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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Latin* |  | *English* |
| **CAPUT X.** |  | **Chapter X** |
| *De Siricio, Innocentio, et aliis septem pontificibus.* |  | *Concerning Siricius, Innocent, and seven other pontiffs.* |
| Decimusquartus est Siricius, quem Joannes Calvinus accusat lib. 4. Inst. cap. 12. § 24. quod in epist. ad Hispan. conjugium, pollutionem vocaverit. Sed Calvinus more suo impudenter mentitur. Non enim Siricius conjugium verum et legitimum pollutionem appellat, sed illicitam conjunctionem eorum, qui post peractam publicam poenitentiam, iterum redeunt ad eandem conjunctionem, propter quam poenitentiam unquam egit, quod inierit legitimum matrimonium. |  | The fourteenth is Siricius, whom John Calvin accuses in book 4 of the Institutes, chapter 12, § 24, of having called marriage “pollution” in his epistle to the Spaniards. But Calvin, in his usual manner, lies impudently. For Siricius does not call true and legitimate marriage pollution, but rather the illicit union of those who, after completing public penance, return again to the same union for which they once did penance. He never did penance for entering into legitimate matrimony. |
| Decimusquintus est Innoc. I. quem Magdeburgenses Centur 5. cap. 10. in vita ipsius Innocentii dicunt, graviter errasse, quod in epist. 2. cap. 12. praeceperit, sacram virginem jam velatam, quae nupserit, aut fornicata sit, non recipi ad poenitentiam, donec vivit ille cum quo ipsa peccavit; videtur enim iniquum, mulierem poenitentem non debere absolvi, nisi prius moriatur qui eam seduxit. Item, quod in epist. 18 ad Alexandr. antioch. scripserit, nullum quidem esse Arianorum baptisma; sed non conferri per eos Spiritum sanctum; quia se ab Ecclesia separaverunt. Ubi videtur velle, efficaciam sacri baptismi pendere a bonitate ministri; quod est contra Ecclesiae communem sententiam. Item, quod in epist. 22. cap. 1. docuerit, sacerdotem non posse esse eum, qui viduam in uxorem acceperit, cum Moyses in Levitico praecipiat, ut sacerdos virginem uxorem accipiat, quasi Christiana religio adhuc legibus judicialibus Testamenti veteris. |  | The fifteenth is Innocent I, whom the Magdeburg Centuriators, in Century 5, chapter 10, in the life of Innocent himself, say gravely erred because in Epistle 2, chapter 12, he ordered that a consecrated virgin who has married or fornicated should not be received for penance while the man with whom she sinned still lives; for it seems unjust that a penitent woman should not be absolved unless the man who seduced her dies first. Likewise, that in Epistle 18 to Alexander of Antioch, he wrote that the baptism of the Arians was indeed null, but that the Holy Spirit was not conferred through them because they had separated themselves from the Church. Here he seems to maintain that the efficacy of holy baptism depends on the goodness of the minister, which is contrary to the common teaching of the Church. Also, that in Epistle 22, chapter 1, he taught that a man who has taken a widow as his wife cannot be a priest, since Moses in Leviticus commands that a priest should take a virgin as his wife, as if the Christian religion were still bound by the judicial laws of the Old Testament. |
| Respondeo ad primum: Innocentium velle dicere, non debere recipi ad poenitentiam eas virgines, quae nolunt separari ab adultero, nisi post mortem ejus: et hoc justissimum est; neque enim debent ab Ecclesia absolvi ii, qui in peccato perseverare volunt. |  | I respond to the first objection: Innocent means to say that those virgins who are unwilling to separate from the adulterer should not be received for penance until after his death; and this is most just, for the Church should not absolve those who wish to persevere in sin. |
| Ad secundum dico: Innocentium loqui eo loco de iis, qui baptizantur, vel ordinantur ab haereticis, cum sint ipsi etiam polluti eadem haeresi. Ejusmodi enim vere recipiunt sacramentum baptismi, vel ordinationis: sed non recipiunt Spiritus sancti gratiam, quae in haereticis esse non potest. Et in ordinatione non modo gratiam non percipiunt ab haereticis ordinati, sed nec jus legitime ordines exercendi: id enim jus per haeresim ordinator perdidit; nec tribuere potuit, quod ipse non habuit. Vide Glossam 1. q. 1. can. Arianos. |  | To the second point, I say: Innocent speaks in this passage about those who are baptized or ordained by heretics, when they themselves are also tainted with the same heresy. For such persons truly receive the sacrament of baptism or ordination, but they do not receive the grace of the Holy Spirit, which cannot exist in heretics. And in ordination, those ordained by heretics not only fail to receive grace, but they also do not receive the right to legitimately exercise their orders: for the ordainer lost this right through heresy and could not bestow what he himself did not possess. See the Gloss on Causa 1, Quaestio 1, Canon “Arianos.” |
| Ad tertium dico: Innocentium non velle dicere, teneri nos legibus judaicis, sed velle argumentari a simili, vel potius a majori, hoc modo. Tenebantur sacerdotes in Testamento veteri ex divino praecepto, non ducere uxorem viduam; ergo multo magis convenit, ut in sacerdotibus novae legis Ecclesia requirat, ne viduarum fuerint mariti, propter excellentiam nimirum sacerdotii christiani. |  | To the third point, I say: Innocent does not wish to say that we are bound by Jewish laws, but wishes to argue from similarity, or rather from the greater to the lesser, in this manner. The priests in the Old Testament were bound by divine command not to marry a widow; therefore, it is much more fitting that in priests of the new law, the Church should require that they not have been husbands of widows, evidently because of the excellence of the Christian priesthood. |
| Decimussextus est Coelestinus, quem Nestorii haeresi infectum fuisse affirmat Laurentius Valla, in declamatione de falsa donatione Constantini. Sed Laurentius aperte mentitur; siquidem Coelestinus non modo non fuit unquam de hac haeresi notatus, sed ipse est, qui praecipue illam haeresim condemnavit, ut patet ex Prospero in Chron. anni 431. et ex toto concilio ephes. Deceptus est Valla aequivocatione nominis. Fuit enim Coelestinus haereticus Pelagianus, qui quadam communia cum Nestorianis habuit. |  | The sixteenth is Celestine, whom Lorenzo Valla, in his declamation on the false Donation of Constantine, affirms was infected with the heresy of Nestorius. But Lorenzo plainly lies; indeed, Celestine was not only never charged with this heresy, but he himself was the one who principally condemned that heresy, as is evident from Prosper in his Chronicle of the year 431, and from the entire Council of Ephesus. Valla was deceived by an equivocation of names. For there was a heretic named Celestine who was a Pelagian, who held certain beliefs in common with the Nestorians. |
| Decimusseptimus est Leo I, qui in epist. 79. ad Nicetam dicit, eas mulieres, quae putantes maritos suos esse defunctos, aut numquam redituros ex captivitate, nupserunt aliis, non neccasse: tamen si mariti redierint, dicunt, teneri eas ad primum conjugium renovandum: si autem eas non velint, non teneri. Ubi duo videntur errores. Unus, quod mulier non peccet, si nubat alteri viro, quando existimat primum maritum vivere, sed nunquam rediturum: alter, quod mulier possit manere cum secundo marito, si primus eam nolit. Notarunt hunc errorem Magdeburgenses Centur. 5. cap. 10. in vita Leonis I. |  | The seventeenth is Leo I, who in his 79th letter to Nicetas says that those women who, thinking their husbands to be deceased or never to return from captivity, married others, did not sin; yet if their husbands should return, he states they are bound to renew their first marriage; but if the husbands do not wish to take them back, they are not bound. Herein two errors seem to appear: one, that a woman does not sin if she marries another man when she believes her first husband to be alive but never to return; the other, that a woman may remain with her second husband if the first does not want her. The Magdeburg Centuriators noted this error in Century 5, chapter 10, in the life of Leo I. |
| Respondeo: In neutro Leonem errasse. Nam cum dicit, non peccare mulierem quae nubit, vivente adhuc priore viro; loquitur de illa tantum, quae nubit, quia putat, primum maritum esse mortuum, ut ipse ibidem diserte explicat; de illa autem, quae nubit, quia putat maritum suum nunquam rediturum: non dicit peccare, neque non peccare; quia existimabat rem per se esse malam, nimirum, eam peccare. Quando autem dicit, debere mulierem redire ad primum virum, si ipse eam velit; consequenter vult intelligi, debere virum redire ad mulierem, si ipsa eum velit, etiamsi alioqui eum ille noluisset. Sunt enim pares in hac re vir et mulier. Itaque si alter conjugum velit redire ad conjugium, tenetur alter necessario parere, si autem neuter velit redire, poterunt separati manere quoad usum conjugii. Et hoc solum permittit s. Leo. Neque hinc sequitur, posse mulierem manere cum secundo marito: nam idem Leo ibidem clarissime dicit, primum matrimonium esse insolubile, et necessario reformandum, posteriore soluto, quod verum esse non potest. |  | I respond: In neither case did Leo err. For when he says that a woman who marries while her former husband is still living does not sin, he speaks only of the woman who marries because she believes her first husband to be dead, as he himself explicitly explains in that same passage. However, concerning the woman who marries because she thinks her husband will never return, he neither says that she sins nor that she does not sin, because he considered the matter to be wrong in itself, namely, that she does sin. But when he states that the woman ought to return to her first husband if he wishes to have her back, he consequently wishes it to be understood that the husband ought to return to his wife if she desires him, even if he might otherwise have been unwilling. For in this matter, husband and wife are equal. Thus, if one spouse wishes to return to the marriage, the other is necessarily bound to comply; however, if neither wishes to return, they may remain separated regarding the use of marriage. And this alone is what St. Leo permits. Nor does it follow from this that a woman may remain with her second husband, for the same Leo in that very passage most clearly states that the first marriage is indissoluble and must necessarily be restored after dissolving the later one, which cannot be true otherwise. |
| Decimusoctavus est Gelasius, cujus duas sententias secundum catholicos erroneas notarunt Centuriatores Centur. 4. cap. 4. de coena Domini, et cap. 10. in vita Gelasii. Una est in lib. cont. Eutych. cum carne Christi manere in sacramento verum panem: altera, apud Gratianum de consecrat. d. 2. *De permanente*: non posse sine ingenti sacrilegio sumi unam partem sacramenti eucharistiae sine altera. Aut enim Gelasius erravit in his duobus, aut nos erramus, qui contrarium sentimus, et sequimur. |  | The eighteenth is Gelasius, in whom the Centuriators have noted two opinions erroneous according to Catholics, in Century 4, chapter 4, concerning the Lord’s Supper, and chapter 10, in the life of Gelasius. One is in the book against Eutyches, that true bread remains with the flesh of Christ in the sacrament; the other, cited in Gratian’s Decretum, De Consecratione, distinction 2, “De permanente”: that one part of the sacrament of the Eucharist cannot be taken without the other without committing a great sacrilege. For either Gelasius erred in these two matters, or we err, who hold the contrary opinion and follow it. |
| Respondeo ad primum: Librum illum non esse Gelasii papae, sed esse Gennadii, qui librum ejusdem tituli scripsit ad Gelasium papam: vel Gelasii cujusdam episcopi, cujus meminit Hieronymus circa fin. Catal. Script. Ecclesiast. Siquidem papa Gelasius scripsit quinque libros contra Eutychen, ut Trithemius refert: hic autem unus tantum est exiguus libellus. Deinde hic auctor pollicetur, se fere omnium veterum sententias collecturum de incarnatione Domini, et cum adducat 15 Patres graecos, duos latinos profert Ambrosium et Damascum, et omittit Cyprianum, Hilarium, Hieronymum, Augustinum, Innocentium, Leonem, Prosperum et similes, quos nunquam Gelasius pontifex omisisset, immo nec alius latinus auctor: videtur enim hinc manifeste colligi, hunc auctorem graecum fuisse, non latinum, sed quicumque fuerit, ejus sententiam sanam habere intellectum ostensum est a nobis lib. 2. de eucharistiae sacramento: cap. 27. Ad secundum dico: Gelasium in eo canone loqui solum de sacerdote sacrificante, qui non ootest sine sacrilegio unam tantum speciem sume-re, quia imperfectum sacrificium redderet. |  | I respond to the first point: That book is not by Pope Gelasius, but is by Gennadius, who wrote a book of the same title to Pope Gelasius; or by a certain Bishop Gelasius, whom Jerome mentions near the end of his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers. Indeed, Pope Gelasius wrote five books against Eutyches, as Trithemius reports, while this is only a single small treatise. Furthermore, this author promises to collect the opinions of almost all the ancient authorities concerning the incarnation of the Lord, and while he adduces 15 Greek Fathers, he presents only two Latins, Ambrose and Damascus, and omits Cyprian, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, Innocent, Leo, Prosper, and similar authors, whom Pope Gelasius would never have omitted, nor indeed would any other Latin author. From this it seems manifestly clear that this author was Greek, not Latin. But whoever he may have been, we have shown in our book 2 on the sacrament of the Eucharist, chapter 27, that his statement has a sound meaning. To the second point I say: Gelasius in that canon speaks only of the sacrificing priest, who cannot without sacrilege take only one species, because he would render the sacrifice imperfect. |
| Decimusnonus est Anastasius II, qui trium errorum accusatur. Primo, quod sine concilio errorum, presbyterorum et clericorum totius Ecclesiae, communicaverit Photio, qui communicaverat cum Acacio haeretico. Secundo, quod voluerit occulte revocare Acacium, quem damnaverant Felix et Gelasius papae. Tertio, quod approbaverit baptismata, et ordines collatos ab eodem Acacio, propter quos errores et peccata dicitur idem Anastasius divinitus, morbo immisso, repente extinctus. |  | The nineteenth is Anastasius II, who is accused of three errors. First, that without the council of bishops, presbyters, and clerics of the whole Church, he communicated with Photius, who had communicated with Acacius the heretic. Second, that he secretly wished to restore Acacius, whom Popes Felix and Gelasius had condemned. Third, that he approved baptisms and ordinations conferred by the same Acacius, for which errors and sins the same Anastasius is said to have been divinely struck down, suddenly dying from a disease sent upon him. |
| Hoc scribit auctor pontificalis in vita hujus Anastasii, et eum sequutus Tilmannus Heshusius lib. 1. de Eccles. cap. 9. immo et Gratianus dist. 19, can. Anastasius, et Magdeburgenses Cent. 6. cap. 10. in vita Anastasii. |  | This is written by the author of the Pontifical in the life of this Anastasius, and following him, Tilmannus Heshusius in book 1 on the Church, chapter 9, and indeed also Gratian in distinction 19, canon Anastasius, and the Magdeburg Centuries in century 6, chapter 10, in the life of Anastasius. |
| Respondeo: Falsissimum esse, quod Acacium Anastasius revocare voluerit. Constat enim ex Evagrio lib. 3. cap. 23. et ex Nicephoro lib. 13. et 17. et ex Liberato cap. 19. Acacium obiisse tempore Felicis papae, a quo tertius fuit Anastasius. Quomodo ergo Anastasius eum jamdudum defunctum in suam sedem revocare voluit? Sed dicunt quidam, saltem voluisse revocare ejus nomen. |  | I respond: It is entirely false that Anastasius wanted to restore Acacius. For it is established from Evagrius in book 3, chapter 23, and from Nicephorus in books 13 and 17, and from Liberatus in chapter 19, that Acacius died during the time of Pope Felix, from whom Anastasius was the third successor. How, therefore, could Anastasius have wished to restore to his see someone who had long been dead? But some say that he at least wanted to restore his name. |
| At contra exstat epistola Anastasii hujus papae ad Anastasium imperatorem, in qua petit, ut imperator jubeat, nomen Acacii taceri in Ecclesia, quandoquidem justissime a Felice papa praedecessore suo fuerit condemnatus. Quod vero Gratianus dist. 19. can. Ita Dominus, dicit, errasse in hac epistola Anastasium, quia voluit esse rata sacramenta baptismi, et ordinis, quae Acacius contulerat, id non Anastasium haereticum, sed Gratianum imperitum ostendit. Quis enim ignorat catholicorum, baptizatos ab haereticis, vere esse baptizatos, et similiter ordinatos, vere esse ordinatos, quando ordinator haereticus vere episcopus fuerat, et adhuc erat, saltem quantum ad characterem? |  | On the contrary, there exists a letter from Pope Anastasius to Emperor Anastasius, in which he asks that the Emperor order the name of Acacius to be silenced in the Church, since he had been most justly condemned by Pope Felix, his predecessor. As for what Gratian says in Distinction 19, canon “Ita Dominus,” that Anastasius erred in this letter because he wished the sacraments of baptism and ordination conferred by Acacius to be considered valid, this shows not that Anastasius was a heretic, but that Gratian was ignorant. For who among Catholics does not know that those baptized by heretics are truly baptized, and similarly those ordained are truly ordained, when the heretical ordainer was and still remained a true bishop, at least as far as the sacramental character is concerned? |
| Illud vero de Photio forte est mendacium, sicut de revocatione Acacii: sed verum sit; num propterea non erit catholicus Anastasius? An non licet summo pontifici sine concilio omnium episcoporum, presbyterorum et clericorum totius Ecclesiae, absolvere unum excommunicatum? Quod autem Anastasum papam morte repentina a Deo immissa defunctum, videtur ortum ex eo, quod constat, Anastasium haereticum imperatorem illo ipso tempore fulmine ictum periisse, ut scribit Evagrius, Cedrenus, et Zonaras, et Paulus diaconus in ejus vita, alioqui fabulam esse non dubium est. |  | That claim regarding Photius is perhaps a falsehood, just like the alleged revocation of Acacius’s excommunication. But even if it were true, would Anastasius therefore not be Catholic? Is it not lawful for the Supreme Pontiff, without a council of all bishops, priests, and clerics of the entire Church, to absolve someone who has been excommunicated? The belief that Pope Anastasius died by a sudden death inflicted by God seems to have originated from the fact that it is established that the heretical Emperor Anastasius perished by a lightning strike at that very time, as Evagrius, Cedrenus, Zonaras, and Paul the Deacon write in his life; otherwise, it is undoubtedly a fable. |
| Vigesimus est Vigilius, quem Liberatus in Breviar. cap. 22. refert, epistolam scripsisse ad Theodoram imperatricem, et alios haereticos, qua confirmabat haeresim ipsorum, et anathema dicebat iis, qui confitebantur duas in Christo naturas. |  | The twentieth is Vigilius, whom Liberatus in Breviar. chapter 22 reports to have written a letter to the Empress Theodora and other heretics, in which he confirmed their heresy and pronounced anathema on those who confessed two natures in Christ. |
| Respondeo: Multi existimant, hunc locum Liberati esse corruptum ab haereticis, eo quod in pontificali videatur contrarium narrari. At cum vestigium nullum appareat corruptionis in lib. Liberati, et revera non pugnet narratio Liberati cum narratione pontificalis, aliter respondendum est. Dico igitur: Vigilium scripsisse illam epistolam, et damnasse catholicam fidem, saltem exteriori professione: sed hoc nihil obesse nostrae caussae. Nam id fecit, cum adhuc viveret Sylverius papa, quo tempore Vigilius ipse papa non erat, sed pseudopapa: neque enim duo simul veri pontifices summi esse possunt: et constabat tunc omnibus, Sylverium verum pontificem esse, licet in exilio degeret. |  | I respond: Many believe that this passage of Liberatus was corrupted by heretics, because in the pontifical book the opposite seems to be narrated. But since no trace of corruption appears in the book of Liberatus, and the narrative of Liberatus does not truly conflict with the narrative of the pontifical book, a different response must be given. I say therefore: Vigilius did write that letter and did condemn the Catholic faith, at least in external profession; but this does not obstruct our cause. For he did this while Pope Silverius was still alive, at which time Vigilius himself was not the pope, but a pseudo-pope: for two true Supreme Pontiffs cannot exist simultaneously, and it was evident to all at that time that Silverius was the true pontiff, even though he lived in exile. |
| Sciendum est enim, Anthemium haereticum deposilum fuisse ab Agapeto romano pontifice de episcopatu constantinopolitano: deinde imperatricem petivisse a Sylverio Agapeti successore, ut Anthemium restitueret, quo recusante, Vigilium tunc archidiaconum promisisse imperatrici, se Anthemium revocaturum, si posset romanus pontifex fieri: continuo autem, jussu imperatricis, opera Belisarii, fuisse s. Sylverium expulsum de sua sede in exilium, et Vigilium creatum papam, seu potius antipapam: quo tempore non esset mirum, si errare in fide, et etiam haereticus plane esse potuisset. Quamquam ne tunc quidem definivit aliquid contra fidem tanquam pontifex, neque animo haereticus fuit: siquidem epistolam scripsit nefariam quidem, et Christiano homine indignam: tamen in catholica fide non damnavit palam, neque haeretico animo, sed occulte, propter cupiditatem praesidendi, ut Liberatus ibidem dicit, et ex epistola ipsa Vigilii apparet. Scribit enim ut caveant: ne epistolam illam ullus videat, et ut sint omnia occulta usque ad tempus: erat enim Vigilius tunc in angustiis summis, in quas cum ambitio sua corripuerat. Nam si palam se haereticum profiteretur, metuebat romanos, qui haereticum sedere in Petri cathedra nunquam passuri videbantur: si e contrario catholicum se profiteretur, metuebat imperatricem haereticam, cujus opera pontificatum adeptus fuerat; itaque rationem illam excogitavit, ut Romae catholicum ageret, et interim per literas apud imperatricem haereticum simularet. |  | It should be known that Anthemius, a heretic, was deposed from the bishopric of Constantinople by Agapetus, the Roman Pontiff. Subsequently, the Empress asked Silverius, Agapetus’ successor, to restore Anthemius. When Silverius refused, Vigilius, then an archdeacon, promised the Empress that he would recall Anthemius if he could be made Roman Pontiff. Soon after, by order of the Empress and through Belisarius’ efforts, St. Silverius was expelled from his See into exile, and Vigilius was created Pope, or rather, Antipope. During this time, it would not be surprising if he could have erred in faith, or even have been plainly heretical. Although even then he did not define anything against the faith as Pontiff, nor was he a heretic in his heart. Indeed, he wrote a wicked letter unworthy of a Christian man; however, he did not openly condemn the Catholic faith, nor with a heretical intent, but secretly, due to his desire to preside, as Liberatus says in the same place, and as appears from Vigilius’ own letter. For he writes instructing them to take care that no one sees that letter, and that everything remain hidden until the appropriate time. Vigilius was then in extreme difficulties, into which his ambition had drawn him. For if he openly professed himself a heretic, he feared the Romans, who would never seem to tolerate a heretic sitting in Peter’s chair; if, on the contrary, he professed himself a Catholic, he feared the heretical Empress, through whose aid he had obtained the pontificate. Therefore, he devised this strategy: to act as a Catholic in Rome, while meanwhile pretending to be a heretic to the Empress through letters. |
| Contigit autem paulo post, ut Sylverius moreretur: et Vigilius, qui eo usque in schismate sederat, inciperet jam solus et legitimus pontifex esse, nimirum, confirmante et accipiente eum clero et populo romano. Ab hoc vero tempore nullus inventus est in Vigilio aut error, aut erroris simulatio: sed summa constantia in fide usque ad mortem, ut appareat, cum ipso pontificatu firmitatem fidei eum accepisse, et de levi palea in solidissimam petram commutatum fuisse. Nam cum imperatrix Theodora haeretica freta occultis literis, et promissione Vigilii, peteret ab eo, ut Anthemium patriarcham praedictum, sicut promiserat, restitueret; ille rescripsit, se temere promisisse, graviterque ea promissione peccasse, et ideo non posse, nec velle implere quae promiserat, ne peccata peccatis adderet. Quocirca ab irata imperatrice in exilium missus fuit, et misere vexatus usque ad mortem. Id quod non solum scribitur in pontificali, sed etiam annotarunt Paulus diaconus in vita Justiniani, et Aimonius lib. 5. cap. 32. de gest. Francor. et ipsi etiam Magdeburgenses Cent. 6. cap. 10. in vita Vigilii, et idem etiam indicat brevissime Liberatus, in fine cap. 22. ubi dicit: Vigilium ab illa ipsa haeresi, quam initio occulte foverat, misere afflictum postea fuisse. |  | It came to pass shortly thereafter that Sylverius died, and Vigilius, who until then had sat in schism, began now to be the sole and legitimate pontiff, indeed, with the Roman clergy and people confirming and accepting him. From this time forward, however, neither error nor semblance of error was found in Vigilius, but rather the utmost constancy in faith until death, so that it appears that with the pontificate itself he received firmness of faith, and was transformed from light chaff into most solid rock. For when the heretical Empress Theodora, relying on secret letters and Vigilius’s promise, asked him to restore the aforementioned Patriarch Anthemius, as he had promised, he wrote back that he had rashly promised and had gravely sinned by that promise, and therefore could not and would not fulfill what he had promised, lest he should add sins to sins. For this reason, he was sent into exile by the enraged empress and miserably persecuted until death. This is recorded not only in the Pontifical, but also noted by Paul the Deacon in his Life of Justinian, and by Aimonius in book 5, chapter 32, of Deeds of the Franks, and even by the Magdeburg Centuriators themselves in Century 6, chapter 10, in the Life of Vigilius, and the same is also very briefly indicated by Liberatus at the end of chapter 22, where he says that Vigilius was later miserably afflicted by that very heresy which he had secretly fostered in the beginning. |
| Denique Vigilium, post mortem Sylverii, verum et sanctum pontificem fuisse; testantur omnes illi, qui illo ipso tempore viventes scripserunt aliquid de Vigilio. Gregorius I.lib.2., epist. 36. ad episc. hybern. *Recordandae, inquit, memoriae Vigilius papa in urbe regia constitutus, contra Anthimum, vel Acephalos, damnationis promulgavit sententiam.* Cassiodorus lib. de div. lect. cap. 1. *Origenem*, inquit, *praesenti tempore a Vigilio papa viro beatissimo constat esse damnatum.* Arator praefat. Act. apostol. quos carmine scripsit, et Vigilio papae dedicavit, sic incipit: *Domino sancto beatissimo apostolico, et in toto orbe primo omnium sacerdotum papae Vigilio.* Denique constat ex Evagrio lib. 4. cap.37. a Vigilio confirmatam fuisse V.synodum generalem, in qua damnata est haeresis illa, quam Theodora fovebat, et de qua ipse Vigilius ab adversariis accusatur. |  | Finally, that Vigilius, after the death of Silverius, was a true and holy pontiff is attested by all those who, living at that very time, wrote something about Vigilius. Gregory I, in Book 2, Letter 36 to the Bishop of Hibernia, says: *“Pope Vigilius of revered memory, stationed in the royal city, promulgated a sentence of condemnation against Anthimus and the Acephali.”* Cassiodorus in his book On Divine Readings, chapter 1, states: *“It is well known that Origen was condemned in our present time by Pope Vigilius, a most blessed man.”* Arator, in the preface to the Acts of the Apostles, which he wrote in verse and dedicated to Pope Vigilius, begins thus: *“To the holy Lord, most blessed apostolic, and first of all priests in the entire world, Pope Vigilius.”* Finally, it is established from Evagrius, Book 4, chapter 37, that the Fifth General Council was confirmed by Vigilius, in which that heresy which Theodora fostered was condemned, and of which Vigilius himself is accused by his adversaries. |
| Posset etiam dici: epistolam illam Vigilii, cuius meminit Liberatus, fuisse confictam ab haereticis: Liberatum autem credidisse falso rumori, quem haeretici sparserant. Nam quod haeretici confinxerint epistolam quandam Vigilii papae nomine ad Theodoram et Justinianum, deprehensum fuit certis indiciis in VI. synodo, act. 14. sed quidquid de hoc sit; satis nobis est, eum nulla in re errasse, quo tempore verus pontifex fuit. |  | It could also be said that the letter of Vigilius, which Liberatus mentions, was fabricated by heretics, and that Liberatus believed a false rumor spread by heretics. For it was discovered by certain evidence in the Sixth Council, Act 14, that heretics had forged a certain letter in the name of Pope Vigilius to Theodora and Justinian. But whatever the truth of this may be, it is sufficient for us that he erred in no matter during the time he was the true pontiff. |
| Vigesimusprimusis est s. Gregorius I. qui a Durando in 4. dist. 7. q. 4. accusatur erroris, quod in epistol. 26. lib. 3. ad Joan. episc. Caralan. permiserit presbyteris conferre confirmationis sacramentum, quod jure divino solis episcopis convenit. Propter quem locum Gregorii Hadrianus in quaest. de confirmat. art: ult. asserit, pontificem posse errare in definiendis dogmatibus fidei. |  | The twenty-first is St. Gregory I, who is accused of error by Durandus in Book 4, distinction 7, question 4, because in his Epistle 26, Book 3, to John, Bishop of Caralana, he permitted priests to administer the sacrament of confirmation, which by divine law belongs solely to bishops. Because of this passage from Gregory, Hadrian, in his question on confirmation, final article, asserts that the pontiff can err in defining dogmas of faith. |
| Respondeo primo: Non b. Gregorium, sed Durandum potius et Hadrianum errasse. Siquidem concilium florentinum in instruct.armen.et tridentinum sess.7.can.ult.docent,confirmationis ordinarium ministrum esse episcopum, at quo sequitur posse extraordinarie,etiam non episcopum esse ministrum ejus sacramenti.Deinde,Gregorius non decretum aliquod de hac re edidit, sed solum concessit quibusdam presbyteris, ut absentibus episcopis confirmarent: proinde, si in hoc s. Gregorius errasset, non doctrinae, sed exempli seu facti error fuisset. Est etiam alius quidam error, qui s. Gregorio attribuitur, sed falso, de quo dicemus infra, cum agemus de Gregorio III. |  | I respond first: It was not blessed Gregory who erred, but rather Durandus and Hadrian. Indeed, the Council of Florence, in its instruction to the Armenians, and the Council of Trent, session 7, final canon, teach that the ordinary minister of confirmation is the bishop, from which it follows that, extraordinarily, even a non-bishop can be the minister of this sacrament. Furthermore, Gregory did not issue any decree on this matter, but only granted to certain priests that in the absence of bishops they could confirm; therefore, if St. Gregory had erred in this, it would not have been an error of doctrine, but of example or fact. There is also another certain error attributed to St. Gregory, but falsely so, which we shall discuss below when we treat of Gregory III. |
| Vigesimussecundus est Bonifacius V. quem graviter reprehendunt Magdeburgenses Cent. 7. cap. 10. quod ipse in epist. ad Eduuuun regem Angl. quam refert Beda lib. 2. hist.Angl.cap.10.docuerit, Christum a solo originali peccato nos liberasse. |  | The twenty-second is Boniface V, whom the Magdeburg Centuriators severely criticize in Century 7, chapter 10, because in his epistle to Edwin, King of England, which Bede cites in Book 2 of his History of England, chapter 10, he taught that Christ liberated us from original sin alone. |
| Respondeo: Centuriatores de suo addidisse illam vocem *Solo*. Bonifacius enim sic ait: *Accedite ergo ad agnitionem ejus,qui vos creavit, qui in vobis vitae insufflavit spiritum, qui pro vestra redemptione filium suum unigenitum misit, ut vos ab originali peccato eriperet.* Haec ille. Ubi, quod non meminerit aliorum peccatorum caussa fuit, quia peccatum originale est principale, et propter quod delendum principaliter Christus mortuus est. Luc.Joan. 1. legimus: *Ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi.* Graece, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, idest, *peccatum illud mundi*, hoc est, *peccatum originale*, quod solum est commune toti mundo: nam plurimi nullum aliud habent, ut omnes pueri. |  | I respond: The Centuriators have added that word *Solo* [Alone/Only] on their own. For Boniface says thus: *Come therefore to the knowledge of Him who created you, who breathed the spirit of life into you, who for your redemption sent His only-begotten Son, that He might rescue you from original sin.* These are his words. The reason he did not mention other sins was because original sin is the principal one, and it was primarily for the removal of this sin that Christ died. In Luke [sic] John 1, we read: *Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him who takes away the sins of the world.* In Greek, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, that is, *that sin of the world*, which means *original sin*, which alone is common to the entire world: for many have no other sin, as is the case with all children. |
|  |  |  |
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