

De Ecclesia Christi (*On the Church of Christ*)

by Antonius Straub, S.J. (Anthony Straub), 1912

[Online Location of Text Here](#)

- OCR of the original text by AI (claude-sonnet-4-5-20250929).

- Translation of the original text performed by AI (claude-sonnet-4-5-20250929).

- Last Edit: November 20, 2025.

- Version: 1.0

- Selection pages: 251-264 and 851-909

Latin

Thesis XXV.

[883] *Praeterea potestas docendi infallibilis magisterii sacri extenditur ad illa omnia divinitus non revelata, quibus negatis depositum ipsius revelationis per apostolos factae integrum, ut par est, custodiri jam non posset.*

Declaratio.

Veritates, divinitus non revelatae cum veritatibus a Deo per apostolos revelatis speciali ratione nexae esse possunt, idque dupliciter: aut solo nexu certitudinis, quatenus negatis vel in dubium vocatis illis ipsae veritates revelatae forent pro fidelibus tantummodo non certae, aut etiam nexu veritatis, quatenus falsis illis veritates revelatae forent falsae.

[884] Ad priorem classem pertinent facta, quae dogmatica vocantur, ut concilium tridentinum fuisse legitimum, Pium IX re ipsa fuisse s. Petri successorem in primatu; quibus, factis nutantibus certitudo summa de ipsis veritatibus fidei, auctoritate concilii vel pontificis ejusdem definitis, jam non exstisset. Etsi facta talia etiam ad classem alteram pertinere possunt, quatenus rerum revelationis aliquarum, ut concilia a capite ecclesiae legitime convocari, primum Petri

English

Thesis XXV.

[883] *Furthermore, the infallible teaching power of the sacred magisterium extends to all those things not divinely revealed, which, if denied, would mean that the deposit of revelation itself made through the apostles could no longer be preserved intact, as is fitting.*

Declaration.

Truths not divinely revealed can be connected with truths revealed by God through the apostles by a special relationship, and this in two ways: either by a nexus of certitude alone, insofar as, if those truths were denied or called into doubt, the revealed truths themselves would be merely uncertain for the faithful, or also by a nexus of truth, insofar as, if those truths were false, the revealed truths would be false.

[884] To the first class belong facts which are called dogmatic, such as that the Council of Trent was legitimate, that Pius IX was in fact the successor of St. Peter in the primacy; if these facts were to waver, the highest certitude concerning those very truths of faith defined by the authority of that council or of the same pontiff would no longer exist. Although such facts can also belong to the second class, insofar as the very truth of certain revealed matters—such as that councils are legitimately convoked by the head of the Church, that the

perpetuum esse, ipsa veritas pendere inde potest.

[885] Alterius classis primum sunt textus dogmatici, i. e., textus originis humanae, qui de rebus revelatis agunt proindeque fidei deposito aut consentanei aut quadantenus adversi sunt; quibus textibus aut repudiatis, cum essent fidei conformes, aut approbatis, cum difformes essent, veritas fidei ipsa proderetur; unde ecclesiae multum interest de iis judicare acceptis non quidem secundum auctoris sensum subjectivum, sed secundum sensum objectivum seu illum, qui vi textus et contextus exprimitur ideoque et intentus ab auctore merito praesumatur vel iuridicè habeatur.

[886] Deinde huc referuntur veritates complures speculativae atque practicae, sive sunt tales, quae aperte instar principiorum veritatibus revelatis praevis supponantur, cum ordo revelationis super ordinem rationis construatur, sive tales, quae aperte ex veritatibus revelatis consequantur: rejectis nimirum veritatibus ejusmodi suppositis vel consecrariis, per syllogismum rite formatum, adhibitis scilicet veritatibus non revelatis, sed naturali lumine compertis, ad veritates revelatas ipsas infitiandas perveniretur. Nec tamen veritates ita cum revelatis cohaerentes hac de causa item revelatae numerandae sunt: nam illae veritates intelliguntur tantum eae, quae ex veritate aliqua revelata ope veritatis novae aliunde cognoscendae ideoque discursu proprie dicto, non pure explicante sensum ipsius veritatis revelatae deducuntur; atqui illud solum est a Deo revelatum, quod est immediate in se ipso vel formaliter ab eō dictum seu vel explicite enuntiatum vel, si est quadantenus implicitum, per simplicem analysim veritatis revelatae ut talis reperitur. Ita quis recte quidem censeat, Deum revelando, homines omnes nasci in peccato, revelasse, etiam hunc illumve hominem fuisse ab origine in peccato, quatenus qui dicit omnes in

primacy of Peter is perpetual—can depend upon them.

[885] The first type of the other class consists of dogmatic texts, that is, texts of human origin that deal with revealed matters and are therefore either consonant with or to some degree opposed to the deposit of faith. Should such texts be rejected when they were in conformity with the faith, or approved when they were non-conforming, the very truth of the faith would be betrayed. Hence it is of great concern to the Church to judge these texts once they have been received—not indeed according to the subjective meaning of the author, but according to the objective meaning, that is, the meaning which is expressed by virtue of the text and context and therefore may be rightly presumed to have been intended by the author or may be held as such juridically.

[886] Furthermore, to this category belong numerous speculative and practical truths, whether they are such as are openly presupposed as antecedent to revealed truths in the manner of principles (since the order of revelation is constructed upon the order of reason), or such as openly follow from revealed truths: namely, with such presupposed or consequent truths rejected, one would arrive at denying the revealed truths themselves through a properly formed syllogism, that is, by employing truths that are not revealed but ascertained by natural light. Nevertheless, truths thus connected with revealed ones are not for this reason to be counted as likewise revealed: for those truths are understood to be only those which are deduced from some revealed truth by means of a new truth to be known from elsewhere and therefore by discourse properly so called, not by purely explicating the sense of the revealed truth itself; but that alone is revealed by God which is immediately in itself or formally spoken by Him, either explicitly enunciated or, if it is to some extent implicit, discovered through simple analysis of the revealed truth as such. Thus one might rightly judge that God, in revealing that all men are born in sin, has also revealed that this or that particular man was in sin from the beginning, insofar as one who says “all” concretely and absolutely—who at any time exist—also expresses individuals who are supposed

concreto et absolute, qui aliquando sint, effert item singulos, qui loco suo et tempore sine negotio cogniti vel cognoscendi supponuntur, ac si eos ipse in individuo designet, similiter ut praedicta quaedam a Deo ipso edicuntur, quamvis ante eventum minus clare eadem ab audientibus accipiantur; sed non aequè Deus revelando, Christum esse hominem, ipse quoque dixit, in Christo esse in concreto ea distincte omnia, quae studio laborioso nunc in homine deteguntur; veritates igitur istiusmodi cum revelata conectuntur, non revelatae ipsae sunt. Ceterum existimem huc referendas esse veritates ipsas naturales sive illas, quae sunt ex se manifestae, sive illas, quarum ope ex revelatis veritates aliae inferuntur, si nexus veritatum naturalium cum deductis et ab ecclesia peremptorie statutis ita exploratus est, ut eversis illis hae veritates caderent. Sane ex revelatione ut absolute nunquam licet abusu facultatis loquendi proferre verbum otiosum (*Matt* 12, 36), eo quod est otiosum, item eadem ratione absolute non licebit ponere actum otiosum ullum externum vel internum ideoque abusu intellectus dissentire a veritate qualicumque satis manifesta, quod est verbum internum plus quam otiosum, quatenus non solum sine ratione sufficiente, sed magis contra rationem interna affirmatione adhaeretur falso; quocum principio cohaeret, absolute non licere dissentire ab hac illave in concreto veritate per lumen naturale satis omnibus manifesta, nec licere dissentire ab hac illave veritate naturali, quae sit certa ex nexu explorato cum veritate per ecclesiam peremptorie statuta, quamvis non revelata. Quae altera affirmatio cohaeret etiam cum veritate revelata, pro peccato ipso vitando fugiendum per se esse periculum peccandi (*Eccli* 3, 27), quatenus qui negat veritatem arte nexam cum veritate per auctoritatem ecclesiae tenenda, ad hanc veritatem ipsam negandam fere cogitur. Atqui is, qui statuit, absolute non licere ab hac illave sententia dissentire, aequivalenter statuit, sententiam eam veram esse, siquidem dissentire ab errore absolute

to be known or knowable in their place and time without difficulty, as if he himself designates them individually, similarly as certain predictions are proclaimed by God himself, although before the event they are received less clearly by the hearers; but not equally has God, in revealing that Christ is man, also said that in Christ there exist concretely all those things distinctly which are now discovered in man through laborious study; therefore truths of this sort are connected with the revealed, but are not themselves revealed. Furthermore, I think that to this category should be referred natural truths themselves, whether those which are self-evident or those by whose aid other truths are inferred from revealed ones, if the connection of natural truths with those deduced and peremptorily established by the Church is so well-established that with the former overturned, these truths would fall. Indeed, from revelation, since it is absolutely never permitted to utter an idle word through abuse of the faculty of speech (*Matt* 12:36), because it is idle, likewise for the same reason it will be absolutely impermissible to posit any idle act, external or internal, and therefore to dissent from any sufficiently manifest truth through abuse of the intellect, which is an internal word more than idle, insofar as one adheres to falsehood by internal affirmation not only without sufficient reason, but rather against reason; with this principle it coheres that it is absolutely not permitted to dissent from this or that concrete truth sufficiently manifest to all through natural light, nor is it permitted to dissent from this or that natural truth which is certain from an established connection with a truth peremptorily established by the Church, although not revealed. This latter affirmation also coheres with the revealed truth that for avoiding sin itself, the danger of sinning must be avoided in itself (*Ecclus* 3:27), insofar as one who denies a truth skillfully connected with a truth to be held by the authority of the Church is almost compelled to deny this truth itself. But one who establishes that it is absolutely not permitted to dissent from this or that opinion equivalently establishes that the opinion is true, since to dissent from error absolutely cannot be evil. Thus there can be connected with revealed truths not

malum esse nequit. Ita coniecti cum revelatis potest non solum veritas, textum quemdam dogmaticum originis humanae pro sensu objectivo revelationi congruere vel adversari, sed etiam veritas naturalis, hunc illumve esse ejus sensum objectivum, cum scilicet sensus clarus est, quia ambiguum textum talem non, ut locos dubios scripturae vel divinae traditionis, auctoritate sacra modo absoluto definiendum, pro concordia vel repugnantia cum verbo Dei scripto vel tradito, attribuimus, cui definitioni sensus objectivus certus textus supponatur. Ita praeter veritatem revelationi junctam, ordinationes ritu anglicano actas esse irritas, haec alia veritas necti potest, modo hoc illove ordinationes anglicanas actas esse, sive modus iste ex historia cognitus et perspectus est, sive est modus saltem in concreto unicus, quo ordinationes eadem intellegi irritae possint. Praeterea exempla veritatum huc pertinentium naturalium, quae sint ex se liquidae vel et revelationi supponantur, invenias in articulis damnatis Nicolai de Ulricuria (D 457—467).

[887] Tum fidei deposito intime conjungitur rectitudo disciplinae ecclesiasticae universalis. Etenim ecclesia regens, quotiens non solum animo invito quaedam tolerat nec solum quaequam transeuntia vel particularia statuit, sed fert legem disciplinae, ex se scilicet stabilem, ab omnibus servandam, facto ipso docet, et legem illam observando ecclesia oboediens tota facto ipso profitetur (cf. s. *Thomae* S. theol. p. I. 2. q. 97. a. 3), legem talem, si non semper optimam nec maxime opportunam, esse tamen bonam et per se quidem et generatim utilem proindeque verae fidei vel morum honestati sive lege Dei positiva sive lege naturali (cf. *Rom* 2, 9—16) pronuntiatae respondere, certe non adversari. Qua sententia abjecta periclitarentur principia fidei et morum revelata vel revelatis juncta, unde illa disciplina et doctrina emanavit, vel labefieret ipsum dogma ecclesiae Dei sanctae, per quod ecclesia

only the truth that some dogmatic text of human origin agrees with or opposes revelation in its objective sense, but also the natural truth that this or that is its objective sense, namely when the sense is clear, because we do not attribute such an ambiguous text, like doubtful passages of Scripture or divine tradition, to be defined by sacred authority in an absolute manner for agreement or disagreement with the written or transmitted word of God, for which definition the certain objective sense of the text is presupposed. Thus, besides the truth joined to revelation that ordinations performed according to the Anglican rite are invalid, this other truth can be connected: that ordinations were performed in this or that Anglican manner, whether this manner is known and perceived from history, or is at least the only concrete manner by which those ordinations can be understood to be invalid. Moreover, you may find examples of natural truths pertaining to this category, which are either self-evident or presupposed to revelation, in the articles condemned of Nicholas of Autrecourt (D 457—467).

[887] Moreover, the rectitude of universal ecclesiastical discipline is intimately joined to the deposit of faith. For indeed, whenever the governing Church not only tolerates certain things with unwilling spirit, nor only establishes certain transient or particular matters, but establishes a law of discipline—namely, one that is stable in itself and to be observed by all—by this very fact it teaches; and the entire obedient Church, by observing that law, by this very fact professes (cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, Part I-II, q. 97, a. 3) that such a law, if not always the best nor most opportune, is nevertheless good and useful both in itself and generally, and therefore corresponds to—certainly does not oppose—true faith or moral uprightness as pronounced either by God's positive law or by natural law (cf. *Romans* 2:9-16). With this principle rejected, the revealed principles of faith and morals, or those joined to revealed truths from which that discipline and doctrine emanated, would be endangered; or the very dogma of the holy Church of

universa ex fine proprio per voluntatem Domini efficacem nunquam neglegendo salutifera pro bono malum praecipere vel suscipere nullum potest.

[888] Hinc vinculo haud dissimili cum veritatibus revelatis coniecti invenitur bonitas et utilitas hujus illiusve ordinis religiosi seu modi vivendi fidelium aliquorum ad salutem suam vel et proximi et ipsam perfectionem vitae christianae consequendam, observatis etiam per vota perpetua consiliis evangelicis (ex *Mat* 19; 10—12. 21; *I Cor* 7, 32—38) et regulis pro fine proprio instituti propriis. Namque error in hac causa redundaret satis manifesto in depositum ipsum fidei et morum revelatum vel; ordine religioso jam per ecclesiam cognito et approbato, redundaret in articulum, quo credimus ecclesiae sanctitatem, cui repugnat ordinem sancire ex se ad finem religiosum obtinendum non idoneum, similiter ac constituere disciplinam, quae sit contraria bonis moribus vel in ecclesiae totius damnum cedat; etsi enim ecclesia universa institutum ordinis cujusdam religiosi nequitiam amplectitur, hoc tamen institutum vi approbationis plenae ut via ex se ducens ad virtutem in sua perfectione assequendam omnibus fidelibus proponitur et cum proportionem commendatur.

[889] Eodem spectat veritas, quae ipso iudicio de hominis jam defuncti sanctitate, gloria, dignitate veneranda continetur. Quae veritas attingere revelationem tunc praesertim potest, cum defunctus est martyrium pro Christo passus (vide v. g. *Mat* 10, 32. 39; 16, 25 cum parallelis *Marc* 8, 35; *Luc* 9, 24; 17, 33; *Jo* 12, 25), vel cum post ipsam quoque hominis mortem miracula ad invocationem illiusmet vel venerationem reliquiarum fiunt, siquidem hoc pacto noscitur Deus non veritatem ab illo praedicatam, sed invocationem et cultum hominis talis comprobare (cf. s. *Thomae* S. theol. p. 2. 2. q. 178. a. 2); quare dogma sanctitatis Dei interponitur, quamvis, nulla existente

God would be undermined—the dogma by which the universal Church, from its proper end through the efficacious will of the Lord, can never neglect salutary matters or command or accept evil in place of good.

[888] Hence, it is found that the goodness and utility of this or that religious order or mode of life of certain faithful for attaining their salvation or that of their neighbor and the very perfection of Christian life itself is connected by a bond not dissimilar to that with revealed truths, with the evangelical counsels being observed also through perpetual vows (from *Matt* 19:10–12, 21; *I Cor* 7:32–38) and rules proper to the particular end of their institute. For an error in this matter would redound quite manifestly to the very deposit of revealed faith and morals; or, with a religious order already known and approved by the Church, it would redound to the article by which we believe in the Church's sanctity, which is incompatible with sanctioning an order that is not suitable in itself for obtaining a religious end, just as it is incompatible with establishing a discipline that would be contrary to good morals or would result in harm to the entire Church. For although the universal Church by no means embraces the institute of any particular religious order, nevertheless this institute, by virtue of full approbation, is proposed to all the faithful as a way leading in itself to the attainment of virtue in its perfection and is commended with due proportion.

[889] The same principle applies to the truth that is contained in the very judgment concerning the sanctity, glory, and venerable dignity of a person who has already died. This truth can especially touch upon revelation when the deceased has suffered martyrdom for Christ (see, for example, *Matthew* 10:32, 39; 16:25 with the parallel passages in *Mark* 8:35; *Luke* 9:24; 17:33; *John* 12:25), or when, even after the person's death itself, miracles occur through invocation of that same person or veneration of relics, since in this way it becomes known that God approves not the truth preached by that person, but rather the invocation and worship of such a person (cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, part 2-2, question 178, article 2); therefore the

locutione Dei proprie dicta, sanctitas defuncti revelata dici nequeat. Quin pro fulgore martyrii vel vitae virtutibus heroicis ornatae cum miraculis sequentibus in medium proferre etiam dogma illud ut facillime applicandum licet, quo generatim gloriam sanctorum credimus. Et accedere potest, quod saepius ecclesia pro studio laudabili augendae gloriae Dei et hominum salutis promovendae excitatur juste et quasi conaturaliter, ut statuatur definitum hominem defunctum instar exemplaris vitae christianae imitandum vel etiam lege disciplinae generali, prospiciente unitati cultus, instar patroni invocandum et instar amici Dei venerandum; ubi, si imitandus ille ediceretur, cujus mores imitandi reapse minime essent, vel si colendus ille exhiberetur, cujus cultus, ut damnati, pius honestusque non existeret, jam sacrum depositum fidei et morum vel puritas, ecclesiae credenda, sicut per alias perversas disciplinae leges, laederetur. Quo referas illa *Hieronymi* (in *Philem* 4 ss; *M* 26, 609 s): „Non putemus levem Philemonis praedicationem, si eandem fidem habeat in sanctos quam et in Deum. Qui credit Deum sanctum esse, utique non errat. Quod si quis hominem qui sanctus non est, sanctum esse crediderit, et Deum junxerit societati, Christum violat, cujus corporis omnes membra sumus. „Qui dicit“, inquit, „justum injustum, et injustum justum, abominabilis uterque apud Deum est“ (*Prov* 17, 15): similiter qui sanctum dicit esse non sanctum, et rursum non sanctum, asserit sanctum, abominabilis apud Deum est. Omnes credentes, secundum apostolum, Christi corpus efficiuntur (al. efficimur) (*1 Cor* 6, 15). Qui in Christi corpore errat et labitur, asserens membrum ejus vel sanctum esse, cum non sit: vel non sanctum esse, cum sanctum sit, vide quali crimine obnoxius fiat: „Vae“, ait *Isaias*, „qui dicunt dulce amarum, et amarum dulce: ponentes tenebras lucem, et lucem tenebras“ (*Is* 5, 20). Dulce, puto esse sanctimoniam: amarum, quod sanctimoniae contrarium est; aequae lux sanctimonia intelligi potest,

dogma of God's sanctity is interposed, although, with no utterance of God properly so-called existing, the sanctity of the deceased cannot be said to be revealed. Indeed, given the splendor of martyrdom or of a life adorned with heroic virtues along with subsequent miracles, it is also permissible to bring forward that dogma as most easily applicable, by which we generally believe in the glory of the saints. And there can be added the fact that the Church is quite often stirred justly and almost naturally, out of a praiseworthy zeal for increasing the glory of God and promoting the salvation of mankind, to determine definitively that a deceased person should be imitated as a model of Christian life, or even by a general law of discipline, looking toward the unity of worship, should be invoked as a patron and venerated as a friend of God; where, if that person were declared to be one who should be imitated, whose conduct should by no means actually be imitated, or if that person were presented as one who should be venerated, whose veneration, as that of a damned person, would not be pious and proper, then the sacred deposit of faith and morals, or the purity that should be believed of the Church, would be harmed, just as it would be through other perverse laws of discipline. To this you may refer those words of St. Jerome (on *Philemon* 4 ff.; *Migne* 26, 609 f.): "Let us not think that Philemon's praise is trivial, if he has the same faith in the saints as he has in God. One who believes that God is holy certainly does not err. But if anyone should believe that a man who is not holy is holy, and should join him to God's company, he violates Christ, of whose body we are all members. 'He who calls the righteous unrighteous, and the unrighteous righteous, both are abominable before God' (*Proverbs* 17:15): similarly, one who says that the holy person is not holy, and again asserts that the non-holy person is holy, is abominable before God. All believers, according to the Apostle, become (variant: we become) the body of Christ (*1 Corinthians* 6:15). One who errs and stumbles in Christ's body, asserting that a member of it is either holy when it is not, or not holy when it is holy, see to what crime he becomes liable: 'Woe,' says *Isaiah*, 'to those who call sweet bitter, and bitter sweet: putting darkness for light, and light for

tenebrae contrariae sanctitati.“ Ista etiam plenius in cultum pleniorē valent.

[890] His denique addam nominatim facta divina, ut miracula, quae non ipso deposito revelationis contineantur. Certe revelatum est, miracula v. g. ipsius Christi et facta esse, de quorum veritate historica cōstare possit, et vere rationem miraculi habere, et vere comprobāre illud, ad quod firmandum sunt producta (*Mat* 11, 2—6. 20—24; *Jo* 2, 11; 5, 36; 10, 25. 26. 37. 38; 11, 41—48; 12, 37—43; 15, 22—25; 20, 29—31; cf. concilii vaticani s. III. cn. 4. de fide; *D* 1660). Atqui hae tres veritates manifesto vacillarent eo, quod consimile iudicium recusaretur de factis consimilibus, quae post tempus apostolicum hodiēque fiunt. Item revelatum est, signa mirabilia post fidem simpliciter proindeque plus minusve semper secutura esse (*Marc* 16 17. 18; *Jo* 14, 12); cui intime jungitur, haec vel illa facta etiamnum evenientia miracula agnosci.

[891] Ad tales igitur veritates cum rēvelatis copulatas peremptorie asserendas magisterium ecclesiae infallibile se extendere affirmamus. Videlicet non sane ut ad depositum fidei pertinentes vel ut rēvelatas, sed ut ad custodiam depositi spectantes vel ut rēvelatis hoc illove gradu et modo conexas veritates illas proponere et, quod eodem redit, sententias iisdem immediate oppositas non quidem ut haereses, sed ut aliter pravās, censuris vel notis doctrinae malae inustus variis, profligare magistri sacri potestate infallibili possunt; quod agendo non tam munus testium, quam doctorum sensu pressiore veritates creditas adscitis aliis explicantium et vindicum ipsorum propugnaculorum fidei exercent. Ubi adversariis incidimus jansenianis, qui disputantes directe quidem de textibus dogmaticis originis humanae contendunt, ecclesiam infallibilem ‘certe esse’ in quaestione juris, at non in quaestione

darkness’ (*Isaiah* 5:20). I think that sweetness is sanctity: bitter is what is contrary to sanctity; equally, light can be understood as sanctity, darkness as contrary to sanctity.” These considerations apply even more fully to fuller worship.

[890] Finally, I shall add by name those divine facts, such as miracles, which are not themselves contained in the deposit of revelation. Certainly it has been revealed that the miracles of Christ himself, for example, both occurred and can be established as historically true, and truly possess the character of miracles, and truly confirm that for whose establishment they were produced (*Matt* 11:2–6, 20–24; *John* 2:11; 5:36; 10:25–26, 37–38; 11:41–48; 12:37–43; 15:22–25; 20:29–31; cf. Vatican Council, Session III, canon 4, on faith; *D* 1660). But these three truths would manifestly waver if a similar judgment were refused concerning similar facts which occur both after apostolic times and even today. Likewise, it has been revealed that miraculous signs are to follow faith simply and therefore more or less always (*Mark* 16:17–18; *John* 14:12); to which is intimately joined the recognition that these or those facts still occurring are to be acknowledged as miracles.

[891] We therefore affirm that the infallible magisterium of the Church extends to the peremptory assertion of such truths as are connected with revealed truths. That is to say, not indeed as pertaining to the deposit of faith or as revealed, but as relating to the custody of the deposit or as truths connected in this or that degree and manner with revealed truths, the sacred teachers can propose those truths with infallible power and—which amounts to the same thing—can condemn sentences immediately opposed to them, not indeed as heresies, but as otherwise erroneous, marked with various censures or notes of evil doctrine. In doing this, they exercise not so much the office of witnesses as of teachers in the more precise sense, explaining truths believed by adopting other truths and serving as defenders of the very bulwarks of faith. Here we encounter Jansenist adversaries who, while disputing directly about dogmatic texts of human origin, contend that the Church is infallible ‘certainly’ in a question of law, but not in a question

facti. Distinguitur enim quaestio primum de doctrina quadam spectata in se ipsa vel in abstracto, utrum sit fidei consona an dissona, bona an mala, quae est quaestio juris; dein succedit quaestio de doctrinae ejusdem enuntiatione in concreto per librum humanum quendam facta, num ab auctore doctrina ea recta vel perversa reapse in libro sit expressa, quae est quaestio facti. Ecclesia autem definiendo, doctrinam rēvelatis gradu modove suo sive congruentem sive repugnantem libro contineri, definit directe vel explicitē quaestionem facti, quasi indirecte vel implicite quaestionem juris; quod et in aliis definitionibus praeter doctrinam factum respicientibus contingit. Porro thesis nostra ex dicendis saltem est doctrina catholica omnino agnoscenda, immo ratione bona jam dogma fidei ducitur.

[892] Demonstratio. 1. Magisterium ecclesiae infallibile eum certe ambitum obtinet, qui pro fine suo consequendo vel munere implendo postulatur; quod constat vel per ipsam Christi institutoris sapientiam, ut quae sane fini media sufficientia aptentur. Atqui fini suo vel muneri imposito magisterium infallibile nequit, ut par est, satisfacere, nisi ad illa omnia extenditur, quibus neglectis depositum sacrum revelationis non potest efficaciter custodiri; cujusmodi sunt ultra veritates ipsas revelatas etiam complura in se non revelata, quae cum revelatis nexu speciali sive certitudinis sive veritatis conjunguntur. Ergo magisterium ecclesiae infallibile praeter veritates in se revelatas, ut objectum suum primum, ad veritates quoque alias, cum revelatis nexu speciali cohaerentes, velut objectum secundarium, refertur.

[893] *Prob. prior pars minoris:* Institutum est divinitus magisterium ecclesiae in hunc finem, ut agente ipso depositum revelationis custodiretur integrum seu fidelium fides pura et una semper servaretur, proindeque, salubri doctrina proposita et noxiis erroribus exclusis, via salutis tuta et expedita monstretur et

of fact. For a distinction is made first regarding the question of some doctrine considered in itself or in the abstract—whether it is consonant or dissonant with faith, good or evil—which is a question of law; then follows the question concerning the enunciation of that same doctrine in concrete form through some human book, whether that right or perverse doctrine has actually been expressed by the author in the book—which is a question of fact. But the Church, in defining that doctrine either congruent with or repugnant to revealed truths in its own degree or manner is contained in a book, defines directly or explicitly the question of fact, and as it were indirectly or implicitly the question of law; which also occurs in other definitions that regard fact beyond doctrine. Furthermore, our thesis, from what is to be said, is at least to be acknowledged as thoroughly Catholic doctrine; indeed, on good grounds it is already considered a dogma of faith.

[892] Demonstration. 1. The infallible magisterium of the Church certainly obtains that scope which is required for achieving its end or for fulfilling its office; this is established either through the very wisdom of Christ the institutor, so that suitable means are appropriately fitted to the end. But the infallible magisterium cannot, as is fitting, satisfy its proper end or the office imposed upon it, unless it extends to all those things which, if neglected, would prevent the sacred deposit of revelation from being efficaciously guarded; of this kind are, beyond the revealed truths themselves, also many things not revealed in themselves, which are joined to revealed truths by a special connection either of certitude or of truth. Therefore, the infallible magisterium of the Church refers not only to truths revealed in themselves, as its primary object, but also to other truths which cohere with revealed truths by a special connection, as its secondary object.

[893] *Proof of the first part of the minor premise:* The teaching authority of the Church has been divinely instituted for this purpose: that through its agency the deposit of revelation might be preserved intact, or rather that the faith of the faithful might always be kept pure and unified, and consequently, with salutary doctrine proposed and harmful errors

sternetur; sicut enim potestas ecclesiastica universa, ita potestas docendi ad hominum salutem ordinatur. Atqui gravissimo huic fini magisterium ecclesiae nequit, ut par est, satisfacere, nisi ad ea omnia extenditur, quorum doctrina est plus minusve necessaria vel maxime opportuna ad depositi custodiam, ad fidei puritatem et unitatem procurandam, ad errores vel pericula deceptionis a fidelibus removenda et sic tandem salutem animarum in tuto collocandam (cf. *Act* 20, 29—31; *Eph* 5, 6; *Col* 2, 8; *1 Tim* 1, 3; 6, 20 s; *2 Tim* 1, 13 s; 2, 16 s). Sed qua necessitate magisterium ipsum, hac et infallibilitas magisterii, pro doctrina peremptoria quidem proferenda, ad illa omnia porrigitur. Etenim tam late patet infallibilitas quam sacra docendi suprema potestas, cum eam instar proprietatis consequatur. Insuper magisterium fallibile assensum absolutum in rebus adhuc dubiis postulare ideoque controversias terminare non valeret. Tandem actibus docendi omnibus, quos magisterium sacrum ponat, fidei depositum custoditur; hac autem in custodia ipsa et pro ipsa infallibile est, cum peremptorie docet, ecclesiae magisterium.

[894] *Prob. altera pars minoris:* Depositum revelationis, ut par est, custoditur vel fidei integritas proindeque sanctitas et salus hominum procuratur per veritatis revelatae legitimam indubitate propositionem, sinceram explicationem, rectam pro scientia et vita christiana applicationem, diligentem ab erroribus adversis distinctionem validamque defensionem. Atqui ad hanc efficacem propositionem, explicationem, applicationem, distinctionem, defensionem minime sufficit proponere veritates revelatas ipsas seu dogmata fidei eaque discernere ab erroribus directe oppositis seu ab haeresibus cavendis; sed etiam necessarium est seu summopere opportunum proferre complures veritates in se non revelatas, sed revelatis conjunctas, easque distinguendo ab

excluded, the way of salvation might be shown and laid out as safe and unimpeded; for just as all ecclesiastical power, so too the power of teaching is ordered toward the salvation of men. But the teaching authority of the Church cannot adequately satisfy this most grave purpose unless it extends to all those things whose doctrine is more or less necessary or most opportune for the custody of the deposit, for procuring the purity and unity of faith, for removing errors or dangers of deception from the faithful, and thus finally for placing the salvation of souls in safety (cf. *Acts* 20:29-31; *Ephesians* 5:6; *Colossians* 2:8; *1 Timothy* 1:3; 6:20f; *2 Timothy* 1:13f; 2:16f). But by whatever necessity the teaching authority itself extends to all these things, by that same necessity does the infallibility of the teaching authority extend to them, for the purpose of setting forth peremptory doctrine. For infallibility extends as widely as the supreme sacred power of teaching, since it follows upon it as a property. Moreover, a fallible teaching authority would not be able to demand absolute assent in matters still doubtful and therefore could not terminate controversies. Finally, the deposit of faith is guarded by all the acts of teaching that the sacred teaching authority establishes; but in this very custody and for this custody itself, the teaching authority of the Church is infallible when it teaches peremptorily.

[894] *The second part of the minor premise is proven:* The deposit of revelation, as is fitting, is preserved, or the integrity of faith and therefore the sanctity and salvation of men is secured through the legitimate and undoubted proposition of revealed truth, its sincere explanation, correct application for Christian knowledge and life, careful distinction from adverse errors, and valid defense. But for this efficacious proposition, explanation, application, distinction, and defense, it is by no means sufficient to propose the revealed truths themselves or the dogmas of faith and to discern them from directly opposed errors or from heresies to be avoided; rather, it is also necessary or supremely opportune to put forward numerous truths not revealed in themselves, but connected to revealed truths, and by distinguishing them from errors directly connected to truths, to vindicate them against those that shake

erroribus directe veritates nexas, indirecte propius vel remotius fidem salutarem labefactantibus vindicare; quales veritates intelleguntur ex praemissa (n. 883—890) declaratione tum facta dogmatica, veritates revelationi praesuppositae vel conclusiones theoreticae et practicae, quae ex veritatibus revelatis tamquam principiiis fecundis paulatim ratiocinando inferantur et ad omnem vitam hominum pro variis temporum adjunctis applicentur, honestas disciplinae ecclesiasticae, bonitas ordinis religiosi, sanctitas hominis defuncti, miracula usque adhuc patrata, tum textus dogmatici, de quibus nominatim janseniani litem intenderunt; nam abjudicata ecclesiae facultate textus illos ex sensu objectivo rectos vel pravos peremptorie declarandi et haereticis ipsis effugium apertum semper superesset cum unitatis fidei jactura manifesta, et catholicis, praesertim rudioribus, praesens nec valide propulsandum periculum maneret veneni erroris perniciosi pro vera et salutifera doctrina ex libris doctorum sive corruptis hauriendi.

[895] 2. Ex *Mat* 28, 18–20 infallibile est magisterium sacrum, quotiens aliquid a Domino mandatum observandum ultimo ecclesiam totam docet (cf. n. 834). Atqui cum fert legem, per se scilicet perpetuam, universalem disciplinam, quamvis in se non revelatae, ultimo ecclesiam totam docet, observandam esse hic et nunc absolute vel sine ulla tergiversatione oboediendo, nisi magisterium ipsum de jure suo decedat, potestatem legiferam a Domino mandatam (vide *Mat* 16, 18. 19; 18, 17. 18; cf. 1 *Cor* 11, 34 cum 4, 1; *concilii tridentini* s. XXI, c. 2; *D* 809). Ergo magisterium sacrum infallibile est in statuenda lege universali disciplinae etiam non revelatae ita, ut haec tantum absolute observanda ideoque bona esse possit. Atqui infallibilitas, quae ex verbis Domini extendatur ad disciplinam non revelatam exsequendam, pariter ad res omnes cum revelatis nexas, etiam speculativas lege quadam ecclesiae tenendas, extendenda est.

salvific faith indirectly, whether more closely or more remotely. Such truths are understood from the preceding declaration (n. 883–890) as both dogmatic facts—truths presupposed to revelation or theoretical and practical conclusions which are gradually inferred by reasoning from revealed truths as from fruitful principles and applied to the entire life of men according to various circumstances of the times—the honesty of ecclesiastical discipline, the goodness of religious order, the sanctity of a deceased person, miracles accomplished up to this point, and dogmatic texts, concerning which the Jansenists specifically raised controversy. For if the Church's faculty of peremptorily declaring those texts correct or corrupt from an objective sense were denied, an escape would always remain open to heretics themselves with manifest loss of the unity of faith, and for Catholics, especially the more unlearned, there would remain a present and not validly repulsed danger of drinking the poison of pernicious error from the books of learned men, whether corrupted, in place of true and salutary doctrine.

[895] 2. From *Matthew* 28:18–20, the sacred magisterium is infallible whenever it ultimately teaches the entire Church that something commanded by the Lord is to be observed (cf. n. 834). But when it enacts law—namely, universal discipline that is *per se* perpetual—although not revealed in itself, it ultimately teaches the entire Church that this discipline must be observed here and now absolutely, or without any evasion through obedience, unless the magisterium itself withdraws from its right to exercise the legislative power commanded by the Lord (see *Matthew* 16:18–19; 18:17–18; cf. 1 *Corinthians* 11:34 with 4:1; *Council of Trent*, session XXI, chapter 2; *D* 809). Therefore, the sacred magisterium is infallible in establishing universal law of discipline, even when not revealed, such that this discipline can only be observed absolutely and therefore can only be good. But the infallibility which, according to the words of the Lord, extends to carrying out non-revealed discipline, must equally be extended to all matters connected with revealed

[896] 3. Idem ex sensu praxique ecclesiae demonstratur. Ecclesia enim ipsa Spiritu sancto assistente debet profecto posse scire vel opportune significare, quibus in rebus erroris sit immunis; aliter infallibilitatis donum inutile evaderet. Atqui ecclesia vel pontifex romanus ecclesia sequente in rebus etiam non revelatis, sed cum revelatione intime nexis infallibilem sese exhibebat. Ita

a. *Gregorius M.* non solum dogmata definita in conciliis, sed imprimis ipsa quattuor concilia, quae facta sunt dogmatica, firmissime suscipere et venerari se fatetur (supra n. 847). — Congruit symbolum fidei a *Leone IX* propositum (*D* 297). — Similiter ex articulo 5 inter 39, de quibus suspecti errorum Wiclef et Hus jubente *Martino V* interrogandi erant, tenendum est, concilio etiam constantiensi universalem ecclesiam repraesentantem esse; quo posito per articulum sequentem significatur credendum, esse approbandum illud, quod concilium constantiense in favorem fidei et ad salutem animarum approbavit (*D* 551. 552). Et articulo 24 proponitur credendum, papam canonice electum, qui pro tempore fuerit, ejus nomine proprio expresso, successorem b. Petri esse (*D* 568). — Ad haec videas professionem fidei orientalibus praescriptam ab *Urbano VIII* et *Benedicto XIV*, qua et synodi universales suscipiuntur (*D* 873).

[897] b. Ad textus dogmaticos quod attinet, ecclesia ipso facto asserebat sibi potestatem judicandi peremptorie ideoque infallibiliter non solum de heterodoxia vel orthodoxia propositionis alicujus doctrinaeve simpliciter, sed prout propositio vel doctrina eadem exstaret in aliquo originis humanae libro, proindeque pro re nata adscribebat sibi facultatem definiendi, doctrinam perversam, v. g. haereticam, libro illo contineri ita, ut ipse liber haereticus habendus esset atque haereticus, in casu quidem pertinaciae,

truths, even speculative ones to be held by some law of the Church.

[896] 3. The same thing is demonstrated from the sense and practice of the Church. For the Church itself, assisted by the Holy Spirit, must surely be able to know or appropriately indicate in which matters it is immune from error; otherwise the gift of infallibility would prove useless. But the Church, or the Roman Pontiff with the Church following, has shown itself to be infallible even in matters that are not revealed but are intimately connected with revelation. Thus

a. *Gregory the Great* declares that he most firmly receives and venerates not only the dogmas defined in councils, but especially those four councils themselves which became dogmatic (above n. 847). — This accords with the symbol of faith proposed by *Leo IX* (*D* 297). — Similarly, from article 5 among the 39 concerning which those suspected of the errors of Wycliffe and Hus were to be interrogated by order of *Martin V*, it must be held that the Council of Constance was also representing the universal Church; this being established, it is signified by the following article that it must be believed and approved what the Council of Constance approved in favor of the faith and for the salvation of souls (*D* 551. 552). And in article 24 it is proposed as a matter of belief that the canonically elected pope, whoever he may be at the time, with his proper name expressed, is the successor of blessed Peter (*D* 568). — In addition to these, see the profession of faith prescribed for Orientals by *Urban VIII* and *Benedict XIV*, by which universal synods are also received (*D* 873).

[897] b. As regards dogmatic texts, the Church *ipso facto* asserted for itself the power to judge peremptorily and therefore infallibly not only concerning the heterodoxy or orthodoxy of some proposition or doctrine simply considered, but insofar as the same proposition or doctrine existed in some book of human origin, and consequently ascribed to itself *pro re nata* the faculty of defining that a perverse doctrine, for example a heretical one, was contained in that book in such a way that the book itself was to be held as heretical and its author was to be judged heretical, at least in the case of

censendus esset libri auctor. Sic *concilium nicænum* I Arii opinionem, verba, librum affectum nomine *Thaliae* condemnavit (ex *Socratis* hist. eccl. 1. 1. c. 9. et *Sozomeni* hist. eccl. 1. 1. c. 21; *M* 67, 78 ss. 922 s). — *Anastasius I* damnavit scripta prava Origenis (*K* 276. 281. 282. 284). — *Innocentius I* scripta quaedam apocrypha non solum repudianda, verum etiam damnanda exhibet (ep. 6. ad Exsuperium episc. tolos. c. 7. n. 13; *M* 20, 502); idem in libro Pelagii nihil paene esse censuit, quod non a quovis damnandum atque calcandum esset (ep. 31. ad quinque episc. n. 5; *M* 20, 596). — In *concilio Ephesino* (act. 1; *H* 1, 1363 ss) orthodoxa pronuntiata est epistula Cyrilli ad Nestorium, damnata est epistula Nestorii ad Cyrillum, quâ lecta episcopi simul omnes exclamarunt: „Quicumque Nestorium non anathematizat, anathema sit. Hunc recta fides anathematizat: hunc sancta synodus anathematizat. Quicumque Nestorio communicat, anathema sit. Omnes Nestorii epistolam et dogmata anathematizamus: omnes haeticum Nestorium anathematizamus.“ — In *formula Hormisdæ* omnes haereses, praecipue *Nestorius* haeticus cum aliis compluribus anathematizantur (*D* 141). — Pariter, *synodus V* damnatis aliis hominibus et scriptis reprobavit (cn. 12—14; *D* 183—186) *Theodorum Mopsuestenum* et impia ejus scripta, scripta aliqua *Theodreti*, epistolam *Ibae*, ita quidem, ut omnibus ea defendentibus diceret anathema. — Item *Gregorius M.* supra (n. 847) doctrinas cum auctoribus a conciliis irrevocabiler judicatas exhibet. — Congruit concilii later. a. 649 sub *Martino I* cn. 18 (*D* 219). — Eodem spectat articulus 7. 8. 11 ex iis, de quibus errorum *Wicleff* et *Hus* suspecti ex mandato *Martini V* interrogandi erant, ubi assensus firmus de viris illis cum *Hieronymo de Praga* habendis pro haeticis et eorum libris et doctrinis habendis pro perversis postulatur (*D* 553—555). — Unde etiam *Alexander VII* per constitutionem „Cum ad s. Petri sedem“ 16. oct. 1656 quinque

pertinaciam. Thus the *First Council of Nicaea* condemned the opinion, words, and book of Arius entitled *Thalia* (from *Socrates' Ecclesiastical History* bk. 1, ch. 9, and *Sozomen's Ecclesiastical History* bk. 1, ch. 21; *M* 67, 78 ff. 922 f). — *Anastasius I* condemned the corrupt writings of Origen (*K* 276. 281. 282. 284). — *Innocent I* presents certain apocryphal writings as not only to be rejected, but even to be condemned (ep. 6 to Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse, c. 7, n. 13; *M* 20, 502); the same Pope judged that there was scarcely anything in Pelagius' book that should not be condemned and trampled underfoot by anyone (ep. 31 to five bishops, n. 5; *M* 20, 596). — In the *Council of Ephesus* (act. 1; *H* 1, 1363 ff) the letter of Cyril to Nestorius was pronounced orthodox, while the letter of Nestorius to Cyril was condemned, and when it was read all the bishops together exclaimed: "Whoever does not anathematize Nestorius, let him be anathema. The right faith anathematizes him: the holy synod anathematizes him. Whoever communicates with Nestorius, let him be anathema. We anathematize all of Nestorius' letters and doctrines: we anathematize Nestorius the heretic." — In the *Formula of Hormisdas* all heresies are anathematized, especially *Nestorius* the heretic along with many others (*D* 141). — Similarly, the *Fifth Synod*, having condemned other men and writings, reprobated (cn. 12—14; *D* 183—186) *Theodore of Mopsuestia* and his impious writings, certain writings of *Theodoret*, and the letter of *Ibas*, indeed in such a way that it pronounced anathema upon all who defended them. — Likewise *Gregory the Great* above (n. 847) presents doctrines along with their authors as irrevocably judged by councils. — The canon 18 of the *Lateran Council* of 649 under *Martin I* agrees (*D* 219). — To the same point pertain articles 7, 8, and 11 from those concerning which *Wyclif* and *Hus* were suspected of errors and were to be interrogated by mandate of *Martin V*, where firm assent was demanded that those men along with *Jerome of Prague* should be held as heretics and their books and doctrines should be held as perverse (*D* 553—555). — Whence also *Alexander VII* by the constitution "Cum ad s. Petri sedem" of October 16, 1656, defined that the five

propositiones Jansenii in sensu a Jansenio intento, scilicet intentione verbis expressa, damnatas esse definivit et constitutione „Regiminis apostolici“ 15. febr. 1664 eas ita sincero animo reiciendas esse edixit (*D* 971), postea vero *Clemens XI* sua „perpetuo valitura“ constitutione „Vineam Domini“ 16. jul. 1705 declaravit (*D* 1317), „damnatum in quinque . . . propositionibus janseniani libri sensum, quem illarum verba prae se ferunt, ut praefertur, ab omnibus Christi fidelibus ut haereticum, non ore solum, sed et corde recipi ac damnari debere.“ — Ipsum *concilium vaticanum* docet (s. III. c. 4; *D* 1645): „Omnem . . . assertionem veritati illuminatae fidei contrariam omnino falsam esse definimus. Porro ecclesia, quae una cum apostolico munere docendi, mandatum accepit fidei depositum custodiendi, jus etiam et officium divinitus habet falsi nominis scientiam proscribendi, ne quis decipiatur per philosophiam, et inanem fallaciam. Quapropter omnes christiani fideles hujusmodi opiniones, quae fidei doctrinae contrariae esse cognoscuntur, maxime si ab ecclesia reprobatae fuerint, non solum prohibentur tanquam legitimae scientiae conclusiones defendere, sed pro erroribus potius, qui fallacem veritatis speciem prae se ferant, habere tenentur omnino.“ Cf. cn. 2. de fide et ratione (*D* 1664). Pro qua definitione sollemni ecclesia textus dogmaticos originis humanae saltem eos, qui immediatè vel formaliter doctrinae revelatae adversentur, peremptorie vel infallibiliter proscribere potest. — Congruenter *Pius X* (encycl. 7. sept. 1907; *D*¹⁰ 2084—2086) repudiavit delirationem modernistarum, qui affirmationes scientiae qualescumque magisterio ecclesiae obnoxias nullo modo volunt, prius praetextendo, pro objecti diversitate discidium inter fidem et scientiam numquam esse posse, dein inopinato adjungendo, fidem scientiae etiam subjectam esse. Eodem spectat error modernistarum a s. officio 3. jul. 1907 rejectus 5 (*D*¹⁰ 2005): „Cum in deposito fidei veritates tantum revelatae

propositions of Jansenius were condemned in the sense intended by Jansenius, namely the intention expressed in the words, and by the constitution “Regiminis apostolici” of February 15, 1664, he declared that they were to be rejected with sincere heart (*D* 971), but later *Clement XI* by his constitution “Vineam Domini” of July 16, 1705, “to remain perpetually valid,” declared (*D* 1317), “that the sense condemned in the five propositions of the Jansenist book, which those words bear on their face, as it is set forth, must be received and condemned by all the faithful of Christ as heretical, not only with the mouth, but also with the heart.” — The *Vatican Council* itself teaches (sess. III, c. 4; *D* 1645): “We define that every assertion contrary to the illuminated truth of faith is altogether false. Furthermore, the Church, which together with the apostolic office of teaching received the mandate of guarding the deposit of faith, also has the divinely given right and duty of proscribing falsely so-called knowledge, lest anyone be deceived through philosophy and vain fallacy. Therefore all Christian faithful are forbidden to defend such opinions, which are known to be contrary to the doctrine of faith, especially if they have been reprobated by the Church, not only as conclusions of legitimate science, but are bound to hold them rather as errors that present a deceptive appearance of truth.” Cf. canon 2 on faith and reason (*D* 1664). By this solemn definition the Church can peremptorily or infallibly proscribe dogmatic texts of human origin, at least those which immediately or formally oppose revealed doctrine. — Congruently *Pius X* (encyclical of September 7, 1907; *D*¹⁰ 2084—2086) repudiated the delirium of the Modernists, who in no way want any assertions of science to be subject to the magisterium of the Church, first pretending that because of the diversity of object there can never be disagreement between faith and science, then unexpectedly adding that faith is also subject to science. To the same point pertains the error of the Modernists rejected by the Holy Office on July 3, 1907, proposition 5 (*D*¹⁰ 2005): “Since only revealed truths are contained in the deposit of faith, it does not pertain to the Church under any respect to pass judgment on the assertions of human disciplines.”

contineantur, nullo sub respectu ad ecclesiam pertinet iudicium ferre de assertionibus disciplinarum humanarum.“ Et damnatus error 7 (*D¹⁰* 2007): „Ecclesia, cum proscribit errores, nequit a fidelibus exigere ullum internum assensum, quo iudicia a se edita complectantur.“

[898] c. Ad haec ecclesia iudicio peremptorio, proinde infallibili non solum veritates revelatae proponere et errores his oppositos ut haereses proscribere, sed etiam veritates vel suppositas revelationi vel inde consequentes solebat definire seu errores ipsis repugnantes condemnare, infligendo quidem huiusmodi erroribus non haeresis, sed aut determinatam nullam doctrinae malae notam vel censuram aut in globo censuras praeter haeresim varias aut censuram quandam censura haeresis inferiorem. Nimirum; ut vis argumenti hujus descriptis censuris praecipuis et explanationis indigentibus plenius intellegatur, haeretica ipsa sententia a magisterio sacro ea declaratur, quae certo et immediate, verbis explicitis vel aequivalentibus, adversatur dogmati, i. e., veritati pro revelata sive jam satis ante sive per declarationem eam ipsam ad credendum propositae; notoriae haeretica est, quae non solum certo, sed etiam terminis ex se clavis dogmati eique jam prius in ecclesiae agnito repugnat; sin autem sensus non certo, sed plus minusve probabiliter est haeticus, propositio suspecta de haeresi vocatur; sin sententia quandamtenus ambigua etiam, sive ex se ipsa sive ex adjunctis, sensum potius haeticum praese fert, haeresim sapiens dicitur. Erronea, specificè scilicet et ut talis, non ut latius vel aliquando sub respectu alio simul est haeretica, sententia censetur, quae directe opponitur aut conclusioni theologicæ certae, i. e., veritati ex una revelata et altera theologicè vel naturaliter certa deductae, aut doctrinae satis quidem propositae in ratione veritatis sacrae, sed non aequè firmiter, quamvis quodammodo, in ratione veritatis revelatae; quo in altero casu, si de doctrinâ saltem fere certo revelatâ agitur, sententia

And the condemned error 7 (*D¹⁰* 2007): “The Church, when it proscribes errors, cannot demand from the faithful any internal assent by which they embrace the judgments issued by it.”

[898] c. Furthermore, the Church, by definitive judgment and therefore infallible, was accustomed not only to propose revealed truths and to proscribe errors opposed to these as heresies, but also to define truths either supposed to be revealed or consequent thereupon, or to condemn errors repugnant to these truths, inflicting indeed upon such errors not the note of heresy, but either some determined evil note of doctrine or censure, or various censures other than heresy taken collectively, or some censure inferior to the censure of heresy. Indeed, so that the force of this argument may be more fully understood through the principal censures described and requiring explanation, a heretical opinion itself is declared by the sacred magisterium to be one which certainly and immediately, in explicit or equivalent words, is adverse to dogma, that is, to a truth proposed for belief as revealed either already sufficiently beforehand or through that very declaration; one is notoriously heretical which not only certainly, but also in terms clear in themselves, opposes dogma and that which was already previously recognized in the Church; but if the meaning is not certainly, but more or less probably heretical, the proposition is called suspect of heresy; but if an opinion, even somewhat ambiguous, whether from itself or from circumstances, presents a rather heretical meaning, it is said to savor of heresy. An erroneous opinion, specifically indeed and as such, not as more broadly or sometimes under another aspect it is simultaneously heretical, is censured as one which directly opposes either a certain theological conclusion, that is, a truth deduced from one revealed premise and another theologically or naturally certain, or doctrine indeed sufficiently proposed in the character of sacred truth, but not equally firmly, although in some way, in the character of revealed truth; in which latter case, if it concerns doctrine at least almost certainly revealed, the erroneous opinion is also called proximate to

erronea etiam hæresi proxima vocatur. Temeraria, ut ab hæretica et erronea distinguatur, judicatur propositio ea, quæ aut doctrinâ cum revelatâ remotius quidem nexa, sed constanter et communiter ut sat solida recepta jam sine justa causa repudiatur, aut doctrinâ probabilis vel probabilior inique condemnatur. Præter has censuras hæresis, erroris, temeritatis indicantes gradum repugnantiae immediatæ vel mediatæ cum deposito fidei morumve revelato aliæ sunt, quibus gradus ita non exprimitur, ut materia sive revelata sive non revelata significetur, in qua per propositiones notatæ delinquatur. Sic propositio blasphema appellatur, quæ Deo vel sanctis contumeliam infert; impia, quæ cultum Dei vel sanctorum lædit; piarum aurium offensiva, quæ saltem vi verborum usitata aliquid contrarium observantiæ erga Deum continet; injuriosa, quæ honorem Deo, sanctis, personis certis debitum violat. Schismatica renuntiatur, quæ unitati ecclesiæ opponitur; seditiosa, quæ potestati divinitus ordinatæ adversatur. Ut scandalosa designatur, quæ ruinæ spiritualis occasionem præbet. Denique sunt censuræ, quæ neque gradum certum pugnae directæ vel indirectæ contra revelationem neque materiam offensionis specialem exhibent, ut cum propositio proscribitur simpliciter ut falsa, h. e., gradu non accuratius definito veritati revelatæ disconveniens, vel cum dicitur male sonans, enuntiata scilicet verbis ex communi usu minus rectis nec per circumstantias aliter explanandis, unde facilius in sensum pravam, revelationi quomodocumque adversum accipiat, vel cum vocatur captiosa, verbis in speciem rectis sententiam perversam illiusmodi iniciens. Porro sæpius non propositionibus singulis singulæ censuræ, sed propositionum cumulo censuræ in cumulo vel globo apponuntur, ita ut propositiones omnes vitandæ intellegantur, quatenus propositioni omni censura saltem aliqua apposita conveniat. Quales censuræ minimè confundi debent vetitis disciplinaribus, ne propositiones quædam

heresy. A proposition is judged temerarious, so as to be distinguished from heretical and erroneous, which either rejects without just cause doctrine indeed more remotely connected with the revealed, but constantly and commonly received as sufficiently solid, or unjustly condemns probable or more probable doctrine. Besides these censures indicating the degree of immediate or mediate repugnance with the deposit of revealed faith and morals, there are others by which the degree is not so expressed that the matter, whether revealed or not revealed, is signified in which offense is committed through the noted propositions. Thus a proposition is called blasphemous which brings insult to God or the saints; impious, which harms the worship of God or the saints; offensive to pious ears, which at least by force of customary words contains something contrary to observance toward God; injurious, which violates the honor due to God, the saints, certain persons. It is denounced as schismatic which opposes the unity of the Church; seditious, which is adverse to divinely ordained authority. It is designated as scandalous which provides occasion for spiritual ruin. Finally, there are censures which exhibit neither a certain degree of direct or indirect conflict against revelation nor special matter of offense, as when a proposition is proscribed simply as false, that is, disagreeing with revealed truth in a degree not more accurately defined, or when it is said to be ill-sounding, namely enunciated in words less correct according to common usage and not to be explained otherwise by circumstances, whence it is more easily taken in a depraved sense somehow adverse to revelation, or when it is called captious, insinuating a perverse opinion of such kind with words seemingly correct. Moreover, quite often not single censures to single propositions, but censures collectively or in a mass are applied to an accumulation of propositions, so that all propositions are to be understood as to be avoided, insofar as some censure at least applied befits every proposition. Such censures must by no means be confused with disciplinary prohibitions, lest certain propositions somewhat inopportune be taught in the meantime. Now, not a few examples are found of censures which definitively note depraved doctrine

parum opportunæ interim doceantur. Age, censurarum, quæ peremptoriē notent doctrinam pravam sive generatim pro gradu pravitatis qualicumque sive etiam expresse, in globo vel singillatim, infra hæresim proindeque feriant errores solum indirecte revelationi repugnantes, exempla non pauca reperiuntur.

[899] Ita jam *Joannes XXII* errores fraticellorum complures partim hæreticos, partim insanos, partim fabulosos cognitos generali formula damnavit (*D 418*), idemque articulos aliquot *Ekardi* censuris notæ hæresis minoribus confixit (*D post 455*); *Urbanus V* conclusionem unam alteramque *Dionysii Soulechat* gradatim falsam, erroneam, hæreticam declaravit (*D 468. 469*); *Gregorius XI* propositiones *Raymundi Lulli* ex parte ut erroneos reprobavit (*D ante 474*); *Martinus V*, postulans explicite assensum firmum cum concilio Constantiensi, diversis censuris in globo articulos *Joannis Wicleff* et *Joannis Hus* affecit (*D 555*); *Innocentius VIII* propositionem *Joannis Pici Mirandulani* pro erronea et hæresim sapiente habuit (*D 620*); in globo censuris variis rejecit *Leo X* errores Lutheri (*H 9, 1891 ss*), *Pius V*, *Gregorius XIII*, *Urbanus VIII* sententias *Baji* (*D 959*); *Pius V* simpliciter quædam cambia condemnavit (*D 960. 961*), *Clemens VIII* propositionem aliquam minoribus censuris perculit (*D 962*); item *Innocentius X* *Alexander VII*, *Clemens XI* censuris etiam inferioribus repudiarunt propositionem 1. 4. 5 *Jansenii*, cui damnationi *Alexander VII* juratum quoque sinceri animi obsequium exegit (*D 966. 969. 970*); censuras inferiores inflixit *Alexander VII* propositionibus 45 (*D post 1016*), aliis 65 *Innocentius XI* (*D post 1082*), qui et propositiones *Michaelis de Molinos* in globo censuris variis compressit (*D post 1155*); *Alexander VIII* propositionem quandam censura minore profligavit (*D 1157*), alias 31 in globo censuris differentibus prostravit (*D post 1188*), *Innocentius XII* propositiones 23 de amore purissimo in globo censuris inferioribus notavit (*D post 1215*),

either generally according to the degree of depravity of whatever kind or even expressly, collectively or individually, below heresy and therefore strike errors only indirectly repugnant to revelation.

[899] Thus already *John XXII* condemned numerous errors of the Fraticelli, some as heretical, some as insane, some as fabulous, by means of a general formula (*D 418*), and the same pope struck certain articles of *Meister Eckhart* with censures bearing the mark of lesser heresies (*D post 455*); *Urban V* declared one conclusion and another of *Dionysius Soulechat* to be gradually false, erroneous, and heretical (*D 468. 469*); *Gregory XI* rejected propositions of *Raymond Lull* in part as erroneous (*D ante 474*); *Martin V*, explicitly demanding firm assent along with the Council of Constance, afflicted with various censures en masse the articles of *John Wycliffe* and *John Hus* (*D 555*); *Innocent VIII* held a proposition of *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola* to be erroneous and savoring of heresy (*D 620*); *Leo X* rejected en masse with various censures the errors of Luther (*H 9, 1891 ss*), as did *Pius V*, *Gregory XIII*, and *Urban VIII* with the opinions of *Michel de Bay* (*D 959*); *Pius V* simply condemned certain propositions (*D 960. 961*), *Clement VIII* struck certain propositions with lesser censures (*D 962*); likewise *Innocent X*, *Alexander VII*, and *Clement XI* rejected with even inferior censures propositions 1, 4, and 5 of *Cornelius Jansen*, to whose condemnation *Alexander VII* also demanded sworn obedience of sincere mind (*D 966. 969. 970*); *Alexander VII* inflicted inferior censures on 45 propositions (*D post 1016*), *Innocent XI* on 65 others (*D post 1082*), who also suppressed the propositions of *Miguel de Molinos* en masse with various censures (*D post 1155*); *Alexander VIII* struck down a certain proposition with a lesser censure (*D 1157*), and prostrated 31 others en masse with differing censures (*D post 1188*), *Innocent XII* marked 23 propositions concerning purest love en masse with inferior censures (*D post 1215*), *Clement XI* proscribed the propositions of *Pasquier Quesnel* en masse with multiple censures (*D post 1316*),

Clemens XI propositiones *Quesnelli* in globo censuris multiplicibus proscripsit (*D post 1316*), *Benedictus XIV* praxim quandam exquirendi nomen complicitis censuris levioribus affixit (*D 1323*) similiterque propositiones 5 de duello improbavit (*D post 1347*), *Pius VI* librum *Eybelii* ut continentem propositiones censuris variis in globo designatas reppulit (*D ante 1363*), propositionibus vero plurimis pistoriensibus singulis censuras singulas non minus explorate inferiores quam propositionibus aliis censuram ipsius hæresis apposuit (*D 1364 ss*).

Thesis XXXIX.

Sola ecclesia illa, quae romana catholica nominatur, est ecclesia vera Jesu Christi.

[1451] Declaratio. Adhibendo notas ecclesiae praestitutas jam evincimus, ecclesiam Christi veram ideoque praerogativis ecclesiae per hunc tractatum vindicatis omnibus instructam esse eam, quae ex parte sua praestantiore vel capite visibili, pontifice romano, eodemque principio et centro unitatis suae romana, ex diffusionione per orbem catholica nominatur; videlicet ecclesia romana non particularis neque etiam prae particularibus aliis principalis, sed universalis hoc quidem loco intelligitur. Thesis est dogma fidei, i. e., veritas revelata satis proposita saltem ita, ut ecclesia vera sit catholica romana sensu specificativo, nempe *haec* ecclesia *successori* Petri in primatu, qui nunc est episcopus *romanus*, juncta, proinde quatenus vel quamdiu episcopus romanus est *successor* Petri in primatu ideoque nomen episcopi romani pro successore Petri supponitur; non autem thesis est dogma fidei ita, ut ecclesia vera sit catholica romana sensu reduplicativo, quatenus episcopo romano prae quovis alio successore Petri in primatu firmitate perpetua adhaereat; etsi enim ex sententia in se certa pontifex romanus per jus divinum immutabile revelatum successor Petri manet (th. XVI. XVII), id tamen nondum satis inter fideles vel theologos

Benedict XIV attached lighter censures to a certain practice of inquiring into the name of an accomplice (*D 1323*) and similarly disapproved 5 propositions concerning dueling (*D post 1347*), *Pius VI* rejected the book of *Joseph Valentin Eybel* as containing propositions designated en masse with various censures (*D ante 1363*), but to the very numerous propositions of Pistoia he applied individual censures to individual propositions, no less certainly inferior than to other propositions to which he affixed the censure of heresy itself (*D 1364 ss*).

Thesis XXXIX.

Only that church which is called Roman Catholic is the true church of Jesus Christ.

[1451] Declaration. By applying the marks of the church already established, we now demonstrate that the true church of Christ—and therefore one endowed with all the prerogatives of the church vindicated throughout this treatise—is that which, from its more excellent part or visible head, the Roman Pontiff, and by this same principle and center of its unity is called Roman, and from its diffusion throughout the world is called Catholic; namely, the Roman church is understood in this place not as particular, nor even as principal among other particular churches, but as universal. The thesis is a dogma of faith, that is, a revealed truth sufficiently proposed at least in such a way that the true church is Roman Catholic in a specificative sense, namely *this* church joined to the *successor* of Peter in the primacy, who is now the *Roman* bishop, and therefore insofar as or as long as the Roman bishop is the *successor* of Peter in the primacy, and accordingly the name of Roman bishop is assumed for the successor of Peter; but the thesis is not a dogma of faith in such a way that the true church is Roman Catholic in a reduplicative sense, insofar as it adheres with perpetual firmness to the Roman bishop before any other successor of Peter in the primacy; for although according to the opinion certain in itself the Roman Pontiff remains the successor of Peter by divine right immutably revealed (thesis XVI. XVII), this nevertheless does not yet sufficiently stand established among all the

omnes constat.

[1452] Demonstratio. 1. Sola ea est ecclesia vera Christi, in qua invenitur nota ecclesiae a coetibus christianis quidem falsis dinoscendae prima et per se sufficiens, i. e., communio cum successore Petri (th. XXXVIII. p. IV). Atqui hanc notam habet ecclesia romana catholica, quoniam romana nominatur pro communione sua cum pontifice romano, qui ipse est successor Petri (th. XV—XVII).

[1453] 2. Insuper notae ad unicam ecclesiam Christi discernendam necessariae et sufficientes sunt unitas, sanctitas, catholicitas, apostolicitas (th. XXXVIII. p. V. col. n. 1414. 1415. th. XXXI. XXXV. XXXVI. XXXVII). Atqui hae notae omnes coetui romano catholico inesse conspiciuntur.

Prob. min. per partes. a. Viget in coetu romano catholico, exclusis (pro th. XXXIII) hominibus unitati repugnantibus, summa unitas, videlicet unitas professionis fidei in rebus satis ad credendum propositis, unitas sacramentorum et sacrificii, unitas socialis, cum principio efficaci unitatis, posito in episcopis, maxime in uno capite visibili auctoritatis plenissimae, episcopo romano. Id liquet ex receptis a coetu illo toto symbolis, actis conciliorum, fidei professionibus, ex usitatis catechismis vel approbatis libris theologicis, ex observatis ritualibus vel precibus liturgicis, ex factis unitatem omnis modi vivam continentibus publicis et cotidianis. Quin unitatem eam in romano coetu existentem ipsi adversarii agnoscunt agnitamque pro indole alia alii admirantur, alii contemptui exponere student.

[1454] b. Floret in eodem coetu etiam post separationem graecorum atque protestantium sanctitas in charismatis vel miraculis manifestantibus posita; quae v. g. ex biographiis hominum sanctorum hujus coetus vel ex causis beatificationis et canonizationis patet. Sane omissis antiquioribus ab anno 1500 ad annum 1900 beati 542, beati et sancti vel certe

faithful or theologians.

[1452] Demonstration. 1. That alone is the true Church of Christ in which is found the mark of the Church that is primary and per se sufficient for distinguishing it from false Christian assemblies, that is, communion with the successor of Peter (thesis XXXVIII. part IV). But the Roman Catholic Church possesses this mark, since it is called Roman precisely because of its communion with the Roman Pontiff, who is himself the successor of Peter (thesis XV—XVII).

[1453] 2. Moreover, the marks necessary and sufficient for discerning the one Church of Christ are unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity (thesis XXXVIII. part V. column number 1414. 1415. thesis XXXI. XXXV. XXXVI. XXXVII). But all these marks are clearly seen to be present in the Roman Catholic community.

Minor Problem. by parts. a. There exists in the Roman Catholic assembly, excluding (according to thesis XXXIII) those persons who oppose unity, the highest unity, namely unity of profession of faith in matters sufficiently proposed for belief, unity of sacraments and sacrifice, social unity, with an efficacious principle of unity, placed in the bishops, especially in one visible head of most complete authority, the Roman bishop. This is clear from the symbols received by that entire assembly, the acts of councils, professions of faith, from the customary catechisms or approved theological books, from the observed rituals or liturgical prayers, from public and daily deeds containing living unity of every kind. Indeed, even adversaries themselves acknowledge this unity existing in the Roman assembly, and having acknowledged it, some admire it according to their different dispositions, while others strive to expose it to contempt.

[1454] b. Holiness also flourishes in this same body even after the separation of the Greeks and Protestants, a holiness manifested in charisms or miracles; this is evident, for example, from the biographies of holy men of this body or from the causes of beatification and canonization. Indeed, omitting the more ancient ones, from the year 1500 to the year 1900, 542 blessed, and 113 blessed and

sancti 113 declarati in ecclesia romana catholica numerantur; atqui sententiae tales miracula a Deo per servos suos edita supponunt, ex tempore Urbani VIII beatificationes singulae formales quidem miracula saltem duo, canonizationes singulae miracula nova duo, ad invocationem vel intercessionem sive singulorum sive aliquando plurium amicorum Dei nexu individuo junctorum perpetrata; quae non agnoscuntur vera, nisi facta ex testimoniis aptissimis plane certa et iudicio peritorum, ut medicorum opportune consultorum, actionibus naturae manifesto superiora sunt; eademque referri ad ecclesiam divinitus approbandam inde liquet, quod, cum populus supplex miracula facienda pro sanctitate fidei famulorum Dei per ecclesiam acceptae et vitae ad fidei regulam compositae deponat et ecclesia, ut in canonizatione, miracula sic facta pro exaltatione fidei catholicae ideoque confirmatione missionis suae divinae ad homines salutariter docendos et regendos vel pro executione praedictionis a Domino sibi datae habeat, nihilominus illiusmodi miracula iterum iterumque continuatione morali, qualis sola congruit notioni miraculi, fieri non desinunt; quin etiam per se vel seposita diserta provocatione eventus miraculorum tam continuus communionem romanam prae aliis ecclesiam divinitus dilectam unicam ostendit. Ipsa quoque ecclesiae pontifici romano adhaerentis propagatio et catholicitas perpetua in tanta unitate credendi et agendi, consideratis omnibus adjunctis, adjumentis naturaliter non sufficientibus, impedimentis magnis ab inimicis omnis generis, ut falsa scientia, mala cupiditate, impia potentia oppositis, instar miraculi perennis esse intellegitur (cf. n. 1378). Ad haec ibi floret hodieque sanctitas membrorum per virtutum actus varios aspectabiles eaque non tantummodo communis in hominibus innumerabilibus servantibus mandata Dei vel mox de peccato poenitentiam agentibus, sed etiam in permultis eximia, immo pro altitudine quidem rei in, non

saints or certainly saints are numbered as having been declared in the Roman Catholic Church; yet such judgments presuppose miracles produced by God through his servants, and from the time of Urban VIII individual formal beatifications require at least two miracles, individual canonizations require two new miracles, performed through the invocation or intercession of either individuals or sometimes several friends of God joined by an individual bond; these are not acknowledged as true unless they are made completely certain from the most suitable testimonies and, by the judgment of experts, such as physicians appropriately consulted, are manifestly superior to the actions of nature; and it is clear that these same miracles are to be referred to the Church as divinely approved, because, while the suppliant people request that miracles be performed for the sanctity of the servants of God accepted by the Church through faith and of life composed according to the rule of faith, and the Church holds such miracles as made for the exaltation of the Catholic faith and therefore for the confirmation of its divine mission to teach and govern men for their salvation or for the execution of the prediction given to it by the Lord, as in canonization, nevertheless miracles of this kind do not cease to be made again and again with that moral continuity which alone befits the notion of miracle; indeed, even by themselves or setting aside explicit provocation, such a continuous sequence of miraculous events shows the Roman communion above others to be the unique Church divinely beloved. The very propagation and perpetual catholicity of the Church adhering to the Roman pontiff in such great unity of believing and acting, considering all the circumstances, with naturally insufficient aids, with great impediments from enemies of every kind, such as false science, evil cupidity, impious power opposed to it, is understood to be like a perennial miracle (cf. n. 1378). In addition to these things, there flourishes there even today the holiness of members through various observable acts of virtue, and this not only common holiness in innumerable men observing the commandments of God or soon doing penance for sin, but also extraordinary holiness in very many,

paucis heroica; quae sanctitas eximia vel heroica, eliciens laudes summas ex ore ipsorum acatholicorum, apparet in tot hominibus consilia evangelica etiam vi voti perpetuo sequentibus, apparet in tot fidelibus vitam suam cognitioni, amori, servitio Dei apud se curando vel apud alios dilatando impendentibus, apparet in tot operibus misericordiae spiritualis et temporalis exercitatae erga infideles, barbaros, pueros, orphanos, senes, lapsos, **aegrotos**, peregrinos, captivos, pauperes, miseros vivos omnes, animas et corpora defunctorum, apparet in sodalitatibus domibusve propriis fine eo pio per orbem totum conditis tamquam monumentis beneficae et industriae caritatis, apparet in ipsis heroibus sanctitatis christianae ab ecclesia fecunda matre et intemerata Christi sponsa usque semper progenitis, siquidem beati vel sancti memorati illi ordinis multiplicis, quorum sanctimonia accuratissime examinata heroico vel martyrio vel virtutum exercitio inclaruit, etiam his ultimis saeculis exstiterunt; quibus alii ab ecclesia adhuc examinandi sive martyres sive confessores serie longa adiunguntur. Nec mirum; enimvero praecepta fidei, leges morum, sacra, caerimoniae, preces, instituta coetus romani, etiam in se spectata, per sanctitatem suam in veritate (cf. *Jo* 17, 17. 19) vel efficacitatem reddendi obsequentes sanctos rationi ipsi se commendant, certe, si qua sunt supra caput, sanctitati refragari nunquam demonstrantur. Neque ecclesiae hostes sanctitatem talem infitari possunt nisi testificationi probatae fidem contra principia historicis communia denegando, vim suam satis evidentem factis detrectando, doctrinam vel disciplinam ecclesiae per ignorantiam vel calumniam distorquendo. — Videas *Benedicti XIV* de serv. Dei beatif. et canon., ut l. I. c. 13. n. 3. 5. 8—10; c. 19. n. 17; c. 20—22; 25—27; 30; 32; 33; Card. Steinhuber dissert. in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1905. I. 1 ss; *acta sanctorum* bollandiana; *Germanus, Reformatorenbilder*, Votr. I. 4—8; *Hammerstein, Erinnerungen eines*

indeed heroic holiness in not a few, considering the sublimity of the matter; this extraordinary or heroic holiness, eliciting the highest praise from the mouth of non-Catholics themselves, appears in so many men perpetually following the evangelical counsels even by force of vow, appears in so many faithful spending their life in attending to the knowledge, love, and service of God in themselves or in spreading it among others, appears in so many works of spiritual and temporal mercy exercised toward infidels, barbarians, children, orphans, the elderly, the fallen, **the sick**, pilgrims, captives, the poor, all the living wretched, and the souls and bodies of the dead, appears in sodalities or proper houses founded throughout the whole world with that pious purpose as monuments of beneficent and industrious charity, appears in the very heroes of Christian sanctity always continually brought forth by the Church as fruitful mother and spotless bride of Christ, since those blessed or saints mentioned of manifold rank, whose sanctity most carefully examined became renowned through heroic martyrdom or exercise of virtues, existed even in these latest centuries; to these others are joined in a long series, whether martyrs or confessors, still to be examined by the Church. Nor is this surprising; for indeed the precepts of faith, laws of morals, sacred rites, ceremonies, prayers, institutions of the Roman body, even considered in themselves, through their holiness in truth (cf. *Jn* 17, 17. 19) or effectiveness in rendering the obedient holy, commend themselves to reason itself, certainly, if any are above comprehension, they are never shown to be contrary to holiness. Nor can the enemies of the Church deny such holiness except by denying faith to proven testimony contrary to principles common to historians, by deprecating its sufficiently evident force from facts, by distorting the doctrine or discipline of the Church through ignorance or calumny. — See *Benedict XIV* on the beatification and canonization of servants of God, as l. I. c. 13. n. 3. 5. 8—10; c. 19. n. 17; c. 20—22; 25—27; 30; 32; 33; Cardinal Steinhuber dissertation in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1905. I. 1 ff; *acta sanctorum* Bollandiana; *Germanus, Reformatorenbilder*, Votr. I. 4—8; *Hammerstein, Erinnerungen eines alten*

alten Lutheraners, fere c. 15. et 16; *Das katholische Ordenswesen*, ut c. 12; *Heimbucher*, Die Orde und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche^[^1]; *Braunsberger*, Rückblick auf das katholische Ordenswesen im 19. Jahrhundert; *Marshall*, Die christlichen Missionen, ihre Sendboten, ihre Methode und ihre Erfolge, ut c. 2, 1; 3, 1; 9 10; magna ex parte v. *Ruville*, Zurück zur heiligen Kirche; *Die katholischen Missionen*, imprimis 1873, 26. 27. 79. 115 ss; 1874, 113 ss. 137 ss. 152 ss. 169 ss. 205 ss. 255 ss; 1875, 19 ss. 106. 127 s. 159 ss. 177 ss. 191; 1877, 13 ss; 1878, 6 ss. 45 ss; 1879, 230 ss; 1880, 13 ss. 128 ss. 172 s. 249 s; 1881, 171(1). 241 ss; 1882, 172 s; 1883, 157 ss. 214 s; 1884, 57 ss. 145 ss. 164 ss. 181 ss. 210 ss; 1885, 38. 104 ss. 151. 153; 1886, 135 s. 155 s. 175 s; 1887, 86 ss. 131 s; 1888, 69 ss. 98 ss. 123 s. 137 ss; 1890, 51 ss; 1892, 80 s. 147 ss. 210 s; 1893, 157 ss. 181 ss; 1894, 91 ss. 178 ss; 1895, 70 s. 83 ss; 1896, 1 ss. 266 ss; 1897, 245 ss; 1899, 182 s; 1900, 38. 210. 237 ss. 267. 271 ss; 1901, 6 ss. 38. 82 ss. 142 ss. 204 ss. 237 ss; 1902, 148 ss; 1903, 113. 215 s^[^2]; 1905, 64 ss. 146 ss. 158 s. 175 ss; 1907, 19; 1909, 66. 217 ss. 211 ss. 255 ss. 270 ss; 1910, 65 s. 70; 1911, 83. 109 ss. 178 199 s. 205. 214. 216. 234; praeterea **legesis** 1873, 69 s; 1874, 193 ss; 1875, 17 ss. 175 s; 1876, 128 ss. 150 s. 157 ss; 1877, 63 s; 1879, 86 ss; 1884, 94 ss. 137 ss; 1885, 18 s. 211. 257. 262; 1886, 40 s. 124 ss. 155; 1888, 87 s; 1889, 171 ss; 1890, 244; 1891, 67. 238; 1892, 60. 102 s. 172 ss; 1893, 83 ss. 261 s. 266; 1894, 117 s. 283; 1895, 216. 234; 1897, 140. 218; 1900, 130 ss; 1901, 42 s; 1902, 223 ss. 247 ss; 1903, 1 ss. 30 ss. 57 ss. 103 ss. 193 ss. 222 ss. 246 ss. 270 ss; 1906, 187 ss; 1907, 166; 1908, 8 ss. 118 s. 133. 191; 1909, 11 ss. 50. 60 ss. 118. 136. 223 s; 1910, 20. 35. 40 s. 203. 223. 254; 1911, 175. 298 s. 309; *Katholische Kirchenzeitung*, 10. jul. 1906^[^3]; his addatur *Vaterland* (18. jun. 1909. n. 272), quatenus refert laudes, quibus homines protestantes ordines religiosos catholicos prae aliis nominatim

Lutheraners, nearly c. 15. and 16; *Das katholische Ordenswesen*, as c. 12; *Heimbucher*, Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche^[^1]; *Braunsberger*, Rückblick auf das katholische Ordenswesen im 19. Jahrhundert; *Marshall*, Die christlichen Missionen, ihre Sendboten, ihre Methode und ihre Erfolge, as c. 2, 1; 3, 1; 9 10; for the most part see *Ruville*, Zurück zur heiligen Kirche; *Die katholischen Missionen*, especially 1873, 26. 27. 79. 115 ff; 1874, 113 ff. 137 ff. 152 ff. 169 ff. 205 ff. 255 ff; 1875, 19 ff. 106. 127 f. 159 ff. 177 ff. 191; 1877, 13 ff; 1878, 6 ff. 45 ff; 1879, 230 ff; 1880, 13 ff. 128 ff. 172 f. 249 f; 1881, 171(1). 241 ff; 1882, 172 f; 1883, 157 ff. 214 f; 1884, 57 ff. 145 ff. 164 ff. 181 ff. 210 ff; 1885, 38. 104 ff. 151. 153; 1886, 135 f. 155 f. 175 f; 1887, 86 ff. 131 f; 1888, 69 ff. 98 ff. 123 f. 137 ff; 1890, 51 ff; 1892, 80 f. 147 ff. 210 f; 1893, 157 ff. 181 ff; 1894, 91 ff. 178 ff; 1895, 70 f. 83 ff; 1896, 1 ff. 266 ff; 1897, 245 ff; 1899, 182 f; 1900, 38. 210. 237 ff. 267. 271 ff; 1901, 6 ff. 38. 82 ff. 142 ff. 204 ff. 237 ff; 1902, 148 ff; 1903, 113. 215 f^[^2]; 1905, 64 ff. 146 ff. 158 f. 175 ff; 1907, 19; 1909, 66. 217 ff. 211 ff. 255 ff. 270 ff; 1910, 65 f. 70; 1911, 83. 109 ff. 178 199 f. 205. 214. 216. 234; moreover **the law** 1873, 69 f; 1874, 193 ff; 1875, 17 ff. 175 f; 1876, 128 ff. 150 f. 157 ff; 1877, 63 f; 1879, 86 ff; 1884, 94 ff. 137 ff; 1885, 18 f. 211. 257. 262; 1886, 40 f. 124 ff. 155; 1888, 87 f; 1889, 171 ff; 1890, 244; 1891, 67. 238; 1892, 60. 102 f. 172 ff; 1893, 83 ff. 261 f. 266; 1894, 117 f. 283; 1895, 216. 234; 1897, 140. 218; 1900, 130 ff; 1901, 42 f; 1902, 223 ff. 247 ff; 1903, 1 ff. 30 ff. 57 ff. 103 ff. 193 ff. 222 ff. 246 ff. 270 ff; 1906, 187 ff; 1907, 166; 1908, 8 ff. 118 f. 133. 191; 1909, 11 ff. 50. 60 ff. 118. 136. 223 f; 1910, 20. 35. 40 f. 203. 223. 254; 1911, 175. 298 f. 309; *Katholische Kirchenzeitung*, 10. jul. 1906^[^3]; to these should be added *Vaterland* (18. jun. 1909. n. 272), insofar as it reports the praises with which Protestant men extol Catholic religious orders above others, specifically for the works of mercy that flow from their faith and vows.

ob opera misericordiae ex fide et votis suis prodeuntia extollunt.

[1455] c. Catholicitas ecclesiae romanae luce propria nec cuiquam diffitenda splendet. Nam sicut hodie quoque prae coetibus dissidentibus sola et a suis et ab adversariis vel invitis simpliciter catholica appellatur, ita vere est, catholicitate primum absoluta, quod illa moraliter per totum orbem cum magna et conspicua membrorum multitudine est diffusa; etenim ea una incolarum Europae prope partem dimidiam, h. e., supra 177,000,000, item dimidiam partem Americae, h. e., supra 71,000,000 tenet, per regna Asiae habens sectatores alibi plures, alibi pauciores, in summa saltem 11,500,000, per Africam totam habens hominum circiter 3,000,000, in Australia et Oceania amplius 1,000,000 notabiliter propagata cernitur (vide *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1903. 2, 16 ss. 187 ss). Tum autem ecclesia romana adeo ubique gentium dilatata est catholica catholicitate hominum ipsorum etiam relativa; quamvis enim sit difficile numeros prorsus accuratos indicare proindeque forte alios alii perhibeant, constat tamen multitudine catholicorum sectas omnes differentes, quae ecclesiae Christi nomen sibi tribuant, longe superari saltem singulas; quippe relationem mutuam satis recte exprimit supputatio diligentissima, qua (l. c.) initio hujus saeculi numerantur homines in coetu romano 264,505,922 vel plures, cum protestantes inter se tantopere diversi fere 166,627,109, graeci, qui schismatici dicuntur, simul sumpti 111,320,643, socii sectarum ceterarum orientis 6,554,913, janseniani 8754 censeantur esse. Sed et in unum computatos, quamquam non sunt unum, reliquos omnes, qui se christianos vocant, per abundantiam vincit facile ecclesia romana; videlicet simul atque ea aliunde vel ex ipsa catholicitate hominum et regionum sufficiente est agnita ecclesia una vera, oportet ei adscribere membra alia plurima, h. e., infantes ubicumque valide baptizatos, siquidem hi per vim baptismi a Christo constitutam, cui ipsi

[1455] c. The catholicity of the Roman Church shines forth with its own light and cannot be denied by anyone. For just as today it is simply called Catholic by both its own members and by adversaries (even unwillingly) in distinction from dissenting assemblies, so it truly is Catholic, first by absolute catholicity, because it is morally diffused throughout the entire world with a great and conspicuous multitude of members; indeed, it alone holds nearly half the inhabitants of Europe, that is, over 177,000,000, likewise half of America, that is, over 71,000,000, having throughout the kingdoms of Asia followers more numerous in some places, fewer in others, totaling at least 11,500,000, throughout all of Africa having about 3,000,000 people, and in Australia and Oceania more than 1,000,000, and is seen to be notably propagated (see *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1903. 2, 16 ff. 187 ff). Moreover, the Roman Church, being so widely spread among all nations, is Catholic by the relative catholicity of the people themselves; for although it is difficult to give entirely accurate numbers and therefore perhaps some may report different figures, it is nevertheless established that the multitude of Catholics far surpasses all the different sects that attribute to themselves the name of Christ's Church, at least individually; indeed, a most diligent calculation expresses the mutual relationship quite correctly, by which (l. c.) at the beginning of this century there are counted in the Roman assembly 264,505,922 or more people, while Protestants so greatly diverse among themselves number nearly 166,627,109, the Greeks, who are called schismatics, taken together 111,320,643, associates of other Eastern sects 6,554,913, and Jansenists are reckoned to be 8,754. But even computing all the rest who call themselves Christians as one (though they are not one), the Roman Church easily surpasses them by abundance; evidently, as soon as it is recognized from elsewhere or from this very sufficient catholicity of people and regions as the one true Church, it is necessary to ascribe to it many other members, that is, infants validly baptized anywhere, since these are inserted into Christ's Church through the power of baptism

obicem interponere nequeunt, ecclesiae Christi inseruntur (cf. n. 1308). Immo etsi catholicitas relativa quidem est per se et primo nota distinguens ecclesiam a coetu quovis perperam christianum se ferente (cf. n. 1346), nihilo setius ecclesia romana catholica jam inter religiones quaslibet in numero hominum non minus quam nationum eminet, quia habitatorum terrae supra 1.536,000,000 exstantium judicantur praeter catholicos ceterosque christianos qualescumque indicatos confuciani cum cultoribus majorum 235,000,000, brahmani vel hinduistae 210,100,000, mohammedani 202,048,240, cultores fetischorum cum similibus 144,700,000, buddhistae 120,250,000, taoistae 32,000,000, schintoistae 17,000,000, asseclae cultuum veterum Indiae 12,113,756, judaei 11,036,607, alii 2,844,482 (*Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* l. c.). Consimilis principatus confessionis catholicae apparet per calculum, quem ex recenti americano *Blue Book of Mission* tradit *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* (6. jun. 1905), unde hominum 1.563,446,000 nunc vivorum sunt catholici 272,638,500, protestantes 166,066,500, graeci, nempe separati 120,157,000, confuciani et taoistae 231,816,000, mohammedani 216,630,000, hinduistae 209,659,000, animistae, cultores fetischorum similesve 157,069,500, buddhistae 137,935,000, schintoistae 24,900,000, judaei 11,222,000, alii 15,352,500. Ut refert *Vaterland* (20. jan. 1911. n. 32), catholici jam sunt fere 286,000,000. Insuper vero ecclesia romana quemadmodum a primordio et deinceps memor mandati Domini praedicando evangelium infidelibus barbarisque crevit, sic etiamnum gentiles convertendo et apostolicos praefectos, vicarios, episcopos novos constituendo tum detrimentum alibi fortasse captum sarcit tum progressus laetos facit in dies singulos locis omnibus perviis et quidem hominibus quantumvis perditis Deo benedicente tam penitus mutatis, ut existant inde paulatim etiam digni ministri sacri vel homines utriusque sexus alii modo peculiari Domino devoti,

established by Christ, to which they themselves cannot interpose an obstacle (cf. n. 1308). Indeed, even though relative catholicity is per se and primarily the distinguishing mark of the Church from any assembly falsely presenting itself as Christian (cf. n. 1346), nonetheless the Roman Catholic Church already stands out among any religions in the number of people no less than nations, because of the earth's inhabitants, existing over 1,536,000,000, there are judged to be, besides Catholics and other Christians of whatever kind indicated: Confucians with ancestor worshippers 235,000,000, Brahmans or Hindus 210,100,000, Mohammedans 202,048,240, fetish worshippers with similar 144,700,000, Buddhists 120,250,000, Taoists 32,000,000, Shintoists 17,000,000, followers of ancient Indian cults 12,113,756, Jews 11,036,607, others 2,844,482 (*Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* l. c.). A similar primacy of the Catholic confession appears through the calculation which the *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* (6 Jun. 1905) transmits from the recent American *Blue Book of Mission*, whence of 1,563,446,000 people now living there are Catholics 272,638,500, Protestants 166,066,500, Greeks, namely the separated 120,157,000, Confucians and Taoists 231,816,000, Mohammedans 216,630,000, Hindus 209,659,000, animists, fetish worshippers and similar 157,069,500, Buddhists 137,935,000, Shintoists 24,900,000, Jews 11,222,000, others 15,352,500. As *Vaterland* reports (20 Jan. 1911. n. 32), Catholics are already nearly 286,000,000. Furthermore, just as the Roman Church grew from the beginning and thereafter, mindful of the Lord's command by preaching the gospel to infidels and barbarians, so even now by converting gentiles and constituting new apostolic prefects, vicars, and bishops, it both repairs damage perhaps suffered elsewhere and makes joyful progress in individual days in all accessible places, and indeed with people however lost, by God's blessing so thoroughly changed that there gradually arise from them even worthy ministers of the sacred or other people of both sexes devoted to the Lord in a special way, and so that many, where there is a choice to be made, do not hesitate in the least to undergo the loss of external goods, dire torments, and death for faith and

et ut multi, ubi eligendum est, pro fide et sanctitate directionem bonorum externorum, cruciatus diros, mortem subire minime dubitent. — Visatur Marshall ib. c. 1; 2, 1; 3, 1; 4-10; Hammerstein, *Erinnerungen eines alten Lutheraners*, c. 15. n. 7; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1905. I, 140s; *Die katholischen Missionen* passim, ut praeter locos complures (n. 1454) citatos 1873, 25 ss. 49 ss. 78 ss; 1876, 104 ss; 1877, 126 ss; 1882, 106 s; 1885, 83 ss; 1886, 170 s. 242 ss; 1887, 108 ss; 1888, 175 ss. 224; 1889, 40 ss. 255 s; 1890, 173 s; 1891, 47 s; 1893, 25 ss. 108 ss; 1894, 49 ss. 94 s. 239; 1895, 244; 1898, 162 s. 177 ss. 199 ss. 220 ss. 239 s; 1900, 89; 1901, 31. 38 ss. 47 s. 51. 73 ss. 98 ss. 275 ss; 1902, 211 s. 270 ss; 1904, 1 ss. 25 ss; 1906, 38. 65 s. 194. 220. 280; 1907, 10 ss. 20. 86. 90. 121 ss. 145 ss. 151. 179. 183 s. 207 s. 228 ss. 279; 1908, 33 s. 47. 58 ss. 67 ss. 91 s. 108 s. 124 ss. 134 ss. 152 s. 181 s. 193 ss. 202 ss. 220 ss. 230 s. 244 ss. 267 ss; 1909, 64 ss. 88. 99 s. 123. 160 s. 185 ss. 206. 232. 260. 278 s. 281 s; 1910, 6 s. 21. 63. 89 s. 92 s. 117 s. 125 s. 151. 172 ss. 214 s. 235 ss. 250. 255. 268 ss. 274 ss. 299 s; 1911, 22. 29 ss. 45 s. 75 s. 93 s. 154. 193 ss. 206. 217. 260. 265 ss. 276 s. 281 ss. 285. 304 s. 307; Werner, *Katholischer Missions-Atlas*; *Katholischer Kirchen-Atlas*; *Orbis terrarum catholicus*; K. Streit, *Katholischer Missionsatlas*; *Statistische Notizen zum katholischen Missionsatlas*; Krose, *Katholische Missionsstatistik*; Huonder, *Der einheimische Klerus in den Heidenländern*; Leo-Gesellschaft, *Die katholische Kirche unserer Zeit und ihre Diener in Wort und Bild*, praesertim Bd 3; *La Gerarchia cattolica* quotannis Romae edi solita.

[1456] d. Indubia denique est coetus romani apostolicitas. Ad 1456 quam profecto non requiritur, ut ecclesiae particulares omnes ejus coetus sint immediate apostolicae, i. e., ut unus ex apostolis, paucis illis, vel vir ab apostolis ipsis ordinatus in omnibus et singulis tot

holiness. — See Marshall ib. c. 1; 2, 1; 3, 1; 4-10; Hammerstein, *Erinnerungen eines alten Lutheraners*, c. 15. n. 7; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1905. I, 140f; *Die katholischen Missionen* passim, as besides many places (n. 1454) cited 1873, 25 ff. 49 ff. 78 ff; 1876, 104 ff; 1877, 126 ff; 1882, 106 f; 1885, 83 ff; 1886, 170 f. 242 ff; 1887, 108 ff; 1888, 175 ff. 224; 1889, 40 ff. 255 f; 1890, 173 f; 1891, 47 f; 1893, 25 ff. 108 ff; 1894, 49 ff. 94 f. 239; 1895, 244; 1898, 162 f. 177 ff. 199 ff. 220 ff. 239 f; 1900, 89; 1901, 31. 38 ff. 47 f. 51. 73 ff. 98 ff. 275 ff; 1902, 211 f. 270 ff; 1904, 1 ff. 25 ff; 1906, 38. 65 f. 194. 220. 280; 1907, 10 ff. 20. 86. 90. 121 ff. 145 ff. 151. 179. 183 f. 207 f. 228 ff. 279; 1908, 33 f. 47. 58 ff. 67 ff. 91 f. 108 f. 124 ff. 134 ff. 152 f. 181 f. 193 ff. 202 ff. 220 ff. 230 f. 244 ff. 267 ff; 1909, 64 ff. 88. 99 f. 123. 160 f. 185 ff. 206. 232. 260. 278 f. 281 f; 1910, 6 f. 21. 63. 89 f. 92 f. 117 f. 125 f. 151. 172 ff. 214 f. 235 ff. 250. 255. 268 ff. 274 ff. 299 f; 1911, 22. 29 ff. 45 f. 75 f. 93 f. 154. 193 ff. 206. 217. 260. 265 ff. 276 f. 281 ff. 285. 304 f. 307; Werner, *Katholischer Missions-Atlas*; *Katholischer Kirchen-Atlas*; *Orbis terrarum catholicus*; K. Streit, *Katholischer Missionsatlas*; *Statistische Notizen zum katholischen Missionsatlas*; Krose, *Katholische Missionsstatistik*; Huonder, *Der einheimische Klerus in den Heidenländern*; Leo-Gesellschaft, *Die katholische Kirche unserer Zeit und ihre Diener in Wort und Bild*, especially Bd 3; *La Gerarchia cattolica* customarily published annually in Rome.

[1456] d. The apostolicity of the Roman assembly is undoubtedly certain. For this apostolicity, it is certainly not required that all the particular churches of this assembly be immediately apostolic, that is, that one of the apostles—those few—or a man ordained by the apostles themselves should have been the first to occupy each and every one of so

sedibus episcopalibus olim conditis vel procedente tempore condendis ecclesiarum particularium primus sederit (cf. n. 436); verum plane sufficit, si est ecclesiae totius sedes aliqua ab apostolo fundata et serie nunquam interrupta ab episcopis apostolo succedentibus occupata, cui tamquam principi vel matri omnium stabili sedes ejusdem coetus ceterae cum ecclesiis suis particularibus tamquam subditae vel filiae adhaereant (cf. verba *Tertulliani* n. 1211, *Optati* n. 487. 1440, *Leonis M.* n. 771, *Pelagii I* n. 1394). Atqui talem pro sedibus ecclesiarum particularium coetus romani reliquis aperte se ostendit sedes urbis Romae; quae ex sedibus immediate apostolicis continuo perseverans sive una sive clarior, ut eminens ab initio omnibus cognita et apostolica per excellentiam usque agnita apparet; quo spectant dicta *Irenaei* (n. 489. col. 984 ss), *Tertulliani* (de pudic. c. 21; *M* 2, 1025, col. c. 1, supra n. 498), *Cypriani* (n. 488), *Firmiliani* (n. 68), auctoris tractatus *adversus aleatores* (n. 488. col. 1392), concilii sardicensis (n. 493. col. 738), *Athanasii* (hist. *arian.* n. 35; *M* 25, 734), *Basilii M.* (n. 990), *Damasi I* (ep. 7. ad episcopos orientis; *M* 13, 379 s), *Optati* (n. 236. 487. 1440), *Gregorii naz.* (n. 987), *Epiphani* (n. 528), *Prudentii* (ib.), *Chrysostomi* (n. 164. col. 500. 515), concilii carthag. (ad *Innoc.* I ep. 175. al. 90 inter *Augustin.* n. 2—4; *M* 33, 760 s), *Innocentii I* (n. 487. 990), *Pelagii* haeresiarchae (n. 994), *Paulini* diaconi (adv. *Coelestium* n. 1—4; *M* 20, 711 ss), *Zosimi* (n. 487. 728), *Hieronymi* (cont. *Vigilantium* c. 2; *M* 23, 341), *Bonifatii I* (n. 487. 728. 759), *Augustini* (n. 502. 987. 992. 1365, cont. ep. fund. 1427), concilii ephesini (n. 71. 493. 816), *Coelestini I* (n. 487. 507. 727. 816), inscriptionis antiquae de eodem (apud Grisar, *Geschichte Roms* 1, n. 260), *Vincentii I* (n. 1058), *Petri Chrysologi* (n. 486), *Flaviani* (n. 501, lib. appell.), *Eusebii doryl.* (ib.), *Theodoret* (n. 184. 501), concilii chalced. (n. 71. 493. 730), *Leonis M.* (n. 147. 164. 475. 486. 502. 553. 771).

many episcopal sees, whether founded in ancient times or to be founded in subsequent ages of particular churches (cf. n. 436); but it is entirely sufficient if there is some see of the whole Church founded by an apostle and occupied by a never-interrupted succession of bishops succeeding the apostle, to which, as to a prince or mother of all, the other established sees of the same assembly with their particular churches should adhere as subjects or daughters (cf. the words of *Tertullian* n. 1211, *Optatus* n. 487. 1440, *Leo the Great* n. 771, *Pelagius I* n. 1394). But such a see among the sees of the particular churches of the Roman assembly, superior to the rest, is clearly shown to be the see of the city of Rome; which, persevering continuously among the immediately apostolic sees, whether alone or more illustriously, appears as eminent from the beginning, known to all and acknowledged as apostolic par excellence; to which point refer the statements of *Irenaeus* (n. 489. col. 984 ff), *Tertullian* (de pudic. c. 21; *M* 2, 1025, col. c. 1, supra n. 498), *Cyprian* (n. 488), *Firmilian* (n. 68), the author of the treatise *against gamblers* (n. 488. col. 1392), the council of Sardica (n. 493. col. 738), *Athanasius* (hist. *arian.* n. 35; *M* 25, 734), *Basil the Great* (n. 990), *Damasus I* (ep. 7. to the bishops of the East; *M* 13, 379 f), *Optatus* (n. 236. 487. 1440), *Gregory Nazianzen* (n. 987), *Epiphanius* (n. 528), *Prudentius* (ib.), *Chrysostom* (n. 164. col. 500. 515), the council of Carthage (to *Innocent I* ep. 175. al. 90 among *Augustine* n. 2—4; *M* 33, 760 f), *Innocent I* (n. 487. 990), *Pelagius* the heresiarch (n. 994), *Paulinus* the deacon (adv. *Coelestius* n. 1—4; *M* 20, 711 ff), *Zosimus* (n. 487. 728), *Jerome* (cont. *Vigilantius* c. 2; *M* 23, 341), *Boniface I* (n. 487. 728. 759), *Augustine* (n. 502. 987. 992. 1365, cont. ep. fund. 1427), the council of Ephesus (n. 71. 493. 816), *Celestine I* (n. 487. 507. 727. 816), an ancient inscription concerning the same (in Grisar, *Geschichte Roms* 1, n. 260), *Vincent of Lérins* (n. 1058), *Peter Chrysologus* (n. 486), *Flavian* (n. 501, lib. appell.), *Eusebius of Dorylaeum* (ib.), *Theodoret* (n. 184. 501), the council of Chalcedon (n. 71. 493. 730), *Leo the Great* (n. 147. 164. 475. 486. 502. 553. 771. 791. 817. 825. 1066), the metropolitan bishops of Arles (n. 486), *Prosper*

791. 817. 825. 1066), episcoporum metrop. arelat. (n. 486), *Prosperi* (n. 486. 992), episcoporum prov. tarracon. (n. 995), *Simplicii* (n. 485), *Felices III* testantis de Flavita (n. 763), *Gelasii I* (n. 148. 485. 502. 575. 821. 988), *Aviti* (n. 484), *Ennodii* (ib.), monachorum secundae Syriae (n. 506), *Possessoris* (ib.), *Hormisdas* cum episcopis plurimis et synodo VIII (n. 493), *Stephani lariss.* (n. 771), *Athalarici* regis (ep. ad *Joannem II*; M 66, 11 s), *Justiniani I* imperatoris (n. 506), *Fulgentii Ferrandi* (n. 989. 990), *Pelagii I* (n. 1394), *Liberati* (n. 501), *Pelagii II* (n. 148), *Joannis hieros.* (n. 996), *Gregorii M.* (n. 544. 990. 994. 1395), episcoporum prov. afric. (n. 991), *Sergii cypriensis* (n. 996), *Stephani dorensis* (ib.), *Mauri ravenatis* (n. 730), *Maximi* martyris (n. 102. 645), *Vitaliani* (n. 148), *Agathonis* (n. 983), concilii VI, constantinop. III (n. 493. 983), *Constantini Pogonati* imperatoris (n. 983), *Leonis II* (n. 826), *Beda* (n. 92), *Hadriani I* cum concilio nicaeno II (n. 493. 550), *Theodori Abucara* (apud *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1910, 422 ss), *Theodori studiae* (n. 148. 165. 483. 645. 730. 991), *Nicephori* (n. 822), *Nicolai I* (n. 989), concilii remensis (n. 772), *Leonis IX* (n. 149. 555. 989), *Gregorii VII* (n. 544), *Bernardi* (n. 149. 165), concilii later. IV (n. 494), *Innocentii III* (n. 106. 149. 166. 174), *Thomae aquinatis* (n. 166. 997), *Bonaventurae* (n. 732. 997), *Humberti* (n. 555), concilii lugdun. II (n. 494), *Bonifatii VIII* (n. 1227), *Joannis XXII* (n. 772), *Clementis VI* (n. 556), concilii florent. (n. 494), *Georgii trapez.* (n. 140), *Pii VI* (n. 729. 772), concilii vaticani (n. 438. 467), *Leonis XIII* (n. 561. 600. 1272. 1292). Unde adversarii sapientiores ipsi apostolicitatem originis et successionis saltem materialis, qualis ad rationem notae necessariae postulatur (cf. n. 1414. 1415), coetui romano catholico non abjudicant.

[1457] 3. Nimirum ecclesia ideo romana catholica nominatur, 1457 quod ei inest cathedra romana, quae est Petri. Atqui

(n. 486. 992), the bishops of the province of Tarragona (n. 995), *Simplicius* (n. 485), *Felix III* testifying concerning Flavita (n. 763), *Gelasius I* (n. 148. 485. 502. 575. 821. 988), *Avitus* (n. 484), *Ennodius* (ib.), the monks of Syria Secunda (n. 506), *Possessor* (ib.), *Hormisdas* with many bishops and the eighth synod (n. 493), *Stephen of Larissa* (n. 771), King *Athalaric* (ep. to *John II*; M 66, 11 f), Emperor *Justinian I* (n. 506), *Fulgentius Ferrandus* (n. 989. 990), *Pelagius I* (n. 1394), *Liberatus* (n. 501), *Pelagius II* (n. 148), *John of Jerusalem* (n. 996), *Gregory the Great* (n. 544. 990. 994. 1395), the bishops of the African province (n. 991), *Sergius of Cyprus* (n. 996), *Stephen of Dora* (ib.), *Maurus of Ravenna* (n. 730), *Maximus* the martyr (n. 102. 645), *Vitalian* (n. 148), *Agatho* (n. 983), the Sixth Council, Constantinople III (n. 493. 983), Emperor *Constantine Pogonatus* (n. 983), *Leo II* (n. 826), *Bede* (n. 92), *Hadrian I* with the second council of Nicaea (n. 493. 550), *Theodore Abucara* (in *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1910, 422 ff), *Theodore of Studium* (n. 148. 165. 483. 645. 730. 991), *Nicephorus* (n. 822), *Nicholas I* (n. 989), the council of Reims (n. 772), *Leo IX* (n. 149. 555. 989), *Gregory VII* (n. 544), *Bernard* (n. 149. 165), the Fourth Lateran Council (n. 494), *Innocent III* (n. 106. 149. 166. 174), *Thomas Aquinas* (n. 166. 997), *Bonaventure* (n. 732. 997), *Humbert* (n. 555), the Second Council of Lyon (n. 494), *Boniface VIII* (n. 1227), *John XXII* (n. 772), *Clement VI* (n. 556), the council of Florence (n. 494), *George of Trebizond* (n. 140), *Pius VI* (n. 729. 772), the Vatican Council (n. 438. 467), *Leo XIII* (n. 561. 600. 1272. 1292). Hence even the wiser adversaries themselves do not deny to the Roman Catholic assembly the apostolicity of origin and succession, at least material, such as is required for the notion of a necessary mark (cf. n. 1414. 1415).

[1457] 3. Indeed, the Church is called Roman Catholic precisely because it contains within itself the Roman Chair, which is Peter's. Moreover, with

cum hac nota ecclesiae Christi prima reliquae cohaerent, non solum quod ex illa tamquam sufficiente concluduntur, sed quod ex illa tamquam radice oriuntur. Enimvero per cathedram Petri romanam ecclesia est apostolica, quoniam ab illa ut plenitudine perenni potestas apostolica congruens pro usu expedito, quin et per se ipsa in rectores omnes ecclesiae derivatur (th. XXII); quare vel a sola apostolicitate cathedrae romanae indolem apostolicam ecclesiae conjunctae etiam sat diserte repetunt majores nostri, ut *Irenaeus* (n. 489. col. 984 ss), auctor tractatus *adversus aleatores* (n. 488. col. 1392), *Optatus* (n. 487. 1440), *Leo M.* (n. 771), *Pelagius I* (n. 1394), *Theodorus studita* (n. 483), *Joannes XXII* (n. 772).

Per cathedram eandem apostolicam universalem ecclesia universa una est, quia cum illa tamquam principio efficaci et centro unitatis fideles omnes undique conveniunt; quod ipsum vidimus ratum Patribus, ut *Irenaeo* (n. 489. col. 984 ss), *Cypriano* (n. 27. 68. 128 s. 488. col. 1410), *Firmiliano* (n. 68), *Optato* (n. 92. 236. 487), *Paciano* (n. 87), *Hieronymo* (n. 236), *Leoni M.* (n. 791), *Gelasio I* (n. 1218), *Pelagio I* (n. 1394), proinde *Pio VI* (n. 772), concilio vaticano (n. 438. 712. 1227), *Leoni XIII* (n. 475).

Similiter per cathedram illam ipsam apostolicam universalem ecclesia est catholica, quandoquidem antiquitus et adhuc semper ab illa rite missi fidei praecones ad gentes omnes in ecclesiam aggregandas exeunt et ad illam tamquam coetus sacri originem, radicem, parentem aggregatae gentes pro ecclesia orbis stabili formanda referuntur; quo faciunt verba *Cypriani* (n. 129. col. 1410), *Optati* (n. 487), *Innocentii I* (n. 546. 990), *Bonifatii I* (n. 487), *Augustini* (n. 1345, *de symb.*, vel n. 1365, *serm.* 46, col. n. 70), *Leonis M.* (*serm.* 82. al. 80. c. 1. 3; M 54, 422 ss; cf. n. 572), *Prosperi* (n. 486), monachorum secundae Syriae (n. 506), concilii later. IV (n. 494), *florentini* (ib.). Denique per cathedram apostolicam universalem ecclesia est sancta, quatenus

this primary mark of Christ's Church, the remaining marks cohere, not only because they are concluded from it as from a sufficient principle, but because they spring from it as from a root. For truly, through Peter's Chair the Church is apostolic, since from it, as from a perennial fullness, apostolic power fitting for ready use is derived into all the Church's rulers, and indeed through the Chair itself (thesis XXII); therefore, even from the apostolicity of the Roman Chair alone, our predecessors quite clearly derive the apostolic character of the united Church, such as *Irenaeus* (n. 489. col. 984 ff), the author of the treatise *against dice-players* (n. 488. col. 1392), *Optatus* (n. 487. 1440), *Leo the Great* (n. 771), *Pelagius I* (n. 1394), *Theodore the Studite* (n. 483), *John XXII* (n. 772).

Through that same apostolic see, the entire universal church is one, because with it as the efficient principle and center of unity, all the faithful from everywhere come together; this very thing we have seen confirmed by the Fathers, such as *Irenaeus* (n. 489. col. 984 ss), *Cyprian* (n. 27. 68. 128 s. 488. col. 1410), *Firmilian* (n. 68), *Optatus* (n. 92. 236. 487), *Pacian* (n. 87), *Jerome* (n. 236), *Leo the Great* (n. 791), *Gelasius I* (n. 1218), *Pelagius I* (n. 1394), and likewise *Pius VI* (n. 772), the Vatican Council (n. 438. 712. 1227), *Leo XIII* (n. 475).

Similarly, through that same apostolic chair the universal church is catholic, inasmuch as from ancient times and still always, preachers of the faith duly sent forth from that chair go out to all nations to be gathered into the church, and the nations thus gathered are referred back to that chair as to the origin, root, and parent of the sacred assembly, for the formation of a stable worldwide church; which is supported by the words of *Cyprian* (n. 129. col. 1410), *Optatus* (n. 487), *Innocent I* (n. 546. 990), *Boniface I* (n. 487), *Augustine* (n. 1345, *de symbolo*, or n. 1365, *sermon* 46, col. n. 70), *Leo the Great* (*sermon* 82. or 80. c. 1. 3; M 54, 422 ff; cf. n. 572), *Prosper* (n. 486), the monks of Syria Secunda (n. 506), the Fourth Lateran Council (n. 494), *the Florentine* [Council] (ibid.). Finally, through the apostolic chair the universal church is holy, insofar as both faith and other aids to salvation,

et fidem et aliam salutis opem ab illa tamquam templi fundamento incorrupte sustentatam sanctitas etiam eximia et heroica caritatis et signa miraculorum divinitus promissa consequuntur (cf. n. 1341—1343), suffragantibus *Optato* (n. 487. 1440), *Leone M.* (n. 70. 399), concilio vaticano (n. 237), ipsa experientia historica; unde haud immerito pontifex romanus titulo sanctitatis vel sanctissimi honoratur.

[1458] 4. Accedit argumentum exclusionis. Namque praeter ecclesiam romanam catholicam non sunt coetus notabiliores, qui de nomine christiano gloriantur, nisi primum protestantes, qui cumque scilicet originem a novatoribus saeculi XVI in ecclesia romana catholica reicienda trahunt; deinde sunt graeci slavive dissidentes, quos schismaticos ideo vocant, quod discessionis ratio prima potius quam haeresis fuit voluntas impatiens principatus sacri romani vel quod, quamvis ipsa dogmata aliqua catholicorum sive pro haeresibus sive pro opinionibus falsis vel meris habeant, tamen etiamnum haeresibus comparative ad protestantes paucis sunt infecti (cf. *Pelesz, Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom* 2, 786—792; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1896, 46; *Theol. prakt. Quartal-Schrift* 1909, 289 ss); postremo sunt sectae haereticae orientis, i. e., nestoriani et eutychiani vel monophysitae. Atqui, omissa nota communionis cum successore Petri pontifice romano, ex quatuor notis aliis ecclesiae Christi necessariis ne unam quidem protestantes, graeci vel slavi dissidentes, sectae haereticae orientis possidere convincuntur.

[1459] *Prob. prima pars min. a.* Protestantibus deest unitas vel fucata, siquidem eorum notissima est dissensio imprimis in fide ipsa. Sicut enim ab initio de rebus gravissimis et ex indole sua sententiam explicitam unam pro coetu religioso uno exigentibus, ut de reali praesentia Christi in eucharistia vel de hierarchia a Christo instituta, protestantes

sustained incorruptly from that chair as from the foundation of the temple, are followed by sanctity that is also exceptional and heroic charity and signs of miracles divinely promised (cf. n. 1341—1343), with the support of *Optatus* (n. 487. 1440), *Leo the Great* (n. 70. 399), the Vatican Council (n. 237), and historical experience itself; whence not undeservedly is the Roman pontiff honored with the title of sanctity or “most holy.”

[1458] 4. An argument from exclusion is added. For apart from the Roman Catholic Church, there are no groups of notable significance who glory in the Christian name, except first the Protestants, who indeed trace their origin from the innovators of the 16th century in rejecting the Roman Catholic Church; then there are the Greek or Slavic dissidents, whom they call schismatics because the primary reason for their separation was rather dissent than heresy—namely, a will impatient of the sacred Roman primacy—or because, although they may hold certain Catholic dogmas either as heresies or as false opinions or mere [human traditions], nevertheless they are still infected with comparatively few heresies in relation to the Protestants (cf. *Pelesz, Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom* 2, 786—792; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1896, 46; *Theol. prakt. Quartal-Schrift* 1909, 289 ff.); finally, there are the heretical sects of the East, that is, the Nestorians and Eutychians or Monophysites. However, setting aside the mark of communion with the successor of Peter, the Roman Pontiff, the Protestants, Greek or Slavic dissidents, and heretical sects of the East are proven to possess not even one of the four other marks necessary to the Church of Christ.

[1459] *The first part of the minor [proposition] is proved.* Protestants lack unity, or possess only a counterfeit unity, since their most notorious dissension is evident, especially in faith itself. For just as from the beginning the Protestants disagreed concerning the most serious matters which by their very nature require one explicit opinion for one religious community—such as concerning the real

dissensuerunt, ita jam dissentiunt publice de veritatibus manifestis in scriptura et traditione christiana prima traditis, de articulis pro fundamentalibus per ipsos olim habitis, de symbolo apostolico, de sanctissima Trinitate, de divinitate Christi, de iis, pro quibus novè inventis illi ab ecclesia antiqua recesserunt, vix vel ne vix quidem intacto dogmate Dei a mundo hoc distincti, in quo agnoscendo, nedum christiani, sed homines omnes sani (col. *Sap* 13; *Rom* 1, 18 ss) convenire religiose debent et conveniunt. Neque, id quod caput est, pro magisterio infallibili ecclesiae repudiato remansit protestantibus ad unitatem fidei praesertim constantem, non plane precariam, efficiendam principium idoneum; quale et a priori pro scripturae sacrae vel legentium indole et docente experientia intellegitur non esse scriptura sacra, tamquam regula fidei unica adversus auctoritatem vivam ecclesiae custodis scripturam exhibentis ab illis primo posita, de cuius jam non solum interpretatione, sed inspiratione et veracitate ipsa tenenda litigant vel deflectunt; neque magis sufficit auctoritas, quam cogente necessitate in auxilium vocaverunt, sive mere humana ducum suorum primorum, librorum symbolicorum ab hominibus doctoribus pro populo conscriptorum, potestatis regiae vel civilis, sive divina quasi postliminio inducta ecclesiae a Christo et apostolis institutae vel vane jactata ecclesiae nuperrime a Spiritu sancto restauratae. Immo in locum principii unitatis protestantes inde ab exordio substituerunt principium unitati fidei exitiale, iudicium tandem privatum hominum singulorum, scripturas scilicet ipsas sibi interpretantium; quod nominatim ii efferunt, qui meritum reformationis non tam in veris repositis quam in liberatione mentis ab auctoritate cernunt. Porro item pernota est, quae ex dissentanea fide sequitur, discordia protestantium in cultu, cum vel de baptismo, quo christiani fiunt, rite administrando inter se rixentur.

presence of Christ in the Eucharist or concerning the hierarchy instituted by Christ—so now they openly disagree concerning truths manifestly handed down in Scripture and in the primitive Christian tradition, concerning articles formerly held by themselves as fundamental, concerning the Apostolic Symbol, concerning the most Holy Trinity, concerning the divinity of Christ, concerning those matters for which these newly invented [doctrines] caused them to withdraw from the ancient Church, with scarcely, or hardly at all, the dogma of God as distinct from this world left intact—a dogma in recognizing which not only all Christians, but all sound men (cf. *Wisdom* 13; *Romans* 1:18ff) ought religiously to agree and do agree. Moreover, what is the main point, with the infallible magisterium of the Church having been rejected, no suitable principle remained for the Protestants to achieve unity of faith, especially a constant unity that would not be entirely precarious; such [a principle] is understood both a priori from the nature of Sacred Scripture and of its readers, and from instructive experience, not to be Sacred Scripture as the unique rule of faith set forth by them in the first place against the living authority of the Church as guardian exhibiting Scripture, concerning which they now dispute or waver not only about its interpretation, but about its very inspiration and veracity to be held; nor does the authority suffice which they have called upon for help under compelling necessity, whether merely human [authority] of their first leaders, of symbolic books written by learned men for the people, of royal or civil power, or [quasi-]divine authority introduced as if by postliminium of the Church instituted by Christ and the apostles, or the vainly boasted [authority] of a Church most recently restored by the Holy Spirit. Indeed, in place of the principle of unity, the Protestants from the very beginning substituted a principle destructive to the unity of faith, namely the private judgment of individual men interpreting the Scriptures for themselves; this is expressly proclaimed by those who see the merit of the reformation not so much in truths restored as in the liberation of the mind from authority. Furthermore, equally well-known is the discord of Protestants in worship that follows from

Consimiliter pervulgata est absentia unitatis socialis, quae tum ex discidio fidei et cultus memorato tum ex defectu potestatis communis vitam sociale continentis provenit. Quodsi potestas quaedam, parum consequenter, apud coetus singulares protestantium se ostendit, haec sive omnis sive suprema ne per speciem quidem exteriorem talis est, qualem Christus determinavit, i. e., episcoporum, sed ab initio ipso per homines episcopali dignitate minime insignitos vel etiam laicos usurpata deprehenditur, hodieque ministri eorumdem laici sunt et a laicis constituuntur; qui cuncti auctoritate necessaria destituti dissolutionem *lenius celeriusque* progredientem efficaciter impedire nequeunt. Unde numerantur tot communitates protestantium inter se non dependentes, videlicet primum quidem divisi in se ipsis pro diversis sive factionibus sive regnis lutherani, reformati, i. e., *zvingliani* vel *calviniani*, anglicani, evangelici, si non in confessione, saltem quomodocumque in cultu et regimine secundum civitates singulas uniti, tum baptistae, sociniani, quakeri, methodistae, irvingiani, sectae denique permultae majores minoresque, quae etiam difficile omnes cognoscuntur et item in se scissae sunt vel in partes alias, colligatas fere sola negatione matris ecclesiae catholicae, processu inevitabili continuo dilabuntur.

[1460] Itaque, quod ad unitatem attinet, merito ad protestantes applicatur illud *Irenaei* (l. 4. c. 35. n. 4; *M.* 7, 1089): „Tantae sunt de uno inter eos diversitates, ac iisdem principibus varias habentes sententias ... Cum igitur inter eos convenerit de iis quae in scripturis sunt praedicta, tunc et a nobis confutabuntur. Non enim bene sentientes, interim tamen semetipsos arguunt, de iisdem verbis non consentientes.” — Valet pariter acuta disputatio *Tertulliani* (n. 1466), quam non ineptè *anticipatam* quandam historiam protestantium appellavit. — Adeoque congruit dictum *Augustini* (serm. 4. al. de

disagreement in faith, since they quarrel among themselves even about the proper administration of baptism, by which Christians are made. Similarly widespread is the absence of social unity, which arises both from the aforementioned division of faith and worship and from the lack of common authority sustaining social life. But if some authority, rather inconsistently, shows itself among individual Protestant communities, this authority, whether general or supreme, is not even in external appearance such as Christ determined, i.e., of bishops, but is found from the very beginning to have been usurped by men by no means distinguished with episcopal dignity or even by laymen, and today their ministers are laymen and are constituted by laymen; all of whom, destitute of necessary authority, cannot effectively impede the dissolution progressing *more gently and swiftly*. Hence are numbered so many communities of Protestants not dependent upon each other, namely first indeed the Lutherans divided within themselves according to different factions or kingdoms, the Reformed, i.e., *Zwinglians* or *Calvinists*, Anglicans, Evangelicals, if not in confession, at least somehow united in worship and government according to individual cities, then Baptists, Socinians, Quakers, Methodists, Irvingians, and finally very many sects both greater and lesser, which are also difficult to recognize completely and are likewise split within themselves or into other parts, bound together almost solely by negation of the Catholic mother Church, and by an inevitable process continuously fall apart.

[1460] Therefore, as regards unity, that saying of *Irenaeus* (book 4, chapter 35, number 4; *Migne* 7, 1089) is rightly applied to the Protestants: “So great are the differences among them concerning one matter, and having various opinions with the same principles... When therefore they shall have agreed among themselves concerning those things which are predicted in the scriptures, then they will also be refuted by us. For though they do not think rightly, they nevertheless argue against themselves in the meantime, not agreeing about the same words.” — The acute disputation of *Tertullian* (number 1466) is equally valid, which someone not inappropriately called a certain *anticipated* history of the Protestants.

divers. 44. c. 31. n. 34; *M.* 38, 50): „Videte illos, fratres mei, qui se ab unitate praeciderunt, in quot frustra praecisi sunt.”

— Hinc juste conqueritur concilium *Vaticanum* (III proem.; *L.* 7, 249): „Nemo enim ignorat, haereses, quas tridentini Patres proscripserant, dum, rejecto divino ecclesiae magisterio, res ad religionem spectantes privati cujusvis iudicio permitterentur, in sectas paulatim dissolutas esse multiplices, quibus inter se dissentientibus et concertantibus, omnis tandem de Christo fides apud non paucos labefactata est. Itaque ipsa sacra biblia, quae antea christianae doctrinae unicus fons et iudex asseverabantur, jam non pro divinis haberi, imo nec pro communibus accenseri coeperunt.” — Hinc et monitio *Leonis XIII* (lit. ad principes populosque univ., 20 jun. 1894): „Caritate non minore ad populos respicimus, quos, recentiore memoria, insolita quaedam rerum temporumque conversio ab ecclesia romana sejunxit. Variis exactorum temporum causis oblivione dimissis, cogitationem supra humana omnia erigant, animoque veritatis et salutis unice *cupido*, reputent apud se constitutam Christi ecclesiam. Quaerant si verius congregationes eorum sint, et quo loco in illis religio sit aestimare, facile dabunt, se quidem multis maximisque in rebus, primordiorum oblitos, a *novo errore* varie deflexisse; neque diffitebuntur, ex quo valet patrimonio veritatis, quod novarum rerum auctores secum in secessione avexerant, nullam fere formulam fidei iam cuius auctoritas praedictam ipsos superesse. — Consulatur *Möhler*, *Symbolik* § 43 vel 44 ss; *Döllinger*, *Die Reformation* 2, 3 ss. 286 ss. 378 ss. 505 ss. 516. 700 s; *Jörg*, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in seiner neuesten Entwicklung*; *L.* 7, 595 ss; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1870. 1, 408 ss; 1871. 1, 695 ss; 1872. 1, 585 ss. 641 ss. 823 ss. 885 ss; 1877. 1, 96 ss; 1878. 1, 687 ss; 1885. 1, 595 ss; 1893. 2, 721 ss; *Kirchenlexikon*(2) 10, 480 ss; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1898, 737 ss; *Huppertz*, *Der deutsche Protestantismus zu Beginn des*

— And so the saying of *Augustine* (sermon 4, otherwise on diverse topics 44, chapter 31, number 34; *Migne* 38, 50) fits perfectly: “See them, my brothers, who have cut themselves off from unity, into how many fragments they have been cut.” — Hence the *Vatican* Council justly complains (III proem.; *Lacensis* 7, 249): “For no one is ignorant that the heresies which the Tridentine Fathers had proscribed, while the divine magisterium of the Church was rejected and matters pertaining to religion were left to the private judgment of anyone whatsoever, were gradually dissolved into multiple sects, which, disagreeing and contending among themselves, finally undermined all faith in Christ among not a few. Thus the sacred scriptures themselves, which previously were asserted to be the sole source and judge of Christian doctrine, began to be held not as divine, indeed not even to be reckoned as ordinary.” — Hence also the admonition of *Leo XIII* (letter to the princes and peoples of the world, June 20, 1894): “With no less charity do we look upon the peoples whom, in recent memory, a certain unusual revolution of affairs and times has separated from the Roman Church. Having dismissed from memory the various causes of past times, let them raise their thoughts above all human things, and with a mind *eager* solely for truth and salvation, let them consider the Church of Christ as established. If they seek whether their congregations are more truly [the Church], and in what place religion should be esteemed among them, they will easily grant that they have indeed, forgetful of their origins, variously turned aside *from new error* in many and very great matters; nor will they deny that from that patrimony of truth which the authors of new things had carried away with them in their secession, scarcely any formula of faith now survives whose authority they had predicted would remain.” — Consult *Möhler*, *Symbolik* § 43 or 44 ff.; *Döllinger*, *Die Reformation* 2, 3 ff. 286 ff. 378 ff. 505 ff. 516. 700 f.; *Jörg*, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in seiner neuesten Entwicklung*; *Lacensis* 7, 595 ff.; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1870. 1, 408 ff.; 1871. 1, 695 ff.; 1872. 1, 585 ff. 641 ff. 823 ff. 885 ff.; 1877. 1, 96 ff.; 1878. 1, 687 ff.; 1885. 1, 595 ff.; 1893. 2, 721 ff.; *Kirchenlexikon*(2) 10, 480 ff.; *Zeitschrift für kath.*

zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts nach protestantischen Zeugnissen dargestellt 1907. 7—127. 146—150; Rieder, *Zur innerkirchlichen Krisis des heutigen Protestantismus; Die katholischen Missionen* 1907, 193 ss; 1909, 35 ss; 1910, 228.

[1461] b. Sanctitate quoque sectas protestantium carere constat. Sane omissis fabulis anilibus miracula germana, signa sanctificationis qualia perpetua Lutherus ipse in ecclesia catholica agnovit (Döllinger, *Die Reformation* 3, 210), nulla fiunt in protestantibus, vel ex ipsorum fere confessione, quae veteres haereticos etiam facilius redarguebant (cf. testimonium Irenaei n. 1343); nominatim ad invocationem sanctorum in fide vel communione eadem cum protestantibus defunctorum miracula evenire eo ipso nequeunt, quod invocatio sanctorum illi non admittunt. Neque ullam hujus rei, qua qualis ecclesia Christi convincit, sanctitatis particularis non passim innotescit, occurrere apud illos sive vulgarem quandam honestatem sive facta sanctitatis etiam insigniora, pro auxiliis solitis gratiae, quae ex voluntate salutifera universali Deus etiam extra corpus ecclesiae secundum promissiones unice divinae indulgentiae, non ipsis sectis, quatenus impeditis, et pro parte subsidiorum salutis ex instituto ecclesiae adhuc retenta vel resumpta, ut exemplo Christi, praeceptis nonnullis revelatis fidei vel morum, sacramento baptismi, quod per accidens vel per ignorantiam excusantem ipsis exsortibus ecclesiae fructuosum esse potest (cf. n. 355); sed non apparet illic sanctitas eximia vel heroica ad hominum vivendi rationem totam, multitudinem, aetates sat diffusa, nedum aequae late patens atque in ecclesia romana catholica, praesertim cum observationem consiliorum evangelicorum et ascetism vel castigationem corporis proprii, et ipsam (v. g. ex *Mat* 6, 16—18; *1 Cor* 9, 27; *1 Pet* 4, 1) adeo valentem ad sanctitatem caritatis majorem assequendam et

Theol. 1898, 737 ff.; Huppertz, *Der deutsche Protestantismus zu Beginn des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts nach protestantischen Zeugnissen dargestellt* 1907. 7—127. 146—150; Rieder, *Zur innerkirchlichen Krisis des heutigen Protestantismus; Die katholischen Missionen* 1907, 193 ff.; 1909, 35 ff.; 1910, 228.

[1461] b. It is also established that Protestant sects lack sanctity. Indeed, setting aside old wives' tales, genuine miracles—those signs of sanctification which Luther himself acknowledged as perpetual in the Catholic Church (Döllinger, *Die Reformation* 3, 210)—do not occur among Protestants, or occur by their own near-confession, which also more easily refuted the ancient heretics (cf. the testimony of Irenaeus n. 1343); specifically, miracles cannot occur at the invocation of saints who died in the same faith or communion with the Protestants, precisely because they do not admit the invocation of saints. Nor does any particular sanctity of this kind, by which the Church of Christ is proven to be authentic, become widely known among them, whether some common decency or even more distinguished deeds of sanctity, in place of the usual aids of grace, which God grants from His universal salvific will even outside the body of the Church according to the promises of divine indulgence alone—not to the sects themselves, insofar as they are hindered—and in part from the subsidies of salvation still retained or resumed from the institution of the Church, such as the example of Christ, certain revealed precepts of faith or morals, the sacrament of baptism, which through accident or through excusable ignorance may be fruitful to those who are strangers to the Church (cf. n. 355); but there does not appear among them that eminent or heroic sanctity sufficiently diffused throughout the entire way of life of men, the multitude, and ages, much less extending as widely as in the Roman Catholic Church, especially since Protestants today also neglect or oppose the observance of the evangelical counsels and asceticism or mortification of one's own body, which is itself (e.g., from *Matt* 6, 16—18; *1 Cor* 9, 27; *1 Pet* 4, 1) so powerful for attaining and maintaining the greater sanctity of charity. However many good things seem to be or

tuendam, protestantes hodie quoque neglegant vel impugnent. ‘Quotquot’ autem boni videntur in iisdem esse vel sunt vere, contra vel praeter principia fundamentalia protestantium vetustorum, jam sive theoretice sive saltem practice derelicta, non ex natura peculiari sectae suae, tales sunt, siquidem doctrina de plena hominis ad bonum impotentia, de nullo libero arbitrio humano, de fide vel fiducia sola justificante, de justificatione facienda per imputationem merae exteriorum, de operibus bonis ad salutem minime necessariis, de Deo auctore peccati, de reprobatione antecedente positiva, huiusmodi, inquam, doctrina, cum excuset quodvis scelus, utique censi sancta nequit. Quae etiam (ex *Mat* 7, 15 ss) mox tristes fructus, consensu quodam communi aequalibus et [seminatoribus] propriis agnitos produxit; nec certe, cum pro sanctitate instauranda viros sanctos eligere Deus soleat, reformationis, quae dicitur, auctores ipsi sanctitate vitae vel exemplis virtutum eminerunt. Hinc procedente tempore tot homines protestantes tantae inopiae praesidiorum salutarium apud suos pertaesii alii sectis novis se dedere consueverunt, alii iique ingenio vel voluntate bona excellentes ad ecclesiam antiquam catholicam conversi sunt. Et haec quidem de sanctitate ad salutem sempiternam ordinata, in qua finis proprius ecclesiae efficacitate consentanea praedita consistit (th. IX). Ceterum quam nulla vel exigua in se et prae ecclesia catholica insit protestantium instituto vis supra (n. 328) memorata ad populum in ipsis officiis directe bonum temporale attingentibus socialibus, civilibus vel politicis, religiose contineendum, regiones protestantes comparatae cum catholicis ejusdem imperii, ut nunc germanici, ostendunt; unde si in officiis illis vel in bonis temporalibus, sane ecclesiae secundariis nec nimis appetendis (*Mat* 6, 31 ss; *1 Tim* 6, 8. 9), nationes aliquot catholicae se interim minus convenienter habere comperiuntur, id partim et praecipue fraudulentae deminutioni vel

truly are in them, they are such contrary to or beyond the fundamental principles of the ancient Protestants, now abandoned either theoretically or at least practically, not from the peculiar nature of their sect, since the doctrine of man’s complete powerlessness for good, of no human free will, of faith or trust alone justifying, of justification made through merely external imputation, of good works not at all necessary for salvation, of God as the author of sin, of positive antecedent reprobation—such doctrine, I say, since it excuses any crime, surely cannot be considered holy. This same doctrine also (from *Matt* 7, 15 ff) soon produced sad fruits, acknowledged by some common consensus of contemporaries and their own [sowers]; nor certainly, since God is accustomed to choose holy men for restoring sanctity, did the authors of the so-called reformation themselves excel in sanctity of life or examples of virtues. Hence, as time progressed, so many Protestant men, weary of such poverty of salvific aids among their own, some have customarily given themselves to new sects, others—and these excelling in talent or good will—have converted to the ancient Catholic Church. And these things indeed concern sanctity ordered to eternal salvation, in which the proper end of the Church endowed with appropriate efficacy consists (th. IX). Furthermore, how little or no power the Protestant institution possesses in itself and compared to the Catholic Church for religiously restraining the people in social, civil, or political offices that directly affect temporal good, as mentioned above (n. 328), is shown by Protestant regions compared with Catholic ones of the same empire, such as now the German; whence if in those offices or in temporal goods, surely secondary to the Church and not to be too eagerly desired (*Matt* 6, 31 ff; *1 Tim* 6, 8. 9), some Catholic nations are found to conduct themselves less appropriately in the meantime, this is to be attributed partly and principally to the fraudulent diminution or violent oppression of ecclesiastical liberty, which is formidable to adversaries, partly to the natural character of the people or other hostile external circumstances. — Let one read Möhler, *Symbolik* §. 2—4. 10—12. 14. 16. 18. 19. 22. 24—26. 32; Döllinger, *Die Reformation* passim, as 1, 12 ff. 32

violentae oppressioni libertatis ecclesiasticae, adversariis scilicet formidabilis, partim indoli naturali gentis aliisve adjunctis exterioribus infestis imputandum est. — Legatur Möhler, *Symbolik* §. 2—4. 10—12. 14. 16. 18. 19. 22. 24—26. 32; Döllinger, *Die Reformation* passim, ut 1, 12 ss. 32 ss. 113 s. 129 s. 136 ss. 140 ss. 147 ss. 164 ss. 186. 190 ss. 195 ss. 199 ss. 204 ss. 216 ss. 245 ss. 283 ss. 357 ss. 408 ss. 551 ss; 2, 13 ss. 58 ss. 78 ss. 90 ss. 112 ss. 145 ss. 173 ss. 206 ss. 249 ss. 268 ss. 313 ss. 322 ss. 353 ss. 399 ss. 433 ss. 456 ss. 487. 491. 495. 497 ss. 509 ss. 524 ss. 545 ss. 574 ss. 584 ss. 630 ss. 640 ss. 693 ss; 3, 9 ss. 51 ss. 88 ss. 212 s. 228 ss. 239 ss. 262 ss; *Kirche und Kirchen* 190—490; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1876. 2, 665 ss; 1878. 1, 573 ss. 648 ss. 835 s; *Katholik* 1877. 1, 528 ss; Hettinger, *Fundamentaltheologie* 2, §. 9. B. III; Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, ut Bd 2, 2. I. III. VI; 3. II; Bd 3, 1. IV. V. IX; 2. II. V. XII. XIII. XIX. XXI; 3. VII; Bd 4, 1. VII—IX. XIII. XIV; 3. IX. X; Bd 5, 2. IV; Bd 7, 2. VI; Bd 8, 2. IV; 3. I. II; Hammerstein, *Erinnerungen eines alten Lutheraners*, c. 8; Germanus, *Reformationsbilder*, Votr. 2. 3. 8; *Kirchenlexikon*(2) 3, 1053 ss; Pesch Heinrich, *Die sociale Befähigung der Kirche*(2); Krose, *Der Einfluss der Konfession auf die Sittlichkeit; Religion und Moralstatistik*; Huppert 1. c. 39—52. 127—146; Denifle, *Luther und Lutherthum*; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1905, 417 ss; Grisar, *Luther*, ut 2, XVII. XXII. XXIV[⁴]).

[1462] e. Catholicae sectae protestantium, videlicet lutheranorum calvinianorum, anglicanorum, evangelicorum pro evangelio fidei solius justificantis, aliorum, ut non magis quam vetustae nominantur (cf. n. 1362 ss), sic non sunt. Etenim si considerentur omnes simul, carent unitate (n. 1459 s), i. e., *elemento catholicitatis fundamentalis*, quo deficiente protestantes qualescumque, non ecclesia eadem protestantium existere ubique potest; insuper elementum formale

ff. 113 f. 129 f. 136 ff. 140 ff. 147 ff. 164 ff. 186. 190 ff. 195 ff. 199 ff. 204 ff. 216 ff. 245 ff. 283 ff. 357 ff. 408 ff. 551 ff; 2, 13 ff. 58 ff. 78 ff. 90 ff. 112 ff. 145 ff. 173 ff. 206 ff. 249 ff. 268 ff. 313 ff. 322 ff. 353 ff. 399 ff. 433 ff. 456 ff. 487. 491. 495. 497 ff. 509 ff. 524 ff. 545 ff. 574 ff. 584 ff. 630 ff. 640 ff. 693 ff; 3, 9 ff. 51 ff. 88 ff. 212 f. 228 ff. 239 ff. 262 ff; *Kirche und Kirchen* 190—490; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1876. 2, 665 ff; 1878. 1, 573 ff. 648 ff. 835 f; *Katholik* 1877. 1, 528 ff; Hettinger, *Fundamentaltheologie* 2, §. 9. B. III; Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, as Bd 2, 2. I. III. VI; 3. II; Bd 3, 1. IV. V. IX; 2. II. V. XII. XIII. XIX. XXI; 3. VII; Bd 4, 1. VII—IX. XIII. XIV; 3. IX. X; Bd 5, 2. IV; Bd 7, 2. VI; Bd 8, 2. IV; 3. I. II; Hammerstein, *Erinnerungen eines alten Lutheraners*, c. 8; Germanus, *Reformationsbilder*, Votr. 2. 3. 8; *Kirchenlexikon*(2) 3, 1053 ff; Pesch Heinrich, *Die sociale Befähigung der Kirche*(2); Krose, *Der Einfluss der Konfession auf die Sittlichkeit; Religion und Moralstatistik*; Huppert 1. c. 39—52. 127—146; Denifle, *Luther und Lutherthum*; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1905, 417 ff; Grisar, *Luther*, as 2, XVII. XXII. XXIV[⁴]).

[1462] e. The Catholic sects of Protestants, namely Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans, Evangelicals [who preach] the gospel of justification by faith alone, and others, just as they are not called ancient (cf. n. 1362 ff.), so they are not [truly Catholic]. Indeed, if all are considered together, they lack unity (n. 1459 f.), that is, *the fundamental element of catholicity*, and with this lacking, Protestants of whatever kind cannot exist everywhere as the same Protestant church; moreover, the formal element of relative catholicity is absent, since even when taken individually, those

catholicitatis relativae deest, quod etiam una sumpti illi numero longe majore hominum coetus Romani superantur (n. 1455). Neque sectae singulae protestantium sunt catholicae, sive relative, id quod in singulis nimis evidens est, sive absolute, quod ipsae potiores ab eodem summo capite civili et religioso gubernatae et conjunctione ista aegre in unitate qualilibet conservatae regnis politicis singulis naturaliter singulae constringuntur. Accedit, quod, cum ecclesia Christi vera ex primordio palaestino semel adulta facto ipso necessario sit catholica, protestantes saeculo XVI demum in Germania, Helvetia, Anglia a paucis auctoribus et sectatoribus incepterunt. Neque saltem efficacia divinitus indita ecclesiae propagandae apud protestantes reperitur; nam propagationis primae celeris, protestantium quidem dissonorum, non ecclesiae, rationes naturales vel carnales, ut lucra temporalia ex bonis ecclesiasticis capienda, potestas in rem sacram principibus delata, vis, fraudes, cupido vitae licentioris in hominibus etiam antea dispositis exstabant; quibus rationibus cessantibus propagatio talis quidem cessavit; neque postea, at modo in Austria, nisi momentis consimiliter humanis fideles Christi vel catholici remissiores quotidie ad protestantes abducuntur. Ubi ignoscant nobis, si vel nolentibus in mentem veniat illud *Tertulliani* (*de Praescript.* c. 42; M 2, 57): „De verbi autem administratione quid dicam, cum hoc sit negotium illis, non ethnicos convertendi, sed nostros evertendi? Hanc magis gloriam captant, si stantibus ruinam, non si jacentibus elevationem operentur, quoniam et ipsum opus eorum non de suo proprio aedificio venit, sed de veritatis destructione. Nostra suffodiunt, ut sua aedificent. Adime illis legem Moysi, et prophetas, et creatorem Deum, accusationem eloqui non habent. Ita fit ut ruinas facilius operentur stantium aedificiorum, quam exstructiones jacentium ruinarum.“ Porro missiones ad gentes infideles, si pro tentaminum ambitu

assemblies are surpassed by the Romans in far greater number of people (n. 1455). Neither are the individual Protestant sects Catholic, whether relatively—which is all too evident in individual cases—or absolutely, since the more prominent ones, being governed by the same supreme civil and religious head and barely maintained in any kind of unity through that connection, are naturally confined individually to individual political kingdoms. It must be added that, since the true Church of Christ, once it had grown from its Palestinian beginnings, was necessarily Catholic from the very fact of its establishment, the Protestants only began in the 16th century in Germany, Switzerland, and England through a few founders and followers. Neither is the divinely implanted efficacy of propagating the Church found among Protestants; for the natural or carnal reasons for their initial rapid propagation—indeed of discordant Protestants, not of the Church—were temporal gains to be seized from ecclesiastical goods, power over sacred matters conferred upon princes, violence, fraud, and the desire for a more licentious life in people already so disposed; when these reasons ceased, such propagation likewise ceased; nor afterwards, except now in Austria, are the faithful of Christ or lax Catholics drawn away daily to the Protestants except by similarly human considerations. May they forgive us if, even unwillingly, that saying of *Tertullian* (*De Praescriptione* c. 42; M 2, 57) comes to mind: “But what shall I say about their administration of the word, since this is their business—not to convert pagans, but to subvert our own? They seek this glory more: to work ruin for those who stand rather than elevation for those who lie fallen, because their very work comes not from their own proper building, but from the destruction of truth. They undermine our foundations in order to build their own. Take away from them the law of Moses, and the prophets, and God the Creator, and they have no accusation to speak. Thus it happens that they more easily work the ruin of standing buildings than the construction of fallen ruins.” Furthermore, missions to infidel peoples, even if they now extend sufficiently for the scope of their efforts, nevertheless cannot be compared with the missions of the Roman Catholic

nunc satis extenduntur, non tamen secundum longitudinem convenientem temporis, altitudinem finis, latitudinem vel profunditatem successus cum missionibus ecclesiae romanae catholicae comparari possunt, sed et ‘susceptae sero’ sunt et magnam partem rationibus utilitatis terrenae sustinentur et numerum multo minorem conversorum ad sectas etiam simul sumptas comprehendunt et id, quamvis pauca et levia quaedam credenda et agenda postulent et prae religione supernaturali magis civilitatem et culturam per se naturalem, promotis abundantia mediorum humanorum scholis, litteris, operibus medicinae, afferant, et de sinceritate vel constantia assecularum persecutionibus saevis et martyriis probatae hactenus minime sunt. — Inspiciatur Perrone, *praelect. theol.* vol. 1. p. 2. prop. 10; Döllinger, *Die Reformation* 2, 54. 62 s. 80 s. 343 s. 354 s. 522 s. 678. 695; 3, 212 ss. 228 ss. 301; *Kirche und Kirchen* 361; Förg, l. c. 2, 439 ss; Hettinger, l. c. V. 3; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1886, 204 s; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1893. 2, 510 ss; Huppert l. c. 160—180; Marshall, *Die christlichen Missionen, ihre Sendboten, ihre Methode und ihre Erfolge*, c. 1; 2, 2; 3, 2; 4—10; Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte* 3, 172 s; Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste* 4. 2, 404 s. 515 s. 517 ss; 5, 678 ss. 692 ss; Krose, *Katholische Missionsstatistik; Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1910. 2, 253 ss; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1874, 6. 225 ss. 231 ss. 262 ss; 1875, 23 s. 54 ss. 67 s. 131 s. 199. 215 ss. 260; 1876, 112. 219 s; 1877, 24. 200. 238 s; 1878, 24; 1879, 165 s; 1880, 132. 199 s; 1881, 190 ss; 1882, 132; 1883, 117 s; 1884, 91 s. 255 s; 1885, 23 s; 1888, 47 s; 1889, 224; 1890, 180; 1891, 93 ss. 156; 1893, 218 s; 1895, 24. 119 s. 267; 1896, 71 s; 1898, 264; 1900, 42 s. 106. 206 ss; 1901, 46 s. 226. 279 s; 1902, 24. 114 s; 1903, 50; 1904, 49 ss. 230. 239 s; 1905, 37 s. 64 ss. 275 s; 1907, 67. 178. 262; 1908, 22 ss. 47. 118. 134; 1910, 107 s. 129. 188 ss. 236. 294; 1911, 65 s. 75. 145 s. 155 s. 163 ss. 204. 218 s.

Church according to the appropriate length of time, the height of purpose, the breadth or depth of success, but they have been ‘undertaken late’ and are supported in large part by considerations of earthly utility and comprise a much smaller number of converts even to the sects taken together, and this despite demanding few and light things to be believed and done, and before supernatural religion they bring rather civilization and culture that is natural in itself, promoting an abundance of human means—schools, literature, works of medicine—and concerning the sincerity or constancy of adherents proven by severe persecutions and martyrdoms, they have thus far shown very little. — See Perrone, *Praelectiones theologicae* vol. 1. p. 2. prop. 10; Döllinger, *Die Reformation* 2, 54. 62 f. 80 f. 343 f. 354 f. 522 f. 678. 695; 3, 212 ff. 228 ff. 301; *Kirche und Kirchen* 361; Förg, l. c. 2, 439 ff; Hettinger, l. c. V. 3; *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 1886, 204 f; *Historisch-politische Blätter* 1893. 2, 510 ff; Huppert l. c. 160—180; Marshall, *Die christlichen Missionen, ihre Sendboten, ihre Methode und ihre Erfolge*, c. 1; 2, 2; 3, 2; 4—10; Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte* 3, 172 f; Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste* 4. 2, 404 f. 515 f. 517 ff; 5, 678 ff. 692 ff; Krose, *Katholische Missionsstatistik; Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1910. 2, 253 ff; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1874, 6. 225 ff. 231 ff. 262 ff; 1875, 23 f. 54 ff. 67 f. 131 f. 199. 215 ff. 260; 1876, 112. 219 f; 1877, 24. 200. 238 f; 1878, 24; 1879, 165 f; 1880, 132. 199 f; 1881, 190 ff; 1882, 132; 1883, 117 f; 1884, 91 f. 255 f; 1885, 23 f; 1888, 47 f; 1889, 224; 1890, 180; 1891, 93 ff. 156; 1893, 218 f; 1895, 24. 119 f. 267; 1896, 71 f; 1898, 264; 1900, 42 f. 106. 206 ff; 1901, 46 f. 226. 279 f; 1902, 24. 114 f; 1903, 50; 1904, 49 ff. 230. 239 f; 1905, 37 f. 64 ff. 275 f; 1907, 67. 178. 262; 1908, 22 ff. 47. 118. 134; 1910, 107 f. 129. 188 ff. 236. 294; 1911, 65 f. 75. 145 f. 155 f. 163 ff. 204. 218 f.

[1463] d. Tandem protestantibus non inest apostolicitas. Etenim primum cum coetus protestantium, olim ecclesiae romanae catholicae in unitate fidei, cultus, communionis conjunctorum, omnes, velut rami arboris separati, defectione immediata vel mediatata ab ecclesia orti sint, haec ecclesia ipsa romana catholica tempore defectionis secundum originem et successionem continuam aut apostolica fuisse aut non fuisse dicitur. Atqui si prius illud statuatur, protestantes, ipsa sua secessione homines sectae novae, apostolicitatem originis vel continuatae successionis, quae est nota ecclesiae verae, amittendo simpliciter extra ecclesiam apostolicam constituti sunt; sin autem alterum, aequae nulla est sectarum protestantium apostolicitas, quia amplius quoque continuatio cum ecclesia apostolica desideratur. Quod argumentum commento ecclesiae invisibilis evadere frustra student (th. XXX). Ad hoc etsi in coetu a vera ecclesia diviso fides apostolica aliquando superesse potest, protestantes tamen excidisse fide tali constat; nam fides apostolica per ecclesiam semper una eademque custoditur (vide v. g. *Mat* 28, 19 s; *Jo* 14, 16 s; *Gal* 1, 6 ss; *1 Tim* 3, 15; 6, 20; *2 Tim* 1, 14; 2, 2; *Jud* 3); sed illi fidem ecclesiae universae a saeculis pluribus traditam alia mutaverunt et in dies singulos mutare alia ad arbitrium quique pergunt (n. 1459); quare utique corruptores fidei apostolicae haeretici ideoque ex sententia antiquitatis christianae (th. XXXIII) ex torres ecclesia apostolica judicandi sunt. Deinde ubi conspicitur nulla missio, nulla potestas pro indole ecclesiae apostolica apparet (resume th. XXXVII). Atqui ipsi auctores commotionis ejus, quam reformationem vocant, manifesto nullam habebant pro ecclesia reformanda vel apostolicae conformanda missionem; non sane habebant ordinariam, i. e., ab ecclesia ipsa sibi propagatam, quod se ecclesiae praesidibus opposcentes potestate, si quam ante per illos obtinebant, sunt privati; nec certe novatores ipsi rebelles ab ecclesia jam rejecta missionem suam serio

[1463] d. Finally, apostolicity is not inherent in Protestants. For indeed, first, since all the assemblies of Protestants, once united with the Roman Catholic Church in unity of faith, worship, and communion, have all arisen from the Church through immediate or mediate defection, like branches separated from a tree, this very Roman Catholic Church at the time of the defection is said, according to origin and continuous succession, either to have been apostolic or not to have been apostolic. But if the former is established, then the Protestants, by their very secession becoming men of a new sect, having lost the apostolicity of origin or continued succession, which is a mark of the true Church, have been simply constituted outside the apostolic Church; but if the latter, equally null is the apostolicity of the Protestant sects, because moreover the continuation with the apostolic Church is also lacking. They vainly strive to evade this argument with the fiction of an invisible church (th. XXX). Furthermore, even if apostolic faith could sometimes survive in an assembly divided from the true Church, it is nevertheless established that the Protestants have fallen away from such faith; for apostolic faith is always preserved as one and the same through the Church (see, for example, *Matt* 28:19ff; *John* 14:16ff; *Gal* 1:6ff; *1 Tim* 3:15; 6:20; *2 Tim* 1:14; 2:2; *Jude* 3); but they have changed the faith handed down by the universal Church for many centuries with other doctrines, and each continues daily to change other matters according to his own judgment (n. 1459); wherefore they are certainly to be judged as corruptors of apostolic faith, heretics, and therefore, according to the opinion of Christian antiquity (th. XXXIII), exiles from the apostolic Church. Then, where no mission is observed, no power appears according to the character of the apostolic Church (resume th. XXXVII). But the very authors of that upheaval which they call reformation manifestly had no mission for reforming the Church or conforming it to the apostolic model; they certainly did not have an ordinary one, that is, one propagated to them by the Church itself, since by opposing the Church authorities with power, they were deprived of whatever power they had previously obtained through them; nor certainly did

repetebant, verum potius pro opportunitate vel necessitate missionis, quantumvis apertam, abnuebant, vel missionem a populo et magistratibus civilibus, expertibus scilicet ipsis potestatis, sibi asserebant, vel missionem extraordinariam quandam divinam sibi vindicabant; quam tamen novam, cum ad exemplum omnium nomine Dei nove prodeuntium, ut prophetarum veteris testamenti (*Ex* 4, 1 ss; *3 Reg* 18, 36 ss; cf. *Deut* 18, 20 ss; *Jer* 23, 21), *Christi Domini* (*Jo* 5, 36; 10, 37 s; 14, 12; 15, 24), apostolorum (*Marc* 16, 20; *Act* 5, 12), nove comprobare debuissent, comprobare non valebant, deficientibus miraculis, quae appellare possent, veris et generatim omnibus divinae legationis signis. Neque id est mirum, quoniam praeter, nedum contra potestatem ordinariam ecclesiae Christi (ex th. XII) nunquam defecturae potestas extraordinaria sacra ita nulla datur, ut homines ecclesiae perpetuo audiendae (cf. *Mat* 18, 17 s) obloquentes ad probationem certissime fucosam missionis suae ne admittendi quidem, sed in antecessum ut doctores erroris reprobandi sint (cf. *Mat* 24, 24 s; *2 Thes* 2, 9 ss; *Deut* 13, 1 ss). Hinc defectum missionis cujuslibet sentiendo Lutherus opinionem suam de missione propria intra viginti quattuor annos quaterdecies mutavit.

[1464] Quare hominibus illis novis praeter verba *Tertulliani* 1464 (n. 1391) aliorumve merito haec adaptantur *Paciani* contra novatianos (ep. 3. ad *Sympronian*. n. 1; *M* 13, 1063 ss):

Quis hoc vindicat . . . ? . . . Novatianus hoc praecepit. Immaculatus aliquis et purus, qui Novatum non audierit, qui numquam ecclesiam deseruerit, qui ab episcopis episcopus factus sit, qui jure ordinario consecratus, qui vacantem cathedram in ecclesia consecutus? Quid ad te? inquires; Novatianus hoc docuit. At vel quando, frater, quibusve temporibus?

Statim post Domini passionem? post Decii principatum, id est, post trecentos prope

these innovators, rebels already rejected by the Church, seriously claim their mission from the Church, but rather, according to opportunity or necessity, they either denied their mission, however open it might be, or they asserted for themselves a mission from the people and civil magistrates, who were themselves clearly without power, or they claimed for themselves some extraordinary divine mission; which latter, however, since according to the example of all who come forth anew in the name of God, like the prophets of the Old Testament (*Ex* 4:1ff; *1 Kings* 18:36ff; cf. *Deut* 18:20ff; *Jer* 23:21), *Christ the Lord* (*John* 5:36; 10:37f; 14:12; 15:24), the apostles (*Mark* 16:20; *Acts* 5:12), they should have proven anew, they were unable to prove, lacking miracles which they could invoke, true ones and generally all signs of divine legation. Nor is this surprising, since beyond, much less against, the ordinary power of Christ's Church (from th. XII), which will never fail, no extraordinary sacred power is given, so that men speaking against the Church which must be perpetually heard (cf. *Matt* 18:17f) are not even to be admitted to the proof of their certainly false mission, but are to be rejected in advance as teachers of error (cf. *Matt* 24:24f; *2 Thes* 2:9ff; *Deut* 13:1ff). Hence, sensing the lack of any mission, Luther changed his opinion about his own mission fourteen times within twenty-four years.

[1464] Therefore, to those modern men, besides the words of *Tertullian* 1464 (n. 1391) and others, these words of *Pacianus* against the Novatians are fittingly applied (epistle 3 to *Sympronian* n. 1; *M* 13, 1063 ff):

Who vindicates this...? Novatian prescribed this. Some immaculate and pure man, who had not heard Novatus, who never deserted the Church, who was made bishop by bishops, who was consecrated by ordinary right, who obtained a vacant chair in the Church? "What is it to you?" you will say; "Novatian taught this." But when, brother, and in what times?

Immediately after the Lord's passion? After the principate of Decius, that is, after nearly three

annos dominicae passionis. Quid ergo tunc? Prophetas secutus est ut cataphryges, an Philomenem aliquam, ut Apelles; an ipse tantum auctoritatis accepit? Linguis locutus est? Prophetavit? Suscitare mortuos potuit? Horum enim aliquid habere debuerat, ut evangelium novi juris induceret. Et si contra clamet apostolus: *'Licet nos, aut angelus de coelo evangelizaverit praeterquam quod evangelizavimus vobis, anathema sit'* (Gal 1, 8). Novatianus sic intellexit, inquit: sed Christus hoc docuit. Ergo a Christi usque Decii principatum nullus intelligens? . . . Novatiano vindice, justitia liberatur; auctore, corrigitur quidquid erravit. Item illis hoc *Augustini* contra donatistas dictum accommodate exprobrari potest (*de baptismo* l. 3, c. 2. n. 3; *M* 43, 140 s): *'Si autem tunc non erat ecclesia . . . unde Donatus apparuit? de qua terra germinavit? de quo mari emersit? de quo coelo cecidit? . . . Ipsi autem considerent ubi sint, qui, neque unde propagati sunt possunt dicere, si jam tunc ecclesiam recepti sine baptismo haeretici et schismatici communionis contagione perdiderant.'* Praeterea sectae protestantium sicut a presbyteris meris vel laicis, Luthero, Zwinglio, Calvino, Henrico VIII exordium duxerunt, ita usque ad hunc diem potestate laica, vel a gerentibus rei civilis vel a populo usurpata et per ministros varii nominis exercita diriguntur ideoque ne levissimam quidem speciem potestatis divinitus in apostolis institutae perpetuae, i. e., episcopalis prae se ferunt, non exceptis anglicanis, apud quos et ipsos potestas jurisdictionis saltem summa in rebus ecclesiasticis pariter ac politicis olim regi, immo et mulieri reginae, nunc viris populi selectis, quamvis in episcopos quosdam profundenda, attribuitur; insuper potestas ordinis penes anglicanos nulla est; nam etiam seposita quaestione, num Barlow episcopus reformatus consecrator Matthaei Parker, postmodo fere ceteros episcopos anglicanos consecrantis, ipse fuisset consecratus, certe ex rituali regis Eduardi VI in ordinando presbytero et

hundred years from the Lord's passion. What then at that time? Did he follow the prophets like the Cataphrygians, or some Philomena, like Apelles; or did he alone receive such authority? Did he speak in tongues? Did he prophesy? Could he raise the dead? For he ought to have had some of these things in order to introduce a gospel of new law. And if the apostle cries out against this: *'But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed'* (Gal 1:8). You will say that Novatian understood it thus: but Christ taught this. Therefore from Christ until the principate of Decius was there no one who understood? . . . With Novatian as defender, justice is liberated; with him as author, whatever has erred is corrected. Likewise, this saying of *Augustine* against the Donatists can be appropriately reproached to them (*On Baptism* book 3, chapter 2, number 3; *Migne* 43, 140 ff): *'But if the church did not exist then . . . whence did Donatus appear? From what earth did he spring forth? From what sea did he emerge? From what heaven did he fall? . . . But let them consider where they are, who can neither say whence they have been propagated, if already then heretics and schismatics received without baptism had destroyed the church by the contagion of communion.'* Moreover, the Protestant sects, just as they took their beginning from mere presbyters or laymen—Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Henry VIII—so even to this day they are directed by lay power, either usurped by those conducting civil affairs or by the people and exercised through ministers of various names. Therefore they do not even present the slightest appearance of power divinely instituted in the apostles as perpetual, that is, episcopal power, not excepting the Anglicans, among whom even they themselves attribute the power of jurisdiction, at least the supreme power in ecclesiastical as well as political matters, formerly to the king, indeed even to a woman queen, now to men selected by the people, although to be conferred upon certain bishops; moreover, the power of orders among the Anglicans is null; for even setting aside the question whether Bishop Barlow, the reformed consecrator of Matthew Parker (who afterward consecrated nearly all the other Anglican bishops),

episcopo forma potestatem sacerdotalem nec per se satis, praesertim ante mutationem seram, significans et pro intentione aliunde cognita excludens, proinde invalida illic usitata est, id quod *Leo XIII* (lit. 13. sept. 1896) in luce collocavit. — Evolvatur *Döllinger*, *Die Reformation* 3, 201 ss. 227 s. 247 ss; *Kirche und Kirchen* 52 ss. 60 s. 126 ss. 133 ss, 150 ss. 190 s. 210 ss. 228 s. 350 s; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1878. 2, 1 ss; *Hettinger* l. c. V. 2; *Janssen*, l. c. Bd 2, 2. I. VI; Bd 5, 2. IV; *Germanus* l. c. Vortr. 2; *L* 7, 606 s; *Huppert* l. c. 95—127; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1897, 198 ss; *Grisar*, *Luther*, ut 2, XVI.

[1465] *Prob. altera pars min.* (cf. n. 1458), i. e., graecos slavosque separatos notis postulatis ecclesiae Christi destitutos esse.

a. Imprimis non apparet sanctitas ulla miraculis severius examinatis confirmata nec sanctitas latius diffusa caritatis. Etsi enim, maxime pro institutis ex se salutaribus etiam pluribus quam apud protestantes conservatis, homines pii in orientalibus divisus existere possunt vel exsistunt (cf. n. 1461), tamen sanctitas voluntatis satis ampla, praesertim praeclarius et heroica, frustra ibi quaeritur. Immo, cum ante schisma numerus magnus hominum sanctitate aequae ac doctrina excellentium inventus illic sit, nunc vita supernaturalis generatim stagnat atque depressa jacet per ipsius cleri saecularis et monastici miserrimam condicionem, ut servitutem turpem sub dominatione principum, ignorantiam diuturnam, simoniam, vitia alia, in caeremoniis quidem innumeris externis vel etiam usibus superstitiosis. Qui autem ab orientalibus segregatis ut sancti recensentur, ab unitate catholica romana avulsi minime erant aut cum schismatis patribus ipsis, *Photio*, *Michaelae Caerulario*, *Petro M.*, nequaquam sanctitate se sua commendabant aut sancti argumentis nullis aptis commonstrantur. In rem est illud „monitum

had himself been consecrated, certainly from the ritual of King Edward VI, a form was used there in ordaining presbyter and bishop that did not sufficiently signify sacerdotal power in itself, especially before the late change, and excluding it from the intention otherwise known, and therefore invalid, which *Leo XIII* (letter of September 13, 1896) brought to light. — Let *Döllinger* be consulted, *Die Reformation* 3, 201 ff. 227 f. 247 ff; *Kirche und Kirchen* 52 ff. 60 f. 126 ff. 133 ff, 150 ff. 190 f. 210 ff. 228 f. 350 f; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1878. 2, 1 ff; *Hettinger* l. c. V. 2; *Janssen*, l. c. Bd 2, 2. I. VI; Bd 5, 2. IV; *Germanus* l. c. Vortr. 2; *L* 7, 606 f; *Huppert* l. c. 95—127; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1897, 198 ff; *Grisar*, *Luther*, ut 2, XVI.

[1465] *The other minor part is probable* (cf. n. 1458), that is, that the separated Greeks and Slavs lack the required marks of the Church of Christ.

a. First, there appears to be no sanctity confirmed by rigorously examined miracles, nor any sanctity more widely diffused in charity. For although pious men can exist or do exist among the separated Orientals (especially due to institutions that are in themselves salutary and are preserved even more extensively than among Protestants, cf. n. 1461), nevertheless a sufficiently ample sanctity of will, especially the more illustrious and heroic kind, is sought there in vain. Indeed, whereas before the schism a great number of men excelling equally in sanctity and doctrine was found there, now supernatural life generally stagnates and lies depressed through the most wretched condition of the clergy itself, both secular and monastic, such as shameful servitude under the domination of princes, prolonged ignorance, simony, other vices, amid countless external ceremonies or even superstitious practices. Moreover, those who are counted as saints by the separated Orientals were by no means torn away from Roman Catholic unity, or with the patriarchs of the schisms themselves—*Photius*, *Michael Caerularius*, *Peter the Great*—they in no way commended themselves by their sanctity, or they are shown to be saints by no suitable arguments. To the point is that “warning of hagiographers concerning the Greek-Slavic ecclesiastical year” which is found

hagiographorum de anno ecclesiastico graecoslavico“, quod invenitur in *actis sanctorum* bollandianis (octobris t. 11); ubi haec monemur (n. 12 s): „Apparet quam difficile sit definire qui . . . catholici fuerint, qui non, seu quinam ex iis, qui kalendariis slavorum inscripti sunt, inter sanctos catholicos retinendi sint, quinam autem expungendi . . . Neque licuit in referendis eorum omnium gestis accuratiores esse. Slavi enim aeque ac reliqui recentiores orientales plane vitas nullas habent historicas, quales latini legunt bene multas; sed quas versant et amant, panegyres sunt verbosae, communibus laudibus plenae, ex quibus vix quidquam de sanctorum gestis cognoscas, ne indolem quidem . . . Perquam itaque difficile est earum examen instituere, cum nil fere quod singulare sit contineant. Miracula autem saepe prima specie fabulosa apparent; alia autem, quae miraculorum loco habentur, hoc nomine nequaquam digna sunt, siquidem merè naturalia sint: quo referas inprimis corporum integritatem, quae fundamentum est plerarumque canonizationum slavicarum recentiorum. Quis enim nescit multis in locis corpora sponte et naturaliter servari integra? Aliquando vero corpora sponte siccari, non corrumpi? Verbo nil tam incertum esse, quam hoc prodigium? Quare inter catholicos pro miraculo nequaquam admittitur corporis integritas, nisi comes molles maneant et elasticae, nisi membra plane mobilia sint, nisi annos duret incorruptio quadraginta aut quinquaginta; intra quos (nisi digitus Dei adsit) comes non possint non exsiccarí. Sed horum omnium nil curant slavi et graeci; quibus persuasum est omnem corporis conservationem prodigiosam esse; si enim mala fama accedat, signum esse mortuum excommunicatum esse; si bona fama, eum esse sanctum. Neque ullum aliud miraculum novimus, quod serio examinatum fuerit. Hinc intelligitur quam parum fidei videantur nobis mereri laudes, quibus qui sanctorum albo russiaco inscripti sunt a suis onerantur, et miracula,

in the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum* (October, vol. 11), where we are warned thus (n. 12 ff.): “It appears how difficult it is to define who were Catholic, who were not, or which of those who are inscribed in the Slavic calendars should be retained among the Catholic saints, and which should be expunged... Nor was it permitted to be more accurate in reporting all their deeds. For the Slavs, like the other more recent Orientals, have absolutely no historical lives such as the Latins read in great abundance; but what they handle and love are verbose panegyrics, full of common praises, from which you can scarcely learn anything about the deeds of the saints, not even their character... Therefore it is extremely difficult to institute an examination of them, since they contain almost nothing that is distinctive. Moreover, miracles often appear fabulous at first sight; but others, which are held in place of miracles, are by no means worthy of this name, since they are merely natural: to which category you should refer especially the integrity of bodies, which is the foundation of most recent Slavic canonizations. For who does not know that in many places bodies are naturally preserved intact of their own accord? Sometimes indeed bodies spontaneously dry up rather than decay? In short, nothing is so uncertain as this prodigy? Therefore among Catholics the integrity of a body is by no means admitted as a miracle unless the flesh remains soft and elastic, unless the limbs are completely mobile, unless the incorruption lasts forty or fifty years; within which time (unless the finger of God is present) the flesh cannot but be desiccated. But the Slavs and Greeks care nothing for all these things; they are persuaded that every preservation of the body is prodigious; for if bad reputation is added, it is a sign that the dead person is excommunicated; if good reputation, that he is a saint. Nor do we know of any other miracle that has been seriously examined. Hence it is understood how little faith the praises seem to deserve from us with which those inscribed in the Russian album of saints are burdened by their own people, and the miracles on account of which many are called thaumaturges or new thaumaturges.” See also *ibid.* May vol. I preface; August vol. I preliminary treatise sec. 5 supplement 4. Even if

propter quae complures vocantur thaumaturgi aut novi thaumaturgi.“ Videas etiam ib. maji t. I. praef.; augusti t. I. tract; praelim. sec. 5. parerg. 4. Quodsi nunc hagiographia apud russos colitur, non tamen persuasionem de miraculis dissidentium veris ea praebent, quae (apud *Slavor. litt. theol.* 1905, 114 ss) ex *Golubinskij* scribente historiam canonizationis sanctorum in ecclesia russica referuntur. Quin ipsae leges plures a Petro M. statutae, quibus dissidentes in Russia regebantur vel reguntur, sanctae non apparent, ut est de prodendo in casibus quibusdam sigillo sacramentali, de statu religioso non ingrediendo nisi natis annos quadraginta, de votis per feminas non faciendis nisi anno aetatis sexagesimo, de usu calami interdicto monachis, de eleemosyna, quae non sine duritie hominibus dissuadetur. — Huc pertinet *Pitzipios*, L'église orientale p. 3. c. 1. 6; *Walter*, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts aller christlichen Confessionen §. 28 a; *Döllinger*, Kirche und Kirchen 156—189; *Schouvaloff*, Meine Bekehrung und mein Beruf Abt. 1. c. 1., n. 4; c. 2. n. 2; c. 3. n. 5. 7. 12. 16. 18; Abt. 2. n. 2. 4. 11; *Gagarin*, Le clergé russe; *Marshall*, Die christlichen Missionen, ihre Sendboten, ihre Methode und ihre Erfolge c. 8 (pag. 477. 482 ss. 550. 578 ss); *Hergenröther*, Photius 2, 717 ss; 3, 736; *Hefele*, Concilieng. 4², 228 ss; *Granderath*, Geschichte des vatik. Konzils Bd 3. B. 2. K. 7; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* 1877. 1, 797 ss; *Pelesz*, Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom 1, 169—182; 2, 747 s. 757 ss; *Nilles*, Kalendarium manuale 1, agens 11. jul. de s. Olga, 15. jul. de s. Wladimiro, 12. febr. de s. Alexio kioviensi; *Pierling*, La Russie et le Saint-Siège IV. t. 3. c. 1. n. 3; c. 2. n. 3; t. 4. c. 2. n. 1; *Palmieri Aurelio*, La chiesa russa c. 3. n. 3—6. 13; c. 4. n. 2. 7. 9; c. 5. n. 1—3. 9; c. 6. n. 5—10; c. 8. n. 3. 4; c. 9. n. 3. 5. 6. 10; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1877, 662 ss; 1879, 192 s; 1890, 445; 1894, 344. 417 ss; 1909, 169 ss; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1876, 111 s; 1885, 144 ss. 187; 1886, 71 ss. 99. 187

hagiography is now cultivated among the Russians, nevertheless they do not provide persuasion concerning true miracles of the dissidents, which things are reported (in *Slavonic Theological Literature* 1905, 114 ff.) from *Golubinsky* writing the history of canonization of saints in the Russian church. Indeed, the very laws established by Peter the Great by which dissidents in Russia were or are governed do not appear holy, such as those concerning betraying the sacramental seal in certain cases, concerning not entering religious life except for those who have reached forty years of age, concerning vows not to be made by women except in the sixtieth year of age, concerning the use of the pen forbidden to monks, concerning almsgiving, which is discouraged to people not without harshness. — To this pertains *Pitzipios*, The Oriental Church p. 3 c. 1. 6; *Walter*, Textbook of Church Law of all Christian Confessions §. 28 a; *Döllinger*, Church and Churches 156—189; *Schouvaloff*, My Conversion and My Calling Part 1 c. 1., n. 4; c. 2. n. 2; c. 3. n. 5. 7. 12. 16. 18; Part 2 n. 2. 4. 11; *Gagarin*, The Russian Clergy; *Marshall*, The Christian Missions, their Messengers, their Method and their Successes c. 8 (pages 477. 482 ff. 550. 578 ff.); *Hergenröther*, Photius 2, 717 ff.; 3, 736; *Hefele*, History of Councils 4², 228 ff.; *Granderath*, History of the Vatican Council Vol. 3 Book 2 Chapter 7; *Historical-Political Papers* 1877. 1, 797 ff.; *Pelesz*, History of the Union of the Ruthenian Church with Rome 1, 169—182; 2, 747 f. 757 ff.; *Nilles*, Manual Calendar 1, treating July 11 concerning St. Olga, July 15 concerning St. Vladimir, February 12 concerning St. Alexius of Kiev; *Pierling*, Russia and the Holy See IV vol. 3 c. 1. n. 3; c. 2. n. 3; vol. 4 c. 2. n. 1; *Palmieri Aurelio*, The Russian Church c. 3. n. 3—6. 13; c. 4. n. 2. 7. 9; c. 5. n. 1—3. 9; c. 6. n. 5—10; c. 8. n. 3. 4; c. 9. n. 3. 5. 6. 10; *Journal of Catholic Theology* 1877, 662 ff.; 1879, 192 f.; 1890, 445; 1894, 344. 417 ff.; 1909, 169 ff.; *The Catholic Missions* 1876, 111 f.; 1885, 144 ff. 187; 1886, 71 ff. 99. 187 ff.; 1887, 69 ff.; 1890, 224; 1898, 241 ff. 266 ff.; 1899, 272 f.; 1900, 176 ff.; 1902, 107 ff.; 1905, 83. 179 f.; 1906, 106. 204 ff. 274 ff.; 1908, 105 ff. 154 ff.; 1910, 30 f. 167; *Slavonic Theological Literature* 1906, 33 ff.; 1907, 305; 1908, 348 f.

ss; 1887, 69 ss; 1890, 224; 1898, 241 ss. 266 ss; 1899, 272 s; 1900, 176 ss; 1902, 107 ss; 1905, 83. 179 s; 1906, 106. 204 ss. 274 ss; 1908, 105 ss. 154 ss; 1910, 30 s. 167; *Slavor. litt. theol.* 1906, 33 ss; 1907, 305; 1908, 348 s.

[1466] b. Nec minus deest se junctis orientis catholicitas. Qui 1466 omnes etiam simul computati, quamvis absolute hominum saltem numero multi, nullo modo unum coetum romanum catholicum adaequant (n. 1455). Verumtamen iidem inter se divisi ipsi sunt in communitates plures, quarum praecipuae sunt tres, primum ea, quae patriarchae constantinopolitano adhuc jungitur, tum communitas russica, denique communitas regni graeci, cujus caput est Athenis. Et quidem russica, omnium longe maxima, nunc homines plus 86,000.000 comprehendere dicitur (vide *Die katholischen Missionen* 1902, 191; 1907, 94), sed reapse raskolnici, qui ab illa desciverunt, declarati 2,173.000, jam multo frequentiores, ut hominum 20,000.000, rectius existimantur (l. c. 1905, 180; *Palmieri Aurel.* l. c. c. 7. n. 6). Praeterea coetus illi inter se disjuncti singuli ex eo deprehenduntur non catholici, quod principatui politico alligati fere fines cujusdam nationis vel imperii, ut turcorum, russorum, graecorum, non excedunt, unde etiam simul atque partes aliae Graeciam imitatae a regno Turciae separantur, ecclesias pariter alias constituere festinant; nec fines proprios saltem explent, quod et sectae quomodocumque christianae variae, judaei, mohammedani, gentiles, et homines ecclesiam romanam catholicam sequentes ritus sive latini sive graeci vel slavici, ut rutheni, sive orientalis qualiscumque cum illis commixti reperiuntur. Quare illi ipsi se ecclesiam orthodoxam orientalem vocant, catholicos simpliciter vel pro sectarum amplitudine nominare se non audent; sin in symbolo, libris symbolicis, documentis aliis orientales se catholicos profitentur, hoc illi inde explicant, quod ex oriente, ex

[1466] b. Nor is catholicity any less lacking among the separated Eastern churches. All of these combined, though they may be numerous in absolute terms at least in number of people, in no way equal the one Roman Catholic assembly (n. 1455). Nevertheless, these same groups are themselves divided among themselves into several communities, of which the principal ones are three: first, that which is still joined to the Patriarch of Constantinople; then the Russian community; finally, the community of the Greek kingdom, whose head is at Athens. And indeed the Russian, by far the largest of all, is now said to comprise more than 86,000,000 people (see *Die katholischen Missionen* 1902, 191; 1907, 94), but in reality the raskolniki [Old Believers], who have separated from it, officially declared at 2,173,000, are already much more numerous and are more correctly estimated at 20,000,000 people (l. c. 1905, 180; *Palmieri Aurelius* l. c. c. 7. n. 6). Moreover, those individual groups, separated from each other, are shown to be non-Catholic precisely because, being bound to political principalities, they scarcely exceed the boundaries of a certain nation or empire, such as the Turks, Russians, or Greeks. Hence, as soon as other regions, imitating Greece, are separated from the Turkish kingdom, they likewise hasten to establish other churches; nor do they even fill their own boundaries, since various sects that are somehow Christian, Jews, Mohammedans, pagans, and people following the Roman Catholic Church of Latin or Greek or Slavic rites, such as the Ruthenians, or of any Oriental rite whatever, are found mixed together with them. Therefore, they call themselves the Orthodox Eastern Church; they do not dare to call themselves simply Catholics or to name themselves according to the breadth of their adherents. But if in their creed, symbolic books, and other documents the Orientals profess themselves to be Catholics, they explain this on the grounds that from the East, from the former Jerusalem church, the faith was

hierosolymitana olim ecclesia inter gentes omnes propagata sit et quod in oriente ad tempus nostrum fides catholica, scilicet ipsorum *orthodoxa*, teneatur et quod ecclesia nec jure loco ullo nec tempore coartetur. Ad haec constat, propriam causam separationis ab ecclesia romana exstitisse nimis naturalem, ambitionem hominum graecorum, imprimis patriarcharum et imperatorum per hos evectos magis dominari affectantium, tum autem nutritum auctumque esse schisma stimulis praejudicii odiique nationalis, fallaciis vel violentia saeva, praeterea in pervertendis fidelibus catholicis potius quam convertendis infidelibus dissidentes occupari. Certe russos a saeculo IX ad XI non schismaticos, sed, summum conatu quodam Photii praevio, teste *Constantino Porphyrogenito* imper. (de vita Basilii Macedonis n. 97; M 109, 359) quandamtenus Ignatius, nempe patriarcha Constantinopolitanus catholicus, deinde plenius inter Photii et Caerularii schisma graeci alii cum ecclesia romana cohaerentes, ut *Nicolaus Chrysoberges* patriarcha, ad fidem adduxerunt. Post secessionem suam graeci quidem, defectus virtutis supernaturalis ideoque impotentiae suae quasi sibi conscii, de convertendis infidelibus vix unquam laborarunt; russi ex dissidentibus facile soli iique tarde in terris suis vel contiguas, ratione videlicet politica, missiones ad gentes infideles, fere omnes fructu verae sanctitatis sive exiguo sive nullo, assumpserunt. — Eo spectat *Pitzipios* l. c. introduct. et p. 3. c. 2—4; p. 4. c. 2; *Walter* l. c. §. 22. 25. 25 a. 28 a; *Döllinger* l. c. et 5—9; *Schouvaloff* l. c. Abt. 1. c. 3. n. 16; Abt. 2. n. 4. 11; *Gagarin, La Russie sera-t-elle catholique?* c. 1. 2; *Réponse d'un russe à un russe; Le clergé russe* c. 5; *Marshall* l. c., c. 1. (pag. 1); c. 8 (pag. 574 ss. 581 ss); *Hergenröther, Photius* 1, 299 ss; 3, 840 ss; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* l. c.; *Pelesz* l. c. 1, 53—85. 133 s. 169—182; 2, III—VI. 549 ss. 575 ss. 583 ss; *Hergenröther-Kirsch, Kircheng.* 2^a, 282 ss; *Nilles* l. c. et ad diem 9. maji; *Wilmers, de Christi ecclesia*

propagated among all nations, and that in the East down to our time the Catholic faith—that is, their own *orthodox* faith—is held, and that the Church is not restricted by law to any place or time. Beyond this, it is established that the proper cause of separation from the Roman Church was all too natural: the ambition of the Greek people, especially of the patriarchs and emperors elevated through them who sought to dominate more extensively. But then the schism was nourished and increased by the stimuli of national prejudice and hatred, by deceptions or savage violence, and furthermore the dissidents occupy themselves in perverting Catholic faithful rather than converting infidels. Certainly the Russians from the ninth to the eleventh centuries were not schismatic, but—despite a certain prior effort by Photius—as witnessed by Emperor *Constantine Porphyrogenitus* (in his *Life of Basil the Macedonian* n. 97; Migne 109, 359), Ignatius (namely the Catholic Patriarch of Constantinople) brought them to the faith to some extent, and then more fully between the schisms of Photius and Caerularius, other Greeks adhering to the Roman Church, such as Patriarch *Nicholas Chrysoberges*, completed their conversion. After their secession, the Greeks indeed, being somewhat conscious of their lack of supernatural virtue and therefore of their impotence, scarcely ever labored to convert infidels; among the dissidents, the Russians alone and they only tardily, easily undertook missions to infidel peoples in their own or neighboring lands, evidently for political reasons, nearly all with little or no fruit of true sanctity. — On this point see *Pitzipios* l. c. introduction and p. 3. c. 2—4; p. 4. c. 2; *Walter* l. c. §. 22. 25. 25 a. 28 a; *Döllinger* l. c. and 5—9; *Schouvaloff* l. c. Section 1. c. 3. n. 16; Section 2. n. 4. 11; *Gagarin, La Russie sera-t-elle catholique?* c. 1. 2; *Réponse d'un russe à un russe; Le clergé russe* c. 5; *Marshall* l. c., c. 1. (page 1); c. 8 (page 574 ff. 581 ff); *Hergenröther, Photius* 1, 299 ff; 3, 840 ff; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* l. c.; *Pelesz* l. c. 1, 53—85. 133 f. 169—182; 2, III—VI. 549 ff. 575 ff. 583 ff. 803 ff. 841 ff; *Hergenröther-Kirsch, Kirchengeschichte* 2^a, 282 ff; *Nilles* l. c. and for the day 9 May; *Wilmers, de Christi ecclesia* n. 342 f; *Kirchenlexikon*² 3, 985 ff; 10, 1375 ff;

n. 342 s; *Kirchenlexikon*² 3, 985 ss; 10, 1375 ss; *Kirchliches Handlexikon* 1, 1793 ss; *Palmieri Aurel. l. c. c. 7. n. 10—12. 16—24*; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1877, 662 ss; 1879, 192 s; 1894, 417 ss; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1901. 1, 116 ss; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1886, 71 s. 100 ss. 121 ss. 142 ss. 187 ss; 1889, 136; 1904, 214 s; 1905, 65; 1906, 280; 1907, 140. 190. 214; 1908, 84. 165; 1910, 30. 150. 167. 204; 1911, 33 ss. 102. 120. 169 s. 274; *Werner, Katholischer Missions-Atlas*; *Katholischer Kirchen-Atlas*; *Orbis terrarum catholicus*; *K. Streit, Katholischer Missionsatlas*; *Statistische Notizen zum katholischen Missionsatlas*; *La Gerarchia cattolica*.

[1467] e. Et cum abunde haec sufficiant ad dignitatem ecclesiae 1467 Christi verae graecis slavisque separatis denegandam, etiam deficientis necessariae unitatis illi explicite coarguuntur. Utique non potiuntur unitate spectati simul omnes, quod autocephalae, ut loquuntur; jam existunt ecclesiae Constantinopolis, Alexandriae, Antiochiae, Hierosolymorum, Russiae, partis Austriae et Hungariae, Graeciae, Serbiae, Rumaeniae, Bulgariae, aliae; quae saltem in regimine reapse non inter se dependent, etsi verbo quidem sub Christo capite invisibili synodum œcumenicam, secundum eos ipsos a tempore nicaenae II nunquam celebratam nec sane a quoquam cum potestate convocandam, auctoritate summa praeditam agnoscunt; quin etiam in fide eo discrepant, quod baptismum catholicorum et protestantium, non per immersionem ministratum, russi pro valido, graeci pro invalido habent, et quod potestatem concilii œcumenici, quae in confessione orthodoxa orientalium divisorum non restricta exhibetur, russi aliive intellegunt jam restrictam ad causas summas, quasi potestas divinitus constituta pro rebus majoribus minores perficere non valeat.[⁵] Porro ecclesiae enumeratae singulae unitatem non sat firmam, sed caducam interim tenent, quia praeter lethargiam suam cohibentur

Kirchliches Handlexikon 1, 1793 ff; *Palmieri Aurelius l. c. c. 7. n. 10—12. 16—24*; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1877, 662 ff; 1879, 192 f; 1894, 417 ff; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1901. 1, 116 ff; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1886, 71 f. 100 ff. 121 ff. 142 ff. 187 ff; 1889, 136; 1904, 214 f; 1905, 65; 1906, 280; 1907, 140. 190. 214; 1908, 84. 165; 1910, 30. 150. 167. 204; 1911, 33 ff. 102. 120. 169 f. 274; *Werner, Katholischer Missions-Atlas*; *Katholischer Kirchen-Atlas*; *Orbis terrarum catholicus*; *K. Streit, Katholischer Missionsatlas*; *Statistische Notizen zum katholischen Missionsatlas*; *La Gerarchia cattolica*.

[1467] e. And since these points abundantly suffice to deny the dignity of the true Church of Christ to the separated Greeks and Slavs, they are also explicitly convicted of lacking the necessary unity. Certainly, when considered all together, they do not possess unity, since there already exist what they call “autocephalous” churches: Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Russia, part of Austria and Hungary, Greece, Serbia, Romania, Bulgaria, and others. These churches, at least in governance, do not actually depend upon each other, even though they verbally acknowledge an ecumenical synod under Christ as invisible head—which, according to them, has never been celebrated since the Second Council of Nicaea, nor can it be convoked by anyone with authority—as endowed with supreme authority. Moreover, they disagree even in faith, inasmuch as the Russians hold the baptism of Catholics and Protestants (when not administered by immersion) to be valid, while the Greeks hold it to be invalid. Furthermore, regarding the power of an ecumenical council, which in the Orthodox confession of the divided Orientals is presented as unrestricted, the Russians and others understand it to be already restricted to the highest causes, as if a divinely constituted power for greater matters could not accomplish lesser ones.[⁵] Moreover, each of the enumerated churches maintains a unity that is not sufficiently firm, but rather precarious in the meantime, because beyond their own lethargy, they are restrained chiefly by

maxime vi politica, quam in discordantes Turciae una cum sacra concessam sibi sub imperatore patriarcha constantinopolitanus, extra Turciam potissimum monarcha Russiae exercere hactenus consuevit; quapropter illa abolita, ut paulatim membris, imperii turcici solutis, communio ecclesiastica passu pari aboletur; atque etiam illa non obstante sectae, ut raskolnicorum, exstiterunt; et ipsi raskolnici, in Russia exorti contra librorum liturgicorum revisionem saeculo XVII a *Nicone* patriarcha russo factam, denuo in sectas multas, partim sacerdotibus instructas, partim destitutas discinduntur.

[1468] Insuper autem, quamvis coetus singuli divisi orientis prae protestantibus unitatem quandam in se obtinere videantur, dilucide ostendere valemus, unitatem in illis non vigere veram, i. e., effectam per ipsum principium vel centrum unitatis divinitus ordinatum, sed mere fucosam, idque nunc probatur etiam seposita demonstratione primatus romani, quam superius protulimus. Namque, quae est veritas saltem historica praemittenda, ante schisma praevis discidiis brevioribus a *Photio* saeculo IX motum et a *Michaelae Cæculario* saeculo XI renovatum ecclesia graeca cum patriarchis constantinopolitanis romano coetui adhaerens episcopum romanum ut principium et centrum unitatis ecclesiae totius in Petro divine constitutum ideoque immutabile agnoscebat. Recordare testimonia vel gesta plurima pridem tradita graecorum in pontifice romano simpliciter caput ecclesiae universae observantium, ut ipsius *Athanasii* (n. 498. 499), *Basilii M.* (n. 500. 505. 990), *Gregorii naz.* (n. 987), *Chrysostomi* (n. 164. 500), *Flaviani constantinop.* (n. 501), *Joannis hieros.* (n. 996), *Maximi martyris* (n. 102. 645), *Theodori studitae* (n. 148. 165. 483. 645. 991); recordare formulam *Hormisdæ*, quam supra (n. 493) attulimus, subscriptam ab episcopis orientis, ab imperatore *Justiniano*, ab ipsis patriarchis

political force, which the Patriarch of Constantinople has customarily exercised within Turkey over the discordant along with the faithful (this authority being granted to him under the Emperor), while outside Turkey it has been exercised principally by the Monarch of Russia. Consequently, when this authority is abolished—as it gradually is with the dissolution of the members of the Turkish Empire—ecclesiastical communion is likewise abolished step by step. Even despite this authority, sects such as the *raskolniki* have arisen. And these *raskolniki*, who emerged in Russia against the revision of liturgical books made in the 17th century by *Nikon*, the Russian Patriarch, are again divided into many sects, some provided with priests, others destitute of them.

[1468] Furthermore, although the individual divided communities of the East appear to maintain among themselves a certain unity in comparison to the Protestants, we are able to demonstrate clearly that true unity does not prevail among them—that is, unity brought about by the very principle or center of unity divinely ordained—but merely a counterfeit unity. This is now proven even setting aside the demonstration of Roman primacy which we presented above. For, what is at least the historical truth that must be premised: before the schism preceded by the briefer divisions stirred up by *Photius* in the ninth century and renewed by *Michael Cerularius* in the eleventh century, the Greek Church with the Constantinopolitan patriarchs, adhering to the Roman community, acknowledged the Roman bishop as the principle and center of unity of the entire Church divinely constituted in Peter and therefore immutable. Recall the very numerous testimonies or acts of the Greeks previously transmitted, who observed the Roman pontiff simply as the head of the universal Church, such as those of *Athanasius* himself (n. 498. 499), *Basil the Great* (n. 500. 505. 990), *Gregory of Nazianzus* (n. 987), *Chrysostom* (n. 164. 500), *Flavian of Constantinople* (n. 501), *John of Jerusalem* (n. 996), *Maximus the Martyr* (n. 102. 645), *Theodore of Stoudios* (n. 148. 165. 483. 645. 991); recall the formula of *Hormisdas*, which we cited above (n. 493), subscribed by the bishops of the East, by the emperor *Justinian*, by the

constantinopolitanis *Joanne II, Epiphanio, Menna*, a concilio œcumenico VIII^[6]; quin immo addere licuit (n. 494) verba sollemnia, quibus etiam post schisma Cæularii pontificem romanum principium unitatis ecclesiae graeci iterum iterumque in ipso concilio lugdunensi II et *florentino* professi sunt; et quidem professionem florentinam, cum *Joseph* patriarcha constantinopolitanus moriens ad certam omnium fidem papae senioris Romae ut patri patrum et maximo pontifici et vicario Jesu Christi plene se subjectum per litteras declarasset, praeter imperatorem Joannem Palaeologum cum episcopis graecis etiam „*Isidorus* metropolita Kiaeviensi totiusque Russiae“ (H 9, 406. 423 ss) subscripsit; quod autem *Marcus Eugenicus ephesus* adversus omnes praesentes unus subscriptionem recusavit, solum monstrat, quam liberi episcopi Florentiae in agendo fuerint.

Apposite *Leo XIII* scribit (principibus populisque univ., 20. jun. 1894): „Peramanter respicimus ad orientem, unde in orbem universum initio profecta salus. Videlicet expectatio desiderii Nostri jucundam spem inchoare jubet, non longe abfore ut redeant, unde discessere, fide avita gloriaque vetere illustres, ecclesiae orientales. Eo vel magis quod non ingenti discrimine sejunguntur: imo, si pauca excipias, sic cetera consentimus, ut in ipsis catholici nominis vindiciis non raro ex doctrina, ex more, ex ritibus, quibus orientales utuntur, testimonia atque argumenta promamus. Praecipuum dissidii caput, de romani pontificis primatu. Verum respiciant ad initia, videant quid majores senserint sui, quid proxima originibus aetas tradiderit. Inde enimvero illud Christi divinum testimonium ‚Tu es Petrus et super hanc Petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam‘ luculenter extat de romanis pontificibus comprobatum. . . Plane liquet quo tempore, qua causa, quibus auctoribus infelix excitata discordia. Ante illud tempus, quo tempore homo separavit quod Deus conjunxerat, sanctum erat apud omnes

Constantinopolitan patriarchs themselves *John II, Epiphanius, Menna*, by the eighth ecumenical council^[6]; indeed, we were able to add (n. 494) the solemn words by which even after the schism of Cerularius the Greeks again and again professed the Roman pontiff as the principle of unity of the Church in the very Second Council of Lyon and the *Florentine* council; and indeed, when *Joseph* the Constantinopolitan patriarch, dying, had declared through letters to the certain faith of all that he was fully subject to the senior pope of Rome as father of fathers and supreme pontiff and vicar of Jesus Christ, not only did the emperor John Palaiologos with the Greek bishops subscribe to the Florentine profession, but also “*Isidore* metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia” (H 9, 406. 423 ff) subscribed; but that *Marcus Eugenicus of Ephesus* alone among all those present refused subscription against everyone else only shows how free the bishops were in acting at Florence.

Appropriately, *Leo XIII* writes (to the princes and peoples of the universe, June 20, 1894): “We look with great love toward the East, whence salvation first proceeded into the entire world. Indeed, the expectation of Our desire commands us to begin a joyful hope that the Eastern churches, illustrious by their ancestral faith and ancient glory, may not be far from returning whence they departed. All the more so because they are not separated by any great difference: indeed, if you except a few things, we agree on the rest to such an extent that in the very vindications of the Catholic name we frequently draw testimonies and arguments from the doctrine, custom, and rites which the Orientals use. The principal head of disagreement concerns the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. But let them look back to the beginnings, let them see what their ancestors thought, what the age closest to the origins handed down. For indeed from this source that divine testimony of Christ ‘You are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church’ clearly appears confirmed concerning the Roman Pontiffs... It is entirely clear at what time, for what cause, and by what authors the unhappy discord was stirred up. Before that time, when man separated what God had joined together, the name of the apostolic see was

christiani orbis gentes sedis apostolicae nomen, romanoque pontifici, ut beati Petri successori legitimo, ob eamque rem Jesu Christi in terris vicario, oriens pariter atque occidens consentientibus sententiis sine ulla dubitatione parebant. Hanc ob causam, si respiciatur ad initia dissidii, *Photius* ipse oratores de rebus suis Romam destinandos curavit^[7]; *Nicolaus* vero I pontifex maximus Constantinopolim legatos suos, nullo contra dicente, ab urbe misit, ut *Ignatii* Patriarchae causam diligenter investigarent, et sedi apostolicae plenius ac veracibus referrent indiciis^[8]; ita ut tota rei gestae historia primatum romanae sedis, quacum dissensus tum erumpebat, aperte confirmet. Denique in conciliis magnis tum lugdunensi II, tum florentino, supremam romanorum pontificum potestatem nemo ignorat, facili consensione et una omnes voce, latinos graecosque ut dogma sanxisse.“

[1469] Unde est primum argumentari: Ecclesia graeca ante schisma adhaerens tamdiu romano successori Petri aut adhaerebat principio unitatis vero, per Christum pro ecclesia instituto immutabili, aut non adhaerebat. Atqui in hypothesis priore ecclesia graeca in regimine, in sacrorum communione, in fide ipsa nunc abscissa non amplius adhaeret principio vero unitatis proindeque non est amplius intra ecclesiam Christi veram, pro sanctitate quidem essentiali nullo praetextu deserendam, similiter ac provincia quaedam major minorve contra regem provinciasque fideles seditiosa pars antiqui regni esse manifesto desinit; in altera hypothesis ecclesia graeca principio vero unitatis ideoque societate ecclesiae verae pariter non fruitur, siquidem potius affirmandum esset, ecclesiam Christi interisse, quando per tot saecula principium efficiens unitatis verae a Domino positum defuisset, quam contendendum, principium aliud, ut patriarcham Constantinopolis vel imaginariam illam synodum oecumenicam

sacred among all nations of the Christian world, and both East and West, with agreeing sentiments and without any doubt, obeyed the Roman Pontiff as the legitimate successor of blessed Peter and, for that reason, the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. For this reason, if one looks back to the beginnings of the disagreement, *Photius* himself took care to send orators to Rome concerning his affairs^[7]; but *Nicholas* I, the supreme pontiff, sent his legates from the city to Constantinople, with no one speaking against it, so that they might carefully investigate the cause of Patriarch *Ignatius* and report to the apostolic see with full and truthful evidence^[8]; so that the entire history of the events openly confirms the primacy of the Roman see, with which disagreement was then erupting. Finally, in the great councils, both Lyons II and Florence, no one is ignorant that the supreme power of the Roman Pontiffs was sanctioned as dogma by all with easy consensus and one voice, both Latins and Greeks.”

[1469] Hence it is easy to argue: The Greek Church, adhering for so long to the Roman successor of Peter before the schism, either adhered to the true principle of unity established by Christ for the Church as immutable, or it did not adhere to it. But in the former hypothesis, the Greek Church, now severed in governance, in communion of sacred things, and in faith itself, no longer adheres to the true principle of unity and therefore is no longer within the true Church of Christ, which indeed must not be abandoned on account of its essential sanctity under any pretext, just as some province, greater or lesser, being seditious against the king and the faithful provinces, manifestly ceases to be part of the ancient kingdom. In the latter hypothesis, the Greek Church likewise does not enjoy the true principle of unity and therefore not the fellowship of the true Church, since it would rather have to be affirmed that the Church of Christ had perished when for so many centuries the effective principle of true unity established by the Lord had been lacking, than to contend that some other principle—such as the Patriarch of Constantinople or that imaginary ecumenical synod lacking the Roman Pontiff—had existed contrary to or apart from the traditional

etiam expertem pontificis romani, contra vel praeter principium tralatitium saeculo demum IX vel XI, videlicet a se ipso, exstitisse; cujusmodi angustias sentiendo graeci ipsi ad principium priscum redire interdum maluerunt. Quae ratio argumentandi multo magis in homines illos valet, qui per aliud schisma ab ecclesia constantinopolitana, agnita prius praefecta, recedendo coetus proprios constituerunt. Ita nominatim pro se russi a. 1589 dignitatem patriarchalem sui juris et ea suppressa sub Petro M. a. 1721 synodum permanentem condiderunt, qua episcopi se obstrictos jurant et imperator velut instrumento utitur^[9]; adaeque neograeci recentius praeter alios a patriarchatu constantinopolitano digressi a. 1833 synodum perennem regi quidem obnoxiam creaverunt.

Quodsi patriarcha constantinopolitanus synodos tales approbando quoadtenus auctoritatem suam interposuisse videatur, hac certe approbatione ipsa vinculum sufficiens unitatis cum coetu russo et neograeco emancipato rumpi sivit; neque enim vinculum ejusmodi ibi est, ubi potestas summa communis, sive cogitatur propria episcopi unius sive episcoporum simul omnium, pro causis pluribus et facile pro omnibus practice quidem ablata est. Scissionem hanc significavit jusjurandum cuivis membro synodi russicae fere adhuc emittendum illis verbis: „Confiteor porro et jurejurando assevero, supremum hujusce collegii judicem esse ipsum totius Russiae monarcham Domnum nostrum clementissimum.“ Quo simul percipimus, regimen ecclesiae saltem summum in Russia non esse episcopale, vel umbra principii unitatis a Christo dati exclusae; quod quidem plus minusve etiam aliis segregatis orientis accidit.

[1470] Immo doctrina ipsa orientalium divisorum de ecclesia sua vera una repugnantias plures in se continet.^[10] Etenim primum illi episcopos ecclesiae, putatos quidem omnes divinitus aequales, ponunt infallibiles, si consentiant in

principle only in the ninth or eleventh century, namely established by itself. Sensing such difficulties, the Greeks themselves sometimes preferred to return to the ancient principle. This line of argument applies much more forcefully to those men who, departing through another schism from the Constantinopolitan Church (previously acknowledged as superior), constituted their own assemblies. Thus specifically, the Russians in 1589 established for themselves a patriarchal dignity of their own right, and when this was suppressed under Peter the Great in 1721, they founded a permanent synod to which bishops swear themselves bound and which the emperor uses as an instrument^[9]; and likewise the modern Greeks more recently, having departed from the Constantinopolitan patriarchate along with others in 1833, created a permanent synod indeed subject to the king.

But if the Patriarch of Constantinople, by approving such synods insofar as he appears to have interposed his authority, has through this very approval allowed a sufficient bond of unity with the Russian and neo-Greek emancipated assembly to be broken; for there is no bond of this kind where supreme common authority, whether conceived as proper to one bishop or to all bishops together, has been practically removed for many causes and easily for all. This schism was signified by the oath that must still be taken by nearly every member of the Russian synod in these words: “I confess furthermore and affirm by oath that the supreme judge of this college is the monarch of all Russia himself, our most clement Lord.” By this we perceive at the same time that the government of the church, at least the supreme government in Russia, is not episcopal, with even the shadow of the principle of unity given by Christ excluded; which indeed happens more or less also to other separated churches of the East.

[1470] Indeed, the very doctrine of the Eastern schismatics about their allegedly true and unified church contains numerous contradictions within itself.^[10] For first, they maintain that the bishops of the church, who are supposedly all divinely equal, are infallible if they consent in council or even

concilio vel etiam extra illud^[11], haud dubie universitate etiam sola morali vel multitudine superante, sicut historia fateri cogit. Hoc principio semel posito fieri nunquam potest, ut in rebus revelatis pars episcoporum plane major erret, minor veritatem teneat; unde in dissensione omni diligentissime id ut infallibiliter verum exquirendum est, quod episcopi numeri praevalentis docent; qui autem ratione doctrinae a se examinatae judicat episcopos, quamvis pauciores, orthodoxos esse, eo ipso infallibilitatem episcoporum, quam verbis explicitis asseverat, facto et implicate repudiat. Atqui ita agunt orientales dissidentes; ne quaestionem quidem habent, quid tempore orti schismatis episcopi numerosiores senserint, sed episcopos suos prae ceteris homines sententiae cohaerentis cum ecclesia antiqua ideoque rectae ex considerata indole sententiae pronuntiant.

Deinde illi fundamentum vel caput ecclesiae universae divinitus positum profitentur omnino nullum nisi Christum; simul autem ecclesiam universam dicunt in rebus fidei subjectam universitati infallibili episcoporum, quod est reapse nihil aliud quam praeter Christum invisibilem dicere collegium episcoporum fundamentum vel caput aliquod ecclesiae universae visibile et id aequè divinitus constitutum ac divinitus existit infallibilitas, qua per fundamentum et caput illud Deus ipse ecclesiam praeditam voluerit. Atqui haec duo, esse praeter Christum fundamentum vel caput ecclesiae universae omnino nullum, et esse praeter Christum fundamentum vel caput ecclesiae ejusdem aliquod alterum, profecto inter se confligunt. Denique ubi agitur vel de apostolis omnibus vel de episcopis efferendis, quos illi vere capita agnoscunt, jam id expresse sic declarant, ut Christus sit fundamentum simpliciter et primario (ἀπλῶς καὶ πρῶτως), apostoli secundum quid et secundarium (κατὰ τι καὶ δεύτερον), ut Christus sit caput tamquam pastor princeps ecclesiae universae, episcopi sint capita tamquam

outside of it^[11], undoubtedly even by a mere moral unanimity or by a prevailing majority, as history compels us to acknowledge. Once this principle is established, it can never happen that in revealed matters a clearly greater part of the bishops should err while the minority holds the truth; hence in every disagreement, what the bishops of the prevailing number teach must be sought out most diligently as infallibly true. But whoever judges bishops to be orthodox on the basis of doctrine examined by himself, even though they may be fewer in number, thereby repudiates in fact and implicitly the infallibility of bishops which he explicitly asserts in words. Yet this is exactly how the Eastern dissidents act; they do not even raise the question of what the more numerous bishops thought at the time when the schism arose, but they pronounce their own bishops above all other men to be of sound judgment, coherent with the ancient church and therefore correct, based on their consideration of the character of the position.

Furthermore, those [Protestant theologians] profess that there is absolutely no foundation or head of the universal Church established by divine authority except Christ alone; yet at the same time they say that the universal Church in matters of faith is subject to the infallible totality of bishops. This is in reality nothing other than saying that, besides the invisible Christ, the college of bishops is some visible foundation or head of the universal Church, and that this is equally constituted by divine authority, just as the infallibility by which God himself wished the Church to be endowed through that foundation and head exists by divine authority. But these two positions—that there is absolutely no foundation or head of the universal Church besides Christ, and that there is some other foundation or head of that same Church besides Christ—clearly conflict with each other. Finally, when it comes to discussing either all the apostles or the bishops whom they truly acknowledge as heads, they now expressly declare this in such a way that Christ is the foundation simply and primarily (ἀπλῶς καὶ πρῶτως), while the apostles are foundation in a qualified sense and secondarily (κατὰ τι καὶ δεύτερον); that Christ is the head as the chief

vicarii (τοποτηρηταί) pro Christo in ecclesiis particularibus. Atqui cum hoc distinguendi et componendi modo non consistit, quod illi Christum solum fundamentum et caput ita esse volunt, ut nullum secundum quid, secundarium, vicarium habeatur in ecclesia universa; nam cum capita vicaria visibilia pro Christo invisibili ideo postulenter, ut ecclesiae particulares visibiles in unitate contineantur, multo magis requiritur caput vicarium visibile pro Christo invisibili, ut in unitate contineatur corpus visibile ecclesiae universae. Quare illi concinnius, talem repugnantiam dimittendo et principium visibile unitatis ecclesiae universae divinitus existens ingenue concedendo, controversiam totam eo revocarent, utrum principium divinitus statutum esset dumtaxat collegium episcoporum, qui singuli omnes ex se tenerent potestatem parem, an principium divinitus statutum esset collegium episcoporum, quatenus adhaereret Petro et successori Petri episcopo romano ut principio unitatis ipsius quoque collegii, ac proinde episcopus romanus etiam unus. In qua controversia utique illorum opinioni scriptura et traditio et ipsa ratio theologica, flagitans pro Christo physice uno principium unitatis physice unum in ecclesia universali pariter et particulari, adversatur.[¹²] Ceterum adeatur *Pitzipios* l. c. introduct. et p. 2; p. 4. c. 2. n. 3; c. 4. n. 2. 3; *Walter* l. c. §. 22. 23. 25. 25 b. 26. 28 a. 163 a. 164. 166; *Döllinger* l. c.; *Schouwvaloff* l. c. Abt. 1. c. 3. n. 7; Abt. 2. n. 4; *Gagarin*, Le clergé russe c. 5; *Marshall* l. c., c. 8 (pag. 482 ss. 492 ss. 580); *Hist.-polit. Blätter* l. c.; *Hefele*, Concilieng. 7, 739 ss; *Pelesz* l. c. 1, 469 s; 2, 375 ss. 744—756. 759 ss; *Nilles* l. c. 2, c. 3. de synodo florentina; *Wilmers* l. c. n. 318; *Kirchenlexikon*² 3, 985 ss; 5, 1234 ss; *Kirchliches Handlexikon* 1, 1793 ss; *Pierling*, La Russie et le Saint-Siège IV. 1. 4. c. 2. n. 1; *Palmieri Aurel.* l. c., c. 7. n. 1—9; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1877, 662 ss; 1886, 569; 1890, 416 ss; 1894, 203. 341; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1885, 187; 1886, 74. 99; 1897,

shepherd of the universal Church, while bishops are heads as vicars (τοποτηρηταί) for Christ in particular churches. But what they want—namely, that Christ alone is foundation and head in such a way that nothing qualified, secondary, or vicarious is held to exist in the universal Church—is inconsistent with this method of distinguishing and reconciling. For since visible vicarious heads for the invisible Christ are demanded precisely so that visible particular churches may be maintained in unity, much more is a visible vicarious head required for the invisible Christ, so that the visible body of the universal Church may be maintained in unity. Therefore, they would argue more harmoniously by abandoning such contradiction and frankly conceding a divinely existing visible principle of unity for the universal Church, and by reducing the entire controversy to this point: whether the divinely established principle was merely the college of bishops, who individually all hold equal power in themselves, or whether the divinely established principle was the college of bishops insofar as it adheres to Peter and Peter's successor, the Roman bishop, as the principle of unity of that college itself, and therefore the Roman bishop also as an individual. In this controversy, certainly, Scripture and tradition and theological reasoning itself—which demands for the physically one Christ a physically one principle of unity in the universal Church equally as in the particular Church—stands opposed to their opinion.[¹²] For the rest, see *Pitzipios* l. c. introduct. and p. 2; p. 4. c. 2. n. 3; c. 4. n. 2. 3; *Walter* l. c. §. 22. 23. 25. 25 b. 26. 28 a. 163 a. 164. 166; *Döllinger* l. c.; *Schouwvaloff* l. c. Abt. 1. c. 3. n. 7; Abt. 2. n. 4; *Gagarin*, Le clergé russe c. 5; *Marshall* l. c., c. 8 (pag. 482 ss. 492 ss. 580); *Hist.-polit. Blätter* l. c.; *Hefele*, Concilieng. 7, 739 ss; *Pelesz* l. c. 1, 469 s; 2, 375 ss. 744—756. 759 ss; *Nilles* l. c. 2, c. 3. de synodo florentina; *Wilmers* l. c. n. 318; *Kirchenlexikon*² 3, 985 ss; 5, 1234 ss; *Kirchliches Handlexikon* 1, 1793 ss; *Pierling*, La Russie et le Saint-Siège IV. 1. 4. c. 2. n. 1; *Palmieri Aurel.* l. c., c. 7. n. 1—9; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1877, 662 ss; 1886, 569; 1890, 416 ss; 1894, 203. 341; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1885, 187; 1886, 74. 99; 1897, 84; 1900, 176 ss; 1903, 251; 1906, 106; 1911

84; 1900, 176 ss; 1903, 251; 1906, 106; 1911 91. 166; *Vaterland* 1 jul. 1905. n. 181; *Slavor. litt. theol.* 1906, 273; 1907, 324 ss; 1908, 253 s; 1910, 60; ad haec videsis quae exposui de principio essentiali unitatis ecclesiae Christi apud *acta II. convent. celebrad.* pag. 51 ss.

[1471] d. Sane consequenter perspicitur abesse orientalibus separatis apostolicitatem etiam materialem (cf. n. 1414), quod successio in potestate sacra jurisdictionis ab origine apostolica continuatae vix mere apparens, nedum simpliciter apparens, illis restat; quippe potestas jurisdictionis ad usum expedita vel et in se ipsa (cf. th. XXII; n. 1292) non obtinetur nisi per principium unitatis ecclesiae divinitus positum germanum, a quo illi ex dictis (n. 1469) in hypothesi omni nimis aperte alieni sunt. Et revera antiquitus secundum morem confirmatio ideoque jurisdictio sacra quomodocumque in patriarcham ipsum alexandrinum, antiochenum, constantinopolitanum a successore Petri pontifice romano, nempe tamquam fonte apostolico omnibus agnito desuper semper pleno, emanavit (repete n. 759—766), unde ab hoc fonte interclusi illi rivi exaruerunt; quali sorte non eximitur patriarcha constantinopolitanus, praesertim cum Byzantium, a Constantino M. Constantinopolis, oboediens primitus metropolitae heracleensi post saecula demum locum inter vel ante patriarchatus orientis antiquiores, scilicet alexandrinum et antiochenum, et superadditum hierosolymitanum acquisiverit, quod ut sedes imperii Roma nova esset; quae ratio per se profana ad summum dignitatem sacram jure ecclesiastico adaugandam suo tempore superiori legitimo per jus immutabile divinum apostolico suadere, non jurisdictionem sacram ab eodem superiore deficientem supplere unquam potest (cf. n. 762. 824 s). Aliorum vero dissidentium, ut russorum vel neogræcorum, jurisdictio cum nunc etiam distet a rivo constantinopolitano ipso arefacto, a quo olim derivata ducebatur, titulo duplici exsiccata est. Insuper

91. 166; *Vaterland* 1 jul. 1905. n. 181; *Slavor. litt. theol.* 1906, 273; 1907, 324 ss; 1908, 253 s; 1910, 60; concerning these matters, see what I have set forth regarding the essential principle of the unity of Christ's Church in the *acts of the second convention celebrated*, page 51 ff.

[1471] d. Consequently, it is clearly perceived that the separated Eastern Christians lack even material apostolicity (cf. n. 1414), since the succession in the sacred power of jurisdiction continued from apostolic origin remains for them scarcely merely apparent, much less simply apparent; for the power of jurisdiction prepared for use or even in itself (cf. th. XXII; n. 1292) is not obtained except through the genuine principle of Church unity divinely established, from which they are, according to what has been said (n. 1469), in every hypothesis all too openly alienated. And indeed in ancient times, according to custom, confirmation and therefore sacred jurisdiction was somehow transmitted to the patriarch himself—whether Alexandrian, Antiochene, or Constantinopolitan—from the successor of Peter, the Roman pontiff, namely as from an apostolic source acknowledged by all as always complete from above (repeat n. 759—766), whence those streams, cut off from this source, dried up; the Constantinopolitan patriarch is not exempted from this fate, especially since Byzantium, renamed Constantinople by Constantine the Great, originally obedient to the metropolitan of Heraclea, only after centuries finally acquired a place among or before the more ancient patriarchates of the East, namely the Alexandrian and Antiochene, and the additionally established Hierosolymitan, so that it might be a new Rome as the seat of empire; this reason, profane in itself, can at most persuade the legitimate superior at the proper time through immutable divine apostolic right to augment sacred dignity by ecclesiastical law, but can never supply sacred jurisdiction lacking from that same superior (cf. n. 762. 824 ff). Moreover, the jurisdiction of other dissidents, such as Russians or neo-Greeks, since it is now also distant from the very Constantinopolitan stream which has dried up, from which it was once considered to be derived, has been desiccated by a double title. Furthermore, the

episcopi divisi orientis a potestate principis sive civili sive sacra arrogata quasi superiore in exsistendo et agendo ita pendent, ut vel tenuis species regiminis apostolici plerumque sit destructa, eo quidem magis, quod princeps in Turcia infidelis est, alibi etiam femina, ut Catharina I et II in Russia, esse potest. Et haec quidem de jurisdictione; nam potestas ordinis sejunctorum orientalium fere valida habetur (cf. *Granderath, Geschichte des vatik. Konzils* Bd 1, B. 1, K. 7, n. 6); quare si non licite, tamen valide conficere illi sacra possunt excepto sacramento paenitentiae, quod pro validitate jurisdictionem quoque postulat.[^13]

Quamquam eruditi aliqui censent, virum illum, qui a. 1620 comparens in urbe Kiev jactavit se Theophanem patriarcham hierosolymitanum atque episcopos complures consecravit, episcopum consecratum reapse non fuisse; quo pacto hierarchia ordinis in Russia saltem *eatenus* nulla judicanda esset, quatenus ab errore illo descendisset.

Ceterum fides apud abscissos apostolica, i. e. vera tempore favente quidem esse potest; sed non omnino talis, omissis turbis *palamitarum*, vel eo comperitur, quod illi pugnant inter se de modo valide baptizandi et de potestate synodi oecumenicae (cf. n. 1467) et quod illi omnes pugnant secum ipsi confitendo fidem de ecclesia una: in se *dissentaneam* (n. 1470) et reluctando non solum professioni propriae denuo in concilio lugdunensi II et florentino editae (n. 1468), sed etiam libris liturgicis, quamvis partim depravatis usibusque suis, qui processionem Spiritus sancti etiam a Filio, primatum romanum, purgatorium usque testificantur; cui accedit, quod russi ab aetate Petri M. *aliive* acceptis *quadantenus* opinionibus protestantium vel incredulorum contra doctrinam pristinam pugnant.

De his agit *Pitzipios* l. c. introduct. et p. 1.

bishops of the divided East depend so much on the power of a prince, whether civil or sacred, arrogated as if superior in existing and acting, that even the slight appearance of apostolic government is usually destroyed, all the more so because the prince in Turkey is an infidel, and elsewhere can even be a woman, as Catherine I and II in Russia. And this indeed concerns jurisdiction; for the power of orders of the separated Eastern Christians is generally held to be valid (cf. *Granderath, Geschichte des vatik. Konzils* Vol. 1, B. 1, Ch. 7, n. 6); therefore, if not licitly, they can nevertheless validly perform the sacred rites except for the sacrament of penance, which also requires jurisdiction for validity.[^13]

Although certain learned men maintain that the man who, appearing in the city of Kiev in the year 1620, boasted that he was Theophanes, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and consecrated several bishops, was not actually a consecrated bishop; in which case the hierarchy of orders in Russia would have to be judged null at least *to that extent* insofar as it descended from that error.

Furthermore, the apostolic faith among those who have separated themselves, that is, the true faith, can indeed exist when circumstances are favorable; but it is not entirely such—setting aside the tumults of controversialists—as is discovered from the fact that they fight among themselves concerning the proper manner of valid baptism and concerning the authority of an ecumenical synod (cf. n. 1467), and that they all fight against themselves by confessing faith in one church that is *discordant* within itself (n. 1470) and by resisting not only their own profession again published in the Second Council of Lyon and the Florentine Council (n. 1468), but also their liturgical books, however partially corrupted, and their own practices, which still testify to the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son, the Roman primacy, and purgatory; to which is added the fact that the Russians, from the age of Peter the Great or others, having accepted *to some degree* the opinions of Protestants or unbelievers, fight against their ancient doctrine.

These matters are treated by *Pitzipios* l. c. introduct.

c. 8. 12; p. 4. c. 2. n. 4; c. 4. n. 3; *Walter* l. c. §. 22. 28 a. 164. 166. 239; *Döllinger* l. c. 162 s. 167. 171 ss. 183. 187 ss; *Schouvaloff* l. c. Abt. 1. c. 3. n. 10; Abt. 2. n. 10; *Gagarin*, *La Russie sera-t-elle catholique?* Idem, *Réponse d'un russe à un russe*; *Le clergé russe* c. 3—5; *Marshall* l. c. pag. 494 s. 580; *Hist.-polit. Blätter* l. c.; *Hefele*, *Concilieng.* 2², 17 ss. 527 ss; *Hettinger*, *Fundamentaltheologie* 2, §. 9. B. VI; *Pelesz* l. c. 2, 140 ss. 744—756. 788—792; *Nilles* l. c. 1, de usu dogmatico testimoniorum ex libris liturg. ecclesiae orient. desumpt., et ad 2. jan., 16. jan., 18. febr., 12. mart., 13. april., 29. jun.; 2, c. 2. §. 2. de purgat. vel de process. Spiritus s. (cf. supra n. 72. 80. 87. 483. 486. 496. 995); *Kirchenlexikon*² 3, 985 ss; 10, 1380 ss; *Kirchliches Handlexikon* 1, 1793 ss; *Pierling* l. c.; *Palmieri Aurel.* l. c., c. 1. n. 1. 2; c. 2. n. 1—3; c. 6. n. 1—4; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1877, 662 ss; 1880, 743 ss; 1894, 260 ss. 336 ss. 417 ss; 1909, 170 s; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1876, 111 s; 1885, 146. 187; 1886, 71 ss. 99 s; 1897, 84; 1899, 272 s; 1900, 176 ss; 1905, 179 s; 1906, 104 ss. 274 ss; *Stimm. litt. theol.* 1906, 273; 1907, 324 ss; *Theol.-prakt. Quartal-Schrift* 1909, 289 ss; *acta II. convent. velehrad.* pag. 65. 95 ss. 104 ss.

[1472] *Prob. tertia pars min.* (cf. n. 1458). Nimirum similia vel fortiora in sectas orientales haereticas minores saeculo V ortas intorqueri possunt. Primum enim in his non magis quam in dissidentibus aliis sanctitas miraculorum vel, quanta par est, vita virtutis sancta, sed potius egestas deserti spiritualis cernitur (cf. *Marshall* l. c., c. 7. pag. 338 ss. 359. 366 s; c. 8. pag. 608 ss. 615 ss. 625; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1906, 78 ss. 207; 1908, 206 s. 270 s; 1910, 292; 1911, 7 ss). Deinde quamvis illae, videlicet divisae vel et contrariae, in unum colligantur, absolute in obscuritatem nimiam hominum et locorum coarctatae, relative ad catholicos jam minimae comparent (recole n. 1455); insuper cum iisdem simul homines catholici sive ritus latini sive ipsorum

et p. 1. c. 8. 12; p. 4. c. 2. n. 4; c. 4. n. 3; *Walter* l. c. §. 22. 28 a. 164. 166. 239; *Döllinger* l. c. 162 s. 167. 171 ss. 183. 187 ss; *Schouvaloff* l. c. Abt. 1. c. 3. n. 10; Abt. 2. n. 10; *Gagarin*, *Will Russia become Catholic?* Idem, *A Russian's Reply to a Russian*; *The Russian Clergy* c. 3—5; *Marshall* l. c. pag. 494 s. 580; *Historico-Political Papers* l. c.; *Hefele*, *Concilieng.* 2², 17 ss. 527 ss; *Hettinger*, *Fundamental Theology* 2, §. 9. B. VI; *Pelesz* l. c. 2, 140 ss. 744—756. 788—792; *Nilles* l. c. 1, on the dogmatic use of testimonies drawn from the liturgical books of the Eastern Church, and ad 2. jan., 16. jan., 18. febr., 12. mart., 13. april., 29. jun.; 2, c. 2. §. 2. on purgatory or on the procession of the Holy Spirit (cf. supra n. 72. 80. 87. 483. 486. 496. 995); *Church Lexicon*² 3, 985 ss; 10, 1380 ss; *Ecclesiastical Manual* 1, 1793 ss; *Pierling* l. c.; *Palmieri Aurel.* l. c., c. 1. n. 1. 2; c. 2. n. 1—3; c. 6. n. 1—4; *Journal for Catholic Theology* 1877, 662 ss; 1880, 743 ss; 1894, 260 ss. 336 ss. 417 ss; 1909, 170 s; *The Catholic Missions* 1876, 111 s; 1885, 146. 187; 1886, 71 ss. 99 s; 1897, 84; 1899, 272 s; 1900, 176 ss; 1905, 179 s; 1906, 104 ss. 274 ss; *Stimm. litt. theol.* 1906, 273; 1907, 324 ss; *Theological-Practical Quarterly* 1909, 289 ss; *acts of the II. convention of Velehrad* pag. 65. 95 ss. 104 ss.

[1472] *Proof of the third minor part* (cf. n. 1458). Indeed, similar or even stronger arguments can be directed against the minor Eastern heretical sects that arose in the 5th century. For in these sects, no more than in other dissidents, is there to be discerned the sanctity of miracles or, as would be fitting, a holy life of virtue, but rather the poverty of spiritual desolation (cf. *Marshall* l. c., c. 7. pag. 338 ff. 359. 366 f; c. 8. pag. 608 ff. 615 ff. 625; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1906, 78 ff. 207; 1908, 206 f. 270 f; 1910, 292; 1911, 7 ff). Moreover, although these sects, namely the divided or even opposing ones, may be gathered into one, they appear absolutely constrained by the excessive obscurity of men and places, and relatively speaking are already minimal in comparison to Catholics (recall n. 1455); furthermore, along with these same groups are found Catholic men both of the Latin rite and of their own

rituum orientalium, nempe in rebus juris non divini, sed ecclesiastici mutabilis differentium, ut praeter graecos cum melchitis et maronitis armeni, syri, copti, chaldaei ecclesiae catholicae uniti inveniuntur, quorum numerus reversis etiam nuperrime tum ab haeresi monophysitarum ex parte jacobitis, armenis, coptis, tum nestorianis crevit (videas *Marshall* l. c., c. 7. pag. 344 ss; c. 8. pag. 517 ss. 525. 532 ss. 545 s. 549 s. 604 s. 610 ss; *Kirchenlexikon*² 9, 1051 s; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1885, 191; 1900, 58 s. 93 ss. 227; 1901, 46. 72; 1903, 165. 186; 1904, 153 ss; 1905, 15 ss. 206 s; 1907, 35 ss. 50. 237; 1908, 85; 1909, 116. 142. 191; 1910, 57 ss. 243 s. 271 ss. 278; *Werner*, Katholischer Missions-Atlas; Katholischer Kirchen-Atlas; Orbis terrarum catholicus; *K. Streit*, Katholischer Missionsatlas; Statistische Notizen zum katholischen Missionsatlas; *La Gerarchia cattolica*).

Praeterea deest unitas; nam sicut nestoriani monophysitis opponuntur, ita monophysitae, prae illis jam evanescentibus soli *quandamtenus* conspiciendi, saltem in syros cum aliis, qui dicuntur cuncti a Jacobo Baradai episcopo edesseno *angustiùs* jacobitae, in armenos, in coptos cum abessiniis scissi sunt; adde, quod pro unitate ecclesiae universae genuina principio unitatis genuino haeretici memorati omnes manifesto carent; quale principium non fuit Nestorius episcopus merus constantinopolitanus, cujus decessor celeberrimus *Chrysostomus* verbo et facto primatum successoris Petri haud ambigue agnovit (n. 164. 500); neque principium tale exstitit sive Eutyches ipse primus auctor monophysitarum simplex archimandrita (cf. n. 501) sive *Dioscorus* haeresis eutychianae antesignanus, patriarcha dumtaxat alexandrinus, cujus decessores magni *Dionysius*, *Athanasius*, *Cyrillus* tribunal romanum summum in ecclesia coluerant (n. 498. 499. 816); quemadmodum etiam devii armeni et jacobitae Aegypti, i. e., copti cum

Eastern rites, namely differing in matters not of divine law but of mutable ecclesiastical law, such that besides the Greeks, there are found united to the Catholic Church the Melkites and Maronites, Armenians, Syrians, Copts, and Chaldeans, whose number has grown through recent conversions both from the Monophysite heresy on the part of the Jacobites, Armenians, and Copts, and from the Nestorians (see *Marshall* l. c., c. 7. pag. 344 ff; c. 8. pag. 517 ff. 525. 532 ff. 545 f. 549 f. 604 f. 610 ff; *Kirchenlexikon*² 9, 1051 f; *Die katholischen Missionen* 1885, 191; 1900, 58 f. 93 ff. 227; 1901, 46. 72; 1903, 165. 186; 1904, 153 ff; 1905, 15 ff. 206 f; 1907, 35 ff. 50. 237; 1908, 85; 1909, 116. 142. 191; 1910, 57 ff. 243 f. 271 ff. 278; *Werner*, Katholischer Missions-Atlas; Katholischer Kirchen-Atlas; Orbis terrarum catholicus; *K. Streit*, Katholischer Missionsatlas; Statistische Notizen zum katholischen Missionsatlas; *La Gerarchia cattolica*).

Furthermore, unity is lacking; for just as the Nestorians oppose the Monophysites, so the Monophysites—who alone are *to some extent* visible now that the former have largely vanished—are divided at least into the Syrians along with others (who are all called, more *specifically*, Jacobites after Jacob Baradaeus, bishop of Edessa), into the Armenians, and into the Copts together with the Abyssinians. Add to this that all the aforementioned heretics manifestly lack a genuine principle of unity for the universal church's genuine unity; such a principle was not found in Nestorius, who was merely bishop of Constantinople, whose celebrated predecessor *John Chrysostom* had unambiguously acknowledged the primacy of Peter's successor both in word and deed (n. 164. 500); nor did such a principle exist either in Eutyches himself, the first author of the Monophysites and a simple archimandrite (cf. n. 501), or in *Dioscorus*, the standard-bearer of the Eutychian heresy and merely patriarch of Alexandria, whose great predecessors *Dionysius*, *Athanasius*, and *Cyril* had honored the Roman tribunal as supreme in the church (n. 498. 499. 816); just as also the wayward Armenians and the Jacobites of Egypt (i.e., the Copts together with

abessiniis, et Palaestinae ipsi saltem ad tempus errorem suum fassi unioni graecorum in concilio florentino accesserunt, nestoriani jam saeculo XIII cum ecclesia catholica aliquamdiu uniti erant (videsis *Pitsipios* l. c. p. 4. c. 7; *Marshall* l. c., c. 8. pag. 607; *Hefele* l. c. 7, 788 ss. 793 ss; *Kirchenlexikon*² 8, 1795 ss; 4, 1376 s; 3, 41 ss; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1903, 523 ss). Hinc denique nestoriani et monophysitae expertes apostolicitatis necessariae, pro potestate jurisdictionis quidem, perspicue cognoscuntur; eam enim accipere oportet a principio unitatis ecclesiae totius, unde secundum consuetudinem sectis illis priorem ipsi patriarchae orientis per sedem s. Petri romanam confirmabantur (resume n. 759—766), a qua alienati orientales haeretici similiter ac schismatici jugum non sane apostolicum principum temporalium subierunt; neque fides hominum istorum apostolica, utique immutabiliter ecclesiae servanda una, esse potest, quia non plene convenit ei, quam ipsi in concilio florentino vel ante uniendi professi sunt atque etiamnum in liturgia sua (cf. n. 72. 516; *acta II. convent. velehrad.* pag. 65) antiquitus tradita et in canonibus adhuc retentis. (n. 742. adnot. 2) profitentur, et eodem jure, quo revincunt nestoriani haeticos arianos ut adversos concilio nicaeno I, etiam ipsi ut adversi concilio ephesino revincuntur, et eodem jure, quo revincunt monophysitae haeticos arianos ut adversos concilio nicaeno I et nestorianos ut adversos concilio ephesino, etiam ipsi ut adversi concilio chalcedonensi revincuntur (ceterum vide *Pitsipios* l. c. p. 1. c. 12; p. 4. c. 7; *Döllinger* l. c. 162 s; *Marshall* l. c. pag. 608 s).

[1473] 5. Teste ipsâ experientiâ ecclesiam romanam mali prae aliâ quavis odio habent nec nisi terrena sapientes deserunt, boni, si sunt ei juncti, diligendo tenent, sin sunt separati et de ea satius docti, vel etiam cum jactura terrenorum amplectuntur vel saltem attrahentem sentiunt. Atqui his cognoscitur ecclesia

the Abyssinians), and those of Palestine itself, at least for a time confessed their error and joined the union of the Greeks at the Council of Florence, while the Nestorians had already been united with the Catholic Church for some time in the thirteenth century (see *Pitsipios* l. c. p. 4. c. 7; *Marshall* l. c., c. 8. pag. 607; *Hefele* l. c. 7, 788 ff. 793 ff; *Kirchenlexikon*² 8, 1795 ff; 4, 1376 f; 3, 41 ff; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1903, 523 ff). Hence, finally, the Nestorians and Monophysites are clearly recognized as lacking the necessary apostolicity, at least regarding the power of jurisdiction; for this must be received from the principle of unity of the entire church, whence according to the custom prior to those sects, the patriarchs of the East themselves were confirmed through the Roman See of St. Peter (resume n. 759—766), from which the Eastern heretics, alienated like the schismatics, have submitted to the yoke—certainly not apostolic—of temporal princes; nor can the faith of these men be apostolic, which must indeed be preserved by the church unchangeably as one, because it does not fully agree with that which they themselves professed when uniting at the Council of Florence or before, and which they still profess even now in their liturgy (cf. n. 72. 516; *acta II. convent. velehrad.* pag. 65) handed down from antiquity and in canons still retained (n. 742. adnot. 2), and by the same right by which the Nestorians refute the Arian heretics as opposed to the First Council of Nicaea, they themselves are also refuted as opposed to the Council of Ephesus, and by the same right by which the Monophysites refute the Arian heretics as opposed to the First Council of Nicaea and the Nestorians as opposed to the Council of Ephesus, they themselves are also refuted as opposed to the Council of Chalcedon (for the rest, see *Pitsipios* l. c. p. 1. c. 12; p. 4. c. 7; *Döllinger* l. c. 162 f; *Marshall* l. c. pag. 608 f).

[1473] 5. By the testimony of experience itself, the wicked hold the Roman Church in hatred above any other, and being wise only in earthly matters, they abandon it; the good, if they are joined to it, hold it fast through love, but if they are separated from it and are better instructed concerning it, they either embrace it even with the loss of earthly goods, or at

romana prae aliā quavis portis inferi et mundo cum concupiscētiis invisa (cf. *Mat* 16, 18; *Jo* 15, 19; 1 *Jo* 2, 16), hominibus probis impulsu caelestis gratiae accepta, i. e., ecclesia vera Christi.

[1474] 6. Reapse comparatione facta nunc quidem ea pronuntianda est prae ceteris se offerentibus ecclesia unice vera, quae similior invenitur ecclesiae prioribus post Christum saeculis praecellens, ecclesiae videlicet, in qua tot et tanti Patres sanctitate vitae aequae ac sapientia scriptorum instar lucis mundi effulgebant; nam aut ista fuit aut nunquam exstitit ecclesia Jesu Christi. Atqui similitudinem summam quandam ecclesia romana catholica prae se fert; idem enim conspicitur hodie in hac studium unitatis fidei ejusque ab antiquitate traditae, quod apud Patres vidimus (n. 1211 s. 1261 ss. 1424—1428. 1446; eadem cura unitatis sacrorum vel communionis socialis, quae in ecclesia ab initio floruit (cf. n. 1205. 1217 s. 1269—1273); talis hierarchia, qualis ecclesiam primorum saeculorum administravit (cf. n. 431 ss); similes fructus et signa sanctitatis in hominibus virtutis omnis, etiam eximiae, vel martyribus vel aliis, in exsecutoribus consiliorum evangelicorum, in miraculis, ac quibus apologetae vetusti ecclesiae gloriati sunt (cf. n. 1323 ss. 1331—1334. 1338 s. 1343. 1447); amplitudo per orbem et contentio ampliandi compar ei, quae in ecclesia olim exstitit (cf. n. 1358—1361. 1448); sollicitudo successionis episcoporum rite continuandae tanta, quantam ecclesia jam avita habuit (cf. n. 1390—1399. 1449); conjunctio cum sede apostolica romana, sicut in principio a fidelibus custodita est (cf. v. g. n. 489. 984 ss. 498. 506); ne multa, ecclesia romana catholica hodierna permoscitur esse eadem ut ecclesia antiqua in rebus majoribus quibusque, nempe divinitus essentialibus vel necessariis, cum differentiae, quatenus sunt in minoribus, ex potestate ecclesiae data disciplinae secundum locorum

least feel themselves drawn to it. Now by these signs the Roman Church is recognized above any other as being hateful to the gates of hell and to the world with its lusts (cf. *Mat* 16, 18; *Jo* 15, 19; 1 *Jo* 2, 16), yet acceptable to upright men through the impulse of heavenly grace—that is, as the true Church of Christ.

[1474] 6. Indeed, having made the comparison, it must now be declared that among all the churches presenting themselves, that one is uniquely true which is found to be most similar to the church excelling in the earlier centuries after Christ—namely, the church in which so many and such great Fathers shone forth like the light of the world, equally in holiness of life and in wisdom of writings; for either this was the church of Jesus Christ, or the church of Jesus Christ never existed. But the Roman Catholic Church displays a certain supreme similarity; for the same zeal for unity of faith and for that faith handed down from antiquity is observed today in this church as we have seen among the Fathers (n. 1211 ff. 1261 ff. 1424—1428. 1446); the same care for unity of sacred rites or social communion which flourished in the church from the beginning (cf. n. 1205. 1217 ff. 1269—1273); such a hierarchy as administered the church of the first centuries (cf. n. 431 ff.); similar fruits and signs of holiness in men of every virtue, even extraordinary—whether martyrs or others, in those who follow the evangelical counsels, in miracles, and in those things of which the ancient apologists of the church boasted (cf. n. 1323 ff. 1331—1334. 1338 ff. 1343. 1447); an extent throughout the world and an effort to expand comparable to that which existed in the church of old (cf. n. 1358—1361. 1448); such solicitude for the proper continuation of episcopal succession as the church already possessed in ancient times (cf. n. 1390—1399. 1449); union with the Roman apostolic see, just as it was maintained by the faithful in the beginning (cf. e.g. n. 489. 984 ff. 498. 506); not to mention many other things, the Roman Catholic Church today is recognized to be the same as the ancient church in all the more important matters, namely those that are divinely essential or necessary, while the differences, insofar as they exist in lesser matters, are easily explained by the power given to

temporumque varietatem commutandae facile explicentur. E contrario coetus reliqui dignitatem ecclesiae Christi sibi tribuentes *nōn* aequae ecclesiam primaevam in elementis indicatis referunt, sed potius veterum sectarum diu exstinctarum exprimunt imaginem, sive in aliis sive in resuscitandis doctrinis ab antiquitate christiana condemnatis et devictis, quod de protestantibus quidem *Bellarminus*, contemplatus haereses pristinas ostendit (de conciliis et ecclesia l. 4. c. 9). Et vero praestantia ecclesiae romanae catholicae prae coetibus degeneribus adeo evidens est, ut acatholici ipsi interdum admirabundi eam verbis magnificis extollant.^[14]

[1475] 7. Quandoquidem ecclesia, quae romana catholica nominatur, initio aut ecclesia Christi vera aut in ecclesia vera fuit, esse desivisset aut per corruptionem invalescentem in se ipsa, quamvis essentialiter tota ecclesia vera Christi, aut per separationem sui tamquam partis factam ab ecclesia aliqua, cui dignitas ecclesiae totius verae permansisset. Atqui casus prior est exclusus, cum ecclesia Domini exitio corruptionis, in re scilicet essentiali, obnoxia esse nequeat (th. XII), immo secundum illud *Irenaei* (supra n. 1388) semper a Spiritu sancto servata juvenescat. Neque idem casus inde commendatur, quod sicut Lutherus de hac causa incertissimus haesit, ita universe in designando tempore corruptionis assertores inter aetatem apostolicam et concilium Vaticanum mira discrepantia vagantur (cf. *Döllinger, Die Reformation* 3, 194 ss; *Hettinger, Fundamentaltheologie* 2, § 9, B. V. 1). Praesertim quae a protestantibus praetenditur corruptela, eo incredibilior est, quo illam in artioribus sine pugna introductis, ut in onere operum bonorum, executione consiliorum evangelicorum, confessione peccatorum, jejuniis, libertate per ecclesiam injuste diminuta, non in laxioribus ponunt. Qua de causa dissidentes orientis ipsi, praecipue synodo Hierosolymis a. 1672 habita (H 11, 179

the church to change discipline according to the variety of places and times. On the contrary, the remaining groups attributing to themselves the dignity of Christ's church do *not* equally represent the primitive church in the elements indicated, but rather express the image of ancient sects long extinct, whether in other doctrines or in reviving teachings condemned and defeated by Christian antiquity—which Robert Bellarmine, having contemplated the pristine heresies, demonstrates concerning Protestants (On Councils and the Church, book 4, chapter 9). And indeed the excellence of the Roman Catholic Church over the degenerate assemblies is so evident that non-Catholics themselves sometimes admiringly extol it with magnificent words.^[14]

[1475] 7. Since the church which is called Roman Catholic was at the beginning either the true Church of Christ or was within the true church, it would have ceased to be such either through corruption growing strong within itself—even though essentially the entire true Church of Christ—or through its separation as a part from some church to which the dignity of the entire true church had remained. But the former case is excluded, since the Church of the Lord cannot be subject to the destruction of corruption in any essential matter (th. XII); indeed, according to that statement of *Irenaeus* (above n. 1388), it is always kept young by the Holy Spirit. Nor is this same case recommended by the fact that just as Luther remained most uncertain about this cause, so universally in designating the time of corruption, its assertors wander with remarkable discrepancy between the apostolic age and the Vatican Council (cf. *Döllinger, Die Reformation* 3, 194 ff; *Hettinger, Fundamentaltheologie* 2, § 9, B. V. 1). Especially the corruption alleged by Protestants is all the more incredible in that they place it not in laxer matters, but in stricter ones introduced without struggle, such as in the burden of good works, the execution of evangelical counsels, the confession of sins, fasting, liberty unjustly diminished by the church. For this reason the Eastern dissidents themselves, especially in the synod held at Jerusalem in the year 1672 (H 11, 179 ff), condemn the opinions of the Protestants;

ss), sententias protestantium damnant, quin etiam homines jam ex concilio ephesino vel chalcedonensi oecumenico haeretici dogmata pleraque cum catholicis communia, ut imprimis hierarchiae cujusdam ideoque ecclesiae visibilis a Christo institutae, a primordio rei christianae transmissa attestantur (videas *Walter, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts aller christlichen Confessionen* § 24; *Marshall, Die christlichen Missionen* c. 7. pag. 367. 374 s; c. 8. pag. 490 s. 498 ss. 606 s); etsi alioqui orientales isti omnes indicia nimis manifesta corruptentis senectutis, non vigorem juvenilem ecclesiae romanae prae se ferunt. Sed non magis eligendo viam perniciiei alteram ecclesia romana catholica instar partis se ab ecclesia Christi vera separavit.

Quae hypothesis est historice absurda, quoniam ne coetum quidem, a quo romana ecclesia discesserit, nedum nomen novum inde pro rei novitate adhaerescens vel circumstantias ullas discessionis talis, e more perhibentis desertores jam *Justini* (dial. cum Tryphone n. 35; *M* 6, 551), *Hegesippi* (apud *Eusebii* hist. eccl. l. 4. c. 22; *M* 20, 379 ss), *Clementis alex.* (strom. l. 7. c. 17; *M* 9, 547 ss), *Tertulliani* (de praescript. c. 30. 37; *M* 2, 42. 51; supra n. 534. 1391), *Chrysostomi* (in Act hom. 33. n. 4; *M* 60, 244 ss), perhibere possunt. Neque enim serio quisquam dixerit, ecclesiam catholicam ab hac illave secta haeretica vel schismatica quasi ecclesia vera defecisse, nisi forte inverso ordine recto negat, ecclesiam ipsam a parte mera aliqua relictam habendam esse eam, quacum manserit velut lapidum aedificii fundamentum, radiorum luminis centrum, ramorum arboris radix, rivorum aquae fons, membrorum corporis caput eousque indubitatum, i. e., episcopus romanus (revise v. g. supra n. 87. 129. 483. 487. 771. 991). Quocirca haeticos vel schismaticos temporis hujus pro similitudine quidem condicionis similiter ac veteres refutat *Clemens alex.* (n. 1261), quod ab ecclesia catholica egressi

indeed, even men already heretical from the ecumenical council of Ephesus or Chalcedon attest to most dogmas held in common with Catholics, such as especially that of a certain hierarchy and therefore of a visible church instituted by Christ, transmitted from the beginning of the Christian religion (see *Walter, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts aller christlichen Confessionen* § 24; *Marshall, Die christlichen Missionen* c. 7. pag. 367. 374 f; c. 8. pag. 490 f. 498 ff. 606 f); even though otherwise all these Orientals display signs too manifest of corrupting old age, not the youthful vigor of the Roman church. But no more by choosing the other path of destruction did the Roman Catholic Church separate itself as a part from the true Church of Christ.

This hypothesis is historically absurd, since they cannot point to any assembly from which the Roman Church departed, much less any new name adhering to it from the novelty of the matter, or any circumstances of such a departure, as was customary for those who already describe deserters—as we see in Justin Martyr (Dialogue with Trypho n. 35; *Migne* 6, 551), Hegesippus (in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History l. 4. c. 22; *Migne* 20, 379 ff), Clement of Alexandria (Stromata l. 7. c. 17; *Migne* 9, 547 ff), Tertullian (On Prescription c. 30. 37; *Migne* 2, 42. 51; above n. 534. 1391), John Chrysostom (Homily 33 on Acts n. 4; *Migne* 60, 244 ff). For no one would seriously claim that the Catholic Church defected from this or that heretical or schismatic sect as if it were the true Church, unless perhaps by inverting the proper order he denies that the Church itself should be considered as having been abandoned by some mere part—that Church with which there remained, as it were, the foundation of a stone building, the center of rays of light, the root of branches of a tree, the source of streams of water, the head of members of a body, hitherto undoubted, i.e., the Roman bishop (review e.g. above n. 87. 129. 483. 487. 771. 991). Therefore, regarding the heretics or schismatics of this time, by similarity of condition, he refutes them similarly as the ancients: Clement of Alexandria (n. 1261) [refutes them] because, having departed from the Catholic Church,

conciliabula sua fecerint, objurgat *Tertullianus* (n. 1391), quod posterior nostra res non sit, immo omnibus prior sit, accusat *Cyprianus* (n. 1212), quod non nos ab illis, sed illi a nobis recesserint, deplorat *Augustinus* (n. 1345), quod tamquam sarmenta inutilia praecisa de vite ab ecclesia catholica exierint. Quid quod protestantes saltem Luthero duce sua sponte sunt confessi, se ab ecclesia catholica sejungi (cf. *Döllinger* l. c. 200. 204. 215. 220. 244 ss), unde et *afferrent* criminationes, quibus justam esse secessionem propriam monstrarent? Ergo restat, ut ecclesia romana catholica sit ipsa ecclesia vera Christi.

[1476] 8. Hinc Patribus diserte idem est esse in ecclesia vera et esse in ecclesia catholica romana, i. e., pontifici romano juncta, sive expresse hunc appellant, sive antonomastice successorem Petri nominant; quo pertinent effata *Irenaei* (n. 489. col. 984 ss), *Cypriani* (n. 488. 550), *Optati* (n. 236. 487. 1440), *Ambrosii* (n. 87. 550), *Epiphani* (n. 528), ipsius *Pelagii* haeretici (n. 994), *Hieronymi* (n. 87. 550. 995), *Bonifatii I* (n. 487), *Augustini* (n. 70. 1365, *cont. ep. fund.*), *Eusebii doryl.* (n. 501), *Arnobii jun.* (n. 550), *Voconii* nunc conjectati (n. 994. adnot.), formulae *Hormisdas* (n. 493), *Pelagii I* (n. 1394), *Gregorii M.* (n. 994. 1395), *Maximi martyris* (n. 102), *Theodori studitae* (n. 645).

Proinde *intellegimus*, sanctam ecclesiam vel sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, quā symbolis antiquissimis (D¹⁰ 2, 6, 9, 14, 86) credere jubemur, reapse nullam dici aliam nisi *aedificatam* super successorem Petri pontificem romanum. Simul intellegimus, consentaneas dumtaxat explicationes articuli ejusdem esse formulas fidei eas, quibus credenda ecclesia romana catholica proponatur; qualis est professio fidei praescripta ab *Innocentio III* waldensibus (supra n. 367), a *Clemente VI* armenis (ib.), doctrina *Pii IX* (n. 374. 375), s. *officii romani*

they made their own conventicles; *Tertullian* (n. 1391) rebukes [them] because our cause is not posterior, but rather is prior to all; *Cyprian* (n. 1212) accuses [them] because it is not we who withdrew from them, but they from us; *Augustine* (n. 1345) laments [them] because they went out from the Catholic Church like useless branches cut off from the vine. What of the fact that the Protestants, at least under Luther's leadership, have spontaneously confessed that they are separating themselves from the Catholic Church (cf. *Döllinger* l. c. 200. 204. 215. 220. 244 ff), whence they also brought forth accusations by which they might show their own secession to be just? Therefore it remains that the Roman Catholic Church is itself the true Church of Christ.

[1476] 8. Hence for the Fathers it is expressly the same thing to be in the true Church and to be in the Roman Catholic Church, that is, united to the Roman Pontiff, whether they expressly invoke him or antonomastically name him the successor of Peter; to this pertain the pronouncements of *Irenaeus* (n. 489. col. 984 ff), *Cyprian* (n. 488. 550), *Optatus* (n. 236. 487. 1440), *Ambrose* (n. 87. 550), *Epiphanius* (n. 528), *Pelagius* himself the heretic (n. 994), *Jerome* (n. 87. 550. 995), *Boniface I* (n. 487), *Augustine* (n. 70. 1365, *against the epistle of the foundation*), *Eusebius of Dorylaeum* (n. 501), *Arnobius the Younger* (n. 550), *Voconius* now conjectured (n. 994. note), the formula of *Hormisdas* (n. 493), *Pelagius I* (n. 1394), *Gregory the Great* (n. 994. 1395), *Maximus the Martyr* (n. 102), *Theodore of Studium* (n. 645).

Therefore we *understand* that the holy church, or holy catholic church, which we are commanded to believe in the most ancient creeds (D¹⁰ 2, 6, 9, 14, 86), can in reality be called nothing other than that which is *built* upon the successor of Peter, the Roman Pontiff. At the same time we understand that only those explanations of this same article are consistent which are formulas of faith by which the Roman Catholic Church is proposed as the object of belief; such is the profession of faith prescribed by *Innocent III* to the Waldensians (above n. 367), by *Clement VI* to the Armenians (ibid.), the doctrine of *Pius IX* (n. 374. 375), of the *Roman Holy Office*

(n. 1450); in ipso *concilio vaticano* ecclesia Christi ut sancta catholica apostolica romana ecclesia inducitur (s. III. c. 1; D 1631) vel romanus pontifex caput ecclesiae per totum orbem diffusae definitur (s. IV. c. 3; D 1672 ss); ubi et paratus fuit canon 13: „Si quis dixerit, veram Christi ecclesiam, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, aliam esse praeter unam, sanctam, catholicam, et apostolicam romanam; anathema sit“ (L 7, 577; cf. ib. 633 et *syllabi* errorum prop. 21; D 1569).

Cui definitioni praeparatae congruit haec enuntiatio *Leonis XIII* (de americanismo, 22 jan. 1899; D¹⁰ 1976): „Una unitate doctrinae sicut unitate regiminis eaque catholica est ecclesia: cujus quoniam Deus in cathedra beati Petri centrum ac fundamentum esse statuit, jure romana dicitur; ‚ubi‘ enim ‚Petrus, ibi ecclesia‘ (*Ambros.*; supra n. 87).“

Quamobrem *quicumque* catholico nomine censi vult, is verba *Hieronymi* ad Damasum pontificem usurpare ex veritate debet: „Ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequens Beatitudini tuae, id est cathedrae Petri, communionem consocior: super illam petram aedificatam ecclesiam scio; quicumque tecum non colligit, spargit“ (ib.) Ex dictis dignitas divina ecclesiae catholicae romanae sensu quidem (n. 1451) declarato dogma fidei comperitur. Et vero erat dogma fidelibus ab initio secundum verba Domini credendum, ecclesiam tunc aedificatam super Petrum ipsam ecclesiam Christi esse; quod dogma, cum ex effatis Servatoris ecclesia aedificata super Petrum in successoribus suis vivum semper eadem perduraret, in ecclesiam determinatam quovis tempore praesentem cadere nunquam desinebat; sed ecclesia talis ab exordio hactenus continuata non est alia quam quae ex gentibus omnibus adhaerens successori Petri pontifici romano catholica romana nominatur. Nec quidquam impedit, quominus ecclesia, sicut per rationem atque revelationem legata Dei perhibetur (cf. n. 1195), ita pro

(n. 1450); in the *Vatican Council* itself the Church of Christ is presented as the holy catholic apostolic Roman Church (sess. III. c. 1; D 1631) or the Roman Pontiff is defined as the head of the Church spread throughout the whole world (sess. IV. c. 3; D 1672 ff); where also canon 13 was prepared: “If anyone shall say that the true Church of Christ, outside of which no one can be saved, is other than the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Roman Church; let him be anathema” (L 7, 577; cf. ibid. 633 and *Syllabus* of Errors prop. 21; D 1569).

To this prepared definition corresponds this declaration of *Leo XIII* (on Americanism, January 22, 1899; D¹⁰ 1976): “The Church is Catholic by unity of doctrine just as by unity of government: since God has established its center and foundation in the chair of blessed Peter, it is rightly called Roman; for ‘where Peter is, there is the Church’ (*Ambrose*; above n. 87).”

Therefore, *whoever* wishes to be considered under the Catholic name must in truth adopt the words of *Jerome* to Pope Damasus: “I, following no one as first except Christ, am united in communion with Your Beatitude, that is, with the chair of Peter: I know that the Church was built upon that rock; whoever does not gather with you, scatters” (ibid.) From what has been said, the divine dignity of the Roman Catholic Church, understood in the sense declared (n. 1451), is found to be a dogma of faith. And indeed it was a dogma to be believed by the faithful from the beginning according to the Lord’s words, that the Church then built upon Peter is the Church of Christ itself; which dogma, since from the utterances of the Savior the Church built upon Peter in his successors would always endure as the same living Church, never ceased to apply to the definite Church present at any time; but such a Church continued from the beginning until now is none other than that which, adhering to the successor of Peter, the Roman Pontiff, from all nations is called the Roman Catholic Church. Nor does anything prevent the Church, just as it is declared to be bound by God’s law through reason and revelation (cf. n. 1195), from likewise urging every fundamental dogma of its own heavenly origin and

potestate proponendae veritatis revelatae omnis etiam dogma fundamentale originis et indolis caelestis suae ipsa definiendo urgeat.

[1477] 9. Superest, ut dubitationibus quibusdam dissolutis thesis confirmetur. a. Praecipua difficultas ex *schismate* magno occidentis provenit. Quid enim? Verene et quomodo per luctuosum illud tempus annorum ferme quadraginta (a. 1378 — 1417) ecclesia romana fuit una vel insuper catholica vel etiam visibilis? Licet respondere primum, ex demonstratis coetui nulli proprietates notasve ecclesiae genuinae necessarias jure majore adscribi posse quam coetui romano, proinde aut ecclesiam Christi veram periisse aut esse ecclesiam romanam; ergo, cum ecclesia sit perpetua, ecclesiam romanam etiam tempore schismatis unitate, catholicitate, visibilitate, sufficiente quidem pro ecclesia vera, praeditam fuisse. Cui responso indirecto evincenti saltem rem unitatis, catholicitatis, visibilitatis tunc retentae adjungimus directum, quo ipse modus unitatis, catholicitatis, visibilitatis perstantis explicetur.

[1478] Et quidem unitatem conservatam *theologi* complures in eo cernere solent, quod christiani diversis summis pontificibus addicti seu differentes, quae vocantur, obedientiae permanserint concordēs omnes in profitenda necessitate vel etiam sincera voluntate unius pontificis romani, legitimi tamquam capitis ecclesiae universae agnoscendi; unde error exsisteret tantum in facto vel persona, qui unitatem ecclesiae obœdientias illas continentis quadantenus obscuraret, non everteret. At opinionem talem cum principiis certis per hunc tractatum probatis conjungere non possumus ideoque unitatem minime obscuratam in eo collocamus, quod obœdientia una unius veri pontificis romani, exclusis ceteris, ecclesia Christi fuerit. Nam primum valet semper illud: „Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia“ (cf. supra n. 87), i. e., qui adhaerent re ipsa fundamento vel capiti ecclesiae vero, successori Petri

nature by defining it through its power of proposing revealed truth.

[1477] 9. It remains that the thesis be confirmed by resolving certain doubts. a. The principal difficulty arises from the great *schism* of the West. For what then? Did the Roman Church truly remain one, and in what manner, and furthermore catholic and even visible during that sorrowful period of nearly forty years (1378-1417)? It is permissible to respond first that, from what has been demonstrated, no assembly can be assigned the properties or marks necessary for the genuine Church by greater right than the Roman assembly; therefore, either the true Church of Christ has perished or the Roman Church is that Church; consequently, since the Church is perpetual, the Roman Church even during the time of schism was endowed with unity, catholicity, and visibility sufficient indeed for the true Church. To this indirect response, which proves at least the matter of unity, catholicity, and visibility then retained, we add a direct one, by which the very manner of the persisting unity, catholicity, and visibility may be explained.

[1478] And indeed, many *theologians* are accustomed to perceive the unity that was preserved in this: that Christians devoted to different supreme pontiffs, or the differing obediences, as they are called, all remained in agreement in professing the necessity or even sincere will of acknowledging one Roman pontiff, legitimate as head of the universal Church; whence the error would exist only in fact or person, which would somewhat obscure, but not overthrow, the unity of the Church containing those obediences. But we cannot reconcile such an opinion with the certain principles proven throughout this treatise, and therefore we place unity as not obscured in the least in this: that the Church of Christ belonged to one obedience of one true Roman pontiff, with all others excluded. For first, this always holds: “Where Peter is, there is the Church” (cf. above n. 87), i.e., those who adhere in actual fact to the true foundation or head of the Church, the genuine successor of Peter, the legitimate Roman pontiff—these and these alone are found in actual

genuino, romano pontifici legitimo, ii et ii soli in ædificio vel corpore ecclesiæ re ipsa inveniuntur. Atqui romanus pontifex legitimus tempore uno eodemque non potest esse nisi unus. Deinde essentialem vidimus ecclesiæ esse unitatem non tantummodo fidei vel sacrorum, sed et socialem ita, ut sit unum regnum (th. XXXI). Atqui obœdientiæ per schisma variæ nullam inter se servabant unitatem socialem, nec nisi minus proprie unius regni partes appellentur; quicumque enim pluribus supremis potestatibus plane independentem agentibus subiciuntur, non regnum unum, sed vere plura hic et nunc constituere intelleguntur. Præterea cum supremæ illæ potestates etiam mutuo anathemate se ferirent, subjectum potestatis saltem non legitimæ per sententiam ab homine in ipsum nominatim latam ex ecclesiæ est ejectum. Atqui ecclesiæ membra non sunt illi, qui sequuntur caput quodpiam a corpore ecclesiæ divisum. Insuper sectatores capitum diversorum ipsi inter se pugnabant. Atqui cœtus ex factionibus ejusmodi compositus non sapit unitatem socialem eam, quæ est proprietas et nota ecclesiæ Jesu Christi. Quin unitas etiam fidei in obœdientiis illis simul sumptis non florebat talis, qualis ecclesiæ Christi convenit. Ne urgeamus, indolem legitimam pontificis romani, ut Urbani VI, esse factum dogmaticum, quod satis objective propositum ab ecclesia tota sit tenendum (cf. th. XXV), certe unitas in fide ecclesiæ essentialis est consensus non qualiscumque, sed per principium conspicuum supremum unum tuto efficienda (th. XXXI). Atqui eatenus hæc unitas ætate schismatis vigeat, quatenus communitas tantum dedita legitimo pontifici ecclesia Christi erat. Et re vera fieri etiam per se poterat, ut unus ex duobus vel tribus illis pontificibus aliquid credendum definiret, reliquis aut nihil aut, cum unus tantum infallibilis foret, oppositum declarantibus; quo in casu, per dissensionem aut negativam aut positivam, ipsa unitas in rebus fidei amissa esset. Atqui membra ecclesiæ,

fact in the building or body of the Church. But there cannot be more than one legitimate Roman pontiff at one and the same time. Furthermore, we have seen that unity is essential to the Church not only of faith or sacred matters, but also social unity, so that it is one kingdom (th. XXXI). But the various obediences through schism preserved no social unity among themselves, nor can they be called parts of one kingdom except in a less proper sense; for whoever are subject to several supreme powers acting entirely independently are understood to constitute not one kingdom, but truly several, here and now. Moreover, since those supreme powers also struck each other with mutual anathema, the subject of at least non-legitimate power has been cast out from the Church through a sentence pronounced by a man specifically against him. But those who follow some head divided from the body of the Church are not members of the Church. Furthermore, the followers of different heads fought among themselves. But an assembly composed of such factions does not savor of that social unity which is the property and mark of the Church of Jesus Christ. Indeed, even unity of faith did not flourish in those obediences taken together such as befits the Church of Christ. Not to press the point that the legitimate character of the Roman pontiff, such as Urban VI, is a dogmatic fact, which when sufficiently objectively proposed must be held by the whole Church (cf. th. XXV), certainly unity in faith essential to the Church is a consensus not of just any kind, but one to be safely achieved through one supreme conspicuous principle (th. XXXI). But this unity flourished in the age of schism only insofar as the community devoted to the legitimate pontiff alone was the Church of Christ. And indeed it could even happen intrinsically that one of those two or three pontiffs might define something to be believed, while the others declared either nothing or, since only one would be infallible, the opposite; in which case, through dissension either negative or positive, unity itself in matters of faith would be lost. But the members of the Church, the pillar and ground of truth, can never be of such a condition to which that danger is intrinsically connected.

columnæ et firmamenti veritatis, nunquam condicionis ejus esse possunt, cui periculum illud sit per se conjunctum.

[1479] Denique infirma sunt, quæ contra hanc sententiam proferuntur. Nam quod obœdientiæ omnes agnoscebant unicum non partis ecclesiæ, sed ecclesiæ universæ caput, successorem s. Petri, legitimum episcopum romanum, videlicet in abstracto, hoc utique demonstrat, non fuisse schisma hæresi commixtum; minime autem probat, non fuisse schisma, quamvis merum, tamen verum, quod vere ab ecclesia separaret. Patroni argumenti talis rationem unitatis ecclesiæ justam non habere vel unitatem aliquam in obligatione affirmata et voluntate sola existentem cum unitate actuali necessaria confundere videntur. Nimirum quisquis baptizatus infitatur principium, pontifici romano vero adhaerendum esse, extra ecclesiam versatur ut hæreticus sive formalis sive materialis. Neque tamen qui illud profitetur, jam est in ecclesia; potest enim, quamvis necessitatem adhaerendi credat, vel non adhaerere pontifici romano vero vel etiam adhaerere falso, et sic est extra ecclesiam ut schismaticus, formalis quidem, si culpa propria a vero pontifice dissideat, materialis, si errore dumtaxat inculcato facti retineatur; quo errore posito ita re ipsa est disjunctus, ut voto bonæ voluntatis cum vero pontifice et ecclesia jungatur, paratus scilicet re conjungi, simul atque illum noscat. Cui homini non est comparandus, qui magisterio ecclesiæ adhaerens negat dogma, quod opinatur a magisterio non doceri; nam hic alter in ecclesia manet, quia magisterio ecclesiæ, principio unitatis fidei visibili legitimo concreto firmiter adhaeret, in quo agnito dogma quoque omne implicite confitetur; ex contrario homo prior extra ecclesiam existit, quia ipsi principio unitatis ecclesiæ vero concreto non adhaeret, etsi se ei adhaerere putat. Proinde cum sententia nostra conciliatur, quod etiam in obœdientiis a corpore ecclesiæ re disjunctis homines multi bonæ fidei,

[1479] Finally, the arguments brought forward against this position are weak. For the fact that all the obediences recognized a single head—not of a part of the Church, but of the universal Church—a successor of Saint Peter, a legitimate Roman bishop (namely, in the abstract), this certainly demonstrates that the schism was not mixed with heresy; but it by no means proves that there was no schism, which, though it may have been pure, was nonetheless true and truly separated from the Church. The supporters of such an argument seem either not to have a proper understanding of the reason for the unity of the Church, or to confuse some unity existing in affirmed obligation and will alone with the actual unity that is necessary. Indeed, whoever among the baptized denies the principle that one must adhere to the true Roman Pontiff is outside the Church as a heretic, whether formal or material. Nevertheless, one who professes that principle is not thereby already in the Church; for he can, even though he believes in the necessity of adhering, either not adhere to the true Roman Pontiff or even adhere to a false one, and thus he is outside the Church as a schismatic—formal indeed, if by his own fault he dissents from the true Pontiff; material, if he is held back only by a blameless error of fact. With this error in place, he is so disconnected in reality that he is joined to the true Pontiff and the Church by the desire of good will, namely, prepared to be joined in reality as soon as he recognizes him. To such a man cannot be compared one who, adhering to the magisterium of the Church, denies a dogma which he thinks is not taught by the magisterium; for this latter person remains in the Church, because he firmly adheres to the magisterium of the Church, the legitimate concrete visible principle of the unity of faith, in recognizing which he also implicitly confesses every dogma. On the contrary, the former man exists outside the Church, because he does not adhere to the true concrete principle of the unity of the Church itself, even if he thinks he adheres to it. Therefore, it is consistent with our position that even in the obediences actually separated from the body

immo valde sancti fuerint. Neque illi obstat, quod sacramentum paenitentiae in obœdientiis præposteris, excepto mortis articulo, invalidum exstiterit; ubi non difficultas major quam in schismate alio quolibet reperitur. Itaque maneat, in sola obœdientia pontificis legitimi ecclesiam tunc fuisse.

[1480] Porro quemnam habeamus pro legitimo pontifice, seu, cum per leges electionis pontifices serierum singularum, a schismatis exordio duarum, deinde trium, percipiantur esse rationis paris, qualem seriem comprobemus? Imprimis ut non legitimam excludimus seriem incipientem demum a synodo pisana a. 1409, i. e., illum Petrum Philargi, qui se vocavit Alexandrum V, et successorem ejus Balthasarem Cossa, qui sibi nomen Joannis XXIII imposuit. Etenim series alterutra eorum, qui jam ab anno 1378 de pontificatu concertabant, legitima utique erat; proinde legitimus erat pontifex, qui tempore pisanæ synodi vivebat, aut Gregorius XII sequens proxime Innocentium VII, remotius Bonifatium IX et Urbanum VI, aut Benedictus XIII (*Petrus de Luna*), successor Clementis VII (*Roberti genevensis*). Idque fatendum esset, etiamsi aemulus uterque pontifex dubius exstisset; falsum enim est effatum pro dijudicanda hac ipsa controversia inventum: *Papa dubius papa nullus* (vide n. 590. adnot.). Sed pontifex legitimus, ut potestatem immediate a Christo Domino habens (th. XVIII), deponi auctoritate humana nequit; jure autem divino per delictum solius hæresis vel schismatis publicum dignitate excidit (cf. n. 589. adnot. alt.), cujusmodi vel hæresim vel schisma pontificis legitimi ridicule in eo posuerunt, quod ille pisanam synodum reiceret vel saltem facto pontificatus non dimissum articulum unitatis ecclesiasticæ credendum pernegaret vel ab ecclesia tamquam fautor inveterati schismatis secederet; neque enim actis suis, sive prorsus prudenter atque recte sive minus recte, quidquam aliud nisi jura propria ipsius principii centricæ unitatis

of the Church, there were many men of good faith—indeed, very holy ones. Nor does it pose a difficulty for our position that the sacrament of penance in the perverse obediences was invalid (except at the point of death), since no greater difficulty is found there than in any other schism. Therefore, let it stand that the Church was then in the obedience of the legitimate Pontiff alone.

[1480] Furthermore, whom should we regard as the legitimate pontiff, or rather, since according to the laws of election the pontiffs of individual series—from the beginning of the schism first of two, then of three—are perceived to be of equal standing, which series should we approve? First of all, we exclude as illegitimate the series beginning only from the Pisan synod in the year 1409, that is, that Peter Philargi who called himself Alexander V, and his successor Balthasar Cossa, who imposed upon himself the name John XXIII. For indeed, one or the other of the series of those who had been contending for the pontificate since the year 1378 was certainly legitimate; therefore, the pontiff who was living at the time of the Pisan synod was legitimate, either Gregory XII following immediately after Innocent VII, more remotely after Boniface IX and Urban VI, or Benedict XIII (*Peter de Luna*), successor of Clement VII (*Robert of Geneva*). And this would have to be admitted even if each rival pontiff had appeared doubtful; for false is the saying invented for deciding this very controversy: *A doubtful pope is no pope* (see n. 590, note). But the legitimate pontiff, as having power immediately from Christ the Lord (thesis XVIII), cannot be deposed by human authority; however, by divine law he falls from dignity through the public crime of heresy or schism alone (cf. n. 589, second note), and they ridiculously placed such heresy or schism of the legitimate pontiff in the fact that he rejected the Pisan synod or at least by the fact of not having relinquished the pontificate, denied the article of ecclesiastical unity as something to be believed, or seceded from the church as a supporter of inveterate schism; for indeed by his actions, whether entirely prudent and correct or less correct, he vindicated nothing other than the proper rights of the very principle and center of unity, nor did he himself

vindicavit, neque ipse a fidelibus, sed fideles multi ab ipso discesserunt. Atqui pontifice legitimo auctoritatem suam retinente novus nullus pontifex locum habere poterat. Quamobrem, seposita serie pisana, aut solum Urbanum VI residentem Romæ cum suis successoribus ipsoque Gregorio XII, aut Clementem VII residentem Avenione cum Benedicto XIII romanum pontificem legitimum agnoscere oportet.

[1481] Legitimum autem fuisse Urbanum VI efficitur tam firmis argumentis, ut id pro explorato sit habendum. Enimvero huc refertur argumentum, quod historia suppeditat tum ex actu electionis in se ipso cum omnibus adjunctis considerato tum ex dictis et scriptis et actis subsequentibus publicis privatisque hominum ætatis illiusmet, ipsorum quoque et præcipue cardinalium eligentium et in his Roberti Genevensis, sicut etiam cardinalium ceterorum adhuc Avenione commorantium; unde sufficiens libertas electionis clare noscitur (cf. pro hoc aliisve factis *historicis* deinceps commemorandis v. g. *Pastor*, Geschichte der Päpste 14, 115 ss; *Hergenröther-Kirsch*, Kirchengeschichte 24, 807 ss); de qua eo minus dubitari potest, quod ipse metus gravis et injustus extrinsecus ad eligendam personam etiam determinatam per vim incussus electionem per se invalidam non reddit (cf. *Wernz*, *Jus decretalium* 2², n. 581). Accedit argumentum theologicum, quod Urbanum VI per menses plures nomen catholicum totum haud dubie ut legitimum agnoscebat; in quo facto dogmatico ecclesia universa falli nequit (cf. th. XXV). Idem ut ex initio, ita ex fine schismatis colligitur: Nam pontifex certo legitimus ab omnibus est agnitus Martinus V cum suis successoribus. Atqui legitimus hic ita erat, si erat legitimus Gregorius XII proinde decessor ejus Urbanus VI. Sane perperam asseritur, tunc pontificem successorem præter voluntatem decessoris veri, ut incerti, ideo potuisse eligi, quod in necessitate tali potestas eligendi ipso jure

depart from the faithful, but many of the faithful departed from him. But with the legitimate pontiff retaining his authority, no new pontiff could have a place. Therefore, setting aside the Pisan series, one must acknowledge as legitimate Roman pontiff either Urban VI alone, residing in Rome, with his successors including Gregory XII himself, or Clement VII residing in Avignon with Benedict XIII.

[1481] That Urban VI was legitimate, however, is established by such firm arguments that this must be held as thoroughly proven. Indeed, the argument that history supplies is brought to bear here, both from the act of election considered in itself with all its circumstances, and from the subsequent public and private words, writings, and acts of men of that very age, including those of the electing cardinals themselves and especially of Robert of Geneva, as well as of the other cardinals still remaining at Avignon; whence sufficient freedom of election is clearly recognized (cf. for this and other *historical* facts subsequently commemorated, e.g., *Pastor*, Geschichte der Päpste 14, 115 ff; *Hergenröther-Kirsch*, Kirchengeschichte 24, 807 ff); concerning which there can be all the less doubt, since even grave and unjust fear externally instilled by force for electing even a determined person does not per se render an election invalid (cf. *Wernz*, *Jus decretalium* 2², n. 581). There is added a theological argument, that the entire Catholic world undoubtedly acknowledged Urban VI as legitimate for several months; in this dogmatic fact the universal Church cannot err (cf. th. XXV). The same thing is gathered from the end of the schism as from the beginning: For Martin V was acknowledged by all as certainly a legitimate pontiff along with his successors. But he was legitimate in this way, if Gregory XII was legitimate and therefore his predecessor Urban VI. Certainly it is erroneously asserted that then a successor pontiff could have been elected contrary to the will of the true predecessor, as uncertain, because in such necessity the power of electing would devolve by natural law itself to the Church or to a general council. But now, setting aside other things said about a doubtful pope, this escape is

naturali ad ecclesiam vel concilium generale devolveretur. At, nunc omissis aliis de papa dubio dictis, effugium hoc excluditur. Potestas eligendi pontificis æque ac potestas ecclesiæ universa supernaturalis est, quæ a Christo servatore, *non* per merum jus naturæ datur. Sed Christus dedit potestatem illam soli Petro ejusque successoribus (cf. n. 589). Hinc pontifex non est nisi qui a pontifice præcedente per se vel per electores a se approbatos designatur. Et vero aliter actum esset de potestatis summæ apostolicitatis, nempe potestatis Petro primo datæ unius ejusdemque hereditariæ velut per manus continua transmissione, quæ requirit, ut potestas pontificis novi eligendi et electo potestatem summam a Deo conferendam exigendi ne præter Petrum ejusve successorem in ecclesia exsistat, sed tamquam tradux potestatis summæ ab ipso pontifice decessore habeatur. Hoc posito coherentia inter indolem legitimam Martini V et Gregorii XII præ Benedicto XIII illo perspicitur. Quippe Benedicto pertinaciter se nunquam abdicante Gregorius pontificatū renuntiavit, facultate etiam plena concilio constantiensi facta electionis novæ modo, qui placeret, perficiendæ; unde Martinus a 23 cardinalibus assumptis ex omnibus oboedientiis et a 30 aliis praelatis doctoribusque nationum creari recte potuit. Sane *Joannes Dominici*, legatus Gregorii XII, hæc in concilio constantiensi (s. XIV; H 8, 388) protulit: „Ego Joannes . . cardinalis, Ragusinus vulgariter nuncupatus, . . auctoritate ipsius domini nostri papæ, quantum ad eundem spectat, ut prædicta (ecclesiastica) sancta unio, reformatio, et hæreticæ pravitatis extirpatio, Deo auctore, meliorem sortiatur effectum, et ut sub diversorum professione pastorum dissidentes christiani in unitate sanctæ matris ecclesiæ et caritatis vínculo jungantur, istud sacrum concilium generale convoco, et omnia per ipsum agenda auctorizo et confirmo, juxta modum et formam, prout in litteris domini nostri . . plenius

excluded. The power of electing a pontiff, just as the power of the universal Church, is supernatural, which is given by Christ the Savior, *not* through mere natural law. But Christ gave that power to Peter alone and his successors (cf. n. 589). Hence there is no pontiff except one who is designated by the preceding pontiff either personally or through electors approved by him. And indeed it would have been otherwise concerning the supreme apostolic power, namely the power first given to Peter as one and the same hereditary power through continuous transmission as it were from hand to hand, which requires that the power of electing a new pontiff and of demanding that supreme power be conferred by God upon the elect should not exist in the Church apart from Peter or his successor, but should be held from the predecessor pontiff himself as a derivative of the supreme power. This being established, the coherence between the legitimate character of Martin V and Gregory XII in preference to that Benedict XIII is perceived. Indeed, with Benedict never abdicating pertinaciously, Gregory renounced the pontificate, also granting full faculty to the Council of Constance to carry out a new election in whatever manner pleased them; whence Martin could rightly be created by 23 cardinals taken from all obediences and by 30 other prelates and doctors of the nations. Indeed *John Dominici*, legate of Gregory XII, brought forward these words in the Council of Constance (s. XIV; H 8, 388): “I John... cardinal, commonly called Ragusinus,... by the authority of our lord pope himself, insofar as it pertains to him, so that the aforesaid holy (ecclesiastical) union, reformation, and extirpation of heretical depravity may, with God as author, obtain a better effect, and so that Christians dissenting under the profession of diverse pastors may be joined together in the unity of holy mother Church and the bond of charity, I convoke this sacred general council, and I authorize and confirm all things to be done through it, according to the mode and form as is more fully contained in the letters of our lord...” Where you see at the same time that not all obediences are exhibited as consisting in the Church; which is also understood as the opinion of that synod, since, “so that these two obediences, namely

continetur.“ Ubi simul vides, non omnes oboedientias ut in ecclesia consistentes exhiberi; quae et sententia illius synodi intellegitur, siquidem, „ut istae duae oboedientiae, videlicet illa quae profitetur Joannem XXIII olim fuisse papam, et illa quae profitetur dominum Gregorium XII esse papam, uniantur una alteri, et altera alteri conjungantur sub capite Christo,“ synodus „amodo has supradictas oboedientias conjunctas et unitas esse decernit et declarat in uno corpore Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et hujus sacri universalis concilii generalis“ (ib. 389). Quibus aliisque praemissis alter Gregorii XII legatus haec pronuntiavit (ib. 399 s): „Ego *Carolus de Malatestis* . . sanctissimi domini nostri papae procurator, . . ut omnibus aperte pateat per effectum, quanta sinceritate, quantaque cordis affectione sacram unionem et redintegrationem christianorum in unitate sanctae matris ecclesiae prosecutus fuit, prosequaturque per viam etiam renuntiationis inclusive, pure et libere et sincere procuratorio nomine ipsius sanctissimi domini nostri, domini Gregorii papae XII in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti renuntio et cedo expresse in his scriptis, realiter et cum effectum, juri, titulo et possessioni, quod, quem et quam ipse habet in papatu; et resigno nomine praefati domini nostri papatum, et omne jus papatus, titulum et possessionem, quod, quem et quam habet coram domino nostro Jesu Christo, qui ecclesiae suae sanctae est caput et sponsus, in hac sacrosancta synodo et universali concilio, „sanctam romanam et universalem ecclesiam repraesentante.“ Tandem Benedictus XIII vel potius *Petrus de Luna* a sua oboedientia et ipso sancto *Vincentio Ferrerio* est jam in perpetuum desertus; unde et contendit, ecclesiam catholicam seu arcam Noe esse in castello Peñíscola, quo sese receperat. Atqui hic ipse exitus ostendit, *Petrum de Luna*, pontificem legitimum nequiquam fuisse; neque enim, quae est divina providentia et promissio, ecclesiae corpus totum a vero suo capite potest peremptorie separari, neque

that which professes John XXIII to have been pope formerly, and that which professes lord Gregory XII to be pope, may be united one to the other, and the other joined to the other under Christ as head,” the synod “henceforth decrees and declares these aforesaid obediences to be joined and united in one body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of this sacred universal general council” (ib. 389). With these and other things having been premised, the other legate of Gregory XII pronounced these words (ib. 399 f): “I *Charles de Malatesta*... procurator of our most holy lord pope,... so that it may openly appear to all through the effect with what sincerity and with what affection of heart he has pursued and pursues the sacred union and reintegration of Christians in the unity of holy mother Church even by way of renunciation inclusively, purely and freely and sincerely in the name of procurator of that most holy lord of ours, lord Gregory pope XII, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, I renounce and cede expressly in these writings, really and with effect, the right, title and possession which he has in the papacy; and I resign in the name of the aforesaid lord our pope the papacy, and all right of the papacy, title and possession which he has before our lord Jesus Christ, who is head and spouse of his holy Church, in this most sacred synod and universal council ‘representing the holy Roman and universal Church.’” Finally Benedict XIII or rather *Peter de Luna* has now been abandoned forever by his own obedience and by Saint *Vincent Ferrer* himself; whence he also contended that the Catholic Church or the ark of Noah was in the castle of Peñíscola, to which he had withdrawn. But this very outcome shows that *Peter de Luna* was by no means a legitimate pontiff; for neither, given divine providence and promise, can the entire body of the Church be peremptorily separated from its true head, nor can the Catholic Church be reduced to some corner of Spain.

ecclesia catholica ad angulum Hispaniae quendam redigi.

[1482] Verum enimvero si pacto explanato salva est ecclesiae unitas, qua ratione catholicitas servetur? Primum est notandum, historicos in hac causa nondum omnia desideranda protulisse. Etenim catholicitas per se multitudine ecclesiarum particularium et hominum fidelium orbis, non numero potestatum politicarum, universitatum scientiarum, insigniorum personarum metienda est. Atqui descriptione ista generali societatum inter se per schisma divulsarum historici contenti fere sunt neque longius in particularia illa aperienda omnia descendunt, sive per defectum fontium sufficientium impediuntur, sive per negotii laborem et difficultatem deterrentur; quae difficultas etiam inde aucta est, quod saepe in iisdem regionibus episcopi oboedientiarum dissidentium versabantur. Nihilominus proportionem veram numerorum aliquatenus attingemus, si cum historicis in universum affirmamus, priore schismatis periodo, i. e., usque ad aetatem synodi pisanae stetisse paene cum Urbano VI ejusve successoribus Italiam, excepto regno neapolitano, Germaniam, Angliam, Britanniam minorem, Flandriam, Hungariam, Poloniam, Sueciam, Norvegiam, Daniam, diutius Lusitaniam, Roberti autem vel *Petri de Luna* fuisse studiosam Galliam, Hispaniam, Scotiam, Sabaudiam, plerumque regnum neapolitanum, semel atque iterum parumper Lusitaniam. Unde jam apparet oboedientia illa prior seu ecclesia Christi vera notabiliter amplior quam factio opposita, insuper interdum deminuta, quod ejus pars, praecipue Gallia, oboedientiae *Petri de Luna* ad tempus (a. 1398—1403) se subtraxit; similis scilicet fuerit secessio schismaticorum ac postea protestantium.

[1483] Deinde quidem, cum sub aetatem concilii pisani nonnulla regna, praesertim Gallia et Anglia, neutri pontifici se adhaerere declarassent, periodo

[1482] But truly, if with the pact explained the unity of the Church is preserved, by what reasoning is catholicity maintained? First, it must be noted that historians in this matter have not yet brought forth all that is to be desired. For indeed, catholicity is to be measured by the multitude of particular churches and faithful people throughout the world, not by the number of political powers, universities of learning, or distinguished persons. But historians have been content with that general description of societies torn apart from one another by schism, and they do not descend further into opening up all those particulars, either because they are hindered by a lack of sufficient sources, or because they are deterred by the labor and difficulty of the task; this difficulty has also been increased by the fact that often in the same regions there were bishops of dissenting obediences. Nevertheless, we shall attain the true proportion of numbers to some extent, if we affirm with historians in general that in the earlier period of the schism, that is, up to the time of the synod of Pisa, there stood almost with Urban VI and his successors: Italy (except for the Neapolitan kingdom), Germany, England, Lesser Britain, Flanders, Hungary, Poland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and for a longer time Portugal; but France, Spain, Scotland, Savoy, mostly the Neapolitan kingdom, and once and again for a little while Portugal were zealous for Robert or rather *Pedro de Luna*. From this it already appears that the former obedience, or the true Church of Christ, was notably more extensive than the opposing faction, and moreover was sometimes diminished, because part of it, especially France, withdrew itself from the obedience of Pedro de Luna for a time (1398-1403); similar, that is, would be the secession of schismatics and later of Protestants.

[1483] Furthermore, since during the period of the Council of Pisa certain kingdoms, especially France and England, had declared that they would adhere to neither pontiff, in the period following that assembly

conventum illum subsequente videri possit major pars fidelium accessisse ad pseudopontificem pisanum Alexandrum V et Joannem XXIII; quippe Gregorio dicuntur permansisse tantum magna pars Italiae, Germaniae, regna septentrionalia, Petro de Luna Hispania, Scotia aliaeque minores quaedam regiones, reliquum se pisanis subjecisse. Verumtamen ne iterum inculcemus, latiore extensionem oboedientiae falsae historice probatam nondum accurate esse, id prorsus arbitramur, probatum iri nunquam talem, quae catholicitatis genuinae indolem comprehendat. Ea enim ut suppositam sibi postulat unitatem seu cohaerentiam cum principio unitatis non qualem libet, sed firmam. Atqui historia talem conjunctionem firmam hominum fidelium cum fictis pontificibus a synodo pisana provenientibus minime testatur, immo potius attestatur, fuisse eam non ex persuasione certa ortam, fuisse dubiis multis aegram et corrosam, fluctuantem, ad resiliendum pronam. Huc spectat, quod pisani congregati ita se gesserunt, quasi potestati suae ipsi minime fiderent sibi quae ipsi animos addere vellent; eodem spectat anceps ratio ipsius quoque concilii constantiensis erga pontifices oppositos eorumque sectatores, etiam sub oboedientia pseudopontificis Joannis adhuc Constantiae praevalet; spectat et ipsa facilitas, qua idem pontifex a cunctis est abjectus, spectant diserta testimonia; exemplo sit confessio *Petri de Alliaco*, cardinalis cameracensis, qui quamvis oboediret Joanni XXIII, haec ipsi constantiensi synodo proposuit (H 8, 220 s): „Prima conclusio. Licet concilium fuerit legitime et canonice convocatum, rite et canonice celebratum, et duo olim contententes de papatu juste et canonice condemnati, et electio domini Alexandri V fuerit canonice et rite facta, et dicta electio ab illis, qui fuerunt in dicto concilio, fuerit legitime et canonice accepta, prout haec omnia tenet oboedientia domini nostri papae Joannis XXIII, tamen duae oboedientiae duorum contententium probabiliter tenent

it might appear that the greater part of the faithful had aligned themselves with the Pisan pseudopontiff Alexander V and John XXIII. Indeed, it is said that there remained with Gregory only a large part of Italy, Germany, and the northern kingdoms, while to Peter de Luna remained Spain, Scotland, and certain other smaller regions, with the remainder having subjected themselves to the Pisans. Nevertheless, lest we belabor the point again, we judge that the broader extension of false obedience has not yet been accurately proven historically, and we consider that such an extension as would encompass the character of genuine catholicity will never be proven. For genuine catholicity demands for itself a presupposed unity or coherence with the principle of unity—not just any kind, but a firm one. But history by no means testifies to such a firm conjunction of the faithful with the fictitious pontiffs originating from the Pisan synod; rather, it attests that this adherence did not arise from certain conviction, but was sick and corroded by many doubts, fluctuating, and prone to recoil. To this point pertains the fact that those assembled at Pisa conducted themselves as if they had minimal confidence in their own authority and wished to encourage themselves; to the same point pertains the ambivalent attitude of the Council of Constance itself toward the opposing pontiffs and their followers, even while the obedience to the pseudopontiff John still prevailed at Constance; and to this pertains also the very ease with which that same pontiff was cast off by all, as do the explicit testimonies. Let the confession of *Pierre d'Ailly*, Cardinal of Cambrai, serve as an example, who although he obeyed John XXIII, proposed these words to the Constance synod itself (H 8, 220 ff): “First conclusion. Although the council was legitimately and canonically convoked, properly and canonically celebrated, and the two formerly contending for the papacy were justly and canonically condemned, and the election of Lord Alexander V was canonically and properly made, and said election was legitimately and canonically accepted by those who were in said council, as all this obedience of our lord Pope John XXIII holds, nevertheless the two obediences of the two contenders probably hold the contrary, in which

contrarium, in qua opinionum diversa et adversa varietate non sunt minores difficultates juris et facti, quam ante concilium pisanum erat de justitia duorum contendendum. Ex quo sequitur secunda conclusio, quod sicut ante concilium pisanum ad evitandum difficultates juris, et facti, et prolixitatem, et dilationem pacis ecclesiae, tunc acceptata fuit ab omnibus Christi fidelibus, et laudata via cessionis amborum contendendum, sic et nunc trium contendendum de papatu, similiter autem (aut?) majori ratione acceptanda est et laudanda.” Oboedientia vero erga pontificem legitimum sicut ab initio firma erat, ita firma facile remanere poterat, cum rationes meliores et omnino solidae pro ipsa semper essent.

[1484] Postremo quid, si monstrarentur post synodum pisanam tot fideles jam de pontifice genuino dubitantes a Gregorio XII recessisse, ut firmiter perseverantes soli ad ecclesiam vere catholicam constituendam non sufficerent, seu ut omnes fere non quidem pontificem legitimum penitus vel definite repudiarent, id quod pro indole infallibili ecclesiae fieri non potest, sed in incerto essent vel meris opinionibus quadantenus probabilibus ducti huic illive praetendenti tamquam pontifici supremo adhaererent? Censemus, etiam in casu tali, parum adhuc perquisito, relinquere nobis viam nodi expediendi. Sane potest evenire, ut cathedra romana etiam per aliquot annos vacet neque ideo una catholica ecclesia tunc desinat; ita jam antiquitus post Marcellinum sedes apostolica per annos duos, menses sex vel amplius vacavit (cf. *R* ad a. 304). Atqui annos illos dubii suppositi *universalis*, a synodo pisana a. 1409 incipientes, ut non nimis multos, merito liceret comparare atque computare cum tempore reapse subsequente cathedrae post cessionem pontificis legitimi a. 1415—1417 vacantis; ut enim ecclesia pastore summo carens exspectat ejus electionem, sic et ecclesia moraliter universa de pastore suo dubitans exspectaret ejus sufficientem certamque

diverse and adverse variety of opinions there are no fewer difficulties of law and fact than there were before the Council of Pisa concerning the justice of the two contenders. From which follows the second conclusion, that just as before the Council of Pisa, to avoid the difficulties of law and fact, and the prolixity and delay of the Church’s peace, the way of cession by both contenders was then accepted by all the faithful of Christ and praised, so now also for the three contenders for the papacy, it should similarly or for even greater reason be accepted and praised.” But obedience toward the legitimate pontiff, just as it was firm from the beginning, could easily remain firm, since better and entirely solid reasons always existed for it.

[1484] Finally, what if it were demonstrated that after the Synod of Pisa, so many faithful who were already doubting the genuine pontiff had withdrawn from Gregory XII that those who remained steadfast alone would not suffice to constitute the truly Catholic Church, or that nearly all had not indeed completely or definitively repudiated the legitimate pontiff (which cannot happen given the infallible nature of the Church), but were in uncertainty or, led by mere opinions that were in some measure probable, were adhering to this or that claimant as supreme pontiff? We judge that even in such a case, which has been little investigated, a way of resolving the difficulty would remain to us. Indeed, it can happen that the Roman chair may remain vacant even for several years, and yet the one Catholic Church does not therefore cease to exist; thus already in ancient times after Marcellinus the apostolic see remained vacant for two years, six months or more (cf. *R* at year 304). But those years of supposed *universal* doubt, beginning from the Synod of Pisa in the year 1409, as they were not too many, might deservedly be compared and reckoned with the time that actually followed when the chair was vacant after the cession of the legitimate pontiff in 1415-1417; for just as the Church lacking a supreme pastor awaits his election, so also would the morally universal Church doubting about its pastor await his sufficient and certain presentation; therefore the true Church of Christ, in the case of a

propositionem; quae proinde ecclesia Christi vera in casu pontificis pro catholica saltem agnitione non satis promulgati ex ipsis quoque haesitantibus tamquam membris coalesceret.

[1485] Et visibilitas ecclesiae, quae a visibilitate capitis dependet? Haec certe aderat satis, gradu majore vel minore, per stadium schismatis prius idque multo diuturnius, quemadmodum ex argumento primo alterove paulo supra pro Urbani VI electione recta jam prolato facile inferri potest. Quodsi multi, praesertim loco vel tempore remotiores, fallaciis hominum potentium iniquorum fide simpliciore primitus susceptis et deinceps hereditariis de pontifice vero discernendo sine sua culpa sunt decepti, id factum est per accidens; unde existerent homines materialiter tantummodo schismatici, sicut et hodie tales schismatici vel haeretici multi sint. Altero quidem stadio schismatis, inducto fere a concilio pisano, ut quod pontificem legitimum accusaret peccati notorii schismatis et haeresis divinitus ab ecclesia excludentis, offuscae utique sint tenebrae majores. At si potest sine visibilitatis ecclesiae jactura aliquamdiu sede vacante esse caput nullum, cur non possit esse aliquamdiu caput minus manifestum? Ceterum haec obscuritas qualiscumque a tempore synodi pisanae habitae a. 1409 non durabat nisi ad a. 1415 vel 1416, ubi per spontaneam abdicationem pontificis legitimi, Gregorii XII, per voluntariam debitamque submissionem Balthazaris Cossa, per evidentem et absolutam divisionem corporis ecclesiae a Petro de Luna sedes apostolica aperte jam vacare coepit. Quae cum sint ita, ecclesia catholica romana funesto illo aevo schismatis visibilitatem vere sibi propriam minime deperdidit. Quin potius ex hac ipsa periculosissima omnium procellarum contemplatori diligenti claritate mira id elucet, ecclesiam catholicam romanam Christo protegente esse eam, quam portae inferi nunquam sint victurae.

pontiff not sufficiently promulgated for at least Catholic recognition, would coalesce from those very hesitating ones as its members.

[1485] And what of the visibility of the Church, which depends upon the visibility of its head? This certainly existed sufficiently, in greater or lesser degree, throughout the earlier period of the schism—and that much longer period—just as can easily be inferred from the first and second arguments set forth a little above in favor of the legitimate election of Urban VI. But if many people, especially those more remote in place or time, were deceived without fault of their own in discerning the true pontiff—having initially accepted in simpler faith the deceptions of powerful and wicked men, and thereafter through inheritance of such errors—this happened accidentally. Hence there would exist men who were merely materially schismatic, just as today there are many such schismatics or heretics. In the second stage of the schism, indeed, brought about largely by the Pisan council—insofar as it accused the legitimate pontiff of the notorious sin of schism and heresy that divinely excludes one from the Church—certainly greater darkness was cast over matters. But if the Church can exist for some time without any head during a vacancy of the see without loss of the Church's visibility, why could it not exist for some time with a head that is less manifest? Moreover, this obscurity of whatever kind from the time of the Pisan synod held in the year 1409 lasted only until the years 1415 or 1416, when through the spontaneous abdication of the legitimate pontiff Gregory XII, through the voluntary and due submission of Balthazar Cossa, and through the evident and absolute separation of the body of the Church from Pedro de Luna, the apostolic see began openly to be vacant. Since these things are so, the Roman Catholic Church in that calamitous age of schism by no means lost the visibility that is truly proper to it. Rather, from this very most perilous of all storms, it shines forth to the diligent observer with wondrous clarity that the Roman Catholic Church, under Christ's protection, is that Church which the gates of hell shall never overcome.

[1486] b. Sane immerito ecclesia romana carere unitate requisita eo dicitur, quod saepius haereticos vel schismaticos in se ipsa continuerit. Etenim vere haeretici vel schismatici tantum ii sunt, qui principium unitatis fidei vel communionis in auctoritate summa ecclesiae positum reiciunt, sive diserte negando vel nolendo, sive facto, v. g. rejectionis veritatis ab ecclesia ad credendum sibi firmiter propositae et ut talis certo cognitae (cf. n. 1254 s), et hi ipsi haeretici vel schismatici, quamdiu non sunt satis publici, in ecclesiae membris recte numerantur (th. XXXIV). Sed quotquot haeretici vel schismatici in ecclesia existentes proferuntur, aut principium unitatis modo nullo vel nondum publico infitiabantur, aut membra ecclesiae minime habebantur. Ita Cyprianus in controversia de baptismo solum edicto pontificis romani, quod directe erat disciplinae, restitit, auctoritatem sacram summam ipsam non abiecit (cf. n. 1007). Porro acacianos auctoritate sedis apostolicae palam repudiata extorres ab ecclesia judicatos esse, ostendit formula Hormisdas, qua discidium extinctum est (cf. n. 493). Similiter occidentales ii, qui concilio constantinop. II publice repugnabant, extra ecclesiam versati sunt, postquam concilium illud oecumenicum et peremptorie capitula tria damnans, proinde concilio chalcedonensi haud adversum, satis compererunt (cf. n. 1021). Neque Patres francofordienses aliive improbant concilium nicaenum II aliter intra ecclesiam constiterunt, quam quod hoc concilium imaginibus sacris adorationem supremam et absolutam decrevisse et confirmatione ultima pontificis romani vacare putaverunt (cf. n. 1027). Postea quicumque in Gallia concilium florentinum non agnoverunt oecumenicum, quae indoles oecumenica per se est merum factum dogmaticum (cf. n. 884), eatenus in ecclesia manserunt, quatenus res ipsas a concilio definitas non manifesto negarunt. Gallicani auctoritatem plenam pontificis romani saltem ut conjuncti cum corpore

[1486] b. Indeed, the Roman Church is said without merit to lack the requisite unity because it has often contained heretics or schismatics within itself. For truly, only those are genuine heretics or schismatics who reject the principle of unity of faith or communion established in the supreme authority of the Church, whether by expressly denying or refusing it, or by deed, for example, by rejecting truth proposed by the Church for firm belief and certainly known as such (cf. n. 1254 ff), and these very heretics or schismatics, as long as they are not sufficiently public, are rightly numbered among the members of the Church (thesis XXXIV). But however many heretics or schismatics existing in the Church are brought forward, either they denied the principle of unity in no way or not yet in a public manner, or they were by no means considered members of the Church. Thus Cyprian in the controversy concerning baptism resisted only the edict of the Roman Pontiff, which was directly disciplinary, but did not reject the supreme sacred authority itself (cf. n. 1007). Furthermore, that the Acacians, having openly repudiated the authority of the apostolic see, were judged to be cast out from the Church is shown by the Formula of Hormisdas, by which the schism was extinguished (cf. n. 493). Similarly, those Westerners who publicly opposed the Second Council of Constantinople existed outside the Church, after that council was sufficiently established to be ecumenical and peremptorily condemning the Three Chapters, and therefore not adverse to the Council of Chalcedon (cf. n. 1021). Nor did the Fathers of Frankfurt or others disapproving of the Second Council of Nicaea remain within the Church otherwise than because they thought this council had decreed supreme and absolute adoration of sacred images and lacked the final confirmation of the Roman Pontiff (cf. n. 1027). Later, whoever in Gaul did not recognize the Council of Florence as ecumenical—which ecumenical character is in itself a mere dogmatic fact (cf. n. 884)—remained in the Church to the extent that they did not manifestly deny the matters themselves defined by the council. The Gallicans acknowledged the full authority of the Roman Pontiff at least as united with the body of

episcoporum ceterorum fassi sunt; etsi vero ante concilium vaticanum contenderunt, non esse illam in pontifice romano etiam solo, hanc tamen doctrinam credita simul necessitate absoluta adhaerendi successori Petri vi sua exuerunt. Tandem janseniani ab initio non extra ecclesiam vagati sunt, quod non aperte se fidei ecclesiae opposuerunt, praesertim prout directe non veritatem revelatam, sed explicationem sensus Jansenii recusarunt, quam ipsam ab ecclesia infallibiliter posse fieri ex fide parum constitit (cf. n. 885. 897. 918 ss). Sicut autem haeretici vel schismatici publici non ecclesiam diviserunt, sed ipsi se ab ecclesia manente una diviserunt, ita fragmentis minoribus vel majoribus abscissis ecclesiae magnae catholicitas salva semper apparuit, etiam tempore ariano, de quo supra (n. 1370) diximus.

[1487] c. Neque efficacius sanctitas ecclesiae romanae catholicae ex malefactis variis impugnatur. Quae nihil convincunt, nisi demonstrantur vere esse facta et vere esse mala et juste imputari ecclesiae vel magistratui sacro, non civili, et contineri factis non simplicibus vel prorsus particularibus, sed mala ecclesiae sive doctrina universali sive lege universali vel consuetudine obtinente vim legis universalis et quidem lege mala pro adjunctis loci vel temporis ejus, quo lex vel consuetudo vigeat. Atqui nullum de ecclesia dicitur malefactum, in quod momenta enumerata omnia concurrere probentur.

Sic cultus sanctorum, sacrarum imaginum vel reliquiarum, peregrinationes, usus indulgentiarum, alia locis propriis commonstrantur per se bona.

Item per se bonum est tribunal inquisitionis, quo ecclesia de haeresi vel haeticis judicet, quamquam olim societas civilis poenis canonicis poenas proprias addebat (cf. th. XIX; *Döllinger*, Kirche und Kirchen 50 s; *Hergenröther*, Katholische Kirche und christlicher Staat c. 11. 12; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1877,

other bishops; although before the First Vatican Council they contended that this authority did not exist in the Roman Pontiff even alone, nevertheless they stripped this doctrine of the simultaneously believed absolute necessity of adhering to the successor of Peter by his own power. Finally, the Jansenists from the beginning did not wander outside the Church, because they did not openly oppose themselves to the faith of the Church, especially since they directly refused not revealed truth, but the explanation of the meaning of Jansenius, which explanation could be made infallibly by the Church was little established from faith (cf. n. 885. 897. 918 ff). But just as public heretics or schismatics did not divide the Church, but divided themselves from the Church remaining one, so with fragments both smaller and larger cut off, the catholicity of the great Church always appeared intact, even during the Arian period, concerning which we spoke above (n. 1370).

[1487] c. Nor is the sanctity of the Roman Catholic Church more effectively attacked by various alleged misdeeds. These prove nothing unless they are demonstrated to be truly committed and truly evil and justly imputable to the Church or to the sacred (not civil) magistracy, and to be contained in acts that are not merely simple or entirely particular, but evil for the Church either by universal doctrine or by universal law or by custom obtaining the force of universal law—and indeed by law that is evil according to the circumstances of place or time in which the law or custom is in force. But no misdeed is alleged against the Church in which all the enumerated elements are proven to concur.

Thus the cult of saints, of sacred images or relics, pilgrimages, the use of indulgences, and other practices are shown in their proper contexts to be good in themselves.

Likewise, the tribunal of the Inquisition, by which the Church judges concerning heresy or heretics, is good in itself, although formerly civil society used to add its own penalties to canonical penalties (cf. th. XIX; *Döllinger*, Kirche und Kirchen 50 s; *Hergenröther*, Katholische Kirche und christlicher Staat c. 11. 12; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1877, 154

154 s; 1879, 548 ss; 1891, 363 ss; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1909. 2, 290 ss. 412 ss).

Nec quidquam mali in eo invenitur, quod Innocentius VIII per bullam *Summis desiderantes* a. 1484 jurisdictionem inquisitorum quorundam in Germania ad magiam pertinere declaravit (cf. *Hergenröther* ib. c. 11. n. 41 ss; *Janssen*, Geschichte des deutschen Volkes Bd 8, 3. III; *Pastor*, Geschichte der Päpste Bd 3, 1. VI; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1885, 162 s; 1891, 715; 1900, 586).

Praeterea lex prohibens faenus ipsum moderatum juste pro aetate ea data est, qua pecunia per se sterilis nondum communiter condicionibus adventiciis frugifera evaserat; attamen etiam tunc licuit sine labore proprio ex pecunia percipere utilitatem vel modis aliis justis, ut emptione censuum, contractu societatis atque contractu trino, vel titulis extrinsecus accedentibus, ut periculo sortis, poena conventionali, damno emergente seu lucro cessante.

Haud dubie in adhibenda instituta quamvis per se bona abusus irrepserunt et delicta pontificum et fidelium aliorum acciderunt; at his contra doctrinam vel legem ipsius ecclesiae perpetratis dumtaxat ecclesiae dogma confirmatur, quo etiam peccatores membra ecclesiae esse possunt (th. XXXII), non sanctitas ecclesiae detrahitur (cf. n. 1326), unde obtrektoribus recte opponitur illud *Augustini* (de moribus ecclesiae catholicae c. 34. n. 76; *M* 32, 1342): „Nunc vos illud admoneo, ut aliquando ecclesiae catholicae maledicere desinatis, vituperando mores hominum quos et ipsa condemnat, et quos quotidie tanquam malos filios corrigere studet.“

[^1]: {org. 1} Quo loco haec habentur: „Die protestantische Zeitung *Ceylon Times* spendet den katholischen Missionären auf Ceylon folgendes Lob, das eben so sehr unserer heiligen Kirche als dem über seine parteierhabenen Urteile des Schreibers zur Ehre gereicht: ... In

s; 1879, 548 ss; 1891, 363 ss; *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1909. 2, 290 ss. 412 ss).

Nor is anything evil found in the fact that Innocent VIII, through the bull *Summis desiderantes* in the year 1484, declared that the jurisdiction of certain inquisitors in Germany pertained to matters of magic (cf. *Hergenröther* ibid. c. 11. n. 41 ff; *Janssen*, Geschichte des deutschen Volkes Bd 8, 3. III; *Pastor*, Geschichte der Päpste Bd 3, 1. VI; *Zeitschrift für kath. Theol.* 1885, 162 f; 1891, 715; 1900, 586).

Furthermore, the law prohibiting even moderate usury was justly given for that age in which money, sterile by itself, had not yet commonly become fruitful through adventitious conditions; nevertheless, even then it was lawful to receive profit from money without one's own labor either through other just means, such as the purchase of annuities, contracts of partnership, and triple contracts, or through extrinsic titles, such as risk to the principal, conventional penalty, emergent loss, or cessant gain.

Undoubtedly, in the application of institutions, however good they may be in themselves, abuses have crept in and offenses have been committed by pontiffs and other faithful; but when these are perpetrated contrary to the doctrine or law of the Church itself, they merely confirm the dogma of the Church, by which even sinners can be members of the Church (thesis XXXII), and the sanctity of the Church is not diminished (cf. n. 1326). Hence, to detractors is rightly opposed that saying of Augustine (On the Morals of the Catholic Church, c. 34, n. 76; Migne 32, 1342): “Now I admonish you to cease at some point from speaking evil of the Catholic Church by censuring the conduct of men whom she herself condemns, and whom she daily strives to correct as wayward children.”

[^1]: {org. 1} In this place we find the following: “The Protestant newspaper *Ceylon Times* bestows the following praise upon the Catholic missionaries in Ceylon, which redounds to the honor of our holy Church as much as to the impartial judgment of the writer: ... In the noble endeavor to alleviate the sufferings of the poor population, the Catholics take

dem edeln Bemühen, die Leiden der armen Bevölkerung zu mildern, nehmen, wie in vielen andern Punkten, die Katholiken den ersten Rang ein, nicht selten zur Beschämung der übrigen christlichen Glaubensbekenntnisse — man darf die Wahrheit nicht verschweigen. — Kein Bewohner von Ceylon, der mit Aufmerksamkeit beobachtet, was sich vor unsern Augen unter der eingeborenen Bevölkerung vollzieht, kann sich dem Gefühle der Bewunderung verschließen, angesichts der Opfer, welche die Diener der römischen Religion tagtäglich uns zum Beispiele bringen, und wir wären nur zu glücklich, würde dieses Beispiel unter unsern protestantischen Predigern mehr Nachahmer finden! Handelt es sich um Selbstverläugnung, muß der Missionär einer aus dem Volke werden, in dessen Mitte ihn die Vorsehung geführt hat, muß er voll Mitgefühl ihre Leiden und Entbehrungen empfinden und durchleben, muß er ihnen greifbare Beweise seiner Liebe geben, — so übertreffen die römisch-katholischen Missionäre unendlich weit alle andern Sendboten. — Sagen wir es nur offen heraus: sie allein entsprechen dem Ideale, das wir uns von einem wahren Apostel gebildet haben. Und welches sind die Erfolge dieses ihres Opferlebens in unserer Mitte? Das Volk ist ihnen mit unerschütterlicher Liebe zugetan, und während ihre Bekehrungen nach Zehntausenden zählen, haben wir kaum einige Hunderte von Anhängern. Die Werke der Liebe sind übrigens zu jeder Zeit das Charakteristische der Katholiken gewesen, das Schlachtfeld, auf dem sie ihre schönsten Lorbeeren sammelten. In der Anstalt der Barmherzigen Schwestern z. B. sehen wir auf den ersten Blick, was sie zu Stande bringen können und in was sie ihre Ehre setzen. Diese Schwestern haben sich bis an die Grenzen der Welt ausgebreitet; überall weihen sie das Leben ihrem Berufe, so daß man sie an der Arbeit findet, wo immer ein Werk der Liebe und der Barmherzigkeit getan werden soll.“

first rank, as in many other matters, not infrequently to the shame of the other Christian confessions—one must not conceal the truth. No inhabitant of Ceylon who observes with attention what takes place before our eyes among the native population can close himself to the feeling of admiration in the face of the sacrifices which the servants of the Roman religion daily bring as an example to us, and we would be only too happy if this example would find more imitators among our Protestant preachers! When it comes to self-denial, when the missionary must become one of the people into whose midst Providence has led him, when he must feel and live through their sufferings and privations with full compassion, when he must give them tangible proofs of his love—then the Roman Catholic missionaries surpass infinitely all other messengers. Let us say it openly: they alone correspond to the ideal that we have formed of a true apostle. And what are the results of this their life of sacrifice in our midst? The people are devoted to them with unshakeable love, and while their conversions are counted by the tens of thousands, we have scarcely some hundreds of adherents. The works of love have, moreover, been at all times the characteristic of Catholics, the battlefield on which they gathered their most beautiful laurels. In the institution of the Sisters of Mercy, for example, we see at first glance what they can accomplish and in what they place their honor. These sisters have spread to the ends of the earth; everywhere they consecrate their lives to their calling, so that one finds them at work wherever a work of love and mercy is to be done.”

[^2]: {org. 1} Ibi haec leguntur: „Ein schönes Zeugnis für die katholischen Missionäre und Schwestern entnimmt das *Tablet*, 1903, I, 331 dem *Amsterdamschen Courant*. Dort schreibt die rationalistische holländische Schriftstellerin Madame Lohmann u. a.: „Es ist unmöglich, beim Anblick der unermesslichen Segnungen, welche durch die katholischen Orden und Missionäre verbreitet werden, nicht mit aufrichtiger Hochachtung erfüllt zu werden. Der katholische Glaube besitzt immer noch eine Macht, welcher über kurz oder lang der entscheidende Sieg über den Protestantismus zufallen muß. Ich weiß, diese Behauptung wird mir den Unwillen vieler meiner Landsleute zuziehen; nichtsdestoweniger nehme ich keinen Anstand, zu wiederholen, daß das moderne protestantische Christentum damit enden wird, eine hohle Phrase zu sein. Sowohl in West- wie Ostindien und in manchen Teilen Europas hatte ich Gelegenheit, in nächster Nähe das musterhafte Leben katholischer Ordensleute und Missionäre kennen zu lernen und die verschwenderische Liebe sowohl der lehrenden wie krankenpflegenden Schwestern zu beobachten. Manche unserer Leute waren, ehe sie selbst diese Länder besucht, gewohnt, sei es aus Unwissenheit oder aus Menschenfurcht, die Katholiken zu verunglimpfen. Nachdem sie aber die Wunder des katholischen Apostolates unter den Aussätzigen und den verachteten Negern geschaut, habe ich dieselben Leute mit Beschämung das Eingeständnis machen hören, daß der Heroismus der katholischen Liebestätigkeit alles übertrifft, was man sich in dieser Hinsicht vorstellen kann, und daß sie in der Welt und in der Geschichte einzig dasteht.““

[^3]: {org. 2} Ubi haec narratur: „Den katholischen Missionen wurde unlängst ein hohes Lob aus unparteiischem Munde gespendet. Der frühere Kommandant der deutschen Schutztruppe in Südwestafrika, Generalleutnant v. *Trotha*, der jetzt in

[^2]: {org. 1} Here these words are read: “A beautiful testimony for the Catholic missionaries and sisters is taken by the *Tablet*, 1903, I, 331 from the *Amsterdamschen Courant*. There the rationalist Dutch writer Madame Lohmann writes, among other things: ‘It is impossible, when beholding the immense blessings which are spread by the Catholic orders and missionaries, not to be filled with sincere high esteem. The Catholic faith still possesses a power to which the decisive victory over Protestantism must sooner or later fall. I know this assertion will draw upon me the displeasure of many of my countrymen; nevertheless I do not hesitate to repeat that modern Protestant Christianity will end by being a hollow phrase. Both in the West and East Indies and in many parts of Europe I had opportunity to become acquainted at closest range with the exemplary life of Catholic religious and missionaries and to observe the lavish love of both the teaching and nursing sisters. Many of our people were accustomed, before they themselves visited these countries, whether from ignorance or from human respect, to disparage the Catholics. But after they beheld the miracles of the Catholic apostolate among the lepers and the despised Negroes, I have heard these same people make the admission with shame that the heroism of Catholic charitable activity surpasses everything that one can imagine in this regard, and that it stands unique in the world and in history.’”

[^3]: {org. 2} Where these things are recounted: “Catholic missions recently received high praise from an impartial source. The former commander of the German colonial troops in Southwest Africa, Lieutenant General v. *Trotha*, who now lives in Godesberg on the Rhine, had more than once during

Godesberg am Rhein lebt, hatte den Vätern und Schwestern der Oblaten vom heiligen Franz von Sales mehr als einmal während der Dauer seines Kommandos“ Bewunderung gezollt und ihnen stets ein väterliches Wohlwollen erwiesen. Als ihm deshalb der Provinzial der Gesellschaft P. Lebeau seinen Dank aussprach, antwortete der General dem „hochwürdigsten Pater“ in einem sehr freundlichen Schreiben: „Nicht Sie haben mir für irgend etwas zu danken, sondern ich bin es, der Ihnen und den Patres und Schwestern der Kongregation zu *äußerstem* Danke verpflichtet ist. Die Schwestern haben furchtlos und treu nach ihrem Gelübde die schwere Arbeit getan und manches Leben meiner Reiter ist sicher ihrer Fürsorge zu danken ... Überall auf der Erde, wo ich katholische Missionen in Tätigkeit gesehen habe, in Ostafrika, in China und nun im West, überall dasselbe Bild tatkräftiger Arbeit, hinreißender Pflichttreue, immer mit der Devise *labora et ora* und überall mit sichtlichem Erfolg. Ich beglückwünsche die katholische Kirche zu diesen Erfolgen und erbitte Gottes reichsten Segen für ihre Arbeit ... Ihnen, Herr Pater Superior, wünsche ich, daß es Ihnen gelingen möge, noch viele solche Patres und Schwestern auszubilden für ihren schweren Beruf und sie hinauszusenden zum Heile der Zivilisation und des Christentums.“

[^4]: {org. 1} Vim salutarem ecclesiae catholicae prae coetibus protestantium, quales quidem nunc sunt, ipse *Harnack* vel invitatus sic agnoscit (*Lehrbuch der Dogmeng.* 3, 903): „Das Existenzrecht der katholischen Kirche kann füglich nicht bestritten werden. Wer die Menschen nimmt, wie sie sind und noch viele Generationen hindurch bleiben werden, kann die Berechtigung dieses weltumspannenden Instituts nicht in Zweifel ziehen. Diese Kirche erzeugt fort und fort Heilige und lehrt zugleich ihre übrigen Kinder ‚Speere werfen und die Götter ehren‘ d. h. die Religion so zu nehmen, wie sie von der Menge stets

the duration of his command expressed admiration for the fathers and sisters of the Oblates of Saint Francis de Sales and had always shown them paternal benevolence. When therefore the provincial of the society, Father Lebeau, expressed his thanks to him, the General replied to the ‘Most Reverend Father’ in a very friendly letter: ‘It is not you who have to thank me for anything, but rather I am the one who is obliged to express the *utmost* gratitude to you and to the fathers and sisters of the congregation. The sisters have fearlessly and faithfully performed the difficult work according to their vow, and many a life of my cavalry is surely owed to their care... Everywhere on earth where I have seen Catholic missions in action, in East Africa, in China and now in the West, everywhere the same picture of energetic work, inspiring devotion to duty, always with the motto *labora et ora* and everywhere with visible success. I congratulate the Catholic Church on these successes and ask God’s richest blessing for their work... To you, Father Superior, I wish that you may succeed in training many more such fathers and sisters for their difficult vocation and in sending them out for the salvation of civilization and Christianity.”

[^4]: {org. 1} Even *Harnack* himself, however reluctantly, acknowledges the beneficial force of the Catholic Church in comparison to Protestant assemblies, such as they now are (*Lehrbuch der Dogmeng.* 3, 903): „Das Existenzrecht der katholischen Kirche kann füglich nicht bestritten werden. Wer die Menschen nimmt, wie sie sind und noch viele Generationen hindurch bleiben werden, kann die Berechtigung dieses weltumspannenden Instituts nicht in Zweifel ziehen. Diese Kirche erzeugt fort und fort Heilige und lehrt zugleich ihre übrigen Kinder ‚Speere werfen und die Götter ehren‘ d. h. die Religion so zu nehmen, wie sie von der Menge stets genommen worden ist und wie die Menge sie verlangt. Was will man mehr? Solange

genommen worden ist und wie die Menge sie verlangt. Was will man mehr? Solange man die für das gemeinschaftliche Leben nötigen Tugenden und die Zügelung der niederen Triebe nicht aus Gleichungen und auch nicht aus der Retorte gewinnen kann — und einstweilen ist nicht abzusehen, dass das gelingt —, wird man die Notwendigkeit und Heilsamkeit einer Anstalt zugestehen müssen, die die gemeine Menschheit zügelt und dabei auch sehr zarten Gewissen giebt, was sie wollen, und sich ihnen als eine übernatürliche Schöpfung zu beglaubigen vermag. . Anders steht es mit den evangelischen Kirchen. Haben sie sich nach einer nun vierhundertjährigen Probezeit wirklich bewährt und ihre Notwendigkeit dargetan? Erscheinen sie nicht als halbschlächlige und nachgerade überflüssige Gebilde, die das nicht leisten, was die katholische Kirche leistet, und das höhere Streben nicht wirklich fördern? Dass sie jenes nicht leisten oder nicht mehr leisten, wenn sie es je geleistet haben, ist gewiss. Man frage nur unsre Staatsmänner und unsre Sozialpolitiker. Was aber das höhere Streben betrifft, so wird über die Rückständigkeit der Kirchen laute Klage geführt, und nicht Wenige behaupten, dass sie von Anfang an falsch angelegt seien.“ His congruit, quod alibi refertur (*Die katholischen Missionen* 1908, 283): „Vor seiner Abreise von den Philippinen stellte Herr William Howard Taft, deinde praesidens statuum Americae septentrionalis foederatorum, in einer öffentlichen Versammlung der katholischen Kirche auf den Philippinen folgendes Zeugnis aus: ‚Einer der grössten Unglücksfälle (disasters), welche die Philippinen betroffen haben, war die Zerstörung katholischer Kirchen. Die Kirche ist ein Werkzeug zur Erhaltung des Friedens und der Ordnung. Sie ist auch für das Staatswohl von der grössten Bedeutung und musste schon daher erhalten werden. Ich betrachte die Sache von einem rein weltlichen Standpunkte aus. Die katholische Kirche gilt als die grosse christianisierende Macht der Erde.

man die für das gemeinschaftliche Leben nötigen Tugenden und die Zügelung der niederen Triebe nicht aus Gleichungen und auch nicht aus der Retorte gewinnen kann — und einstweilen ist nicht abzusehen, dass das gelingt —, wird man die Notwendigkeit und Heilsamkeit einer Anstalt zugestehen müssen, die die gemeine Menschheit zügelt und dabei auch sehr zarten Gewissen giebt, was sie wollen, und sich ihnen als eine übernatürliche Schöpfung zu beglaubigen vermag. . Anders steht es mit den evangelischen Kirchen. Haben sie sich nach einer nun vierhundertjährigen Probezeit wirklich bewährt und ihre Notwendigkeit dargetan? Erscheinen sie nicht als halbschlächlige und nachgerade überflüssige Gebilde, die das nicht leisten, was die katholische Kirche leistet, und das höhere Streben nicht wirklich fördern? Dass sie jenes nicht leisten oder nicht mehr leisten, wenn sie es je geleistet haben, ist gewiss. Man frage nur unsre Staatsmänner und unsre Sozialpolitiker. Was aber das höhere Streben betrifft, so wird über die Rückständigkeit der Kirchen laute Klage geführt, und nicht Wenige behaupten, dass sie von Anfang an falsch angelegt seien.“ This agrees with what is reported elsewhere (*Die katholischen Missionen* 1908, 283): „Vor seiner Abreise von den Philippinen stellte Herr William Howard Taft, subsequently president of the United States of America, in einer öffentlichen Versammlung der katholischen Kirche auf den Philippinen folgendes Zeugnis aus: ‚Einer der grössten Unglücksfälle (disasters), welche die Philippinen betroffen haben, war die Zerstörung katholischer Kirchen. Die Kirche ist ein Werkzeug zur Erhaltung des Friedens und der Ordnung. Sie ist auch für das Staatswohl von der grössten Bedeutung und musste schon daher erhalten werden. Ich betrachte die Sache von einem rein weltlichen Standpunkte aus. Die katholische Kirche gilt als die grosse christianisierende Macht der Erde. Ich gehöre zwar selbst nicht dieser Kirche an, aber jeder, der ihre Tätigkeit unter der Bevölkerung dieser Inseln beobachtet hat, muss den mächtigen Einfluss anerkennen, den sie zum Besten des Landes ausübt.‘ But how great progress the Catholic people can make even in culture, when not impeded by external forces, a recent splendid example from Belgium

Ich gehöre zwar selbst nicht dieser Kirche an, aber jeder, der ihre Tätigkeit unter der Bevölkerung dieser Inseln beobachtet hat, muss den mächtigen Einfluss anerkennen, den sie zum Besten des Landes ausübt.‘ Quantos autem progressus etiam in cultura populi catholici, non aliunde quidem impeditus, facere valeat, exemplum recens splendidum Belgii ostendit (vide *Vaterland*, 14. feb. 1911. n. 71). Ad haec cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* 1907, 1 ss; 1911, 99 s.

[^5]: {org. 1} Videas documentum russicum excerptum apud *Wilmers* (de Christi ecclesia n. 318. adnot. 1); similiter docet *Milas* (*Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche* §. 79), et ipse russicus catechismus *Philareti* (p. 1. n. 11) unitatis ecclesiae universae tantum in fide, lege divina, sacerdotio cum sacramentis, oratione meminit.

[^6]: {org. 1} Quae autem per occasionem concilii ejusdem fuit disceptatio de *Bulgaria*, politicae male mixta, ut jam supra (n. 817) diximus, ad jurisdictionem non propriam primatus, sed tantum patriarchatus pertinuit eademque in sententiam a legatis apostolicis repudiatam desiit (cf. *Jungmann*, dissert. 17. in *hist. eccl.* p. 81 ss. 94 ss vel etiam *Hergenröther*, *Photius* 2, 149 ss).

[^7]: {org. 1} Cf. *Hergenröther*, *Photius* 1, 405 ss; *Hefele*, *Concilieng.* 4², 236 ss; *Hergenröther-Kirsch*, *Kircheng.* 2³, 236.

[^8]: {org. 2} Ep. 106. *Nicolai I* ad universos catholicos per Asiam et Libyam constitutos; M 119, 1092.

[^9]: {org. 1} De lege condente Petri M. fatetur *Milas* (l. c. § 28): „In den gedruckten Ausgaben dieses Reglements sind noch zwei Zusätze enthalten, wovon der eine über die Mischehen handelt, und der andere die Instruktion für den sogenannten ‚Ober-Prokurator‘, d. i. den Vertreter des Kaisers in der heiligen Synode, umfasst. Auf Grund dieses Reglements und im Sinne der ausdrücklich, in dem Bestätigungs-Reskripte des Kaisers Peter I. vom 25.

demonstrates (see *Vaterland*, 14 Feb. 1911, n. 71). On these matters, cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* 1907, 1 ff; 1911, 99 f.

[^5]: {org. 1} See the Russian document excerpted in *Wilmers* (concerning Christ’s church, n. 318, note 1); similarly *Milas* teaches (*Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche* §. 79), and the Russian catechism of *Philaret* itself (p. 1, n. 11) mentions the unity of the universal church only in faith, divine law, priesthood with sacraments, and prayer.

[^6]: {org. 1} But the disputation concerning *Bulgaria* that arose on the occasion of that same council, badly mixed with politics, as we have already said above (n. 817), pertained not to the proper jurisdiction of the primacy, but only to that of the patriarchate, and this same matter ceased when it was rejected by the apostolic legates (cf. *Jungmann*, dissertation 17 in *hist. eccl.* p. 81 ff. 94 ff. or also *Hergenröther*, *Photius* 2, 149 ff.).

[^7]: {org. 1} Cf. *Hergenröther*, *Photius* 1, 405 ff.; *Hefele*, *Concilieng.* 4², 236 ff.; *Hergenröther-Kirsch*, *Kircheng.* 2³, 236.

[^8]: {org. 2} Epistle 106 of *Nicholas I* to all Catholics established throughout Asia and Libya; M 119, 1092.

[^9]: {org. 1} Concerning the law to be established by Peter M., *Milas* admits (l. c. § 28): “In the printed editions of this regulation there are still two additional provisions included, one of which deals with mixed marriages, and the other encompasses the instruction for the so-called ‘Chief Procurator,’ that is, the representative of the Emperor in the holy Synod. On the basis of this regulation and in the sense of the directive expressly contained in the confirmatory rescript of Emperor Peter I from January 25, 1721, the holy Synod has further

Jänner 1721 enthaltenen Anordnung, hat die heilige Synode ihre gesetzgebende Tätigkeit durch das Erlassen verschiedener Normen in Fragen der Verwaltung der russischen Kirche weiter entfaltet, natürlich (!) unter steter Einholung der kaiserlichen Genehmigung.“

[^10]: {org. 1} Talis doctrina traditur libris supra (n. 1415 adnot.) citatis.

[^11]: {org. 2} Diserte *Milas* (l. c. § 51. 83) concilio oecumenico episcopos extra concilium consentientes aequiparat et hac via altera confessionem orthodoxam orientalem exstitisse scribit.

[^12]: {org. 1} Quam pondere quovis argumentatio orientalium separatorum in hac causa careat, exemplo quodam novissimo illustretur. *Milaš*, episcopus dissidentium in Dalmatia, ad primatum Petri et successoris Petri excludendum (operis citati §. 49. 51) primum silentio absoluto praeterit locos pro potestate Petri propriae classicos (*Mat* 16, 18 s; *Luc* 22, 31 s; *Jo* 21, 15 ss). Deinde affert locos sententiam suam minime probantes, ut quibus potestas apostolis omnibus communis, potestati illi Petri unius propriae non adversa, promittitur (*Mat* 18, 17 s; 28, 19 s; *Jo* 20, 21 s; cf. supra n. 119 s. 198), vel fastus et abusus potestatis prohibetur (cf. n. 151), vel concordia fidelium commendatur (*Mat* 18, 20 col. *Act* 1, 21 ss; 6, 2 ss; 15, 1–29), vel dignitas apostolica s. Pauli et dissensio cum s. Petro traditur (*Gal* 2, 8 ss; cf. supra n. 200. 182. 190 ss), vel Dominus ipse, etiam postquam commisit oves suas sub se pascendas Petro, unus pastor princeps dicitur (*Jo* 10, 14. 16; *Heb* 13, 20; 1 *Pet* 5, 4). Nominatim cum confessione orthodoxa eorum ille urget, quod secundum apostolum (*Eph* 5, 23; *Col* 1, 18) Christus solus sit ecclesiae caput. At loquens de ecclesia tamquam corpore uno, in quo sit spiritus unus (cf. *Eph* 4, 4–16), apostolus solum Christum caput explicite quidem memorat, cum Christus corporis ecclesiae, quatenus est visibile, existat

developed its legislative activity through the issuing of various norms in questions of the administration of the Russian Church, naturally (!) under the constant obtaining of imperial approval.”

[^10]: {org. 1} Such doctrine is transmitted in the books cited above (n. 1415 note).

[^11]: {org. 2} *Milas* explicitly (l. c. § 51. 83) equates bishops consenting outside the council with an ecumenical council and writes that in this alternative way the orthodox confession of the Orientals came into existence.

[^12]: {org. 1} Let the weightlessness of the argumentation of the separated Orientals in this matter be illustrated by a most recent example. *Milaš*, a bishop of the dissidents in Dalmatia, in order to exclude the primacy of Peter and Peter's successor (from the cited work §. 49. 51), first passes over in absolute silence the classic passages concerning Peter's proper power (*Matt* 16:18ff; *Luke* 22:31ff; *John* 21:15ff). Then he brings forward passages that by no means prove his opinion, such as those in which a power common to all the apostles, not opposed to that power proper to Peter alone, is promised (*Matt* 18:17ff; 28:19ff; *John* 20:21ff; cf. above n. 119 s. 198), or where pride and abuse of power are forbidden (cf. n. 151), or where the concord of the faithful is commended (*Matt* 18:20 col. *Acts* 1:21ff; 6:2ff; 15:1–29), or where the apostolic dignity of Saint Paul and his dissension with Saint Peter is related (*Gal* 2:8ff; cf. above n. 200. 182. 190ff), or where the Lord himself, even after he had committed his sheep to Peter to be pastured under him, is called the one chief shepherd (*John* 10:14. 16; *Heb* 13:20; 1 *Pet* 5:4). Specifically, with the orthodox confession of those people, he urges that according to the apostle (*Eph* 5:23; *Col* 1:18) Christ alone is the head of the church. But speaking of the church as one body, in which there is one spirit (cf. *Eph* 4:4–16), the apostle explicitly mentions only Christ as head, since Christ exists as the unique principal head of the body of the church, insofar as it is visible, and exists as the unique head

caput unicum principale, et corporis ejusdem, quatenus est gratis spiritus per se invisibilibus plenum ideoque mysticum, existat caput unicum simpliciter; non tamen negat apostolus, immo potius comprehendit et aliunde notum supponit caput visibile pro principali invisibili vicarium, quod ab ipso corpore visibili ecclesiae non excluditur, sed exigitur (cf. supra n. 189). Perperam autem fulcitur exclusio capitis pro capite principali unico vicarii ratione ea, quod homo mortalis caput ecclesiae esse nequeat, siquidem cum successione Petri moraliter continua Christus ipse etiam physice perennis caput summum ecclesiae non minus in sententia catholicorum quam dissidentium manet. Et parum sibi constans inculcat *Milaš*, ecclesiae ut regno spirituali caput terrenum non convenire, nisi forte idem aut ecclesiam suam particularem prorsus materialem aut se episcopum caelestem esse censet. Insuper ut fundamenti, ita capitis ecclesiae ipso nomine Petrus vel successor ejus jam antiquitus appellatur; recale v. g. dicta supra (n. 1441). Neque felicius provocat *Milaš* ad *Cyprianum*, de quo supra (n. 1410) egimus, ad *Irenaeum*, cujus dictum pridem (n. 1390) positum primatui haud obstat, ad *Alexandrum alex.* quasi sic ad omnes episcopos scribentem: „Uns allen insgesamt und jedem einzelnen insbesondere, ist ein Leib der allgemeinen Kirche anvertraut, und uns die Vereinigung untereinander durch das Band des Friedens und der Liebe geboten.“ Quae verba Alexandri etsi genuina essent, conciliari cum primatu Petri possent; sed reapse haec sunt (*Socratis hist. eccl.* l. 1. c. 6; *M* 67, 44): Ἐνὸς σώματος ὄντος τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐντολῆς τε οὐσης ἐν ταῖς θεαῖς γραφαῖς, τηρεῖν σύνδεσμον τῆς ὁμονοίας καὶ εἰρήνης, ἀκόλουθόν ἐστι γράφειν ἡμᾶς καὶ σημαίνειν ἀλλήλοις τὰ παρ’ ἐκάστοις γιγνόμενα, ἵνα εἴτε πάσχη ἐν μέλος ἢ συμπάσχωμεν, εἴτε χαίρη ἐν μέλος, ἢ συγχαίρωμεν ἀλλήλοις, quae recte sic vertuntur: „Cum unum sit catholicae corpus ecclesiae, mandatumque

simpliciter of the same body, insofar as it is filled with graces of the spirit invisible in themselves and therefore mystical; nevertheless the apostle does not deny, but rather comprehends and supposes as known from elsewhere, a visible head vicarious for the principal invisible one, which is not excluded from the visible body of the church itself, but is required by it (cf. above n. 189). But the exclusion of a head vicarious for the unique principal head is wrongly supported by the reasoning that a mortal man cannot be the head of the church, since with the morally continuous succession of Peter, Christ himself, even physically perpetual, remains the supreme head of the church no less in the opinion of Catholics than of dissidents. And *Milaš* rather inconsistently insists that an earthly head does not befit the church as a spiritual kingdom, unless perhaps he considers either his own particular church to be entirely material or himself to be a celestial bishop. Moreover, just as of the foundation, so by the very name of head of the church, Peter or his successor has been called from antiquity; recall, for example, the things said above (n. 1441). Nor does *Milaš* more successfully appeal to *Cyprian*, whom we discussed above (n. 1410), to *Irenaeus*, whose saying placed earlier (n. 1390) does not oppose the primacy, to *Alexander of Alexandria* as if writing thus to all bishops: “To all of us collectively and to each individual in particular, a body of the universal Church is entrusted, and union among ourselves through the bond of peace and love is commanded.” Even if these words of Alexander were genuine, they could be reconciled with the primacy of Peter; but in reality these are the words (*Socrates’ Ecclesiastical History* l. 1. c. 6; *M* 67, 44): “Since there is one body of the catholic church, and there is a commandment in the divine scriptures to keep the bond of concord and peace, it follows that we should write and signify to each other the things that happen among each of us, so that whether one member suffers, we may suffer with it, or whether one member rejoices, we may rejoice with each other,” which are correctly translated thus: “Since there is one body of the catholic church, and it is commanded in the sacred scriptures that we preserve the bond of peace and concord, it is fitting that whatever is done among

sit in sacris litteris, ut pacis et concordiae vinculum conservemus, consentaneum est ut quaecunque apud singulos geruntur, nobis invicem per litteras significemus, quo scilicet, seu patiente, seu gaudente uno membro, ipsi vicissim aut compatiatur, aut collaetemur.” Sane vel a priori capitur, Alexandro perinde ac decessori *Dionysio* et successor *Athanasio* (vide supra n. 498. 499) primatum pontificis Romani constituisse. Neque aliter sentit *Hieronymus* (ep. 146. al. 85. ad Evangelium; M 22, 1192 ss; cf. supra n. 463 s), ubi presbyterum diacono superiorem et potius episcopo comparandum ostendit etiam eo, quod excepta ordinatione episcopus nihil faciat, quod presbyter non faciat, et deinde consuetudinem Romanam, qua v. g. „ad testimonium diaconi presbyter ordinatur“ (n. 2), diluit affirmando (n. 1): „Nec altera Romanae urbis ecclesia, altera totius orbis existimanda est ... Si auctoritas quaeritur, orbis maior est urbe. Ubicumque fuerit episcopus, sive Romae, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriae, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem episcopum non facit (al. episcopum facit). Ceterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt.“ Nimirum consuetudo orbis magis quam particularis quaedam urbis consideranda exhibetur, et episcopus Romanus meriti et sacerdotii ejusdem, scilicet potestatis ordinis non minoris, cum quovis alio episcopo vel successore apostolorum dicitur, ut inde etiam presbyter Romanus pariter ac quivis alius diaconum superare intellegatur. Ceteroqui primatum jurisdictionis episcopi Romani proprium *Hieronymus* clare asserit (ut supra n. 87, 995). Ex contrario *Milaš*, ne primatum episcopi unius confirmantis ipsa concilia oecumenica admittat, ex episcopis omnibus tandem facit oves et ex populo pastorem declarando (l. c. §. 79): „Der Charakter der Allgemeinheit der Konzilien ist ... von ... Bedingungen abhängig, wozu ... die Annahme der

individuals should be signified to us mutually through letters, so that whether one member suffers or rejoices, we ourselves may in turn either suffer with it or rejoice together.” Certainly it is grasped even a priori that Alexander, just like his predecessor *Dionysius* and successor *Athanasius* (see above n. 498. 499), acknowledged the primacy of the Roman pontiff. Nor does *Jerome* think otherwise (ep. 146. al. 85. to Evangelus; M 22, 1192ff; cf. above n. 463f), where he shows that a presbyter is superior to a deacon and rather to be compared to a bishop also by the fact that except for ordination, a bishop does nothing that a presbyter does not do, and then he dilutes the Roman custom by which, for example, “a presbyter is ordained at the testimony of a deacon” (n. 2), affirming (n. 1): “Nor should the church of the Roman city be considered one thing, and that of the whole world another... If authority is sought, the world is greater than the city. Wherever there may be a bishop, whether in Rome, or in Gubbio, or in Constantinople, or in Reggio, or in Alexandria, or in Tanis, he is of the same merit and the same priesthood. The power of riches and the humility of poverty does not make a bishop either more exalted or inferior (al. make a bishop). For the rest, all are successors of the apostles.” Obviously the custom of the world rather than that of some particular city is shown to be more worthy of consideration, and the Roman bishop is said to be of the same merit and priesthood, namely of no lesser power of orders, with any other bishop or successor of the apostles, so that from this a Roman presbyter may likewise be understood to surpass a deacon just as any other. Otherwise *Jerome* clearly asserts the proper primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman bishop (as above n. 87, 995). On the contrary, lest *Milaš* admit the primacy of one bishop confirmed by the very ecumenical councils, he finally makes sheep out of all bishops and declares the people to be the pastor, declaring (l. c. §. 79): “The character of the universality of councils is... dependent on... conditions, among which... the acceptance of the decrees by all churches,... as well as further the acceptance of these decrees by the entire clergy and people belonging to the church is to be counted. Certain decisions of councils can, for example, be

Beschlüsse seitens sämtlicher Kirchen, ... sowie ferner die Annahme dieser Beschlüsse seitens des gesamten der Kirche angehörigen Klerus und Volkes zu zählen ist. Gewisse Entscheidungen der Konzilien können beispielsweise von allen versammelten Kirchenvorstehern einstimmig erlassen werden; allein dieselben haben keinen allgemeinen Charakter, wenn sie nicht von dem gesamten Klerus und Volke angenommen werden, wie auch das Konzil, welches diese Entscheidungen erlassen hat, nicht als ein allgemeines angesehen werden kann. Es gab häretische Kirchenversammlungen, wie z. B. jene, in welcher das semi-arianische Symbolum verfasst wurde, oder solche, deren Akten eine bedeutend grössere Zahl von Bischöfen unterfertigte, als dies bei dem V. allgem. Konzil der Fall war; wiederum andere, deren Akten von den Patriarchen und Staatsoberhäuptern gezeichnet waren; allein trotzdem wurden diese Kirchenversammlungen nicht als allgemeine anerkannt, weil das Volk ihre Entscheidungen nicht als wahre Stimme der Kirche ansehen konnte.“ At ex veritate per historiam ecclesiae antiquae ipsam manifesta vis conciliorum minime a populo pependit, sed e. c. concilium oecumenicum V ideo validum evasit, quod episcopi Romani approbatio accessit, concilia autem alia, ut infecta errore ariano, latrocinium ephesinum sub *Dioscoro*, pseudosynodus Constantinop. contra imagines sacras habita, ideo nihil valuerunt, quod approbatio Romana defuit (resumé th. XXIII).

[^13]: {org. 1} Præter baptismum ab homine quolibet valide ministrandum et sacramentum matrimonii, quod est ipse validus contractus matrimonii inter baptizatos, disjuncti ratione validi sacramenti ordinis, servatis ceteroqui servandis, habere possunt validum sacramentum eucharistiae, confirmationis, extremae unctionis. Neque hanc veritatem minuit, quod apud segregatos orientis plerumque presbyteri, non episcopi

issued unanimously by all the assembled church leaders; but these do not have a universal character if they are not accepted by the entire clergy and people, just as the council that issued these decisions cannot be regarded as universal. There were heretical church assemblies, such as those in which the semi-Arian creed was composed, or such whose acts were signed by a significantly greater number of bishops than was the case with the Fifth General Council; again others whose acts were signed by the patriarchs and heads of state; but nevertheless these church assemblies were not recognized as general, because the people could not regard their decisions as the true voice of the church.” But from the truth manifested by the history of the ancient church itself, the force of councils by no means depended on the people, but e.g. the Fifth Ecumenical Council therefore turned out to be valid because the approval of the Roman bishop was added, while other councils, such as those infected with Arian error, the Robber Council of Ephesus under *Dioscorus*, the pseudo-synod of Constantinople held against sacred images, therefore had no validity because Roman approval was lacking (resumé th. XXIII).

[^13]: {org. 1} Apart from baptism, which can be validly administered by any person whatsoever, and the sacrament of matrimony, which is itself a valid matrimonial contract between baptized persons, those separated by reason of valid holy orders can have valid sacraments of the Eucharist, confirmation, and extreme unction, provided that other requirements are otherwise observed. Nor does this truth diminish the fact that among the separated Eastern Christians, priests rather than bishops

confirmationis sacramentum conferunt et oleum pro unctione infirmorum consecrant. Etenim potestate valide tum confirmandi tum consecrandae materiae sacramenti infirmorum presbyteros simplices ex voluntate legitimi magistratus sacri, praecipue pontificis romani, potiri posse et reapse prae aliis orientalibus sicut antiquitus, ita adhuc potiri pridem exposuimus (n. 682 ss). Jam vero ipsis dissidentibus presbyteris orientis facultatem valide confirmandi ante schisma usitatam, nisi expresse pro hac illave regione sit adempta, etiamnum obvenire, declaratione sedis apostolicae observata a *concilio smyrnensi* a. 1869 (L 6, 569 s) certum est; porro, pro rationis similitudine, similis facultas olei infirmorum valide consecrandi presbyteris separatis orientalibus ut antiquitus, item nunc obtinet. Attamen aliquid intererit; nam ante schisma presbyteri orientales designationem cum jure ad potestatem confirmandi vel consecrandi olei infirmorum divinitus obtinendam acceperunt ab episcopis suis, ipsi potestate designandi voluntate implicita pontificis summi praeditis; discidio autem irretiti habebunt designationem immediate a pontifice romano praebente consensum modo qualicumque satis efficaci, quia episcopi separatione ipsa a sede apostolica, etiam sine hujus declaratione, cum jurisdictione reliqua jus designandi amiserunt; quod quidem discrimen imprimis ubi episcopi legitimi non sint, immo ubique valeat. Unde consequitur, presbyteros divisos hodie valide confirmare vel oleum infirmorum consecrare, etsi praeter vel contra voluntatem episcoporum agant. Porro ecclesia licite sacerdotes ipsos dissidentes ad confirmationem vel olei consecrationem saltem validam designare potest usque consimili ratione ac qua Christus homines ab ecclesia alienos valide baptizare vel et sacra alia conficere posse voluit. Nimum ita hinc succurritur iis pro consuetudine inveterata recipientibus, qui sint bonae fidei, illinc non praestatur incitamentum peccandi

usually confer the sacrament of confirmation and consecrate the oil for the anointing of the sick. For we have previously explained (n. 682 ff.) that simple priests can obtain the power to validly confirm and to consecrate the matter of the sacrament for the sick by the will of legitimate sacred authority, especially the Roman Pontiff, and that Eastern Christians above others actually possess this power, as in ancient times, so still today. Now it is certain that these very dissident Eastern priests retain the faculty of validly confirming that was customary before the schism, unless it has been expressly removed for this or that region, as observed by the declaration of the Apostolic See from the *Council of Smyrna* in 1869 (L 6, 569 s); furthermore, by similar reasoning, a similar faculty for validly consecrating the oil for the sick continues to belong to separated Eastern priests as in ancient times, even now. Nevertheless, there will be some difference; for before the schism, Eastern priests received their designation with the right to obtain the power of confirming or consecrating the oil for the sick from their bishops, who themselves were endowed with the power of designation by the implicit will of the Supreme Pontiff; but those caught up in the schism will have their designation immediately from the Roman Pontiff providing consent in whatever manner is sufficiently efficacious, because the bishops, by their very separation from the Apostolic See, even without a declaration from it, have lost the right of designation along with their other jurisdiction; this distinction is especially valid where there are no legitimate bishops, indeed it applies everywhere. Hence it follows that separated priests today validly confirm or consecrate the oil for the sick, even if they act beyond or against the will of their bishops. Moreover, the Church can lawfully designate these very dissident priests for confirmation or oil consecration that is at least valid, for a reason similar to that by which Christ willed that men alienated from the Church could validly baptize or even perform other sacred acts. In this way, on one hand, sufficient provision is made for those who receive in good faith according to inveterate custom, while on the other hand, no incentive for sinning is provided to the ministers, since the prohibition on ministering

ministrantibus, cum vetitum ministrandi maneat, quo neglecto dissidentes illicite per se faciunt; quin etiam horum culpa deminuitur, quoniam gravius *delinquent*, qui sacris invalide quam qui solum illicite operantur; accedit, quod ecclesia utendo *clementia* per rationes propositas honesta ideoque desistendo nominatim confirmatione hominum a sejunctis *confirmatorum* animos dissidentes non etiam gravius exacerbat. Aliter utique dicendum est de sacramento paenitentiae ex eo, quod idem est iudicium; nequit enim licite ecclesia subicere ideoque pro sanctitate sua non subicit homines iudiciis, quos constat non talibus sentiendi vel agendi principiis imbutos esse, ut secundum ea de peccatis, v. g. *haeresis* vel schismatis, recte iudicare possint. Hinc *generalim* quidem dissidentes ex defectu jurisdictionis sacramento paenitentiae valido destituuntur (cf. *Schouvaloff* l. c. Abt. 1. c. 3. n. 5. 8. 10; Abt. 2. n. 10), sed convenit excipere articulum mortis, in qua necessitate extrema quidquid ad hominem bonae fidei reddendum salvum ecclesia concedere valet, concedere etiam licebit; huc merito refertur declaratio concilii trid. (s. XIV. c. 7; D 782; cf. supra n. 785. 786).

[^14]: {org. 1} Ita saeculo superiore *Macaulay* iudicium celebratum illud protulit (Ausgewählte Schriften Bd II. Zu Ranke's Geschichte der Päpste): „Das Papstthum existirt noch, und nicht im Verfall, nicht als blosses Alterthum, sondern in Lebensfülle und jugendlicher Kraft. Noch heutigen Tages sendet die katholische Kirche bis zu den fernsten Weltenden Gläubensboten, die eben so eifrig sind, wie jene, welche mit Augustin in Kent landeten, und noch immer treten die Päpste feindlichen Königen so muthig entgegen, wie Leo I Attila. Die Zahl ihrer Kinder ist grösser als in irgend einer früheren Zeit. Die Eroberungen der römischen Kirche in der neuen Welt haben das, was sie in der alten einbüsste, mehr als ersetzt. Ihre geistliche Herrschaft

remains, and by neglecting this, the dissidents act illicitly in themselves; indeed, their guilt is even diminished, since those who operate invalidly in sacred matters *transgress* more gravely than those who operate only illicitly; it should be added that the Church, by using *clemency* for the honest reasons proposed and therefore by refraining from specifically confirming those *confirmed* by separated clergy, does not further embitter the minds of dissidents more gravely. Certainly something different must be said about the sacrament of penance, precisely because it is a judgment; for the Church cannot lawfully subject, and therefore in its holiness does not subject, people to judges who are clearly not imbued with such principles of thinking or acting that they can judge rightly according to them concerning sins, for example, of *heresy* or schism. Hence *generally* indeed, dissidents are deprived of the valid sacrament of penance due to lack of jurisdiction (cf. *Schouvaloff* l. c. Abt. 1. c. 3. n. 5. 8. 10; Abt. 2. n. 10), but it is fitting to except the article of death, in which extreme necessity the Church may and should concede whatever it can concede to render a person of good faith safe; to this is rightly referred the declaration of the Council of Trent (s. XIV. c. 7; D 782; cf. above n. 785. 786).

[^14]: {org. 1} Thus in the last century *Macaulay* delivered that celebrated judgment (Ausgewählte Schriften Bd II. Zu Ranke's Geschichte der Päpste): “The Papacy still exists, and not in decay, not as a mere relic of antiquity, but in the fullness of life and youthful vigor. Even today the Catholic Church sends missionaries to the farthest ends of the world, who are just as zealous as those who landed with Augustine in Kent, and still the Popes stand up to hostile kings with the same courage as Leo I faced Attila. The number of their children is greater than in any previous age. The conquests of the Roman Church in the new world have more than replaced what it lost in the old. Its spiritual dominion extends over the immense territories that lie between the plains of the Missouri and Cape Horn, over a region that in a century will probably be as populated as Europe is now. The members of its communion are

erstreckt sich über die unermesslichen Landstriche, die zwischen den Ebenen des Missouri und dem Cap Horn liegen, über ein Gebiet, das in einem Jahrhundert wahrscheinlich eben so bevölkert ist wie gegenwärtig Europa. Der Mitglieder ihrer Gemeinschaft sind sicher nicht weniger als hundertundfünfzig Millionen, während es schwierig sein würde, für alle andern christlichen Secten zusammen mehr als hundertundzwanzig Millionen nachzuweisen. Noch tritt kein Zeichen hervor, welches andeutete, dass das Ende ihrer langen Herrschaft herannahe. Sie sah den Anfang aller Regierungen und aller Kirchen, die es gegenwärtig in der Welt giebt, und wir möchten nicht verbürgen, dass sie nicht auch das Ende von allen erlebte. Sie war gross und geachtet, ehe die Sachsen in England Fuss fassten, ehe die Franken den Rhein überschritten, als die griechische Beredsamkeit noch in Antiochien blühte und im Tempel von Mecca noch Götzen verehrt wurden. Vielleicht besteht sie noch in ungeschwächter Kraft, wenn dereinst ein Reisender aus Neuseeland inmitten einer unermesslichen Wüstenei auf einem zertrümmerten Pfeiler der Londoner Brücke seinen Standpunkt nimmt, um die Ruinen der Paulskirche zu zeichnen.“ Sed etiam *Fairbairn* agnosticus ecclesiam catholicam sic describit (apud *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1906. I, 478 ss.): „Wenn der Vorzug, gleichzeitig die stärkste und die ausgebreitetste, die schmiegsamste und unbeugsamste kirchliche Organisation zu sein, genügte, um eine Kirche als die vollkommenste Verkörperung und Trägerin der Religion zu legitimieren, dann ist es unmöglich, die Ansprüche des Katholizismus zu bestreiten. Der Mann auf der Suche nach einer autoritativen Kirche kann nicht lange schwanken. Nimmt er einmal an, dass eine sichtbare und hörbare Autorität zum Wesen der Religion gehört, so bleibt ihm keine Wahl: er muss katholisch werden oder doch innerlich sich zur Kirche rechnen.“ „Die römische Kirche nimmt seinen Verstand mit unbesieglcher Logik gefangen und

certainly not fewer than one hundred and fifty million, while it would be difficult to demonstrate more than one hundred and twenty million for all other Christian sects combined. Still no sign appears that would indicate the approaching end of its long dominion. It saw the beginning of all governments and all churches that presently exist in the world, and we would not guarantee that it will not also witness the end of them all. It was great and respected before the Saxons gained a foothold in England, before the Franks crossed the Rhine, when Greek eloquence still flourished in Antioch and idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. Perhaps it will still exist in undiminished strength when someday a traveler from New Zealand takes his position on a shattered pillar of London Bridge in the midst of a vast wasteland to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's Church.” But even *Fairbairn* the agnostic describes the Catholic Church thus (cited in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* 1906. I, 478 ff.): “If the advantage of being simultaneously the strongest and most widespread, the most flexible and most inflexible ecclesiastical organization sufficed to legitimize a church as the most perfect embodiment and bearer of religion, then it is impossible to dispute the claims of Catholicism. The man in search of an authoritative church cannot long hesitate. Once he assumes that a visible and audible authority belongs to the essence of religion, he has no choice: he must become Catholic or at least inwardly count himself among the Church.” “The Roman Church takes his intellect captive with invincible logic and at the same time embraces his imagination with irresistible enchantment.” “With great pride her sons speak to him: She alone is catholic, is apostolic (continuous), is venerable, sublime, she alone is the Church that Christ founded, that his apostles built and established. She possesses all the attributes and marks of universality, an unbroken apostolic succession of shepherds, an uninterrupted tradition, an infallible teaching authority, unity, holiness, truth, an inviolable priesthood, a holy sacrifice, grace-working sacraments.” “The Protestant churches are only from yesterday, without authority, without truth, without a spiritual mediatorial office that alone can reconcile man with God; they are nothing but a

umfängt gleichzeitig seine Einbildungskraft mit unwiderstehlichem Zauber.“ „Mit grossem Stolze sprechen ihre Söhne zu ihm: Sie allein ist katholisch, ist apostolisch (continuous), ist ehrwürdig, erhaben, sie allein ist die Kirche, die Christus gegründet, die seine Apostel aufgebaut und eingerichtet haben. Sie besitzt alle Attribute und Merkmale der Allgemeinheit, eine lückenlose apostolische Hirtenfolge, eine ununterbrochene Überlieferung, ein unfehlbares Lehramt, Einheit, Heiligkeit, Wahrheit, ein unverletzliches Priestertum, ein heiliges Opfer, gnadenwirkende Sakramente.“ „Die protestantischen Kirchen sind erst von gestern, ohne Autorität, ohne Wahrheit, ohne ein geistliches Mittleramt, das allein den Menschen mit Gott versöhnen kann; sie sind nichts als ein Schwarm sich bekämpfender Sekten, deren konfuses Stimmengewirr laut ihre eigene Unzulänglichkeit verkündet, deren hilflose Schwäche die Sünde des Schismas schon allein dadurch fast wieder gut macht, dass sie die Macht, Majestät und Einheit Roms um so glänzender hervortreten lässt.“ „Im vollsten Gegensatz zu ihnen, steht die römische Kirche da, wo ihr Meister sie hingesezt, auf dem Felsen, ausgestattet mit allen Vorrechten und Machtbefugnissen, die er ihr gab, und unbesiegbar trotzend den Pforten der Hölle.“ „Übernatürliche Gnadengaben sind ihr als Mitgift geworden, und das Wunder, das Wunder, das über ihrer Wiege wachte, das sie begleitete auf allen ihren Wegen durch die Jahrhunderte, und das auch heute noch nicht von ihr gewichen ist.“ „Sie ist nicht wie der Protestantismus: eine Konzession an den Geist der Verneinung, ein unheiliger Kompromiss mit der naturalistischen Weltauffassung.“ „Alles an ihr ist positiv und übernatürlich (transzendent). Sie steht da als die Trägerin göttlicher Wahrheit, als Vermittlerin einer göttlichen Ordnung, deren übernatürlichen Charakter sie dem Natürlichen gegenüber fest und

swarm of warring sects, whose confused babel loudly proclaims their own inadequacy, whose helpless weakness almost makes good the sin of schism by the very fact that it makes the power, majesty and unity of Rome shine forth all the more brilliantly.“ „In complete contrast to them, the Roman Church stands where its Master placed it, upon the rock, equipped with all the prerogatives and powers that he gave it, and invincibly defying the gates of hell.“ „Supernatural gifts of grace have become its dowry, and the miracle, the miracle that watched over its cradle, that accompanied it on all its paths through the centuries, and that even today has not yet departed from it.“ „It is not like Protestantism: a concession to the spirit of negation, an unholy compromise with the naturalistic worldview.“ „Everything about it is positive and supernatural (transcendent). It stands there as the bearer of divine truth, as mediator of a divine order, whose supernatural character it firmly and fearlessly upholds against the natural.“ „The saints too, they belong to it, and the man whom it receives into its bosom may rejoice in their intimate communion, feels their influence, partakes of their merits and the blessings that pass through their hands. Their earthly life made the Church's past glorious, their activity in heaven weaves the visible and invisible together, carries time up to eternity.“ „To honor the saints means to honor sanctity, and by guiding its sons to love the saints, the Church helps them to gain love for sanctity itself.“ „And the Fathers, they too belong to it; their labors, sufferings, martyrdoms were for it. Only the sons of the Catholic Church may speak: 'Athanasius and Chrysostom, Cyprian and Augustine, Anselm and Bernard, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus are ours, their wealth is our inheritance, at their feet we learn childlike reverence and divine wisdom.'“ „But as rich as the Church is in great men, it is still richer in truth. Its worship is a sublime sacrament, its mysteries are an unfathomable depth; hidden holiness and meanings surround man here. The sacramental principle clothes even the simplest things, actions and rites with a mysterious yet deeply blessed meaning, transforms every liturgical act now into a divine parable that speaks of the profound things of God,

unerschrocken aufrecht hält.“ „Auch die Heiligen, ihr gehören sie an, und der Mann, den sie in ihren Schoss aufnimmt, darf ihrer vertrauten Gemeinschaft sich freuen, fühlt ihren Einfluss, nimmt teil an ihren Verdiensten und den Segnungen, die durch ihre Hände gehen. Ihr (der Heiligen) irdisches Leben machte die Vergangenheit der Kirche ruhmwürdig, ihre Tätigkeit im Himmel knüpft das Sichtbare und Unsichtbare ineinander, trägt die Zeit empor zur Ewigkeit.“ „Die Heiligen ehren, heisst die Heiligkeit ehren, und indem die Kirche ihre Söhne anleitet, die Heiligen zu lieben, hilft sie ihnen, die Heiligkeit selbst lieb zu gewinnen.“ „Und die Väter, auch sie gehören ihr an; ihr galten deren Arbeiten, Leiden, Martyrien. Nur die Söhne der katholischen Kirche dürfen sprechen: „Athanasius und Chrysostomus, Cyprian und Augustinus, Anselm und Bernhard, Thomas von Aquin und Duns Scotus sind unser, ihr Reichtum ist unser Erbe, zu ihren Füßen lernen wir kindliche Ehrfurcht und göttliche Weisheit.“ „Aber so reich die Kirche an grossen Männern ist, noch reicher ist sie an Wahrheit. Ihr Gottesdienst ist ein erhabenes Sakrament, ihre Geheimnisse sind eine unergründliche Tiefe; verborgene Heiligkeit und Bedeutungen umfassen hier den Menschen. Das sakramentale Prinzip umkleidet selbst die einfachsten Dinge, Handlungen und Riten mit einer geheimnisvollen und doch tief beglückenden Bedeutung, verwandelt jeden gottesdienstlichen Vorgang jetzt in eine göttliche Parabel, die von den tiefsinnigen Dingen Gottes spricht, jetzt in eine Brücke, auf welcher Gott sich gnadenspendend und tröstend zum Menschen herablässt und der Mensch hinwiederum voll Ehrfurchtsschauer und Reue, voll Hoffnung und Zuversicht Gott sich nähert.“ „Symbole sind tiefer als Worte, sprechen, wo Worte versagen, machen Eindruck, wo Worte ihre Bedeutung verlieren, und darum lehrt die Kirche in Stunden heiligster Andacht durch Symbole Wahrheiten, die sonst

now into a bridge on which God graciously and consolingly descends to man and man in turn, full of reverential awe and repentance, full of hope and confidence, approaches God.” “Symbols are deeper than words, speak where words fail, make an impression where words lose their meaning, and therefore in hours of most sacred devotion the Church teaches through symbols truths that no language could otherwise express.” “And yet again it knows better than anyone how to speak the clear language of reason; to it belong the Fathers and great theologians.” “For every difficulty of the intellect, heart or conscience it has not only one, but a thousand solutions”; that is to say, in difficult sacred matters, whatever solution is at least suitable, to be accommodated in many ways to the manifold capacity of men (cf. the words of *Augustine* n. 328), is never lacking for the divine office of the Church; indeed, truth cannot contradict truth, whence, what the agnostic does not perceive, in confronting those difficulties of mind, heart, conscience, the Church is always able to show that the conflict of natural truth with revealed truth is either nonexistent or, where it concerns mysteries inaccessible in this life, not properly demonstrated. “Tender hearts that cannot reconcile themselves to the harsh thought that all outside the Church are lost, it knows how to calm through the distinction between the body and soul of the Church, through emphasizing the different kinds and degrees of culpable ignorance, and thus transforms the harshness of strict doctrines into lenient mildness,” not as if it were actually changing its doctrine about the necessity of the Church as too harsh by softening it with something else, but because it explains the genuine meaning of doctrine once delivered for all time, alien to excessive severity, for men whether of more tender disposition or others, by professing that from ignorance free of grave fault, a thoroughly perfect conjunction with the Church is not required for salvation (cf. th. XI). “If doubts arise regarding infallibility, whether in view of papal sins and errors in the past, or in consideration of the liberal currents of the present or the progress of the future, a way out is found without difficulty through the manner of interpretation and through reference to certain well-known and famous

keine Sprache auszudrücken vermag.“ „Und doch weiss sie auch wieder besser als irgend jemand die klare Sprache der Vernunft zu reden; ihr gehören ja die Väter und grossen Theologen.“ „Für jede Schwierigkeit des Verstandes, des Herzens oder Gewissens hat sie nicht nur eine, sondern tausend Lösungen“; videlicet in re sacra difficili quaecumque solutio idonea saltem una, modis quidem multis capacitati hominum multiplici accommodanda (cf. verba *Augustini* n. 328), pro munere divino ecclesiae nunquam deest; quippe verum vero repugnare nequit, unde, id quod agnosticus non percipit, difficultatibus illis mentis, cordis, conscientiae occurrendo ecclesia ostendere semper valet, pugnam veritatis naturalis cum revelata aut nullam esse aut, ubi de mysteriis in hac vita inaccessis agitur, non rite commonstrari, „Zartfühlende Herzen, die sich mit dem harten Gedanken, dass alle ausserhalb der Kirche verloren gehen, nicht versöhnen können, weiss sie durch die Unterscheidung von dem Leibe und der Seele der Kirche, durch die Betonung der verschiedenen Arten und Stufen schuldiger Unwissenheit zu beruhigen und wandelt so die Härte strenger Lehren in nachsichtige Milde“, non quasi doctrinam suam de ecclesiae necessitate reapse ut justo duriorem mutando alia emolliat, sed quod sensum doctrinae semel in perpetuum traditae genuinum, a severitate nimia alienum pro hominibus sive indolis tenerioris sive ceteris explicat profitendo, ex ignorantia exsorte culpae gravis conjunctionem penitus perfectam cum ecclesia ad salutem non requiri (cf. th. XI). „Erheben sich Bedenken in Bezug auf die Unfehlbarkeit, sei es im Hinblick auf päpstliche Sünden und Fehlgriffe in der Vergangenheit, sei es in Rücksicht auf die freiheitlichen Strömungen der Gegenwart oder die Fortschritte der Zukunft, so findet sich unschwer ein Ausweg durch die Art der Interpretation und durch den Hinweis auf gewisse bekannte und berühmt gewordene konstitutionelle Beschränkungen“; nempe

constitutional limitations“; namely, against distorting doubts it must often be pointed out that infallibility is neither to be confused with impeccability of life nor attributed to particular acts of government, but is to be referred to doctrine concerning faith or morals peremptorily proposed to the universal Church (cf. th. XXIV—XXVII). “Only in the Church has casuistry developed into a science, so perfect that it has ready a decision and remedy for every actual or possible case of conscience,” certainly because the Church alone knows itself to be divinely given as guide for directing any human acts whatever toward the end of sanctity and salvation (cf. th. IX). “In its schools theology has become a perfectly developed scientific system, which has systematically organized the total content of its teachings, discussed their legal foundation, and established their existence and claims.” “And so the Catholic Church in a sense entirely peculiar to it is not merely an ecclesiastical institution, but a religion, a system, suited to guide consciences, satisfy the heart, regulate practical behavior, and establish the relations between God and man in a satisfactory way.” From his heart *Soloviev* again recognized the divine excellence of the Catholic Church (cf. *Slavor. litt. theol.* 1907, 323 ff.). Other splendid testimonies of non-Catholic men, whether Protestant or Eastern, are provided by *Die katholischen Missionen* 1900, 89 f.; 1904, 22, from which latter place *Nicodemus*, formerly patriarch of Jerusalem, declared: “Reasonable Greeks by no means desire the downfall and decay of the Papacy. From the deepest depths of their hearts they pray to heaven that the only, invincible bulwark of Christendom may resist the assault of enemies. If the Papacy were to succumb, at the same time all other Christian confessions would also perish in the whirlpool of godlessness. The decay of Catholicism would be equivalent to the death of Orthodoxy. Protestantism is crumbling more and more, the worm of liberalism weakens its strength, and Orthodoxy dissolves into various national churches. A coherent mass is found only in Catholicism, and it owes this unity to the Papacy. The Papacy therefore gives Christianity its vital force alone. Those who long for its downfall wish that the gates of hell

contra dubitationes detorquentes saepius monendum est, infallibilitatem neque cum vitae impeccantia confundi neque actionibus regiminis particularibus attribui, sed ad doctrinam de fide vel moribus ecclesiae universae peremptorie proponendam revocari (cf. th. XXIV—XXVII). „Nur in der Kirche hat sich die Kasuistik zu einer Wissenschaft entwickelt, so vollkommen, dass sie für jeden wirklichen oder möglichen Gewissensfall eine Entscheidung und ein Heilmittel bereit hat“, eo utique, quod ecclesia se ducem pro actibus hominum quibuslibet ad sanctitatis et salutis finem dirigendis divinitus datam sola novit (cf. th. IX). „In ihren Schulen ist die Theologie ein vollkommen ausgebautes wissenschaftliches System geworden, das den Gesamtinhalt ihrer Lehren planmässig gegliedert, ihre rechtliche Grundlage erörtert, ihr Dasein und ihre Ansprüche begründet hat.“ „Und so ist die katholische Kirche in einem ganz ihr eigentümlichen Sinne nicht bloss eine kirchliche Institution, sondern eine Religion, ein System, geeignet, die Gewissen zu leiten, das Herz zu befriedigen, das praktische Verhalten zu regeln und die Beziehungen zwischen Gott und Mensch in befriedigender Weise festzusetzen.“ Ex animo *Soloviev* rursus excellentiam divinam ecclesiae catholicae agnovit (cf. *Slavor. litt. theol.* 1907, 323 ss). Testimonia alia splendida hominum acatholicorum, sive protestantium sive orientis, praebent *Die katholischen Missionen* 1900, 89 s; 1904, 22, ex quo loco altero *Nicodemus*, prius patriarcha hieros., declaravit: „Die vernünftigen Griechen wünschen keineswegs den Untergang und Verfall des Papsttums herbei. Von tiefstem Herzensgrund flehen sie zum Himmel, dass das einzige, unbesiegbare Bollwerk der Christenheit dem Ansturm der Feinde widerstehe. Würde das Papsttum erliegen, so gingen zu gleicher Zeit auch alle andern christlichen Bekenntnisse im Strudel der Gottlosigkeit unter. Der Verfall des Katholizismus wäre gleichbedeutend mit

triumph over the Church of Jesus Christ. When I was engaged in theological studies in Jerusalem, I read one day in the newspaper that Pius IX had fled from Rome and sought refuge in Gaeta. Beside myself with joy, I reported this news to an elderly monk who was my friend. At the same time I gave room to my hope to soon see the end of the Papacy. How great was my astonishment when I saw my old friend become sad. ‘My son,’ he said, ‘pray to heaven that it may lead the Pope back to his episcopal city. Pray that his sufferings and trials may not last long. The clouds that gather over the Chair of Rome also foretell an ominous storm for us, and the Pope’s sufferings will be our own sufferings.’” Likewise *Jochumsson*, a distinguished man in Iceland, frankly asserted (ib. 1908, 250): “Everything that one brings forward against the blessed Mother, the sublime Church, is untruth, lies, slander. Everything that the Catholic Church, this assembly of saints, preaches and teaches, has no other goal than the sanctification of souls.” To these add what is narrated about *Anesaki Masaharu*, professor of comparative religion in Japan, among other things (ib. 1910, 1): “As he expressed in public assembly, the Catholic Church appears to him as ‘the most powerful, most magnificent religious organization that the history of humanity knows.’ ‘The only true Christianity,’ he expresses himself another time, ‘is that which has its center in Rome.’ He believes ‘that the religion of the Catholic Church recommends itself especially for Japan because it represents the principle of authority more than any other.’ In another place he speaks with admiration of the saints of the Catholic Church, who rose so high above the ordinary lowlands. The world needs such ideals of high morality, especially in our time with its strongly materialistic character. ‘Therefore even for the progress of society, sanctity is a necessary element.’ From this standpoint, the Roman Church appears to him admirable, since in it the striving for higher moral perfection finds such zealous cultivation especially in religious life. The quiet influence that emanates from it, the services it renders to society, are incalculable.”

dem Tode der Orthodoxie. Der Protestantismus zerbröckelt immer mehr, der Bohrwurm des Liberalismus schwächt seine Kraft, und die Orthodoxie löst sich in verschiedene Nationalkirchen auf. Eine zusammenhängende Masse findet man nur im Katholizismus, und diese Einheit verdankt er dem Papsttum. Das Papsttum verleiht also dem Christentum einzig seine Lebenskraft. Diejenigen, welche seinen Untergang herbeisehnen, wünschen, dass die Pforten der Hölle über die Kirche Jesu Christi triumphieren. Als ich in Jerusalem den theologischen Studien oblag, las ich eines Tages in der Zeitung, Pius IX sei aus Rom geflohen und habe in Gaeta eine Zuflucht gesucht. Ausser mir vor Freude meldete ich diese Neuigkeit einem mir befreundeten schon bejahrten Mönche. Zu gleicher Zeit gab ich meiner Hoffnung Raum, bald das Ende des Papsttums zu schauen. Wie gross war aber mein Erstaunen, als ich meinen alten Freund traurig werden sah. „Mein Sohn“, sagte er, „flehe zum Himmel, er möge den Papst in seine Bischofsstadt zurückführen. Bete, dass seine Leiden und Prüfungen nicht lange dauern. Die Wolken, die sich über dem Stuhle von Rom ballen, verkünden auch uns einen unheilvollen Sturm, und die Leiden des Papstes werden unsere eigenen Leiden.“ Item ingenue *Jochumsson*, vir clarus in Islandia, asseveravit (ib. 1908, 250): „Alles, was man gegen die gebenedeite Mutter, die erhabene Kirche vorbringt, ist Unwahrheit, Lüge, Verleumdung. Alles, was die katholische Kirche, diese Versammlung der Heiligen, predigt und lehrt, hat kein anderes Ziel als die Heiligung der Seelen.“ His adde, quod de *Anesaki Masaharu*, scientiae comparativae religionum professore in Japonia, inter alia narratur (ib. 1910, 1): „Wie er in öffentlicher Versammlung aussprach, erscheint ihm die katholische Kirche als ‚die machtvollste, grossartigste religiöse Organisation, welche die Menschheitsgeschichte kenne‘. ‚Das einzig wahre Christentum‘, so äussert er sich ein anderes Mal, ‚ist dasjenige, das

sein Zentrum in Rom hat'. Er meint, „dass die Religion der katholischen Kirche schon deshalb sich für Japan besonders empfehle, weil sie mehr als jede andere das Prinzip der Autorität vertrete“. An anderer Stelle spricht er mit Bewunderung von den Heiligen der katholischen Kirche, die so hoch über die gewöhnlichen Niederungen emporragten. Die Welt bedürfe solcher Ideale hoher Sittlichkeit, zumal in unserer Zeit mit ihrem stark materialistischen Gepräge. „Daher ist selbst für den Fortschritt der Gesellschaft die Heiligkeit ein notwendiges Element“. Von diesem Standpunkte aus betrachtet, erscheine ihm die römische Kirche bewunderungswürdig, da in ihr das Streben nach höherer sittlicher Vollkommenheit zumal im Ordensleben eine so eifrige Pflege finde. Der stille Einfluss, der von ihr ausgehe, die Dienste, die sie der Gesellschaft leiste, seien unberechenbar.“