

To a friend who turned Sedevacantist:

O Tertullian, why hath thou fallen?

I am deeply troubled by your complete transformation. You are not faithfully transmitting either the traditions of the Church or the position (or teachings) of Archbishop Lefebvre. It is not we who have changed, but you.

Remember when Saint Athanasius asked, 'Would you rather have the churches or the Faith'? Many so-called Traditionalists chose the churches headed by Bishop Fellay, just as their forebears chose the churches headed by the robber Council called Vatican II.

So too, I believe that may have happened with you. You correctly rejected the new form of the SSPX led by Bishop Fellay, but, instead of entrenching and awaiting the aid of Bishop Williamson or Father Pfeiffer or others who would faithfully transmit that which the Church has always taught, you ran to the CMRI Church.

There they have corrupted you. You always seemed more concerned with the validity of a Mass rather than with its celebrant's doctrinal teaching. I kept telling you: Validity just means whether something happens or not. It does not indicate whether it is licit, except in so much as it would have to be valid to be licit. But licitness does not proceed from validity. The Russian Orthodox Church has valid Masses—the real true presence is found there, but it is illicit to attend. So too, at the CMRI, you saw a valid Mass and decided to attend, but the doctrine they teach is one they made up. They made it to justify themselves, not unlike many of the protestant sects.

What is with my Tertullian remark at the beginning, you may wonder? Tertullian was a master debater in the early days of the Church, a champion of the Catholic Faith against the pagans. His works were favoured by Origen and others. But unfortunately, before he could become a Saint Augustine, before there was an Augustine, he fell into heresy.

From the book *Church History* by Father John Laux, M.A., 1940, pages 63-64:

“His full name was Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus. He was born about 160 A.D. at Carthage, where his father was serving as a centurion of the proconsul of Africa. After an excellent training in Greek and Latin literature, he became a lawyer and practised his profession in Rome for many years. After his conversion to Christianity (about 193 A.D.) he settled in Carthage. St. Jerome says that he was advanced to the priesthood, but this is hardly probable; to all appearances Tertullian lived and died as a layman. Tertullian was easily the most original and the most prolific of all the early Latin writers. He has been justly called the “Father of Ecclesiastical Latin.” His chief work is the *Apologeticus*, a defense of the Christians addressed to the governors of proconsular Africa in 197. It disposes in masterly fashion of the charges brought against the Christians for secret crimes and public offenses, and proves the absolute superiority of Christianity over all other religions and philosophical systems.

Unfortunately, about the year 203 Tertullian fell under the influence of the Montanists and in 213 went over to them altogether; and henceforth he employed his great talents in defending and propagating the tenets of that sect of fanatic rigorists. Some of his favorite contentions after he had become a Montanist were that the Church could not absolve persons guilty of very grave offenses,

such as apostasy and adultery; that Christians were not at liberty to avoid persecution by flight or to purchase their safety with money; that second marriage was adultery; that amusements of all kinds were sinful, and that the power to rule in the Church depended on spiritual endowments and not on the Sacrament of Holy Orders.”

Hundreds of years later, the aforementioned St. Augustine would be fighting the Donatists, after his battles with the Pelagians. From the same book (pages 147-148):

“ The Donatists.—The year 311 saw the birth of the Donatist schism at Carthage. It grew out of the erroneous doctrine of St. Cyprian that Baptism depended for its validity on the *faith* of the minister. The Donatists maintained that the validity of the Sacraments depended on the faith and even the *moral character* of the minister. Moreover, with the Novatians they taught that sinners could not be members of the Church. Although there were some good men among them, the Donatists were, on the whole, a bad and mischievous sect. Their origin was bad, and their subsequent history one of hatred, intolerance and violence.

In 311 Mensurius, the saintly Archbishop of Carthage, died, and the clergy and people of the city duly elected the Archdeacon Caecilian as his successor. This aroused the ire of a certain Lucilla, a wealthy but very meddling widow, who harbored a grudge against the Archdeacon for having upbraided her for superstitious practices. For a consideration—and a very small one, it seems—she prevailed upon a number of Numidian bishops to declare the election and consecration of Caecilian invalid and to consecrate her servant, the Lector Majorinus, as Archbishop of Carthage. In order to justify their conduct the schismatics charged that Bishop Felix of Aptunga, who had consecrated Caecilian, was a *Traditor*, (i.e. one who had given up copies of the Scriptures and the sacred vessels to the heathens in time of persecution) and consequently, he being an unworthy minister, that the consecration was invalid. Majorinus died in 313, and was succeeded by *Donatus*, surnamed the Great, from whom the sect took its name. The schism spread rapidly, and in a very short time there were rival churches and rival bishops in every town and city of Africa.

The Governor of Africa, at the command of Constantine, to whom the Donatists had appealed, examined into the accusation against Felix and found it false. A similar verdict was handed down by Pope Melchiades, and in 314 the Council of Arles, after pronouncing Felix innocent, declared that even if he had been guilty the consecration of Caecilian would still have been valid.

The schismatics remained irreconcilable, and even went so far as to set up a rival bishop in Rome itself...”

This is a short history of comparable rigourists who see everything in black and white.

Point of fact: What unites the Sedevacantists to each other is only their denial that there exists a Roman Pontiff. They disagree on other points of doctrine. Paradoxically, Sedevacantists stand ready to attend anyone's Mass whom they deem “valid”. This is quite confusing.

The problem lies not with Bishop Williamson, but with the Sedevacantists who, above all, champion their own right to privately judge higher offices, pronounce definitions on dogmas, or alter them or expand upon them when it serves their purposes.

It is tough being Catholic, since we cannot change things to suit an argument. But, 'C'est la vie', as the

French say.

Before we get into the doctrine of papal infallibility itself, I would like to point out something. You are trying to confuse the real issue by pointing to the recent canonizations as proof that you are right. First and foremost, the canonizations do not date back to the origins of the Church. They originated in the Middle Ages, and they were designed specifically to make sure that those who were unworthy would not be declared Saints. The form they used took an extremely long time, usually many decades for each Saint's cause. If they had believed that the Pope could just know whether the person was a Saint or not, I don't believe they would have used such a process. While it is possible that the canonizations following that process were infallibly declared, there is no certainty of that being the case. However, when the New Church got rid of the devil's advocate in the canonization process and eliminated all inspection on the life of the one under review (as if they actually reviewed them and didn't just push them through), there is very much a grave certainty that they are very much not infallible.

One thing is for certain, as I will show later, that they do not fall under the Ex Cathedra Vatican I definition of infallibility.

Some, such as Padre Pio, may well be real Saints; others, such as the founder of the Opus Dei, are undoubtedly not, especially in the sense of someone to be looked up to. I personally think the new canonizations are invalid, either by form, defect, or intention. It is of course not up to me to either impose that view on someone else or to declare it dogmatically. It is not for you either. It is to be left to a successor of the chair of St. Peter to definitively state how any and/or all canonizations are or are not infallible.

I did not come to this view recently. I would not even know that JP II was canonized if you had not mentioned it. I do not care about what goes on in the New Church.

If you believe that the false canonization of Pope John Paul II was the final straw, tipping the scales of proof in favour of your position, then why did you leave for the Sedevacantists beforehand? And does this mean that you previously believed that Escriva was a saint? It is more probable that neither of them are saints and that some defect in formulae has allowed them to be called such. This of course would be corrected in time: For instance, it was discovered that in the 8th century someone mistook Saint Felix with the Arian-appointed Anti-Pope Felix II who occupied the See of Rome during the exile of Pope Liberius. Thus they added Felix II to a feast day. By the 1960's, many of the missals had been changed to correct this. Others did not.

[http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_\(1913\)/Pope_Felix_II](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Pope_Felix_II)

In any event, the Sedevacantists are wrong even on the fact of papal elections. Firstly a Pope is a pope merely by becoming the Bishop of Rome. The crisis beginning with Pope Formosus is a classic example of this. I would recommend reading the entire articles from the Catholic Encyclopedia of 1913 on each of the following three popes:

[http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_\(1913\)/Pope_Formosus](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Pope_Formosus)

[http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_\(1913\)/Pope_John_IX](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Pope_John_IX)

[http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_\(1913\)/Pope_Sergius_III](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Pope_Sergius_III)

Not to scandalize you too much, but this time period was a very chaotic time for the papacy. In the end, they were all Pope because they were Bishop of Rome. Some of them claimed that the elections of rivals were invalid, but that was false. It doesn't matter what the laws of men say; Once Pope, you are Pope. Before this crisis, the law was that no bishop could become a bishop of another See. However, when this occurred, it was declared valid in synods in Rome by Pope John IX. Some of the Popes during this time had been excommunicated before they became Pope, but they were still Pope.

We know that not all popes are impeccable; so too we know that not everything they say is infallible.

Here is another story that is illustrative: We know Pope Liberius signed a traitorous and heretical document. He later repented and helped restore the Church with the help of St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose of Milan, and also the two young champions just rising at the end of the Arian Crisis, St. Jerome and St. Augustine.

I will demonstrate Pope Liberius' fall with quotes from *The Complete History of the Catholic Church* by the Rev. Fernand Mourret, S.S. (translated by the Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D.).

The first quote shows that the situation then was as dire as it is now. The Arian Crisis had, over time, taken over the whole Church with only remnants here and there resisting.

“Then follows this anathema of heresy:

“I curse the blasphemies, that spoke Sabellius and Arius. These Simons I heed not.”

From the depth of exile, the voices of Hilary and Athanasius were still heard refuting and denouncing Arius. But, among the bishops still in office, none any longer dared echo these refutations and anathemas. Terror had spread through the whole Empire. Saturninus, Ursacius, and Valens in the West, Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and George of Laodicea in the East, exercised a sort of insolent and annoying police surveillance over their fellow-bishops. Every prelate suspected of loyalty to the *homoousios* formula or of sympathy toward Athanasius, was denounced as guilty of Sabellianism and of treason to the Empire. Each denunciation was followed by prompt and terrible penalties. Striking examples of this were seen in the banishment of Pope Liberius, Paulinus of Treves, Athanasius, and many others. To all human seeming, the cause of orthodoxy was lost” (page 165, *The Complete History of the Catholic Church*, Volume 2).

The second quote will demonstrate the fall of Liberius and his return, and how Liberius' fall does not in any way conflict with the dogma of infallibility, because the infallibility of the teaching office of the pope is limited; it is restricted to definitions of the teachings of the Church on faith and morals, and all of these must come from the beginning of the Church.

“Question of Pope Liberius

Constantius had just terminated Liberius' banishment and requested him to take part in the Council of Sirmium. Perhaps it was convoked only on his account. They began by asking him—we are still following Sozomen's account—to condemn. In the doctrine of the *homoousios* (*i.e.* the consubstantiality of the Word). The aged pontiff refused to do so. Then Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and Eleusios of Cyzicus explained that the word *homoousios* was very dangerous, that it had been used by Paul of Samosata and by Photinus to spread their errors, and that two Councils of Antioch had rejected it. The Pope yielded to these arguments and signed the formulary. Yet he thought it necessary to declare that “those who affirm that the Son is not like unto the Father in substance and in all other respects, are excommunicated.”³⁸

In the very words of the historian who is the most explicit on this subject, such is the famous incident of "the fall of Pope Liberius" at the third Council of Sirmium. The simple narrative of the events amply demonstrates that the old pontiff, by affixing his signature, through ignorance or fear, to a formulary drawn up by semi-Arians, did not abandon a particle of the orthodox faith. Still less could we say that he purposed setting forth an *ex cathedra* definition of faith. But was not this event preceded by a defection at Beroea? That is another question, and one far less clear.

St. Athanasius, in his *History of the Arians*, written for the monks of Egypt, declares that "Liberius, after he had been in banishment two years, gave way and from fear of threatened death, subscribed." ³⁹ St. Hilary writes, in his *Contra Constantium*: "You have carried the war even to Rome, you have snatched away its bishop, and I know not whether you were not more impious in sending him back than in banishing him." ⁴⁰ In the *Historical Fragments* of St. Hilary, which are probably merely the remains of a vast work on the history of the Councils of Rimini and Seleucia, ⁴¹ are found still more significant evidences. ⁴² From these documents we may conclude that Liberius, worn out by his exile and circumvented by the Arian Bishop Demophilus, obtained his freedom and his return to Rome by promising to separate from Athanasius and hold communion with the semi-Arians. Bossuet, along with Fleury and Tillemont, credited the importance of all this evidence. But he did not tremble for the honor of the Roman Church. In his *Second Pastoral Instruction on the Promises of the Church* he writes: "What shall we say of the fall of Liberius? Did the Church preserve her succession when a pope rejected the communion of Athanasius, entered into communion with the Arians, and subscribed to a confession of faith in which the Nicene faith was suppressed? Can you believe that the succession of the Church was interrupted by the fall of one pope, when we are certain of the fact that he yielded only to open force and that of his own accord he returned to his duty? Every act extorted by violence is null. Moreover, it is certain that this pope, after straying for a few months, returned to his first dispositions and completed his pontificate, which was a long one, in communion with a St. Athanasius, a St. Basil, and the others of like merit and repute. We know he is praised by St. Epiphanius and by St. Ambrose, who twice calls him 'Pope Liberius of holy memory' " " (pages 169-171, Volume 2).

Thirdly, I will show Liberius' return against the Anti-Pope Felix.

“Antipope Felix

After the conclusion of the Council of Sirmium,

"Constantius permitted Liberius to return to Rome. The bishops who were then convened at Sirmium wrote to Felix who governed the Roman Church, and to the Roman clergy, desiring them to receive Liberius; they directed that Felix and Liberius should share the apostolic throne and be associated together without dissension in the discharge of the ministerial functions, and that whatever illegalities might have occurred in the ordination of the one or the banishment of the other, might be buried in oblivion. The people of Rome regarded Liberius as a good man and esteemed him highly on account of the courage he had evinced in opposing the Emperor, ⁴⁸ so that they had even excited seditions on his account." ⁴⁹ Theodoret supplies the following detail: "The edict of the Emperor was read in the race-course, and the multitude shouted, that the imperial regulation was just, that the spectators were divided into two factions, each deriving its name from its own color, and that each faction would now have its own bishop. After having thus ridiculed the edict of the Emperor, they all exclaimed with one voice: 'There is but one God, one Christ, one bishop.' " ⁵⁰ Sozomen relates that "Felix survived but a short time; and Liberius found himself in sole possession of the Church. This event was, no doubt, ordained by God, that the seat of Peter might not be dishonored by the occupancy of two bishops; for such an arrangement, being contrary to ecclesiastical law, would certainly have been a source of discord" "

(pages 172-173, Volume 2).

There is also the case of Pope John XXII, a good Pope who nevertheless believed in a doctrine that was heretical. He preached it before he became Pope, he preached it in his sermons while he was Pope, and he repented of it and renounced it on his deathbed. His successor condemned the heresy for all time definitively (that is, ex cathedra) and defined the true dogma. Below is the story in greater detail:

“In the last years of John's pontificate there arose a dogmatic conflict about the Beatific Vision, which was brought on by himself, and which his enemies made use of to discredit him. Before his elevation to the Holy See, he had written a work on this question, in which he stated that the souls of the blessed departed do not see God until after the Last Judgment. After becoming pope, he advanced the same teaching in his sermons. In this he met with strong opposition, many theologians, who adhered to the usual opinion that the blessed departed did see God before the Resurrection of the Body and the Last Judgment, even calling his view heretical. A great commotion was aroused in the University of Paris when the General of the Minorites and a Dominican tried to disseminate there the pope's view. Pope John wrote to King Philip IV on the matter (November, 1333), and emphasized the fact that, as long as the Holy See had not given a decision, the theologians enjoyed perfect freedom in this matter. In December, 1333, the theologians at Paris, after a consultation on the question, decided in favour of the doctrine that the souls of the blessed departed saw God immediately after death or after their complete purification; at the same time they pointed out that the pope had given no decision on this question but only advanced his personal opinion, and now petitioned the pope to confirm their decision. John appointed a commission at Avignon to study the writings of the Fathers, and to discuss further the disputed question. In a consistory held on 3 January, 1334, the pope explicitly declared that he had never meant to teach aught contrary to Holy Scripture or the rule of faith and in fact had not intended to give any decision whatever. Before his death he withdrew his former opinion, and declared his belief that souls separated from their bodies enjoyed in heaven the Beatific Vision.”

[http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_\(1913\)/Pope_John_XXII](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Pope_John_XXII)

You note that a definite decision on a doctrine was not made. Writing a book is not an infallible act.

Of course the most famous of all is Pope Honorius.

Firstly, I am including the entire article from the 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia on Pope Honorius, for you to read in full or in part.

“Pope (625-12 October, 638), a Campanian, consecrated 27 October (Duchesne) or 3 November (Jaffé, Mann), in succession to Boniface V. His chief notoriety has come to him from the fact that he was condemned as a heretic by the sixth general council (680).

This subject will be considered under the following headings:

The Letter of Sergius to Honorius

Monothelism

The Reply of Honorius

The Ecthesis of Heraclius

The Type of Constans

In What Sense was Honorius Condemned

Modern Controversies on the Subject

Character and Work of Honorius

The Monothelite question was raised about 634 in a letter to this pope from the Patriarch of Constantinople, Sergius. He related that Emperor Heraclius, when in Armenia in 622, in refuting a Monophysite of the Severian sect, had made use of the expression "one operation" (energy, *energeia*) of the Incarnate Word. Cyrus, Bishop of the Lazi, had considered this doubtfully orthodox, and had asked advice of Sergius. Sergius replied (he says) that he did not wish to decide the matter, but that the expression had been used by his predecessor Mennas in a letter to Pope Vigilius. In 630 Cyrus had become Patriarch of Alexandria. He found Egypt almost entirely Monophysite, as it had been since the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Cyrus, by the use of the expression for which Sergius had been able to produce such good authority, had formulated a series of propositions, which most of the Monophysites were willing to accept, and they were by this means reunited in large numbers to the Catholic Church, "so that those who formerly would not speak of the divine Leo and the great Council of Chalcedon now commemorated both with a loud voice in the holy mysteries". At this juncture Sophronius, a Palestinian monk, famed for holiness, came to Alexandria. He disapproved of the formulary of Cyrus, and Sergius was evidently somewhat disquieted at this. The reunion of so many heretics was indeed glorious; but the ease with which it had been accomplished must have seemed suspicious. Sophronius was not ready at once with quotations from the Fathers to show that "two operations" was the only orthodox expression. But Sergius was ready to drop the expression "one operation" if Sophronius would do nothing that might destroy the union already accomplished at Alexandria. Sophronius agreed. Sergius, however, was not satisfied with recommending Cyrus for the future to refrain from all mention of either one or two operations, but thought it necessary to place the whole matter before the pope. Sergius has commonly been treated as a heretic who did his best to deceive the pope. It seems more fair and more accurate to say that he was rather a politician than a theologian, but that he acted in good faith. He naturally was anxious to defend an expression which the emperor had used, and he was unaware that the letter of Mennas to Vigilius was a Monophysite forgery. But Cyrus's large use of his formula and its denunciation by St. Sophronius caused him to take precautionary measures. His readiness to drop the expression shows modesty, if his wish that Sophronius's formula also be dropped shows ignorance. Nothing could have been more proper, or more in accordance with the best traditions of his see, than to refer the whole matter to Rome, since the Faith was in question.

The Monothelite heresy is not in reality distinct from that of the Monophysites. The last few years have made us better acquainted with the writings of Timothy Ælurus, Severus of Antioch, and other Monophysites, and it is now plain that the chief points on which the various sections of Monophysites were agreed against Catholicism were the assertions that there is but one Will in the Incarnate Word, and that the operations (activities, *energeiai*) of Christ are not to be distinguished into two classes, the Divine and the human, but are to be considered as being the "theandric" (Divino-human) actions of the one Christ (see EUTYCHIANISM). Now these two formulæ, "one Will", and "one theandric operation", are characteristic of Monothelism. It was not perceived by the ancients that this Monothelism, when it arose, was no new heresy, but expressed the very essence of Monophysitism. This was because the war with the latter heresy had been a war of words. The Catholics, following St.

Leo and the Council of Chalcedon, confessed two natures, *physeis*, in Christ, using the word *nature* to mean an essence without subject, i. e. as distinct from hypostasis; whereas the Monophysites, following St. Cyril, spoke of "one nature", understanding the word of a subsistent nature or subject, and as equivalent to *hypostasis*. They consequently accused the Catholics of Nestorianism, and of teaching two Persons in Christ; while the Catholics supposed the Monophysites to hold that the human nature in Christ was so swallowed up in the Divine that it was non-existent. It does not appear that the Monophysite leaders really went so far as this; but they did undoubtedly diminish the completeness of the human nature of Christ, by referring both will and operation to the one Person and not to the two distinct natures. It followed that a human free will and a human power of action were wanting to Christ's human nature. But this real error of the heretics was not clearly detected by many Catholic theologians, because they spent their force in attacking the imaginary error of denying all reality to the human nature. Our new knowledge of the Monophysite theology enables us to perceive why it was that Cyrus succeeded so easily in uniting the Monophysites to the Church: it was because his formula embodied their heresy, and because they had never held the error which he supposed they were renouncing. Both he and Sergius ought to have known better. But Sergius, at the end of his letter, gets very near to accuracy, when he says that "from one and the same Incarnate Word proceeds indivisibly every human and Divine operation", for this does distinguish the human operations from the Divine operations, though it refers them rightly to a single subject; and Sergius proceeds to quote the famous words of St. Leo's dogmatic letter to Flavian: "Agit utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est", which amount to a condemnation of "one energy".

It was now for the pope to pronounce a dogmatic decision and save the situation. He did nothing of the sort. His answer to Sergius did not decide the question, did not authoritatively declare the faith of the Roman Church, did not claim to speak with the voice of Peter; it condemned nothing, it defined nothing. Honorius entirely agrees with the caution which Sergius recommends. He praises Sergius for eventually dropping the new expression "one operation", but he unfortunately also agrees with him that it will be well to avoid "two operations" also; for if the former sounds Eutychian, the latter may be judged to be Nestorian. Another passage is even more difficult to account for. Following the lead of Sergius, who had said that "two operations" might lead people to think two contrary wills were admitted in Christ, Honorius (after explaining the *communicatio idiomatum*, by which it can be said that God was crucified, and that the Man came down from heaven) adds: "Wherefore we acknowledge one Will of our Lord Jesus Christ, for evidently it was our nature and not the sin in it which was assumed by the Godhead, that is to say, the nature which was created before sin, not the nature which was vitiated by sin." Other passages in the letter are orthodox. But it is plain that the pope simply followed Sergius, without going more deeply into the question. The letter cannot be called a private one, for it is an official reply to a formal consultation. It had, however, less publicity than a modern Encyclical. As the letter does not define or condemn, and does not bind the Church to accept its teaching, it is of course impossible to regard it as an *ex cathedra* utterance. But before, and even just after, the Vatican Council such a view was sometimes urged, though almost solely by the opponents of the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Part of a second letter of Honorius to Sergius was read at the eighth council. It disapproves rather more strongly of the mention of either one operation or two; but it has the merit of referring to the words of St. Leo which Sergius had cited.

Sergius, after receiving the pope's letter approving his recent cautiousness, composed an "Ecthesis", or exposition, which was issued by the emperor towards the end of 638. In conformity with the words of Honorius it orders all the subjects of Heraclius to confess one Will in our Lord, and to avoid the expressions "one operation" and "two operations". Before Sergius died, in December, he assembled a great synod at Constantinople, which accepted the Ecthesis as "truly agreeing with the Apostolic preaching"; the letter from the Apostolic See was evidently the surety for this. Honorius was already dead, and had no opportunity of approving or disapproving the imperial document which had been

based upon his letter. St. Sophronius, who had become Patriarch of Jerusalem even before Sergius wrote to the pope, also died before the end of the year, but not before he had collected a large number of testimonies of the Fathers to the "two operations", and had sent to all metropolitans of the world a remarkable disquisition, which admirably defines the Catholic doctrine. He also solemnly commissioned Stephen, Bishop of Doza, the senior bishop of his patriarchate, to go to Rome and obtain a final condemnation of the new error. The Roman envoys who came to Constantinople in 640 to obtain the emperor's confirmation of the new pope, Severinus, refused to accept the Ecthesis, on the ground that Rome was above all synodical law. Severinus only reigned two months, but condemned the Ecthesis, and so did his successor, John IV. Emperor Heraclius then wrote to the pope, laying the blame on Sergius, and disowning the Ecthesis. He died shortly afterwards (February, 641). To his elder son John IV addressed a letter known as the "Apology for Pope Honorius". He explains quite truly that both Sergius and Honorius asserted one Will only because they would not admit contrary wills; yet he shows by his argument that they were wrong in using so misleading an expression. St. Maximus of Constantinople, a monk and formerly secretary of Heraclius, now becomes the protagonist of orthodoxy and of submission to Rome. His defence of Honorius is based upon the statements of a certain abbot, John Symponus, the composer of the letter of Honorius, to the effect that the pope only meant to deny that Christ had not two contrary human wills, such as are found in our fallen nature. It is true that the words of Honorius are inconclusively though not necessarily, heretical. Unfortunately the Monophysites habitually argued in just the same inconclusive way, from the fact that Christ could have no rebellious lower will, to prove that His Divine and human will were not distinct faculties. No doubt Honorius did not really intend to deny that there is in Christ a human will, the higher faculty; but he used words which could be interpreted in the sense of that heresy, and he did not recognize that the question was not about the unity of the Person Who wills, nor about the entire agreement of the Divine Will with the human faculty, but about the distinct existence of the human faculty as an integrant part of the Humanity of Christ.

Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius, was condemned at Rome for refusing to withdraw the Ecthesis. Emperor Constans deposed him for political reasons, and set up a new patriarch, Paul. Pyrrhus recanted at Rome. Paul, on his appointment, sent the customary confession of faith to the pope. As it did not confess two wills, it was condemned by Pope Theodore. Paul first showed anger, but then prevailed on Constans to withdraw the Ecthesis, for which was substituted a *Typos*, or "Type", in which it was again forbidden to speak of one or two operations, but "one Will" was no longer taught; instead it was said that neither one nor two wills were to be spoken of, but no blame was to attach to any one who had used either expression in the past. The penalties for disobedience were to be: deposition for bishops and clergy, excommunication, loss of goods or perpetual exile for others. This edict was based upon a misinterpretation of the Apology of John IV, who had shown that "one Will" was an improper expression, but had declared that Honorius and Sergius had used it in an orthodox sense. But John IV had neither defended nor blamed Honorius and Sergius for wishing the expression "two operations" to be avoided. It was consequently assumed that Honorius was right in this, and it was quite logical to assimilate the question of one or two wills to that of one or two operations. The penalties were severe; but both patriarch and emperor declared that they forced no man's conscience. The Type, unlike the Ecthesis, was not an exposition of faith, but a mere prohibition of the use of certain words, for the avoidance of wrangling. The edict was issued about the first half of 649. Pope Theodore died in May, and was succeeded by St. Martin I, who in the great Lateran Council of 649 solemnly condemned the Ecthesis and the Type as heretical, together with Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus (who had fallen back), and Paul. The emperor was furious. He had the pope dragged to Constantinople, loaded with chains, and exiled him to the Crimea, where he died a martyr for the Faith in 655. St. Maximus also suffered for his devotion to orthodoxy and his loyalty to the Holy See. The decrees of the Lateran Council which were sent to all bishops by St. Martin as papal dogmatic decisions, mark a new stage in the Honorius

controversy. Honorius and Sergius must stand or fall together. John IV defended both. St. Martin condemns Sergius and Cyrus, and not a word is said in favour of Honorius. It was evidently felt that he could not be defended, if the Type was to be condemned as heretical because it forbade the orthodox expressions "two operations" and "two Wills", since in this it was simply following Honorius. But be it carefully noted that the Type of Constans is not Monothelite. Its "heresy" consists in forbidding the use of orthodox expressions together with their heretical contraries. A study of the Acts of the Lateran Council will show that the question was not as to the toleration of Monothelite expressions, for they were forbidden by the Type, but the prohibition of the orthodox formulæ. No doubt it was still held at Rome that Honorius had not intended to teach "one Will", and was, therefore, not a positive heretic. But no one would deny that he recommended the negative course which the Type enforced under savage penalties, and that he objectively deserved the same condemnation.

Constans was murdered in 668. His successor, Constantine Pogonatus, probably did not trouble to enforce the Type, but East and West remained divided until his wars against the Saracens were over in 678, and he began to think of reunion. By his desire Pope St. Agatho sent legates to preside at a general council which met at Constantinople on 7 Nov., 680. They brought with them a long dogmatic letter in which the pope defined the faith with authority as the successor of St. Peter. He emphatically declares, remembering Honorius, that the Apostolic Church of St. Peter has never fallen into error. He condemns the Ecthesis and Type, with Cyrus, Sergius, Theodore of Pharan, Pyrrhus, Paul, and his successor Peter. He leaves no power of deliberation to the council. The Easterns are to have the privilege of reunion by simply accepting his letter. He sent a book of testimonies from the Fathers, which were carefully verified. The Monothelite Patriarch of Antioch, Macarius, had been allowed to present other testimonies, which were examined and found to be incorrect. The Patriarch of Constantinople, George, and all the council accepted the papal letter, and Macarius was condemned and deposed for not accepting it. Honorius, so far, had been thrice appealed to by Macarius, but had been mentioned by no one else. In the twelfth session, 12 March, 681, a packet was produced which Macarius had sent to the emperor, but which the latter had not opened. It proved to contain the letter of Sergius to Cyrus and to Honorius, the forged letter of Mennas to Vigilius, and the letter of Honorius to Sergius. In the thirteenth session, 28 March, the two letters of Sergius were condemned, and the council added: "Those whose impious dogmas we execrate, we judge that their names also shall be cast out of the holy Church of God", that is, Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Peter, Paul, Theodore, all which names were mentioned by the holy Pope Agatho in his letter to the pious and great emperor, "and were cast out by him, as holding views contrary to our orthodox faith; and these we define to be subject to anathema. And in addition to these we decide that Honorius also, who was pope of elder Rome, be with them cast out of the holy Church of God, and be anathematized with them, because we have found by his letter to Sergius that he followed his opinion in all things, and confirmed his wicked dogmas". These last words are true enough, and if Sergius was to be condemned Honorius could not be rescued. The legates made no objection to his condemnation. The question had indeed arisen unexpectedly out of the reading of Macarius's packet; but the legates must have had instructions from the pope how to act under the circumstances.

Some other writings of the condemned heretics were further read, including part of a second letter of Honorius, and these were all condemned to be burnt. On 9 Aug., in the last session, George of Constantinople petitioned "that the persons be not anathematized by name", that is, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter. He only mentions his own predecessors; but Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, and Honorius would evidently have been spared also, had the legates supported the suggestion. But there was no attempt to save the reputation of Honorius, and the petition of George was negatived by the synod. In the final acclamations, anathema to Honorius, among the other heretics, was shouted. The solemn dogmatic decree, signed by the legates, all the bishops, and the emperor, condemns the heretics mentioned by St. Agatho "and also Honorius who was pope of elder Rome", while it enthusiastically

accepts the letter of St. Agatho. The council, according to custom, presented an address of congratulation to the emperor, which was signed by all the bishops. In it they have much to say of the victory which Agatho, speaking with the voice of Peter, gained over heresy. They anathematize the heretics by name, Theodore, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, Peter, Cyrus, "and with them Honorius, who was Prelate of Rome, as having followed them in all things", and Macarius with his followers. The letter to the pope, also signed by all, gives the same list of heretics, and congratulates Agatho on his letter "which we recognize as pronounced by the chiefest head of the Apostles". The modern notion that the council was antagonistic to the pope receives no support from the Acts. On the contrary all the Easterns, except the heretic Macarius, were evidently delighted with the possibility of reunion. They had never been Monothelites, and had no reason to approve the policy of silence enforced under savage penalties by the Type. They praise with enthusiasm the letter of St. Agatho, in which the authority and inerrancy of the papacy are extolled. They themselves say no less; they affirm that the pope has indeed spoken, according to his claim, with the voice of Peter. The emperor's official letter to the pope is particularly explicit on these points. It should be noted that he calls Honorius "the confirmer of the heresy and contradictor of himself", again showing that Honorius was not condemned by the council as a Monothelite, but for approving Sergius's contradictory policy of placing orthodox and heretical expressions under the same ban. It was in this sense that Paul and his Type were condemned; and the council was certainly well acquainted with the history of the Type, and with the Apology of John IV for Sergius and Honorius, and the defences by St. Maximus. It is clear, then, that the council did not think that it stultified itself by asserting that Honorius was a heretic (in the above sense) and in the same breath accepting the letter of Agatho as being what it claimed to be, an authoritative exposition of the infallible faith of the Roman See. The fault of Honorius lay precisely in the fact that he had not authoritatively published that unchanging faith of his Church, in modern language, that he had not issued a definition *ex cathedra*.

St. Agatho died before the conclusion of the council. The new pope, Leo II, had naturally no difficulty in giving to the decrees of the council the formal confirmation which the council asked from him, according to custom. The words about Honorius in his letter of confirmation, by which the council gets its ecumenical rank, are necessarily more important than the decree of the council itself: "We anathematize the inventors of the new error, that is, Theodore, Sergius,...and also Honorius, who did not attempt to sanctify this Apostolic Church with the teaching of Apostolic tradition, but by profane treachery permitted its purity to be polluted." This appears to express exactly the mind of the council, only that the council avoided suggesting that Honorius disgraced the Roman Church. The last words of the quotation are given above as in the Greek of the letter, because great importance has been attached to them by a large number of Catholic apologists. Pennacchi, followed by Grisar, taught that by these words Leo II explicitly abrogated the condemnation for heresy by the council, and substituted a condemnation for negligence. Nothing, however, could be less explicit. Hefele, with many others before and after him, held that Leo II by the same words explained the sense in which the sentence of Honorius was to be understood. Such a distinction between the pope's view and the council's view is not justified by close examination of the facts. At best such a system of defence was exceedingly precarious, for the milder reading of the Latin is just as likely to be original: "but by profane treachery attempted to pollute its purity". In this form Honorius is certainly not exculpated, yet the pope declares that he did not actually succeed in polluting the immaculate Roman Church. However, in his letter to the Spanish King Erwig, he has: "And with them Honorius, who allowed the unspotted rule of Apostolic tradition, which he received from his predecessors, to be tarnished." To the Spanish bishops he explains his meaning: "With Honorius, who did not, as became the Apostolic authority, extinguish the flame of heretical teaching in its first beginning, but fostered it by his negligence." That is, he did not insist on the "two operations", but agreed with Sergius that the whole matter should be hushed up. Pope Honorius was subsequently included in the lists of heretics anathematized by the Trullan Synod,

and by the seventh and eighth ecumenical councils without special remark; also in the oath taken by every new pope from the eighth century to the eleventh in the following words: "Together with Honorius, who added fuel to their wicked assertions" (*Liber diurnus*, ii, 9). It is clear that no Catholic has the right to defend Pope Honorius. He was a heretic, not in intention, but in fact; and he is to be considered to have been condemned in the sense in which Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia, who died in Catholic communion, never having resisted the Church, have been condemned. But he was not condemned as a Monothelite, nor was Sergius. And it would be harsh to regard him as a "private heretic", for he admittedly had excellent intentions.

The condemnation of Pope Honorius was retained in the lessons of the Breviary for 28 June (St. Leo II) until the eighteenth century. Difficulties made themselves felt when, after the Great Western Schism, papal infallibility began to be doubted. Protestantism and Gallicanism made vigorous attacks on the unfortunate pope, and at the time of the Vatican Council Honorius figured in every pamphlet and every speech on ecclesiastical subjects. The question has not only been debated in numerous monographs, but is treated by the historians and the theologians, as well as by the professed controversialists. Only a few typical views need here be mentioned.

Bellarmino and Baronius followed Pighius in denying that Honorius was condemned at all. Baronius argued that the Acts of the Council were falsified by Theodore, a Patriarch of Constantinople, who had been deposed by the emperor, but was restored at a later date; we are to presume that the council condemned him, but that he substituted "Honorius" for "Theodorus" in the Acts. This theory has frequently been shown to be untenable.

The more famous Gallicans, such as Bossuet, Dupin, Richer, and later ones as Cardinal de la Luzerne and (at the time of the Vatican Council) Maret, Gratry, and many others, usually held with all Protestant writers that Honorius had formally defined heresy, and was condemned for so doing. They added, of course, that such a failure on the part of an individual pope did not compromise the general and habitual orthodoxy of the Roman See.

On the other hand the chief advocates of papal infallibility, for instance, such great men as Melchior Canus in the sixteenth century, Thomassinus in the seventeenth, Pietro Ballerini in the eighteenth, Cardinal Perrone in the nineteenth, have been careful to point out that Honorius did not define anything *ex cathedra*. But they were not content with this amply sufficient defence. Some followed Baronius, but most, if not all, showed themselves anxious to prove that the letters of Honorius were entirely orthodox. There was indeed no difficulty in showing that Honorius was probably not a Monothelite. It would have been only just to extend the same kindly interpretation to the words of Sergius. The learned Jesuit Garnier saw clearly, however, that it was not as a Monothelite that Honorius was condemned. He was coupled with Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, the *Ecthesis*, and the *Type*. It is by no means clear that Sergius, Pyrrhus, and the *Ecthesis* are to be accounted as Monothelite, since they forbade the mention of "one operation"; it is quite certain that Paul and the *Type* were anti-Monothelite, for they prohibited "one Will" also. Garnier pointed out that the council condemned Honorius for approving Sergius and for "fomenting" the dogmas of Pyrrhus and Paul. This view was followed by many great writers, including Pagi.

A theory put forward by Pennacchi at the time of the Vatican Council attracted an unnecessary amount of attention. He agreed with the Protestants and Gallicans in proclaiming that the letter of Honorius was a definition *ex cathedra*; that the pope was anathematized by the council as a heretic in the strict sense; but the council, not being infallible apart from papal confirmation, fell in this case into error about a dogmatic fact (in this point Pennacchi was preceded by Turrecremata, Bellarmine, Assemani, and many others), since the letter of Honorius was not worthy of censure. Leo II, in confirming the council, expressly abrogated the censure, according to this view, and substituted a condemnation for negligence only (so also Grisar—see above). There is evidently no ground whatever for any of these assertions.

Bishop Hefele before 1870 took the view that Honorius's letter was not strictly heretical but was gravely incorrect, and that its condemnation by an ecumenical council was a serious difficulty against the "personal" infallibility of the popes. After his hesitating acceptance of the Vatican decrees he modified his view; he now taught that Honorius's letter was a definition *ex cathedra*, that it was incorrectly worded, but that the thought of the writer was orthodox (true enough; but, in a definition of faith, surely the words are of primary importance); the council judged Honorius by his words, and condemned him simply as a Monothelite; Leo II accepted and confirmed the condemnation by the council, but, in doing so, he carefully defined in what sense the condemnation was to be understood. These views of Hefele's, which he put forth with edifying modesty and submission as the best explanation he could give of what had previously seemed to him a formidable difficulty, have had a surprisingly wide influence, and have been adopted by many Catholic writers, save only his mistaken notion that a letter like that of Honorius can be supposed to fulfill the conditions laid down by the Vatican Council for an *ex cathedra* judgment (so Jungmann and many controversialists).

Pope Honorius was much respected and died with an untarnished reputation. Few popes did more for the restoration and beautifying of churches of Rome, and he has left us his portrait in the apsidal mosaic of Sant Agnese fuori le mura. He cared also for the temporal needs of the Romans by repairing the aqueduct of Trajan. His extant letters show him engaged in much business. He supported the Lombard King Adalwald, who had been set aside as mad by an Arian rival. He succeeded, to some extent, with the emperor's assistance, in reuniting the schismatic metropolitan See of Aquileia to the Roman Church. He wrote to stir up the zeal of the bishops of Spain, and St. Braulio of Saragossa replied. His connexion with the British Isles is of interest. He sent St. Birinus to convert the West Saxons. In 634 he gave the pallium to St. Paulinus of York, as well as to Honorius of Canterbury, and he wrote a letter to King Edwin of Northumbria, which Bede has preserved. In 630 he urged the Irish bishops to keep Easter with the rest of Christendom, in consequence of which the Council of Magh Lene (Old Leighlin) was held; the Irish testified to their traditional devotion to the See of Peter, and sent a deputation to Rome "as children to their mother". On the return of these envoys, all Southern Ireland adopted the Roman use (633).

PIGHIUS, *Diatriba de Actibus VI et VII Conc.*; BARONIUS, *Ann. Eccl.*, ad ann. 626 and 681, with PAGI's notes on 681; BELLARMINE, *De Rom. Pont.*, iv, II; THOMASSINUS, *Dissert. in Concilia*, XX; GARNIER, *Introd. to Liber Diurnus (P. L., CV)*; P. BALLERINI, *De vi ac ratione primatus*; DAMBERGER, *Synchronistische Geschichte der Kirche*, (15 vols., Ratisbon, 1850-63, II); BOTTEMANNE, *De Honorii papæ epistolarum corruptione* (The Hague, 1870); DÖLLINGER, *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters* (1863); SCHNEEMANN, *Studien über die Honoriusfrage* (Freiburg im Br., 1864); HEFELE, *Causa Honorii papæ* (Naples, 1870), a treatise presented to the Vatican Council; IDEM, *Honorius und das sechste allgemeine Concil* (Tübingen, 1870); IDEM, *Conciliengeschichte*, III and IV (written about 1860, altered in 2nd ed., 1873; th. Edinburgh, 1896); LE PAGE RENOUF, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (London, 1868), against the definition; BOTALLA, *Pope Honorius before the tribunal of reason and history* (London, 1868; IDEM in *Dublin Review*, XIX-XX (1872); PENNACCHI, *De Honorii Romani Pontificis causâ* (Ratisbon and Rome, 1870); GRATRY, *Lettres* (Paris, 1870); WILLIS, *Pope Honorius and the Roman Dogma* (London, 1879), the principal Protestant attack in English; JUNGMANN, *Dissertationes selectæ in Historiam eccl.*, II (Ratisbon and New York, 1881); BARMBY in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; GRISAR in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; CHAPMAN, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, reprinted from *Dublin Rev.*, CXXXIX-XL, 1906 (London, 1907); HERGENRÖTHER, *Handbuch der allgem. Kirchengesch.*, I, gives a good summary of opinions. Minor works are enumerated in CHEVALIER, *Bio-bibl.*, s. v. *Honorius*.—On the general history of Pope Honorius, see the *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. DUCHESNE; and MANN, *The Lives of the Popes*, I (1902), pt. I.

JOHN CHAPMAN.”

[http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_\(1913\)/Pope_Honorius_I](http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Pope_Honorius_I)

Then there is a work by Father Dolan in 1909 during the reign of Pope St. Pius X. This work was commissioned to present the true nature of papal infallibility to the Anglicans and to prove it has always been believed that way. It succeeds in that attempt. Of course it is the same belief on papal

infallibility that Archbishop Lefebvre always taught and that Bishop Williamson teaches. It also agrees with the above article.

Here is an excerpt from Father Dolan's book regarding the case of Pope Honorius.

“The thirteenth session, March 28, 681, furnishes us with the remarkable procedure of an (Ecumenical Synod anathematizing a Pope for heresy. There are few facts of Church history that have developed a richer literature, than the condemnation of Pope Honorius. Efforts have been made to show that it never took place, on the ground that the Acts are spurious. Other attempts have had for their objective, a demonstration of the fact, that the Sixth Council was not oecumenical *in the act of condemnation*. Some again have tried to prove, that the Synod misunderstood the letters of Honorius to Sergius, Bishop of Constantinople, upon which his condemnation is based, and that these letters, being actually orthodox, the Council in anathematizing Honorius, *erred in facts dogmatico*, and that the anathema was not the act, therefore, of an (Ecumenical Infallible Council. The opponents of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, have devoted themselves with much enthusiasm, to attempting to demonstrate that Honorius was condemned for teaching heresy *ex cathedra*, which were it true, would deal a death blow to our doctrine. The best and sanest endeavors in the matter, have been those which, while admitting the heretical character of the letters of Honorius, and his condemnation as a heretic, because of those letters, prove that he taught no heresy *ex cathedra*. One of the most entertaining writers upon the subject is Baronius. To save the Pope, Baronius is willing to go to any length. He assumes, and endeavors to prove, that the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Synod have been hopelessly falsified. The attempt is little short of ludicrous. Baronius is thoroughly confused upon some of the most important details of the contemporary history, and brazenly assumes wholesale forgeries, without a particle of respectable evidence, to bolster up his bold but utterly untenable hypothesis, which Hefele dissects with a master-hand, and then throws aside as worthless. 1

The theory of Pennacchi,² namely, that the letters of Honorius were perfectly orthodox, but that the Synod could not understand them, would indicate that the bishops composing the Council, were an imposing assembly of fools.

The Sixth (Ecumenical Synod, unquestionably condemned Honorius as a heretic, and Pope Leo II, who confirmed the Council, reiterated the condemnation. The documents in the case are unimpeachable, and the words of the Council and the Pope, surely constitute evidence of the first quality. The Synod, in its sentence of condemnation of the Monothelite letters of Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus of Phasis, and to Pope Honorius, as well as the letters of Honorius to Sergius, and of the persons of Sergius, Cyrus of Alexandria, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter of Constantinople, and Theodore of Pharan, closes its list of worthies with the name of Pope Honorius. “Cum his vero simul projici a sancta Dei catholica ecclesia, simulque anathematizari praevidimus et Honorium, qui fuerat Papa antiquae Romae, eo quod invenimus perscripta, quas ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium, quia in omnibus ejus mentem secutus est, impia dogmata confirmavit.” “And with these we decide that Honorius also, who was Pope of old Rome, shall be cast out of the holy Church of God, and be anathematized with them, because we have found through letters, which were written by him to Sergius, that he followed his view in all things, and confirmed his impious dogmas. “ 1 Pope Leo II in his confirmation of the Sixth (Ecumenical Synod, thus expresses himself: “And in like manner we anathematize . . . Honorius, who did not illumine this Apostolic See with the doctrine of apostolic tradition, but by profane treachery allowed its purity to be polluted. (Insert Greek phrase that my computer will not copy) The Latin translation of the Greek original, is unfaithful in the last portion of the above sentence. The Latin reads “profana prodicione, immaculatam fidem vertere conatus est” “who attempted to corrupt its spotless faith.” The two renditions are very different, since (Insert Greek word that my computer will not copy) implies at most

neglect, but “conatus est” implies a positive attack upon the purity of orthodoxy. 1 How one can deny, in the face of the two quotations just given, that the Synod actually condemned Honorius for heresy, is extremely difficult of explanation. The language of Honorius to Sergius, is unquestionably heretical; yet as one inspects his famous answer to the bishop of Constantinople, the conviction gradually forces itself on the mind, that Honorius was very much confused. To put it in common phrase, he seems not to have known what he was talking about. That he was orthodox in intention, hardly admits of any doubt, but he was expressly a heretic, and the Council had to deal only with his expressions. Under the circumstances, it is difficult to see, that there was any other course open to the Council beside that which it pursued.

The contention that Honorius taught heresy *ex cathedra* is utterly worthless. The Vatican decree states, that the Pope teaches *ex cathedra*: “Cum omnium Christianorum pastoris et doctoris omnere fungens, pro supremasua Apostolica auctoritate, doctrinam de fide vel moribus, ab universa ecclesia tenendam definit.” “When in the exercise of his office as shepherd and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine of faith or morals, to be held by the entire Church, then he teaches *ex cathedra*, and as a consequence *infallibly*. There is no evidence whatever, that the letter which Honorius addressed to Sergius *alone*, was intended as a decree. The form of the letter is entirely at variance with that with which the solemn utterances of the Popes have always been invested. There is no appeal to Papal authority, the Petrine commission, the jurisdiction of the See of Rome. Honorius addresses only *one*, *he defines nothing*, and clearly advocates a cowardly policy of silence. “If the letter of Honorius to Sergius, is to be *ex cathedra*,” says Dom John Chapman, “*a fortiori*, all Papal encyclicals addressed to the whole Church at the present day, must be *ex cathedra*, quod est absurdum.”

1 Furthermore, if the Council intended to condemn Honorius for teaching heresy *ex cathedra*, it would have given the lie direct to Agatho's letter to the Emperors, in which Rome's constant inerrancy is insisted upon. This document the Synod accepted without modification, which it could never have done, in the hypothesis, that it regarded the utterance of Honorius to Sergius as *ex cathedra*. The Acts do not reveal the remotest objection to Agatho's pronouncement, which was received with profound reverence by the Synod, as we shall see further on. The consciousness of Agatho upon the constant fidelity of Peter's successors to their great trust, as that consciousness is set forth in his letter, is of itself a valuable argument against the *ex cathedra* hypothesis in the case of Honorius. Was Agatho ignorant of the history of his own see during the sixty years immediately preceding his election?

“Honorius was fallible, was wrong, was a heretic, “ says the learned Chapman, “precisely because he did not, as he should have done, declare authoritatively the Petrine tradition of the Roman Church. To that tradition he made no appeal, but had merely approved and enlarged upon, the half-hearted compromise of Sergius. The Roman tradition had been asserted with authority by Popes Severinus, John IV, Theodore, Martin and their successors; and Martin had sealed his testimony, with his sufferings and death. *Neither the Pope nor the Council consider that Honorius had compromised the purity of Roman tradition, for he had never claimed to represent it.*1

Therefore just as to-day we judge the letters of Pope Honorius by the Vatican definition, and deny them to be *ex cathedra*, because they do not define any doctrine, and impose it upon the whole Church, so the Christians of the seventh century, judged the same letters, by the custom of their own day, and saw that they did not claim what Papal letters were wont to claim. The grounds of both judgements are in reality the same, viz., that the Pope was not defining with authority.”

From *The Papacy and the First Councils of the Church*, Father Dolan, 1909, pages 161-168

The aforementioned Church history books agree with the above quote: pages 131-133 of *The Complete History of the Catholic Church*, Volume 3, from 1936; page 158 of Father John Laux's

Church History, which reiterates that in no way could it be ex cathedra since there was no condemnation of anyone who didn't believe it.

Later on, I will be quoting a text of Pope St. Nicholas I, his letter to the Bulgars. Did you know that it contains heresy (which I will not quote, but you can look up from the citation)? The heresy was condemned before he wrote it, in fact. He quotes St. Ambrose of Milan in his view that Baptism could be in the name of Christ and be valid. But, it was previously defined that it must be a complete Trinitarian baptism to be valid. The Doctor of the Church, St. Ambrose, was wrong. He erred. Pope St. Nicholas I erred in his official letter to the Bulgars. Clearly not infallible in all things. Once again, all the conditions laid out by the first Vatican Council must be met, as we shall see later.

From here I will attempt to prove that the SSPX of Archbishop Lefebvre always held this view against the new heresy that crept forth in the 1920's whereby people started believing that the Pope was infallible in all things. It is the over-extension of papal infallibility which has nothing to do with the first Vatican Council's teaching.

From the History of the SSPX, 1996

The history of the Society of Saint Pius X begins, of course, in the mind of God. But do not believe that its temporal origin is to be found solely at the time of the post-Conciliar crisis. The Society of Saint Pius X was made possible by the providential foresight of an extraordinary man, Fr. Le Floch, superior of the French Seminary in Rome, who in the 1920's formed a group of future prelates and priests who, having been warned by him of the dangers of the Modernist infiltration in the Church, remained faithfully attached to her traditions in the neo-Protestant Revolution. Fr. Le Floch announced in 1926:



Marcel Lefebvre with fellow seminarians at the French Seminary in Rome in the 1920's. Bottom row, second from the right

' The heresy which is now being born will become the most dangerous of all; the exaggeration of the respect due to the Pope and the illegitimate extension of his infallibility. '

http://web.archive.org/web/20030411135559/http://sspx.org/SSPX_FAQs/appendix_iii_history_1.htm)

And below, from over the years, are the official statements of the SSPX.

The following quotes are from the book *Best of Questions and Answers* from the *Angelus*, which is a very good resource of the SSPX's teachings before they fell into modernism.

Firstly, I will show that the Non Una Cum Sedevacantists are in grave error, since they are judging now even the internal intentions of the Popes, not just their public actions.

"When we pray for the Holy Father's intentions when gaining a plenary indulgence, for whom do we pray?

When we are asked by the Church to offer Mass or to pray for the pope's intentions, we are not being asked to pray for the private or personal intentions of a particular pope. The Church, through the authority given her by Christ and acting in union with the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, determines what the pope's intentions

comprise, which are the intentions of Christ Himself: (1) the exaltation of Holy Mother Church; (2) the propagation of the Faith; (3) the uprooting of heresies; (4) the conversion of sinners; (5) peace and concord among Christian nations; and (6) the other needs of Christianity. It is God to whom we are offering the Mass and prayers, and it is God who determines the use to which they will be directed. This must be the case, or how would you gain a plenary indulgence during the time it takes to elect another pope? --Fr. Carl, April 1978" (page 44)

Clearly one is not praying for the personal intentions of the popes. Nay, if they are in error, they need our prayers all the more so that they will ask for the grace to see they are in error and change.

Next, we shall proceed to what the SSPX of the Archbishop believed regarding the office of the Papacy.

"If a Pope is neither crowned nor takes the papal oath, is he then the pope or just an administrator sitting in the Chair of Peter?

By the fact of being the bishop of Rome a man is constituted the successor of blessed Peter, the holder of the primacy. After his legitimate election he obtains at once, from the moment he accepts the election, the full power of his supreme jurisdiction, and this by divine right. As a bishop, both of Rome and of the world, he has full power of jurisdiction in matters of faith and morals as well as discipline. He is therefore, by nature, the supreme administrator. --Father Doran, July 1993" (pages 39-40)

You can see this in the controversy regarding Pope Formosus. He violated the law concerning papal elections yet, in a Synod headed by Pope John IX, was declared to have been Pope, and all his acts were declared valid, this despite the fact Pope Stephen VI had dug up the unfortunate Pope and wrongly declared his election null and his acts invalid.

"Do sedevacantists really love the Church? Do they not judge Pope John Paul II personally, as they say?

It is certainly true that many sedevacantists (*i.e.*, those who believe that the pope has lost the office of the papacy through his heretical actions) think that they love the Church. But they do not love her as she really is, with all the faults and defects to be found in her members. If a man would not love his wife as she really is, but rather a mental picture of how he would like her to be, would he really love her?

Some sedevacantists might state that they do not judge the pope personally. However, to state that his heretical actions remove him from office is to make a public, official judgement. Only a higher authority in the Church can make such a judgment. However, there is no higher authority than the pope, which is why the axiom is to be held *Papa a nemine judicatur*—the pope is judged by no one. By stating that he has lost the papacy, sedevacantists personally judge the pope, as if they had authority over him. This is not Catholic, regardless of the gravity of his materially heretical actions. It is the Protestant principle of personal judgement which is thereby erected into a principle of faith, thus destroying the visibility and hierarchy of the Church. --Father Scott, June 1998" (page 50)

"In writing an encyclical the pope is not writing as a mere private theologian but as the supreme, authoritative teaching authority in the Church. But Pope John Paul II's recent encyclical on ecumenism is a practical denial of the Catholic doctrine of the universality of papal jurisdiction, of the oneness of the Catholic and Roman Church, outside of which there is no salvation. Would it not seem then that he has abandoned his infallibility and that

consequently it is contrary to our Catholic Faith to maintain that he is still the pope?

The pope's tragic betrayal of the Church in *Ut Unum Sint*, so much more explicit than the documents of Vatican II, has certainly brought to light the whole problem of papal infallibility. It certainly runs against the *sensus fidei*, the Catholic instinct of faith, to maintain that a pope should be so gravely in error. How can this be possible? Would it not, perhaps, be less blasphemous to maintain that he is not the pope at all?

The answer to this dilemma lies in the true understanding of the Church's magisterium, the way it is exercised and the limits of its infallibility.

The magisterium of the Church is its teaching authority, in virtue of the mission given by Our Lord Jesus Christ (Mt. 28:20), to teach divinely revealed truth and thus keep the deposit of faith (2 Tim. 6:20). This teaching takes place in various ways: in sacred Scripture, interpreted as the Church has always understood it; in the various documents which express Tradition as handed down since the apostles (*e.g.*, the writings of the Fathers); in catechisms and the constant preaching of the Faith; by the common teaching of the theologians; and finally by the teaching and definitions of ecumenical Councils and popes.

What concerns us here is the last expression of the Church's teaching authority-- the teaching and definitions contained in encyclicals and other writings of the pope. It is Vatican I which both defines as a dogma of the Catholic faith the pope's personal infallibility and also describes its limitations:

Porro fide divina et catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur et ab Ecclesia sine solemnibus iudicio sive ordinario et universalis magisterio tamquam divinitus revelata credenda proponuntur. (Dz. 3011)

Further, by divine and Catholic faith, all those things must be believed which are contained in the written word of God and in Tradition, and those which are proposed by the Church, either in a *solemn pronouncement* or in her *ordinary and universal teaching power*, to be believed as divinely revealed.

Infallibility is therefore to be found both in the extraordinary magisterium, that is, in the pope's solemn or *ex cathedra* pronouncements and definitions, and also in the ordinary magisterium, but under different conditions in each case. The four conditions for the infallibility of the extraordinary magisterium are clearly defined by Vatican I: "[T]hat he teaches as pastor of the universal Church in matters of faith or morals by means of a definition which he imposes obligatorily on all Catholics, under pain of mortal sin, that is by the condemnation of the contrary opinion with an anathema attached to it" (*Pastor Aeternus*, Dz. 3074). It is clear that these four conditions are rarely all fulfilled at the same time. Clear examples include the definitions of the Immaculate Conception (1854) and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (1950). It is also very probable that Pope John Paul II invoked the same infallibility in *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* of May 22, 1994, in which he made a definitive statement excluding once and for all the ordination of women (*The Angelus*, January 1995, pp. 30-32).

Vatican II, however, did not use this charisma of infallibility that it could have had a right to. This was explicitly stated by Pope Paul VI in his discourse to close the Council on December 7, 1965 in which he stated: "Although the magisterium of the Church did not wish to pronounce itself under the form of extraordinary dogmatic pronouncements..." He repeated this again in his Wednesday audience of January 12, 1966, in which he declared that the Council "had avoided proclaiming in an extraordinary manner dogmas having the mark of infallibility." There were many reasons for this; first of all, its many humanistic and liberal principles and ideas

which are not at all matters of faith and morals; secondly, its practice of proceeding by manner of confusing ambiguity and refusing to make clear definitions. Thirdly, and most importantly, was its refusal to impose doctrine in the name of the Faith, and to oblige under the pain of sin by the means of contrary anathemas as previous Councils had done. The liberal popes John XXIII and Paul VI, in fact, paralyzed their extraordinary magisterium by voluntarily refusing to condemn error, which refusal is reflected in the lack of any condemnation in the formulae of promulgation of the conciliar documents. Paul VI had, in fact, said in his opening discourse to the fourth session, which promulgated the Decree on Religious Liberty: "The Council, instead of inflicting condemnations against anyone at all, will only have thoughts of goodness and peace."

A simple glance at the encyclicals and other documents of the present pope will clearly show that, with the one exception mentioned above, there is never any formal definition and condemnation of error obliging all Catholics and that consequently they are not documents of the extraordinary magisterium.

But could they be said to be documents of the ordinary magisterium, and as such infallible? The difficulty in answering this question lies in the ambiguity which surrounds the term ordinary magisterium. It is sometimes misunderstood to mean all the teaching that the popes have taught in their official documents. That this is an error (which is at the root of the blindness of those who reject the papacy on account of the liberal ideas contained in these post-conciliar documents) is clear from the definition of Vatican I, which specifically mentions that it is the ordinary and *universal* magisterium which is infallible. These documents only contain infallible teachings of the ordinary magisterium inasmuch as they contain universal teachings on matters of faith or morals. Otherwise, they are given the name of the simply authentic magisterium, which is neither ordinary nor infallible because it is not universal, but which is to be received with respect provided that it is not opposed to the doctrine of faith.

The necessity of universality for any teachings to be truly teachings of the ordinary magisterium and hence infallible has always been believed in the Church. The *Commonitorium* of St. Vincent of Lerins is the most concise and well known statement of this: "In the Catholic Church very special care is to be given that we might hold fast to that which is believed everywhere, to that which has been believed always, to that which has been believed by all" (*Rouet de Journal*, no. 2168). Thus is indicated the universality in the teaching of the same revealed truth throughout the entire Catholic world, the constancy in teaching exactly the same truth through all ages, and the unanimity of Catholics in believing these truths. The indefectibility of the Church requires this infallibility as described by Vatican I.

This very rule needs to be applied to the teachings of the popes. Clearly, to start with, no truth which is not presented as divinely revealed can be part of the magisterium of the Church (*e.g.*, religious liberty). Moreover, truths presented as divinely revealed will only form a part of the infallible ordinary magisterium of the Church if they are universal in all three ways, that is, if they have been taught always in the Church, everywhere, and by all. One example would be the physical resurrection and another the universal mediation of grace of the Blessed Virgin Mary and another the Church's constant condemnation of birth control. However, it could easily be imagined that there can be difficulty in understanding exactly what is guaranteed by the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium. This is precisely why there is the necessity for the solemn pronouncements and the infallibility of the extraordinary magisterium.

It is in the light of the above that we can see how to react to such modernist encyclicals as *Ut Unum Sint*. It is not a solemn pronouncement of the extraordinary magisterium. Moreover, it does not even pretend to present

this novelty of ecumenism as obligatory, as it is stated to be, as a revealed truth. Consequently, it is not even an act of the magisterium at all. Even if it did pretend to present ecumenism or religious liberty as a revealed truth, it would be clearly manifest that this would not be guaranteed by the infallibility of the ordinary and universal magisterium of the Church for the very simple and obvious reason that these ideas have not been taught always, everywhere, and by all Catholics in the Church, and that they are a manifest novelty.

In fact, there is no contradiction at all with the Church's and the pope's infallibility for such a document to contain explicit heresy. It is indeed an utter tragedy, destroying within the minds of so many Catholics the very authority on which the Church is built. But it is not a denial of his infallibility. Likewise it is in no way a contradiction to say that the pope has the supreme (but not absolute and arbitrary) authority to teach in matters of faith and morals, and to reject such statements or encyclicals which are manifestly opposed to previous declarations of the Church's infallible ordinary and extraordinary magisterium. Here lies the crux of the mystery of iniquity, of the terrible crisis of faith and conscience which is presently afflicting the Catholic Church. It is a vast and very erroneous simplification of the reality, and denaturation of the Church's magisterial authority, to either maintain that the pope must be obeyed in his modernist errors or that he must be rejected as pope altogether. Father Scott, October 1995", pages 50-54

These are some very clear and concise teachings on papal infallibility and why Sedevacantism is wrong. This is what you used to profess to believe.

I will now proceed to the heart of the teaching: The First Vatican Council.

To my knowledge there was only one official approved commentary on the First Vatican Council in English and that was *The True Story of the Vatican Council* by Cardinal Manning 1877.

I own it, so I'll transcribe some of it. But first I'll copy some of the canons of the first Vatican Council, which you should already know:

First Vatican Council

<http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Councils/ecum20.htm>

Chapter 2 On revelation

The same holy mother church holds and teaches that God, the source and end of all things,

- can be known
 - with certainty from the consideration of created things,
 - by the natural power of human reason : ever since the creation of the world, his invisible nature has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made.
- [13]

It was, however, pleasing to his wisdom and goodness to reveal

- himself and
- the eternal laws of his will

to the human race by another, and that a supernatural, way.

- This is how the Apostle puts it : In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son [14] .

It is indeed thanks to this divine revelation, that those matters concerning God

- which are not of themselves beyond the scope of human reason,
- can, even in the present state of the human race, be known
 - by everyone
 - without difficulty,
 - with firm certitude and
 - with no intermingling of error.

It is not because of this that one must hold revelation to be absolutely necessary; the reason is that God directed human beings to a supernatural end,

- that is a sharing in the good things of God that utterly surpasses the understanding of the human mind; indeed eye has not seen, neither has ear heard, nor has it come into our hearts to conceive what things God has prepared for those who love him [15] .

Now this supernatural revelation, according to the belief of the universal church, as declared by the sacred council of Trent, is contained in

- **written books and**
- **unwritten traditions,**

which were

- **received by the apostles from the lips of Christ himself,**
- **or came to the apostles by the dictation of the holy Spirit,**
- **and were passed on as it were from hand to hand until they reached us [16].**

The complete books of the old and the new Testament with all their parts, as they are listed in the decree of the said council and as they are found in the old Latin Vulgate edition, are to be received as sacred and canonical.

These books the church holds to be sacred and canonical

- **not because she subsequently approved them by her authority after they had been composed by unaided human skill,**
- **nor simply because they contain revelation without error,**
- **but because,**

- **being written under the inspiration of the holy Spirit,**
- **they have God as their author,**
- **and were as such committed to the church.**

Now since the decree on the interpretation of holy scripture, profitably made by the council of Trent, with the intention of constraining rash speculation, has been wrongly interpreted by some, we renew that decree and declare its meaning to be as follows: that

- in matters of faith and morals,
- belonging as they do to the establishing of christian doctrine,
- that meaning of holy scripture must be held to be the true one,
- which holy mother church held and holds,
 - since it is her right to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of holy scripture.

In consequence, it is not permissible for anyone to interpret holy scripture in a sense contrary to this, or indeed against the unanimous consent of the fathers.

The emphasis in bold is mine. Dogmas must come from Christ through the Apostles and be given to us through either Holy Scripture or Tradition. You'll note that this is exactly what Father Scott stated many years ago. It is also what Bishop Williamson teaches. Believing the contrary would be to deny that Revelation ended with the death of the last Apostle.

Now to the book I mentioned:

The True Story of the Vatican Council, Cardinal Manning 1877, Chapter V

"The Definition of Infallibility.

Having thus far completed our brief Story of the Vatican Council, we have only to examine the Definition of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

1. We will therefore first take the text of the fourth chapter of the first Constitution on the Church of Christ, in which is contained the infallibility of the head of the Church; and next we will examine its meaning.

Concerning the Infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff.

Moreover, that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic Primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church confirms, and the Ecumenical Councils also have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said: Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church (S. Matthew. xvi. 18) these things which have been said are approved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion has always been kept undefiled and her holy doctrine proclaimed.

Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion (Fourth Council of Constantinople A.D. 869). And, with the approval of the second Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed that the Holy Roman Church enjoys supreme and full Primacy and pre-eminence over the whole Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the plenitude of power from our Lord Himself in the Person of blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is; and as the Apostolic See is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so also if any questions regarding faith shall arise, they must be defined by its judgement (Second council of Lyons). Finally, the Council of Florence defined: That the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church (John xxi. 15-17).

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

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

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

2. Such is the text of the decree about which before it came, and around which after it had been introduced into the Council, so vivid a conflict was waged. Let us quietly examine its meaning. We have seen that its title was changed from *De Romani Pontificis Infallibilitate* (On the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff) to *De Romani Pontificis Infallibili Magisterio* (On the Infallible Teaching Office of the Roman Pontiff). The reason of this change was not only for greater accuracy, but because even the title of the decree excludes at once the figment of a *personal* infallibility. This, as it is imputed to the supporters of the definition, is a fable. The meaning of the title is explained in the first words of the decree. The *magisterium*, or teaching office, or doctrinal authority, is contained in the primacy. The supreme ruler is also supreme teacher. The primacy contains two things, the fullness of jurisdiction, and a special assistance in the exercise of it. Now, under jurisdiction is contained the office of teaching. To deliver the law is to teach. The assistance of infallible guidance is attached to the

magisterium or teaching office, and the *magisterium* is contained in the primacy. The infallibility is therefore attached to the primacy. It is not a quality inherent in the person, but an assistance inseparable from the office. It is therefore not personal, but official. ...

The Introduction then affirms that this doctrine has always been held by the Holy See, confirmed by the perpetual usage of the Church and of the Ecumenical Councils, especially in those by which the reunion of the East and West was for a moment effected. ... The Profession of Faith then adds that the Roman Church "is bound above all Churches to defend the truth; and if any questions arise about the faith, they ought to be defined (or finally determined) by its judgement."...

4. The decree then recites the action of the Pontiffs in all ages for the propagation of the faith among all nations, and for the preservation of its purity. It recounts the various ways in which this supreme oversight of the teacher of all Christians has been exercised. It declares that sometimes the bishops in Synod, or singly one by one, following the immemorial custom of the Churches of the Catholic unity—for, as Tertullian says, "what is found in all places is not error, but tradition"—have faithfully guarded the form of primitive order, especially when any new peril threatened the dogma of faith, by bringing their causes or controversies to the Apostolic See. This they did "that the breaches of the faith might be repaired," as St. Bernard said "by the authority in which faith cannot fail." ...

Sometimes the Pontiffs have proceeded by consultation with the bishops dispersed throughout the world, of which we have a recent example in the definition of the Immaculate Conception and in the preparation for the Council of the Vatican. In the former case, which related to a question of faith, every bishop throughout the world was required to send his judgement in writing on two points—first, whether the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was definable, and, secondly, whether it ought to be defined. In the latter case, which was a question of opportuneness or of prudence, a certain number only were at first consulted. Sometimes again, the decree says, the Pontiffs have called all the pastors of the world to meet and to consult, as in Ecumenical Councils. Sometimes, it adds, the Pontiffs have proceeded to declare the faith by the Councils of particular Churches or provinces, as when St. Innocent the First, in the fifth century, confirmed the decrees of the Councils of Milevis and of Carthage on Original Sin. No other definition of this doctrine was made until the sixteenth century by the decrees of the Council of Trent. Again, St. Gelasius, in the year 494, by his supreme authority declared the number of the Canonical Books. The Canon of Holy Scripture rested on that pontifical act without any decree of an Ecumenical Council until the definition of the Council of Trent in the year 1546.

5. The Introduction further goes on to preclude by anticipation many misconceptions of the doctrine of infallibility. ... Some have thought that by the privilege of infallibility was intended a quality inherent in the person whereby, as an inspired man, he could at any time and on any subject declare the truth. Infallibility is not a quality inherent in any person, but an assistance attached to an office, and its operation is not to give out answers as may be required by an interrogator, not to know or to make known new truths, or to communicate new revelations. It is an assistance of the Holy Ghost whereby Peter's faith was kept from failing either in the act of believing or in the object of his belief, and through Peter the same assistance attaches to the office he bore, so that his successor in like manner shall be kept from departing from the traditions of faith committed to his custody. Its operation is therefore not the discovery of new truths, but the guardianship of old. It is simply an assistance of the Spirit of Truth, by whom Christianity was revealed, whereby the head of the Church is enabled to guard the original deposit of revelation, and faithfully declare it in all ages. ...

The Council of Trent has declared that the faith is the doctrine which our Lord delivered by word of mouth, and the Holy Ghost revealed to the apostles. Whatsoever, therefore, is not contained in this revelation cannot be a matter of divine faith. It further declares that this revelation has been preserved by the continual succession of the Catholic Church (Sess. iv). The office of the Church, therefore, is to declare what was contained in that original revelation, and infallibility is the result of a divine assistance whereby what was divinely revealed in the beginning is divinely preserved to the end. Of two things one at least: either Christianity is divinely preserved, or it is not. If it be divinely preserved, we have a divine certainty of faith. If it be not divinely preserved, its custody and its certainty now are alike human, and we have no divine certainty that what we believe was divinely revealed. This is the issue to which men must come at last. The definition of the infallibility of the head of the Christian Church means this, and no more than this; that God, who revealed His truth, has founded His Church for the custody and perpetuity of His truth, and that He has made provision that His Church shall never fail in its custody, nor by error in its declaration cause the perpetuity of faith to fail. The visible Church is the highest witness among men for the original revelation of Christianity, both by its historical testimony and by its divine office. Reject this, and where is there divine certainty left on earth? But for the present we are engaged with the literal meaning of the decree.

6. The Introduction proceeds to describe infallibility to be "*a charisma of indefectible faith and truth.*" By this again the notion of a "personal" infallibility is excluded. The word *charisma* is used to express not a *gratia gratum faciens*, as theologians say—that is, a grace which makes the *person acceptable* in God's sight—but a *gratia gratis data*, or a grace the benefit of which is for *others*, such as prophecy or healing, and the like. Now these gifts, as may be seen in Balaam, Caiaphas, and Judas, were not graces of sanctification, nor gifts that sanctified the possessor. They were exercised by men whose sin is recorded for our warning. By this also is excluded another misconception, if indeed any sincere mind ever entertained it—namely, that if Popes are infallible they are therefore impeccable; that if they cannot err in faith, they cannot sin in morals; that if their intelligence be guided by divine light, their will must be necessarily conformed to divine grace. But it is to be doubted whether any man in good faith was ever so confused in mind. To be impeccable is to be confirmed in the sanctifying grace which makes men acceptable before God. To be illuminated or guarded from error may co-exist with the sin of Caiaphas, who was a prophet, and crucified the Redeemer of the world. The decree says that this *charisma* was given by God to Peter and his successors that in the discharge of their office they might not err. It does not even say that it is an abiding assistance present always, but only never absent in the discharge of their supreme office. And it further declares the ends for which this assistance is given—the one that the whole flock of Christ on earth may never be misled, the other that the unity of the Church may always be preserved...

7. Thus far we have spoken of the introduction of the decree. We now come to the definition itself, which runs in these words:

Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra—that is, when in the discharge of his office of pastor and Teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church—is, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church.

The definition declares that the doctrine of the infallibility of the successor of Peter is a tradition from the beginning of the Christian faith; it then declares that doctrine to be contained in the divine revelation. Let it be noted that the definition rests itself not upon any inspiration, or consciousness, or conviction of any person, even of the head of the Church. It affirms a given doctrine to be a tradition from the beginning, and therefore to be revealed. ... And yet it is not on this merely natural reason that the definition is founded; it rests upon the faith that the Divine Founder of the Church has promised to its head that he shall never err in declaring what is divine revelation. ...

It is to be now further observed that the Council of the Vatican expressly quotes the decree of the Council of Florence, and as we have seen that the early Councils unfolded in succession that which was in germ before, making implicit truth explicit, so does this definition. It explains and defines what the Council of Florence meant by saying that the Roman Pontiff is "the pastor and teacher of all Christians." The definition says that he is so when he speaks *ex cathedra*, and he speaks *ex cathedra* when he defines anything of faith and morals to be held by the Universal Church. The phrase *ex cathedra*, though long used in theological schools, was for the first time here inserted in a decree of an Ecumenical Council. Its meaning is plain. "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat, " *in cathedra Moysis*; they spoke in his place and with his authority. The *cathedra Petri* is the place and the authority of Peter, but the place and the authority mean the office. All other acts of the head of the Church outside of his office are personal, and to them the promise is not attached. All acts, therefore, of the Pontiff as a private person, or as a private theologian, or as a local bishop, or as sovereign of a State, and the like, are excluded. They are not acts of the primacy (*The Centenary of S. Peter and the Ecumenical Council*, p. 59. Longmans. *Petri Privilegium* P. iii. 103). The primacy is in exercise when the teaching of the Universal Church is the motive and the end, and then only when the matter of the teaching is of faith and morals. In such acts the promise made to Peter is fulfilled, and a divine assistance guides and guards the head of the Church from error. The definition declares that he then is possessed of the infallibility with which our Saviour willed to endow his Church....

Why then was the infallibility of the head of the Church defined? Simply because it had been denied by some; and lest it should be denied by more, through the apparent impunity granted to the denial, the definition has put it beyond doubt. No one who denies it now is a Catholic; they who doubted it before were in an error which was at least proximate to heresy. They who doubt it now cannot be cleared of formal resistance to the divine authority of the Church. Such is the meaning of the words, "If any contradict this our definition, which God forbid, let him be anathema."

9. In this definition it is explicitly defined that the head of the Church is infallible, and it is assumed as certain that the Church also is infallible.

It is declared that this infallibility extends to all matters of faith and morals, but it not defined where the limits of faith and morals are to be fixed. It is defined that the acts of the head *ex cathedra* are infallible, but cases may perhaps arise in which doubts may be made as to whether this or that act be *ex cathedra* or no. In these cases of doubt no one can decide but the head of the Church. *Cujus est condere, ejus est interpretari*. The legislator alone is interpreter of the law. It was for this reason that Pius the Fourth, by a bull after the Council of Trent, first reserved to himself the interpretation of the decrees of the Council: secondly, prohibited all private persons to undertake to fix the meaning of them; and thirdly, excommunicated all persons who should appeal from the Council of Trent to a future General Council. If, therefore, any doubt be ever mooted as to whether an act be or be not an act *ex cathedra*, no one need be scared by those who, either to ventilate their learning or to

alarm the simple, pretend that there are thirty theories as to what is or is not an act *ex cathedra*. The answer is simple. Ask no one but the author of the act. Half the controversies and nearly all the pretentious censures of the Vatican Council, if men would take this course, would die of inanition. ...

As it has received, so it must declare. Deviation from the truth would be apostasy; silence when truth is denied is betrayal. This is what, it seems, Honorius did, and what some would have had Pius the Ninth do. Truth is not ours, it is of God. We have no jurisdiction against it or over it. Our sole office to truth is to guard it and to declare it...

Every Ecumenical Council leaves its impress upon it, and all these impressions are clear and harmonious. The Church is not like a *codex rescriptus* in which the later writings obliterate or confuse the former, but like the exquisite operations of art in which the manifold lines and colours and tints are laid on in succession, each filling up what the other begins, and combining all into one perfect whole. "

I cannot over-emphasize the line "but cases may perhaps arise in which doubts may be made as to whether this or that act be *ex cathedra* or no. In these cases of doubt no one can decide but the head of the Church. *Cujus est condere, ejus est interpretari*. The legislator alone is interpreter of the law. "

It is a protestantism, a private judgement that would have you deciding what is and what is not a matter *ex cathedra*. Only a Pope can decide such a thing.

So you see, Cardinal Manning, who was at the Council, who was with the Pope who issued the decree, is teaching no differently from what Bishop Williamson has been teaching. He also says you may not go around deciding what is or is not *ex cathedra*, as the Sedevacantists are wont to do.

Now that the main point has been made—that only definitions of dogmas are infallible and that they must come from Christ through the Apostles to us by either Scripture or Tradition—I will take this opportunity to point out that there is one thing I do not agree with Bishop Williamson or yourself on: That is the coddling of the priests who have stayed with Bishop Fellay.

I see that one of them was at your party. This particular priest, I am told, (and if they who told me were in error of which priest told them that, then please forgive me), stated to those who resisted Bishop Fellay that they were "disobedient". This would appear to be an act of schism. Usurpation of an ecclesiastical office would appear to be so. Only someone with jurisdiction has the right to command anyone. The laity cannot be disobedient to a random bishop who has no See, nor to a priest who has no office. Even if the cleric had jurisdiction, one cannot be accused of disobedience when one's object is obedience to God. After all, St. Thomas states that obedience must be to God rather than to men.

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/chr/aquinas/summa/sum360.htm>

(Note: I have also included this below from an abridged source)

The Church has never accused anyone of being disobedient who disobeyed those who betrayed Holy Mother the Church. Nay, you may not be obedient to anyone who is commanding evil. You may not assist him at all in his evil. So really it is this priest who is disobedient, to God and to His Church.

It does not matter if secretly the priest is "not a modernist" because by being under a modernist he represents modernism.

And so, as Anastasius, bishop of the apostolic see, wrote: "*One does not ask, who or what kind of*

person preaches, but rather Whom he preaches”.[9]

[9] Letter to the Emperor Anastasius, ed. A. Thiel, [Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt](#), Hildesheim/New York, 19742, I: 622.

From Pope Nicholas to the Bulgars. <http://historymedren.about.com/gi/dynamic/offsite.htm?site=http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/866nicholas%2Dbulgar.html>

There is also a condemned proposition I would like to expound on, if I may.

Condemned proposition from "Various errors on Moral subjects (II)" during the reign of Innocent XI by the Holy Office decree of March 4 1679

Dz. 1201

"A male servant who knowingly by offering his shoulders assists his master to ascend through windows to ravage a virgin, and many times serves the same by carrying a ladder, by opening a door, or by cooperating in something similar, does not commit a mortal sin, if he does this through fear of considerable damage, for example, lest he be treated wickedly by his master, lest he be looked upon with savage eyes, or, lest he be expelled from the house."

Now this proposition was condemned, so it really means the opposite. The person who does this IS GUILTY of a Mortal Sin.

But let us take it further: Bishop Fellay is the master, he wants to ravage our virgin undefiled doctrines, the priest is his servant opening the windows and the doors so that Bishop Fellay has access to their virgin uncorrupted minds. It does not matter if he will be wickedly treated by his master for refusing. It does not matter if he is laughed at by his peers for refusing. It does not matter if he is called disobedient. And it does not matter if he is kicked out of his house, his society, or his family. He is in mortal sin for following along.

Now I am not his judge, and I am not the Pope's judge, I am not condemning anyone, but I do discern, and I acknowledge that they are wrong, and so I will not participate in their evil. I will ask for help from whoever is around to help. Bishop Williamson, Father Pfeiffer, Father Hewko, and Father Chazal are willing, and I discern that they speak the true doctrine that has always been passed on since Christ, so I accept their help and do my best to assist them in helping others.

This of course brings me to judgement. You as a lawyer, Tertullian, should know that jurisdiction is the right to command and judge. Supplied jurisdiction does not grant anything more than making certain acts valid, sometimes while condemning the person who receives jurisdiction during that act (for example, a priest goes into the confessional but has no jurisdiction. The penitent goes in to confession believing that the priest has jurisdiction. The Church will supply jurisdiction to the priest to render the confession valid for the salvation of the penitent's soul. But, at the same time, the Church condemns the priest for hearing the confession without jurisdiction, except in cases of necessity). But never does supplied jurisdiction, which is not a theological principle but a matter of Canon Law, give the right to command. It works under the same principle that it works for the police. If a policeman is chasing a suspect in his jurisdiction, and he enters another force's jurisdiction, most laws state that the chasing

police officer receives supplied jurisdiction FOR THAT ONE ARREST. He cannot order any other civilians around, he cannot tell other police officers what to do. He has jurisdiction solely to make the arrest legal. So too with a priest, supplied jurisdiction is there to make a sacrament valid. And only for that reason. Never does it convey the right to command or judge.

I am including the teachings of the Church regarding these things so you can see that I am only repeating what the Church has always taught.

From the *Summa Theologica (Everything about Theology)* by St. Thomas Aquinas:

via the book *The Summa Abridged* by Father Gerard M. Paris, O.P. 1950

QUESTION LX

JUDGMENT

(in six articles)

ART. 1.-WHETHER JUDGMENT IS AN ACT OF JUSTICE.

YES.-THE REASON is that judgment, which is so called because the judge asserts his right (*jgs dicens*), is an act of a judge in so far as he is a judge, and denotes a right determination of that which is just, and this properly belongs to justice. For **this** reason Aristotle (*Ethics* book v, chap. 4) says that "men have recourse to a judge as to justice personified."

NOTE: The word judgment, from its original meaning of a right decision about what is just, has been extended to signify a right decision in any matter, whether speculative or practical. Now a right judgment in any matter requires two things. The first is the virtue itself that pronounces judgment, and in this way judgment is an act of reason, because it belongs to the reason to pronounce or define. The other is the disposition of the one who judges, on which depends his aptness for judging aright. In this way, in matters of justice, judgment proceeds from justice. Thus judgment is an act of justice, as inclining to right judgment; and of prudence, as pronouncing judgment: Hence *synesis*, as belonging to prudence, is said to judge rightly (**q.** li, art. 3).

(Ad 1).

ART. II.-WHETHER IT IS LAWFUL TO JUDGE.

YES.-THE REASON is that to judge is an act of judgment. Now that judgment may be an act of justice three things are required: 1) That it proceed from an inclination of justice; 2) that it proceed from him who is in authority; 3) that it be pronounced according to the right ruling of prudence. If judgment is deficient in the first article, it will be perverse or unjust; if in the second, it will be usurped; if in the third, it will be suspicious or rash. And such judgments are harmful, and therefore forbidden by Our Lord, according to Matth. vii, 1: "Judge not, that you may not be judged."

NOTE: Those who are guilty of grievous sins should not judge those who are guilty of the same or lesser sins. Above all does this held when such sins are public, because there would be an occasion of scandal arising in the hearts of the others. If however they are not public, but hidden, and there be an urgent necessity for the judge to pronounce judgment, because it is his duty, he can reprove or judge with humnility and fear (Ad 3).

ART. III.-WHETHER IT IS UNLAWFUL TO FORM A JUDGMENT FROM SUSPICION.

YES-When the suspicion proceeds a) from the fact that someone is evil in himself, and thus is inclined to think evil of others; or b) from the fact that someone is ill disposed towards another, it is a sin. But when the suspicion arises from long experience it diminishes the nature of suspicion.

THE REASON OF THE THIRD is that such an experience leads to certainty, which is contrary to the nature of suspicion. Hence Aristotle says (*Rhet.*, book ii, chap. 13): "Old people are very suspicious, because they have often experienced the faults of others."

NOTE: There are three degrees of suspicion: The first degree is when a man begins to doubt of another's goodness from slight indications. This is a venial and a light sin; for it belongs to human temptation, without which no man can go through this life; the second degree is when a man, from slight indications, esteems another man's wickedness as certain. This is a mortal sin, if it be about a grave matter, since it cannot be without contempt of one's neighbor. The third degree is when a judge goes so far as to condemn a man on suspicion. This pertains directly to injustice, which is about external actions (q. lviii, art. 9); and injustice is a mortal sin in respect of its genus (prec. q., art 4).-(in body of art. and ad 3).

ART. IV.-WHETHER DOUBTS SHOULD BE INTERPRETED FOR THE BEST.

YES.-Doubtful judgements about the wickedness of another are always to be interpreted for the best; but in a judgment about things everyone must try to make his judgment accord with things as they are.

THE REASON OF THE FIRST is that, from the very fact that a man thinks ill of another without sufficient reason, he injures and despises him. Now no man ought to despise or in any way injure another man without urgent cause; and, consequently, unless we have evident indications of a person's wickedness, we ought to deem him good, by interpreting for the best whatever is doubtful about him.

THE REASON FOR THE SECOND is that in a judgment in which we judge concerning things, there is no question of the good or evil of the thing about which we are judging, since it will take no harm, no matter what kind of judgment we form about it; but there is question of the good of the person who judges, if he judges truly, and of his evil if he judges falsely because the true is the good of the intellect and the false is its evil (Ad 2).

NOTE: It can happen that one who interprets a thing for the best is frequently deceived, but it is better to be frequently deceived, by thinking well of a wicked man than to err less frequently through having an evil opinion of some good man, because in the latter case an injury is inflicted, but not in the former (Ad 1).

From the very fact that someone is judged good he is deemed worthy of honor; and if he is judged evil he is deemed worthy of contempt. For this reason we ought, in this kind of judgment, to aim at judging a man good, unless there is evident reason to the contrary (Ad 2).

ART. V.-WHETHER WE SHOULD ALWAYS JUDGE ACCORDING TO THE WRITTEN LAW.

YES.-With regard both to the natural and to the positive law, which latter results from an agreement among men.

THE REASON is that laws are written in order to manifest both laws; otherwise judgment would fall short either of the natural or of the positive right.

NOTE: 1. The written law contains the natural law, but it does not establish it; the positive law both contains and establishes it, because it gives it strength and authority (in body of art.).

2. Just as the written law does not give force to the natural right, so neither can it diminish or annul its force, because neither can man's will change nature. Hence if the written law contains anything contrary to the natural right it is unjust and has no binding force (Ad 1).

ART. VI.-WHETHER JUDGMENT IS RENDERED PERVERSE BY BEING USURPED

YES.-THE REASON is that to pass judgment is in some way to interpret the letter of the law, by applying it to a particular case. Now, it belongs to the same authority to interpret and to make a law. Hence to pass judgment belongs to one who makes the law, i.e., to public authority. Therefore a judgment that is not passed by public authority, of which we are here speaking, is perverse; and this is an usurped judgment.

NOTE: The secular power is subject to the spiritual, even as the body is subject to the soul. Consequently the judgment is not usurped if the spiritual authority interferes in those temporal matters that are subject to the spiritual authority, or which

have been committed to the spiritual by the temporal authority (Ad 3).

ART. 1.-WHETHER A MAN CAN JUSTLY JUDGE ONE WHO IS NOT SUBJECT TO HIS JURISDICTION.

NO.-THE REASON is that the sentence of a judge must have coercive force; otherwise, the judgment would not be efficacious. Now coercive power is lawfully possessed in human affairs only by one who holds a public office. But those who hold public office are considered the superiors of those over whom they receive power, as over subjects. Wherefore no one can justly judge anyone else unless he be his subject, whether by ordinary or by delegated power.

NOTE: In human affairs a man may submit of his own accord to the judgment of others, although these be not his superiors; wherefore it is necessary that the arbitors be upheld by a penalty. Thus Christ voluntarily submitted to human judgment (Ad 2).

ART. III.-WHETHER OBEDIENCE IS THE GREATEST OF THE VIRTUES.

NO.-That is: a) The theological virtues are superior to obedience; b) but obedience is the chief of the moral virtues; not even charity can be without obedience.

THE REASON OF THE FIRST is that those virtues whereby we adhere to God considered in Himself, namely the theological virtues, are higher than the moral virtues, whereby we despise something of the earth, that we may cleave to God. For the end is higher than the means to the end.

THE REASON OF THE SECOND is that the highest human good that man can despise for the sake of God is his own will; and this is done by virtue of obedience.- Hence any other acts of the virtues derive their merit with God from the fact that they are done out of obedience to the divine will. For if anyone should suffer martyrdom, or bestow all his goods on the poor-unless he does this to fulfill the will of God, which belongs directly to obedience-this could not be meritorious.

ART. IV.-WHETHER GOD OUGHT TO BE OBEYED IN ALL THINGS.

YES.-THE REASON is that God is the prime mover of all wills (1-11, q. ix, art.

6). Therefore, just as all natural things are subject to the divine motion by natural necessity, so also by a certain necessity of justice (in the moral order) are all wills bound to obey the divine command.

NOTE: Though man is not always bound to will what God wills, yet he is always bound to will what God wills him to will. This comes to man's knowledge chiefly through God's command, wherefore man is bound to obey God's command in all things (Ad 3).

ART. V. - WHETHER SUBJECTS ARE BOUND TO OBEY THEIR SUPERIORS IN ALL THINGS.

NO.-That is: Subjects are not bound to obey their superiors in all things for two reasons: a) On account of the precept of a higher power; b) if the superiors command their subjects in something in which the subjects are not subject to them. [For instance, servants are not bound to obey their masters, or children their parents, in the question of contracting marriage or of remaining in the state of virginity. For these are matters touching the nature of the body, and by nature all men are equal. But in matters concerning the disposal of actions and human affairs, a subject is bound to obey his superior within the sphere of his authority.)

THE REASON is that in obeying one is moved to carry out the command of the superior by a certain necessity of justice [which, in the event, may not always exist].

NOTE: Obedience is threefold: 1) Sufficient for salvation, namely obedience given in matters to which we are obliged; 2) perfect, which obeys in all things lawful; 3) indiscreet, which obeys even in matters unlawful (Ad 3).

ART. VI.-WHETHER CHRISTIANS ARE BOUND TO OBEY THE SECULAR POWER.

YES.-THE REASON is that the order of justice demands that inferiors obey

their superiors; otherwise the stability of human society could not endure. Now the order of justice is not taken away by the faith of Christ, but rather is strengthened, according to Rom. iii, 22: "The justice of God through faith in Jesus Christ."

NOTE: Those who are made children of God by grace are free from the spiritual bondage of sin, but not from the bodily bondage, whereby they are held bound by earthly masters. For in the state of life we are freed by the grace of Christ from defects of the soul, but not from defects of the body (Ad 1).

2. Man is bound to obey secular princes in so far as this is required by the order of justice. Wherefore if the prince's authority is not just but usurped, or if he commands what is unjust, his subjects are not bound to obey him, except perhaps accidentally, to avoid scandal or danger (Ad 3).

QUESTON CXX "EPIKEIA" OR EQUITY

(in two articles)

ART. 1.-WHETHER "EPIKEIA" IS A VIRTUE.

YES.-THE REASON is that *epikeia* is directed to this, that in cases where it is bad to follow a law as it stands, a person may set aside the letter of the law and follow what is demanded by justice and the common good, which is good.

ART. II.-WHETHER "EPIKEIA" IS A PART OF JUSTICE.

YB.-It is subjective part.

THE REASON is that *epikeia* is subject to justice (taken in a general sense) as to its genus.

NOTE: *Epikēia* corresponds properly to legal justice, and in one way is contained under it, and in another way exceeds it. For if legal justice denotes that which complies with the lawgiver, which is of more account, then *epikeia* is the more important part of legal justice. But if legal justice denote merely that which complies with the law with regard to the letter, then *epikeia* is a part, not of legal justice but of justice in its general acceptance, and is condivided with legal justice, as exceeding it.

ART. IV.-WHETHER A MAN CAN EXCOMMUNICATE HIMSELF, HIS EQUAL, OR SUPERIOR.

NO.-THE REASON is that jurisdiction establishes a man in a degree of superiority in respect to the one over whom he has jurisdiction, because he is his judge; and therefore no one has jurisdiction over himself, his superior, or his equal

There are also a couple of points from the letter of Pope St. Nicholas I to the Bulgars which are relevant here also:

Chapter CV.

To your inquiry and request for instruction as to what should be done about those who, carried away beyond the commands of the apostles, attempt to preach, one of them, i.e. Paul, responds and has given the following instructions, saying: *Yet if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you something more than what we are preaching to you, let him be anathema.*[Gal. 1:8] When this does happen, however, you who are laymen should not judge indiscriminately or boldly; *for we all offend in many things.*[Jam. 3:2]

Chapter LXXXIII.

You ask if you are permitted to judge anyone concerning sins which are also crimes. Now then, if no one had wanted to sin, no one would have had to judge anyone; but after he sins, he is also judged, of course. For we know, to use the words of the Apostle, *that the law was not established for the just man, but for the unjust, for those who are not submissive, for the impious, the sinners, the wicked, the parricides and matricides, the murderers, the fornicators, sodomites, forgers, liars, perjurers, and whatever else goes against the proper doctrine which conforms to the gospel of glory of blessed God.* [I Tim. 1:9-11] You are not allowed, however, to judge clerics, since it is more fitting that they be judged by themselves.

[http://historymedren.about.com/gi/dynamic/offsite.htm?
site=http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/866nicholas%2Dbulgar.html](http://historymedren.about.com/gi/dynamic/offsite.htm?site=http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/866nicholas%2Dbulgar.html)

Now this also relates to Sedevacantism, because by declaring the Pope to have lost his office, or by declaring him to be a heretic, one is making oneself to be his judge, his superior. This one may never do. Canon Law has always stated that no one loses an office even for a penalty 'Latae Sententiae' until a Superior has made a declaratory sentence stating the person has incurred that penalty (see Canon 2232, Canon 2258, and Canon 2265). This then removes him from office. It is never left to the private interpretations of individuals.

There is a significant difference between judge discern and judge condemn. Thus why I keep using the word 'discern' so as not to cloud the issue. Ever-changing language is what the modernists rely on to confuse people. It is also one of the reasons why the Vatican II modernists' first acts were to bring the vulgar languages into their Mass. Their predecessors, the Protestants did the same thing for the same reason.

'Discernment' is merely recognizing that the Pope has said things which are heretical. 'Judgement' is when you say "YOU ARE GUILTY OF BEING A HERETIC AND THEREFORE YOUR SEE IS VACANT"

That is what you have done, but no one can judge the Pope. Only a future Pope could have that authority, and even then, in the past, they have never declared a Pope to be an Anti-pope for heresy. An anti-Pope is really a pretender to the papal throne.

On the matter of what constitutes a formal heretic: You should know this already, but saying or teaching something heretical does not make one to be a heretic. St. Dionysius of Alexandria, in the year 260, asserted that the Son was 'made by God' and 'did not exist till he was made'. Pope Dionysius asked for an explanation and challenged him on that point. As a result, St. Dionysius sent to Rome two letters explaining away his former language and confessed the Son's eternity. He was not a heretic (*Church History*, Father John Laux, page 104).

The word 'heretic' itself comes from the Greek "to choose", literally a "chooser". To be a heretic, you have to choose to believe a doctrine that you know to be contrary to what the Church teaches. You can be in error and not be a heretic. You can pronounce a heresy without being a heretic if you do not know it is an error. Many of the great heresies came from noted theologians. Arianism arose from the great seminary in Antioch run by St. Lucian, who died a martyr's death in 311. It was his students Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia who would go on to cause the first great crisis in the Church. Just as with our Crisis, Nicaea condemned Arianism, and then as St. Jerome says, "The world woke up and found itself Arian", so too, modernism was condemned, and the world woke up and found itself modernist. Almost all the churches in the world fell to Arianism, so too with this crisis, the churches have fallen into the

heresy of modernism. In the end, it will all be sorted out. I believe it took 70 years to resolve the Arian crisis. It hasn't been that long for this one yet. Beware though, the Monothelites were created by fighting with the Arians: they argued so much that Christ was God that they started to deny He was also Man. When the Church finished with the Arians, the Church had to deal with the Monothelites too. If the devil does not get you one way, he will try to get you another.

Earlier I believe I mentioned the Donatists were one group that declared the Pope to not be a Pope. In their case they said mortal sin had removed him because, as they said, mortal sin removed him and his bishops from the Church.

It is along those lines that Cekada and his kind have acted. They are backed up not with the decrees of the Popes, but with only hypothetical opinions of various theologians—not all theologians, but mostly those of recent times when the heresy of “the Pope is never wrong in anything” came about. 1950's-ism it could be called, though it originated earlier.

Sedevacantism is an attempt to twist the dogmas of the Church, to attack the Popes as a prosecutor, judge and jury, and to set up little fragmented, protestant-like churches that become popes unto themselves, declaring what is or is not dogma, based on personal inspiration or opinion, based on what they do or do not agree with, as said over time. Such can be said of many of the heresies. They could always point to some theologian somewhere who said something in error.

Unfortunately, when a future good Pope does come, even if he condemns Popes John Paul II, Benedict, XVI, Francis, and Paul VI, you will quite possibly not follow him on account of some belief you have crafted, such as that there are no bishops or cardinals or something. What you really believe in would be the destruction wholesale of the Church. There really is no other explanation. You believe that the Church has failed. I believe there is a crisis. That is the difference. If the Pope ended up being declared not to have been a Pope at all, you would still not be justified in having judged him. 'Judged' of course in the sense that you condemned him. I believe it is more probable along the lines of Honorius' condemnation. God has probably allowed this to happen to show the limits of papal infallibility plainly, since most people—clerics and laity alike—were granting the papacy powers it could not and does not have.

In conclusion, canonizations do not fall under the Ex Cathedra infallibility as defined by the first Vatican Council. Any belief in the infallibility of canonizations must fall under another line which has obviously not been defined. It may in fact be defined the other way. Infallible pronouncements as I've shown from the First Vatican Council definition, its prequel explanation, the explanations of Cardinal Manning, and the clear agreement of various Catholic priests I've quoted, show us that to be infallible, the Pope must be representing Tradition, defining a dogma that has always been believed (all dogmas originate with Christ) and been passed on down to us, always in the same sense. Never changing. The point of an infallible definition is not to profess or reveal a new doctrine (public or required revelation ended with the death of the last Apostle), but to clear up that which has been corrupted, not to learn more, because at the earliest stages we knew the doctrines in full, but to fix that which has been attacked by the forces against our Church. To restore the purity of the Faith where many have started to believe differently from all of our past brethren. For Catholic means Universal, in both time and place. Accepting no novelties in doctrine.

To this I believe your understanding may be compromised.

When you realize the error of your ways and stop attempting to convert my family to your errors, then we can be friends again.

Until that time, I will keep doing as I have always done: I will do my best to keep the Faith as it has always been taught, and I will pray for you.

May God grant you the grace to come back to the Faith.

WJS

+JMJ