

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

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 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 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 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 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; *1 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 pertinacity. 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 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.” And the condemned error 7 (*D*¹⁰ 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 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 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*), *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 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 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, 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*, Vortr. I. 4—8; *Hammerstein, Erinnerungen* eines alten Lutheraners, nearly c. 15. and 16; *Das katholische Ordenswesen*, as c. 12; *Heimbucher*, Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche¹; *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 f²); 1905, 64 ff. 146 ff. 158 f. 175 ff; 1907, 19; 1909, 66. 217 ff. 211 ff. 255

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 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} 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

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. 1906³); 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.

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 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.’”

[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 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 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 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* (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 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, 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 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 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. — 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. 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 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 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*, Vortr. 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. XXIV⁴).

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 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,

[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 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

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

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 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. 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 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 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), 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 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 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.

[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 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* 2⁴, 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; *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 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 Constantinopolitan patriarchs themselves *John II*, *Epiphanius*, *Menna*, by the eighth ecumenical

⁵ {org. 1} See the Russian document excerpted in *Wilmer*s (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.

council⁶; 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 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 affairs⁷; 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 evidence⁸; so that the entire history of the events openly confirms the primacy of the Roman see, with which disagreement was then erupting.

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.

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 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 instrument⁹; 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

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 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.”

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 outside of it¹¹, 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 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,

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.

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;

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 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 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 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;

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 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 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

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).

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

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 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 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

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. 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.

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).

[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 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 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 *Pitzipios* 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 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 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

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 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 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, 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 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 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

[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; 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,

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.”

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, 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 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; D^o 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 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 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.

[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 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 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 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 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.

[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 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 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 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. 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 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 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.”