentions it as a well recognized axiom that there should be but one bishop in each city; "In one church there shall not be two bishops."¹⁷ There is also the testimony of several early writers, such as Hegesippus, St. Irenæus, and Eusebius, who drew up lists of bishops for various churches. In each case these lists show a line of single bishops reaching back in unbroken succession to one who had received the ministry directly from the Apostles.

ART. IV. APOSTOLIC PREROGATIVES

§ 1. *The Apostolic Office*

The name *Apostle*, from the Greek *ἀποστέλλειν*, *to send*, signifies *one sent*, a messenger who is also commissioned to act as legate for the one sending. An Apostle, therefore, differs from an *ἄγγελος* (*angel*) because the latter acts merely as a messenger. The word

¹⁵ "Epist. ad Philadelp.," 4; Funk, Vol. I, 267.

¹⁶ 1 Tim. iii, 2, 8.

¹⁷ Council of Nicaea, canon viii.

Apostle occurs but once in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament,¹ but its use in the New Testament is frequent, especially in the writings of St. Paul. In a few instances St. Paul uses the word in its original meaning of a messenger; for example, he calls Epaphroditus an *apostle* of the Philippians because he had acted as their messenger in carrying a letter.² He also mentions *apostles of the churches, i. e.,* messengers sent to him from the various churches which he had founded.³ But he always speaks of himself as an *apostle* in a peculiar, or technical, sense: "*Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God.*"⁴ He carefully distinguishes himself as an Apostle from his co-laborers, who did not enjoy that dignity: "*Paul an apostle . . . Timothy our brother.*"⁵

CONDITIONS REQUIRED. According to St. Paul, a mission from Christ is the first and most important condition for the Apostolic office. An Apostle must be sent, "*not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father.*"⁶ Throughout the whole Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul insists that he is truly an Apostle, equal to the others, because he had received his mission directly from Christ: "*The Gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. For*

¹ 3 Kings xiv, 6.

² Phil. ii, 25.

³ 2 Cor. viii, 23.

⁴ 1 Cor. i, 1; Rom. i, 1.

⁵ 2 Cor. i, 1.

⁶ Gal. i, 1.

neither did I receive it of man; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."⁷ He then proves that he had received neither his mission nor his knowledge of the Gospel from the other Apostles: "*When it pleased him who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me that I might preach him among the gentiles, immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood. Neither went I to Jerusalem to the apostles who were before me, but I went into Arabia.*"⁸ These arguments put forth by St. Paul in defense of his Apostleship presuppose that a personal mission from Christ is a necessary condition.

St. Peter set forth the second condition necessary in an Apostle when he proposed the election of a successor to Judas: "*Wherefore, of these men who have accompanied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, until the day wherein he was taken up from us, one of these must be made a witness with us of his resurrection.*"⁹ It is necessary for an Apostle to have been a witness of the entire public Life of Our Lord, *i. e.,* from His Baptism in the Jordan to His ascension into Heaven; it is especially necessary that he be able to bear witness to the Resurrection, because, as St. Paul says, "*If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain.*"¹⁰

⁷ Gal. i, 11-12.

⁸ Gal. i, 15-16.

⁹ Acts i, 21-22.

¹⁰ 1 Cor. xv, 14.

Our Lord first selected twelve from among His disciples, "*whom he also named apostles.*"¹¹ After the Ascension, Matthias succeeded to the place left vacant by the defection and death of Judas. Matthias had been a constant companion of the Lord and His little band of Apostles; he also received a commission directly from Christ because his election was left to His decision by means of lots. Paul and Barnabas were afterward numbered with the twelve,¹² and St. Paul seems to account Andronicus and Junias as Apostles, but his meaning is not certain.¹³ St. Paul had not been an eye witness of Our Lord's life on earth; in fact it seems that he had never seen Christ during His earthly life, but he was made a witness by means of direct revelation. Hence he appeals to these visions and revelations in proof of his apostleship: "*Am I not an apostle? Have not I seen Christ Jesus Our Lord?*"¹⁴ We have no record of the calling of St. Barnabas as an Apostle, unless it be that mentioned in the Acts: "*The Holy Ghost said to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have taken them.*"¹⁵ This seems to be a call to a particular work of the Apostolate, rather than to the Apostolate itself, since St. Paul considered himself a true Apostle before this time. It is certain, however, that Barnabas did receive

¹¹ Luke vi, 13.

¹² Acts xiv, 13.

¹³ Rom. xvi, 7.

¹⁴ 1 Cor. ix, 1.

¹⁵ Acts xiii, 2.

a divine call and became a witness of the life, death, and Resurrection of Our Lord in some manner, because St. Luke calls him an Apostle along with St. Paul: "*When the apostles Barnabas and Paul had heard, . . . they leaped out among the people.*"¹⁶

§ 2. *Special Prerogatives*

The first ministers of the Church were not only bishops endowed with full power and authority to teach, govern, and sanctify; they were also Apostles, *i. e.*, witnesses of Our Lord's life, death, and Resurrection, whom He personally commissioned to carry out the organization of the Church which He had established. For this purpose they were endowed with special prerogatives; they were personally infallible, exercised universal jurisdiction, were confirmed in grace, and possessed the power of working miracles. As bishops, they were to have true successors, with equal powers to teach, govern, and sanctify; as Apostles they could have no successors, as is evident from the nature of the Apostolic office. Hence the prerogatives peculiar to the Apostles as such, are not perpetuated in their successors.

a) INFALLIBILITY. The mission entrusted to the Apostles, and the conditions under which they labored, made the gift of personal infallibility a practical necessity. They were sent forth to become the foundation stones for the churches which they were to establish

¹⁶ Acts xiv, 13.

among the nations; the faithful, as St. Paul says, being "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets,"¹ *i. e.*, upon the doctrines preached by them concerning Christ, the chief cornerstone. Hence the Apostles, being the foundation stones of doctrine for the churches, must have been enabled to announce the true doctrines of Christ without any admixture of error; they must have been infallible. But the infallibility granted to them as a body was of little use. Circumstances made it impossible for them to meet, except on rare occasions; in consequence each one was left almost entirely to his own resources in the matter of doctrine and discipline. Yet each must preach the true doctrines of Christ if he would be a foundation stone instead of shifting sand. Moreover, all men were obliged under pain of eternal damnation to hear and accept their teaching: "He that believeth not shall be condemned,"² and "He that despiseth you despiseth me."³ Such a demand on the part of Christ presupposes that He had provided against the possibility of error by endowing His Apostles with personal infallibility.

Another argument is found in the words of St. Paul: "Though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you let him be anathema."⁴ These words prove that the

¹ Eph. ii, 19-20.

² Mark xvi, 16.

³ Luke x, 16.

⁴ Gal. i, 8.

great Apostle was confident of his own infallibility in regard to the truths of the Gospel; not even an angel from heaven could convict him of error. On several occasions he appeals to his Apostolic office as sufficient proof for his teachings, fully confident that no further proof would be demanded.⁵ This proves that St. Paul considered infallibility a prerogative attached to the office itself and therefore common to all his brethren in the apostolic college.

The Fathers of the Church show their belief in the personal infallibility of the Apostles when they appeal to the Apostolicity of a doctrine as a certain and undeniable proof that it is a doctrine of Christ Himself. It is a well-known fact that they constantly make this appeal.

b) UNIVERSAL JURISDICTION. Because of the monarchical form of government that prevails in all dioceses throughout the Church, each bishop is limited to a particular territory or diocese. He is known as the bishop of that particular diocese and is forbidden to exercise jurisdiction outside its limits. The Apostles, on the contrary, exercised universal jurisdiction. Each and all were sent to teach all nations. Like St. Paul, they were "separated unto the Gospel of God . . . and received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith in all nations."⁶ They are not known as Apostles of this or that place, of this or that particular nation or people; they are simply *the Apostles of Jesus*

⁵ Rom. xv, 15 ss; 2 Cor. xii, 12 sq.

⁶ Rom. i, 1, 5.

Christ, commissioned to carry the Gospel to every creature.⁷

c) CONFIRMED IN GRACE. Catholic theologians hold that the Apostles were confirmed in grace and therefore preserved from all sin, or at least from grievous sin. St. Thomas does not hesitate to say that "the Apostles, even in their mortal life, could not sin grievously, although they could be guilty of venial sin."⁸ This opinion prevailed widely in the sixteenth century and is still the common opinion, yet it would be difficult to offer any positive proof other than that of fitness. It was eminently fitting that the Apostles should be preserved at least from all grievous sin.

d) GIFT OF MIRACLES. As legates of Christ to all nations, the Apostles needed some means to prove their mission no less than Christ himself. For this reason they received the power to perform miracles as is evident from many passages of Holy Scripture; e. g., "*But they (the Apostles) going forth preached everywhere; the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed.*"⁹ Again: "*By the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people.*"¹⁰

The power of miracles, however, was not a prerogative peculiar to the Apostles alone; many of the faithful were endowed with like powers, as is evident

⁷ See below, pp. 21 sq.

⁸ "Comment in Sent.," III, dist. 12, qu. 2, ad 1.

⁹ Mark xvi, 20.

¹⁰ Acts v, 12; xix, 11 sq; Rom. xv, 18 sq.

from the words of St. Paul to the Corinthians.¹¹ This power always remains in the Church, as was proved elsewhere,¹² but it does not descend by right of succession, and as it was not limited to the Apostles in the beginning, so neither is it limited now to their successors. It is a power residing in the Church, to be exercised at such times and by such persons as God in His wisdom determines, because, unlike the power of Orders or jurisdiction, it is needed only for extraordinary occasions.

GLOSSOLALIA. Among the miraculous powers shared by the Apostles and many of the faithful was the gift of tongues, technically known as *glossolalia*, a Greek word, which means *speaking with tongues*. In narrating the events of Pentecost St. Luke says: "*And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with divers tongues according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak.*"¹³ St. Paul mentions speaking in tongues as one of the gifts enjoyed by many at Corinth, and also states that he himself possessed it: "*I thank my God that I speak with all your tongues.*"¹⁴

No doubt the Apostles were able to preach the Gospel in any language, if need be, just as St. Francis Xavier is said to have done, but there is no proof for this in Scripture. The gift of tongues mentioned there was not for the purpose of preaching, but for prayer and praising God. This may be gathered from the words of St. Paul: "*He that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God; for no*

¹¹ 1 Cor. xiv, 22 sq.

¹² See above, pp. 112.

¹³ Acts ii, 4.

¹⁴ 1 Cor. xiv, 18.

Eccles. Rev. 1910 May-June

*man heareth. Yet by the Spirit he speaketh mysteries. But he that prophesieth speaketh to men unto edification. . . . But in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding that I may instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue."*¹⁵

¹⁵ 1 Cor. xiv, 2-9; cfr. Semeria, "Venticinque Anni di Storia," Lect. II, n. 12; Catholic Eucyclopedia, art. "Tongues, Gift of"; *Ecclesiastical Review*, May and June, 1910.

THE PRIMACY OF PETER

CHAPTER IX

THE PRIMACY PROMISED

As a physical body cannot live and function without a head, so neither can a moral body. Every society must have a head, *i. e.*, a person or group of persons in whom supreme authority resides and by whom it is exercised. Without such a head a society speedily dissolves and passes out of existence. Hence the Church, being a true society, must have a head invested with the supreme authority to teach, govern, and sanctify the faithful. Therefore, after examining the body of the Church, its organization and powers, it is necessary to investigate the nature and person of its head. Is it a single person or a group of persons? What powers does it possess, and what relation does it bare to the rest of the body? Christ Himself is the supreme and only Head of the Church, considered as His Mystical Body; the question here regards the Church simply as an external organization or society of men, and as such it must have a human head.

It has been proved that all power in the Church was conferred upon the Apostles to be transmitted to their

lawful successors, the bishops, who constitute the ruling body in the Church. Consequently the Church is neither a democracy nor a republic in her form of government; she is governed by a divinely constituted body of rulers, but do they rule as a body whose members have equal power and authority, or are they subject to one who exercises supreme authority over the whole Church? In other words, is the Church a monarchy or an oligarchy? These questions are answered by proving that St. Peter was given the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church, and that this primacy descends to his successors.

ART. I. THE PREËMINENCE OF PETER

THE TWELVE. The New Testament constantly represents the Apostles as members of a ruling body in the Church. They are referred to as *The Twelve*, even when their number was more or less. (a) *He called unto him his disciples; and he chose twelve of them whom also he named apostles.*¹ (b) *And having called his twelve disciples together . . . and the names of the twelve apostles are these . . . These twelve Jesus sent.*² (c) *And he made that twelve should be with him and that he might send them to preach.*³ (d) *And when evening was come, he came with the twelve.*⁴ (e) *Jesus answered them: Have not I*

¹ Luke vi, 13.² Matt. x, 1, 2, 5.³ Mark iii, 14.⁴ Mark xiv, 17; Matt. xxvi, 20.

chosen you twelve and one of you is a devil? Now he meant Judas Iscariot . . . for the same was about to betray him, whereas he was one of the twelve."⁵ St. Paul also mentions *the twelve* although at the time of which he was writing, there were only eleven: *"He was seen by Cephas; and after that by the twelve."*⁶ "It is true," says Batiffol, "that at a very early date *The Twelve* are spoken of; the Apocalypse, for instance, reckons only *twelve Apostles of the Lamb*.⁷ The title chosen by the *Didache* is: *The Lord's Teaching through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations*. The expression, *The Twelve Apostles*, is synthetic rather than enumerative; writers speak of the *Twelve* . . . regardless of the fact that the *Twelve* were actually fourteen."⁸ This manner of referring to the Apostles as *The Twelve* in the Scriptures and in the earliest Christian writings, presupposes that they formed a body or corporation, as it were, to rule the Church. This fact is intimated by Christ himself, for He always addresses them collectively when there is question of conferring power or authority upon them: *"Whosoever you shall bind (alligaveritis) . . . Going therefore, teach (docete) all nations . . . Do this (hoc facite) in commemoration of me. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive (remiseritis)."*⁹ His words are always in the plural, al-

⁵ John vi, 71, 72.⁶ 1 Cor. xv, 5 (Greek text).⁷ Apoc. xxi, 14.⁸ P. Batiffol, "Primitive Catholicism," p. 52 (Eng. tr.).⁹ Matt. xviii, 18; xxviii, 20; Luke xxii, 19; John xx, 23; Luke x, 16.

ways addressed to the whole body of the Apostles.

ST. PETER THE HEAD. Since the Apostles constituted a ruling body in the Church, it is natural to expect a head or leader for the little band, and this expectation is realized; St. Peter is everywhere set forth as first among the Apostles, both before and after the Ascension of Our Lord.

a) **BEFORE THE ASCENSION.** Even while Our Lord was personally present among the Apostles, St. Peter enjoyed a certain preëminence. Wherever two or more of them are named, St. Peter always heads the list, but the order of the others varies.¹⁰ In fact, St. Matthew distinctly calls St. Peter the *first*, without assigning any order for the others: "*The names of the twelve apostles are these: First Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew, his brother, James. . . .*"¹¹ There are many other indications of this preëminence; *v. g.*, "*And all denying, Peter and they that were with him said . . . Mary Magdalen ran therefore and cometh to Peter and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved.*"¹² St. Peter was also the first to confess the divinity of our Lord,¹³ and when Christ "*said to the twelve: Will you also go away?*" Peter answering for all said: "*Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.*"¹⁴

¹⁰ Mark iii, 16; Luke vi, 14 sq; Acts i, 13 sq.

¹¹ Matt. x, 2.

¹² Luke viii, 45; John xx, 2, 3.

¹³ Matt. xvi, 16.

¹⁴ John vi, 69.

b) **AFTER THE ASCENSION.** Immediately after the Ascension, St. Peter assumed the rôle of leader among the Apostles. He proposed the election of a successor to Judas, and preached the first sermon to the people;¹⁵ he performed the first miracle and was the first to receive gentiles into the Church.¹⁶ Being filled with the Holy Ghost, he defended the other Apostles before Annas and Caiphas,¹⁷ and at the Council of Jerusalem, when he spoke, the matter was settled, and the people immediately turned to hear Paul and Barnabas relate their experiences among the gentiles: "*And when there had been much disputing, Peter rising up said to them . . . and all the multitude held their peace; and they heard Barnabas and Paul telling what great signs and wonders God had wrought among the gentiles by them.*"¹⁸ St. Paul also hints at the preëminence of Peter, when he says that he went up to Jerusalem for the express purpose of seeing him: "*Then after three years, I went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days. But other Apostles I saw none saving James the brother of the Lord.*"¹⁹

WHENCE THE PREËMINENCE. There can be no doubt that St. Peter held a position of honor among the Apostles and even exercised some authority over

¹⁵ Acts i, 15 ss; ii, 14 sq.

¹⁶ Acts iii, 1 ss; x, 44-48.

¹⁷ Acts iv, 8 sq.

¹⁸ Acts xv, 7, 12.

¹⁹ Gal. i, 18, 19.

them, but whence did he derive this preëminence, and what was its nature? Did his impetuous nature lead him boldly to assume an attitude of superiority, or was he, perhaps, elected to this position by the other Apostles on account of some special fitness for the office? Many non-Catholics give such explanations,²⁰ and they might seem plausible if we had nothing but the foregoing indications to guide us. Fortunately, we have the very words of Christ promising to Peter the primacy, which He afterward conferred upon him in most explicit terms. Before entering further into this question, it is well to consider the nature of primacy in general and its various kinds.

PRIMACY. Etymologically the word *primacy*, from the Latin *primus*—*first*, signifies the state of being first among others for any reason whatsoever. Hence there are many kinds of primacy, the most important being those of *honor, excellence, order, and jurisdiction*. Primacy of *honor* consists in holding the first place among equals; it confers no privilege other than that of being accorded certain marks of respect, such as the place of honor at table or in assemblies. The primacy of excellence is a certain preëminence due to some personal merit or accomplishment. In this sense Demosthenes is known as the prince of orators, Homer as the prince of poets; they hold the first rank of excellence in their respective arts. The primacy of *order* consists in the directive authority necessary to carry out

²⁰ Cf. Palmer, "Treatise on the Church," Vol. II, p. 478; Schaff-Herzog, art. "Peter."

some business with order and promptness. The chairman of an assembly exercises such primacy in directing its deliberations and other proceedings according to recognized rules of order. The primacy of *jurisdiction* consists in holding the supreme powers of government in a society,—the supreme legislative, judicial, and coercive powers.

Such is the primacy claimed for St. Peter over the universal Church, and the Vatican Council declares it an article of faith that this primacy was conferred upon him by Our Lord: "If any one says that Christ the Lord did not constitute the blessed Peter prince of all the Apostles and head of the whole Church militant; or if he says that this primacy is one of mere honor and not of real jurisdiction received directly and immediately from Our Lord Jesus, let him be anathema."²¹

ERRONEOUS TEACHINGS. Today most non-Catholic scholars admit that St. Peter held a certain preëminence among the Apostles, but they maintain that it was a mere primacy of honor. Their doctrine that all power in the Church comes from the body of the faithful, necessarily excludes a primacy of jurisdiction by divine institution; even the primacy of honor was due to accidental circumstances. The extraordinary zeal of St. Peter, his love for Christ, his impetuous nature, or perhaps his more advanced age, caused him to be more highly honored than the others.

The schismatic churches of the East and many An-

²¹ Denzinger, n. 1823.

glicans concede the primacy of honor by divine institution, but they hold that power in the Church was conferred equally upon all the Apostles to be exercised by them as a body. "The special dealing with Peter and the promises to Peter are connected with our Lord's personal dealings with him; and though he appears as leader of the Apostles, it does not appear that any office or authority is given to him which is not shared equally with all the Apostles."²²

These errors are refuted and the true position of St. Peter established by proving that Christ promised him the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church, and afterwards conferred it upon him. The primacy was promised when Christ foretold that Peter was to be (1) the foundation rock of the Church, (2) the key-bearer of the kingdom, (3) its law-giver, and (4) the confirmer of his brethren.

ART. II. PETER THE ROCK FOUNDATION

Thesis.—The primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church was promised to Peter under the figure of a rock foundation

PROOF. The proof of this thesis is found in the words of Christ addressed to St. Peter on the way to Cæsarea Philippi: "Jesus saith to them [the Apostles]: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the

²² Bishop Gore (Anglican), "Catholicism and Roman Catholicism." I.

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: Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."¹ *I will give to thee the keys etc.*

In these words Christ promised to St. Peter a real primacy of jurisdiction, (1) if the Church mentioned in the text is the universal Church of Christ, (2) if St. Peter is the rock upon which the Church is to be founded, and (3) if this rock foundation symbolizes the power of jurisdiction. There can be no doubt in regard to the first condition; any one who admits that Christ founded a church at all, must admit that it is the Church mentioned in the text quoted. Christ simply says "*My Church*,—μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν," without restriction or qualification. It is the Church which He is about to establish upon a rock, and the rock is Peter.

§ 1. St. Peter the Rock

The following considerations show conclusively that St. Peter is the rock designated by Christ as the foundation upon which He will build His Church:

a) The Greek Πέτρος (*Peter*) is simply a masculine form of πέτρα (*a rock*), adopted for use as a proper name. This is evident from the fact that in Aramaic, the language spoken by Christ, the one word *Kepha* was used. This originally Aramaic word has been re-

¹ Matt. xvi, 15-18.

tained in the name *Cephas*, given to St. Peter in several passages of S. Scripture; ¹ in one instance St. John explicitly says that it signifies the same as Πέτρος: "And Jesus looking upon him said: *Thou art Simon the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter.*" ²

In his commentary, St. Ephraim of Syria uses the same word (*kipho*, a rock) for *Petros* and *petra*, just as the French use the one word *pierre*: "*Tu es Pierre et sur cette pierre, etc.*" The proper English translation would be "Thou art Rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church."

b) The context demands that *Petros* and *petra* refer to the same subject. Our Lord has given His Apostle a new name: "*Thou art Simon the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter.*" But we know that new names are never given in Scripture without some special reason. The name of Abram was changed to *Abraham*, and that of Sarai to *Sara*; Jacob received the name *Israel*, and the Blessed Virgin was directed to call her Child *Jesus*.³ In every case the name given by God foreshadowed an important office or dignity. The new name given to Simon must likewise portend some important office or dignity to be conferred upon him. On this occasion Our Lord reveals to him the nature of this office as a reward for his open confession of faith. Thou hast confessed that I am

¹ Cfr. 1 Cor. i, 12; iii, 22; ix, 5; xv, 5; Gal. ii, 9.

² John i, 42.

³ Gen. xvii, 5; xvii, 15; Matt. i, 21.

the Son of God; thou hast acknowledged my divinity. I in return shall reveal to thee who and what thou art: Thou art the son of Jona. I have called thee Peter (a rock), because upon thee shall I build my Church.

The sense of the passage is so evident that all interpreters of any note, whether Catholic or Protestant, agree that St. Peter is the *rock* upon which Christ founded His Church; the only disagreement is in regard to the office or dignity symbolized. Siefert, a non-Catholic, says: "By *rock* Jesus meant the person of the Apostle addressed, as is proved by the fact that in Aramaic, which He spoke, *rock* and *man of rock* would both be expressed by the same word, *kepha*."⁴ Weiss, a rationalist, says: "The emphasis lies on *this*, pointing to Peter; on no other than upon this rock, *i. e.*, upon this rock nature . . . I will build my Church."⁵

The testimony of tradition is unnecessary in a matter so evident, yet a few witnesses may be quoted: (a) TERTULLIAN: "Could any of these things be hidden from Peter who was called the rock, on which the Church was to be built?"⁶ (b) ORIGEN. "See what the Lord said to that great foundation of the Church; that most solid rock upon which Christ founded His Church."⁷ (c) JAMES OF SARUG (451-521) in a Syriac hymn to St. Peter:

⁴ F. Siefert in Schaff-Herzog, art. "Peter the Apostle."

⁵ B. Weiss, "Matthäus-Evangelium," t. I, p. 334.

⁶ "De Præscript.," xxii; P. L., 2, 34.

⁷ "Homil. in Exodum," v, 4; P. G., 12, 329.

"Thou art *Kipho*;⁸ down in the foundations of the great house

I set thee. Upon thee will I build my elected Church. I will place thee first in my building, thou being hardy. Be thou basis to the Holy Temple which I am to inhabit. On thee will I expand all the superstructures of the Daughter of day."⁹

d) THE GREEK LITURGY calls St. Peter "the foundation of the Church and the rock of faith (*ἡ κρηπίς τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἡ πέτρα τῆς πίστεως*)."¹⁰

§ 2. Primacy of Jurisdiction Symbolized

PROOFS. St. Peter is not represented as the cornerstone of the Church, nor even as its substructure; he is the immovable rock upon which the whole building is securely raised. Therefore the relation of St. Peter to the Church must be that of a foundation rock to the structure build upon it; he is to give the Church strength and solidity, and preserve the unity of its parts against all destructive forces, whether they come from within or without. In a society such strength and union of parts is secured and preserved by means of authority; therefore, in calling St. Peter the rock foundation of His Church, Christ promised him the primacy of power and jurisdiction over it.

⁸ The Syriac word for *rock*.

⁹ James of Sarug, Homily xxiv, quoted in "Traditions of the Syriac Church of Antioch," by most Rev. Cyril Benham Benni, p. 21.

¹⁰ Nilles, "Kalendarium Manuale," I, 72.

Christ himself assigns the reason for founding His Church upon a rock; namely, that "*the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" The whole passage is an evident allusion to the parable of the wise man who built his house upon a rock. "*The rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house and it fell not for it was founded upon a rock.*"¹¹ All down the centuries the forces of evil,—the powers of earth and hell,—will beat upon the Church, but it shall not fall, for it is founded upon a rock, and that rock is Peter. Weiss, a rationalist, commenting on this passage says: "On no other than upon this rock, *i. e.*, upon this rock of nature which, as the rock in the parable, could ensure the existence of the house, the continuance and cohesion of the new community, I will build my Church. The primacy among the Apostles is here undoubtedly awarded to Peter."¹²

The Church is here depicted as an impregnable fortress, secure against every foe, because founded upon Peter, the rock. The interpretation of this symbolism is evident: the fortress is the Church and the rock is St. Peter, who renders the Church secure against her every foe. This implies that St. Peter is in supreme command of all her forces with authority to make ordinances, to appoint or remove subordinate officers and to provide everything necessary for all operations both defensive and offensive.

The voice of tradition is in complete accord with the

¹¹ Matt. vii, 25.

¹² B. Weiss, "Matthäus-Evangelium," Vol. I, p. 334.

above interpretation of the *rock* as a symbol of supreme authority in the Church, as the following passages show:

a) ST. AMBROSE: "It was this Peter to whom Christ said: Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church. Therefore where Peter is, there also is the Church."¹³

b) ST. EPHREM OF SYRIA introduces Christ speaking to St. Peter in these words: "Simon, I have made thee foundation of My holy Church; I have called thee Peter, because thou shalt sustain the whole edifice. Thou shalt be overseer of those who build up for Me the Church on earth, . . . if they select faulty material, thou the foundation, shalt restrain them. . . . Behold I have made thee master of all my treasures."¹⁴

c) GREEK LITURGY. In the office for the 29 June, St. Peter is called "the leader and ruler of the Church (*προστάτης καὶ πρόεδρος ἐκκλησίας*)."¹⁵

d) SYRIAC LITURGY. In the Syriac Liturgy for the 29 June, St. Peter is thus addressed: "Thou, O Simon, who duly wast named *Kipho* when Our Lord established the true and immaculate faith of the Church which He had redeemed by Christ, thou wert made and authorized head shepherd of rational sheep."¹⁶

e) SYRO-CHALDAIC LITURGY: "He is Simon, the head of the Apostles, the foundation, the ruler, the

¹³ "In Ps." xl, n. 30; P. L., 14, 1082.

¹⁴ "De Passione et Ressor. Salvatoris," R. 1. (Lamy, I, 412.)

¹⁵ Nilles, "Kalendarium Manuale," I, 194.

¹⁶ Benni, "Traditions of the Syriac Church of Antioch" p. 57.

pastor and the governor of the Church of Christ, to whom his Lord bore witness saying: Thou art a rock (*kipho*), and upon this rock I will build my Church."¹⁷

§ 3. *Objections Answered*

OBJECTION I.—St. Paul says that the Israelites in their wanderings "*drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ.*"¹ The rock is a symbol of Christ; therefore, Christ himself and not Peter is the rock upon which the Church is founded.

ANSWER.—The application of a symbol is not always the same; the meaning it is intended to convey must be determined from the context in which it is found. Because *rock* is a symbol for Christ in one passage, does not prove that it must be in another. Christ himself said: "*I am the light of the world,*"² yet this did not prevent Him from saying to the Apostles: "*You are the light of the world.*"³ They were truly the light of the world, because they participated in and reflected "*that true light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world.*"⁴ In like manner both Christ and His Apostle, St. Peter, are the rock upon which the Church is built; Christ primarily and by nature, St. Peter secondarily and by participation as an ancient author explains: "Peter indeed is a rock, but not in

¹⁷ Benni, "Traditions of the Syriac Church of Antioch," p. 55.

¹ 1 Corinth. x, 4.

² St. John viii, 12.

³ St. Matt. v, 14.

⁴ St. John i, 19.

the same manner as Christ, who is the immovable rock. Peter is rock because of that other Rock, for Jesus can share His dignities without exhausting them . . . He is a Priest, yet He constitutes others priests . . . He is a Rock, yet He fashions a rock and gives to His servant His own dignities." ⁵

OBJECTION II.—In his first Epistle to the Corinthians St. Paul says: "*Other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus.*" ⁶ How, then, can St. Peter be called a foundation?

ANSWER.—In this passage the Apostle makes no reference whatever to the *foundation* of the Church; he is speaking of the *foundation* of doctrine, or faith. Rival parties had sprung up at Corinth and were causing much strife. Some claimed to be the followers of Paul; others of Apollo, whom they praised as a more eloquent preacher and a better teacher of doctrine. St. Paul rebukes them for such folly; he and Apollo taught them the same doctrine, although he had been unable to use the eloquence of Apollo or to expound the more sublime doctrines of Christ: "*I, brethren, could not speak to you as unto spiritual ones, but as unto carnal; as unto little ones in Christ. I gave you milk to drink, not meat, for you were not able as yet. But neither indeed are you now able, for you are yet carnal*" ⁷ as your conduct shows. The Corinthians,

⁵ "Homily on Penance," a work formerly attributed to St. Basil, P. G., 31, 1483.

⁶ 1 Cor. iii, 11.

⁷ 1 Cor. iii, 1 sq.

being babes in Christ, St. Paul was forced to omit all attempts at eloquence and to teach them the mere rudiments of doctrine. He taught them nothing "*but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.*" ⁸ This is the foundation of all faith and any one who gives them further instruction must build upon it, for "*other foundation no man can lay.*"

Even though St. Paul were speaking of Christ as the foundation of the Church, it would offer no difficulty; what was said above concerning Christ as the *Rock* of the Church would be sufficient to explain it.

OBJECTION III.—St. Paul writes to the Ephesians: "*You are no more strangers and foreigners; but you are fellow citizens with the saints, and domestics of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone.*" ⁹ Here all the Apostles are mentioned equally as the foundation stones of the Church in dependence upon our Lord as the chief cornerstone.

ANSWER.—This passage also has reference to doctrine, as is evident from the context, in which the prophets are associated with the Apostles as foundation stones of the Church. Yet the prophets were certainly not foundations of the Church in the same sense that Christ calls St. Peter the foundation rock. St. Paul teaches that the faithful are built upon the foundation of the prophets and Apostles by being instructed concerning Christ crucified, whom the prophets

⁸ 1 Cor. ii, 2.

⁹ Eph. ii, 19-20.

had foretold, and whom the Apostles now preach to them. Christ Himself is the chief cornerstone, *i. e.*, the One foretold and now announced to the people.

Although St. Paul does not refer to the Apostles as the foundation of the Church, he could have done so with perfect truth; all were in a true sense foundation stones. They were the first members of the Church and its first ministers; through them Our Lord effected the actual organization of His Church, and by them it was extended far and wide to Jew and Gentile. For this reason it is often said that Christ instituted the Church in and through the Apostles, and St. John describes the Church triumphant as a city, "*and the walls of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.*"¹⁰ The twelve Apostles were the twelve foundation stones; St. Peter was even more than this. He was also the solid rock upon which stood both foundation and superstructure.

OBJECTION IV.—The Fathers frequently speak of Christ as the rock of the Church; they also mention Peter's faith as the rock. Hence they did not recognize St. Peter himself as the rock.

ANSWER.—The Fathers frequently speak of Christ as the Rock of the Church, and rightly so, for, as noted above, Christ was primarily and by nature the *Rock* or *Foundation* of the Church, St. Peter only secondarily and by participation. In this sense the Fathers call him the rock upon which the Church is built, as the

¹⁰ Apoc. xxi, 14.

quotations given above amply prove. Innocent III says: "Although the first and principal foundation of the Church is Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, . . . the second and subordinate foundation is Peter, who . . . by authority was chief among the others."¹¹

The faith of St. Peter and his open confession may also be called the rock or foundation of the Church, as is done at times by the Fathers. It was through his faith that St. Peter merited the honor of becoming the foundation; it was through his faith that he participated in the nature of the principal *Rock* and thus himself became a *rock*.

ART. III. PETER THE KEY-BEARER

Thesis.—Primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church was promised to St. Peter under the symbol of keys

PROOF. When Christ had designated St. Peter as the rock upon which He would build His Church, He immediately added: "*And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.*"¹ In these words Christ promised to St. Peter the primacy of universal jurisdiction, (1) if St. Peter was the person addressed, (2) if the *Kingdom of Heaven* meant the Church which Christ was about to establish, and (3) if the *keys* are a symbol of supreme power in the Church. There can be no

¹¹ "Epist. ad Patriarch. Constantinop"; P. L., 214, 758.

¹ Matt. xvi, 19.

doubt in regard to the first two conditions. It is evident from the whole context that St. Peter and he alone was addressed by Our Lord, and all interpreters concede that the *Kingdom of Heaven* is here the same as the Church to be established on Peter the rock. It is the kingdom in which St. Peter shall exercise the power of the keys; therefore, it must be a visible society existing among men, which can be no other than the Church militant. It is also evident that *keys* are here taken symbolically and, since no explanation is given, Our Lord must have intended the symbolism then in common use, for otherwise His words could not have been understood.

SIGNIFICANCE OF KEYS. Among all ancient peoples, especially those of the East, keys were a symbol of power and authority, and the giving of keys indicated a transfer of authority. Henderson, a non-Catholic, says: "In the East the key is the symbol of power and authority, with special reference to palaces, treasures, stores, etc. It resembles a sickle with a long handle, and the crooked part is so formed as to allow of its being suspended on the shoulder or around the neck. That it actually formed part of the insignia of office, and that the language is not to be taken figuratively, is unquestionable. Among the Greeks it was worn as a badge of sacerdotal dignity."²

The use of symbols was much more common among Eastern peoples of antiquity than with us, yet we still

² E. Henderson, "Commentary on St. Matthew."

preserve traces of this use of the key as a symbol of authority. When cities were protected by walls and the only entrance was by means of gates, possession of the keys to these gates gave full authority, because a city was in the power of him who controlled its entrances. City walls long since disappeared as a means of protection, but the ancient custom of giving a king, or other ruler, the keys of the city upon his solemn entry, still obtains. Even in our own country, a person of distinction is honored by giving him the "keys of the city." A similar use of keys also obtains in the transfer of a house or other building; a person leasing or purchasing a building does not get full possession or control until the keys have been delivered to him.

Outside of the passage under consideration, keys are mentioned but six times in Scripture.³ In five of these passages, the key is used as a symbol of power or authority; three times the power of Christ is directly signified, and once a power typifying that of Christ. The latter is found in Isaiah: "*I will call my servant Eliacim the son of Helcias and I will clothe him with thy robe . . . and will give thy power into his hand . . . 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.*"⁴ Our Lord applies these same words to Himself in the Apocalypse: "*These things saith the Holy One the True*

³ Judges iii, 25; Is. xxii, 22; Luke xi, 52; Apoc. i, 18; iii, 7; ix, 1.

⁴ Is. xxii, 19-22.

*One, he that hath the key of David; he that openeth and no man shutteth; shutteth and no man openeth.*⁵ . . . *And behold I am living for ever and ever, and have the keys of death and hell.*"⁶

This Scriptural use of the key as a symbol of power, together with its use in the same sense by all nations of antiquity, proves beyond a doubt that Our Lord promised some special and extraordinary power to St. Peter when He promised him "*the keys of the kingdom of heaven.*"

SYMBOL OF JURISDICTION. The words of Christ, considered in their context and compared with other passages of Scripture, leave no doubt that real jurisdiction over the universal Church militant was promised to St. Peter. Christ had just compared His Church to a house; He now promises the keys to St. Peter, thus constituting him administrator and sole custodian during the Master's absence. Knabenbauer aptly notes that the keys of a house belong to the master and that, by giving them to another, the master thereby entrusts to him the care and administration of the whole house and all that it contains. Therefore, in promising to St. Peter the keys of the kingdom, Christ promised him a power in the Church, subject only to His own.⁷

Mason, a non-Catholic, gives a similar interpretation: "The kingdom of heaven, here to be understood of the Messianic theocracy about to be established, is

⁵ Apoc. iii, 7.

⁶ Apoc. i, 18.

⁷ Knabenbauer, "Commentarium in Matthæum," Vol. II, p. 66.

likened to a house or palace of which Our Lord promises that St. Peter shall be the chief steward or major-domo, who is entrusted with full authority over everything which the house contains. The keys are not merely those of the outer doors of the house, which give the holder power to admit or reject; the porter's office is only part of the authority committed to St. Peter. They are the keys of the inner chambers also, giving command, for example, of the treasures from which it will be his duty to feed the household. As the house is at the same time *the Kingdom*, it is evident that the authority is of very wide range."⁸

AN OBJECTION.—On one occasion Christ said to the Pharisees: "*Woe to ye lawyers, for you have taken away the key of knowledge: you yourselves have not entered in, and those that were entering in, you have hindered.*"⁹ By their false teachings and unwarranted interpretations of Scripture, these Pharisees were preventing the people from accepting Christ as the Messiah; thus they "*shut the kingdom of heaven against them.*"¹⁰ The power of the keys, therefore, is the power or authority to teach. Hence the keys promised to St. Peter symbolizes a mission to preach the Gospel,—a primacy in evangelizing, which he exercised by preaching the first sermon to the people on Pentecost and by admitting the first gentiles into the Church.

ANSWER.—The objection strengthens the arguments for

⁸ A. J. Mason in Hasting's "Dictionary of the Bible," art. "Power of Keys."

⁹ Luke xi, 52.

¹⁰ Matt. xxiii, 13.

Peter's supremacy rather than refuting or weakening them. Christ promised to Peter not the *key of knowledge*, but the *keys of the kingdom*. The objection admits that the *key of knowledge* symbolizes some power or authority over doctrine; therefore the *keys of the kingdom* must signify power and authority over the Church, which is the Kingdom of Heaven on earth,—a power that includes authority to teach, as proved elsewhere.¹¹ The keys of the kingdom are promised to Peter alone; therefore, he alone shall receive supreme power or primacy of jurisdiction over the kingdom.

ART. IV. PETER THE LAW-GIVER

Thesis.—Primacy of universal jurisdiction over the Church was promised to St. Peter under the symbol of binding and loosing

PROOF. Having promised the keys of the kingdom, Our Lord continued to address St. Peter with these words: "*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.*"¹

It cannot be denied that Christ was directly addressing St. Peter in these words; neither can there be any doubt that some extraordinary power was promised to him. Our Lord seems to be fairly struggling, as it were, to convey in human language an adequate idea of the unprecedented powers to be conferred upon St. Peter. He is to be the rock foundation, upon which the Church will stand secure against the natural forces of

¹¹ See below, pp. 325.

¹ Matt. xvi, 19.

decay and all the powers of evil; he shall be its supreme ruler, subject to Christ alone. Now he is told that these powers shall be limited in extent only by the confines of the earth: "*Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, . . . whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth.*" Nay more, his every official act on earth shall be ratified in Heaven!

What can be the nature of this most extraordinary power? What must St. Peter and the other Apostles have understood by the words *bind* and *loose*? These words are often taken as a continuation of the preceding symbol of the keys, with special reference to the power of forgiving sins. But it must be evident to all that keys are for *opening* and *closing*, not for *binding* and *loosing*. In Sacred Scripture keys are never mentioned in connection with *binding* or *loosing*, but in five of the seven passages in which keys are mentioned, they are connected with *opening* and *closing*. Consequently there is a new and distinct symbol presenting the powers of Peter under a different aspect. It refers directly and primarily to the power of jurisdiction; it makes St. Peter the law-giver in the Church as was Moses in the Synagogue. This supreme power of jurisdiction includes the power to forgive sins, but only implicitly.

POWER OF LEGISLATION. Since Christ evidently used the words *bind* and *loose* in a figurative sense, He must have intended them to be accepted according to the meaning current at the time; otherwise neither St. Peter nor the other Apostles could have understood their meaning without explanations, which were not

given. Hence the words must be interpreted according to their acceptance in the time of Christ, with only such changes as the context demands. They are found in hundreds of passages in the Talmud, and in almost every case *to bind* means to declare unlawful, while *to loose* is to pronounce lawful. In the Jerusalem Talmud, for instance, we read: "They do not begin a sea voyage on the eve of the Sabbath nor on the fifth day of the week. The school of Shammai *binds* it even on the fourth day, but the school of Hillel *looses*,"² *i. e.*, the followers of Shammai declare it unlawful to undertake a sea voyage on the fourth day of the week, whereas the followers of Hillel maintain that it is lawful.

If the person who declares a thing lawful or unlawful, does so officially, he thereby imposes an obligation in conscience, *i. e.*, he commands or forbids, makes laws or abrogates them. Consequently, the terms *to bind* and *to loose* assumed by natural transition the sense of making and unmaking laws. There can be little or no doubt that the terms were used in this sense by the rabbis in the days of Our Lord. In fact, Christ himself used the words in this sense: "*Do not think that I am come to destroy [Greek, to loose] the law or the prophets.*"³ In this passage the word *to loose* evidently means to repeal or abrogate. Again He said of the Pharisees: "*They bind heavy and insupportable*

² J. Lightfoot, "Horæ Hebraicæ in Evang. Matt.," xvi, 19.

³ Matt. v, 17.

burdens and lay them on men's shoulders."⁴ The context shows clearly that the *insupportable burdens* were foolish laws and precepts which the Pharisees imposed (*bound*) upon the people.

"The doctors of the Mosaic Law interpreted it and accordingly determined what was lawful and what was unlawful. In like manner Peter is to interpret the Law of Christ; he is to determine and prescribe what is licit and what is not licit according to the mind and doctrine of Christ. . . . This he shall do by the promulgation of laws, precepts, and prohibitions. Hence no one can rightly deny that these words of Christ confer a law-giving power."⁵ Mason, a non-Catholic, gives the same interpretation: "Authority is given to St. Peter to say what the law of God allows and what it forbids; and the promise is added that his ruling shall be upheld in Heaven,—and is consequently to be regarded as binding upon the conscience of Christians. The power of binding and loosing is in fact the power of legislation for the Church."⁶

JUDICIAL AND COERCIVE POWERS. The legislative power explicitly promised to St. Peter necessarily implies the judicial and coercive powers without which laws would be useless. The very words of Our Lord also imply these powers, since no restrictions or limita-

⁴ Matt. xxii, 4.

⁵ Knabenbauer, "Commentarium in Matt.," Vol. II, p. 68.

⁶ A. J. Mason in Hasting's "Dictionary of the Bible," art. "Power of Keys."

tions of any sort are added: *whatsoever* Peter prohibits, *whatsoever* he permits by legislative, judicial, or coercive power, shall be prohibited or permitted by Christ in Heaven. Thomas Arnold, a non-Catholic, makes some pointed observations on this matter. He says: "To bind and to loose are metaphors certainly, but metaphors easy to be understood. They express a legislative and judicial power. [To bind legislatively is to impose a general obligation; to say that a thing ought to be done, or ought not to be done; to bind men's consciences either to the doing of it, or to the abstaining from it. . . . Again, to bind judicially is to impose a particular obligation on an individual, to oblige him to do or to suffer certain things for the sake of justice, which, if left to himself, he would not choose to do or suffer. Again to loose judicially is to pronounce a man free of any such obligation. . . . But such legislative and judicial power is the power of government; government, in fact, consisting mainly of these two great powers." ⁷

PRIMACY OF POWER. The power of government promised to St. Peter under the figure of *binding* and *loosing*, extends to the whole Church and to everything subject to the Church. It is a power to be exercised *on earth* without restrictions as to time or place, and includes within its scope all persons or things subject to the Church,—"*whatsoever thou shalt bind . . . whatsoever thou shalt loose.*" In a word, the power here promised to St. Peter is the supreme power of

⁷ Thomas Arnold, "Fragment on the Church," pp. 35-36.

jurisdiction over the universal Church,—the primacy of jurisdiction.

The fact that Christ afterward addresses these same words to all the Apostles ⁸ does not militate against the primacy of Peter. On that occasion Our Lord addressed the Apostles collectively; He conferred upon them as a body complete authority to rule, but in subjection to St. Peter, their head, to whom alone the words of Christ were addressed individually: "*Whatsoever thou shalt bind . . . whatsoever thou shalt loose.*" ⁹

LIMITATIONS. The words of Christ to St. Peter are absolutely universal and contain no restricting clause. Therefore, the power promised to him is subject to no limitations save those incidental to all authority, *i. e.*, it must be subject to the divine law and be conformed to the nature of the society in which it is exercised. Consequently the power of binding and loosing extends to every bond or obligation that may be imposed or removed by divine law, but since it is to be exercised in the Church, it extends only to persons and things subject to her authority. The power of Peter is measured by the power of the Church. The Church has no authority to change the teachings of Christ, to increase or diminish the number of Sacraments or to sever the bonds of a consummated marriage; neither was such authority promised to Peter. The Church has authority to define doctrines, to make or repeal

⁸ Matt. xviii, 18.

⁹ See below, p. 338.

laws, to inflict punishment, to constitute or remove pastors; the same authority was promised to Peter when Christ said: "*Whatsoever thou shalt bind, . . . whatsoever thou shalt loose.*" In fact, the Church has authority only in so far as it was conferred upon the Apostolic college, of which St. Peter was the head.

ART. V. PETER CONFIRMER OF THE BRETHREN

Thesis.—Primacy of universal jurisdiction in teaching and governing was promised to St. Peter as the one appointed to confirm his brethren

PROOF. On the night of the Last Supper Christ said to Peter: "*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, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.*"¹ On this occasion Our Lord was admonishing the Apostles that eternal happiness in Heaven is to be obtained only after many labors, sorrows, and temptations. Unceasing vigilance and special help from God are necessary, because Satan never wearies in his efforts to lead souls astray; in fact, he was even then seeking to try the Apostles, as he had long before sought to try the constancy of Job:² "*Behold Satan hath desired you, that he may sift you as wheat.*" As he had tempted the Lord, so now he would tempt the Apostles, and through

¹ Luke xxii, 28-32.

² Job i, 9-12.

them the whole Church;³ he would seek especially to weaken and destroy their faith, the very foundation of all spiritual life, but Christ has provided for this danger: "*Satan hath desired you all, but I have prayed for thee, Simon, that thy faith fail not.*"

PRIMACY IN TEACHING. The unconditional prayer of Christ for unfailing faith in His Apostle must produce the effect desired; the faith of Peter shall ever remain immune to all error. This is nothing less than a promise of infallibility made in the clearest terms. Satan seeks to tempt all the Apostles,—"*Satan hath desired you* [the plural, *Vos*],"—but Christ prays for Peter alone,—"*I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.*" Peter is then constituted the future guide for all in matters of faith, the supreme teacher in the Church: "*And thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren.*"⁴ It shall be the duty of St. Peter to confirm the other Apostles in the faith, and through them all the faithful for all time; but this constitutes

³ Temptation is aptly compared to the sifting of wheat. As the wheat is tossed and shaken in the sieve, the light particles of straw and chaff are caught up by the wind and carried away, while the heavier grains remain behind. In like manner, those who are truly virtuous and sound in faith remain unmoved by temptation, whereas the weak and vacillating fall away and are lost. Cfr. Cornelius à Lapide, "*Commentarium in Lucam,*" xxii, 31.

⁴ Interpreters do not agree in explaining the words "thou being once converted." Some take them to mean, "thou being converted to Me again after thy denial and fall." Others interpret them, "and thou in turn confirm thy brethren." But this question has no bearing on our matter, for in either case St. Peter is the one appointed to confirm his brethren.

the primacy of teaching authority for the whole Church.

The other Apostles, being themselves infallible, stood in no need of Peter's confirming power, but Christ was providing for His Church in later ages. The bishops of the Church were not to succeed the Apostles in their special prerogatives; they were not to enjoy the privilege of personal infallibility and would, therefore, need the strengthening power of Peter's faith handed down through his successors.

PRIMACY OF JURISDICTION. The primacy of teaching authority in the Church necessitates the primacy of jurisdiction. The Church founded by Christ is a kingdom of truth, in which unity of true faith must be preserved at all times until the end of the world; but such unity cannot be had nor preserved without proper laws and precepts binding on all. Therefore, he who holds the supreme authority as teacher, must also have the supreme power of ruling, *i. e.*, he must have the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church.⁵

COROLLARY. The parallelism between the words of Our Lord as recorded in Matthew xvi, 18, 19 and those recorded in Luke xxii, 31, 32 is immediately evident upon comparison. In St. Matthew the primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church is promised explicitly but in symbolic language. The primacy of teaching authority is implicitly contained in that of jurisdiction. In St. Luke the primacy of teaching au-

⁵ For the testimony of tradition in this matter, see pp. 334 sq.

thority is explicitly promised and in plain language, while the primacy of jurisdiction is only implied.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

OBJECTION I.—The temptations of Satan mentioned by Our Lord in the passage from St. Luke have reference to the time of the Passion, when, as Christ foretold, "*all you shall be scandalized in me.*"⁶ Hence there is no promise of infallibility or primacy of teaching authority.

ANSWER.—In the passage quoted there is question of temptations to which all the Apostles succumbed, and the fall of St. Peter was especially grievous. In the text from St. Luke it is distinctly foretold that St. Peter shall not only remain steadfast, but also confirm his brethren. Consequently there is no reference here to the time of the Passion, as the facts plainly show.

OBJECTION II.—St. Peter not only deserted Our Lord during His Passion, but even denied Him with an oath. How, then, can he be called the *rock* of the Church and the *confirmer* of his brethren?

ANSWER.—It is a disputed question whether St. Peter actually denied his faith in Christ on that occasion, or simply sinned against it by denying that he knew Our Lord.⁷ But even granting that he actually denied his faith, there is no difficulty to be explained, because at that time he was neither the *rock* of the Church nor the *confirmer* of his brethren. As yet these powers and dignities had only been promised to him. It was not until after the Resurrection of Christ that he was actually constituted head of the Church with universal power to rule and infallible authority to teach.

⁶ Matt. xxvi, 31.

⁷ Cf. Cornelius à Lapide, "Commentarium in Lucam," xxii, 31.

CHAPTER X

THE PRIMACY CONFERRED

The mere promises of Christ are amply sufficient to establish the fact of St. Peter's primacy over the Church, but we also have the words of Our Lord actually conferring this dignity and power upon him. Then we have the teaching of the Fathers to prove that our interpretation of these words is correct. These facts being established, two other questions call for consideration; *viz.*, the relation of St. Peter to the other Apostles, and the perpetuity of the primacy in the Church.

ART. I. INSTITUTION OF THE PRIMACY

§ 1. Peter Constituted Chief Pastor

Thesis.—The primacy of universal jurisdiction was conferred upon St. Peter when he was constituted supreme pastor in the Church

PROOF. After the Resurrection Our Lord appeared to His disciples on the shore of Lake Tiberias, and the following dialogue with St. Peter ensued: "*Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith*

THE PRIMACY OF PETER

*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 said to him the third time: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he had 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."*¹

With this threefold charge, Our Lord solemnly entrusted the care of His flock to St. Peter and thereby conferred upon him the primacy of universal jurisdiction in the Church (*a*) if the *lambs* and *sheep* represent the whole body of the faithful, and (*b*) if the pastoral office signifies the power of jurisdiction.

a) There can be no doubt that here, as elsewhere, the *sheep* are Christ's faithful,—those for whom the Good Shepherd gave His life: "*I am the good Shepherd. The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep. . . . I am the good Shepherd . . . and I lay down my life for my sheep. And other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.*"² When about to leave this *one fold* by ascending into heaven, Christ constituted Peter supreme pastor

¹ John xxi, 15-17. The Greek text for Christ's words of commission are: βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου,—ποιμαίνε τὰ προβάτια μου—βόσκει τὰ προβάτια μου.

² John x, 11-16; cfr. Jer. xxiii, 1 sq; Zach. xiii, 7.

in His stead to care for the whole flock: "*Feed my lambs; feed my sheep.*" No exceptions are made; Christ says *My lambs, My sheep*, and it matters not whether *lambs* and *sheep* represent the young and the old in years, the weak and the strong in faith, or laity and clergy; in any case the whole flock of Christ, including even the other Apostles, is clearly meant.

b) In depicting St. Peter as chief shepherd of the flock, Christ teaches that his powers and duties in regard to the faithful shall be those of a shepherd for the sheep committed to his care. He shall guide them into suitable pastures and restrain them from things hurtful; he shall protect them from ravening wolves, from savage dogs, and lurking thieves; he shall care for the weak and bring back those strayed from the fold. If need be, he shall appoint other pastors subject to his own authority, or remove them when the good of the flock demands it.³

What more picturesque symbol could be found for the supreme ruling authority in the Church? Translating the imagery into plain language shows St. Peter endowed with supreme power to rule and guide the faithful in all things pertaining to their eternal salvation. He has authority to teach the universal Church, to define doctrines to be accepted as true and wholesome or rejected as false and injurious. He has the power to make laws for the whole Church, or for any part of it, and to dispense or repeal them. He has

³ Cfr. Jer. xxiii, 1 sq; Ezech. xxiv, 1 sq; 2 Kings v, 1 sq.; John x, 11 sq.

authority to take cognizance of all things pertaining to faith and morals at any time and throughout the entire Church. He has universal power to judge, absolve, punish, reprove, and correct. He has authority to constitute pastors for any and all parts of the Church, and to limit their jurisdiction in regard to persons, places, and things, or, if need be, to remove them from office. The words are few, "*Feed my lambs, feed my sheep,*" but they are the words of God; their power is divine.⁴

§ 2. *Objections Considered*

OBJECTION I.—Feeding is simply providing food; hence when Christ said, "*Feed my sheep,*" He meant that St. Peter should provide the faithful with the spiritual food of doctrine by preaching the Gospel to them,—a mission given equally to all the Apostles: "*Going therefore, teach all nations.*"¹ There is no proof for a primacy of jurisdiction conferred upon St. Peter in this passage.

ANSWER.—Neither the English nor the Latin version brings out the full meaning of our Lord in this passage. The Greek text has βόσκει (*feed*) and ποιμαίνει (*shepherd*). Hence Moffatt, a non-Catholic, correctly translates: "*Feed my lambs, . . . be shepherd to my sheep, . . . feed my sheep.*"² Feeding the flock is only part of St. Peter's duty; he must fulfill all the duties of a shep-

⁴ Murray, "De Ecclesia Christi," Disp. xviii, n. 69.

¹ Matt. xviii, 19.

² James Moffatt, "Translation of the New Testament."

herd toward his flock: "Shepherd my sheep." In all ancient literature, whether sacred or profane, ποιμαίνειν taken figuratively means to rule as king, *i. e.*, with supreme authority. Homer often calls kings ποιμένες λαῶν (*pastors of the people*). The Psalmist says: "The Lord ruleth me (ποιμαίνει με),³ and in the Apocalypse it is said that Christ shall rule (ποιμανεῖ) with a rod of iron.⁴ Arnold, a non-Catholic, says: "This term of feeding as a shepherd feeds his flock, is one of the oldest and most universal metaphors to express a supreme and at the same time a beneficent government."⁵

OBJECTION II.—On this occasion Our Lord was simply restoring to St. Peter the Apostolic dignity and office lost by his denial on the eve of the Passion. The triple profession of love was to atone for the threefold denial.

ANSWER.—There is not the slightest indication anywhere in Scripture that St. Peter lost the Apostolic office on account of his denial, and even had he lost it, he must have received it anew on the very day of the Resurrection, when Our Lord said to him as to the other Apostles: "As the Father hath sent me I also send you."⁶ The threefold profession of love was evidently intended to remind St. Peter of his fall and give him the opportunity to make public reparation. St.

³ Psalm xxii, 1.

⁴ Apoc. xix, 15.

⁵ Thomas Arnold, "Fragment on the Church," p. 26.

⁶ John xx, 21.

Peter must have understood it in this light, because he was grieved when Christ asked him the third time: "Lovest thou me?" But this fact has no bearing on the nature of the powers conferred; it would serve to warn him of the manner in which they should be exercised, for as St. Augustine remarks: "What else mean the words, 'Lovest thou me? Feed my sheep,' than if it were said, If thou lovest me, think not of feeding thyself, but feed my sheep as mine, and not as thine own; seek my glory in them, and not thine own; my dominion, and not thine; my gain, not thine."⁷

OBJECTION III.—St. Paul evidently did not recognize in St. Peter any superiority, such as the primacy of jurisdiction would have conferred upon him, otherwise he would not have rebuked him as he did at Antioch: "But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed."⁸

ANSWER.—The same argument would force us to deny that Herod was king for we read that John the Baptist rebuked him to his face. Superiors can claim no exemption from just reproof on the part of a subject, provided that due respect be observed. Hence St. Paul's rebuke to St. Peter at Antioch proves nothing against the primacy; in fact, it proves rather that St. Paul did recognize some sort of superiority in St. Peter. Some false brethren of Jewish origin had been trying to force all Christians to observe the Mosaic Law. St.

⁷ "Tractatus in S. Joannem," cxxiii, 5; P. L., 35, 1967.

⁸ Gal. ii, 11.

Paul was their great opponent in this matter, and for this reason they wished to minimize his authority. It seems that they had even denied that he was an Apostle of equal standing with the rest. St. Paul wrote to the Galatians to warn them against these Judaizers and proves that he is a true Apostle and recognized as such by Peter, James, and John, whom the Judaizers were holding up as pillars of the Church. He then goes on to show how he had constantly opposed those "*who came in privately to spy our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus that they might bring us into servitude [to the Mosaic Law].*" He had even gone so far as to withstand Peter to his face when he was acting imprudently in this matter at Antioch. St. Paul's whole line of argument indicates that his rebuke to St. Peter was something out of the ordinary and therefore presupposed some sort of superiority on the part of St. Peter. This superiority, as just proved, consisted in his primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church.

ART. II. THE TESTIMONY OF TRADITION

It is to be expected that a doctrine so clearly set forth in S. Scripture as that of St. Peter's primacy will find frequent mention in the writings of the Fathers. This expectation is fully justified by facts. Implicit references are innumerable, since all the Fathers and Councils of the Church from the very earliest times teach that the Roman Pontiff holds supreme jurisdiction in the Church, because he is the legitimate successor of

St. Peter. Such implicit testimony usually has more weight than direct statements, because only doctrines admitted as certain by all can be adduced in proof of other doctrines without the formality of proof for their own truth. Many such implicit arguments will be found in the chapter on the Roman Pontiff: ¹ For the sake of brevity only a few of the more explicit testimonies from the Eastern and Western Churches will be cited here.

I. EASTERN CHURCH. a) ORIGEN: "When the chief care of the sheep was being committed to Peter, and the Church was being founded upon him as the foundation, the profession of no other virtue than charity was demanded of him." ²

b) ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM: "He said unto him; *Feed my sheep.* And why, having passed by the others, doth He speak with Peter on these matters? He was the chosen one of the Apostles, the mouthpiece of the disciples, the leader of the band; on this account also Paul went up upon a time to inquire of him rather than the others. And at the same time to show him that he must now be of good cheer, since the denial was done away, Jesus putteth into his hands the chief authority among the brethren. . . . He said: If thou lovest Me, preside over My brethren. . . . And if any one should say: How then did James receive the chair at Jerusalem?—I would make reply, that He appointed Peter teacher, not of the chair but of the world. . . .

¹ See below pp. 351 sq.

² "In Epist. ad Romanos," i, 5; P. G., 14, 1053.

He was entrusted with the chief authority over the brethren." ³

c) ST. EPHREM SYRUS: "Our Lord selected Simon Peter, constituted him prince of the Apostles, the foundation of His holy Church and her firm support. He made him head of the Apostles and commanded him to feed His flock and teach laws for the preservation of pure doctrine." ⁴

d) GREEK LITURGY. In the Greek Liturgy St. Peter is often referred to as occupying the chief throne among the Apostles (ὁ πρωτόθρονος τῶν ἀποστόλων), the supreme head of the Apostles (ὁ κορυψαιότατος τῶν ἀποστόλων) and the one presiding over them (προέδρος τῶν ἀποστόλων).⁵

e) SYRIAC LITURGY: "Christ, the Head-Shepherd, stayed thee up, O Peter, as ruler of the faithful, and entrusted thee with the management of His flock." ⁶

f) SYRO-CHALDAIC LITURGY: "Here is Simon, whom the Lord thrice called upon, saying, Feed my rams and my gentle sheep. I entrust thee with the keys of my spiritual treasury, that thou mayest bind and loose on earth and in Heaven. I will install thee vicar of the Heavenly Kingdom; rule justly and govern the children of thy household the Church." ⁷

II. WESTERN CHURCH. a) ST. CYRIAN: "Peter, whom the Lord chose first and upon whom He built

³ "Hom., in Joannem," lxxxviii, I, 2; P. G., 59, 478.*

⁴ "De Abraham Kidnuaia," Hymn, v (Lamy, I, 75).

⁵ Nilles, "Kalendarium Manuale," I, 72, 194.

⁶ Benni, "Tradition of the Syriac Church of Antioch," p. 57.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 50.

His Church, when Paul disputed with him about circumcision, did not claim anything insolently, nor did he arrogantly assume anything so as to say that he held the primacy and ought to be obeyed by novices." ⁸ In this passage St. Cyrian praises St. Peter for his humility and meekness in not *arrogantly* asserting his power of primacy, as he might have done.

b) MARIUS VICTORINUS: "After three years, says Paul, I came to Jerusalem. He then gives the reason: To see Peter! For if the foundation of the Church was placed in Peter, as the Gospel says, and this was known to Paul by revelation, he realized that he ought to visit the one to whom Christ had given such great authority." ⁹

c) AMBROSIASTER: "Paul's desire to see Peter was praiseworthy because Peter was the first among the Apostles and the one to whom the Saviour had committed the care of the churches." ¹⁰

d) ST. LEO THE GREAT: "Peter alone, out of the whole world, was selected to preside over the calling of all nations, and was placed over all the Apostles and all parts of the Church, so that, although there are many priests and pastors among the people of God, Peter really rules those whom Christ primarily rules." ¹¹

⁸ "Epis. ad Quintum," 3; P. L., 4, 410.

⁹ "In Galatas," I, 18; P. L., 8, 1155.

¹⁰ An ancient commentary formerly attributed to St. Ambrose, hence the unknown author is designated "Ambrosiaster." (P. L., 17, 344.)

¹¹ "Sermon.," IV; P. L., 54, 149.

ART. III. ST. PETER AND THE OTHER APOSTLES

APOSTLES SUBJECT TO PETER. St. Peter alone was constituted the foundation of the Church and supreme pastor of the flock. He alone was appointed to confirm the brethren, and to him alone were given the keys of the kingdom. He was therefore constituted supreme ruler of the whole Church and of its every part; all the faithful, individually and collectively, were subjected to his authority. Consequently St. Peter possessed real power of jurisdiction over the other Apostles, both as individuals and as members of the Apostolic college.

When speaking to all the Apostles as a body, Christ said: "*All power is given to me in heaven and on earth, going therefore, teach ye all nations. . . . As the Father hath sent me I also send 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.*"¹ These words, taken by themselves, would indicate that equal powers were given to all the Apostles, and that in consequence St. Peter enjoyed no preëminence of authority over the rest. But, as noted before, all authority must be exercised according to the constitution of the society for which it is given. The power conferred upon the Apostles was to be exercised in the Church instituted by Christ as a kingdom with St. Peter as supreme ruler. It is evident, then, that all power received by the other Apostles was sub-

¹ Matt. xxviii, 18, 19; John xx, 21; Matt. xviii, 18.

ject to the authority of St. Peter and to be exercised under his direction, *i. e.*, St. Peter had real jurisdiction, both direct and indirect, over the other Apostles.

DIRECT JURISDICTION. All the faithful were committed to the teaching and governing power of St. Peter, when Christ said to him: "*Feed my lambs; feed my sheep.*" The Apostles were included with the rest of the faithful, since Christ made no exception; in fact, an exception for the Apostles is precluded by the very nature of their office. The Apostles constituted an organized governing body, of which St. Peter was the divinely appointed head; consequently they were directly subject to him as members of the Church and also as members of the Apostolic body. But the Apostles, being personally infallible, confirmed in grace and endowed with special knowledge by the Holy Ghost, could neither err against faith nor fail seriously in regard to charity or prudence; hence there was but little need for the exercise of any authority over them on the part of St. Peter. Such authority was needed only for extraordinary affairs such as, for instance, the election of St. Matthias, the calling of a council or the enactment of disciplinary regulations for the whole Church.

INDIRECT JURISDICTION. The Apostles were also indirectly subject to St. Peter because of his direct jurisdiction over those immediately subject to them. In virtue of their office, received directly from Christ, the Apostles had equal authority to preach the Gospel and to establish churches in any part of the world, but

orderly progress and discipline in the Church demanded that no Apostle should interfere with, or exercise jurisdiction over, a church established by another Apostle. For this reason St. Paul writes to the Romans that he had long desired to preach the Gospel to them as to other nations, but that he had been restrained hitherto because it was his custom not to preach "*where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation.*"² Peter alone, as supreme pastor, was privileged to exercise jurisdiction over all churches throughout the world. It was his special prerogative to make laws for all the faithful, even against the will of the Apostle who labored among them. He could also annul any law or regulation made by the other Apostles for their respective churches.

COROLLARY. St. Peter, as an Apostle, was in no way superior to the other Apostles. In virtue of the Apostolic office, all possessed the same power of Orders and the same authority to teach and govern. For this reason the Fathers often say that the Apostles enjoyed equal powers; *e. g.*, St. Cyprian says: "Assuredly the rest of the Apostles were also the same as Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honor and power."³ St. Peter exercised supreme jurisdiction because he was more than an Apostle; he was also the head of the Church, as St. Cyprian explains in the passage from which the above words are quoted: "Although to all the Apostles, after the Resurrection,

² Rom. I, 11 sq.; xv, 20.

³ "De Unitate Ecclesiae," 4; P. L., 4, 449.

Christ gives an equal power, . . . yet that He might set forth unity, He arranges by His authority the origin of that unity as beginning from one [St. Peter]."

ART. IV. THE PRIMACY A PERMANENT INSTITUTION

Protestant scholars today generally admit that St. Peter enjoyed a certain preëminence of honor; some even admit a primacy of jurisdiction; but practically all agree that whatever privileges or powers he possessed were strictly personal and, therefore, not to be perpetuated by a line of succession. "Protestants generally," says a non-Catholic author, "even when they have admitted the individual primacy of Peter, have denied that these powers and privileges have been continued in his successors, the Bishops of Rome. The usual assertion and favorite contention of Protestants is that the papacy originated in the Middle Ages and was the result of the worldly ambition and love of power on the part of certain designing popes. When the stern light of history, thrown upon the medieval period, has forced these controversialists to seek a more distant beginning for the papacy, they have hit upon some earlier Pope, as Gregory the Great, Leo I, or Victor, as the originator of the Roman supremacy."¹

Lightfoot even admits that the first steps toward papal domination are found in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, towards the end of the first century.² But whatever the date of its origin, the

¹ Edmund S. Middleton, "Unity and Rome," p. 62.

² J. B. Lightfoot, "St. Clement of Rome," Vol. I, p. 70.

primacy found in the Church today, in the opinion of Protestants, is a mere human institution that owes its existence chiefly to the importance which attached to the Church of Rome on account of its location in the capital of the Empire.

Eastern schismatics admit a primacy of honor transmitted to the successors of St. Peter, but they seem to hold that this primacy was transferred to Constantinople when that city became the capital of the Roman Empire.³ Anglicans of the High Church party also admit a primacy of honor perpetuated to an extent in the successors of St. Peter; a few of the more advanced High Churchmen even admit a primacy of jurisdiction. Opposed to these theories is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, expressed in the following thesis:

Thesis.—St. Peter's primacy of universal jurisdiction over the Church is perpetuated in his successors according to divine institution

This doctrine is a dogma of faith, defined by the Vatican Council in the following words: "If any one should deny that it is by the institution of Christ the Lord, or by divine right, that blessed Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the primacy over the universal Church, . . . let him be anathema."⁴

It is here maintained that the primacy of universal jurisdiction conferred upon St. Peter was not a personal

³ D'Alès, "Dictionnaire Apologétique," Vol. II, col. 365.

⁴ Denzinger, n. 1825.

privilege, such as the power of working miracles, or freedom from sin, but a permanent institution, necessary for the very existence of the Church. Therefore, the primacy with all its powers and privileges is transmitted to the successors of St. Peter, who form an unbroken line of supreme pastors to rule the Church in its continued existence as the *one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic* Church founded by Christ.

PROOF. The various symbols used by Our Lord to designate the powers conferred upon St. Peter, clearly indicate their nature and the purpose for which they were conferred, thus proving also that their continued existence in the Church is a necessity.

a) St. Peter was constituted the rock foundation of the Church in order to give it unity and strength, and to secure it against the powers of darkness and the gates of hell in all ages, "*even to the consummation of the world.*" Therefore, the power and authority that made St. Peter the *rock* of the Church must remain intact for all time; his primacy of jurisdiction must be perpetuated in the only possible way, *i. e.*, by transmission through a continuous line of successors. No doubt, Our Lord could have provided some other means to preserve the unity of His Church and secure it against all foes, but we are not concerned with what He *could* have done; we wish to know what He *actually did*, and the only answer is that He provided for the continued existence of the Church by establishing a primacy of jurisdiction. Therefore, such a primacy is necessary by divine institution.

b) Through the power of the keys, St. Peter became custodian of the Church and all its spiritual treasures; the power to bind and loose constituted him supreme law-giver and judge in the Church. Such powers are never given for the benefit of him who exercises them, but for those over whom he rules; therefore, the duration of Peter's primacy is to be measured, not by the brief span of his mortal life, but by the ever lengthening centuries of the Church's existence. The Church must ever have a custodian, a supreme law-giver and judge, if she is to continue as Christ founded her.

The primacy was not a personal privilege granted to St. Peter as a reward for his outspoken professions of faith and love, as some would have it. To institute an office is one thing; to confer that office upon one person rather than another is quite a different thing. St. Peter's faith and love, no doubt, merited for him the honor of being chosen supreme pastor of the Church, but they contributed nothing to the institution of the office itself.

c) The permanent character of the primacy is also deduced from the teaching authority committed to St. Peter with the injunction to *confirm* his brethren. In conferring this power, Christ was undoubtedly looking to the future, when the successors of the Apostles, lacking the gift of personal infallibility, would stand in need of such a guiding power in the Church to prevent their being "*carried about by every wind of doctrine; ever learning but never attaining to the knowledge of*

truth."⁵ The wisdom of Christ in establishing such an authority is readily seen by comparing the unity of faith in the Church with the Babel of confusion that reigns outside.

⁵ Eph. iv, 14; 2 Tim. iii, 7.

THE ROMAN PONTIFF

CHAPTER XI

SUCCESSORS OF ST. PETER

Since the primacy of St. Peter is a permanent institution, perpetuated in the Church by a line of legitimate successors, the question naturally arises: Who are those successors? The answer is stated in the form of a thesis.

ART. I. THE DOCTRINE AND ITS PROOFS

Thesis.—The Roman Pontiff is the legitimate successor of St. Peter in his primacy of universal jurisdiction over the Church

DOCTRINE DEFINED. The doctrine set forth in the thesis has been defined as a dogma of faith by the Vatican Council: "If any one should deny . . . that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of the blessed Peter in his primacy; let him be anathema."¹ And again: "Peter the Prince and Chief of the Apostles . . . lives, presides, and judges to this day and always in his successors, the bishops of the Holy See of

¹ Denzinger, n. 1825.

THE ROMAN PONTIFF

347

Rome, which was founded by him and consecrated by his blood. Hence, whosoever succeeds to Peter in this See, does by the institution of Christ himself obtain the Primacy of Peter over the whole Church."²

Fifteen hundred years before this, Pope Damasus I had defined the same doctrine. In the year 382 he solemnly decreed that "the holy Roman Church obtained the primacy, not by decrees of councils, but by the words of the Lord and Saviour: *Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church.*"³

NATURE OF PROOFS. Whether or not the bishop of Rome is the legitimate successor of St. Peter is a purely historical question that must be established in the same manner as every other historical fact, *i. e.*, by the testimony of competent witnesses and by a critical examination of everything connected with it. Therefore it is necessary (1) to adduce competent witnesses sufficient to establish the fact, and (2) to consider the objections urged against it.

It is taken for granted that St. Peter came to Rome, where he established his episcopal see and gave his life for the faith. These facts are now admitted by all, but the truth of our thesis does not depend upon them. Christ could have personally designated the bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter, or He could have left it to St. Peter to designate a line of succession. In

² Denzinger, n. 1824.

³ This decree, first made by Damasus I, was afterwards repeated by Gelasius I, in 495. (See Denzinger, n. 163; P. L., 59, 159.)

either case the bishop of Rome, being designated as such, would have become the lawful successor of St. Peter with all his powers of jurisdiction, even though St. Peter had never set foot within the Eternal City.

As a matter of interest, however, it may be mentioned that all scholars of reputation, both Catholic and non-Catholic, admit that St. Peter came to Rome and died there about the year 67. It will be sufficient to quote the eminent archeologist, Rodolfo Lanciani: "For the archeologist the presence of SS. Peter and Paul in Rome are facts established beyond the shadow of doubt by purely monumental evidence. There was a time when persons belonging to different creeds made it almost a case of conscience to affirm or deny *a priori* these facts according to their acceptance or rejection of the tradition of any particular church. This state of feeling is a matter of the past, at least for those who have followed the progress of recent discoveries and of critical literature."⁴

THE ARGUMENT STATED. Since the successors of St. Peter are the supreme pastors in the Church with jurisdiction over bishops, priests, and people in every part of the world, their identity must have been a matter of common knowledge to all in every age. No organized society, as least none publicly known and operating in the light of day, can be ignorant of its own organization and of the official who exercises its supreme power. Therefore, whoever has been recognized at all times by the whole Church as supreme

⁴ Rodolfo Lanciani, "Pagan and Christian Rome," p. 123.

pastor, must be the legitimate successor of that first pastor, St. Peter. But the bishop of Rome, and he alone, has been recognized at all times by the universal Church as its supreme head on earth. Therefore the bishop of Rome is the legitimate and only successor of St. Peter and rules the Church by divine authority.

In order to substantiate the fact of universal recognition of the bishop of Rome as supreme head of the Church, it is necessary to consider the first five or six centuries only. Even the most pronounced enemies of the Roman Primacy freely admit that the bishop of Rome has been universally recognized as head of the Church in the West since the sixth century, and perhaps even since the fifth. They also admit that the idea of the Primacy was forming in the Church even before that date, but maintain that it was entirely unknown in the first centuries and was never accepted in the East, except, perhaps, as a primacy of mere honor.

It will be sufficient, then, to cite a few of the innumerable witnesses at hand to prove that both East and West recognized in the bishop of Rome a primacy of real jurisdiction over the whole Church, and this not from the third or fourth century only, but from the very days of SS. Peter and Paul in Rome. These witnesses will be arranged by centuries, beginning with the fifth and going back to the first. Brevity is sacrificed for accuracy by quoting more at length than is customary in order to show that the sense of a writer has not been perverted by taking his words out of

their context. Brief notices of councils and other historical events are added to bring out the exact values of the testimony cited.

The wealth of material in this matter and its real evidential value can be appreciated only by an extended study of the literature of those ages. No amount of quoting from authors can do justice to the question. The voluminous correspondence that passed between the bishops of Rome on the one hand, and the bishops and emperors of the East on the other, seldom mentions the primacy of Rome directly; this fact was admitted by all, and other questions are discussed on that basis. Even a casual perusal of the varied correspondence brings this fact home with striking force; but from the nature of the case, it is often impossible to select any single passage that will even partially reveal this constantly underlying faith in the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

Witnesses are selected largely from the Eastern Church, and for two reasons: first, because of the persistent claim that the Eastern Church never recognized a primacy of jurisdiction in the Church of Rome, and, secondly, because any authority exercised over the Eastern Church by the Roman Pontiff must be ascribed to his primacy over the universal Church. The Pope, as is well known, exercises a multiple authority in his various capacities as bishop of Rome, primate of Italy, patriarch of the West, and supreme pastor of the whole Church. Authority exercised over a church of the West might, at times, be ascribed to his power as patriarch, but this cannot be the case in the East, where he possesses no authority except that of supreme pastor of the universal Church.

ART. II. THE TESTIMONY OF HISTORY

§ 1. *Witnesses from the Fifth Century*

I. FLAVIAN OF CONSTANTINOPLE. Eutyches, archimandrite of a monastery outside the walls of Constantinople, was excommunicated and deposed by Flavian. He appealed to Rome and accused Flavian of condemning him after he had made an appeal. Flavian also wrote the Pope, Leo the Great, as follows: "Deign to confirm by your letters the deposition canonically made. . . . The affair needs only aid and pressure on your part to bring peace and tranquillity at once through your prudence. By the help of God, through your letters, the heresy which has arisen and the tumult which it has caused will be easily ended. The council, which reports say is to be called, will also be forestalled and disturbance to all churches throughout the world prevented."¹

The fact that Eutyches appealed to Rome proves that the Pope had an acknowledged right to interfere in matters pertaining to the Eastern Church. When Leo rebuked Flavian for condemning Eutyches after he had appealed his case to Rome, Flavian did not exculpate himself by saying that Leo had no authority to interpose in the matter, but simply explained that Eutyches had misrepresented the case by stating that

¹"Epist. ad Leonem"; P. L., 54, 747.

Correspondence between Popes and Eastern Bishops and Emperors to prove Primacy of Pope

his condemnation had taken place after appeal to Rome, which was not true. It was on this occasion that Flavian wrote the words quoted above, openly acknowledging supreme power of jurisdiction in the bishop of Rome, because without such power letters from him could not have ended the heresy and even forestalled a council.

II. COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON. Eutyches having lost his case in Rome, now turned to the civil power for assistance. The Emperor Theodosius yielded to his entreaties and called a council to meet at Ephesus in 449. By command of the Emperor, Dioscorus patriarch of Alexandria, presided, but Leo's letter to the council was not read, the canons of the Church were disregarded, and the whole proceedings were carried out in such a high-handed manner that the Pope dubbed it the *Robber Council*, and annulled all its acts. This fact alone proves the recognized power of the Pope over the Eastern Church, but the sequel is still more convincing.

In 451 another council of about six hundred Eastern bishops convened at Chalcedon, to correct the evils caused by the Robber Council of Ephesus. When the legates sent by Pope Leo saw Dioscorus sitting in the council, one of them, Paschasius by name, arose and addressed the bishops in these words: "We hold in our hands letters from that most blessed and Apostolic man, the Pope of Rome, who is head of all the churches. His Apostolic Excellency commands by these letters that Dioscorus shall not have a seat in the council and

shall only be admitted for a hearing. It is necessary that these instructions be carried out." Then turning to the imperial officers, he continued: "Your Excellencies will order this man to leave, or we go out." When asked for the reason of this action, Lucentius, another legate, replied: "Because he has dared to hold a council without authority from the Apostolic See, a thing that was never done before, and is not lawful to be done."²

Dioscorus was ejected from the council, his case was heard, and sentence pronounced against him in these words: "Leo, the most holy and blessed Archbishop of the great and elder Rome, through us and through this holy Synod, together with the thrice blessed and most praiseworthy Apostle Peter, who is the rock and support of the Catholic Church and the foundation of true faith, has stripped Dioscorus of his episcopal dignity, and also removed him from all priestly ministrations."³

At the close of the council, the bishops sent the *Acts* to Pope Leo for confirmation. In the accompanying letter they said: "If Christ promised to be in the midst of two or three gathered together in His name, what should we not expect when five hundred and twenty bishops are assembled, . . . especially when thou didst preside as head over its members. This thou didst in those who represented thee. . . . We have brought the whole contents of what we have done

² Mansi, t. vi, coll. 579-582.

³ Mansi, t. vi, col. 1047.

to thy knowledge, and have communicated it to thee for confirmation and assent." ⁴

Comments on the transactions just described are superfluous; they speak for themselves, explicitly acknowledging supreme power of jurisdiction in the bishop of Rome. Words could not be plainer, and they express the unanimous belief of more than five hundred Eastern bishops!

III. THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS. Pope Celestine condemned the heretic Nestorius and deposed him from the See of Constantinople. Execution of the sentence was entrusted to St. Cyril of Alexandria in these words: "Taking to yourself the authority of our See, and acting in our stead, you will execute the sentence strictly according to its provisions; *viz.*, He shall condemn his evil teachings in writing within ten days, . . . or failing this, Your Holiness will immediately look to the good of his church and let it know that he must be entirely removed from our body." ⁵

Nestorius, after the usual manner of heretics, appealed to the civil authorities, and Theodosius, wishing to favor him, called a council, which met at Ephesus in 431. St. Cyril presided. After the council had opened, legates arrived from Rome with a letter from Pope Celestine, saying: "In our solicitude we have sent the holy brethren, our fellow-ministers, . . . Bishop Arcadius, Bishop Projectus and the Presbyter Philip, to take part in the proceedings and to carry

⁴ Migne, P. L., 54, 959 sq.

⁵ "Epist. ad Cyrillum Alexand."; P. L., 50, 463.

out what we have already decreed. We do not doubt that Your Holiness will give assent thereunto." ⁶

In the second session of the council Philip addressed the bishops as follows: "No one doubts, in fact it has been known in all ages, that the most holy and most blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the pillar of faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys to the kingdom from Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind. The power of binding and loosing sins was also given to him, who even today and ever lives and judges in his successors. Our holy and most blessed Pope, Bishop Celestine, holding the place of this Peter in due order of succession, has sent us to represent him in this holy synod." ⁷

After the three citations demanded by canon law, the council proceeded to pass sentence of deposition against Nestorius: "We come to the sorrowful sentence against him in accordance with the sacred canons, being constrained of necessity by the letter of the most holy Father and fellow minister Celestine, bishop of the Roman Church. . . . Wherefore, let Nestorius understand that he is separated from communion in the priesthood of the Catholic Church." ⁸

Here again two hundred bishops of the Eastern Church acknowledge by word and act the supreme jurisdiction of Rome. Pope Celestine excommunicated

⁶ "Epist. ad Synodum Ephesinam"; P. L., 50, 511.

⁷ Mansi, t. iv, col. 1295.

⁸ Mansi, t. iv, coll. 1211, 1295.

and deposed Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, at that time capital of the Empire; he commissioned St. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, to execute the sentence. He sent legates to the council with letters directing the bishops to confirm what he had decreed, yet there was not a word of protest voiced in the council. On the contrary, the bishops acknowledged his rights and powers in the matter; they openly stated that they were constrained,—*necessarily* constrained,—by Celestine's letter to proceed against Nestorius. In the second session of the council, the Pope's legate stated that St. Peter's position as head of the Church was known to all, and that Celestine, being his legitimate successor, occupied the same position, yet no one denied or questioned the statement. A more explicit acknowledgment of Rome's supremacy could not be made.

§ 2. Witnesses from the Fourth Century

I. POPE DAMASUS I (366–384). The convictions of Pope Damasus in this matter are evident from his decree of 382: "The Church of Rome was not raised above the other churches by any synodical decree, but received the primacy by virtue of the words of Our Lord and Saviour recorded in the Gospel: *Thou art Peter, etc.*"¹ He exercised this supremacy over East and West alike. He condemned Eustatius and Apollinaris, both heretics of the East; he deposed Maximus

¹ Denzinger, n. 163; P. L., 59, 159.

the Cynic from the See of Constantinople and confirmed the election of Nectarius in his stead.² When a number of Eastern bishops petitioned him to depose Timothy, also an Eastern bishop, he replied: "It is indeed a great honor to yourselves that you give due reverence to the Apostolic See. . . . I wish to inform you, brethren, that we have already deposed Timothy, the profane disciple of Apollinaris, and condemned his impious doctrine."³ St. Jerome also informs us that matters from every part of the Church were brought to Pope Damasus for adjudication. He says: "Several years ago, while I was assisting Damasus, bishop of the City of Rome, in the office of the Church archives, I used to reply to synodical matters referred both from the East and from the West."⁴

II. ST. JEROME. In 376 St. Jerome himself consulted Pope Damasus concerning a matter pertaining to the church in Antioch, where a schism was in progress, with three claimants for the episcopal throne. He says: "The church here is divided into three parties, each trying to draw me to their side. . . . But I cry out: I hold with the one who is in union with the chair of Peter. Melitius, Vitalis, and Paulinus all claim to be in union with you. If only one of them claimed this, I could believe him, but as it is, two at least, and perhaps all of them, are lying.

² Jaffé, "Regist. Episcoporum," 237, 238.

³ Pope Damasus, "Epist. ad Episcopos Orientis"; P. L., 13, 370.

⁴ "Epist. ad Ageruchiam"; P. L., 22, 1952.

Therefore, I beseech Your Blessedness . . . to inform me by letter with whom I am to communicate here in Syria."⁵

These words of St. Jerome leave no doubt that union with the See of Rome and approbation by the Roman Pontiff were considered necessary at Antioch, itself a patriarchal see that claimed St. Peter as its founder. If the primacy of Rome be denied, there is no reason why Antioch should have considered union with her any more important than union with the other patriarchal sees.

III. ST. BASIL THE GREAT. Appeal was also made to Pope Damasus from the East by St. Basil the Great of Cappadocia. In 371 he wrote to Damasus describing the sad condition of the Church in those parts, and implored his assistance: "I have looked upon the visit of Your Mercifulness as the only possible solution of our difficulties. Ever in the past have I been consoled by your extraordinary affection; and for a short time my heart was cheered by the gratifying report that we shall be visited by you. But as I was disappointed, I have been constrained to beseech you by letter to be moved to help us. . . . In this I am by no means making any novel request, but am only asking what has been customary."⁶

In another letter on the same subject, St. Basil says: "Of these things I implore you to take due heed. This will be the case if you will consent to write to all the

⁵ "Epist. ad Damasum"; P. L., 22, 359.

⁶ "Epist. ad Damasum"; P. G., 32, 434.*

churches of the East, that those who have perverted these doctrines are in communion with you if they amend, but that if they contentiously determine to abide by their innovations, you are separated from them."⁷ Even stronger words are found in a letter to St. Athanasius: "It has seemed to me to be desirable to send a letter of the Bishop of Rome, begging him to examine our condition, and since there are difficulties in the way of representatives being sent from the West by a general synodical decree, to advise him to exercise his own personal authority in the matter by choosing suitable persons to sustain the labors of a journey,—suitable too, by gentleness and firmness of character to correct the unruly amongst us."⁸

IV. THE CASE OF EUSTATIUS. The history of this case proves the authority of the Roman Pontiff over the Eastern Churches. Eustatius, bishop of Sebaste in Asia Minor, was deposed by the Synod of Melitene. He immediately appealed Pope Liberius, who reversed the decision and ordered his reinstatement. When he appeared with the Pope's letter at the Synod of Tyana, he was restored to his see without further question. This is evident from a letter of St. Basil written to Liberius's successor, Pope Damasus, regarding Eustatius: "What propositions were made to him by Liberius, and to what he agreed, I am ignorant. I only know that he brought a letter restoring him, which

⁷ "Epist. ad Damasum"; P. G., 32, 982.*

⁸ St. Basil the Great, "Epist. ad Athanasium"; P. G., 32, 431.*

he showed to the synod of Tyana and was restored to his see."⁹

V. COUNCIL OF SARDICA (343 or 344). Among the decrees passed at Sardica in Moesia, several deal with the trial and deposition of bishops and with the procedure in case of appeal to the Bishop of Rome. One of these reads: "If judgment has gone against a bishop in any case, and he thinks that he has a good case, in order that the question may be reopened, let us, if it be your pleasure, honor the memory of St. Peter, the Apostle, and let those who tried the case write to Julius, the Bishop of Rome, and if he shall judge that the case should be retried, let that be done, and let him appoint judges."¹⁰

Another decree provides that in case a bishop, condemned in this second trial, should appeal to Rome, no one shall be consecrated in his stead, until the bishop of Rome has decided the case: "When any bishop has been deposed by the judgment of those bishops who have sees in neighboring places, and he shall announce that his case is to be examined in the city of Rome,—no other bishop shall in any wise be ordained to his see after the appeal of him who is apparently deposed, unless the case shall have been determined in the judgment of the Roman bishop."¹¹

These decrees explicitly acknowledge the right of any bishop to appeal his case to the supreme tribunal

⁹ St. Basil the Great, "Epist. ad Damasum"; P. G., 32, 979.*

¹⁰ Mansi, t. iii, col. 32.*

¹¹ Mansi, t. iii, col. 32.*

of the Roman Pontiff, and in case he does so, any sentence of deposition pronounced against him shall be held in abeyance,—he is only *apparently deposed*,—until the sentence has been ratified in Rome. For this reason no one is to be ordained to his see in the meantime.

VI. POPE JULIUS I (337–352). The Eusebian party of Arians unjustly brought about the deposition and exile of St. Athanasius and Marcellus in 336. They then met at Antioch and passed decrees to prevent their return. Pope Julius severely condemned this action and wrote as follows: "Even if they were guilty of crime, as you say, judgment should have been given according to the canons of the Church, not in the manner in which you acted. You should have written to us first of all, that we might decide what was just. . . . Above all, why was nothing written to us from the church at Alexandria? Do you not know that it is the custom to write us first of all, so that justice may be dispensed from here? If any suspicion attached to the bishop of that city, it should have been notified to this church. But they have proceeded in the matter without notifying us; . . . but that was a strange procedure, a novel invention."¹²

The Pope's action in this matter, and even the tone of his letter, shows that the bishop of Rome possessed a recognized authority of long standing in the Eastern Church; acting without his authority was a strange and novel proceeding. Nor was this a mere assump-

¹² Pope Julius I, "Epist. ad Antiochenos"; P. L., 8, 906.

tion on the part of Julius, as is evident from the fact that St. Athanasius journeyed to Rome to lay the matter before him,—a useless undertaking if the Pope's authority was not recognized in the East.

§ 3. *Witnesses from the Third Century*

The incessant persecutions that harassed the Church during the first three centuries made it difficult, and often impossible, for the Roman Pontiff to exercise jurisdiction over distant churches; nevertheless, several incidents are recorded which prove that the Pope was recognized as chief pastor in the Church, and that he actually exercised authority as such, when occasion demanded and circumstances permitted.

I. TERTULLIAN. After Tertullian fell away from the Church, he became very bitter toward the bishops of Rome, as heretics are wont to do. In his work *De Pudicitia* he inveighs against a certain edict published by Zephyrinus or Callistus. He says: "I even hear that an edict has been published,—a peremptory edict, which the supreme pontiff, that bishop of bishops, has put forth."¹ The titles here used in derision by Tertullian evidently presuppose a claim to supreme jurisdiction on the part of the Pope; no other meaning could be attached to the phrase "*bishop of bishops*." This is also true of the other title, "*supreme pontiff*." The Pontifex Maximus (supreme pontiff) was the highest in authority among the pagan priests of Rome, with jurisdiction over all religious matters. The office

¹ "De Pudicitia," c. I; P. L., 2, 980.

had been held by the emperors themselves since the year 13 B. C. Hence, when Tertullian applies the term to the bishop of Rome, he clearly intimates the position claimed for the pope in the Church.

II. DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA (d. 264). St. Athanasius says that when Dionysius, patriarch of Alexandria, was accused of heresy by some of his people, the Pope, who happened to bear the same name, immediately asked for an explanation and a profession of faith. The patriarch at once complied by composing two works concerning the faith which he submitted to the Pope: "When Dionysius the bishop, . . . moved by zeal for religion, had written to Ammonius and Euphranor against the Sabellian heresy, some of the brethren . . . betook themselves to Rome and accused him before his namesake, Dionysius, bishop of Rome. When he had heard these things, he sent a letter to Dionysius to acquaint him of the things of which he was accused by these men. In order to prove his innocence, Dionysius set about at once to edit the books which he entitled *Elenchus* and *Apolo-
logia*."²

The very fact that these men went to Rome to accuse their bishop, proves that they recognized some superior authority in the bishop of that city, and Dionysius' solicitude to refute their charges shows that he also acknowledged this superiority.

III. ST. CYPRIAN (200–258). Felicissimus and Fortunatus rejected the authority of St. Cyprian in

² St. Athanasius, "In Sententiam Dionysii"; P. G., 25, 499.

Carthage and started an open schism by setting up a bishop of their own. They then sent emissaries to Rome, in order to stir up like troubles there. St. Cyprian, apprised of this project, writes to Pope Cornelius. He describes their actions in Carthage and then adds: "After such things as these they still dare . . . to set sail and to bear letters from schismatic and profane persons to the throne of Peter, and to the chief Church, whence priestly unity takes its source."³

On another occasion, when St. Cyprian had heard that Marcian, bishop of Arles, had fallen into heresy, he wrote to Pope Stephen, asking him to excommunicate Marcian and have another bishop installed in his place. He says: "It behooves you to write a very copious letter to our fellow bishops appointed in Gaul, not to suffer any longer that Marcian . . . should insult our assembly, because he does not yet seem to be excommunicated by us. . . . Let letters be directed by you into the province and to the people abiding at Arles, by which Marcian being excommunicated, another may be substituted in his place."⁴

St. Cyprian takes for granted that Pope Stephen has the necessary authority to excommunicate a bishop in Gaul and to see to it that another is consecrated in his stead; it is only necessary to remind him of the need for taking such action.⁵ No doubt is entertained that

³ "Epist. ad Cornelium," xiv; P. L., 3, 818.*

⁴ St. Cyprian, "Epist. ad Stephanum Papam"; P. L., 3, 993-994.

⁵ See pp. 388 sq. regarding St. Cyprian's controversy with Pope Stephen.

such action will be taken; in fact, it is so certain that St. Cyprian speaks as if the matter were already settled, for he says: "Inform us who has been substituted at Arles in the place of Marcian, that we may know to whom to direct our brethren, and to whom we ought to write."

IV. EMPEROR AURELIAN (270-275). The supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff was known even to the pagans of Rome, as is evident from an incident that happened in the reign of Aurelian. Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, had been deposed by his fellow-bishops, but refused to give up possession of the episcopal residence. He was protected in this matter by Zenobia, queen of Palmyra. When Aurelian came to Antioch after his victory over Zenobia, the case was brought before him for settlement; "and he decided it most equitably, ordering the building to be given to those to whom the bishops of Italy and of the city of Rome should adjudge it."⁶

The mention of *bishops of Italy* in connection with the bishop of Rome does not weaken the testimony in the least, since it is well-known that the Pope did not decide important questions without first seeking counsel of others. It was customary to convoke a synod composed of the bishops in the vicinity of Rome, and those who happened to be visiting there at the time. The titular priests and regional deacons also took part in the deliberations. The decisions arrived at were embodied in the form of synodal decrees. For this reason the Pope generally employed the plural *we* when com-

⁶ Eusebius, "Hist. Ecclesiastica," vii, 30, xix; P. G., 20, 719.*

municating with other churches. The Pope still has his advisers; the bishops in the vicinity of Rome, the titular priests of the City, and the regional deacons form the college of cardinals,—the Pope's cabinet of official counselors.

§ 4. *Witnesses from the Second Century*

I. ST. IRENÆUS (d. about 200). The testimony of St. Irenæus is especially valuable, because it gives the faith of the Church in the East and West alike. He was born and grew to manhood in Asia Minor, where he heard the teaching of St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist. He then came to Rome and was finally made bishop of Lyons in Gaul.

In his work *Against Heresies*, St. Irenæus appeals to the doctrines handed down by lawful succession from the Apostles as proof against the heretics of his day. He then says: "It would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions in all the churches," it will be sufficient "to indicate that tradition derived from the Apostles of the very great, the very ancient and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, . . . for it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church on account of its preëminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the Apostolic tradition has been preserved by those who exist everywhere."¹

¹ "Adversus Hæreses," iii, 2, 2; P. G., 7, 848.

It is evident that St. Irenæus attributes some special preëminence to the Roman Church, whose bishops are the lawful successors of SS. Peter and Paul: "The blessed Apostles, then having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate . . . to him succeeded Anacletus, and after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement was allotted the bishopric." Consequently the Roman Church is eminent, not because it was located at Rome, but because it was founded by the Apostles and derives its authority from them. St. Irenæus indicates the nature of this preëminence in his account of St. Clement's Letter to the Corinthians: "In the time of this Clement, no small dissension having occurred among the brethren at Corinth, the Church in Rome despatched a most powerful letter to the Corinthians exhorting them to peace, renewing their faith and declaring the tradition which it had lately received from the Apostles."² In other words, the Church at Rome, under the guidance of St. Clement, exercised a preëminence of real jurisdiction over the Church at Corinth.

Some non-Catholic scholars seek to evade the force of the passage from St. Irenæus by claiming that the *preëminent authority* was that of the city, to which people flocked from all parts of the Empire, bringing with them the traditions of their own churches. "Everybody visits Rome," says one author, "hence you find there faithful from every side; and

² "Adversus Hæreses," iii, 3, 3; P. G., 7, 849.*

their united testimony it is which preserves in Rome the pure Apostolic tradition. The faith is preserved by those who come to Rome, not by the Bishop who presides there."³ In this interpretation the Latin *convenire* is taken to mean *assemble* or *resort*, instead of *agree*; "Every church must *resort* to the Church of Rome because of the fact that it is located in the capital of the Empire." But this does not suit the context; the *principality* is that of the Church in Rome, not of the city itself, which is mentioned only incidentally. Furthermore, why was it *necessary* for every church to *resort* to the church at Rome, if it possessed no special authority? St. Irenæus plainly states that Apostolic traditions are preserved in the Roman Church, not by the faithful who flock there, but by the lawful succession of pastors in that church. He says: "To this Clement there succeeded Evaristus . . . Soter having succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherius does now in the twelfth place from the Apostles, hold the inheritance of the episcopate. In this order, *and by this succession*, the ecclesiastical tradition from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth have come down to us."⁴

II. POPE VICTOR I (189-198). The Churches of Asia Minor celebrated Easter on the day of the Jewish Pasch, regardless of the day of the week on which it might fall. The Western Church had always celebrated the feast on a Sunday. Several years before the time of Victor, this difference in rite had been discussed by Pope Anicetus and St. Polycarp but nothing was done in the matter. Pope Victor now decided to bring about uniformity by having the churches of Asia

³ Roberts-Donaldson, "Ante-Nicene Fathers," Vol. I, p. 460.

⁴ "Adversus Hæreses," iii, 3, 3; P. G., 7, 8.*

follow the practice of the West; he therefore asked the bishops of those parts to hold conferences to consider the matter and report to him. This is evident from the letter of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, informing Pope Victor of their decision. He says: "I could mention the bishops who were present, whom I summoned at your request." He then continues to inform the Pope that the bishops had decided to continue the old custom, because it had been handed down from the days of St. John the Apostle, and had been hallowed by the approval of many saintly bishops.⁵

This decision did not please the Pope; he condemned their custom and threatened to excommunicate all who refused to conform with the practice of the West in this matter. At this juncture, St. Irenæus wrote to Pope Victor, with due reverence (*προσηκόντως*), as Eusebius informs us, but more sharply than was necessary (*πληκτικώτερον*). He did not accuse the Pope of exceeding his authority by threatening excommunication, but simply advised moderation in a matter that was purely disciplinary. He cited the example of Victor's predecessors, who were content to tolerate a custom of such antiquity. The whole tenor of the letter, as preserved by Eusebius, recognizes full authority in the Pope to proceed with the threatened excommunication, but questions the prudence of such action.⁶

It is not certain whether Victor actually excommunicated the refractory bishops of the East; but

⁵ Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles.," v, 24 (Greek text); P. G., 20, 495.

⁶ Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles.," v, 24; P. G., 20, 494 sq.

the western custom of celebrating Easter on Sunday soon became the practice of the universal Church, despite the Apostolic origin claimed for the practice of the Asiatic churches. This in itself shows the influence which Rome exercised over the whole Church in those early days.

III. ST. ABERCIUS. In the epitaph which Abercius, bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia, composed for his own tomb, he says that he had travelled to Rome at the command of Christ, "to contemplate the royal city, and to behold a queen in vestments of gold, and golden sandals on her feet. There I saw a people having a gleaming seal."

Abercius uses symbolic language throughout the inscription. For example, he calls Christ "the Fish which the chaste virgin drew from the fountain." In like manner he refers to the church in Rome as "*a queen in vestments of gold.*" Lowrie, a non-Catholic scholar, says: "Under the figure of the queen clad in gold, he refers to the Roman Church. The Christian people of Rome had the *gleaming seal*. It is well known that baptism was commonly spoken of under the figure of a seal."⁷

Now, since Abercius undertook the long and difficult journey to Rome at the command of Christ to see the church there, he must have recognized some special importance attached to that church. The epitaph does not state the nature of that preëminence,

⁷ Walter Lowrie, "Monuments of the Early Church," p. 236; cfr. Leclerq in "Dictionnaire d'Archéologie," Vol. I, col. 66 sqq.

but it may easily be conjectured, if we remember that only a few years later St. Irenæus calls it the very great and very ancient church founded by the two great Apostles Peter and Paul; the church with which all others must agree, or to which all others must resort, on account of its preëminent authority.

§ 5. *Witnesses from the First Century*

I. ST. IGNATIUS MARTYR.¹ About 107 St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch in Syria, was sent to Rome to be cast to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre. While on his journey he wrote to several churches in Asia and also to the church at Rome. Each letter begins with epithets in praise of the church addressed; those in praise of the Roman Church are far more numerous and more significant than any other. It is the church "which has obtained mercy through the majesty of the Most High Father, and Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Son; the Church which is beloved and enlightened by the will of Him that willeth all things which are according to the love of Jesus Christ, our God; which presides in the place of the region of the Romans, worthy of God, worthy of honor, worthy of the highest happiness, worthy of praise, worthy of obtaining her every desire, worthy of being deemed holy and which presides over love."²

¹ The letters of St. Ignatius were written in the first years of the second century, but his testimony is placed in the first, because practically his whole life belonged to that century.

² Funk, "Patres Apostolici," Vol. I, p. 253.*

Such praise bestowed upon the Church of Rome certainly bespeaks some preëminence, as the Anglican Bishop Lightfoot concedes.³ The Roman Church presides in the country of the Romans; she presides over the love-feasts or as some scholars render it: "*presiding over the society of charity, i. e., the Church*,"—*προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης*. Duchesne remarks that "if the martyr had been writing to the bishop of Rome, these presidencies might be considered local in character, because in his own diocese the bishop always presides. But here there is no question of the bishop, but of the Church. Over what did the Roman Church preside? Was it merely over some other churches or dioceses within a limited area? Ignatius had no idea of a limitation of that kind. Besides, were there in Italy any Christian communities distinct in organization from the community of Rome? The most natural meaning of such language is that the Roman Church presides over all the churches."⁴

St. Ignatius also refers to a teaching authority exercised by the church at Rome over other churches. He says: "Ye have never envied any one; ye have taught others. Now I desire that those things may be confirmed (by your conduct) which in your instructions ye enjoin (on others)."⁵

³ J. B. Lightfoot, "St. Clement of Rome," Vol. I, p. 71.

⁴ Duchesne, "Églises Separées," Engl. Tr. by A. H. Mathew, pp. 85-86.

⁵ Funk, "Patres Apostolici," Vol. I, p. 255.*

II. ST. CLEMENT OF ROME (91-100). About ten years before St. Ignatius addressed his letter to the Romans, St. Clement had occasion to use the teaching authority referred to in that letter. He also interposed in the government of another church, thus showing his primacy of jurisdiction. "In the time of this Clement," says St. Irenæus, "no small dissention having occurred at Corinth, the Church in Rome dispatched a most powerful letter to the Corinthians, bringing them to peace, renewing their faith, and declaring the tradition which it had lately received from the Apostles."⁶ This letter mentioned by St. Irenæus is still extant, and all scholars admit that it was written by St. Clement of Rome, the third successor of St. Peter.

It is not certain whether the Corinthians had appealed to St. Clement, or whether he intervened of his own accord, but it is certain that he acted with full authority, as Lightfoot candidly admits. He says: "It may perhaps seem strange to describe this noble remonstrance as the first step toward papal domination; and yet undoubtedly this is the case."⁷ If this be the first step toward papal domination, then such domination must have been of Apostolic origin, for, as St. Irenæus says, "this man [Clement], as he had seen the blessed Apostles, and had been conversant with them, might be said to have the preaching of the

⁶ St. Irenæus, "Adversus Hæreses," III. 3, 3; P. G., 7, 850.

⁷ J. B. Lightfoot, "St. Clement of Rome," Vol. I, p. 70.

Apostles still ringing in his ears, and their traditions before his eyes."⁸

One passage will be sufficient to show the tone of authority used by St. Clement: "But if any will not obey these things which He [Christ] has spoken through us, let them know that they will be implicating themselves in no small danger and offense."⁹ This passage alone amply justifies the statement of Bishop Lightfoot. St. Clement claims divine authority; it is Christ who has spoken through him, and those who do not obey, will be guilty of grievous sin. Yet despite this imperious tone and the claim to divine authority, there was not the slightest protest on the part of the Corinthians. For many years the letter was read at Corinth during divine services and even numbered among the inspired works of Scripture, as Eusebius informs us.¹⁰ The Corinthians must have accepted this "first step toward papal domination" as in full accord with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles!

CONCLUSION

The testimony of Christian antiquity proves beyond doubt that the bishop of Rome was universally recognized as head of the Church by East and West alike. The witnesses for the third, fourth, and fifth centuries are numerous; those from the first and second are

⁸ "Adversus Hæreses," III, 3, 3; P. G., 7, 850.*

⁹ Funk, "Patres Apostolici," Vol. I, p. 175.

¹⁰ "Hist. Eccles.," iv, 23; P. G., 20, 390.

necessarily few in number, because very few documents have come down to us from those times. Only three extra-scriptural documents by Christian authors can be ascribed to the first century, yet one of these shows the bishop of Rome exercising undisputed supremacy in the Church. A recent author has said: "Instead of being distressed at the small amount of evidence for the papal claims in the earliest times, I stand amazed at the celerity with which the papal idea came to maturity. . . . The most eminent Protestant scholars in Germany take a view of the development of the Roman Church which in some cases, I think, exaggerates its rapidity and import. But when all allowances are made, the facts as they are, present us with a surprising development in an age when the relation of the Son of God to the Father, and the Divinity of the Holy Ghost . . . were ill understood, or incorrectly stated, by Catholic writers."¹

The actual exercise of papal powers gradually increased with the growth of the Church. Many powers, latent in the primacy of Peter, were not exercised or fully realized until circumstances demanded it. This is true of all governmental powers, and was therefore to be expected in the Church. Christ instituted the primacy to meet conditions as they arose in the Church; it must be sufficiently elastic to accommodate itself to the ever-growing needs of the Church, as she increases in numbers and extent. It must also be able to meet the problems presented by the advancing stages of

¹ Dom Chapman, "Bishop Gore and Catholic Claims," p. 62.

civilization among the various peoples and nations. There must be a gradual unfolding of latent powers to make it possible for the Church "to keep her identity without losing her life, and keep her life without losing her identity; to enlarge her teachings without changing them, and to remain ever the same, yet always developing."²

God summed up His revelations to man when He promised that the seed of the woman should one day bruise the serpent's head; all subsequent prophecy was but the unfolding of this one promise. So likewise in the creation of His Church, Christ set forth in a word the person of its ruler and the nature of its perpetual government. He spoke to Peter once in promise and once in fulfillment. It was the voice of the Creator summing up his work in a word. Age after age brings to light more and more the force of that word. Time has not yet exhausted that first prophecy made to Adam, neither has it revealed all contained in those words addressed to Peter on the shores of Lake Tiberias some nineteen hundred years ago.³

ART III. OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED

OBJECTION I.—The Roman primacy is excluded by the fact that Christ alone is Head over all the Church: "The Church, being to abide through all generations of time, needs also an ever-abiding head; and such is

² W. H. Mallock, "Is Life Worth Living?" p. 313.

³ T. W. Allies, "The See of Peter," pp. 167-168.

Jesus Christ alone. Wherefore the Apostles take no higher title than that of ministers of the Church."¹

ANSWER.—This is the stock argument of the Eastern schismatics, who do not seem to realize that it would also exclude the authority of their own patriarchs, since Christ is Head of each and every part of the Church in the same sense in which He is Head of the whole Church. Only Protestants who maintain that the Church is essentially invisible can logically bring such an objection against the primacy. But it has already been proved against them that the Church is an external, visible society, and as such must have a visible head. The Roman Primacy does not exclude or deny the headship of Christ, since the Roman Pontiff is head of the Church in his capacity as Vicar of Christ. Our Lord said to Peter: "*Feed My lambs; feed My sheep.*" The chief shepherd of a flock need not be the owner of it.

The fact that the Apostles called themselves ministers is no objection; they were ministers of Christ and as such exercised jurisdiction over His Church with St. Peter at their head. Their position in the Church is determined from the authority they exercised, rather than from the title they assumed. The Pope frequently signs himself, "*the servant of servants,*" but he does not thereby intend to renounce his supreme authority in the Church.

OBJECTION II.—The primacy of the Roman Pontiff

¹ Philaret's "Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church"; cfr. Schaff, Vol. ii, p. 485.

is due entirely to human causes. The bishop of Rome, living in the capital of the Empire, soon came to be regarded as having some preëminence over other bishops. This gradually developed into a preëminence of power and jurisdiction, which ambition gladly seized upon for its own aggrandizement.²

ANSWER.—No hypothesis, however plausible it may seem, can be accepted in explanation of a fact whose true explanation we *know* to be different. We know why the bishop of Rome was accepted as supreme pastor in all ages, because we have the testimony of those who so accepted him. The Fathers of the Church and the bishops assembled in councils have always proclaimed the Roman Pontiff supreme pastor, because he holds the place of Peter, prince of the Apostles and foundation of the Church. They never connected the primacy with Rome because Rome was the capital of the Empire. Moreover, the bishop of Rome did not lose his preëminence when the imperial power was transferred to Constantinople, which was never recognized as anything more than a patriarchal see, and that only after long and persistent efforts on the part of bishops and emperors.

There is no doubt that God, in His wisdom, selected Rome as the seat of primacy in the Church, because external circumstances made the exercise of universal jurisdiction easier there than elsewhere. The imperial preëminence of Rome was not the cause of the primacy, but the reason why it was located there instead of else-

² Cf. W. Palmer, "Treatise on the Church," Vol. ii, p. 547 sqq.

where, for, as Leo the Great says, "The most blessed Peter, prince of the Apostolic band, was appointed to the citadel of the Roman Empire, that the light of truth, which was being displayed for the salvation of all the nations, might spread itself more effectively throughout the body of the world from the head itself."³

OBJECTION III.—The first Council of Constantinople (381) issued a decree to the effect that "the bishop of Constantinople shall have the prerogative of honor after the bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."⁴ Therefore, the Roman Pontiff owes his preëminence to the fact that he is bishop of "Old Rome," as the Council of Chalcedon explicitly stated in its twenty-eighth canon (451): "We also enact and decree the same things concerning the privileges of the most holy Church of Constantinople, which is New Rome. For the Fathers rightly granted privileges to the throne of Old Rome, because it was the royal city. And the hundred and fifty most religious bishops,⁵ actuated by the same considerations, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of New Rome, justly judging that the city which is honored with the Sovereignty and the Senate, and enjoys equal privileges with the old imperial Rome, should in ecclesiastical matters also be magnified as she is, and rank next after her, so that in the Pontic, the Asian and the Thracian

³ Leo the Great, "Sermon.," 82, 3; P. L., 54, 424.*

⁴ Mansi, T. III, col. 573.

⁵ The bishops attending the first Council of Constantinople.

dioceses, the metropolitans only and such bishops also of the dioceses aforesaid as are among the barbarians, should be ordained by the aforesaid most holy throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople." ⁶

ANSWER.—The two canons quoted are a proof for the divine origin of the Roman primacy rather than an objection against it. If the bishop of Rome obtained preëminence because of the imperial dignity of the city, the bishop of Constantinople, now become the capital of the Empire, should have received this preëminence instead of ranking *next after* Rome. The Fathers of two great councils would certainly not have committed such a blunder.

As a matter of fact, neither of these two canons is concerned with the primacy of Rome; they refer to patriarchal rights and privileges, as the latter part of the canon of Chalcedon explicitly states. From the earliest times, the Church had been divided into three patriarchates,—Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch,—with precedence of honor in the order named. In each case the patriarch had certain rights and privileges in regard to consecrating bishops and archbishops in his territory. The Nicene Council (325) had recognized these ancient rights and ordered them to be respected.

The Emperors and bishops of Constantinople constantly strove to have their own church raised to patriarchal dignity next to that of Rome, and therefore, with precedence over Alexandria and Antioch.

⁶ Mansi, t. vii, col. 370.*

But the ancient arrangement sanctioned by the sixth canon of Nicæa stood in their way; they could offer but one reason for changing the established order,—because Constantinople is New Rome, *i. e.*, the new capital of the Empire. They would have it raised to patriarchal dignity with jurisdiction over the churches of Pontus, Asia Minor, and Thrace. Leo the Great, who was pope at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, rejected the canon on the ground that it violated the sixth canon of Nicæa, but he made no reference to any violation of his own rights as supreme pastor. Consequently he failed to see any denial of the Roman Supremacy involved, although his legates were present at the council and must have known the sentiments of its Fathers.

In regard to this matter, a non-Catholic scholar says: "It should be remembered that the change effected by this canon did not affect Rome directly in any way, but did seriously affect Alexandria and Antioch, which till then had ranked next after the See of Rome. When the Pope refused to acknowledge the authority of this canon, he was in reality defending the principle laid down in the canon of Nicæa that in such matters the ancient customs should continue. Even the last clause, it would seem, could give no offence to the most sensitive on the papal claims, for it implies a wonderful power in the rank of Old Rome, if a See is to rank next to it because it happens to be "New Rome." ⁷

⁷ Henry R. Percival in "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," Vol. xiv, p. 178.

OBJECTION IV.—The sixth canon of Nicæa makes the Church of Alexandria equal in power with that of Rome: "Let the ancient customs in Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis prevail, that the bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction in all these, since this is also the custom for the bishop of Rome."

ANSWER.—This canon was evidently intended to confirm some rights of jurisdiction which the church of Alexandria had been exercising over other churches in Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis. What these rights were is uncertain, but the reasons for their official recognition are given; *viz.*, their antiquity ("let the ancient customs prevail") and the authority, or perhaps the example, of the Roman Church ("this is also the custom for the bishop of Rome"). The meaning of this last phrase is very obscure. Some take it to mean that the ancient customs should prevail because approved of by the bishop of Rome. The more probable meaning is that the ancient customs should prevail because a like custom obtains at Rome, *i. e.*, the bishop of Rome exercises like jurisdiction over the churches of his patriarchate. The first interpretation explicitly recognizes the supremacy of Rome,—customs are to prevail because approved by Rome. The second implicitly recognizes that supremacy by making the Roman Church the model for all others. But in any case the council is concerned only with patriarchal rights, as a non-Catholic author freely admits: "It is evident that the council has not in view here the

primacy of the Bishop of Rome over the whole Church, but simply his power as patriarch."⁸

OBJECTION V.—The Church in Africa did not recognize any primacy in the Roman Church, as is evident from the action taken at the provincial council held at Mileve in 416. It decreed that "presbyters, deacons, and lower clerics, who are dissatisfied with the judgments of their bishops in any case, may be heard by neighboring bishops; . . . but if they wish to appeal from their decision, such appeal shall be made to an African council or to the primates of their provinces. Any one presuming to appeal *beyond the seas*, shall be excommunicated in Africa."⁹ The phrase, *beyond the seas*, evidently refers to Rome. Consequently any appeal to Rome from Africa was punished by excommunication, according to this canon, which was approved by a synod held at Carthage in 418 and by another at Mileve in 419.

ANSWER.—The right of appeal *beyond the seas* was denied priests and lower clerics only; bishops were not included in the provisions of this canon, and the case of Apiarius proves that appeal to Rome on the part of priests was not so strictly forbidden as the canon would indicate. Apiarius, a priest in Africa, was excommunicated and deposed shortly after this decree had been passed, but he went to Rome and presented his case

⁸ Henry R. Percival in "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," Vol. xiv, p. 16.

⁹ Canon xxii; Labbe-Cosart, t. ii, col. 1542.

to Pope Zosimus, who decided that he should have a rehearing. As a result, the African bishops absolved and reinstated him. Four years later he was again deposed, and again appealed to Rome. Celestine, who was then Pope, ordered him reinstated and sent a legate into Africa to see that the order was carried out. In the meantime, Apiarius had confessed to the crimes of which he was accused, and the legate's mission came to nought, because it was evident that the Pope had acted without due knowledge of the case. The bishops of Africa then wrote to Celestine: "We beseech you that hereafter you will not give ear too readily to persons coming from Africa, nor receive into communion those whom we have excommunicated, lest it appear that persons excommunicated in their own provinces have been too hastily restored to communion by Your Holiness without due consideration."¹⁰

These words contain a sharp but well-deserved rebuke, yet they plainly recognize the primacy of Rome. There is no denial of the pope's authority; neither is there any complaint that Apiarius had violated the canon against appeals beyond the seas,—a canon made, not to deny the supremacy of Rome, but to prevent just such mistakes as Celestine had made in the case of Apiarius.

OBJECTION VI.—St. Jerome, writing to Evangelus, says: "If you ask for authority, the world outweighs its Capital. Wherever there is a bishop, whether it be at Rome or at Eugubium, whether it be at Con-

¹⁰ "Epist. ad Cælestinum"; P. L., 50, 424.

stantinople or at Rhegium, whether it be at Alexandria or at Zaon, his dignity is one and his priesthood is one."¹¹

ANSWER.—The words quoted from St. Jerome's letter have no reference whatever to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, but are directed against an abuse then prevalent at Rome. This abuse consisted in an assumption of superiority over the priests on the part of the deacons. St. Jerome says: "Bad habits have by degrees so far crept in that I have seen a deacon, in the absence of the bishop, seat himself among the presbyters and at social gatherings give his blessing to them. Those who act thus must learn that they are wrong and must give heed to the Apostles' words. . . . They must consider the reasons which led to the appointment of deacons in the beginning."

When it was objected that this was the custom at Rome, St. Jerome replied: "Why do you bring forward a custom which exists in one city only? Why do you oppose to the laws of the Church a paltry exception which has given rise to arrogance and pride? . . . If you ask for authority, the world outweighs its capital," *i. e.*, if you seek to justify your actions by appealing to custom, you should appeal to the customs of the Church in general, not to the abuse of your own city. Why should deacons be set above priests in your city, if they are not so exalted in the rest of the world, since priests are of equal dignity wherever they are found? In fact, priests differ from bishops only in the

¹¹ "Epist. ad Evangelum"; P. L., 22, 1194.*

power of giving Orders, yet all bishops have the same priesthood and are entitled to the same honor. If deacons are not exalted above bishops in any part of the world, why should they be exalted above priests in Rome or elsewhere?

There is not a single word in the whole letter that refers even remotely to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

OBJECTION VII.—St. Gregory the Great severely rebuked John the Faster, bishop of Constantinople, for assuming the title of "*universal bishop*." He says: "None of the Roman Pontiffs ever wished to be known by such a title; no one was ever so foolhardy as to assume such a name."¹² Here, then, is an explicit repudiation of the primacy; before Gregory's day no bishop of Rome was so foolhardy as to assume the title of *universal bishop*, as the Popes now do.

ANSWER.—In reply to this objection it may be asked, why St. Gregory dared to reprove the bishop of an eastern Church if he had no authority to do so? It was not a case of fraternal correction; he sent Sabinianus as legate to Constantinople and wrote to John saying: "In case of your refusing to amend, I forbade him to celebrate Mass with you, that so I might first appeal to Your Holiness through a sense of shame, to the end that, if the execrable and profane assumption could not be corrected through shame,

¹² "Epist. ad Eulogium"; P. L., 77, 771.

strict canonical measures might be resorted to."¹³ In another letter to John, bishop of Syracuse, he says: "Who doubts that the Church of Constantinople is subject to the Apostolic See, as the most pious Emperor and our brother, the bishop of the same city, constantly profess?"¹⁴

Why, then, did Gregory say that no bishop of Rome had ever assumed such a title as that of *universal bishop*? The solution of this question is very simple when it is known that John the Faster used the title to signify that he was the only bishop properly so-called; all others were merely his vicars or agents. That, at least, is the sense in which St. Gregory understood it, for he wrote to Empress Constantia: "It is sad to see how my brother and fellow-bishop is patiently borne with when he rejects all others and wishes to be called the only bishop."¹⁵ He uses the same words in his letter to John himself: "Having rejected your brethren, you desire to be known as the only bishop."¹⁶ It is perfectly true that no bishop of Rome ever assumed the title of *universal bishop* in that sense.

OBJECTION VIII.—There is not a single word concerning the primacy of the Roman Pontiff in St. Cyp-

¹³ St. Gregory the Great, "Epist. ad Joannem Constant."; P. L. 77, 738.*

¹⁴ St. Gregory the Great, "Epist. ad Joannem Syracusanum"; P. L. 77, 957.

¹⁵ "Epist. ad Constantiam"; P. L., 77, 749.*

¹⁶ "Epist. ad Joannem Constant."; P. L., 77, 738.

rian's treatise on the unity of the Church, yet in a work of that nature he could scarcely have failed to mention the primacy if it had been known to him.

ANSWER.—St. Cyprian wrote this treatise on unity for the purpose of combating a schism then ravaging the Church at Carthage. His sole intention was to prove that, according to the institution of Christ, there can be but one lawful bishop in each church, and that, as a consequence, whoever withdraws from the authority of that one bishop, ceases to be a member of the Catholic Church. He was concerned with the unity, not of the whole Church, but of each particular church or diocese. For this reason he had no occasion to treat of the Roman primacy. He mentions the See of Peter merely as an example of what Christ intended each particular church to be in regard to unity.

OBJECTION IX.—St. Cyprian and his friend Firmilian of Cæsarea stoutly resisted the decree of Pope Stephen concerning Baptism and declared that, in ruling their dioceses, bishops are accountable to no one except God. They also referred to Pope Stephen as proud, ignorant, contumacious, and the friend of heretics. This proves that neither St. Cyprian nor Firmilian recognized any superior authority in the Roman pontiff.

ANSWER.—In the heat of controversy St. Cyprian acted against his better judgment and thus involved himself in many errors and inconsistencies. The best answer to the objection will be found in a short history of the controversy itself.

St. Cyprian had been teaching that Baptism administered by anyone outside the Church must be invalid, and consequently heretics and schismatics coming into the Church must be re-baptized, or rather baptized, since the former ceremony was no Baptism at all. This doctrine, which he explains at length in a letter to Magnus, was approved by a synod of African bishops at Carthage in 255. A letter to this effect was sent to the bishops of Mauretania, but they rejected the doctrine as opposed to the tradition of the Church. When St. Cyprian heard of this, he rejected the authority of tradition, saying: "The matter is to be settled by reason, not tradition."¹⁷ In this he contradicted himself, because tradition was the principal argument he adduced in his letter to the bishops of Numidia: "We set forth no new doctrine, but one already established by our predecessors."¹⁸

A second synod of sixty bishops held at Carthage in the beginning of 256 reaffirmed the doctrine of St. Cyprian and sent a synodical letter to St. Stephen, in which they openly declared that bishops are free in the administration of their respective dioceses, having to render account to God alone. Consequently each bishop was free to act as he thought proper in the matter of re-baptizing: "In this matter we constrain no one, nor make laws for anyone, since each bishop is free in the administration of his own church and must

¹⁷ "Epist. ad Quintum"; P. L., 3, 1106.

¹⁸ "Epist. ad Januarium"; P. L., 3, 1038.*

render an account to God for his acts." ¹⁹ Here, again, St. Cyprian contradicted himself. He had been teaching that this question of Baptism, was a matter of faith; now it is a mere matter of discipline, in which each bishop may act as he thinks best.

St. Stephen's reply to this letter has not been preserved, but it is evident from St. Cyprian's letter to Jubaianus that he severely reprehended the bishops for their action and called them perverters of the truth. The bishops had written: "We constrain no one, nor do we make laws for anyone." St. Stephen did both by issuing a peremptory decree and threatening excommunication for those who violated it. The decree read: "Therefore, if a person comes to you from any heresy whatsoever, nothing shall be done except what has been handed down by tradition; *viz.*, that hands be imposed upon him in penance." ²⁰

These facts and the nature of the decree are gathered from St. Cyprian's letter to Pompey and from Firmilian's letter to St. Cyprian. Firmilian plainly indicates that St. Stephen had threatened excommunication and based his authority for so doing upon the fact of his being the successor of St. Peter: "Stephen dares to break the peace with you, which his predecessors have always kept. . . . And in this I am justly indignant at this so open and manifest folly of Stephen, that he who so boasts of the place of his episcopate, and contends that he holds the succession from Peter, on

¹⁹ St. Cyprian, "Epist. ad Stephanum"; P. L., 3, 1050.

²⁰ St. Cyprian, "Epist. ad Pompeium"; P. L., 3, 1123.

whom the foundations of the Church were laid, should introduce many other rocks. . . . He is not ashamed to divide the brotherhood for the sake of maintaining heretics; and in addition calls Cyprian a false Christ, a false prophet, and a deceitful worker." ²¹

In September 256 another synod was held in Carthage. Various letters were read to the assembled bishops, but St. Stephen's letter was not among them; neither does his name seem to have been mentioned during the session, yet the address of St. Cyprian shows that the Pope's authority was strongly felt in that meeting. After the letters had been read, St. Cyprian urged the bishops to express their sentiments freely and without fear: "It is now time for every one to express his opinions in this matter of Baptism without judging any one or depriving him of communion if he happens to differ from us. None of us have constituted ourselves a bishop or bishops, neither do we wish to restrain our colleagues by tyrannical fear." ²²

What was the necessity for such admonition if every bishop was free in the government of his own church, having to give an account to God alone? Why the mention of a *bishop of bishops*,²³ if no one claimed that position? Why the reminder that no one was to be excommunicated or constrained by tyrannical fear for holding dissenting views? Almost every word of St.

²¹ Firmilian, "Epist. ad Cyprianum"; P. L., 3, 1169 sq.*

²² St. Cyprian, "Epist. ad Jovianum"; P. L., 3, 1086.

²³ This phrase seems to be an echo of Tertullian, whose works greatly influenced St. Cyprian. Cfr. above, p. 362.

Cyprian manifests a fear of superior authority resting in some *bishop of bishops*, who could be none other than St. Stephen, Bishop of Rome. Furthermore, if St. Cyprian and the other bishops did not recognize the primacy of Rome, why were they so solicitous to gain the approval of St. Stephen? The bishops of Mauretania had rejected their doctrine, but no further attempts were made to win them over. The bishop of Rome,—one single bishop,—rejects the doctrine and strenuous efforts are made to secure his approval; synods are held, letters are dispatched, and at least two delegations are sent to Rome.

Persecution put an end to the controversy, but the decree of St. Stephen was finally accepted throughout the whole Church. Rome had spoken, the case was ended. This is the best proof we could have for the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. St. Cyprian, bishop of the important see of Carthage, with many bishops of Africa and Asia Minor, were arrayed on one side; St. Stephen, bishop of Rome, on the other; acting as successor of St. Peter, he issued a decree of some dozen words, and that decree becomes the law of the universal Church! Rivington well says: "If there be in this an argument against the supremacy of the pope, we can desire nothing better than that our opponents should discover many similar ones in their historical studies."²⁴

This brief account makes it evident that St. Cyprian really resisted the authority of Pope Stephen, and even

²⁴ "The Primitive Church and the See of Peter," p. 116.

denied his primacy, but in words only. In the heat of controversy, he was carried away and would have rejected the authority of Rome, but his inner self would not permit. He struggled against his own convictions and lost the fight. His every action proves that his heart would not consent to what his head contrived. Hence we may say with St. Augustine: "If any cloud of human frailty crossed his mind, it was dispelled by the glorious light of his blood."²⁵ He suffered martyrdom for the faith in 258.

²⁵ St. Augustine, "Contra Donatistas," I, 18; P. L., 43, 125.

CHAPTER XII

PRIMACY AND EPISCOPATE

The supreme power of the Roman Pontiff brings him into certain necessary relations with the other bishops of the Church: (1) in the government of their respective dioceses, and (2) when assembled in council for the government of the universal Church. The nature of these relations is determined by the nature and extent of the powers exercised by the Roman Pontiff in the discharge of his duties as supreme pastor and to some extent also by the manner in which he obtains these powers.

ART. I. NATURE OF POWERS AND TENURE OF OFFICE

§ 1. *Nature of the Powers Exercised by the Roman Pontiff*

The Roman Pontiff is the lawful successor of St. Peter in his supreme power to teach and govern the whole Church and all its parts. To him belongs the power and authority to define doctrines and to condemn errors, to make and repeal laws, to act as judge in all matters of faith and morals, to decree and inflict punishment, to appoint and, if need be, to remove pastors. This supreme power to shepherd the whole

PRIMACY AND EPISCOPATE

flock of Christ is truly *episcopal, ordinary, and immediate*, as the Vatican Council has declared: "We teach and declare that by the ordinance of the Lord, the Roman Church holds the primacy of *ordinary* power over all others, and that this truly *episcopal* power of jurisdiction, which belongs to the Roman Pontiff, is also *immediate*."¹

a) EPISCOPAL. De Dominis and Febronius taught that the power of the Roman Pontiff is that of a mere inspector or supervisor, and consequently he can do no more than watch over the other bishops so that they may discharge their duties faithfully. This doctrine gives the Roman Pontiff a sort of jurisdiction over the bishops, but no direct power over the faithful. The Vatican Council rejected this doctrine when it declared the power of the Roman Pontiff to be truly episcopal, *i. e.*, he has the same power over all the faithful that the bishop has over those of his diocese,—a power that is exercised directly, without any intervention on the part of the bishops.

When Christ said, "*Feed My lambs; feed My sheep,*" He gave to St. Peter, and through him to his successors, direct jurisdiction over all the faithful,—a jurisdiction that does not have to be exercised through the bishops, but reaches the faithful directly in every part of the world, as is evident from those other words, likewise addressed to St. Peter: "*Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be*

¹ Denzinger, n. 1827.

loosed also in heaven." Hence the Roman Pontiff, as successor to St. Peter, has power and authority to impose laws upon the faithful without the consent of their bishop, and even against his wishes. He can also annul any law or obligation imposed by a bishop upon his people. In other words, all the faithful, individually and collectively, are directly subject to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, which is therefore truly episcopal.

b) ORDINARY. The term *ordinary* is here opposed to *extraordinary*. Febronius, Eybel, and others taught that the Roman Pontiff can exercise his supreme authority for extraordinary cases only; *e. g.*, when a bishop fails to perform his duties, or when some unusual danger threatens the Church. The Vatican Council condemned this doctrine in express terms: "If any one should say . . . that this power [of the Roman Pontiff] is not ordinary and immediate, . . . let him be anathema."²

Our Lord did not say to St. Peter, "Feed My sheep if others fail to do so, or if some special danger threatens"; He said simply: "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep." The pastoral office thus committed to St. Peter is lawfully and validly exercised at any time, in any place, and for any cause whatever pertaining to the good of the flock. Ordinarily, however, the Roman Pontiff acts only in matters of general interest to the Church, or in matters of local interest that have been referred to him for adjudication. When affairs in a diocese are proceeding in an orderly manner and religion

² Denzinger, n. 1831.

is prospering under the direction of the bishop, there is little necessity for the Pope to interpose the exercise of his supreme authority.

c) IMMEDIATE. The power and authority of the Roman Pontiff is immediate in the sense that it is received immediately from Christ and not through the agency of another person or group of persons. It has been proved that power and authority in the Church do not come to her ministers through the faithful, but were conferred directly upon the Apostles and descend to their successors by divine institution. In like manner the supreme power of jurisdiction was conferred directly and immediately upon St. Peter, to the exclusion even of the other Apostles. Therefore, neither the faithful nor the bishops of the Church can confer the powers of the primacy upon the successors of St. Peter, for, as the axiom says, *Nemo dat quod non habet*.³

Christ ordained that St. Peter should have successors in his primacy of jurisdiction over the Church, but He did not designate the person of the successor. It is left to the Church to elect, or otherwise designate, the person who then obtains the power of universal jurisdiction by virtue of divine institution, *i. e.*, immediately from Christ, not from those who have elected him. When the Apostolic See is vacant, there is no supreme authority in the Church; the bishops retain power to rule their respective dioceses, but no laws can be made for the universal Church, no dogmas of faith can be de-

³ No one can give what he does not possess.

fined, no legitimate council convened. In place of this supreme authority, the Church has the right and the duty of selecting someone upon whom Christ will again bestow it. It is evident, then, that the Apostolic succession cannot fail in the Apostolic See so long as the Church herself continues to exist, for although the see be vacant for many years, the Church always retains the right to elect a legitimate successor, who then obtains supreme authority according to the institution of Christ.

§ 2. *Tenure of the Supreme Pastoral Office*

ELIGIBILITY. Any person of the male sex having the use of reason can be elected Supreme Pontiff, provided he be a member of the Church and not excluded from the office by ecclesiastical law. It is absolutely necessary that the Roman Pontiff be of the male sex, for to such only has Christ committed the government of His Church and the power of Orders.¹ He must also be a member of the Church since no one can be the head of any society unless he also be a member of that society. Finally, he must have the use of reason because the primacy consists essentially in the exercise of jurisdiction, and this in itself is an act of reason. Consequently a person who is permanently insane, or a person who has not yet attained the age of discretion, cannot be validly elected to the supreme pontificate.

¹ This is proved in any dogmatic treatise on Holy Orders; *e. g.*, MacGuinness, "Commentarii Theologici," Vol. III, p. 506.

A layman can be validly elected to the office, since the power of jurisdiction can be exercised without the power of Orders. In such a case, the person elected would receive the power of jurisdiction immediately upon his election, but the power of Orders would come only through the Sacrament of Orders, which he would be obliged to receive, since Christ evidently intended that His Church be governed by bishops,—bishops by the power of Orders as well as by the power of jurisdiction.

The very nature of the office makes it necessary that the Supreme Pontiff be a member of the Church and have the use of reason; the will of Christ demands that he be of the male sex. Other conditions may be required by the Church, since the Pope, having full authority in the government of the Church, may establish laws that would render a papal election null and void unless the prescribed conditions be fulfilled. It is true that the laws made by one pope do not bind his successors, but they can and do bind the one to be elected.

ELECTION. Since Christ left to His Church the right to select the person of St. Peter's successor, she has authority to make such regulations in the matter as she deems proper. But as the Roman Pontiff holds supreme authority in the Church, the right and duty of making such regulations devolves upon him alone; he alone has authority to designate the electors and the manner of election. In the earlier ages the clergy and people of Rome elected the Pope. St. Cyprian, re-

ferring to the election of Pope Cornelius, says: "He was made bishop by the testimony of almost all the clergy, by the suffrage of the people who were present, and by the assembly of the ancient priests and good men."² Since the middle of the twelfth century the right of electing the pope has been restricted to the cardinals.

It is a disputed question whether the pope has authority to appoint his successor, but the common opinion is that he has not. A few popes did name their successors, but this seems to have amounted to nothing more than a nomination, since "none of the persons thus named ever presumed to declare themselves popes before the ratification of the legal electors had been obtained."³

LOSS OF THE PRIMACY. The power of the primacy may be lost by voluntary resignation. Pope Pontian is said to have resigned when sent into exile, in 235. This he did to allow another to be elected in his stead and thus save the Church the inconveniences that would arise from his enforced absence. Pope Celestine V also resigned, in 1294, after he had consulted the cardinals and with their unanimous consent officially declared that a pope may validly and licitly resign his office.

Perpetual or long continued insanity would deprive

² "Epist. ad Antonianum"; P. L., .iii, 770.*

³ Catholic Encyclopedia, Art. "Papal Elections."

a pope of his office as supreme pastor, because, without the use of reason, he could not perform the duties essential to that office. A temporary attack, however, would not deprive him of jurisdiction, but should there be frequently recurring attacks, he would probably be obliged in conscience to resign, since there would always be reason to doubt the validity of his acts and, as a result, the whole Church would suffer. As a matter of fact, no pope has ever been afflicted with insanity, and it is probable that God in His providence will never permit such an unfortunate circumstance to arise. But should the condition arise, it would devolve upon the bishops of the Church to establish and declare the fact officially; the cardinals would then proceed to the election of a successor.

Finally, if a pope, in his private capacity as an individual, should fall into manifest heresy, he would cease to be a member of the Church, and in consequence would also cease to be her supreme pastor. But this is another purely theoretical hypothesis, since no Pope is known to have fallen into heresy, and it is most probable that the vicar of Christ is divinely protected from such a misfortune, although the Church has never defined anything in the matter.

In case a Pope becomes a scandal to the Church on account of a sinful life, he can and ought to be admonished by the bishops, singly or in council, but they have no authority to depose him. "It would be unlawful to go beyond admonition; a change of heart must

be left to the Providence of God and sought only by prayer and supplication."⁴

A DOUBTFUL POPE. When there is a prudent doubt about the validity of an election to any official position, there is also a similar doubt whether the person so elected really has authority or not. In such a case no one is bound to obey him, for it is an axiom that a doubtful law begets no obligation—*lex dubia non obligat*. But a superior whom no one is bound to obey is in reality no superior at all. Hence the saying of Bellarmine: a doubtful pope is no pope. "Therefore," continues the Cardinal, "if a papal election is really doubtful for any reason, the one elected should resign, so that a new election may be held. But if he refuses to resign, it becomes the duty of the bishops to adjust the matter, for although the bishops without the pope cannot define dogmas nor make laws for the universal Church, they can and ought to decide, when occasion demands, who is the legitimate pope; and if the matter be doubtful, they should provide for the Church by having a legitimate and undoubted pastor elected. That is what the Council of Constance rightly did."⁵

ROME AND THE PAPACY. It is an article of faith that the successor of St. Peter holds supreme jurisdiction in the Church, and that by divine institution. It is also a matter of faith that according to the present order of things the bishop of Rome is that successor.

⁴ Perrone, "Praelect. Theolog.," n. 633; cfr. Suarez, "De Fide," X, 6.

⁵ Bellarmine, "De Concilio," ii, 19.

Theologians, going farther, inquire by what right the primacy is connected with the Roman See, and whether it could be transferred to another. The solution of these questions depends upon the manner in which Rome was selected as the see of St. Peter's successors. There are only three ways in which this could have been done: (a) Our Lord could have personally designated Rome as the see of St. Peter and his successors, or (b) St. Peter could have been left free to select his own see, to which Christ would then attach the primacy for him and his successors. In either case, the primacy would be attached to the chosen see by divine institution and could be changed only by divine intervention. Finally, (c) Christ could have left the selection of a suitable see entirely in the hands of St. Peter and his successors. In this case the primacy would be connected with Rome by purely ecclesiastical law and could be changed at any time by papal authority.

Arguments can be adduced on either side, but the Church, it seems, has never defined the question. The majority of theologians hold that the primacy is attached to the Roman See by divine institution and, therefore, cannot be changed under any circumstances.

Straub even maintains that this is an article of faith. He appeals to three documents in particular to support this opinion: (a) A letter of Nicholas I to the Emperor Michael, in which he says: "The privileges of the Roman Church . . . cannot be lessened in the least nor infringed upon, nor changed, because no human power can remove the foundation which God has

laid." ⁶ (b) The letter of Clement VI to the Catholicos of the Armenians, stating the conditions for reunion with Rome: "If you are ready to believe that all the Roman pontiffs canonically succeeding the blessed Peter, have succeeded and will succeed him in the same plenitude and jurisdiction of power." ⁷ (c) A decree of the Council of Florence: "We define that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff holds the primacy over the whole world, and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter." ⁸

These documents have considerable weight, but they are not entirely convincing. The first two may easily be interpreted without any reference to the question under discussion, and the third, the decree of the Council of Florence, was repeated almost verbatim by the Vatican Council without any intention of deciding this matter, as is evident from the acts: "The questions and hypotheses, more or less freely debated, concerning the perpetuity of the city of Rome and the union of the Primacy with the Roman See were passed by; they did not wish at this time to stigmatize the opinion which holds that Peter's fixing his see at Rome was of human authority." ⁹

COROLLARY. The Roman Pontiff does not cease to be bishop of Rome by the mere fact of taking up his residence

⁶ Denzinger, n. 332.

⁷ Denzinger, n. 3011.

⁸ Denzinger, n. 694.

⁹ Coll. I, vii, 293, 364 sq.

elsewhere. For many years the popes lived at Avignon in France, yet they remained the true and legitimate bishops of Rome. Even granting, then, that the primacy is attached to the Roman See by divine institution, there is nothing to prevent the pope taking up his residence in Jerusalem, as some think he will from the days of Antichrist until the end of the world. He could simply change his residence while still remaining bishop of Rome, or the papacy itself might be removed by divine intervention at the time of Antichrist. The necessity for a change of residence is indicated in the Apocalypse, where the complete destruction of Rome is prophesied,—a destruction that shall continue for all time: "*That great city shall be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all.*" ¹⁰ On the other hand, a future greatness is promised to Jerusalem that would be fittingly fulfilled by the pope's residing there to rule the Church, then completely universal by the submission of all nations and the conversion of the Jews. "*And there shall be one day,*" says the prophet, "*which is known to the Lord. . . . And it shall come to pass in that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them to the east sea, and half of them to the last sea; they shall be in summer and winter. And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Lord, and His name shall be one. . . . And there shall be no more anathema; but Jerusalem shall sit secure. . . . And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and they shall be my people, and I will dwell in the midst of them.*" ¹¹

¹⁰ Apoc. xviii, 21 sq.

¹¹ Zach. xiv, 7-11; ii, 10-12; Cfr. Berry, "The Apocalypse of St. John," pp. 193 sqq.

ART. II. THE POPE AND THE BISHOPS SEVERALLY

THE EPISCOPATE OF DIVINE ORIGIN. The Apostles personally received from Christ a real power of jurisdiction to be exercised in subjection to St. Peter, their divinely constituted head. Christ also ordained that the Apostles should have successors in the Church for all time. He said to them: "*Going therefore, teach ye all nations, . . . and behold, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.*"¹ Consequently the bishops of the Church, as successors of the Apostles, constitute an order of divine institution. It is the will of Christ that there should always be bishops to teach and govern the particular portions of the Church committed to their care. The pope, then, is not free to govern the Church alone without the assistance of bishops, for, as Leo XIII says, "although the power of Peter and his successors is complete and supreme, it is not an only power. He who made Peter the foundation of the Church, also selected the twelve, whom He called Apostles. Just as the authority of Peter must be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so also the ordinary power of the Apostles must be inherited by their successors, the bishops. Hence the order of bishops pertains of necessity to the very constitution of the Church."²

THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION. Every lawfully constituted bishop is a true successor of the Apostles, taken

¹ Matt. xxviii, 19-20.

² "De Unitate Ecclesiæ," 29 June, 1896.

collectively. The Apostles, with St. Peter at their head, formed a ruling body that must be perpetuated for all time, and enlarged, as the Church increases in numbers and extent. In this respect the Apostolic body is like a legal corporation,—it must be perpetuated and enlarged by the admission, from time to time, of new members, who participate in the powers originally conferred upon its first members, the Apostles. A bishop, then, is a new member incorporated into the Apostolic body perpetuated in the Church; he succeeds the Apostles in the same sense that a new member of a corporation succeeds its charter members. The presidency, or supreme power, over the Apostolic body is held *ex officio* by the Roman Pontiff, in virtue of the fact that he is the direct and only successor of St. Peter, whom Christ personally constituted its first head, ordaining that his successors should hold the same position.

Every episcopal see in the Church is truly Apostolic, because its bishop is a true successor of the Apostles and inherits their episcopal powers and authority to teach and govern, although he does not inherit the prerogatives peculiar to them as Apostles. The Roman See is preëminently Apostolic, because its bishop succeeds one particular Apostle, St. Peter, not only in his episcopal power, but also in his power as supreme head of the apostolic body. For this reason the term *Apostolic See* has been applied exclusively to Rome for many centuries. St. Vincent of Lerins, in the beginning of the fifth century, deemed it unnecessary to use

any other title to distinguish the Roman See from all others.

THE APPOINTMENT OF BISHOPS. Christ personally selected the first members of the Apostolic body: "*He called unto him whom he would himself, and they came to him. And he made that twelve should be with him and that he might send them to preach.*"³ None but those chosen by Christ Himself could be numbered with the Apostles, for He said to them: "*You have not chosen me; but I have chosen you and have appointed you, that you should go and bring forth fruit.*"⁴ St. Paul also says: "*Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as Aaron was.*"⁵

After the Ascension St. Peter and his successors take the place of Christ as visible head of the Apostolic body, with full authority to carry out His will: "*Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven.*"⁶ Consequently the Roman Pontiff, as successor of St. Peter, has sole authority to accept new members into the Apostolic body, *i. e.*, he alone has authority to constitute bishops, since authority to teach and govern the faithful was conferred upon the Apostles as a body and can be obtained only by incorporation into that body.

The very nature of the episcopal office and of the

³ Mark iii, 13-14.

⁴ John xv, 16.

⁵ Heb. v, 4.

⁶ Matt. xvi, 19.

primacy proves that the Roman Pontiff has exclusive authority to constitute bishops for every part of the Church. Bishops are shepherds for portions of the flock that was committed in its entirety to the pastoral care of St. Peter and his successors; but no one becomes a shepherd of any portion of a flock unless he be made such by the chief pastor of the whole flock. It is also evident that the chief purpose of the primacy,—the preservation of unity,—could not be realized if the bishops of the Church were not subject in all things to her supreme pastor.

The authority of the Roman Pontiff to constitute bishops for all parts of the Church may be exercised directly by personal appointments, or indirectly by delegating others, either by law or by approved custom, to elect persons to the episcopal office. The former method is in general use today, at least in the Western Church; the latter was common in the earlier ages and is practiced to some extent even today.⁷

EPISCOPAL JURISDICTION. Since the episcopate is a divine institution, bishops receive the power of jurisdiction from Christ; but whether this power comes directly from Christ or through the agency of the Roman Pontiff, is a disputed question. The opinion that jurisdiction is conferred by episcopal consecration is made untenable by the fact that a bishop-elect may exercise jurisdiction even before his consecration, whereas a consecrated bishop loses jurisdiction by deposition; schismatic bishops, though validly conse-

⁷ Cf. Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Bishop."

crated, have no jurisdiction in the Church. Valid episcopal consecration can be given without the consent of the Roman Pontiff, or even against his will, and when once given, cannot be revoked. Consequently, if jurisdiction were given by episcopal consecration, the Pope could not prevent the installation of a bishop, nor depose one already installed; the bishops would be independent of his authority, and the unity of the Church at an end.

Since jurisdiction does not come through the reception of Orders, it must be conferred upon appointment to the episcopal office by the Roman Pontiff; but the question still remains whether the Pope actually confers jurisdiction or whether he simply designates the person upon whom Christ himself confers it. This question was discussed at the Council of Trent, but no decision was given, probably because it has no practical bearing. If the Pope confers the jurisdiction, he may validly withdraw it by deposing a bishop at any time, with or without cause; if he simply designates the person to receive jurisdiction from Christ, he cannot validly withdraw it without sufficient reason.⁸

NOT MERE VICARS. Even though bishops receive all jurisdiction immediately from the Roman Pontiff, they are not mere agents acting in his name; they are veritable rulers in their respective dioceses, for which they make laws in their own name and act as judges in all matters pertaining to their jurisdiction. Hence Leo XIII says: "Although bishops do not exercise com-

⁸ Cfr. Straub, "De Ecclesia Christi," n. 767 sqq.

plete and universal power, nor hold supreme authority, they must not be considered mere vicars of the Roman Pontiff. They are, in the truest sense of the word, rulers of their people, because they exercise a power proper to them."⁹

ECCLESIASTICAL DIGNITIES. The Roman Pontiff and the bishops exercise jurisdiction by divine institution; all other offices in the Church are of ecclesiastical origin and their incumbents exercise a delegated jurisdiction. Cardinals, patriarchs, primates, and metropolitans (archbishops) hold jurisdiction from the Roman Pontiff; pastors, from their bishops. The cardinals are official advisers of the pope and assist him in the government of the Church. Upon the death of the pope it is their privilege and duty to elect a successor. Patriarchs were originally the bishops of the three patriarchal sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. Jerusalem and Constantinople were afterward added to the list. At present several uniat bishoprics of the East enjoy patriarchal privileges, which consist in certain rights of jurisdiction over other bishops within a prescribed district known as the patriarchate.¹⁰ An archbishop (metropolitan) presides over a number of dioceses united to form an ecclesiastical province, whereas a primate unites under his jurisdiction all the provinces of a country or nation.

In former times, when communication with Rome was slow and difficult, the organization of dioceses into

⁹ "De Unitate Ecclesiæ," 29 June, 1896.

¹⁰ Cfr. Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Patriarch."

provinces, and provinces into patriarchates, was almost a necessity for the orderly government of the Church. The primates and metropolitans then exercised far greater authority over their suffragan bishops than at present.¹¹

In each diocese the bishop is the divinely constituted teacher and governor of the faithful, but since he cannot personally care for all the souls committed to his charge, he constitutes pastors, who act as his representatives and hold jurisdiction from him in the government of particular portions of the diocese, known as parishes. The doctrine of *parochialism*, which arose in the thirteenth century, maintained that the division of a diocese into parishes under the care of pastors is a matter of divine institution, and therefore pastors exercise jurisdiction by divine right. This theory is refuted by the fact that the parish system was not generally adopted until the eleventh century, and did not become universal until the Council of Trent in the sixteenth.¹²

ART. III. THE POPE AND THE BISHOPS IN COUNCIL

Ordinarily the bishops of the Church are dispersed throughout the world, each engaged in the government of his own diocese, but at times they assemble in council, where, in union with the Roman Pontiff, they define dogmas of faith or legislate for the universal Church.

¹¹ Cfr. Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Metropolitan."

¹² Cf. Straub, "De Ecclesia Christi," n. 793.

The relation of the Pope to the bishops thus assembled in council is easily determined by considering (1) the nature of councils in general and of ecumenical councils in particular, (2) the rights and powers of the Roman Pontiff in regard to councils, and (3) the objections urged against these rights and powers.

§ 1. Nature and Various Kinds of Councils

The word *council* is probably derived from the Latin *conciere*—to call or bring together. It signifies an assembly, especially an assembly held for deliberation and consultation. In ecclesiastical language, it signifies a lawful assemblage of bishops to decide questions of faith or morals and to legislate for the good of the faithful. Therefore, a Church council is similar to the legislative body in a civil government, yet they differ in certain important features. The bishops assembled in council represent their respective churches, but they are not elected by the people, neither are they delegates of the people, as are the members of our legislative bodies. Again, our legislative bodies have authority to make laws independently of the executive power of the State, whereas a council has no authority to act independently of the Roman Pontiff. This difference arises from the fact that in our government the supreme legislative, executive, and judicial powers are vested in separate and distinct persons or bodies, whereas in the Church they are all vested in one person, the Roman Pontiff. Hence the bishops in union

with the Roman Pontiff constitute one law-making body, but separated from him they have no authority whatever.

Councils may be *provincial*, *national*, *general* or *ecumenical*. A provincial council consists of the bishops of a province convoked and presided over by their metropolitan. Their acts have legal force for the faithful of that province, but not until they have been approved and sanctioned in some way by the Roman Pontiff. A national council is an assemblage of the bishops of a nation or patriarchate convoked and presided over by their primate or patriarch, as the case may be. A council is general when it represents the entire Eastern or Western Church. When *both* the Eastern *and* the Western Churches are represented, the council is ecumenical.

In the earlier centuries all councils exceeding the limits of a single province were known indiscriminately as *universal*, *plenary*, or *general*, and for many centuries all councils were called *synods*. Today this term is usually restricted to an assembly of diocesan priests presided over by their bishop or archbishop, as the case may be.

ECUMENICAL COUNCILS. For the present purpose it will be sufficient to consider ecumenical councils only, since they alone have jurisdiction over the universal Church, and what is true of them is also true of the others in their respective spheres. In order to be completely ecumenical, a council must be universal by *convocation*, *celebration*, and *confirmation*.

a) BY CONVOCATION. A council that is truly ecumenical must represent the whole Church—*τὴν οἰκουμένην*, whence the name *ecumenical*. Consequently all the bishops of the Church must be notified and summoned to attend. It is understood, of course, that *all* is not to be interpreted mathematically to mean each and every bishop without a single exception. It means that practically *all* must be summoned. And none but bishops need be summoned, for to them alone was the government of the Church committed. Neither laymen nor priests, and perhaps not even titular bishops, have any right to sit in councils, unless this has been provided for by the law of the Church or by special act of the Roman Pontiff. The Code of Canon Law provides that the following persons be summoned in addition to the bishops: all cardinals, whether bishops or not, abbots and prelates *nullius*, abbots primate and abbots Superiors of monastic congregations, the supreme moderators of exempt religious clerics, and titular bishops.¹

b) BY CELEBRATION. A council is ecumenical by celebration when the universal Church is represented by its bishops. Such representation does not require the presence of all the bishops of the whole world, which would be a practical impossibility; neither does it require a majority of them. It does require, however, that a sufficient number be present to represent practically all parts of the Church. It would be difficult to assign any definite number. Cardinal Bellar-

¹ Canon 223.

mine says that "the number cannot be defined accurately, but that it should be sufficient to constitute a moral representation of the whole Church. There should be at least some bishops from the majority of provinces.² Bishops who were summoned but fail to attend thereby renounce their rights and consent beforehand to all decrees enacted by their brethren.

c) BY CONFIRMATION. A council becomes ecumenical, *i. e.*, its decrees obtain the force of law for the universal Church, when confirmed by the Roman Pontiff, even though it had not been ecumenical either in its convocation or in its celebration. Papal confirmation may be given either *post factum* or *ante factum*, *i. e.*, the pope may give his approval after the council has taken action, just as the president of the United States signs bills that have been passed by Congress, or he may request certain action to be taken by the council, somewhat in the same manner as the president manages to have measures presented to Congress. In this case, the requested action is approved *ante factum* and needs no further confirmation.

§ 2. Rights of the Roman Pontiff in Regard to Ecumenical Councils.

I. THE RIGHT OF CONVOCATION. "No council is ecumenical unless convoked by the Roman Pontiff."¹ The Roman Pontiff alone has authority to convoke an

² "De Conciliis," I, 17.

¹ "Codex Juris Canonici," Can. 222, 1: "*Dari nequit Oecumenicum Concilium quod a Romano Pontifice non fuerit convocatum.*"

ecumenical council, since he alone, as head of the Apostolic body of bishops, has authority over all its members; even the very calling of a council is an act of jurisdiction affecting the whole Church, and therefore to be exercised only by her supreme pastor. Bishops, as such, have no authority outside the limits of their own dioceses; consequently they can take no action, separately or collectively, that will have the force of law for the universal Church, unless authority to do so be given them by the Roman Pontiff, who alone possesses it. A meeting of bishops without authority of the Roman Pontiff would be similar in every respect to a convention of the State governors in this country; they could pass resolutions and recommend needed legislation, but their action would have no legal force. Hence Straub remarks that he who convokes an ecumenical council must be able to confer upon its members authority to enact laws binding upon the whole Church. But since the Roman Pontiff alone possesses such power, it is evident that the bishops assembled in council receive from the Roman Pontiff authority to unite with him in making laws for the universal Church. This authority is conferred by the very act of convocation.²

THE RIGHT TO PRESIDE. "The Roman Pontiff presides over an ecumenical council either in person or by delegates; he also designates the matters to be con-

² Straub, "De Ecclesia Christi," n. 806; cfr. Palmieri, "De Romano Pontifice," p. 671 sqq.; Wernz, "Jus Decretalium," Vol. II, n. 844.

sidered and the order to be observed.”³ It is not only a matter of *right* that the Pope, as supreme master of the Church, preside at all ecumenical councils; it is also a matter of *necessity*, since the bishops receive from him all authority to legislate for the Church and in union with him constitute one supreme source of teaching and governing power. The moment the pope withdraws his authority, the council ceases to exist; it becomes a mere convention of bishops without authority to legislate, to sit in judgment, or to define doctrines.

Since the Roman Pontiff confers all authority upon the bishops to legislate and define matters for the universal Church, he is free to restrict this authority within certain limits; in other words, he has the right to designate the matter to be discussed and the order to be followed. This also follows from his duty as supreme pastor of the flock, which he has been charged to feed. He has the right as well as the duty to determine what shall be given the sheep at any and all times.

THE RIGHT OF CONFIRMATION. “The decrees of councils have no binding force unless confirmed by the Roman Pontiff and promulgated by his authority.”⁴ The doctrine expressed in this canon is simply a corollary to what has been said regarding the authority of

³ “Codex Juris Canonici,” can. 222, 2: “*Romani Pontificis est Oecumenico Concilio per se vel per alios praeesse, res in eo tractandas ordinemque servandum constituere ac designare.*”

⁴ “Codex Juris Canonici,” can. 227: “*Concilii decreta vim definitivam obligandi non habent, nisi a Romano Pontifice fuerint confirmata et eius iussu promulgata.*”

bishops assembled in council. Their authority comes from the Roman Pontiff and they hold it only while in union with him; hence no decree can have binding force unless accepted and approved by him. “The final sentence remains with the pope. He it is that *ratifies* the decrees either at the council itself, if he is personally present, or when they are submitted to him, generally by the secretary of the council.”⁵ The necessity for such ratification has always been recognized by the councils themselves; every ecumenical council without exception presented its acts to the pope for confirmation. The decrees ratified by him obtained the force of law, whereas those rejected were considered null and void. Pope Gelasius I (492–496) said of the Council of Chalcedon: “Everything, as we have said, remains with the Apostolic See. Whatever the Apostolic See confirmed in this synod, obtained the force of law; whatever it rejected, could have no effect.”⁶ Hence Leo XIII justly remarks: “The acts and decrees of councils have ever been ratified or rejected by the Roman Pontiffs. Leo the Great annulled all the acts of the conciliabulum of Ephesus; Damasus rejected those of Arimini, and Hadrian I, those of Constantinople.”⁷ The twenty-eighth canon of Constantinople which lacked the consent and authority of the Apostolic See, remained a dead letter.”⁸

⁵ Chas. Augustine, O. S. B., “Commentary on Canon Law,” Vol. II, p. 225.

⁶ Gelasius I, “De Anathematis Vinculo”; P. L., 59, 107.

⁷ This refers to a pseudo-synod held in 753 or 754.

⁸ Leo XIII, “De Unitate Ecclesiae,” 29 June, 1896.

The necessity for papal confirmation extends to all councils, whether ecumenical, national or provincial, because without authority from the Apostolic See, bishops can make no laws binding outside the limits of their respective dioceses. They might meet and agree on certain measures, which each bishop could give the force of law for his own diocese, but such agreement would not be legislative action, and the assembly would not constitute a council.

THE CONCILIAR THEORY. At the time of the Western Schism, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, there were two and even three claimants for the throne of Peter, and the faithful were divided in their allegiance, since it was not clear who was the legitimate pope, yet none of the claimants was willing to abandon his position. This produced an intolerable state of affairs that all parties were anxious to remove, but the great question was how to go about the matter, since there was no authority to depose a Roman Pontiff. Finally Peter D'Ailly, Gerson and others hit upon the doctrine of Marsilius of Padua, who had maintained that an ecumenical council is superior to the pope and therefore could depose him.⁹ Since the position of all three claimants was doubtful, there was really no legitimate pope, for, as Cardinal Bellarmine says, a doubtful pope is no pope. Consequently the proper proceeding was for the bishops to declare this fact and authorize the cardinals to elect a legitimate pope.

⁹ Cf. L. Salembier, "The Great Schism of the West," pp. 109 sqq. (Eng. Tr.)

This was finally done at the Council of Constance, when Martin V was elected.

The doctrine of Marsilius, afterward espoused by the Gallicans and Febronians, was condemned by the Vatican Council in these words: "None may re-open the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgments. Wherefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiff to an ecumenical council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff."¹⁰ Pope Gelasius I, at the end of the fifth century, had stated the same doctrine: "We state only what is known by the whole Church throughout the world; *viz.*, that the See of blessed Peter the Apostle has authority to loose what has been bound by sentence of any bishops whatsoever, because it has authority to judge all churches, but can be judged by none. Appeals may be made to it from all parts of the world, but no one may appeal from it."¹¹ Almost a hundred years before this, Pope Zosimus wrote to Aurelius of Carthage: "It is not unknown to you that we rule the Roman Church and hold its power. This you know, my brethren, and as priests you ought to know it. Such is our authority, that no one dare revise our judgment."¹²

The very nature of a council proves the absurdity of

¹⁰ Denzinger, n. 1830.

¹¹ Gelasius I, "Epist. ad Episcopos Dardaniae"; P. L., 59, 66.

¹² Zosimus, "Epist. ad Aurelium"; P. L., 20, 676.

the theory which would make it superior to the Roman Pontiff, from whom it holds all authority. It is simply asserting in different words that the pope is superior to himself. There is only one supreme authority in the Church, and this was committed to St. Peter and his successors. The pope united with the bishops in council has no greater authority than when acting alone. The pope acting alone can legislate, define doctrine, and judge matters for the whole Church; he can also dispense or abrogate any law or disciplinary decree enacted by any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever, including even ecumenical councils.

§ 3. *Objections Considered*

OBJECTION I.—The first eight general councils were called, not by the Pope, but by the emperors; yet they were all accepted as legitimate and truly ecumenical. Consequently the calling of councils was not recognized as an exclusive right of the Roman Pontiff until later centuries.

ANSWER.—A council convoked without authority of the Roman Pontiff is not ecumenical by convocation; in fact, it is not even a council in the strict sense of the word, and its decrees have no binding force on anyone, unless accepted and confirmed by the Roman Pontiff. When thus approved, the council becomes ecumenical by confirmation. If those first councils were convened by sole authority of the emperors, they were not ecumenical until accepted and ratified by the pope. It is

certain, however, that some of them were convoked by the emperor with the consent, and even at the instigation, of the pope. For instance, Leo the Great earnestly begged Theodosius to convoke a council in Italy, but finally consented to have it meet in Chalcedon,¹ where Dioscorus was deposed, because "he had dared to hold a synod without authority from the Apostolic See,—a thing which was never done before, and is not lawful to be done."² In view of this statement it seems very probable that the emperors in every case acted with the knowledge and consent of the Roman Pontiff in summoning councils.

OBJECTION II.—The emperors not only summoned the councils, but also presided over their deliberations. Constantine, for instance, presided at the Nicene Council.

ANSWER.—It is historically certain that the Roman Pontiffs, through their legates, really presided at all ecumenical councils except the first and second of Constantinople, which were not originally intended to be ecumenical, but became such afterwards by papal confirmation. Although the papal legates directed and dominated the councils, the emperors or their representatives were, at times, given an honorary presidency. This was perfectly legitimate and, under the circumstances, a becoming recognition of the emperor's interest and good will. Without his aid the council could

¹ Leo Great, "Epist. ad Pulcheriam Augustam"; P. L., 54, 873 sq.; "Epist. ad Theodoium Augustum"; P. L., 54, 890.

² See above, pp. 353.

not have been held; he provided a suitable place for its meetings, supplied the bishops with the means of travel, and protected them with his soldiers from the attacks of heretics and other enemies.

OBJECTION III.—If the Roman Pontiff can take all necessary measures for the government of the Church without a council, and can even nullify its actions by refusing to ratify them, there can be no reason for its existence. The bishops can only discuss and approve what the pope can do without their approval, and even despite their disapproval.

ANSWER.—The Roman Pontiff has power and authority sufficient to rule and guide the Church at all times and under all circumstances, and this he usually does. Ecumenical councils are confessedly an extraordinary means for the governance of the Church. This is evident from the fact that only twenty such councils have been held in the course of nineteen centuries. Councils are not necessary because of any lack of authority on the part of the Roman Pontiff, yet they may be necessary at times to obtain results more effectively and with greater promptness than would otherwise be possible. The knowledge that matters of great importance have been decided after mature deliberation by the bishops of the whole world, cannot fail to have a wholesome effect upon the minds of the faithful. Even the bishops themselves will feel an increased responsibility and greater readiness to put into effect laws and regulations which they have helped to formulate.

A council can also be of great assistance to the Pope in framing suitable laws for the Church. He cannot use his supreme authority for the best interests of the Church unless he knows her various needs, and the circumstances under which she labors in the different parts of the world. There are many ways to obtain this knowledge, but an ecumenical council may, at times, be the easiest and most effective. When bishops from all parts of the world assemble, the needs of all are made known, and the united counsel of many can scarcely fail to discover the most effective and salutary course to follow.

CHAPTER XIII

THE INFALLIBLE TEACHING AUTHORITY

The Church received from her Divine Founder the solemn commission to teach all nations whatsoever He had commanded. With this commission she received authority to demand acceptance of her doctrines and the promise of immunity from error in discharging her duty as teacher of the nations.

ART. I. THE TEACHING AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH

THE TEACHING OFFICE. Teaching must be numbered among the principal duties of the Church. Christ himself constituted the Apostles teachers for all nations: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."¹ Again He said to them: "Going into the whole world preach the Gospel to every creature."² Because of these commands St. Paul says: "If I preach the Gospel, it is no glory to me, for a necessity lieth upon me; for woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel."³ The other Apostles also

¹ Matt. xxviii, 18-19.

² Mark xvi, 15.

³ 1 Cor. ix, 16.

INFALLIBLE TEACHING AUTHORITY 427

proclaimed that their teaching was by command of God, for when the high priests Annas and Caiphas "charged them not to speak at all, nor to teach in the name of Jesus; Peter and John said to them: If it be just in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye."⁴ St. Paul even intimates that his principal duty as an Apostle was that of preaching: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel."⁵

AUTHORITY IN TEACHING. The Apostles were not only commissioned to teach, but were also endowed with authority, such that all who heard their teaching were obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to accept it: "He that believeth not shall be condemned,"⁶ and "he that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me."⁷ St. Paul says that he received the grace of the Apostolate "for obedience to the faith in all nations, . . . bringing in to captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ; and having in readiness to revenge all disobedience."⁸ He admonished Titus: "These things speak and exhort and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee."⁹

These few references prove that the teaching office, or *magisterium*, of the Church belongs to her power

⁴ Acts iv, 18-20.

⁵ 1 Cor. i, 17.

⁶ Mark xvi, 16.

⁷ Luke x, 16; Matt. x, 14.

⁸ Rom., i, 5; 2 Cor. x, 4 sq.

⁹ Titus ii, 15.

of jurisdiction, which, therefore, includes authority both to rule and to teach and likewise demands submission of intellect and will.

BISHOPS, THE TEACHERS. The very purpose of the teaching office in the Church demands that it be perpetual, for, as St. Paul says, "*God will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.*"¹⁰ And Christ not only promised that He Himself would be with the Apostles for all time in the discharge of their duty as teachers; He also promised them the Holy Ghost to assist them in this same work forever: "*I will ask the Father and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever . . . He will teach you all things and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said.*"¹¹

Since the teaching authority conferred upon the Apostles is a permanent institution in the Church, it must descend to their lawful successors, the bishops, who thereby become the divinely appointed teachers to preserve the doctrines of Christ and bring them to the knowledge of men in all ages until the consummation of the world. For this reason St. Paul was careful to mention ability to teach as a necessary qualification in bishops: "*It behooveth a bishop to be blameless, . . . given to hospitality, a teacher.*"¹² And to Titus he writes: "*A bishop must be without crime, . . . embracing that faithful word which is according to*

¹⁰ 1 Tim. ii, 4.

¹¹ John xiv, 16, 26.

¹² 1 Tim. iii, 2.

doctrine, that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers"¹³

The bishops of the Church are the only divinely authorized teachers, since teaching with authority is an act of jurisdiction, which they alone possess by divine right. From this it follows that the Roman Pontiff, holding the supreme power of jurisdiction, also holds the supreme teaching authority in the Church. In each diocese the bishop is the divinely constituted teacher and judge in matters of faith, but he exercises this office in subjection to the supreme teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff.

EXTENT OF TEACHING AUTHORITY. Christ himself determined the extent of the Church's teaching authority when He said: "*Teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*"¹⁴ The whole body of revealed truth,—whatsoever Christ has taught,—is committed to the Church for the enlightenment of nations. It is her duty, then, to preserve, interpret, and proclaim these truths of revelation, and whatever is necessary for this purpose falls within the scope of her teaching authority. Since this question comes up again in connection with infallibility,¹⁵ it will be enough to mention here only a few practical conclusions that follow from the Church's duty of preserving and teaching the truths of revelation.

¹³ Titus i, 7-8.

¹⁴ Matt. xxviii, 19-20.

¹⁵ See below, pp. 503 sq.

I. REPRESSION OF HERESY. It is the duty of the Church to see to it that the faithful receive the true doctrines of Christ, and to this end she may use adequate means to protect them from the contaminating influence of those who seek to spread false doctrines. She has not only the right, but also the duty, to take all necessary measures to protect the spiritual health of her members, just as the State protects the physical health of its citizens by various regulations, even excluding diseased aliens from its borders. Hence the Church is obliged to condemn and proscribe every doctrine at variance with the teachings of Christ. For this reason St. Paul warned Titus of certain persons in Crete "*who must be reprov'd, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not. . . . Wherefore rebuke them sharply that they may be sound in the faith.*"¹⁶ Our Lord also commanded St. John to write to certain bishops of Asia Minor, severely reprov'ing them because they had not condemned and rooted out false teachings.¹⁷

II. PROHIBITION OF BOOKS. The duty of preserving the truths of revelation and of protecting the spiritual life of the faithful makes it necessary for the Church to point out and condemn books and periodicals dangerous to the faith and morals of her subjects. The State claims the same right in regard to writings considered dangerous to civil order and to the good of the community. For this reason it for-

¹⁶ Titus i, 3 sq.

¹⁷ Apoc., ii, 14 sq.

bids the publication and sale of works advocating treason, anarchy, or the commission of crime; it also forbids the use of the mails for any scheme to defraud the unsuspecting. If the State may prohibit books dangerous to the temporal welfare of its citizens, the Church certainly has like authority to protect the eternal welfare of her members.

Many persons ridicule the Church for her practice of condemning books and forbidding their use to the faithful. They claim it is a suppression of the freedom of thought and a tyrannical use of power in favor of ignorance. But very often these same persons clamor for state and national censorship of theatres, and the suppression of immoral literature, and by so doing prove the wisdom of the Church in her censorship of books.

St. Paul was the first to use this power of the Church by condemning evil books, which he even committed to the flames: "*And many of them who had followed curious arts, brought together their books and burned them before all; and counting the price of them, they found the money to be fifty thousand pieces of silver.*"¹⁸ The Church follows the example set by St. Paul. In the sixth century Pope Leo the Great said: "He that uses books condemned by the Catholic Church, cannot be considered a Catholic."¹⁹

III. IMPRIMATUR. The Church has long recognized the importance of *prophylaxis*, or prevention of

¹⁸ Acts xix, 19.

¹⁹ "Epist. ad Turribium"; P. L., 54, 688.

disease. She not only forbids the use of literature dangerous to faith and morals, but also prevents the publication of such literature by demanding that all books dealing with matters of faith and morals be submitted to her inspection before publication. In this matter, of course, the Church can exercise authority over her own subjects only. The bishops, as divinely constituted teachers in their dioceses, are charged with the duty of inspecting all books on matters of faith and morals before granting permission for publication in places under their jurisdiction. Needless to say, the Roman Pontiff holds supreme authority in this matter for all parts of the world.

If the bishop, upon examining a work, finds nothing in it contrary or injurious to faith or morals, he gives permission for its publication by the Latin formula, *Imprimatur*, or *Imprimi potest*, *i. e.*, it may be published. Hence the permission itself has come to be known as *Imprimatur*.

IV. APPROBATION FOR PREACHING. The duty of preserving purity of doctrine in regard to faith and morals extends to the spoken as well as to the written word. Consequently the Church forbids any one to preach or publicly teach such doctrines without her consent and approval. Here again, the bishops are charged with the duty of guarding the deposit of faith in their several dioceses. They cannot be expected to examine all sermons and religious discourses to be delivered under their jurisdiction, but they are expected and commanded to select and approve only such per-

sons as they know to be qualified for the office of preacher or teacher.

The necessity for episcopal approval in these matters also follows from the fact that the bishop is the only divinely constituted teacher in the diocese. All others act as mere agents to assist him in the work of teaching, but no one can act as agent for another unless he has been selected and commissioned for that express purpose. Consequently no one dares to assume the office of preaching in a diocese without due permission and approval from the bishop: "No one may exercise the ministry of preaching unless he has received due permission from a lawful superior."²⁰

ART. II. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

The Church not only teaches and interprets the doctrines of Christ with divine authority, but also possesses the gift of infallibility, by which these doctrines are proposed and accepted without the possibility of error. Therefore, it is necessary to consider (1) the nature of infallibility, (2) infallibility in teaching, (3) infallibility in believing, and (4) the objections urged against this prerogative of the Church.

§ 1. Nature of Infallibility

Infallibility, from the Latin *in—not* and *falli—to be deceived*, signifies inability to err, and therefore

²⁰ "Codex Juris Canonici," can. 1328.

differs from *inerrancy*. A person is *inerrant* when free from error; he is *infallible* when free from the possibility of error. Infallibility must also be distinguished from *revelation* and *inspiration*. *Revelation* is a manifestation or making known of truths; *inspiration* is a divine impulse to commit certain truths to writing, and a positive assistance of the Holy Ghost to direct the writer in recording precisely those truths which God wishes to have recorded and in the particular way that He wishes them recorded. Infallibility is merely a divine protection by which a person is unfaillingly preserved from error in declaring and interpreting truths already revealed. Consequently, infallibility does not bring to light any new truths; it simply provides that revealed truths be proposed and interpreted without the possibility of error.

Infallibility does not require special divine influence at all times. The interposition of such influence is necessary only when the person, left to his own natural powers, is about to fall into error. The difference between inspiration and infallibility may be illustrated by the assistance given a child in writing. The teacher may grasp the hand of the child and direct it in writing such words as the teacher wishes and in the way he wishes, or he may simply hold his hand in readiness to prevent the child from making any errors in writing the words to be copied. The first case illustrates the action of the Holy Ghost in inspiration; the second, His action in preserving a person from error by the gift of infallibility.

The above explanation makes it evident that infallibility does not exclude, but rather presupposes, the use of natural means to avoid error. The divine protection is only to supply the deficiency of natural means and thereby preclude the possibility of error, but since the exclusion of error is the end to be obtained without fail, neglect on the part of the human agent will not prevent the Holy Ghost from realizing that end. Hence if the person endowed with infallibility fails to use the natural means at hand for discovering the truth, he commits sin, but will be protected from error none the less, because infallibility is a *gratia gratis data*,—a gift freely bestowed for the good of others.

Infallibility, as a property of the Church, is an ever-present right to be divinely preserved from error whenever such divine assistance is needed.

DEGREES OF INFALLIBILITY. Perfect infallibility belongs to God, the Eternal Truth, but rational creatures may enjoy a certain immunity from error,—an immunity which they hold as a gift from God. This communicated infallibility is either *natural* or *supernatural*. *Natural infallibility* is the immunity from error which all men possess in regard to certain self-evident truths. We know from experience that there are certain truths so evident that no one having the use of reason can mistake or misunderstand them. *Supernatural infallibility* is an immunity from error maintained by special assistance of the Holy Ghost. This special gift may concern the teaching of truths

without error, and is then known as *active* infallibility, or *infallibility in teaching*. When its purpose is to prevent error in the acceptance of truths taught, it is called *passive*, or *infallibility in believing*. The Church possesses both active and passive infallibility.

§ 2. *Active Infallibility of the Church*

Thesis.—**The Church of Christ is infallible in teaching revealed truths**

DE FIDE. The Vatican Council indirectly proclaimed the Church infallible in teaching when it declared that "the Roman Pontiff possesses that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals."¹ Even before this declaration the doctrine was rightly considered a dogma of faith for, as Fenélon had said, "the Church always takes for granted that she possesses this fundamental authority and exercises it against those who dare call it in question. This constant practice of the Church is a continual declaration of her infallible authority."²

OPPONENTS OF INFALLIBILITY. a) PROTESTANTS. All Protestants without exception reject the very idea of infallibility as an absurdity. For them it is quite sufficient if a church have authority to declare what doctrines it teaches and to demand their profession by all who wish to become members. No society, it seems,

¹ Denzinger, n. 1839.

² "Instructio Pastoralis," iii, 57.

could be denied such authority, yet the fundamental Protestant doctrine of private interpretation renders even this modicum of authority impossible. In order to become a member of a Protestant church, it is not necessary to accept its doctrinal standards, because all are free to take their faith from the Bible according to their own interpretation of it. In such a system there is no place for a teaching authority, fallible or infallible. No minister can logically claim to present anything more than his own private opinion, which others are, therefore, free to accept or reject. According to this theory, the faithful must be, as St. Paul says, "*ever learning and never attaining to the knowledge of truth.*"³

b) EASTERN SCHISMATICS. The position of the schismatic churches of the East on this question is difficult to determine. They teach that the first seven ecumenical councils were infallible, or at least free from error, in proclaiming the doctrines of Christ. They also maintain that these doctrines have been preserved intact by all so-called Orthodox churches, but whether the Church still possesses an infallible teaching authority seems to be a disputed question. Among the Orthodox theologians of the present day, Androutsos teaches that the Church is infallible, while Kyriakos is said to deny it.⁴

THE QUESTION. It is evident that the infallibility

³ 2 Tim. iii, 7.

⁴ Androutsos, "Δογματική τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας," p. 265; D'Alès, "Dictionnaire Apologétique," Art. "Grecque, Église."

of the Church in teaching can be nothing else than the infallibility of those who exercise the teaching authority in the Church. Hence, to prove the Church infallible in teaching is to prove that the bishops, as successors of the Apostles, are infallible in teaching the truths of Revelation. This must be established by proving that the gift of infallibility was bestowed upon the Apostles, not only as individuals, but also as members of the Apostolic body, of which St. Peter was the head.

Infallibility granted to the Apostles as individuals was a personal prerogative, and consequently did not descend to their successors. But if infallibility was also granted to them as a body, then the bishops, who perpetuate that body in the Church, must possess the same prerogative and in the same manner, *i. e.*, not as individuals, but as a body.

PROOFS. I. *From Reason.* a) The Church, as the mystical body of Christ, is animated and vivified by the Holy Ghost, much the same as the natural body is informed and vivified by the soul; and as in the natural body, all vital activities proceed from the soul, so likewise those of the Church must proceed from the Holy Ghost. Therefore, if the Church as a whole falls into error through her official teaching body, that error must be ascribed to the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, which is manifestly impossible. Consequently, the bishops, as the teaching body in the Church, must be infallible.

b) Christ ordained that all men must accept the

teachings of the Church under pain of eternal damnation: "*He that believeth not shall be condemned.*"⁵ Therefore, He is bound in justice to provide against the possibility of our being led into error by following this precept of obedience to the teaching authority of the Church. Besides, it is inconceivable that Christ, the eternal Truth, could allow a single error to be proclaimed to the world in His name; yet this would be the case if the Church, teaching in His name and by His authority, were not infallible.

II. *From Scripture.* a) Our Lord proclaimed His Church infallible when He said: "*The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*"⁶ If *gates of hell* means the powers of darkness, then Christ directly promised His Church infallibility, because the moment she would fall into error, she would succumb to the powers of darkness, and the promise of Christ would be made void. On the other hand, if the *gates of hell* is merely a synonym for death or destruction, Christ has promised that His Church will endure for all time, unchanged in any essential feature, because the moment it would lose a single essential feature, it would cease to be the Church established by Christ. Therefore Christ has implicitly promised the gift of infallibility, without which unity of faith could not be preserved through all the centuries among peoples of every nation, tribe, and tongue, especially since many of the truths to be preserved transcend the powers of human

⁵ Mark xvi, 16.

⁶ Matt. xvi, 18.

understanding. "The Church of Christ would fail in her immutability, fall from her dignity, and cease to be the necessary means of salvation, if she could wander from the saving truths of faith and morals, or if she could either deceive or be deceived in expounding and proclaiming them."⁷

b) "And Jesus coming, spoke to them [the Apostles], saying: *All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.*"⁸ With these words Our Lord conferred upon His Apostles unlimited authority to teach: Teach all nations, teach all truths; and behold I am with you—not for a month, or a year, or a life-time, but all days, even to the consummation of the world. The mission is for all time; for the Apostles and their successors down through the ages.

It is evident from the very words of Our Lord that He was conferring a most extraordinary power. He appeals to His own divine power to prove, as it were, His authority for the commission He is conferring: "*All Power is given to me in heaven and in earth; going therefore, teach with all my divine power and authority.*" Only a few days before, Our Lord had made a similar appeal as a prelude to the conferring of another extraordinary power: "*As the Father hath sent me I also send you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost.*"

⁷ Canon 9 of the schema proposed at the Vatican Council.

⁸ Matt. xxviii, 16-18.

Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them."⁹ Hence, divine power must be as necessary in one case as in the other, but the mere office of preaching the Gospel would not require such extraordinary power; the ordinary assistance of God's grace would be amply sufficient for that. What, then, was the purpose of this unusual power and the solemn manner in which it was conferred? There can be but one answer to this question: Our Lord was conferring upon His Apostles and their successors an infallible authority to teach all nations whatsoever He had commanded them; He constituted them teachers, whom all must accept under pain of eternal damnation; therefore, He made them infallible.

Christ not only conferred a divine prerogative upon the Apostles as teachers of the nations, but He also promised to be with them in this work until the end of time: "*Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.*" But why this special and constant presence of Christ with His Apostles and their successors down through the ages? Evidently, that they might teach aright the truths of Revelation to all nations until the consummation of time. Here, then, is a promise of complete and perpetual infallibility. Wherever God is said to *be with* a person, it is a promise of special divine assistance that never fails in its purpose. For example, when Moses was sent to lead the Israelites out of Egypt, he hesitated to accept the difficult mission, but God assured him of His

⁹ John xx, 22-23.

assistance and success: "I will be with thee."¹⁰ In like manner God said to Josue: "As I have been with Moses, so will I be with thee: I will not leave thee nor forsake thee."¹¹ It is also said of the Apostles: "And the hand of the Lord was with them: and great numbers believing were converted to the Lord."¹² Hence when Christ promised to be with the Apostles and their successors, He promised them an assistance that cannot fail in its purpose; they shall infallibly teach aright the truths committed to them for the enlightenment of all nations.

c) On the night of the Last Supper Our Lord promised His Apostles the guiding presence of the Holy Ghost, and He promised this not once, but many times: "And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, that he may abide with you forever. . . . But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said to you. . . . But when the Paraclete cometh, whom I will send you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceedeth from the Father, he shall give testimony of me. . . . But I tell you the truth: it is expedient to you that I go, for if I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you. . . . I have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear

¹⁰ Ex. iii, 11-12.

¹¹ Jos. i, 5.

¹² Acts xi, 21.

them now, But when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will teach you all truth."¹³

Throughout this whole discourse, Our Lord refers to the Holy Ghost as the *Paraclete*, i. e., the Helper or Advocate. Christ himself was the *Paraclete* or Helper of the Apostles during His life on earth, and promised to be with them for all time. He now promises another *Paraclete* to assist and guide them during His bodily absence after the Ascension. The coming of this second *Paraclete* is even more important for the Apostles than the continuation of Our Lord's personal presence among them: "It is expedient for you that I go, for if I go not, the *Paraclete* will not come to you." The mission of this second *Paraclete* is clearly marked out. He is the Spirit of truth, who is to keep clearly before the minds of the Apostles all things taught them by Christ: "He will teach you all truth," or as the Greek text has it, "He will lead you into all truth."¹⁴

The Holy Ghost is to abide forever with the Apostles and their successors, and His guidance shall be effective; He shall lead them into all truth and preserve them therein. In a word, the Holy Ghost shall preserve the Apostles and their successors free from every error. He shall render them infallible. Christ had commissioned the Apostles to teach "all things whatsoever I have commanded." He now promises them

¹³ John xiv, 16-17; xiv, 26; xv, 26-27; xvi, 7; xvi, 12-13.

¹⁴ Οδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν.

the Holy Ghost to keep these same truths ever before their minds, that they may teach them without the fear or possibility of error; "*He will bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said to you.*" Could Our Lord have promised infallibility in more explicit or more emphatic language?

d) St. Paul explicitly appeals to the infallibility of the Church in his first Epistle to Timothy. He admonishes Timothy that sound doctrine must be carefully guarded and preached, and all Jewish fables avoided, as becomes a bishop of the Church: "*These things I write to thee . . . that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God.*" He then adds the reason: "*Because the Church of the living God is the pillar and ground of truth.*"¹⁵

The Church is the *pillar* of truth because, like the pillar of a material building, it sustains and strengthens the whole structure of divine Revelation. It is the *foundation* upon which revealed truths are based and made secure for all time. In a word, the Church is the firm foundation and the secure guardian of the truth which she teaches with infallible security from all error.¹⁶

III. *From Tradition.* The infallible teaching authority of the Church has been recognized in all ages, as is evident from the fact that any one who denied or questioned a single dogma of her teaching was

¹⁵ 1 Tim. iii, 15.

¹⁶ Knabenbauer, Commentarius in 1 Tim., iii, 15.

promptly condemned as a heretic and cut off from communion with the faithful. There was never the least question that her teachings might be false. The Fathers also manifest their faith in the infallible authority of the Church by appealing to her teachings as the standard of truth. A few examples will illustrate this belief.

a) *St. Irenæus*: "It is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church,—those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the Apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received *the certain gift of truth* according to the good pleasure of the Father."¹⁷

b) *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*: "The Church is called Catholic, because it extends all over the world . . . and because it teaches *universally and completely one and all the doctrines which ought to come to man's knowledge*, concerning things both visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly."¹⁸

c) *St. Athanasius*. After enumerating a number of errors, St. Athanasius says: "It is enough merely to answer such things as follows: *We are content with the fact that this is not the teaching of the Catholic Church, nor did the fathers hold this.*"¹⁹

d) *St. Augustine*. "Many tongues contradict the true doctrine; hasten thou to the tabernacle of God,

¹⁷ "Adversus Hæreses," iv, 26; P. G., 7, 1053.*

¹⁸ "Catecheses," xviii, n. 23; P. G., 33, 1043.*

¹⁹ "Epist. ad Epictetum"; P. G., 26, 1055.*

cling to the Catholic Church, be not separated from *the standard of truth*, and thou shalt be protected in the tabernacle from the contradiction of tongues." ²⁰

§ 3. *Passive Infallibility of the Church*

Thesis.—The body of the faithful infallibly accept the truths of revelation proposed to them by the teaching authority of the Church

The Church is *infallible in believing*, *i. e.*, the faithful, *as a body*, are preserved from error in accepting and professing the doctrines taught by the Church. Individuals may err; whole provinces, and even nations may fall away from the faith, as history testifies; but those professing the true faith must always remain sufficient in number and in distribution throughout the world to preserve the Church truly Catholic in the unity of faith and worship.

PROOFS. I. *From Reason.* Passive infallibility, in the sense just explained, is a necessary consequence of the indefectible unity of faith and the perpetual Catholicity of the Church. Since the Church is immutably one in the profession of faith, the faithful as a body must be free from error, otherwise the faith would not be one, but many. Moreover, the profession of a false faith constitutes manifest heresy and excludes one from membership in the Church. Consequently, if the faithful as a body could fall into error in the profession of faith, the Church would immediately cease to be

²⁰ "Ennaration. in Ps.," xxx, Sermo. 3; P. L., 36, 2533.

Catholic and would therefore cease to be the Church of Christ. It is evident, then, that the faithful as a body must be infallible or free from error, at least in the profession of faith.

II. *From Scripture.* a) The Church is the mystical Body and the Spouse of Christ, for which He "delivered himself up 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 might be holy and without blemish."¹ But a Church tainted with error and the profession of falsehood would be neither glorious nor without spot; neither would it be a spouse worthy of Christ. If the faithful as a body could fall into error, would not Christ have delivered Himself in vain to cleanse and sanctify the Church which they constitute? And would not the error of the mystical Body be justly imputable to its Head and to the Holy Ghost who animates it?

b) St. Paul describes the Church as the pillar and ground of truth, but this she cannot be, unless the body of the faithful be preserved free from error in accepting and professing the truths of faith. She is the pillar and ground of truth, because the gates of hell cannot prevail against her. In the words of St. Augustine, "the Church is true, the Church is Catholic, fighting against all heresies. She may fight, but she cannot be overcome. All heresies have gone out from her, like useless brambles pruned from the vine. She

¹ Eph. v, 25-27.

herself remains firmly rooted. . . . The gates of hell shall never conquer her." ²

III. *From Tradition.* The Fathers constantly appeal to the faith professed, as well as to that taught, by the universal Church as an unfailing norm of truth. Hence, the famous axiom of ST. VINCENT OF LERINS in the fifth century: "We confess that one faith to be true which the whole Church throughout the world confesses." ³ ST. AUGUSTINE expresses the same thought in almost identical terms: "What is held by the whole Church, and that not as instituted by councils, but as a matter of invariable custom, is rightly held to have been handed down by Apostolic authority." ⁴ TERTULLIAN expressly states that the Church is preserved from error in the profession of faith by the action of the Holy Ghost: "The Holy Ghost was sent with this in view by Christ, and for this asked of the Father that He might be the teacher of truth. . . . Has He neglected His office, permitting the churches for a time to understand differently, and to believe differently what He himself was preaching by the Apostles?" ⁵ He uses this argument to prove that the faith professed in the Catholic Church had not varied from that taught by the Apostles, as the heretics claimed.

COROLLARY. Since the faithful as a body are in-

² "Sermon. de Symbolo," c. 6; P. L., 40, 635.

³ "Commonitorium," c. 2; P. L., 50, 640.*

⁴ "De Baptismo," iv, 24; P. L., 43, 174.

⁵ "De Præscrip. Hær.," 28; P. L., 2, 40.

fallible in accepting and professing the faith proposed to them, it follows that any doctrine professed by the whole Church as a matter of revelation is infallibly true and may be defined as an article of faith by the teaching authority of the Church. A mere opinion or pious belief accepted by the whole Church is not necessarily true, but should not be rejected lightly, because such universal acceptance gives strong presumption in favor of its being a doctrine handed down from the Apostles.

Passive infallibility, bestowed upon the Church primarily for the purpose of preserving unity of faith, also furnishes a rule of faith, since any doctrine professed by the whole Church must be a revealed truth. Practically, however, such a rule of faith is not sufficient for the needs of the faithful, because it requires long and diligent research to discover whether any particular doctrine is held by the universal Church, and also whether it is held as a revealed truth or merely as a pious belief.

§ 4. *Objections Answered*

OBJECTION I.—Infallibility cannot be inferred from the necessity of preserving the true faith, nor from the command of Christ that all must accept the teachings of the Church. In the Old Law there were revealed doctrines to be conserved, and the people were commanded to accept the teachings of their superiors under pain of death: "*He that shall be proud and refuse to*

obey the commandment of the priest . . . and the decree of the judge, that man shall die."¹ Yet, despite these facts the Synagogue, the Church of the Old Law, was not infallible.

ANSWER.—Whether the Synagogue was infallible or not is a disputed question, but granting that it was not, this proves nothing against the necessity of infallibility in the Church. In the Old Law there were but few supernatural truths to be conserved, and those only in one nation, among a people of one language. Yet, even under these conditions, it was necessary for God to send prophets at frequent intervals to recall the people to a knowledge of the truth and to a sense of their duty. In the New Law there are many truths transcending the powers of the human intellect, and these must be preserved intact among peoples of all nations, tribes, and tongues, not for a few centuries only, but for all time. Because of these different conditions under the New Law, God substituted an infallible teaching authority for the prophetic ministry of the Old Law.

OBJECTION II.—Catholics claim to prove the infallibility of the Church from the authority of Scripture, and then, in open violation of all logic, they proceed to establish the authority of Scripture from the infallible authority of the Church.

ANSWER.—Catholics prove the infallibility of the Church from the Scriptures taken as purely historical documents. The historical reliability of the Scriptures

¹ Deut. xviii, 12.

must be established the same as that of any other document. Catholic and non-Catholic scholars have done this to the satisfaction of all reasonable men. Taking the Scriptures as genuine historical documents, Catholics prove that Christ was a divine legate, that He established a Church, and endowed it with infallibility. Having thus established the infallibility of the Church by purely historical arguments, Catholics then appeal to it in proof of the inspired character of those same Scriptures. The whole process is perfectly logical, since the historical accuracy of a work is quite different from its inspiration; many human works are historically accurate, but not divinely inspired.

OBJECTION III.—Even granting the infallibility of the Church, we must still have recourse to the Protestant principle of private judgment. Infallibility is known only by an act of our own reason, but if we must rely on private judgment in this most important matter, why not also in other matters of faith? Again, the knowledge of infallibility rests upon an act of our own judgment. Consequently, an infallible authority can never give any greater certainty than that of the judgment accepting it; a chain is never stronger than its weakest link, which in this case is an act of our own private judgment. Therefore, infallibility is useless.²

ANSWER.—The objection is refuted by the old axiom that "who proves too much, proves nothing." The

² Cf. G. Salmon, "Infallibility of the Church," pp. 47 sq.

same argument would destroy the infallible authority of God and make divine Revelation useless. The existence of God and His infallible authority are known only by an act of our own reason, but if we exercise our judgment in regard to these truths, why not in other matters as well? Therefore, Revelation is useless and does not exist since God can do nothing useless. The absurdity of this conclusion proves the absurdity of the argument from which it is deduced.

We exercise our own reason and judgment to establish the existence of God, His infinite knowledge and truthfulness, and the fact that He has made a Revelation. Then, as becomes rational beings, we accept the infallible authority of God for the knowledge of truths beyond our own powers of intellect, and also for truths which we could know by our own reason, but not so easily or so securely. In like manner, we establish the existence of infallible authority in the Church by the use of reason, and then rely upon that authority for truths which we cannot know by reason, or which we cannot know with ease and security. Even supposing that all men could attain knowledge of all revealed truths by their own private judgment, an infallible authority would not be useless by any means. Any mathematician can construct a table of logarithms, yet he finds it very useful to have one at hand which he knows to be perfectly accurate.

Finally, if infallible authority in the Church could give no certainty of faith, because that authority itself must be established by reason, then all faith, both

human and divine, would become impossible. Divine faith rests upon the testimony of God; human faith, upon the testimony of man; but in either case we must use our reason to establish the existence and trustworthiness of the testimony.

OBJECTION IV.—An infallible teaching authority in the Church is useless unless every member of the Church can be infallibly certain what that authority teaches. But for this knowledge, the members of the Church must depend upon priests, catechists, or parents, none of whom are infallible. Consequently, they believe upon the fallible authority of their teachers instead of the infallible authority of the Church. In other words, they have only human faith.

ANSWER.—This objection also proves too much. It proves that divine Revelation is useless and divine faith impossible. Many persons learn the truths of Revelation from parents, catechists, or pastors, who are neither infallible nor inspired. Therefore, they cannot be infallibly certain what truths have been revealed. Even if these truths be learned directly from Holy Scripture, the person accepting them must rely upon the fallible and uninspired testimony of others for the fact that the books of Scripture are genuine and have come down through the centuries uncorrupted. Consequently, they believe upon the fallible authority of man instead of the infallible authority of God; their faith is human, not divine. The absurdity of the conclusion proves the absurdity of the argument.

Priests, catechists, parents, and others are simply

witnesses to the teachings of the Church. They are human witnesses, it is true, but their testimony can give absolute certainty when the proper conditions are verified, *i. e.*, when we know the witnesses have sufficient knowledge of the matter and are truthful. These two facts are easily established beyond the possibility of doubt when there are many independent witnesses testifying to the same thing. Who, for instance, could force himself to doubt the existence of the city of Paris, although his only knowledge of the fact has been derived from the testimony of others? The witnesses for the teachings of the Church are just as numerous and just as reliable as those for the existence of Paris, and the certainty they beget is no less absolute. Bishops, priests, catechists, parents, learned friends and companions, official creeds and catechisms, books, pamphlets, and periodicals all agree in their testimony regarding the teachings of the Church. From this human testimony we know with absolute certainty what the Church teaches, and knowing this, we believe it, because of her infallible authority.

OBJECTION V.—The infallibility of the Church cannot be a dogma of faith. The Church would have to use her infallible authority to define her own infallibility which is manifestly begging the question,—taking for granted the very thing to be proved. Therefore, since the infallibility of the Church cannot be a dogma of faith, we are not obliged to believe it.

ANSWER.—If we need not accept the testimony of the Church defining her own infallibility, neither are

we obliged to accept the testimony of God revealing His authority, since in both cases the existence of the authority must be established by reason before its testimony can be accepted. The falsity of the conclusion proves the falsity of the argument. As a matter of fact, we arrive at a knowledge of God and His divine authority by the use of reason. Then, relying upon that authority, we accept the testimony of God revealing it to us. In like manner, we prove the infallible authority of the Church from Revelation and then rely upon that authority of the Church when she defines it as an article of faith. What we know by reason, we also accept by faith.

CHAPTER XIV

INFALLIBILITY OF THE BISHOPS

The infallibility of the Church in teaching can be none other than that of her divinely constituted teachers, who, as successors of the Apostles, perpetuate the Apostolic body with all its powers and prerogatives for teaching and governing the faithful. The bishops, then, as successors of the Apostles, enjoy the gift of infallibility, not as individuals, but as a body in union with the Roman Pontiff, their divinely constituted head. But since the bishops exercise their teaching authority when assembled in council to define doctrines of faith or morals for the whole Church, and also when instructing the people of their own dioceses in these same doctrines, it is necessary to consider (1) the infallibility of ecumenical councils, and (2) the infallibility of the episcopal body in its ordinary work of teaching the faithful in the various parts of the Church.

ART. I. INFALLIBILITY OF ECUMENICAL COUNCILS

Thesis.—The bishops assembled in ecumenical council are infallible when exercising their supreme authority to define questions of faith or morals for the universal Church

§ 1. Preliminary Explanations

CONDITIONS. Certain conditions are necessary for

INFALLIBILITY OF THE BISHOPS 457

the exercise of infallible teaching authority by bishops assembled in council, namely: *a*) the council must be summoned by the Roman Pontiff, or at least with his consent and approval, because all power in the Church, whether of teaching or governing, is subject to the supreme authority of the pope. Again, since the bishops enjoy infallibility in their corporate capacity only, they cannot exercise it independently of the Roman Pontiff, their divinely constituted head. From this it also follows that all definitions must have the approval and confirmation of the Roman Pontiff, for without such confirmation the bishops are acting independently of their head and, therefore, without any authority.

b) The council must be truly ecumenical by celebration, *i. e.*, the whole body of bishops must be represented. This, of course, does not require the presence of each and every bishop of the whole Church, for if such were the case, the willful or enforced absence of one bishop would frustrate the will of the entire body. Neither is it necessary that every bishop present should consent to the definition proposed, for since the bishops individually are fallible, false opinions will almost invariably find some supporters among them. On this account it would be practically impossible to define any doctrine if unanimous consent were necessary, yet at times a definition is imperative, because some fundamental doctrine of Christianity is at stake, as happened during the Arian and Nestorian heresies. Hence a lawful and infallible definition may be made with-

out the unanimous consent of the Fathers present. In case of a real division in a council, truth must lie with the party whom the Roman Pontiff supports, since no definitions have any force unless confirmed by him.

Definitions of faith may also be made by councils that are not truly ecumenical in their celebration, but in that case the infallible authority is not that of the bishops, but that of the Roman Pontiff, who approves the decrees and thus makes them his own.

c) Bishops assembled in council are infallible only when exercising their supreme authority as teachers of faith or morals by a definite and irrevocable decree that a doctrine is revealed and, therefore, to be accepted by every member of the Church.¹ But since the bishops need not intend such an irrevocable decision at all times, it is necessary that an infallible definition be so worded as to indicate clearly its definitive character. For this purpose no set formula is necessary; it is sufficient to mention the doctrine as *an article of faith, a dogma of faith, a Catholic dogma, a doctrine always believed in the Church, or a doctrine handed down by the Fathers*. Anathema pronounced against those who deny a doctrine is also sufficient evidence of a dogmatic definition.

A large majority of the acts of councils are not infallible definitions, because they are not intended as such. "Neither the discussions which precede a dogmatic decree, nor the reasons alleged to prove and

¹ Other matters falling under the infallible authority of the Church will be considered elsewhere. Cfr. pp. 503 sq.

explain it, are to be accepted as infallibly true. Nothing but the actual decrees are of faith, and these only if they are intended as such."²

d) Since infallibility is due to mere *assistance* of the Holy Ghost, human agencies should be employed to discover and understand the truth to be defined, but the certitude of the definition does not depend upon the previous investigation made by the bishops of the council, nor upon their skill and learning. Failure to make proper investigation would be sinful on the part of the bishops, but the Holy Ghost can and does prevent all error in the actual definition, even though all investigation has been neglected, or false reasons adduced to prove the doctrine.

ADVERSARIES. Protestants, of course, deny the infallibility of ecumenical councils, since they reject the very idea of infallibility in any form. One of the Thirty-nine articles of the Anglican Church reads: "General councils . . . may err and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining to God."³ The Gallicans and Jansenists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries professed to accept the infallibility of ecumenical councils, but actually denied it by teaching that their decrees and definitions are not irreformable unless accepted by all the faithful. The Modernists hold practically the same doctrine, as is evident from the proposition condemned by Pius X: "In the definition of truths the Church teaching and the Church

² Cardinal Bellarmine, "De Conciliis," I, 17.

³ Art. XXI. Cfr. Schaff, Vol. III, p. 500.

taught work together in such wise that nothing remains for the Church teaching except to sanction the common opinions of the Church taught." ⁴

§ 2. *Infallibility of Councils Demonstrated*

PROOFS. I. *From Reason.* a) If the bishops are free from error at any time, they certainly must be when assembled in council by the supreme head of the Church to exercise their authority as teachers in the most solemn manner by defining matters of faith and morals for the universal Church.

b) If the bishops assembled in council to define questions of faith or morals for the whole Church should fall into error, the Church herself would inevitably fall into the same error, since the faithful are obliged to accept their teachings. Then would the gates of hell prevail against the Church, the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth, would fail in His mission; the indefectibility and Apostolicity of the Church would be destroyed; the Church would cease to be the pillar and ground of truth established by Christ upon the rock.

II. *From Scripture.* "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." ¹ On the occasion when Our Lord uttered these words He was speaking to His Apostles of the man who proves incorrigible under fraternal correc-

⁴ Pius X, "Decree Lamentabili," 3 July, 1907; Denzinger, n. 2006.

¹ Matt. xviii, 15.

tion. He is to be denounced to the Church for official correction, but "if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." Then, to show that the ministers of the Church have authority to handle such cases, He added: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven." Christ then continues to tell the Apostles that, whenever they meet to consider a case of this kind, or, in fact, any matter of interest to the Church, they shall have special assistance and shall obtain whatever they ask of the Father: "Again I say to you, that if two of you shall consent upon earth, concerning any thing whatsoever they shall ask, it shall be done to them by my Father who is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

Now, if two or three gathered together to decide matters of such minor importance, are promised special assistance and shall obtain whatever they ask of the Father, what must be expected when the bishops of the whole world are called together by the supreme head of the Church to define questions of faith or morals for all the faithful? Will not the promise of Christ be fulfilled when they ask the Father for wisdom and light to know the truth and to define it unerringly for the faithful?

III. *From Tradition.* In refuting heretics, the Fathers of the Church constantly appeal to the definitions of ecumenical councils as to a secure standard of faith. For example:

a) *St. Gregory the Great* says: "I confess that I accept and venerate the four councils even as the four books of the Gospel."² At that time there had been but four ecumenical councils, and St. Gregory accepts them as of equal authority with the Gospels.

b) *St. Cyril of Alexandria*: "When the Fathers [of the council] issued canons of sincere and irreproachable faith, they were directed by the Holy Ghost, that they might not depart from the truth. In fact, as Christ the Saviour testifies, it was not they who spoke, but the Spirit of God the Father who spoke in them."³

c) *St. Athanasius*: "The word of the Lord, which came through the ecumenical Synod of Nicæa, abides forever."⁴

d) *Pope Hormisdas*: "Those who hold to the constitutions of the Fathers and cherish those foundations of faith, do not depart from the things which they defined by the impelling power of the Holy Ghost."⁵

The Fathers of the councils always looked upon their definitions as infallibly true and, therefore, excommunicated all who dared deny or question them. The Council of Chalcedon distinctly asserted the fact of divine assistance: "We seemed to see the heavenly Bridegroom present with us. For if where two or three are gathered together in His name, He has said that there He is in the midst of them, must He not

² "Epist. ad Joannem Constantinop."; P. L., 77, 478.

³ "Epist. ad Monachos Aegypti"; P. G., 77, 15.

⁴ "Epist. ad Episcopos Afros"; P. G., 26, 1031.*

⁵ "Epist. ad Epiphanium Hierosol."; P. L., 53, 519.

have been much more particularly present with five hundred and twenty bishops, who preferred the spread of knowledge concerning Him to their country and their ease?"⁶

§ 3. *Objections Answered*

OBJECTION I.—St. Gregory of Nazianzen certainly did not believe councils infallible, for he says: "If I am to write the truth, I keep as far as possible from any meeting of bishops, because I never knew a council with a happy ending, nor one that did not do more harm than good."¹

ANSWER.—In this passage St. Gregory refers to the numerous local councils, in which Arian bishops, under the protection of the emperor, sought to pervert the Catholic faith. Only one ecumenical council,—that of Nicæa in 325,—had been held up to the time of St. Gregory, and he speaks of it with the greatest respect. He says: "In the holy Synod held at Nicæa, the Holy Ghost brought together three hundred and eighteen most chosen men."²

OBJECTION II.—St. Augustine expressly declares that ecumenical councils are fallible, for he says: "Councils which are held in the several districts and provinces must yield, beyond all possibility of doubt, to the authority of plenary councils, which are formed

⁶ "Epistola Synodica ad Leonem"; P. L., 54, 951.*

¹ "Epist. ad Procop."; P. G., 37, 226.

² St. Gregory Nazianzen, "Oratio in Laudem Athanas"; P. G., 35, 1095.

for the whole Christian world; and even of the plenary councils, the earlier are often corrected by those which follow them."³ Councils thus subject to correction cannot be infallible.

ANSWER.—When St. Augustine wrote these words, only two ecumenical councils had been held,—one at Nicæa in 325, and one at Constantinople in 381. Consequently, he was not referring to ecumenical councils when he said that “the earlier are *often* corrected by those which follow them.” *Plenary* councils are evidently those which represent more than one province or district of the Church, but not the *whole Christian world* in the literal sense. But even granting that ecumenical councils are meant, there is nothing to indicate that St. Augustine denied them infallibility. He says: “The earlier are often corrected by those which follow them, when, by some actual experiment, things are brought to light which were before concealed, and that is known which previously lay hid.” A doctrine defined by one council in its more general aspects may be taken up by another council and defined more in detail, because further study or controversy has made such action necessary or advisable. The doctrine of transubstantiation, for instance, was defined by the Fourth Lateran Council, but was afterward defined in more definite terms by the Council of Trent, because the controversies on this subject in the sixteenth century made such action necessary. The words of St. Augustine naturally suggest just this sort of correction.

³ “De Baptismo,” ii, 3; P. L., 43, 128.*

OBJECTION III.—In 431 the Council of Ephesus reaffirmed the Nicene Creed and anathematized any one who should dare write or compose any other. Yet many other creeds have been composed by subsequent councils.

ANSWER.—This objection has reference to the seventh canon of Ephesus, which reads: “The holy Synod decreed that it is unlawful for any man to bring forward, or to write or compose, a different faith as a rival to that established by the holy Fathers assembled with the Holy Ghost in Nicæa.”⁴ If “*to compose a different faith*” simply means to express in different words, or with fuller explanation, the faith defined at Nicæa, the canon is merely disciplinary and might be changed by any subsequent council. On the other hand, if the phrase refers to *a faith* inconsistent with that defined at Nicæa, it is an evident acknowledgment of infallibility in the Council of Nicæa, whose dogmatic decrees cannot be changed by any authority in the Church. That this is the true meaning is evident from the words of St. Cyril of Alexandria, who presided at the Council of Ephesus and seems to have been the author of the canon in question. He says: “The holy Ecumenical Synod gathered at Ephesus provided, *of necessity*, that no other exposition of faith besides that which existed, which the most blessed Fathers, *speaking in the Holy Ghost*, defined, should be brought into the Churches of God.” Then he answers those who accused him of violating this canon by his own

⁴ Labbé-Cossart, T. III, col. 689.*

explanations of the faith: "The divine disciple wrote, 'Be ready always to give answer to every one who asketh you an account of the hope which is in you.' But he who willeth to do this, innovates nothing, nor doth he frame any new exposition of faith, but rather maketh plain to those who ask him, what faith he hath concerning Christ."⁵

ART. II. INFALLIBILITY OF THE BISHOPS IN THEIR
ORDINARY TEACHING CAPACITY

Thesis.—The bishops of the Church, taken as a body in union with the Roman Pontiff, are infallible in the ordinary exercise of their universal teaching authority

§ 1. *Explanation and Proof*

EXPLANATION. The *ordinary* teaching authority of the bishops is that which they exercise in teaching the faithful of their respective dioceses by pastoral letters, by sermons delivered by themselves or by others approved for that purpose, and by catechisms or other books of instruction edited or approved by them.¹ When the bishops of the Church, thus engaged in the duty of instructing their people, are practically unanimous in proclaiming a doctrine of faith or morals, they are said to exercise a *universal* teaching authority, and

⁵ St. Cyril of Alexand., "Epist. ad Acacium"; P. G., 77, 190.*

¹ Wilmers, "De Ecclesia Christi," n, 226.

are then infallible in regard to that doctrine. In other words, a doctrine of faith or morals in which practically all the bishops of the Church agree, is infallibly true.

Taken in the sense just explained, the thesis is a dogma of faith, defined by the Vatican Council in the following words: "All things are to be accepted by divine and Catholic faith, which are contained in the written or traditional word of God and set forth by the Church as divinely revealed, whether this be done by solemn decree or by the ordinary and universal teaching authority."²

PROOFS. I. *From Reason.* The faith of the Church believing must correspond to the faith proposed by the bishops who constitute the teaching body in the Church. Therefore, if the bishops as a body were not infallible, the whole Church might be led into error at any time, and thereby cease to be the Church of Christ, the pillar and ground of truth. The faithful, it is true, have often refused to accept false teachings from bishops and priests, but they refused precisely because the doctrines were recognized as differing from those commonly taught in the Church. In such cases particular churches were saved from error by the recognized infallible authority of the episcopal body as a whole.

II. *From Scripture.* Christ promised special assistance to His Apostles and their successors in the discharge of their duty as teachers. He promised that

² Denzinger, n. 1792.

He himself would be with them all days even to the consummation of the world, and that the Holy Ghost abiding with them forever would lead them into all truth. Neither of these promises was limited to the rare occasions of ecumenical councils; such limitation would nullify the words of Christ, "*I am with you all days.*"

III. *From Tradition.* The Fathers often appeal to the universal teaching of the Church as to an undoubted norm of divine truth. For example, St. Vincent of Lerins says: "Whatever a man shall ascertain to have been held, written, or taught, not by one or two, but by all equally with one consent, openly, frequently, and persistently, that, he must understand, he himself also is to believe without any doubt or hesitation."³

Many heresies in the Church were overcome by the unanimous teaching of the bishops, without the intervention of ecumenical councils. When heretics urged that councils be called to pass judgment on their doctrines, the Fathers often objected that the universal teaching of the Church was sufficient to condemn them. St. Augustine, for instance, said of the Pelagian heresy: "Indeed was there need of the congregation of a synod to condemn this open pest, as if no heresy could at any time be condemned except by a synodical congregation? On the contrary, very few heresies can be found for the sake of condemning which any such necessity has arisen."⁴

³ "Commonitorium," 3; P. L., 50, 641.*

⁴ "Contra Epistolas Pelagianorum," iv, 34; P. L., 44, 638.*

§ 2. *Practical Conclusions*

MAJORITY INFALLIBLE. Since the bishops are infallible in their corporate capacity only, individual bishops may err at any time in regard to faith and morals, but all cannot fall into the *same* error at the *same* time. The further question now arises: Can a majority of the bishops fall into error at one and the same time regarding a matter of faith or morals? Or, to state the opposite side of the question; Is the agreement of a majority of the bishops of the world sufficient to establish the infallible truth of a doctrine, or must there be a practically unanimous agreement? It seems most probable that the agreement of a majority is sufficient to insure the truth of any doctrine, for it would certainly be a great evil for the Church if the greater part of her teaching body could fall into error at any time. It is true that in such a crisis the infallible authority of the Roman Pontiff would be sufficient to preserve the faith, but the Catholicity of the Church would be seriously affected, if not destroyed. Besides, it can scarcely be admitted that Christ, in His wisdom, would allow such a calamity to befall His Church. But it may be objected that this very thing did happen at the councils of Arimini and Seleucia, in 359, when practically all the bishops of the West and many from the East signed an heretical formula of faith. An examination of the facts show that no defection from faith really took place.

The Arian party gained a victory at the double coun-

cil of Arimini and Seleucia by skillfully managing to avoid any direct condemnation of their doctrines. They succeeded in having a creed signed that practically ignored the questions at issue, but the creed itself was not heretical. It clearly taught the equality of the Father and the Son, who was "born before all ages, . . . who is similar to the Father in all things as the Scriptures say and teach."¹ The bishops also condemned in express terms all those who taught that the Son is unlike the Father, but the words *substance*, *person*, *consubstantial*, around which the whole controversy raged, were entirely omitted. Hence the bishops did not err in regard to faith, but simply failed to meet the occasion, as they should have done, by a direct and decisive condemnation.

CUSTODIANS OF FAITH. Even though not infallible as an individual, each bishop is the divinely constituted teacher and judge of the faith in his diocese. He is the custodian of the faith for those committed to his care; his duty is to teach and interpret the truths of revelations and to decided controverted points, when necessity requires. Consequently, his teaching and his declarations on matters of faith and morals are to be accepted, unless they are opposed to the universal teachings of the Church. Should any doubts arise on this point, it must be decided by superior authority, not by the faithful. The bishop is neither the supreme teacher nor the supreme judge in matters of faith or

¹ Socrates, "Hist. Eccles.," ii, 37; P. G., 67, 306.

Sozomen, "Hist. Eccles.," iv, 17; P. G., 67, 1162.

morals; hence, appeal may always be made to a higher tribunal; but order and unity in the Church demand that the bishop's judgment be respected until final decision has been made.

VALUE OF TRADITION. The value of Tradition as proof for revealed doctrine rests principally upon the active and passive infallibility of the Church. Whenever there are sufficient witnesses to prove that a certain doctrine is accepted by the whole Church as a revealed truth, or that it is taught as such by a majority of the bishops, it is immediately evident that the doctrine is infallibly true and could be defined as a dogma of faith, if not already so defined. When appealing to tradition in this sense, it matters not what age of the Church be selected, since truth does not change with the centuries. The truth of a doctrine is established just as securely by proving its universal acceptance today, as by showing that it was universally accepted in any past age of the Church. But when tradition is used simply for its historical value, as a witness to what Christ or His Apostles did or taught, then the earlier the witness, the more valuable his testimony, because he approaches nearer to those who actually saw and heard the things related.²

² So far we have used tradition simply for its historical value. Now that the infallibility of the Church has been established, we may use tradition as a witness to prove that a doctrine is infallibly true because taught or professed by the universal Church.

CHAPTER XV

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF

Since the Roman Pontiff holds supreme power in the Church, the infallible teaching authority of the bishops must be exercised in complete subjection to him. This fact alone is sufficient proof that he himself must be preëminently infallible, for otherwise the infallible authority of the bishops would be thwarted by subjection to their fallible head; but the doctrine is so often misunderstood and so strenuously opposed by non-Catholics that it is necessary to treat it more in detail. This is most conveniently done (1) by giving an accurate statement of the doctrine with proofs drawn from Scripture and Tradition, (2) by answering the principal objections urged against it.

ART. I. THE DOCTRINE OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

Thesis.—The Roman Pontiff is infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra*, defining a doctrine of faith or morals for the universal Church

§ 1. *The Doctrine Explained*

DOGMA OF FAITH. The doctrine of papal infallibility was defined by the Vatican Council in the follow-

INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE 473

ing words: "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 the 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 the discharge of the office of pastor and teacher 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 him in the 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 of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church."¹

CONDITIONS OF INFALLIBILITY. The Council carefully states the conditions under which the Roman Pontiff enjoys the gift of infallibility; *viz.*, that he speak (a) *ex cathedra*, (b) for the universal Church, (c) with supreme authority, (d) on matters of faith or morals.

a) **EX CATHEDRA.** The Greek word *cathedra* (seat) is here used to designate office or authority, just as Our Lord used it when He said: "*The scribes and Pharisees have sitten on the chair [cathedra] of Moses. All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you,*

¹ Denzinger, n. 1839.

observe and do."² The English equivalents for this word are used in the same sense when we say that a judge occupies the *bench*, or a professor, the *chair* of philosophy. In fact, *chair* is as widely recognized as a symbol of teaching authority as *throne* is for ruling authority. In Church usage *cathedra* unites both ideas and designates, in particular, the authority of a bishop to teach and govern, since his throne is known as a *cathedra*, whence the name *cathedral*, *i. e.*, the church containing the bishop's *cathedra*. It is evident, then, that when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra*, he is speaking officially as supreme pastor of the universal Church, and it is then only that the Council declared him infallible. There is nothing to indicate that he is infallible in his private capacity as a theologian or as teacher instructing others in the faith.

b) FOR THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH. As noted above, the Pope is not only supreme head of the Church, but also bishop of Rome, primate of Italy, and patriarch of the West. The Council declared him infallible only in his capacity as supreme pastor,—“when discharging the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians.” Consequently decisions rendered in particular cases, or decrees issued for particular churches, are not considered infallible; but it is not necessary that the Pope directly address all the faithful, or even all the bishops, when defining a doctrine *ex cathedra*. Theologians commonly hold that such a decree might be issued directly to one bishop only, provided it is evidently in-

² Matt. xxiii, 2-3.

tended for the whole Church. Hence, as Cardinal Mazzella observes, “it should be noted *for* whom, rather than *to* whom the Pope speaks. If it is evident from the nature of the matter treated, from the manner of treatment, or from any other circumstance, that he speaks for all, there seems to be nothing lacking for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement.”³

c) WITH SUPREME AUTHORITY. A definition of faith or morals is not infallible unless intended to be such, for the Pope acting as supreme pastor may issue decrees for the whole Church and still not intend them to be definite and irrevocable pronouncements on the matter treated. Hence the Council says: “When, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine,” *i. e.*, when he uses his supreme authority to give a final and irrevocable decision. This does not require the use of a set formula; any words may be used that will sufficiently indicate the definitive nature of the decree.

d) FAITH OR MORALS. Infallibility is given as a means to preserve the truths committed to the custody of the Church,—truths concerning faith and morals, which alone pertain to the matter of salvation. Consequently, the very purpose of infallibility restricts it to these same truths.

SOURCE OF INFALLIBILITY. The Council expressly stated that the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is due to divine *assistance*; both *revelation* and *inspiration* are thus excluded, and the use of natural means of knowl-

³ Mazzella, “De Religione et Ecclesia,” n. 1052.

edge presupposed. Before issuing a definition of faith, the Pope must diligently inquire into the matter to be defined, for otherwise he would be forcing God, as it were, to give supernatural assistance where natural means are sufficient. Should the Pope neglect to make due investigation, he would be guilty of sin, but his decree would be protected from error, because infallibility would be utterly useless if definitions could not be accepted with certainty until it were known that sufficient investigation and study of the matter had been made.

PERSONALLY INFALLIBLE. The advocates of Gallicanism in the seventeenth century taught that the decrees of the Roman Pontiff are not infallible unless accepted by the whole Church. "His judgment is not irreformable or exempt from revision unless accepted by the Church." Some tried to maintain a sort of papal infallibility by making a distinction between the See of Rome and its occupant. They held that the See itself is infallible, although individual Popes may err; if one Pope falls into error, his mistake will be corrected without fail by some successor, thus preserving the See from error.⁴

The Council rejected this doctrine by declaring that "definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church." To make infallibility depend upon acceptance by the Church is to subvert the very constitution of the Church and make the faithful judges of their divinely

⁴ Cf. Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Gallicanism."

constituted rulers and teachers. Power and authority in the Church was given to the Apostles and their successors independently of the consent of the faithful, and the Church never sought such consent to make laws or to define doctrines of faith. The supreme power in the Church was conferred directly upon St. Peter, and through him upon his successors, independently even of the other Apostles; consequently, whatever power and prerogatives the Roman Pontiff holds as successor of St. Peter, he holds and exercises independent of all others, and neither his decrees nor his definitions of faith receive any binding force or infallible authority from the consent of bishops or faithful.

The absurd distinction made by the Gallicans between the See and its occupant would frustrate the very purposes of papal infallibility. If individual popes may err, their definitions could not be accepted as infallible until tested by time, but who is to decide what length of time is necessary? And if one pope reverses the definition of a predecessor, who is to decide which definition is to be accepted as true?

IN PRIVATE CAPACITY. The Council declared the Roman Pontiff personally infallible when speaking officially as head of the universal Church, but left untouched the question whether the Pope in his private capacity, or in his official capacity as bishop, primate or patriarch, can fall into heresy or teach heresy. Some theologians maintain that he can. Straub cites Hadrian II and Innocent III as favoring this opinion. Cardinal Bellarmine, Suarez, and many other eminent

theologians consider the opposite opinion more probable. Suarez says: "God could provide that no injury would accrue to the Church from an heretical pope, but it seems more in accord with His divine providence to preserve the pope from heresy in consequence of the promise that he shall never err in defining faith. Furthermore, as such a thing has never happened in the Church, we may conclude that, in the providence of God, it cannot happen."⁵

§ 2. *The Doctrine Proved from Scripture*

The passages of Scripture having direct reference to this subject are found in *Matthew xvi*, 18, 19; *Luke xxii*, 31, 32 and *John xxi*, 16, 17. In the text from Matthew infallibility is implicitly promised to St. Peter in symbolic language. In Luke it is again promised, but this time explicitly and in plain language. Finally, in John the promise is fulfilled when the primacy of teaching and governing authority is conferred upon St. Peter under the symbol of pastoral care for the flock of Christ. In every case St. Peter is addressed as head of the Apostolic body, and the power conferred upon him is to endure until the end of time; it is a power to be perpetuated in his successors, the bishops of Rome. These texts have been considered in their relation to Peter's primacy of jurisdiction; we shall now examine them briefly in their bearing upon the question of infallibility.

⁵ Straub, "De Ecclesia Christi," n. 1068; cfr. Card. Bellarmine, "De Romano Pontifice," iv, 6; Suarez, "De Fide," Disp. x, 6, n. 11.

a) MATTHEW XVI, 18-19: "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" In these words Our Lord promised that St. Peter and his successors should be the rock-foundation, to render His Church firm and impregnable for all time, even to the consummation of the world. It is to be the *pillar and ground of truth*, and therefore impregnable against the assaults of error. Should the Church fall into error, it would cease to be the Church of Christ and the gates of hell would prevail against it. Therefore, the Church is rendered infallible and preserved infallible by that rock-foundation which secures it against the gates of hell and constitutes it the pillar and ground of truth; and since the Church derives her infallibility from this rock-foundation, *i. e.*, from St. Peter and his successors, the latter must also be infallible, and their infallibility is even prior to that of the Church.

On this same occasion Christ promised that whatever St. Peter would bind or loose on earth, should be bound or loosed also in Heaven. On another occasion the same words were addressed to all the Apostles collectively; but here they are addressed to St. Peter alone, thus promising him a supreme power of binding and loosing that is unlimited in its extent and application; it applies to teaching as well as to governing authority. In fact, most Protestant interpreters claim that it refers to teaching authority alone. Consequently, whatever St. Peter or his successors teach on earth shall be ratified in Heaven, and that without fail since the

promise is unconditional. Could such a promise be made by Our Lord if there were any possibility of error in the teaching which He assures us will be ratified in Heaven?

b) LUKE XXII, 31-32: "*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 being once converted, confirm thy brethren.*" These words form part of the last will and testament of Our Lord, made but a few hours before His death on the cross. Looking out upon the centuries, He saw the trials and temptations prepared for His faithful by Satan; He foresaw the many heresies that would arise to lead astray the unwary and the unsuspecting. He provides against these dangers by conferring a special grace,—the gift of infallibility,—upon the chief pastor of His flock, and charges him to confirm his brethren: "*I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. Confirm thy brethren.*" Plainer or more emphatic words could not have been uttered by Him who came as the Teacher of mankind.

c) JOHN XXI, 16-17: "*Feed my lambs . . . feed my sheep.*" These solemn words of Our Lord, uttered shortly before His Ascension, conferred upon St. Peter and his successors the promised primacy of jurisdiction with its grace of infallibility. The entire flock of Christ was committed to the care of their supreme pastor; the lambs and the sheep were subjected to his authority in all things. But if the pastor, whom the sheep must obey, would fall into error, they would in-

evitably be led into the same error; he would feed them poison instead of the wholesome food of revealed truth and the promises of Christ would be void, for the Spirit of truth would desert the Church. Our Lord must have provided against such an eventuality in the only way possible, *i. e.*, by making the chief pastor of the flock infallible.

§ 3. *Doctrine Proved from Testimony of Councils*

The doctrine of papal infallibility is established beyond the possibility of doubt by the fact that it is accepted throughout the entire Church as a revealed doctrine and taught as such by the bishops of the whole world in their ordinary teaching capacity. It was also defined by an almost unanimous vote of more than eight hundred bishops assembled in ecumenical council from every part of the world. No one can deny these facts today, and it has been proved in the preceding chapters that the believing Church (*ecclesia discens*) is infallible in accepting truths of revelation, and that the bishops as a body are infallible in their ordinary teaching capacity, no less than when assembled in ecumenical council. Again, the fact that a doctrine is now believed and taught by the whole Church as a revealed truth, is positive proof that it has been so believed and taught in all ages, since the Church must proclaim and profess the entire deposit of faith at all times. Hence, in defining the doctrine of papal infallibility, the Vatican Council professed to "adhere

faithfully to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith." Just how faithfully the Fathers of the Vatican Council adhered to tradition may be gathered from a study of other councils celebrated at various times. For this purpose we select five ecumenical councils, ranging over a period of almost ten centuries. With one exception, they were all celebrated in the East and attended almost exclusively by bishops from the Eastern Church which, it is now claimed, never recognized the Roman Primacy, much less the doctrine of papal infallibility.

(A) COUNCIL OF LYONS (1274). The infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is clearly implied in the following words: "The holy Roman Church also holds supreme and complete primacy and domination over the universal Catholic Church, which primacy and domination she truthfully and humbly recognizes as coming from Our Lord himself through the blessed Peter, prince and head of the Apostles, and whose successor is the Roman Pontiff. Wherefore, *as he is obliged above others to defend the truth of faith, it follows that when any questions concerning faith arise, they are to be decided by his judgment.*"¹

This decree was reaffirmed by bishops from the East and the West assembled at the ecumenical Council of Florence during the years 1439-1445.

(B) FOURTH COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE (869). All the Fathers attending this council signed a formula of faith, in which the following significant words occur:

¹ Denzinger, n. 466.

"The first requisite of salvation is to cling to the rule of right faith, and to depart in nothing from the constitutions of the Fathers. Neither can those words of Our Lord Jesus Christ be neglected: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.' The words have been proved by their effects, *for in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has ever been preserved free from stain. . . . Therefore I hope to be worthy to remain with you² in that communion preached by the Apostolic See, in which the true Christian religion is preserved entire and in perfect solidity.*"³

This formula, signed by the bishops at Constantinople in the ninth century, is also a witness to the faith of the Eastern Church in the sixth century, since it was originally drawn up by Pope Hormisdas, about the year 516 and submitted to a number of eastern bishops, who wished to abandon the Acacian schism and return to the Church.⁴

(C) THIRD COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE (680). The letter of Pope Agatho, read before the Fathers of the council and approved by them, contains the following words, setting forth the doctrine of papal infallibility in unmistakable terms: "Through the protection of Peter, who was pronounced blessed, this his Apostolic church has never departed from the way of truth into any error whatsoever. . . . In prosperity

² These words were addressed to Pope Hadrian II.

³ Denzinger, n. 171-172.

⁴ Hormisdas, "Epist. ad Joannem Nicopolitanum"; P. L., 63, 393.

and in adversity, the rule of true faith is held and defended by this spiritual mother, . . . who, by the grace of God, shall never be known to have erred nor succumbed to heretical novelties. From the beginning of the Christian faith even unto the end, she remains unsullied, according to the divine promise made by the Saviour himself to the prince of His disciples: 'Peter, Peter, behold Satan hath desired to have you, etc.' Let your clemency⁵ consider, therefore, that the Lord and Saviour of all, who promised unfailing faith to Peter, admonished him to confirm his brethren. This the Apostolic pontiffs, predecessors of my unworthiness, have ever done, as is known to all."⁶

At the close of the council the acts were sent to Pope Agatho for his approval and confirmation. The accompanying letter contained these words: "We leave to your judgment what should be done, since as bishop of the first See in the universal Church you *stand upon the firm rock of faith*. We willingly agree with the letters of true confession sent to the most pious Emperor by your fatherly Beatitude; we acknowledge them *as divinely prescribed by the chief head of the Apostles*. . . . By means of them we have put down the heretical sect lately arisen . . . and we have cut off the heretics by anathemas, according to the sentence already decreed against them by your sacred letters."⁷

It would be difficult to find a more explicit acknowl-

⁵ The letter was addressed to the Emperor.

⁶ St. Agatho, "Epist. ad Augustos"; P. L., 87, 1169.

⁷ "Epist. ad Agathonem"; P. L., 87, 1248-1249.

edgment of papal infallibility, even today, after its definition by the Vatican Council.

(D) COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON (451). Leo the Great sent representatives to this council, with the instruction that the bishops gathered there should subscribe to the faith as formulated in his letter to Flavian, archbishop of Constantinople. He wrote: "Most dear brethren, let all attempts at disputing against the divinely inspired faith, and the vain unbelief of heretics be laid to rest, and let not that be defended which may not be believed; since in accordance with the authoritative statements of the Gospel, in accordance with the utterances of the prophets and the teaching of the Apostles, with the greatest fulness and clearness *in the letter which we sent to Bishop Flavian of happy memory, it has been laid down what is the loyal and pure confession upon the mystery of Our Lord Jesus Christ's Incarnation.*"⁸

It is evident from these words that Pope Leo formulated the doctrine to which all were to subscribe without *any attempts at disputing against the divinely inspired faith*, yet no one raised his voice in protest against this manifest assumption of infallible authority. When the Pope's letter to Flavian was read, the bishops cried out with one voice: "This is the faith of the Fathers. . . . Anathema to him who believes differently. Peter hath spoken thus by the mouth of Leo."⁹ The sentence of deposition against Dioscorus

⁸ Pope Leo, "Epist. ad Synodum"; P. L., 54, 937, 939.*

⁹ Mansi, VI, col. 971.*

was also passed in the name of Leo, the successor of St. Peter and the *foundation of true faith*. It reads: "Leo through us and through this holy synod, in union with the thrice blessed and most holy Apostle Peter, the rock and support of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the true faith, hath stripped Dioscorus of his episcopal dignity."¹⁰

(E) COUNCIL OF EPHESUS (431). Pope Celestine wrote the Fathers at Ephesus, directing them to "carry out what things have been already decreed by us." When the letter was read, "all the most reverend bishops cried out at the same time: 'To Celestine the guardian of the faith! To Celestine of one mind with the Synod! To Celestine the whole Synod offers its thanks!'" Philip, one of the papal legates, then said: "We offer our thanks that when the writings of our holy and blessed Pope had been read to you, . . . ye joined yourselves to the most holy head by your holy acclamations. For Your Blessedness is not ignorant that *the head of the whole faith, the head of the Apostles, is blessed Peter the Apostle*. . . . We ask that ye give order that there be laid before us what things were done in this holy Synod before our arrival, in order that, according to the opinion of our blessed Pope, . . . we may likewise ratify their determination."¹¹

In the bishops' letter to Pope Celestine these words occur: "The zeal of Your Holiness for piety, and your care for the right faith, so grateful and highly pleasing

¹⁰ Mansi, VI, col. 1047.

¹¹ Labb-Cossart, III, 617.*

to God, the Saviour of us all, are worthy of all admiration. For it is your custom in such great matters to make trial of all things and the confirmation of the Churches you have made your own care."¹²

These various references to the position and authority of the Roman Pontiff do not explicitly mention the doctrine of infallibility, but they certainly presuppose it. The Pope is the *guardian of the faith*, the successor of St. Peter, *head of the whole faith*; he *cares for the right faith*, makes trial of all things, and *confirms* the Churches. Duties such as these demand infallibility for their proper performance, yet the Fathers of the council express no misgivings on that point. These expressions of the Fathers at Ephesus leave no doubt as to their import when they are considered in the light of the more explicit testimony of later councils and of the Fathers who wrote before and after that time.

REMARK. Very little has come down to us from the first council held at Nicæa in 325, or of the first council of Constantinople, in 381. Consequently we have no record of their belief in regard to papal infallibility, but we do have the testimony of the Fathers who lived and wrote in that century. It proves that the doctrine was recognized by the whole Church then as now.

§ 4. *The Doctrine Proved from the Testimony of the Fathers*

The testimony of the councils proves that the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was officially recognized

¹² "Epist. ad Coelestinum"; P. L., 50, 511.*

in every age of which we have a record. It also gives us the united testimony of the hundreds of bishops and Fathers who attended these councils, thus making it really unnecessary to quote from any individual Father or writer of those ages, yet for the sake of completeness, a few private witnesses may be added (*a*) from the West, and (*b*) from the East.

I. FROM THE WEST. (*a*) FULGENTIUS FERRANDUS (died 533). Severus, a scholastic of Constantinople, wrote to Fulgentius, a deacon of Carthage, for instructions concerning the Blessed Trinity, and received the following reply: "Let those speak and preach who have received authority to teach along with the honor of the priesthood. We are ever ready to learn, but do not presume to teach others. Therefore, most prudent man, if you wish to learn the truth, address first of all the bishop of the Apostolic See, *whose doctrine is preserved sound by the judgment of truth and is supported by the strength of authority.*"¹

b) ASCANIUS OF TARRAGONA. About the year 465, Ascanius of Tarragona in Spain and the bishops of his province wrote to Pope Hilary concerning a bishop who had been consecrated contrary to the canons of the Church. They said: "Even though we were not compelled by ecclesiastical discipline, it would still be our duty to have recourse to that privilege of your See by which the preaching of the most blessed Peter sufficed for the illumination of all throughout the whole world. . . . Therefore, we have recourse to that faith praised

¹ "Epist. ad Severum"; P. L., 67, 914.

by the Apostle, and *seek a reply where nothing is given out in error or presumption.*"²

c) ST. LEO THE GREAT (440–461). "The solidity of the faith which was praised in the chief of the Apostles is perpetual; and as that remains which Peter believed in Christ, so that remains which Christ instituted in Peter. . . . The blessed Peter, persevering in the strength of the rock which he received, has not abandoned the helm of the Church . . . and still today he more fully and effectually performs what is entrusted to him. And so if anything is rightly done and rightly decreed by us, it is his work and merits, whose power lives and whose authority prevails in his See. . . . With such solidity is it endued by God that the depravity of heretics cannot mar it nor the unbelief of the heathen overcome it."³

d) ST. AUGUSTINE (died 430). In speaking of the Pelagian heresy, St. Augustine says: "Two councils sent reports of this matter to the Apostolic See, and the decision has come back. The case is finished. Would that the error also were ended."⁴ These few words, clearly recognizing the decision of Rome as final, and therefore infallible, have been crystallized into the well-known saying, "Rome has spoken, the case is ended."

e) ST. JEROME (died 420). When St. Jerome was in Syria, a great controversy was going on concerning

² "Epist. ad Hilarium"; P. L., 58, 14–15.

³ "Sermon.," iii; P. L., 54, 146.

⁴ "Sermon.," cxxxi, n. 10; P. L., 38, 734.

the use of the Greek word *hypostasis* in reference to the persons of the Trinity. Although one of the greatest scholars of his age, Jerome turned to Rome for authoritative information. He wrote to Pope Damasus: "I think it my duty to consult the chair of Peter, and to turn to a church whose faith has been praised by Paul. . . . You alone keep the heritage of the fathers intact. . . . You are the light of the world. . . . Let the state of Roman majesty withdraw; my words are addressed to the successor of the fisherman, to the disciple of the Cross. As I follow no leader save Christ, so I communicate with none but Your Blessedness. For this, I know, is the rock on which the Church is built. . . . I implore Your Blessedness, therefore, to authorize me by letter, either to use or to refuse this formula of the *three hypostases*." ⁵

f) ST. AMBROSE (died 397). Satyr, a brother of St. Ambrose, suffered shipwreck on a voyage to Africa. He was a catechumen at the time, and in thanksgiving for his deliverance, immediately sought baptism; "but he was not so eager as to lay aside caution. He called the bishop to him, and esteeming that there can be no true thanksgiving except it spring from true faith, he enquired whether he [the bishop] agreed with the Catholic bishops, that is with the Roman Church." ⁶ There were heretical bishops in Africa at the time, but Satyr makes sure to receive Baptism from none of

⁵ St. Jerome, "Epist. ad Damasum Papam"; P. L., 22, 356-358.*

⁶ St. Ambrose, "De Excessu Fratris sui Satyri," i, 47; P. L., 16, 1306.*

them; he applies the test of true faith,—agreement with the Catholic bishops, which is established by agreement with the bishop of Rome, for, as St. Irenæus had written two hundred years before, "it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this Church, on account of its preëminent authority." ⁷

II. FROM THE EAST. (a) ST. THEODORE OF STUDIUM (died 826). When the iconoclast heresy was raging in the East, Theodore, the learned abbot of a monastery at Constantinople, wrote to Pope Paschal for assistance. He said: "Give ear, O Apostolic head, whom God hath constituted shepherd of Christ's sheep, doorkeeper of the kingdom of Heaven, and the rock of faith upon which the Catholic Church is built. Thou art Peter, adorning and guiding the See of Peter. Ravening wolves have broken into the house of the Lord; the gates of hell are loosed against it as of old. Come forth from the West, O follower of Christ. Arise and do not cast us off forever! Christ hath said to thee, 'Confirm thy brethren.' Behold, now is the time, and here is the place. Come to our assistance, thou whom God hath raised up for that purpose! . . . Thou hast the power since thou art head over all! . . . Strike terror, we beseech thee, into these fierce heretics by the pen of thy divine word." ⁸

b) MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR was born at Constantinople about 580; died in exile in 662. He wrote:

⁷ St. Irenæus, "Adversus Hæreses," iii, 3, 2; P. G., 7, 848.*

⁸ St. Theodore of Studium; "Epist. ad Paschalem"; P. G., 99, 1151, 1154.

"It is not lawful to praise a man who has been condemned and cast out by the Apostolic See of Rome, until he has been reconciled and received back by it. . . . Therefore, if one does not wish to be a heretic and be known as such, let him not seek reconciliation with this or that see; such action is unnecessary and unreasonable. Let him seek peace with the See of Rome above all others, because he will then be recognized everywhere and by all as orthodox. . . . In vain does he seek recognition elsewhere, if he has not recourse to the blessed Pope of the most holy Church of the Romans, *i. e.*, the Apostolic See, which holds from the Incarnate Word of God Himself the power of government and the authority to bind and loose all things for all men."⁹

c) JOHN, BISHOP OF JERUSALEM (572-592). In a letter to an Albanian bishop, John of Jerusalem mentions the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff in express terms: "We, that is, the Catholic Church, have the words of Our Lord addressed to Peter, head of the Apostles, giving him the *primacy of firm faith for the Churches*. . . . To Peter also he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven and earth, hence . . . the successors in his holy and venerable See remain *sound in faith and infallible* according to the promise of the Lord."¹⁰

d) SOZOMEN (died about 447.) Sozomen in his

⁹ St. Maximus Confessor, "Epist. ad Petrum"; P. G., 91, 144.

¹⁰ John of Jerusalem, "Epist. ad Abbatem Albanorum," quoted by Staub, n. 996.

Church History describes the controversy concerning the divinity of the Holy Ghost and then says: "When this question was being agitated and the heat of controversy was daily increasing, the matter was brought to the attention of the bishop of Rome, who wrote to the Churches of the East that the three Persons of the Trinity are of the same substance and of equal dignity. This doctrine, he said, must be confessed by the bishops of the East as by those of the West. The question having been thus decided by the Roman Church, peace was restored, and the question seemed finally at an end."¹¹

e) ST. GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS (died 390). Timothy, a disciple of Apollinarius, was condemned for heresy by Pope Damasus, but his followers in Cappadocia spread the report that his doctrines were later approved by Rome. St. Gregory says: "If those who hold the views of Apollinarius have either now or formerly been received, let them prove it, and we shall be content. For it is evident that they can only have been so received as assenting to the orthodox faith, for this were impossible on any other terms."¹² These words prove that St. Gregory accepted approval by Rome as an infallible test of the true faith; if those accused of heresy can show that they have been approved at Rome, he is content to admit them to communion, because such approval "were impossible without assent to the orthodox faith."

¹¹ Sozomen, "Church History," vi, 22; P. G., 67, 1347.

¹² St. Gregory Nazianzen, "Epist. ad Cledonium"; P. G., 37, 178.*

f) GREEK LITURGY. In the Greek Liturgy, Pope Sylvester is addressed as the divinely constituted head of the Church, a teacher rendered infallible through the power of the Holy Ghost: "O father Sylvester, thou didst stand forth a pillar of fire, . . . an overshadowing cloud, and didst deliver the faithful from the Egyptian error [Arianism], and didst lead them to the divine light by thy ever *infallible teachings*. As divine head of the sacred Fathers thou didst establish the most sacred dogma and didst close the mouth of heretics. . . . Tongues which consented to error were put to shame *by the power of the Holy Ghost, who wrought in thee.*"¹³

The testimony of the councils and these few quotations from the many Fathers of the East and the West who could be cited in this matter, prove conclusively that the Vatican Council did "faithfully adhere to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith." In defining the doctrine of papal infallibility, it introduced nothing new, but simply defined a doctrine held by the universal Church in all ages.

ART. II. OBJECTIONS AGAINST PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

The doctrine of papal infallibility is completely overthrown if even one pope is found to have erred in his teachings. But history testifies that not only one, but many have actually erred in their teachings concerning faith or morals. For example, the following may be mentioned:

¹³ Nilles, "Kalendarium Manuale," I, 51, 106 sq.

a) LIBERIUS (352-356) signed an heretical formula of faith drawn up at Sirmium by the Arians.

b) ZOSIMUS (414-418) approved the heretical teachings of Pelagius and Celestius and declared that they contained nothing contrary to the Catholic faith.

c) HORMISDAS (514-523) and John II (532-535) taught contradictory doctrines, since Hormisdas declared it heretical to say that "one of the most Holy Trinity was crucified," whereas John II approved the formula as an expression of Catholic doctrine.

d) VIGILIUS (538-555) at first approved what are known as the Three Chapters, and afterwards condemned them as heretical.

e) HONORIUS I (625-638) approved the doctrine of the Monothelites, who taught that there is but one will in Christ. On this account he was condemned as a heretic by the Council of Constantinople in 680, and the condemnation was approved by Pope Leo II.

f) ZACHARIAS (741-752) ordered a certain Virgilius to be excommunicated, because he taught that there are people living on the opposite side of the world.

g) JOHN XXII (1316-1334) fell into heresy concerning the Beatific Vision.

h) GALILEO was condemned as a heretic for teaching that the earth moves around the sun.

ANSWER. It is true that the doctrine of papal infallibility could not be maintained if one single Pope had ever erred in teaching *ex cathedra*, as explained above; but the promise of Christ precludes such a possibility and history offers no evidence to the contrary.

The alleged examples of erroneous teaching present no difficulty, because the requisites for an *ex cathedra* definition of faith are lacking in every instance, and in very few cases was any error really taught. This becomes evident upon examination.

a) POPE LIBERIUS was sent into exile by the Arian Emperor Constantius, but was afterward allowed to return to his see. It is claimed that he obtained his release by signing an heretical creed, drawn up at Sir-mium by the Arian party, who denied the divinity of the Son by teaching that He is like (*ὁμοούσιος*) the Father, but not of the same nature (*ὁμοιούσιος*). The nature of the creed signed by Liberius is a matter of conjecture. In fact, it is by no means certain that he signed any creed at all. Sozomen, the Church historian, is our principal source of information in this matter. If his testimony be accepted, the creed was not heretical, except through a false interpretation made possible by the omission of the disputed terms *homoousios* and *homoiousios*. And Sozomen further states that the Pope first demanded a confession from all present, that "those who say the Son is not like the Father *in substance and in all things*, are cut off from communion in the Church."¹ If this be true, Liberius can be accused of nothing more than imprudence in signing a document open to false interpretation.

Even granting that Liberius actually signed an heretical creed on that occasion, this would prove nothing against the doctrine of papal infallibility. All admit

¹ Sozomen, "Church History," iv, 15; P. G., 67, 1151.

that the signing, if done at all, was done under fear and compulsion, after the Pope had been broken by the hardships of exile. And act performed under such circumstances was not free and, therefore, not valid.²

b) ZOSIMUS. Pelagius and Celestius appealed to Pope Zosimus to examine their teachings and to correct them, if found erroneous. The Pope, deceived by this false pretense of good faith, ordered them to be treated with charity, as they were innocent of intentional wrong-doing in the matter; but he never approved their errors. Hence St. Augustine says: "They were approved on account of their willingness to amend; not on account of their false doctrines."³

c) HORMISDAS. John Maxentius and a number of Scythian monks of Constantinople sponsored the saying that "*One of the Trinity was crucified*," and wished to have it inserted into the Creed. Hormisdas refused to sanction this, partly because the formula was open to heretical interpretation, but more particularly because its sponsors, who were even then suspected of heresy, displayed an unbecoming spirit in the matter. John II afterwards approved the formula in its Catholic sense that Our Lord, who was one of the three divine Persons, suffered in His human nature.⁴ In the days of Hormisdas, many interpreted it to mean that Our Lord has but one nature, the divine, in which He suffered.

² Cf. Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Liberius."

³ St. Augustine, "Contra Pelagianos"; P. L., 44, 574.

⁴ Hormisdas, "Epist. ad Possessorem"; P. L., 63, 490; John II, "Epist. ad Senatores"; P. L., 66, 20-21.

d) VIGILIUS. The *Three Chapters*, strictly speaking, were propositions condemning the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the works of Theodoret of Cyrus against St. Cyril, and a letter written by Ibas of Odessa to Maris of Persia; but the works themselves were also known as the *Three Chapters*. There is no doubt that these works contained heretical teachings. Vigilius refused to condemn them because, being ignorant of Greek, he did not recognize their real nature. Upon learning that they were heretical, he condemned them, but soon after withdrew the decree as inopportune. Finally, under changed circumstances, he reissued the decree of condemnation. The Pope's prudence in the matter may be questioned, but not his faith. At no time did he *approve* the works, and always condemned their errors even while refusing to condemn the works as a whole.⁵

e) HONORIUS I. The charge of heresy against Honorius is based upon certain statements in his letters to Sergius of Constantinople. These statements are claimed to be a denial of the two wills in Christ and because of this denial he was condemned as a heretic by the Council of Constantinople.

Before considering the statements themselves, it should be noted that Honorius disclaimed any intention of issuing a dogmatic decree in the matter. He says that "in order to remove any scandal, we should neither *define* nor *preach* one or two operations." Moreover, the documents were private letters to Sergius, advising

⁵ Cf. Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Vigilius" and "Three Chapters."

him to act prudently in the use of newly devised terms, lest they be misinterpreted. Consequently there was no *ex cathedra* definition of faith; first, because it was not intended as such, and, secondly, because it was not issued for the universal Church. The letters in question were merely a matter of personal advice requested by Sergius, but even as such, they contain no error of doctrine.

At that time the terms *will* and *operation* were coming into use in the East in reference to Our Lord. The Eutychians taught that Christ has but one nature and, therefore, but *one will*. The Nestorians held that there are two persons in Christ and, therefore, *two wills*. Catholics were also using these terms, but in a different sense; they said that Christ has *two wills*, or *operations*, one corresponding to His human, the other to His divine nature, but these two *wills* are one in the sense that the human cannot be at variance with the divine. This confusion in the use of terms lent itself to misunderstandings and controversy and greatly disturbed the minds of the people. For this reason Sergius, archbishop of Constantinople, wrote to Pope Honorius for advice in the matter. In his reply, Honorius plainly teaches that there are *two wills in Christ*,—the one human, the other divine,—but that they are one in the sense of being in harmony one with the other. He then advises Sergius that it were better to avoid entirely the use of such newly invented terms that may easily lead the people into error.⁶

⁶ Honorius, "Epist. ad Sergium"; P. L., 80, 474-476.

This advice was simply approving the sentiments expressed by Sergius himself in his letter to the Pope and, under the circumstances described by Sergius, would have been given by any prudent man; but it seems that the heretics continued to spread their false doctrines under the plea that they had not been condemned. For this reason, the Council of Constantinople condemned Honorius as an abettor of heresy. He had not actually taught any heretical doctrine, but his failure to condemn it promptly and decisively made its propagation easier. This, at least, is the sense in which Pope Leo says that he approved the condemnation by the council: "Theodore, Cyrus, and Sergius were punished by eternal condemnation, . . . along with Honorus, who *did not repress* the flame of heretical doctrine, as becomes the Apostolic authority, but favored it by negligence." He gives the same explanation in a letter to the Emperor Constantius: "Honorius did not illumine this Apostolic Church by the doctrine of Apostolic tradition, but permitted it to be defiled by profane treason."⁷

f) ZACHARIAS. Virgilius, a priest or bishop of Germany, had been accused of heresy in regard to the existence of *people beneath the earth*, and Zacharias directed St. Boniface to depose him if he were found guilty of the charge. There is no question of an *ex cathedra* definition of faith; it was simply an order for St. Boniface to proceed with canonical punishment if

⁷ Leo II, "Epist. ad Hispaniæ Episcopos"; P. L., 96, 414; "Epist. ad Constantium"; P. L., 96, 408; Cfr. Mann, "Lives of the Popes," Vol. I, P. 1, pp. 330 sqq.

the case demanded it. We cannot even say that Zacharias committed an error in the matter, since we know nothing of the doctrine except what can be gathered from the slight reference to it by Zacharias himself. He says: "If it shall be proved that he teaches there is another world and other people beneath the earth, . . . let him be *deposed*."⁸ The mention of *another* world and *other* people makes it probable that Virgilius had fallen into the error of those who taught the existence of people on the opposite side of the world, who were not descended from Adam and therefore not subject to original sin.

g) JOHN XXII. Before ascending the papal throne, John had written works in which he maintained that the souls of the just do not enjoy the Beatific Vision until after the resurrection of the body. After becoming Pope, he still maintained the opinion as probable, but distinctly stated that he did so in his capacity as a private theologian. He justified this action on the ground that the question had never been defined by the Church and was therefore open for discussion by theologians. The question of infallibility is in no way involved in the matter, which was not definitely decided until the time of Benedict XII.⁹

h) THE GALILEO CASE. The condemnation of Galileo is brought forth as undeniable proof for almost every charge against the Church, but it has no bearing

⁸ Zacharias, "Epist. ad Bonifatium"; P. L., 89, 946.

⁹ Cf. Straub, "De Ecclesia Christi," n. 1045; Jungmann, "Dissert. Historicae," Dissert. 32, n. 10.

whatever on the question of papal infallibility. The condemnation was made by the Congregation of the Index, in 1616, and approved by Paul V in the ordinary routine manner; but no theologian ever dreamed that such decrees are infallible; they are not intended to be such. The congregation made a mistake, but that has nothing to do with papal infallibility.¹⁰

¹⁰ Cf. Vacandard, "Études de Critique," Series I, pp. 339 sqq.; D'Alès, "Dictionnaire Apologétique," art. "Galilée"; Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Galilei."

CHAPTER XVI

THE EXTENT OF INFALLIBILITY

The extent of infallibility refers to the truths that may be defined by the Church with infallible authority. Some truths are directly subject to the infallible authority of the Church by their very nature; others only indirectly because of their connection with the former. The one set of truths constitute the primary, the other the secondary extent of infallibility.

ART. I. PRIMARY EXTENT OF INFALLIBILITY

REVEALED TRUTHS. Since infallibility is nothing more nor less than protection from error in teaching and explaining truth, it extends primarily and directly to all the truths committed to the teaching authority of the Church. This includes the whole body of Christian Revelation,—the deposit of faith,¹—for Christ said to His Apostles: "*Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*"² He also promised them the Spirit of truth to preserve them

¹ St. Paul was the first to use this term in reference to the body of revealed truths. He said to Timothy: "*Custodi depositum.*" (1 Tim. vi, 20; Cfr. 2 Tim. i, 14.)

² Matt. xxviii, 20.

from error in teaching these truths: "*He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said to you.*"³ It is evident then that infallibility extends directly and primarily to all revealed truths, whether of faith or morals.

FAITH AND MORALS. Theologians frequently refer to *matters of faith* and *matters of morals*. The former includes all those revealed truths proposed for belief rather than practice, since they are not immediately concerned with the direction of our lives. The latter embraces truths directly and immediately concerned with our actions, and necessary for leading a Christian life, but as they also are revealed, they must be believed no less firmly than the others.

COROLLARIES. Since the infallibility of the Church extends to all revealed truths, she must be infallible in determining the sources of revelation and in explaining their meaning. Therefore,

a) The Church is infallible in determining the canon of Sacred Scripture, *i. e.*, in deciding what books are divinely inspired and, therefore, to be received as the word of God. Inspiration is a fact that can be known by revelation only; consequently the Church, being infallible in defining revealed truth, is necessarily infallible in defining what works belong to Holy Scripture.

b) The Church is infallible in expounding the true sense of revealed truth, whether written or unwritten, because the Church being infallible in teaching revealed truth, must likewise be infallible in interpreting the

³ John xiv, 26.

words through which it is revealed. Furthermore, there could be no certain knowledge of revealed truth, unless there were also certain knowledge of the true meaning of the words in which it is embodied.

c) The Church is infallible in selecting terms suitable to convey the truths which she defines. Truths can be set forth in words only, *i. e.*, by means of creeds and dogmatic decrees. Therefore, to be infallible in teaching, the Church must also be infallible in choosing words that accurately express her meaning without ambiguity.

d) The Church is infallible in condemning doctrines opposed to revealed truth, because in knowing the truth with infallible certainty, she knows with like certainty that its contradictory is false. It is metaphysically impossible for the contradictory of a true proposition to be anything but false.

e) The Church is infallible in explaining the laws and precepts of God and the Evangelical Counsels of Our Lord, since these are all matters of divine revelation.

ART. II. SECONDARY EXTENT OF INFALLIBILITY

Since the Church is endowed with infallible authority for the express purpose of preserving intact the deposit of revealed truth and for expounding it without error, she must also be infallible in judging of doctrines and facts so intimately bound up with revealed truths that they cannot be denied or questioned without endanger-

ing revealed truth itself. Such doctrines and fact constitute the secondary object or extent of infallibility. They fall within the province of infallibility only in so far as they are connected with revealed truth. This secondary or indirect extent of infallibility includes especially (a) theological conclusions, (b) truths of the natural order, (c) dogmatic facts, and (d) general disciplinary matters.

a) THEOLOGICAL CONCLUSIONS. A theological conclusion is a proposition logically deduced from premises, one of which is a revealed truth, the other a truth known by reason, *e. g.*, Christ is true man (revealed truth); but man is composed of body and soul (truth known by reason); therefore, Christ has a human body and a human soul (theological conclusion). The infallible authority of the Church necessarily extends to such conclusions, for otherwise the deposit of faith could not be preserved intact. "If the Church were infallible in revealed truths, but not in matters inseparably connected with them, she would be like a commander ordered to defend a city without authority to make fortifications or to destroy the machinery of war prepared by the enemy."¹

b) NATURAL TRUTHS. Faith necessarily presupposes many truths of the purely natural order; such, for example, as the spirituality of the soul, the possibility of revelation and miracles, and also the possibility of attaining certain knowledge through human testimony. "There are also truths and conceptions, and even terms

¹ Van Noort, "De Ecclesia Christi," n. 88.

of such nature that revealed truths cannot be set forth and properly explained without them. Such, for instance, are the notions of substance, person, transubstantiation."² The Church must have infallible authority in regard to all such natural truths, in so far as they are connected with revealed truth, because without such authority she could not preserve and expound revelation with infallible security.

c) DOGOMATIC FACTS. A dogmatic fact is one that has not been revealed, yet is so intimately connected with a doctrine of faith that without certain knowledge of the fact there can be no certain knowledge of the doctrine. For example, was the Vatican Council truly ecumenical? Was Pius IX a legitimate pope? Was the election of Pius XI valid? Such questions must be decided with certainty before decrees issued by any council or pope can be accepted as infallibly true or binding on the Church. It is evident, then, that the Church must be infallible in judging of such facts, and since the Church is infallible in believing as well as in teaching, it follows that the practically unanimous consent of the bishops and faithful in accepting a council as ecumenical, or a Roman Pontiff as legitimately elected, gives absolute and infallible certainty of the fact.

Whether a particular book or document contains heresy or true doctrine is also a dogmatic fact. Hence, the pope is infallible in condemning books as heretical if the condemnation is issued as an *ex cathedra* decision.

² Dorsch, "De Ecclesia Christi," p. 333.

"We do not maintain," says Tanquerey, "that the pope is infallible in judging a book to be the work of this or that author, or that the author meant to convey the ideas expressed in his work. But we do maintain that the pope can determine with infallible accuracy the sense which the words of the author actually do convey, when considered in the context, and that he can judge with infallible certainty whether that sense is heretical or not."³

The Church, and therefore the Pope also, can declare with infallible authority that a particular version of Holy Scripture is authentic, *i. e.*, he can declare that it contains no mistakes or corruptions of the original affecting doctrines of faith or morals. The Latin Vulgate has been declared free from all such errors and made the official version of the Church. This does not mean that it contains no errors whatsoever, as is evident from the fact that a commission was appointed some years ago to bring out a revised edition; but it does mean that it contains no substantial errors that could in any way affect doctrine.

d) DISCIPLINARY MATTERS. Under this head are included the laws and precepts established by ecclesiastical authority for the regulation of worship or for the guidance of the faithful throughout the world. Such laws and precepts are necessarily subject to the infallible authority of the Church, because of their intimate connection with doctrines of faith and morals. For example, the law prescribing Communion under one

³ Tanquerey, "Synops. Theol. Dogm.," Vol. I, p. 488 (6th ed.).

species presupposes the doctrine that Our Lord is present whole and entire under either form, and the laws concerning the exposition of relics likewise presuppose that veneration of them is licit. Hence in making laws, the Church implicitly passes a twofold judgment:—one of doctrine, the other of prudence; she judges that the law is not opposed to any revealed truth and that, under the circumstances, it will assist and guide the faithful in the performance of their Christian duties. The Church is necessarily infallible in this doctrinal judgment, for if she were not, the faithful might be led into errors of doctrine at any time. But there is no promise that the rulers of the Church shall always enjoy the greatest degree of prudence; consequently, there is no guarantee that their laws and precepts will always be the best possible under the circumstances. Neither is the Church infallible in applying her laws to particular cases. The pope, for instance, may be mistaken in declaring a particular marriage valid or invalid.⁴

COROLLARIES. *a)* The prayers prescribed or approved for universal use in public worship cannot be opposed to any revealed truth. Hence, the axiom, *Lex orandi est lex credendi*,—the rule of prayer is the rule of faith.

b) In the solemn approbation of religious orders the Church is infallible in declaring that their practices and regulations are adapted to the promotion of Christian perfection,

c) The Church is also infallible in canonizing saints,

⁴ Van Noort, "De Ecclesia Christi," n. 91.

for, as Benedict XIV says: "The universal Church cannot be led into error concerning matters of morals by the Supreme Pontiff; but this would be the case if he were not infallible in the canonization of saints."⁵ In the act of canonization, the Church proclaims the saint a model of virtue; she commands all the faithful to honor him, and exhorts all to imitate his life. If the Church could be mistaken in this matter, the faithful would be led into grievous error by imitating the life of a sinner and by honoring one who is forever estranged from the friendship of God.

d) Before canonizing a person the Church usually demands evidence that a certain number of miracles have been performed through his or her intercession. Since the Church uses her authority to judge of the authenticity of these miracles, she may do so with an infallible judgment if she wishes. This, however, is not the custom of the Church either before canonization or in the act of canonization. The decree concerns the sanctity of the person canonized, not the authenticity of the miracles performed; they are merely an incentive for the Church to exercise her infallible authority in canonizing the person in question.⁶

e) The Church could also use her infallible authority to determine the genuineness of relics exposed for the veneration of the faithful, but this is rarely if ever done. The veneration paid to relics is, in reality, an honor paid to the person whom they represent or call to mind and

⁵ Benedict XIV, "De Canoniz. et Beatific. Servorum Dei."

⁶ Straub, "De Ecclesia Christi," n. 917.

cannot be affected by any defect in the relics. For this reason the authenticity of relics can scarcely ever be a matter of such importance as to demand the exercise of infallible authority on the part of the Church.

CONCLUSION. The infallible authority of the Church is primarily and directly concerned with revealed truths only; secondarily, with every doctrine or fact necessary for the proper understanding or faithful preservation of revealed truth. All are equally certain when defined by the Church, but they beget different kinds of faith. Revealed truths, when defined, become the object of divine and Catholic faith; they must be accepted on the authority of God who revealed them. Natural truths defined by the Church become the object of ecclesiastical faith; they are not accepted on the authority of God directly, but on the infallible authority of the Church defining them.

Friendly cooperation

Study

CHAPTER XVII

CHURCH AND STATE

The Church, being an external society, must come into daily contact with the various civil powers that direct the temporal destinies of man. Her members are their members; her mission is closely allied to theirs, and like them, she also must employ certain material means to attain the purpose of her existence. These intimate relations beget certain mutual rights and duties between Church and State and also determine the powers of the pope in regard to civil rulers. Order and clearness in investigating these matters will be obtained most easily by considering (1) the various theories advanced at different times on the subject, (2) the Catholic doctrine from which are deduced, (3) the mutual rights and duties of Church and State, with (4) some practical applications of the principles established, and (5) the powers of the Roman Pontiff in regard to secular rulers.

ART I. VARIOUS THEORIES ON CHURCH AND STATE

I. MARSILIUS OF PADUA. According to the teaching of the *Defensor Pacis*, the joint work of Marsilius and Jean de Jandun, all power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, resides in the people, who delegate it to the

civil authorities to be exercised in their name. Consequently, the Church can exercise no authority except by permission of the civil power, which has complete jurisdiction over it. In refuting this doctrine of absolute subjection to the State, Augustus Triumphus went to the opposite extreme by giving the Church supreme power in both temporal and spiritual matters. He taught that temporal rulers are mere agents of the Roman Pontiff, who holds supreme temporal and spiritual power over the whole world.

II. THE REFORMERS. The so-called Reformers of the sixteenth century were forced to confer all spiritual authority upon secular princes in order to obtain their assistance and protection. A non-Catholic writer says that "the maxim, *cuius regio, eius religio*,¹ the pithy definition of territorialism which makes the religion of the people dependent on the religion of the ruler of the country, became the leading principle in all Protestant States on the Continent. . . . Furthermore, as the bishops everywhere protested against the Reformation, the episcopal authority and jurisdiction had, in the Protestant countries, to be conferred on the civil ruler. . . . The Church became a mere department of his government."² The Church of England declares that "the King's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England and his other dominions . . . over all estates in this realm whether they be ecclesiastical

¹ A phrase meaning that the religion of a country must be that of its ruler.

² Schaff-Herzog, art. "Church and State."

or civil."³ According to this doctrine of the Reformers, the "State is supreme, the Church its servant."⁴

III. GALLICANISM. The doctrines of Gallicanism, if put into practice, would logically lead to the institution of national Churches, subject to the civil power. Its advocates held that civil rulers are completely independent of Church authority in the administration of their office; that the civil power has the right of *vigilance* and *influence* in ecclesiastical affairs, and that the decrees and constitutions of the Roman Pontiff have no force unless approved by the king and published with his authority. This approval was known as the *royal placet* or *exequatur*.

The doctrine itself is known as Gallicanism, because its advocates proclaimed it for the French Church only. They did this on the plea that the authority of the pope was limited in France by ancient custom and by Church canons. The principles of Gallicanism were first systemized by Guy Coquille and Pierre Pithou in a work edited in 1594 under the title, *Liberties of the Gallican Church*. Under the influence of Louis XIV, these principles were reduced to four articles and published in 1682 as the *Declaration of the French Clergy*, although they were signed by only thirty-four out of the hundred and thirty-five prelates of France.⁵

³ The Thirty-nine Articles, Art. xxxvii.

⁴ Schaff-Herzog, art. "Church and State."

⁵ Cf. Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Gallicanism"; Devivier-Sasia, "Christian Apologetics," Vol. II, p. 163 sqq.

IV. FEBRONIANISM. Nicholas von Hontheim, writing under the name of Justinus Febronius, set forth serious errors regarding the constitution of the Church and its relation to the State. According to his doctrine, all powers must be subordinated to the State, which is absolute. From this principle he deduced the right of the State to regulate the external affairs of the Church,—to convoke councils, reform Church discipline, grant and revoke immunities, administer the goods of the Church and receive appeals from the judgment of ecclesiastical authorities.

V. JOSEPHISM. Emperor Joseph II of Austria, influenced by Gallicanism, Febronianism, and the teachings of Voltaire, introduced the system known to history as *Josephism*. It was simply an attempt to create a national Church subject to the State, or, as one of his supporters expressed it, to make "the Church a department of the police, which must serve the aims of the State until such time as the enlightenment of the people permit its release by the secular police."⁶ According to this policy the State is the administrator of all church property and has authority to regulate, change, or suppress anything in divine worship or in the government of the Church that is not essential to religion. As the State was sole judge in the matter, it turned out that religion had very few "essentials." Joseph interfered with Church services to such an extent that Frederick the Great dubbed him "our brother sacristan."

VI. LIBERALISM. Rationalists and materialists, as-

⁶ Sonnenfels, quoted by Catholic Encyclopedia, art. "Joseph II."

suming the title of *Liberals*, teach that the State is supreme and absolute in its powers; from it all rights are derived, and to its power everything must be subjected. The individual exists for the State, not the State for the individual. This doctrine makes the Church a mere private corporation, existing at the pleasure of the State, and subject to the State in every respect. It is a return to the pagan idea of the State as a divinity to be worshipped.⁷

The teaching of Modernism is closely allied to Liberalism on the subject of Church and State and logically leads to it. The Church, according to the Modernists, is not a divine institution, but a society of the faithful, which arose through evolutionary processes. Consequently it must be a private society, having neither rights nor authority other than those granted by the State. Pius X says "that since the phenomena of faith must be subject to science, as they say, so must the Church be subject to the State in its temporal concerns. Perhaps they have not openly asserted this as yet, but they are logically forced to admit it."⁸

VII. MODIFIED LIBERALISM. The advocates of this theory maintain that Church and State are completely independent of each other both in their existence and in their activities. Their motto is "*A free Church in a free State*,"—a phrase that tickles the ear and serves

⁷ Cf. Ryan and Millar, "The State and the Church," p. 195 sqq.

⁸ Pius X, "Pascendi Dominici Gregis," 7 Sept., 1907; Denzinger, n. 2093.

to cover up much false doctrine. Taken at its face value, the phrase expresses a fundamental truth concerning the relations of Church and State, but it is interpreted to mean that religion is an affair of the individual alone, and that the State should give no thought to religion in any of its acts or counsels, since anything is right and just that the popular will demands or consents to. All powers of the State and every right of the individual flow from the consent of the people.

Theoretically, this form of Liberalism grants complete freedom of worship and equal rights to all forms of religion; practically, however, it results in an attempt to overthrow all religion. Those who advocate separation of Church and State on account of peculiar circumstances which obtain in various countries, cannot be classed as Liberals in the sense just explained. Separation is often necessary to avoid greater evils.

RÉSUMÉ. The ancient world subordinated religion and the priesthood to the State, and at Rome the emperor assumed the title and office of "*Pontifex Maximus*." This idea of State supremacy clung for a time to the Christian emperors, especially in the East, where they meddled to a considerable extent in ecclesiastical affairs. During the Middle Ages there was a decided tendency to subject the State to the Church by placing temporal power in the hands of the pope. A non-Catholic historian says: "It was characteristic of the whole period known as the Middle Ages that the State was too weak to stand alone, and consequently sought

support in the spiritual authority of the Church.”⁹ This resulted in a dependence of the State upon the Church and gave to her considerable temporal power, which saved the peoples of the West from absolutism such as that exercised by the ancient State.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century brought about a reversal of this relation between Church and State by subjecting religion to political power. Comte describes this absorption of religion by the State as a “relapse into barbarism.”¹⁰ This change, brought about by the Reformation, gradually developed into the doctrine of State absolutism, which culminated in the teachings of Hegel, who declared the State the highest manifestation of Universal Reason, which all persons and institutions must serve and magnify.¹¹ The system commonly advocated today proclaims Church and State completely independent of each other in their existence, aims, and activities. While some of these systems may be the best obtainable under given circumstances, they are all false in principle and opposed to the teaching of the Church.

ART II. CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON CHURCH AND STATE

Catholic doctrine concerning the relations of Church and State may be summarized in three propositions:

⁹ Hans Delbrück, quoted by Mausbach, “Catholic Moral Teaching,” p. 345.

¹⁰ A. Comte, quoted by Mausbach, “Catholic Moral Teaching,” p. 347.

¹¹ F. W. Hegel, “Philosophie des Rechts,” quoted by Ryan and Millar, “The State and the Church,” p. 198.

(a) Church and State are distinct and perfect societies, each supreme in its own province; (b) the State is *indirectly* subordinate to the Church, and (c) Church and State should be joined in mutual and friendly co-operation.

§ 1. *Church and State Distinct and Perfect Societies*

I. DISTINCT SOCIETIES. Under the Christian dispensation, Church and State are separate and distinct societies, as all admit, and this distinction is a matter of divine institution, as is evident from the origin and purposes of the two societies and from the nature of the means employed to attain those purposes.

a) ORIGIN. Both State and Church have God for their author, for, as St. Paul says, “*there is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God.*”¹ Yet the two societies owe their existence to God in quite different senses. Civil power considered in the abstract is from God; the Church in its concrete form is of divine institution.

Man was created to live in the society of his fellow-men and cannot live happily without it; in fact, he can scarcely eke out an existence without the coöperation of others. Therefore, civil authority which is absolutely necessary for men to live together in peace and security, is from God, who gave man his social nature and social instincts. But the particular form which civil government assumes, depends upon the will of man. God wills that there be civil government with authority to

¹ Rom. xiii, 1.

rule, but He does not determine whether this government shall be a monarchy, a republic, or a pure democracy. The condition of the Church is quite different, since Christ directly established it in the concrete form under which it exists; He not only gave the authority, but also determined the particular form of government, and left no authority to change it in the least. It is evident, then, that the distinction between State and Church is of divine institution and cannot be abolished by any human authority.

b) PURPOSE. The civil power, being a natural society, is ordained for the attainment of a natural end; *viz.*, the happiness of its citizens in this life. It would also have been the duty of the State to provide for man's eternal happiness if God had not ordained otherwise; but since man is destined for a supernatural happiness, the State, being a purely natural society, is not sufficient to attain this end. For this reason the Church was instituted to provide for man's eternal happiness, leaving to the State, as its immediate end, the temporal well-being and happiness of its citizens. The purposes of the two societies are thus separate and distinct: the one temporal, the other eternal; the one natural, the other supernatural.

c) MEANS EMPLOYED. The means employed by the State to attain its end are all of the natural order; those employed by the Church are both natural and supernatural, the principal ones being supernatural, such as Revelation, the Sacraments, divine authority, infallibility, and the like.

II. PERFECT SOCIETIES. Church and State are not only distinct, they are also independent societies,—independent in their origin, in their existence, and in the means employed to attain their respective ends. Christ indicated this when He said: "*Render therefore to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's.*"² It is evident, then, that both Church and State fulfill all the requirements for a perfect society;³ neither depends upon the other or upon any other society for its existence or for the means to attain its end. Furthermore the ends to be attained are different and not subordinated to any other end in the same order. Therefore, both Church and State are perfect societies, each supreme in its own sphere, as Leo XIII explicitly teaches: "God has divided the care of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil; one placed over divine things, the other over human. Each is supreme in its own sphere, and each is confined within certain limits defined by its very nature; . . . therefore each has a world of its own, as it were, in which to exercise its proper functions."⁴

§ 2. *The State Indirectly Subordinate to the Church*

SUBORDINATE. Church and State being distinct societies, must be of equal or unequal rank. In other

² Matt. xxii, 21.

³ See above, p. 45.

⁴ Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," 1 Nov., 1885; Denzinger, n. 1866.

words, the relation between them must be that of *co-ordination* or *subordination*, but societies cannot be truly *coördinate* unless they belong to the same order and are concerned about the same end, *e. g.*, sovereign States are *coördinate* societies; so also are similar political subdivisions of a State, or independent corporations engaged in the same line of business. It is immediately evident, therefore, that Church and State cannot be *co-ordinate*, since they belong to different orders and are concerned about different ends. The one is supernatural, the other natural; the one is concerned with man's eternal happiness, the other with his temporal well-being. Consequently, one must be *subordinated* to the other, and in precisely the same manner that the ends to be attained by the two societies are subordinated one to the other.

Since man was created for eternal happiness, all temporal things must subserve that end. Temporal happiness and material well-being are not things to be sought after for themselves alone; right reason demands that they be used as a means to man's last end, or at least, that they be not opposed to that end, for, as Christ has said, "*what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his own soul?*"¹ Therefore, as man's temporal happiness and prosperity must be subordinate and subservient to his eternal happiness, so also must the State, which provides for the former, be subordinate and subservient to the Church, which provides for the latter. Hence Boniface VIII declared

¹ Matt. xvi, 26.

that "sword should be subject to sword; the temporal authority to the spiritual power, for, as the Apostle says, *there is no power but from God, and those that are from God are ordered*. But they would not be ordered if sword were not subject to sword and the lower directed by the higher to a supreme end."²

INDIRECT SUBORDINATE. Subordination may be *direct* or *indirect*. A society is *directly* subordinated to another when it has the same end in view and its sphere of action falls within that of the superior society. For example, the political divisions of a nation are directly subordinate to the nation itself, and the dioceses of the Church to the Church as a whole. In direct subordination the superior society has jurisdiction over the inferior with authority to prescribe its course of action and to approve or nullify any of its acts. There can be no question of such subordination of State to Church. The State, being a perfect society, supreme in its own order, is not and cannot be directly subject to the Church.

Indirect subordination can occur only when the societies concerned have different aims in view and distinct spheres of action, *i. e.*, when the one is not included within the other. Under these conditions subjection of one society to another may arise from three different sources,—its members, the end it has in view and the means to attain that end.

a) If the members of a society happen to be subject

² Boniface VIII, "Unam Sanctam," 18 Nov., 1302; Denzinger, n. 469.

to another and higher authority, the society itself is thereby indirectly subjected to that higher authority: it has no right to take any action that would cause its members to violate their duties to the higher authority. The State is thus indirectly subject to the Church, in so far as its citizens happen to be subject to the higher spiritual authority of the Church. This sort of subordination is only indirect and negative; it demands that the State refrain from any action that would cause her citizens or rulers to violate their duties to the Church or interfere in any way with the Church's exercise of spiritual authority over every single member, be he the humblest citizen in the land or the king on his throne.

b) A society is also indirectly subject to another if the end it has in view is subordinated to that of the other society. But the temporal happiness of man, the end directly sought by the State, is necessarily subordinate and subservient to his eternal happiness, to be obtained through the Church. Therefore, the State has neither the right nor the authority to seek any temporal happiness or material prosperity for its citizens detrimental to their eternal welfare, and since there can be no true temporal prosperity except that which leads to eternal happiness, it is the duty of the State to provide for eternal happiness indirectly by providing for true temporal happiness. Consequently, the State is indirectly subject to the Church in this matter both *negatively* and *positively*, *i. e.*, the State must not only refrain from anything that would impede the Church

in her mission of salvation, it must also assist the Church indirectly by providing a temporal prosperity that will be conducive to the eternal welfare of her citizens.

c) Finally, a society is indirectly subject to another if the means it employs to attain its end are in any way connected with the attainment of a higher good for its members in that other society. The State is therefore indirectly subject to the Church in this respect, since right reason demands that the State cede to the Church whatever is necessary for her preservation and the proper attainment of her higher purpose,—the eternal salvation of man. Moreover, the actions of civil officials in carrying out the duties of their office often have a moral aspect that affects the spiritual welfare committed to the care of the Church. Consequently, the Church has direct jurisdiction over the official acts of civil authorities in regard to the moral aspect of those acts if the persons in question happen to be subjects of the Church. In this matter, therefore, the Church also exercises an indirect authority over the State.

COROLLARY. The Church has jurisdiction over all things pertaining to the salvation of man and to those only. Consequently the Church has sole jurisdiction in purely spiritual matters, but in temporal matters that neither impede her work in saving souls nor are necessary for that work, she has absolutely no jurisdiction. Temporal things consecrated to God or to the worship of God, and all things necessary for the proper fulfill-

ment of her mission, are subject to the authority of the Church, and therefore removed from that of the State. Consequently, the Church has an inherent right to acquire and possess churches, schools, hospitals, orphanages, cemeteries, and the like, together with sufficient funds for their proper maintenance, and the State has no right to tax such properties, since they are not subject to State authority. The Church also has the right to exempt from the jurisdiction of the State all persons consecrated to God by the reception of Orders or by religious profession. Such exemption is known as *privilegium fori*, because persons so exempt have the privilege of being tried for any crime in the courts (*forum*) of the Church and punished by her authority, if found guilty.

Leo XIII briefly stated these principles in the following words: "The nature and scope of that connection [between Church and State] can be determined only by having regard to the nature of each power, and by taking account of the relative excellence and nobility of their purpose. One has for its proximate and chief object the well-being of this mortal life; the other the everlasting joys of Heaven. Therefore, whatever in things human is sacred in character, whatever belongs by nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls, or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgment of the Church. Whatever is to be ranged under civil and political order, is rightly subject to civil authority. Jesus Christ Himself has given command that what belongs to Cæsar

must be rendered to Cæsar, and that what belongs to God is to be rendered to God."³

In case a conflict of rights should occur, or a controversy arise between Church and State concerning the limits of their respective jurisdictions in particular cases, the State as the inferior society would be obliged, theoretically, to yield to the judgment of the Church. In practice, however, the Church desires that such matters be settled by mutual agreement. "There are occasions," says Leo XIII, "when another method of concord is available for the sake of peace and liberty. We mean, when rulers of the State and the Roman Pontiff come to an understanding touching some special matter. At such times the Church gives signal proof of her motherly love by showing the greatest possible kindness and indulgence." Agreements of this sort between Church and State concerning matters of more or less permanent nature are known as *concordats*, and correspond to treaties between nations.

§ 3. *Church and State in Mutual Support*

The prevailing doctrine today advocates complete separation of Church and State allowing each to go its way without regard to the other. The opposite extreme is union of Church and State, in which one absorbs the other and exercises all authority, both civil and ecclesiastical. Both extremes are wrong in principle and opposed to Catholic teaching. The fact that

³ Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," 1 Nov., 1885; Denzinger, n. 1866.

Christ instituted the Church as a society distinct from the State and independent of it, proves that they should not be united in such wise that either dominates or absorbs the other. On the other hand, complete separation is detrimental to both and, therefore, contrary to the will of Christ.

With societies as with individuals, complete separation is lawful only when just rights and duties are not thereby violated. Persons bound by mutual rights and duties may not disregard them by complete separation, especially if the rights of others are involved. Husband and wife, for example, owe to each other certain duties which neither may lawfully evade by separation without consent of the other. Even mutual consent of the parties will not make separation lawful when the rights of children are concerned. The relation between Church and State is similar to that between husband and wife. Both were instituted to promote the common welfare of mankind,—the Church to care for his spiritual needs, the State for his temporal welfare. But neither of these can be properly provided for unless the other be taken into consideration. This fact gives rise to mutual rights and duties between Church and State, and if these are not fulfilled by friendly coöperation, the subjects of both societies must suffer injury. Leo XIII compares the ideal union between Church and State to that between body and soul in man: “Even in physical things, although of a lower order, the Almighty has so combined the forces and springs of nature with tempered action and wondrous harmony, that no one of

them clashes with another, and all of them most fitly and aptly work together for the great purpose of the universe. There must, accordingly, exist between these two powers [Church and State] a certain orderly connection, which may be compared to the union of body and soul in man.”¹

The nature and extent of this ideal union between Church and State is easily deduced from their mutual rights and duties, as described in the following article; but what it shall be in any particular case will depend upon various circumstances. The principles remain the same, but their application will differ, because it often happens that insistence upon a theoretical right may cause harm rather than good. In such cases it is the part of prudence to avert the greater evil by foregoing the use of a right whose exercise is not absolutely essential.

ART. III. MUTUAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES

I. THE STATE. *a)* RIGHTS. Since the State is a perfect society, supreme in its own sphere, it has the right to free and untrammelled action in those things pertaining to its jurisdiction, such as selecting the form of government, making necessary laws, providing for the common defense, making public improvements, and the like. In a word, the State has an inherent right to free action in everything tending to promote the common good of its citizens, provided nothing is done con-

¹ Leo XIII, “Immortale Dei,” 1 Nov., 1885.

trary to the laws of God or the good of the Church. In certain matters of a mixed nature both State and Church have rights and duties that must be carefully distinguished. Education and marriage belong to this class and demand special attention, because they are matters of constant concern to Church and State alike.

Education tends to promote the welfare of society and the security of the State, especially in a representative government, where the people participate in it through the right of ballot. Consequently, the State has a just right to demand suitable instruction, to establish and maintain schools to impart such instruction, and to require all children to attend them, unless their education is otherwise provided for. The State also has the right to demand reasonable proficiency in all private schools and to see to it that nothing detrimental to the common good is taught or inculcated in them, and, since morality is necessary for the common good, the State has the right and also the duty to see to it that nothing contrary to morality is taught in any school or inculcated by books, newspapers, theatres, or other agencies. But since it belongs to the Church to teach faith and morals, the State must seek guidance from her in these matters and accept her judgment.

Since the peace and security of the nation depends to a large extent upon the peace and security of the family, the State has a just right to regulate marriage in its civil effects. For this purpose it may demand publicity for all marriages by means of an official license or the publication of banns and by a public registration of all

marriages performed. The State also has authority to regulate the rights of husband and wife in regard to the ownership and inheritance of property, and to protect the rights of children by demanding that parents give them proper care and education. The State has no right to interfere with marriage as a Sacrament by prescribing how it shall be solemnized or by establishing diriment impediments. These matters were committed to the authority of the Church, when Christ raised marriage to the dignity of a Sacrament. It should be noted, however, that the marriage of unbaptized persons is not a Sacrament and that the contracting parties are not subject to Church authority; consequently, it belongs to the State to regulate such marriages, but in no case can it grant an absolute divorce, since this is contrary to the law of Christ.

b) DUTIES TO CHURCH. Since civil society owes its existence to God no less than the individual, the State as such is obliged to acknowledge and honor Him by public worship of a social character. "The State," says Leo XIII, "is clearly bound to act up to the manifold and weighty duties linking it to God, by the public profession of religion. Nature and reason, which command every one to worship God devoutly in holiness because we belong to Him and must return to Him from whom we came, also bind the civil community by a similar law. For men living together in society are under the power of God no less than individuals, and society no less than individuals, owes gratitude to God, who gave it being and maintains it, and whose ever

bounteous goodness enriches it with countless blessings. As no one is allowed to be remiss in the service due to God, and as the chief duty of all men is to cling to religion in its teachings and its practice, . . . it is a public crime to act as though there were no God. So, too, is it a sin in the State to act as though religion were something beyond its scope or of no practical benefit."¹ These same principles were proclaimed by Pius IX when he condemned the teaching that "the best interests of society and civil progress demand that governments be organized and ruled with no more regard to religion than if it did not exist, or at least with no distinction between true and false religion."²

The State, as well as the individual, must recognize and worship God in the manner prescribed by Him; it may not "out of many forms of religion adopt that one which chimes in with its fancy, for we are bound absolutely to worship God in that way which He has shown to be His will."³ In fine, the State as such is obliged to profess and protect the true religion of Christ, which is found in the Catholic Church alone. Moreover, as the State is bound to acknowledge and worship God, it is also obliged to prohibit and repress, as far as possible, whatever is opposed to His honor and glory, *i. e.*, whatever is opposed to the natural or positive law of God and the good of His Church. The State must frame its laws and regulate its practices ac-

¹ Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," 1 Nov., 1885.

² Pius IX, "Quanta Cura," 8 Dec., 1864; Denzinger, n. 1689.

³ Leo XIII, "Immortale Dei," 1 Nov., 1885.

ording to right reason and the truths of Revelation, as interpreted by the Church, the divinely appointed teacher and interpreter of all revealed truth.

The duties of the State in matters of religion, which we have deduced from its dependence upon God, "*the King of kings and Lord of lords,*" may also be inferred from its one chief duty, that of providing for the temporal happiness and prosperity of its citizens. This happiness must be in accord with man's nature as a rational creature of God destined for eternal happiness. Therefore, as St. Thomas says, "it is the duty of the king [or civil authorities] to provide for the good of the people in a manner that will lead to eternal happiness in Heaven; he must command those things which will lead to eternal happiness, and forbid, as far as possible, whatever is opposed to its attainment."⁴ But as man can attain eternal happiness only through the practice of true religion in the Catholic Church, it is the duty of the State to protect and promote the interests of the Church in order to promote the true temporal interests of its subjects.

Again, it is the duty of the State to protect every natural and civic right of its subjects; for this especially are governments organized and maintained. But the right of every man to acquire truth, whether natural or revealed, and the right to attain his supreme destiny through the practice of true religion, are fundamental and innate, and the State is obliged to protect them in the only way possible,—by protecting and

⁴ St. Thomas Aquinas, "De Rege et Regno," I, xv.

promoting the interests of the Church divinely appointed to teach and save mankind. Finally, the State is obliged in justice to the people to provide for its own security and preservation, but true religion is the very foundation of all society for the rights of man are not secure when the rights of God are contemned. Society without morality cannot continue long in peace and happiness, and without religion there can be no morality; wherefore the State secures its own position and strengthens its own authority by encouraging and promoting true religion, and every attack upon true religion is an attack upon the very foundations of civil government. On this account heresy was formerly punished as a crime against the State, just as blasphemy or violation of the Sunday are punished by the State in many places at the present time.

II. THE CHURCH. *a) RIGHTS.* The Church being a perfect society, supreme in its own sphere, has the right to free and unimpeded action in everything that is necessary for the salvation of souls,—in teaching, in the administration of the Sacraments, in matters of discipline and worship, and in the education of the clergy. She also has the right to acquire and administer church property, to open schools, and to see to it that nothing contrary to faith or morals is taught in the State schools. She likewise has a right to protection and assistance on the part of the State.

b) DUTIES TOWARD THE STATE. The Church is bound in justice to recognize the supremacy of the State in purely temporal things and to leave to secular author-

ity complete control of such affairs. The Fourth Lateran Council is explicit on this matter: "Since we do not wish the laity to invade the rights of the clergy, so neither do we wish the clergy to usurp the rights of the laity. Therefore, we forbid all clerics to make the liberty of the Church a pretext for extending their jurisdiction at the expense of secular justice. Let them remain content with approved constitution and customs, by which the things of Cæsar are rendered to Cæsar, and the things of God to God."⁵

The Church is also obliged to assist the State by inculcating public honesty and respect for lawful authority, and by promoting peace and tranquillity, all of which tend both to the spiritual and to the temporal welfare of the people. When necessary, the Church must also assist the State in warding off impending dangers that threaten Church and State alike, as often happens in time of war or hostile invasion. The history of our own country is an eloquent witness to the manner in which the Church has always fulfilled this duty to the government. Finally, the Church owes the duty of prayer for the State and its authorities. She must pray, as St. Paul commands, "*for kings, and for all that are in high station, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in piety and chastity.*"⁶ The Church conscientiously fulfilled this duty even to the pagan emperors of Rome during the worst days of per-

⁵ Mansi, T. xxii, col. 1027.

⁶ 1 Tim. ii, 2-3.

secution, and continues to pray for all civil rulers in her public and private devotions.

CONCLUSION. The most superficial examination of the mutual rights and duties flowing from the very nature of the two societies must convince any thinking man that the ideal relation of Church and State is that of friendly coöperation, for, as Ivo of Chartres says, "when the civil and ecclesiastical powers agree, the world is well ruled and the Church flourishes and bears fruit. But when there is discord, everything fails miserably."⁷ This ideal may be difficult to realize in practice, and history bears witness that it has seldom if ever been realized in the past, partly because the agents through which both powers must work are human beings with all the innate frailties of human nature, but ideals are not to be abandoned because they are seldom realized in their fullness. If such were the case, the progress of nations and the betterment of the human race would have to be abandoned as mere idle dreams.

Union of coöperation and mutual support is undoubtedly the ideal relation of Church and State, yet separation must be preferred to a so-called union that amounts to subjection of the Church to the State, for separation with freedom is better far than union with slavery. Attempted unions in the past generally have led to subjection, and present experiences are far from satisfactory. The ideal is, perhaps, more nearly realized in the United States than in any other part of the world today, and this in spite of our protestations of

⁷ Ivo of Chartres, "Epist. ad Paschalem"; P. L., 162, 246.

complete separation. The State recognizes its duty to God and religion by proclaiming a day of national thanksgiving, by opening sessions of Congress and State legislatures with prayer, by appointing chaplains for army and navy, by protecting freedom of worship and the rights of the Church to own and administer her property without taxation, to educate her clergy, and to conduct schools for her children. Both national and State governments, it is true, recognize all religions alike, and secure equal rights to all, contrary to the principles of right reason, since truth alone has rights and falsehood can only be tolerated to avoid greater evils. But under the conditions prevailing in this country, the government could not prudently act otherwise, even if it so wished. In fact, any other course would be unjust to vast numbers living in good faith, because at the very inception of the government a solemn contract was made to recognize all religions alike in order to avoid greater evils.

ART. IV. PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES

Present conditions in the religious and political world seem to preclude all hope of attaining ideal relations between Church and State, yet there are certain rights for which the Church may reasonably demand recognition and respect. What these rights are, and what action the Church may take to enforce them against an unwilling government, must be determined from the circumstances of the case, and will depend largely

upon whether the State in question is Catholic or non-Catholic, Christian or non-Christian.

a) CATHOLIC STATE. In a Catholic State the Church must demand recognition of all her rights, and may reasonably insist that all of them be respected, unless special circumstances prevent the State from fulfilling certain duties toward her. But should the State unjustly refuse to respect the rights of the Church, her course of action is evident, for in this case the authorities of the State and, at least, a large majority of the people are Catholics, directly subject to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church. This makes it possible for the Church to enforce respect for her rights by means of ecclesiastical punishments, which have generally proved effective in the past. But if such means were not sufficient, the Church could justly call upon other Catholic nations to defend her rights by force of arms. The prudence of such action would have to be judged from the circumstances of the case.

b) NON-CATHOLIC STATE. In a Christian State that is professedly non-Catholic, the Church cannot expect recognition of all her rights from the simple fact that she is not recognized as the true Church of Christ; but she can reasonably demand freedom of worship for Catholic subjects of the State and freedom for herself in teaching and making converts. The reasonableness of these demands follow from the fundamental Protestant doctrine of private interpretation and freedom to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience, which a Protestant State could not consistently

deny to any of its subjects. According to the same principle, the Church can reasonably demand recognition as a private society in the State, with all the rights and privileges accorded such societies.

But should the State refuse to respect even these demands of the Church, there is practically no means to enforce them. Theoretically, of course, the authorities and people of the State are subject to the jurisdiction of the Church, for, according to the supposition, they are baptized Christians. But they do not recognize this subjection, and cannot be expected to recognize it so long as they do not recognize the Church herself. This fact would render ecclesiastical punishments of no use whatever, unless enforced by the arms of Catholic nations, but the laws of prudence and charity would limit such action to cases of the most extreme necessity. It would always produce great harm and seldom, if ever, any good.

c) NON-CHRISTIAN STATE. In a non-Christian State force of arms wielded by other nations is the only means of defense against unjust invasion of the rights of the Church, for neither rulers nor people in such a State are subject in any way to the authority of the Church. Such force may be justly used to protect the right of the Church to preach the Gospel and bring souls to Christ, because all men, whether Christians or pagans, Jews or Gentiles, are subject to Christ, who commanded the Gospel to be preached to every creature and commissioned the Church to carry out this mission. Therefore, if a non-Christian State forbids the Gospel

to be preached to its subjects, or to be accepted by them, the Church may call upon other nations to interfere by force of arms, if necessary. Both Catholic and Protestant nations have often intervened in this manner to protect missionaries and converts and thus secure freedom for the Gospel in pagan lands.

d) *INDIFFERENT STATE.* There is a growing tendency today for governments to assume an attitude of complete indifference toward all religions. Such an attitude cannot be defended as an abstract principle by Catholics, but it may often be necessary through force of circumstances. A State may be compelled to tolerate false religions and hold all religions equal before the law, in order to preserve social peace and tranquility. Where such conditions exist, Catholics may and do advocate a policy of religious indifference on the part of the State,—not as an abstract right, but as the least objectionable condition possible under the circumstances.

ART. V. THE ROMAN PONTIFF AND SECULAR RULERS

The supreme authorities in Church and State must stand in the same relation to each other as the societies over which they rule. From this we deduce the following principles: (1) secular rulers are indirectly subject to the Roman Pontiff; (2) the Roman Pontiff is exempt from all civil jurisdiction; and (3) temporal power is necessary to secure this exemption.

§ 1. *Secular Rulers Indirectly Subject to Roman Pontiff*

Boniface VIII decreed that all men are subject to the Roman Pontiff, and the context shows that he had temporal rulers especially in mind, for the whole document is designed to prove that the civil power must be subject to the spiritual. He says: "If the worldly power deviates from the right path, it shall be judged by the spiritual; but if the supreme spiritual power deviates, it can be judged by God alone, as the Apostles testify: *The spiritual man judges all things, but he himself is judged by no one.* . . . Therefore, we declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is necessary for salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff."¹

Taken by themselves, these words of Pope Boniface might suggest a direct and complete subjection of temporal to spiritual rulers, but they have always been interpreted by theologians and by the Church herself as referring to an indirect subjection only. Membership in the Church, which is necessary for salvation, can be neither acquired nor retained without submission to the spiritual authority of her supreme head. For this reason Pope Boniface rightly says that subjection to the Roman Pontiff is necessary for every human creature, be he the meanest subject in the land or the

¹ Boniface VIII, "Unam Sanctam," 18 Nov., 1302; Denzinger. n. 469.

mightiest monarch on his throne. All Catholic rulers, *as members of the Church*, are directly subject to the spiritual authority of the Pope; *as civil rulers*, they are indirectly subject to the same authority, in so far as their official acts have a moral bearing. Since the Roman Pontiff has the right and duty of teaching faith and morals to the whole Church and to every member of the Church, it is his duty to instruct Catholic kings and rulers concerning the morality of all their acts, both private and official. It is his duty to decide what is contrary to the laws of God or the Church, and what is necessary for the protection of public and private morality. If a Catholic ruler violates the laws of God or of the Church, either in private or by official acts, the pope must admonish and punish him, if necessary, by excommunication, interdict, or other ecclesiastical censure, just as he would punish any other member of the Church. It is evident, then, that temporal rulers in their official capacity are subject to the authority of the pope only indirectly; he has no jurisdiction over their official acts except in so far as these acts have a moral bearing. The pope cannot forbid any act on the part of a civil ruler, unless that act be sinful; neither can he command any act, unless its omission would be a sin against the laws of God or the Church.

COROLLARY I. The jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff extends to all subjects of the Church, and, therefore, to all validly baptized rulers of the State, whether Catholic or non-Catholic; but any attempt to exercise this authority over non-Catholic rulers would seldom,

if ever, be expedient, for the simple reason that it is not recognized by them and would produce no good effect. Unbaptized rulers, not being subjects of the Church, are not subject to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, except as noted below, but it must not be concluded that on this account they are in a better position than Catholic rulers. On the contrary, their position is far inferior; they are bound by the laws of God in all their official acts, but are deprived of the infallible authority of the Church to guide them.

COROLLARY II. All civil rulers, whether Christian or non-Christian, may become indirectly subject to the authority of the Roman Pontiff through his spiritual jurisdiction over their subjects. The duty of the Roman Pontiff obliges him to instruct all the faithful in their duties, both private and civic. Therefore, if a law of the State is contrary to the law of God, the pope is bound in conscience to instruct the faithful that it cannot be obeyed, and if the conditions of government are such that the citizens are no longer bound by their oath of allegiance, it is the Pope's right to declare that fact to his own subjects for their spiritual guidance, and if all, or a large majority of the citizens be Catholics, this declaration would be equivalent to deposition of the ruler. In this sense only does the Pope, as such, have power to depose civil rulers. The same power is claimed by Protestants, but it operates in a different manner. With them each individual would have recourse to his own private judgment whether he is bound to allegiance or not, and might easily be misled in the

matter by passion or interest. In such a case Catholics would have recourse to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, to give them an authoritative decision, but in either case the results would be the same so far as the government authorities are concerned.

In the Middle Ages the popes seem to have exercised a direct power of deposing kings and emperors, but this was done by virtue of international law or custom, recognized at that time by all as conferring such authority upon the Pope as head and father of Christians nations.

§ 2. *The Roman Pontiff Exempt from Civil Authority*

The Roman Pontiff is not subject to any power on earth, whether civil or ecclesiastical. This follows of necessity from his position as supreme head of the Church, which is subject to no authority save that of Christ alone. "Being supreme head of the Church, he cannot be judged by any other ecclesiastical power, and as the Church is a spiritual society superior to any temporal power whatever, he cannot be judged by any temporal ruler. Therefore, the supreme head of the Church can direct and judge the rulers of temporal powers, but he can neither be directed nor judged by them without a perversion of due order founded in the very nature of things."¹ This doctrine is taught by the

¹ Cardinal Bellarmine, "De Romano Pontifice," ii, 26.

Fathers and incorporated in the canons of the Church: "The first See is judged by no one."² A synod of bishops held in Rome in 503, to investigate charges against Pope Symmachus, declared that "God wished the causes of other men to be decided by men, but He reserved to His own tribunal, without question, the ruler of this See."³

This complete exemption of the Roman Pontiff from all civil jurisdiction is of divine institution, for Christ himself conferred it upon St. Peter and his successors, at least implicitly, when He entrusted to them the supreme authority, which necessarily implies such exemption. Some also see an explicit exemption from civil authority in the words of Christ concerning the payment of tribute: "*What is thy opinion, Simon? The kings of the earth, of whom do they receive tribute or custom? Of their own children or of strangers? And he said: Of strangers. Jesus said to him: Then the Children are free. But that we may not scandalize them . . . give to them for me and thee.*"⁴ Christ here clearly proclaims His exemption from earthly powers and seems to include St. Peter in the same.

§ 3. *Temporal Power Necessary*

The claim to temporal power on the part of the Ro-

² "Codex Juris Canonici," can. 1556.

³ Ennodius of Ticino, "Apologia"; P. L., 63, 200.

⁴ Matt. xvii, 24-26.

man Pontiff is not a pretension to exercise temporal dominion over the nations of the world, as many non-Catholic falsely believe. It is simply claiming the right to a territory, large or small, free from the dominion of any other power, in which the Pope may be free to rule the Church without let or hindrance. Such power is necessary because of the unique position of the pope as a person exempt from all human authority. In civil society, as well as in the Church, all persons must be classed as subjects or rulers, but if the pope were not the ruler of his own territory, he would find himself in the strange position of being neither subject nor ruler; of being in society without forming any part of it. Such a position could not be maintained without grave danger to his freedom in governing the Church. If he were a subject, or even an honored guest of any temporal ruler, his freedom of communication with all parts of the Church and with other nations might be seriously hampered at any time, or even lost entirely in times of war. He would also be open to the suspicion of being unduly influenced by his host. Such suspicion would greatly discredit his power and bring harm to the Church, as happened during the residence of the Popes at Avignon in France. For this reason the bishops gathered in Rome for the allocution of Pius IX, on 9 June, 1862, unanimously declared that "it is indeed necessary for the Roman Pontiff, as head of the whole Church, to be subject to no prince, nor even the guest of a prince. He should have his own dominion and his own kingdom, so that he may protect and spread the

Catholic faith, rule and govern the Christian commonwealth in noble and peaceful freedom."¹

Our Lord conferred no temporal kingdom upon St. Peter; consequently, we cannot say that temporal power is a matter of divine institution; but it is conditionally of divine right, for, since the pope is exempt from all temporal power by divine right, whatever is necessary to protect and preserve this immunity is also of divine right, but only on condition that other suitable means cannot be found to serve the same purpose. Temporal power seems to be the only possible means to secure the necessary freedom and independence of the pope in the government of the Church; but whether this power should be restricted to a small territory, as at present, or extended to a larger dominion, as formerly, must be judged from circumstances. Either condition presents many advantages over the other, and both also have disadvantages.

Exemption from civil authority is a matter of divine right for the Roman pontiff's, but its actual enjoyment is not absolutely necessary for the existence or mission of the Church, and, as a matter of fact, was not always enjoyed by the popes. St. Peter and his successors for the first three centuries were exempt from civil authority, but could not enjoy the privilege while paganism ruled the world and persecution raged on every side. At the beginning of the fourth century, when paganism was practically overthrown, divine Providence so or-

¹ Quoted from Dorsch, "De Ecclesia Christi," p. 467; Cfr. Leo XIII, "Inscrutabili," 21 April, 1878.

dered affairs that the chief pastors of the Church began to reap the benefits of their privilege by means of civil exemption and power conferred upon them. This was really the beginning of temporal power, which steadily increased, until it was explicitly and solemnly recognized by Charlemagne in the ninth century.² From that time it continued with varying fortunes, until the capture of Rome by Garibaldi, in 1870, when nothing but the Vatican and the territory immediately surrounding it was left to the Popes.

² Cf. De Maistre, "Du Pape," Vol. I, ch. 7; T. W. Allies, "The See of Peter and the Wandering of the Nations."

INDEX

- Aaron, priesthood of, 66
 Abercius, inscription of, 370
 Abiron punished for schism, 271
 Abram, name changed to Abraham, 304
 Adam, head of human race, 199
 Adam, mystical body of, 201
 Adam, Christ the second, 200
 Adults, conditions for membership in Church, 222
 Africa, growth of Church in, 164
 Africa, number of Protestants in, 164
 African bishops write to Pope Celestine, 384
 Agatho, synodical letter to, 483
 Alexander excommunicated by St. Paul, 249
 Alexander V, Pope, 169
 Alexandria, patriarchate of, 379, 382, 411
 Alexandrians, synagogue of, 14
 Allies, T. W., Mystical body of Christ, 201
 Ambrose, St., Papal infallibility, 490
 Peter's primacy, 308
 Unicity of Church, 40
 Ambrosiaster, Peter's primacy, 337
 Anabaptists and holiness of the Church, 108
 Anacletus, Pope succeeded Linus, 367
 Ananias, punishment of, 249
 Andronicus mentioned as Apostle, 288
 Androustos, Chrestos, Infallibility of Church, 437
 Angel, meaning of word, 285
 Anglican Church, established by Parliament, 182
 lack of authority, 178
 lack of unity of doctrine, 177
 lack of succession, 182
 parties in, 177
 Anglicans, and Apostolicity, 142, 180
 the Branch Theory, 179
 Church and State, 513
 the Continuity Theory, 179 sq.
 Infallibility, 459
 reject Catholic doctrines, 181
 reject five Sacraments, 181
 reject works of supererogation, 109
 Anicetus, Pope, and Easter question, 368
 Anselm, St. see of, 178
 Antichrist and end of world, 135 sq., 405
 false miracles of, 119
 Antioch, patriarchate of, 379, 382, 411
 schism in, 357
 Apiarius appeals to Rome, 383
 Apostle, meaning of term, 285
 use of in Old Testament, 286
 use of in New Testament, 286
 use of by St. Paul, 286

- Apostles, authority to teach, 21
 commissioned by Christ, 21 sq.
 confirmed in grace, 292
 constitute bishops, 270
 gift of miracles, 292
 infallible, 289
- Apostles, jurisdiction of, 290
 light of world, 309
 ministers of Christ, 271
 obedience to, 23
 personally chosen by Christ, 286
 powers to govern, 21
 power to sanctify, 22
 prerogatives of, 289
 receive sole authority, 268
 subject to St. Peter, 338 sq.
 succeeded by the bishops, 275
 witnesses for Christ, 287
- Apostles' Creed, 82, 123
- Apostolic See, 141, 407, 492
- Apostolicity, of Church, 55, 138 sq.
 of doctrine, 139, 143
 errors regarding, 141 sq.
 as mark of Church, 156
 of ministry, 139, 143
 nature of, 138
 of origin, 139, 142
 lacking in Orthodox Eastern Churches, 184
 lacking in Protestantism, 176
 of succession, 139, 143
 of succession in Catholic Church, 167
- Appointment of bishops, 408
- Appolinaris condemned, 356
- Approbation for preaching, 432
- Arcadius, papal legate, 354
- Archbishops, 411
- Arian heresy, 136, 169, 469
- Arimini, council of, 469
- Arnold, Thomas on power of binding and loosing, 322
- Articles of Anglican Church revised, 181
- Ascanius of Tarragona on infallibility, 488
- Athanasius, St. appeals to Rome, 362
 on Arian heresy, 170
 on catholicity of Church, 130
 on infallibility, 445, 462
 on visibility of Church, 76
- Attributes of Church, 55 sq.
- Augsburg Confession on visibility, 71
- Augustine, St. on catholicity, 123, 127, 128, 129, 131, 134
 St. Cyprian, 393
 extent of Church, 10
 indefectibility, 64
 infallibility, 445, 447, 448, 463, 468, 489
 membership in Church, 210, 219, 227, 237
 ministerial powers, 260
 Pelagius and Celestius, 497
 synagogue and Church, 13, 34, 66
 soul of Church, 206
 temporal punishment, 252
 visibility, 77
- Augustine, Charles, confirmation of councils, 419
- Aurelian, Emperor and Roman Primacy, 365
- Aurelius of Carthage to Pope Zosimus, 421
- Authority of Church, 245 sq.
 Apostles alone receive, 268
 formal cause of Church, 190
 governing, 21, 268 sq.
 lack of in Anglican Church, 178
 subjection to necessary, 221
 teaching, 21, 426 sq.
- Avignon, Popes at, 548

- Baptism, concorporation with Christ, 108
 door to Church, 53, 242
 by heretics, 389
 necessity of means, 238
 priesthood of laity, 272
 rite of initiation, 23, 220, 238
 Sacrament of, 102
- Baptized, the invalidly, 232
- Barlow, consecrates Parker, 181
- Barnabas, an Apostle, 288
- Barry, Chas. on lack of authority in Anglican Church, 178
- Basil the Great appeals to Rome, 358, 359
- Batiffol, P. "The Twelve," 297
- Becket, Thomas à, see of, 178
- Beckwith, C. A. on nature of Church, 17
- Bellarmino, Card., Catholicity of Church, 132
 doubtful pope, 402
 infallibility, 477
 membership in Church, 232, 234
- Bellarmino, Card., properties of Church, 83
 salvation out of Church, 242
- Benedict XII, Beatific Vision, 501
- Benedict XIV, canonizing of Saints, 510
 membership in Church, 223
- Billot, Card., occult heretics and schismatics, 234
- Billuart, C. R., occult heretics and schismatics, 234
- "Binding and loosing," meaning of terms, 319, 320
 power of, 318 sq.
 symbol of primacy, 322
- Bishop, meaning and use of term, 282 sq.
- Bishop of bishops, 362, 391
- Bishops, appointment of, 408
 appointed by Elizabeth, 181
 constituted by Apostles, 270
 custodians of faith, 470
 infallibility of, 466 sq.
 jurisdiction of, 409
 lists of, 285
 removed by Elizabeth, 181
 schismatic, 409
 successors of Apostles, 270 sq., 407
 teachers, 428
 not mere vicars of Pope, 410
- Body, mystical, of Adam, 201
 of Christ, 38, 105, 111, 191 sq., 198, 241 sq.
- Boniface, St., consults Pope Zacharias, 495, 500
- Boniface VIII, Church and State, 522, 541
 membership in Church, 237
 temporal punishments, 253
- Books, censorship of, 431
 imprimatur for, 431
 prohibition of, 430
- Bozius, Oratorian, Properties of Church, 83
- Branch Theory, 72, 86, 179
- Bride of Christ, 111
- Broad Church, 177
- Buddeus, J. F., Visibility of Church, 71
- Bullinger, H., Marks of Church, 149
- Burger, Rulers of Church, 265
- Called, the, 11
- Callistus, Pope, 362
- Calvin, John, Marks of Church, 249
 membership in Church, 212
 Michael Servetus, 253 (note)
 rulers of Church, 265
 visibility, 71

- Canon Law on temporal punishment, 251
 Canonizing of Saints, 509
 Canons, cathedral, 284
 Cardinals, 400, 402, 411
 Carthage, synods of, 389, 391
 Catechumens, not members of Church, 224
 Catherine of Siena, 175
 Catholic, distinctive term, 122
 meaning of, 123
 Roman, meaning of, 167
 Catholic Church, apostolicity of, 167
 catholicity of, 166
 causative sanctity of, 164
 civilizing influence of, 163
 eminent sanctity in, 162
 fecundity of, 163
 manifestative sanctity of, 161
 unity of faith in, 159
 unity of government in, 160
 unity of worship in, 160
 Catholic doctrine on Church and State, 518 sq.
 Catholicity, absolute, 120, 132
 de facto, 125
 de jure, 125, 127
 diffusion, 124 sq.
 formal, 127
 lacking in Orthodox Churches, 184
 lacking in Protestantism, 176
 mark of true Church, 154 sq.
 mark of Messianic Kingdom, 128
 moral, 130 sq.
 perfect, 133 sq.
 perpetual, 132
 physical, 130
 simultaneous, 130, 131
 successive, 130
 in Catholic Church, 166
 Catholics, number of in Africa, 164
 Catholics, number of in China, 164
 in world, 167
 Cause of Church, efficient, 189
 final, 40, 189
 formal, 190
 material, 190, 212
 Cause of Mystical Body, formal, 190
 material, 190, 212
 Celestine I, condemns Nestorius, 354
 hailed as voice of Peter, 486
 orders Apiarius reinstated, 384
 Celestine V resigns, 400
 Celestius appeals to Rome, 495, 497
 Censorship of books, 431
 Ceremonies of Old Law, 33
 Ceylon, growth of Church in, 163
 Chalcedon, Council of, Primacy of Rome, 353, 379
 infallibility, 462, 485
 Channels of grace, 199
 Chapman, Dom, Primacy of Rome, 375
 Chapter, cathedral, 284
 Chapters, the Three, 498
 Character, baptismal, 227
 Charismata, 279
 Charlemagne, confirms temporal power of Pope, 548
 Chiliasm, 59
 China, growth of Church in, 164
 Christ, the second Adam, 200
 Mystical Body of, 191 sq.
 second coming of, 29
 confers powers on Apostles, 21 sq., 256
 contrasted with Moses, 26

- founds Church, 19 sq.
 founds but one Church, 37
 the Foundation, 310
 frequents Temple, 31
 fullness of, 137
 Head of Church, 82, 193 sq.
 Light of world, 309
 personal reign of, 59
 powers of, 256
 the Rock, 309
 the Vine, 106
 visible, 82
 Christianity and Church, 44
 Chrysostom, St. John, indefectibility, 64
 Primacy of Rome, 335
 visibility, 77
 Church, derivation and uses of term, 9 sq.
 apostolicity of, 55, 138 sq.
 attributes of, 55
 authority of, 245 sq., 426
 Body of Christ, 38, 191 sq.
 catholicity of, 26, 55, 122 sq. 132
 and Christianity, 44
 door to, 58
 Church, errors regarding nature of, 16 sq.
 eschatological kingdom, 19, 29
 a fortress, 307
 Head of, 82, 183 sq.
 of Holy Ghost, 67
 indefectibility of, 56, 60
 infallibility of, 55, 436 sq., 446 sq.
 institution of, 19 sq.
 Joannine, 59
 and the Jews, 134
 and the Kingdom, 48, 52 sq.
 magisterium of, 427
 marks of, 145 sq.
 members of, 211 sq., 226 sq.
 membership in, 209, 212 sq., 219 sq., 241 sq.
 militant, 10
 miracles in, 112
 object of faith, 82
 of Old Law, 11
 parables of, 77 sq.
 Pauline, 58
 period of preparation, 170 sq.
 perpetuity of, 55, 56
 persecuted, 28
 Petrine, 58
 pillar and ground of truth, 444
 powers of, 229, 256 sq.
 purpose of, 40, 41, 189
 Church, and prosperity, 170 sq.
 rights of, 534
 rulers of, 264 sq.
 salvation out of, 209, 241 sq.
 sanctity of, 55, 103 sq.
 a society, 14 sq., 43 sq.
 soul of, 201 sq.
 spouse of Christ, 38
 subjects of, 228
 suffering, 10
 symbols of, 24, 76
 and State, 512 sq.
 and Synagogue, 11, 25, 28, 34, 65
 triumphant, 10
 unicity of, 35 sq.
 unity of, 55, 83
 unity of doctrine in, 94
 unity of government in, 88 sq.
 unity of worship in, 100
 visibility of, 55, 68, 74 sq.
 Church of England. See Anglican Church
 Churches, Protestant. See Protestantism

- Citra, Council of, Membership in Church, 239
 Clement of Rome, succeeds Anacletus, 315
 bishops and deacons, 282
 Roman Primacy, 373
 Clement of Alexandria, holiness of Church, 106
 unicity of Church, 39
 Clement VI, Rome and Papacy, 404
 Clement VII (Robert of Geneva), 168
 Clement XII, Membership in Church, 215
 Commission to Apostles, 21 sq.
 Comprehensiveness, glorious, 177
 Comte, A., Church and State, 518
 Conciliar theory, 420
 Conclusions, theological, 506
 Concordats, 527
 Confirmation of councils, 418
 Conscience, freedom of, 100
 Constance, Council of, elects Pope, 402
 temporal punishment, 251
 Constantinople, 1st. Council, Roman Primacy, 379
 2nd. Council of, and Honorius I, 495, 498
 infallibility, 483
 4th Council of, infallibility, 483
 Constantius exiles Liberius, 496
 Continuity theory, 187 sq.
 Convocation of councils, 416
 Coquille Guy, Gallicanism, 514
 Core, punished for schism, 271
 Corea, growth of Church in, 163
 Cornelius, Pope, election of, 400
 Cornelius à Lapide, occult heretics, 234
 Councils, celebration of, 415
 confirmation of, 416, 418
 convocation of, 415
 Councils, ecumenical, 414 sq.
 infallibility of, 456 sq.
 kinds of, 414
 nature of, 413
 presidency of, 417
 utility of, 424
 Counsels, evangelical, 108, 175, 505
 Coverdale, at consecration of Parker, 181
 Creed, Augsburg, 71
 Apostles', 82
 Dositheus, 184
 Moghila, 184
 Nicene, 83
 Crete, Titus in, 270, 273
 Custodians of faith, 470
 Cyprian, St., Apostolicity, 144
 controversy with St. Stephen, 388 sq.
 election of Cornelius, 399
 institution of Church, 24
 membership in Church, 239
 Primacy of Rome, 336, 340, 363, 387
 unicity of Church, 39
 unity of Church, 91, 97
 Cyrenians, synagogue of, 14
 Cyril of Alexandria, St., papal delegate, 354
 creed of Ephesus, 465
 soul of Church, 294
 Cyril of Jerusalem, St., Catholic Church, 123, 124
 catholicity, 129
 infallibility, 445
 D'Ailly, Peter, Supremacy of Councils, 420
 Damascus, Pope, annulled decrees of Arimini, 419

- condemned Eustatius and Apollinaris, 356
 confirmed election of Nectarius, 357
 deposed Maximus the Cynic, 356
 Roman Primacy, 347, 356
 Daniel, prophet, Abrogation of Old Law, 66
 universality of kingdom, 126, 128
 Dathan, punished for schism, 271
 Deacons, Order of, 279, 280
 Declaration of French Clergy, 514
Defensor Pacis, 264, 512
 De Maistre, Protestant lack of unity, 173
 Deposing power of Pope, 543
 De San, catholicity of Church, 155
 Devotion to B. V. Mary, effects of, 165
 Didache, bishops and deacons, 282
 unicity of Church, 39
 Diffusion of Catholic Church, 125, 166
 Dignities, ecclesiastical, 411
 Diocese, ruler of, 412
 Dionysius of Alexandria, St., Roman Primacy, 363
 Dioscorus of Alexandria, presided at Robber Council, 352
 deposed at Chalcedon, 353
 Divorce, effects of, 175
 Doctors, order in early Church, 279
 Doctrine, apostolicity of, 139, 143
 unity of, 85
 Doctrines, fundamental, 87, 93
Dominicum, 12
 Donatists, and holiness of Church, 108
 Dorsch, Æmil., membership in Church, 233, 234
Dotes, of Church, 55
 Duchesne, L., Roman Primacy, 372
 Easter question, 368
 Eastern Church and Primacy of Peter, 335 sq.
Ecclesia, origin and meaning of word, 9 sq.
 Education, rights of Church and State, 530
 Edwardine ritual reformed, 180
 Election of Pope, 399
 Eligibility to papacy, 398
 Elizabeth declared head of Church, 180
 makes and unmakes bishops, 181
 Elymas healed by St. Paul, 115
 Emperors convene and preside over councils, 422
 Eneas healed by St. Peter, 115
 England, Church of. See Anglican Church
 Epaphroditus called apostle, 286
 Ephesus, council of condemns Nestorius, 355
 and infallibility, 465, 486
 and Roman Primacy, 355
 Ephrem Syrus, St., Primacy of Peter, 304, 308, 336
 Episcopate of divine origin, 408
 and Roman primacy, 394 sq.
 Episcopus, origin and meaning of term, 282
 dispute regarding use of, 282 sq.
 Eucharist source of unity, 106
 Eugene IV on baptism, 220

- Eusebius gives lists of bishops, 285
 Eustatius appeals to Rome, 356
 359
 Eutyches appeals to Rome, 351
 Evangelists, order in early Church, 279
 Excommunicates, 228 sq.
 subjects of Church, 231
 Excommunication, nature and kinds of, 229 sq.
 power of in Church, 228
 Eybel on power of pope, 396
 Ezechial, prophet, holiness of Church, 110
 Facts, dogmatic, 507
 Faith, necessity of internal, 92
 objective, 92
 profession of, 98, 221
 subjective, 92
 unity of, 92, 159
 Febronius, Church and State, 515
 councils, 421
 powers of Pope, 396
 rulers of Church, 266
 Fecundity of Catholic Church, 163
 Felicissimus, of Carthage, 363
 Fichte, threefold Church, 58
 Finlay, Peter, Branch theory, 179
 lack of authority in Anglican Church, 178
 Firmilian, controversy with St. Stephen, 388
 Flavian of Constantinople, Roman Primacy, 351
 Florence, Council of, infallibility, 482
 ministerial powers, 260
 Roman Primacy, 404
 Fortunatus of Carthage, 363
 Franzelin, Card., membership in Church, 234
 Freedom of conscience, 100
 of worship, 100
 Freeman, E. A., continuity theory, 180
 Fulgentius, infallibility, 488
 Fullness of Christ, 197
 Fundamental doctrines, 87, 93
 Fundamentalists, 59, 176
 Galileo condemned as heretic, 501
 Gallican liberties, 514
 Gallicanism, 514
 Gallicans, ecumenical councils, 421
 infallibility, 476
 Garizim, Mount, 80
 Garibaldi seizes papal states, 548
 "Gates of hell," meaning of, 62
 Gelasius I., confirmation of councils, 419
 Roman Primacy, 421
 Genuineness of relics determined, 510
 Gerson, supremacy of councils, 420
 Glossolalia, 293
 Gog and Magog persecute Church, 137
 Gore, Anglican Bishop, apostolicity, 141
 primacy of Peter, 302
 Government, authority of, 21
 monarchical in Church, 284
 threefold powers of, 246
 unity of, 16 sq., 85 sq.
 unity of in Catholic Church, 160
 unity of lacking in Orthodox Churches, 183
 unity of lacking in Protestantism, 174

- Grace, channels of, 199
 condition for membership in Church, 215
 Greek liturgy. See "Liturgy"
 Gregory Great, St., extent of Church, 10
 infallibility, 462
 necessity of miracles, 121
 reproves John the Faster, 386, 387
 Gregory Nazianzen, St., infallibility, 463, 493
 soul of Church, 204
 unity of government, 91
 Gregory XI, Pope, 168
 Harnack, A., kingdom of God, 51
 nature of Church, 17
 Hart, R. L., fundamentalism, 59
 Head, preëminence of, 194
 vivifying influence of, 195
 union with body, 196
 of Church, 193 sq.
 of human race, 199, 200
 Hegel, nature of State, 518
 Hegesippus, gives list of bishops, 285
 Henderson, E., meaning of "keys," 314
 Heresy, Iconoclast, 491
 Monothelite, 495
 Nestorian, 499
 repression of, 430
 Heretic, definition of, 225
 formal, 225
 manifest, 225
 material, 225
 occult, 225
 Heretics, baptism by, 389
 membership in Church, 224 sq., 233
 subjects of Church, 227
 High Church party, 177
 Hilary, Pope appealed to by Ascanius, 488
 Hillel, 320
 Hodgkins assists at consecration of Parker, 181
 Holiness. See "sanctity"
 Holy Ghost, soul of Church, 201 sq.
 united with Church, 208
 Homer, "shepherds of the people," 332
 Hontheim, Nicholas von, see "Febronius"
 Honor, primacy of, 300
 Honorius I condemned as heretic, 495, 498
 Hormisdas, Pope, infallibility, 462, 495, 497
 Huss, John, membership in Church, 212
Hypostasis, 490
 Ibas of Odessa, 498
 Iconoclast heresy, 491
 Ignatius Martyr, St., bishops succeed Apostles, 277
 Catholic Church, 122
 deacons, 280
 membership in Church, 239
 monarchical government, 284
 unity of government, 91
 Impeccability of Apostles, 292
 Imprimatur for books, 431
 Indefectibility, 55 sq.
 India, growth of Church in, 163
 Indifferentism, 136
 Inerrancy, 434
 Infallibility of Apostles, 289
 of bishops, 466 sq.
 of Church, 433 sq.
 of councils, 456 sq.
 degrees of, 435
 Infallibility, extent of, 503 sq.
 opponents of, 436

- and private judgment, 451 sq.
of Synagogue, 450
- Infallibility of Pope, 472 sq.
conditions for, 473
objections to, 495 sq.
personal privilege, 476
proofs for, 478 sq.
source of, 475
- Infants, condition for membership in Church, 223
- Iniquity, mystery of, 137
- Initiation, condition for membership in Church, 220
rite of, 23, 220, 238
- Innocent II, salvation of unbaptized, 232
- Innocent III, Christ the foundation, 313
- Inspiration, 434
- Institution of Church, 19 sq.
- Irenæus, St., apostolicity of succession, 144
bishops successors of Apostles, 277
infallibility, 445
power of miracles in Church, 116
Primacy of Rome, 366 sq.
unity of faith, 96
unity of government, 91
letter to Pope Victor, 369
- Isaias, prophet, catholicity of kingdom, 128
- Islamism foe of Church, 136
- Israel figure of Church, 11
- James of Sarug, St., Primacy of Peter, 305
- Jandun, Jean de, Church and State, 512
rulers of Church, 264
- Jansenists, infallibility, 459
- Januarius, St., miracle of blood, 162
- Jeremias, prophet, foretells New Covenant, 66
- Jerome, St., abuse at Rome, 384
Arian heresy, 169
and Pope Damasus, 357, 489
indefectibility, 64
infallibility, 489
priesthood of laity, 272
primacy of Rome, 357
- Jerusalem, council of, 247
destruction foretold, 31
and Papacy, 405
patriarchate of, 411
prophecies concerning, 405
- Jews, enter Church, 134
expect kingdom of God, 50
persecute Church, 28
religion of tolerated at Rome, 28
- John, St., bishops successors of Apostles, 277
membership in Church, 217, 218
monarchical government, 284
- John the Faster, universal bishop, 386
- John of Jerusalem, infallibility, 492
- John II, infallibility, 495, 497
- John XXII, Beatific Vision, 501
and Louis of Bavaria, 264
- Joseph II of Austria, 515
- Josephism, 515
- Judaizers, 334
- Judicial powers of Church, 248 sq.
- Julius I, Roman Primacy, 360, 361
- Jurieu, unity of doctrine, 87
- Jurisdiction, of Apostles, 290
of bishops, 409
over heretics and schismatics, 227
primacy of, 141, 300 sq.

- principal power, 261
succession of, 140, 272 sq.
- Kepha, Aramaic for Peter, 308
- Key-bearer, 313 sq.
- Key of knowledge, 317
- Keys, significance of, 316 sq.
- Kingdom, eschatological, 29, 53
of God, 48
and the Church, 48 sq.
- Kitchen of Landaff, 181
- Knabenbaur, "binding and loosing," 321
symbolism of keys, 316
- Κυριακόν*, 312
- Kyriakos, infallibility, 437
- Lacordaire, miracles, 121
unity of Church, 161
- Lambeth, conference of, 178
- Lamentabile, decree, condemns errors of Modernism, 20
- Lanciani, Rudolfo, St. Peter in Rome, 348
- Lateran, Council of, corporal punishment, 251
membership in Church, 237
- Lecky, W. E. H., Devotion to B. V. Mary, 165
- Leibnitz, confession, 165
- Leo the Great, Council of Chalcedon, 352 sq.
infallibility, 489
primacy of Peter, 337
Robber Council, 352, 419
- Leo II condemns Honorius I, 495, 498, 500
- Leo XIII, Church and State, 521, 526, 527, 528, 531
confirmation of councils, 419
episcopate, 406, 410
nature of Church, 44
perpetuity, 60
soul of Church, 201
- Lex orandi, 509
- Liberalism, 515, 516
- Liberius, Pope, Roman Primacy, 359
infallibility, 495, 496
- Liberties, Gallican, 514
- Libertines, synagogue of, 14
- Lightfoot, J. B., Ignatius' letter to Romans, 372, 373
papal domination, 341
- Linus, Pope, succeeds St. Peter, 367
- Liturgy, Greek, primacy of Peter, 306, 308, 336
infallibility, 494
- Liturgy, Syriac, primacy of Peter, 308, 336
Syro-Chaldaic, primacy of Peter, 308, 336
- Louis of Bavaria and John XXII, 264
- Louis XIV, and Gallicanism, 514
- Loisy, A., nature of Church, 19
- Loosing and binding, power of, 318 sq.
miracles at, 161
- Low Church party, 177
- Lowrie, Walter, inscription of Abercius, 370
- Lucentius, papal legate, 353
- Luther, membership in Church, 213
rulers of Church, 265
visibility, 70
- Lydda, miracles at, 115
- Lyons, Council of, infallibility, 482
temporal punishment, 251
- Macaulay, lack of unity in Anglican Church, 178
- Magisterium of Church, 427
- Malachias, prophet, catholicity of kingdom, 128

- Manning, Card., soul of Church, 204
 union of Church and Holy Ghost, 209
- Marcellus, exiled, 361
- Marcian of Arles deposed, 364
- Maris of Persia, 498
- Marks of Church, 145 sq.
 apostolicity as mark, 156
 catholicity as mark, 154
 claimed by Orthodox, 148
 claimed by Protestants, 149
 lacking in Anglican Church, 177
 lacking in Orthodox Churches, 183
 lacking in Protestant Churches, 172 sq.
 persecution as a mark, 157
 sanctity as a mark, 152 sq.
 requisites for, 145 sq.
- Marriage, rights of Church and State regarding, 530
 sanctity of, 165
- Marsilius of Padua, Church and State, 512
 councils, 420
 rulers of Church, 264
- Martin V elected, 169, 421
- Mary, reestablishes Catholic religion in England, 180
- Mason, A. J., "binding and loosing," 321
 symbolism of keys, 316
- Matthias elected, 273, 288
- Mauretania, Cyprian to bishops of, 389
- Maximus Confessor, infallibility, 491
- Maximus the Cynic deposed, 356
- Melanchton, visibility, 70
- Melitene, synod of deposes Eustatius, 359
- Melitius of Antioch, 357
- Members of Church, 211 sq., 228, 232
- Membership in Church, conditions of, 219 sq.
 errors regarding, 212 sq.
 necessity for, 235 sq.
- Methodists, divisions of, 174
- Metropolitans, 411
- Middleton, C., power of miracles in Church, 112, 116
- Middleton, Edmund, primacy of Peter, 341
- Mileve, Council of, Roman Primacy, 383
- Ministry, Apostolic, 21, 42
 apostolicity of, 139, 143
- Miracles, false, 119
 gift of, 292
 of St. Januarius' blood, 162
 at Lourdes, 161
 power of in Church, 112 sq.
- Modernist, Church and State, 516
 indefectibility, 58
 infallibility, 459
 nature of Church, 18
- Moffat, James, "shepherd My sheep," 331
- Moghila, creed of, 184
- Monothelite heresy, 495
- Moses contrasted with Christ, 26
- Muratorian Fragment, Catholic Church, 123
- Mystical Body of Christ, 38, 105, 111, 191 sq., 198, 241 sq.
- Mystery of iniquity, 137
- Necessity of means, 235
 of precept, 235
- Nectarius, election of confirmed, 357
- Need of the divine, 18

- Nero, decree against Christians, 28
- Nestorian heresy, 499
- Nestorius condemned, 355
- Nicene Council, 6th canon of, 381, 382
 monarchical government, 285
 Roman Primacy, 382
 unicity of Church, 37
- Nicholas I, privileges of Roman See, 403
- Novatians, and holiness of Church, 108
- Numidia, Cyprian to bishops of, 389
- Oath of royal supremacy, 180
- Old Law, abrogation foretold, 66
 ceremonies of, 33
 relation to Church, 34
 stages of, 34
- Operations in Christ, 499
- Optatus of Mileve, St., catholicity, 129
 succession, 182
- Order, primacy of, 300
- Orders, powers of, 261
 succession of, 140, 272 sq.
 in Orthodox Churches, 184
- Orders, approval of religious, 509
- Origen, membership in Church, 239
 primacy of Peter, 335
- Origin, apostolicity of, 142
- Orthodox, number of, 167
 succession of Orders, 184
- Palmer, Wm., unity of government, 87
 visibility, 73
- Palmieri, Dominico, membership in Church, 232, 234
- Papacy and Jerusalem, 405
 and Rome, 402 sq.
- Papal legates at Ephesus, 354
 at Chalcedon, 352
- Parables of the Church, 77 sq.
- Parker, consecrated, 181
 source of succession in Anglican Church, 181
- Parliament establishes Church of England, 182
 rejects authority of Rome, 180
- Parousia, 138 (note)
- Parochialism, 412
- Paschal, Pope appealed to from East, 491
- Paschasinus papal legate, 412
- Pastors vicars of bishop, 412
- Patriarchs, 411
- Paul, St., an Apostle, 288
 censures books, 431
 compares Church with Synagogue, 28, 67
 indefectibility, 62
 infallibility, 290, 444, 447
 inflicts temporal punishment, 254
 intimates monarchical government, 285
 membership in Church, 216
 Mystical Body of Christ, 191 sq.
 power of miracles, 114
- Paul, St., profession of faith, 99
 rebukes St. Peter, 333
 sanctity of Church, 106
 successors of Apostles, 276
 unity of doctrine, 96
- Paul of Samosata deposed, 365
- Paulinus of Antioch, 357
- Pedagogus, the Synagogue a, 66
- Pelagius appeals to Rome, 495, 497
- Pelagians and holiness of Church, 108

- Percival, H. R. 6th canon of Nicaea, 382
 28th canon of Chalcedon, 381
 failure of Protestantism, 176
 Perfect society, conditions for, 45
 Perpetuity of Church, nature of, 55, 56
 Persecution as mark of Church, 157
 Peter, significance of name, 303, 304
 Peter, St., chief pastor, 329
 confirmer of brethren, 324 sq.
 foundation of Church, 302 sq.
 head of "the Twelve," 293 sq.
 key-bearer, 313 sq.
 more than Apostle, 340
 powers, how limited, 323
 primacy of, 296 sq.
 rebuked by St. Paul, 333
 in Rome, 347
 successors of, 346 sq.
 Peter, St., holiness of Church, 110
 priesthood of laity, 271
 presbyters, 282
 visibility of Church, 81
 Philip the deacon, 280
 Philip papal legate, 354, 486
 Pithou, Pierre, Gallicanism, 514
 Pius VI, rulers of Church, 267
 temporal punishment, 251
 Pius IX, membership in Church, 237
 salvation out of Church, 240
 temporal punishment, 251
 unity of government, 88
 Pius X, Modernism, 516
 Polycarp, and Easter question, 368
 Polycrates and Easter question, 369
 Pontian, Pope resigns, 400
 Pontifex Maximus, 362
 Pontiff, Roman, See Pope
 Pope, and councils, 416 sq.
 deposing power, 543
 doubtful, 402
 election of, 399
 exempt from civil power, 544
 infallibility of, 472 sq.
 Primacy of, 346 sq.
 powers of, 395 sq.
 and secular rulers, 540 sq.
 Pope, successor of St. Peter, 349 sq.
 supreme teacher, 429
 temporal power of, 545
 Popes at Avignon, 546
 Power, coercive, 249
 of government, 246
 judicial, 248
 legislative, 247
 ministerial, 259
 of Orders, 260
 principal, 261
 of sanctification, 22
 Powers, of Christ, 256
 of Church, 256 sq.
 conferred on Apostles, 21 sq., 256
 of jurisdiction, 272 sq.
 of Orders, 272 sq.
 of Peter, 323
 of Pope, 323, 395 sq.
 Preaching, approbation for, 432
 Predestination, 212 note
 as condition for membership, 213
 Preëminence of St. Peter, 296 sq.
 Prerogatives of Apostles, 289 sq.
 Presbyter, meaning of word, 279
 dispute regarding use of, 283
 Presbyterium, 284
 Presidency of councils, 417
 Priests, See Presbyter

- visibility, 70 sq.
 Pseudo-Ambrose, indefectibility, 62
 Punishment, kinds of, 250 sq.
 right of Church to inflict, 250 sq.
 Purpose of Church, 40, 41, 189
 Pusey, E. B. unity of government, 87
 Rationalists, indefectibility, 58
 Redemption, 42
 Reformers, Church and State, 513
 temporal punishment, 252 note
 Reinhard, visibility, 72
 Relics, genuineness determined, 510
 Resignation of Roman pontiff, 400
 Revelation, 434
 Rights of Church against State, 534
 of State against Church, 529
 Rimini, Council of, 169
 Ritual, Edwardine, 180, 181
 Rivington, Luke, Cyprian's controversy, 392
 Rulers, of Church, 264 sq.
 secular, how subject to Church, 540 sq.
 Ruling body in Church, 267 sq.
 Robber Council annulled, 252
 Robert of Geneva (Clement VII), 168
 Rock, faith of Peter, 313
 Peter the rock, 302 sq.
 symbol of jurisdiction, 306
 Rome, destruction of foretold, 405
 and Papacy, how connected, 402 sq.
 patriarchate of, 379, 382, 411
 Priesthood of laity, 272
 Primacy, meaning of term and kinds of, 300
 Primacy of Peter, 295 sq.
 conferred, 328 sq.
 permanent institution, 341
 promised, 302 sq.
 proof from tradition, 335 sq.
 Primacy of Pope, divine origin, 377
 eligibility to, 398
 and episcopate, 394 sq.
 loss of, 400 sq.
 objections to, 376 sq.
 powers of, how limited, 323
 proofs for, 351 sq.
 Primate, 411
 Profession of faith, necessity of, 321
 unity of, 98
 Projectus papal legate, 354
 Prokopovitch, deuterocanonical books, 184
 Properties of Church, 55, 83
 Prophets, order in early Church, 279
 Prosperity and the Church, 170 sq.
 Protestant Episcopal Church, 177
 Protestantism, lacks marks of true Church, 172 sq.
 moral failure, 176
 Protestants, apostolicity, 141
 catholicity, 126
 indefectibility, 57
 infallibility, 436, 459
 kingdom of God, 51
 nature of Church, 16 sq.
 number of, 164, 167
 power of miracles, 112
 rulers of Church, 51
 unicity, 35
 unity, 85 sq.

- persecuted Christians, 28
 tolerated Jewish religion, 28
 Roman Catholic, meaning of, 167
 Roman Pontiff, See Pope.
- Sabatier, formation of Church, 19
- Sacraments, channels of grace, 199
- Saints, canonizing of, 509
- Salmon, G., infallibility, 541
- Salvation out of Church, 209, 241 sq.
- Sanctification, power of, 22
- Sanctity, nature and kinds of, 103, 104
- Sanctity of Church, causative, 107
 eminent, 111
 manifestative, 111 sq.
- Sanctity of Church, mark of, 152 sq.
 moral, or personal, 107 sq.
 ontological, 104
 physical, 104
- Sanctity in Catholic Church, 161 sq.
 lack of in Protestant Churches, 175
- Saphira, punishment of, 249
- Sarai, name changed to Sara, 304
- Sardica, Council of, Roman Primacy, 360
- Satyr, brother of St. Ambrose, 490
- Schelling, threefold church, 58
- Schism, sin of, 90
 Western, 168, 420
- Schismatic, definition and kinds of, 225, 226
- Schismatics, membership in Church, 226, 233
 subjects of Church, 227
- Schismatic Churches of East, not catholic, 183
 no legitimate succession, 184
 no unity, 183
 valid Orders, 184
- Scorey, assisted consecration of Parker, 181
- See, Apostolic, 141, 407, 492
- Seleucia, Council of, 169, 469
- Semeria, Church and Synagogue, 35
- Sergius of Constantinople, 499
- Shepherd, symbol of ruler, 330
- Siefert, F. Peter the rock, 305
- Sin, original, 200
- Smith, E. W. lack of unity in Protestantism, 173
- Social nature of kingdom, 52
- Society, nature of, 14
 formal element of, 15
 material element of, 15
 perfect, 45
- Sonnenfels, Church and State, 515
- Soul of Church, 201 sq.
 membership in, 241 sq.
- Sozomen, infallibility, 492
 Liberius, 496
- Spouse of Christ, 38, 105
- Stahl, powers of the Church, 262
- State and Church, 512 sq.
 duties toward Church, 531
 and education, 530
 and marriage, 530
 rights of, 529
 subordinate to Church, 521 sq.
- Stead, T. W. lack of Saints in Protestantism, 175
- Stephen, St., controversy with St. Cyprian, 388 sq.
- Stowe, Chas. E., lack of unity in Protestantism, 174

- Straub, convocation of councils, 417
 catholicity as mark, 155
 infallibility, 477
 membership in Church, 232, 234
- Strauss, D. F., nature of Church, 17
- Suarez, infallibility, 477
- Suarez, membership in Church, 234
- Subjects of Church, 228, 254
- Successors of Apostles, 270 sq., 407
- Successors of St. Peter, 346 sq.
- Succession, apostolic, 139, 143, 406
 formal, 139
 of jurisdiction, 140, 272 sq.
 material, 139
 of Orders, 140, 272 sq.
 none in Anglican Church, 182
 in Catholic Church, 167
 none in Orthodox Churches, 184
 none in Protestant Churches, 176
- Supererogation, works of, 109, 175
- Supremacy, oath of, 180
- Sylvester, Pope, 494
- Symbols of Church, 24, 76
- Synagogue, abrogation of, 65
 compared with Church, 28, 81
 infallibility of, 450
 meaning of term, 13
 a preparation for Gospel, 26
- Syriac liturgy, see Liturgy
- Syro-Chaldaic liturgy, See Liturgy
- Tanqueray, abrogation of Old Law, 34
 infallibility, 508
- Teaching authority, 21, 426
 extent of, 429
 infallible, 426 sq.
 primacy of, 325
- Temple frequented by Christ and disciples, 31, 32
- Temporal power of Pope, 545
- Tertullian, apostolicity, 144
 infallibility, 448
 Primacy of Peter, 305
 Roman Primacy, 362
 successors of Apostles, 278
 unity, 97, 99
- Theodoret of Cyrus, 498
- Theodore of Mopsuesta, 498
- Theodore of Studium, infallibility, 491
- Theodosius calls Robber Council, 352
- Thomas Aquinas, St., nature of Church, 10
 fullness of Christ, 197
 impeccability of Apostles, 292
- Three Chapters, 498
- Thucydides, use of word "ecclesia," 10
- Timothy condemned by Pope Damasus, 493
- Titus, bishop of Crete, 270, 273
- Tolerati*, 231
- Tradition, value of, 471
- Trent, Council of, "door" of Church, 220
 jurisdiction of bishops, 410
 priests part of hierarchy, 281
 rulers of Church, 267
 succession of powers, 275
- Triumphus, Augustus, Church and State, 513
- Twelve, the, 269, 296
- Talmud, "binding and loosing," 320

- Tyana, synod of restores Eustatius, 359
- Unbaptized not members of Church, 223
- Unicity of Church, 35 sq.
- Union with Holy Ghost, 208
- Unity of Church, bonds of, 84
errors regarding, 85
of doctrine, 85, 159, 172, 183
of government, 85 sq., 160, 172 sq., 183
as mark of Church, 151 sq.
of profession, 98
and Western Schism, 168 sq.
of worship, 98
- Urban VI, 168
- Vatican, Council of, apostolicity, 142
councils, 421
infallibility, 436, 476, 467, 473
institution of Church, 20
perpetuity, 60
power of Pope, 395, 396
Primacy of Peter, 301
Primacy of Roman Pontiff, 342, 346
- Vatican, Council of, unity of doctrine, 95
unity of government, 88
visibility, 74
- Victor, Pope and Easter question, 68
- Victorinus, primacy of Peter, 337
- Vigilius and the Three Chapters, 498
- Vienna, Council of, temporal punishment, 251
- Vincent Lerins, Apostolic See, 407
- infallibility, 468
- Visibility of Church, 55 sq.
errors regarding, 70
formal, 68
material, 68
objections to, 77 sq.
- Vitalis of Antioch, 357
- Vitandi*, 231
- Vulgate, authentic version of Scripture, 508
- Waterland, fundamental doctrines, 94
- Weiss, B, Peter the rock, 305, 307
- Weizsäcker, nature of Church, 18
- Westminster Confession, visibility, 72
- Wilmers, catholicity, 155
membership in Church, 233
- Worship, freedom of, 100
in spirit and truth, 80
unity of, 85, 99
unity of in Catholic Church, 160
- Wyclif, holiness of Church, 108
- Wyclif, membership in Church, 212
- Zacharias, prophet, foretells catholic kingdom, 128
- Zacharias, Pope and infallibility, 495, 500
- Zenobia of Palmyra, 365
- Zosimus, Pope, councils, 421
infallibility, 495, 497
restores Apiarius, 384
- Zwingli, visibility, 71