

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY
AND
PRINCETON REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. 2.—APRIL, 1872.

ART. I.—HENRY COOKE, D. D., AND ARIANISM IN
THE IRISH CHURCH.*

By PROFESSOR LEEBODY, Magee College, Londonderry, Ireland.

DR. HENRY COOKE, the greatest orator and controversialist, and, in many respects, the greatest man which the Irish Presbyterian Church has produced for the last two hundred years, was born in the year 1788, in the farm-house of Grillagh, near Maghera, in Londonderry County. His ancestors were men of true nobility, although of lowly birth. His father, John Cooke, was descended from an English Puritan family, which settled in the North of Ireland in the seventeenth century, and therefore from the same stock as the God-fearing, peace-loving men whose memory still survives in New England homes. His mother was of Scotch descent, and could point with pride to her Covenanting forefathers, who in defence of the truth faced danger and death on their native hills. Of John Cooke we know little. He was a plain, honest farmer, "with little learning and less pretence." Mrs. Cooke was a very superior woman, and those who assert that all remarkable men have had remarkable mothers might refer to her as illustrating the truth of their theory. She possessed intellectual powers of a high order, and had received an excellent education. She

* The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, D.D., LL.D., President of Assembly's College, Belfast. By his son-in-law, J. L. Porter. D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism, Assembly's College, Belfast. London: John Murray, 1871.

ART. IV.—BISHOP C. J. VON HEFELE ON THE CASE
OF POPE HONORIUS.*

By HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., New York.

Introduction.

The Council of Trent in the sixteenth century (1542–1563), confronting the Reformation, said nothing about the dogma of Infallibility. The Roman Catechism, published by the order of this Council under Pius V. in 1566, simply ascribes Infallibility to the Church, without further defining its seat. It says: "This one [Catholic] Church can not err in handing down the doctrine respecting faith and morals."†

The next so-called General Council, the Vatican, begun at Rome 1869–70, defying Protestantism, modern philosophy and civilization, and the whole historic tradition of the Christian Church, makes the Pope of Rome, of himself, without appeal, the seat of infallibility. In its "dogmatic con-

* *Causa Honorii Papæ. Scripsit Carolus Josephus de Hefele, Episcopus Rottenburgensis. Neapoli, 1870, pp. 28.*

Honorius und das sechste allgemeine Concil. Von C. J. von Hefele, (an authorized German translation of the above; with an appendix, in both German and Latin). Tübingen, 1870, s. 43.

Conciliengeschichte (History of Councils, from the Sources). Von. C. J. Hefele, Prof. d. Theologie, Tübingen. Vol. III. 1858, pp. 129–145, 264–285, etc. (On the Heresy and Condemnation of Pope Honorius.)

Mgr. L'Evêque d'Orleans, et Mgr. L'Archevêque de Malines. Par A. Gratry. (Four letters, by A. Gratry, Priest of the Oratory, and Member of the French Academy, Paris, 1870. These letters have been published in an English translation. London.)

Le Pape Honorius et le Bréviaire Romain. Lettre au R. P. Gratry. Par A. de Margerie, Prof. Nancy. 4me édition. Paris et Nancy, 1870.

Drei Briefe über die Unfehlbarkeit, etc. (Letters to Gratry, by V. A. Dechamps, Archbishop of Malines. German version.) Mainz, 1870.

The Case of Pope Honorius. By P. LePage Renouf. London, 1869.

Du Concile Général et de la Paix Religieuse. Par Mgr. H. L. C. Maret, Evêque de Sura, Doyen de la Faculté de Theologie de Paris. 2 Tomes, Paris, 1869.

Le Pape et les Evêques. (A defense of the above.) Par Mgr. Maret. Paris, 1869.

† Catechismus Romanus, I, P. 10, ch. 16.

stitution on the Church of Christ," promulgated July 18, 1870, it thus decreed :* "We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals: and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church. ("Irreformable," here means, what cannot be *revised* or *judged* by any tribunal.)

Special force is given to this dogma by the fact, that in the above Constitution it comes after the ascription to the Pope of "full and supreme power and jurisdiction over the universal Church . . . and that this power is ordinary and *immediate*, both over each and all the Churches, and over each and all the Pastors and faithful." (Dogmatic Constitution, ch iii.) The fulness of Power and the fulness of Infallibility are in the same person; and his decrees are directly binding, without appeal, on every Roman Catholic.

This Papal Infallibility, now first thus proclaimed and enjoined more than eighteen hundred years after Peter died, extends by its very terms to all past occupants of the Roman See, as well as to Pius IX. and his successors. All Popes have been infallible; no one has taught heresy *ex cathedra*. If any one has advocated an heretical doctrine, the dogma of Papal Infallibility is false, the chain is broken. *Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*.

Pending the recent dogmatic decision, it became then a weighty question, whether the alleged heresies ascribed to certain Popes could be shown, on historical grounds, to be unfounded. A sharp controversy sprung up, chiefly within the Roman Catholic Church. Most of the disputants, on

* We give this decree in the translation sanctioned by Archbishop Manning in his "Vatican Council," 1871, p. 240.

both sides, thought that they could sufficiently explain the well-known charges against Liberius and Vigilius. So the discussion chiefly centered upon Honorius. The best German and French learning was on one side. Jesuit text-books and Italian Ultramontaniam were on the other. Some forty or fifty pamphlets and books have been published on this single case within a few years.

The case is this: In the progress of the great controversy respecting the Person of Christ, the general consent of the Church, which meant victory, had settled down upon the position, that in the God-man there was only one Person, but two Natures, the divine and the human. The larger part of the Monophysites, chiefly Orientals, (who held to one nature, as well as one person) at last succumbed to the phraseology of Two Natures, attempting, however, various modifications, (e. g. of "one person *from* two natures,") that they might retain the semblance of consistency. In the course of the seventh century, the dispute was changed from the word "Nature," to the word "Will." The logical doctrine of the Church, as words were then used, led to the affirmation of *Two Wills* in Christ, as well as Two Natures; or rather, it was said, because the one Christ has two natures, he must also have two wills, since the will is the working (energy) of the nature. The Monophysites, struggling for life, took the ground, that though Christ had two natures, he had only one will. (*Monotheism*: the orthodox term was *Duothelism*.)

Honorius I. regnant A. D. 625-638, in two epistles, addressed to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who had sought his counsel, sided with him in discountenancing the specific orthodox term, *Two Energies* (Wills), and in declaring the specific heretical term, *One Will*, to be correct. For this he was anathematized by the Sixth General Council of Constantinople, 680-1, and for a thousand years thereafter.

The sum of the evidence as to Honorius is epitomized by Father Gratry in his first letter.* We give only an abridg-

* Gratry's letters are among the most eloquent and keen products of the recent controversy. The news of his death has just come. A short notice of him will be found in our Literary Intelligence. The above summary corres-

ment of this epitome, as the points come up again. The main facts are these : Before the sixteenth century no one denied that Honorius was condemned by the Sixth Council ; the edition of the Acts of this Council, published at Rome by Paul V., 1608, contains his condemnation and the anathema ; in the eighteenth session of this Council, in the dogmatic decree signed by the Emperor, we read—“ *Sergio et Honorio anathema*,” after which the Fathers of the Council broke forth in a final acclamation, repeating the anathema ; the Fathers of the Council wrote to the reigning Pope, Agatho, and named Honorius among the condemned ; the Emperor issued an edict accepting the Council, and speaking of Honorius as a heretic ; Leo II., the next Pope, in a letter to the Emperor, also anathematized Honorius, and spoke of his *profana proditione* ; the same Pope in his letter to the King of Spain, and other documents, repeated the charge of heresy ; the sixteenth Synod of Toledo assented ; the Seventh General Council, 787, and the Eighth, 869, anathematized Honorius ; the venerable Bede, in England, reported his condemnation ; the *Liber Diurnus* (Book of Formularies), in the text of the *Profession of Faith*, demanded of all new Popes, inserted the name of Honorius as a heretic ; the *Liber Pontificalis* agreed with it ; editions of the Roman Breviary, down into the sixteenth century, reiterated the accusation,—since then silently dropped ; Pope Adrian I. (772–795) approved the acts of the Seventh Council, condemning Honorius ; Cardinal Humbert, Anastasus, the “*bibliothecarius*,” (though an advocate of Honorius) and Hincmar, contemporary with Humbert, all testified that Honorius was condemned by the Sixth General Council ; the Greek theologians, in large numbers, reiterated the accusation of heresy and the fact of the anathema.

The English work on Honorius, by M. Renouf, whose title stands at the head of this article, is a fair summary of the arguments against the Pope, with replies to Dr. Ward of the *Dublin Review*, and to Father Bottala. Its motto is good :

ponds in the main with a dissertation by Garnier, editor of the *Liber Diurnus*, 1680, printed for the first time in the last edition of this *Liber*, by M. de Rozière, 1869.

Nihil est pium nisi quod idem verum est. Archbishop Manning, in his Pastoral on the Vatican Council, deals slightly with the case of Honorius. He relies on others, and says, (p. 245) "That Honorius defined no doctrine whatever," while, as Hefeles shows, Honorius denied the orthodox, and accepted the heterodox, formula: he also declares that "the two epistles of Honorius are entirely orthodox,"—which position Hefeles also demolishes. The late Archbishop Spaulding took the same ground. Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, in his "Speech" intended for the Council, and just published by the American Tract Society, concedes (p. 133) "that the letters of Honorius to Sergius do contain some things which cannot be reconciled with sound doctrine." He also says that Dr. Manning is "more Catholic than any Catholic I ever knew," just as "the English settlers in Ireland are more Irish than Irishmen." Archbishop Kenrick, in the same connexion, asserts that the *schema* of Papal Infallibility "is not a doctrine of faith, and that it cannot become such by any definition whatsoever, *even by the definition of a Council*" (p. 134): but this was before the Council had voted on the question.

The volumes of Mgr. Maret, Bishop of Sura, and Dean of the Faculty of Theology in Paris, upon "The General Council and Religious Peace," are the ablest recent defense of the old cismontane (French) theory of the Papacy in relation to the Episcopate. Among other things they contain a fair statement of the case of Honorius, and come to the same general conclusion with Bishop von Hefeles.

Bishop von Hefeles is the most learned and estimable Roman Catholic prelate of Germany. He was consecrated Bishop of Rottenburg during the early days of the Vatican Council, his consecration having been delayed by the attempt to transfer to Rome some of the rights and privileges held of old by the diocese of Rottenburg. Before that time, for more than thirty years, he was a Professor of Theology in the Catholic Faculty of the University of Tübingen. No ecclesiastic in the kingdom of Württemberg is more honored and revered. His edition of the works of the Apostolic Fathers is widely used. His essay on "Cardinal Ximenes and Spain "

has a high rank; also his two volumes of "Contributions to Church History, Archæology and Liturgies." But his great work is his "History of Councils," (one volume of which has been done into English), which has now reached the 7th vol., including the Council of Constance. Every man is human; and Protestants might say, that a bias for Catholic tradition pervades this work to a certain extent, especially in the interpretation of the decrees and canons of some of the earlier Councils. But still it must be acknowledged to be a candid and thorough work; altogether the best history of Councils extant, and the most readable; prepared with full knowledge, and written in a calm and transparent style. In the third volume of this history, published in 1859, he reviewed at length the case of Honorius and the Sixth General Council (also under the Seventh and Eighth Councils), and came to the same results, with a fuller exhibition of the grounds and reasons which he restates in the pamphlets cited at the beginning of this article. So that this is no new opinion of his, evoked by debate, but an historical judgment, resulting from the facts of the case. Of this document we give a full translation, based upon both the Latin and German editions.

It may be said, that the three eminent divines we have named, Mgr. Maret, Father Gratry, and Bishop Hefele, have renounced these views, since they have all submitted to the dogmatic definition of the Vatican Council. They have submitted, but their works remain. They have submitted for the sake of the peace of the Church. They have submitted, in part, doubtless, because they were bound fast by the meshes of their own logic; for they said, the Pope alone is not infallible, but Pope and Council together are; and both Council and Pope decreed Papal Infallibility. They have submitted; because otherwise they must take the ground that the Vatican Council was not Œcumenical. They have submitted; and their very submission is an additional argument against the iron power of Rome, compelling men at its bidding to renounce in an hour the results and fruits of such life-long, conscientious, historical studies as were never made by any one of the Fathers of the majority of the Council which passed the de-

cree—and least of all by the infallible Pontiff who is now enforcing it at the point of his spiritual bayonet. Such Papal power is destructive of human reason and conscience.

The submission of such men to such an authority is sad indeed. The circular of Bishop Hefele on his submission (April 10, 1871,) says: "The peace and unity of the Church is so great a good that great and heavy personal sacrifices may be made for it." Mgr. Maret,* in his retraction, declares that he "wholly (*prorsus*) rejects everything in his work (above cited) which is opposed to the dogma of the Council," etc., and that he "withdraws his book from sale." Father Gratry, lying upon his dying couch at Montreux, in Switzerland, wrote to the Archbishop of Paris, "accepting the decrees of the Vatican Council. Everything to the contrary I may have written, before the decision, I efface." And this is the same Father Gratry, who in his second letter (p. 78) wrote to the Archbishop of Malines, about Honorius: "Do you know, Monseigneur, in the history of the human mind, a theological, philosophical, historical, or any other question, so dishonored by lies, bad faith, and all the craft of falsifiers? I repeat it, *the question is totally gangrened by fraud.*"

They all submitted, because they accepted the arrogant dogma, falsely ascribed to Augustine, *Roma locuta est, causa finita est.*

The bearing of this case of Honorius upon the question of the personal infallibility of the successor of Peter, is not at all affected by either the affirmation or the denial of the theory that Christ had two wills. For, if he had two wills, Honorius was heretical; if he had only one will, all the subsequent Popes, the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth General Councils, etc., have been under the dominion of error. The doctrine that Christ had two wills is grounded in the psychological theory, that will is the "energy," or the actualizing, of the nature rather than of the person. For, if will be the manifestation or "energy" of person, then, as Christ was one in person, he would have only one will; and this, perhaps, is what the

*Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne, Sept. 1871, p. 236.

Orientalists were struggling ineffectually to express. Whereas, if Christ had two natures, and if will be the direct manifestation of nature, then Christ must have had two wills. Bishop Hefele, in his argument, (p. 283) takes the ground, that will belongs to nature rather than to person: and he somewhat curiously illustrates it by reference to the Trinity, in which he says we have one nature and three persons, but only one will. But this shows how difficult it is for Infallibility itself to maintain its old formulas (which it is forced to do) while thought is deepening and language is growing. For, in the whole of modern philosophy, in consequence of its very peculiarity, as rooted in self-consciousness, the will is well nigh universally held to be the direct expression of personality or personal power; the nature is centralised in the person, and the person is expressed in the will. On the basis of such a psychology, Christ, though having two natures, would have but one will, else the unity of his person would be divided. Some dim anticipation of such a relation of will to person was perhaps in the minds of those theologians, just after the days of Honorius, who tried to make a fantastic compromise between the Monothelites and Duothelites, by putting both together and saying that Christ had three wills,* two for his natures and one for his person! The Patriarch Sergius in his letter to Honorius is not really heretical in saying, "that one and the same only-begotten Son of God works (energizes) as well the divine as the human; and all divine and human energy proceeds undivided and inseparable from one and the same Incarnate Logos." And Honorius in his reply to Sergius (which forms the basis of the charge of heresy) is orthodox when he writes: "The Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and man, works divine works, through the humanity, which is hypostatically united with Him (the Logos); and the same Lord Jesus Christ works human works, since the flesh is united with divinity in an ineffable and unique mode."†

Dr. Dollinger, in his recent inaugural address as rector of

*Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 216-219.
iii. 133, 134.

†Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*,

the University of Tübingen says, that the decrees of the Vatican Council were "intended as a bulwark against the annoying progress of German science;" that the Jesuits waged war unsuccessfully against natural philosophy; "and now it is the turn of history," the Jesuits everywhere "displacing the old text books and introducing works full of falsehood and perversion." This is exactly so. It is now "the turn of history," whose sacred rights are to be maintained against those who falsify the records. No wonder that the Abbé Gratry hurled at these forgers of falsehood that fiery arrow from Job's quiver: "Numquid indiget Deus mendacio vestro?" No wonder that no one of them could now reply as once did Melchior³ Canus: "Non indiget *Petrus* nostro mendacio; adulatione nostra non egit." For this is just what Peter must have or die.

Mgr. Maret, in his work already cited, affirms what seems to us reasonable, in spite of his retraction, that, "in face of the fact of the condemnation of Honorius, the absolute and indivisible monarchy of the Pope cannot be sustained." (i. 292).[§] Whether it be a fact will appear from the following condensed statement, strictly historical and critical, of all the data in the case. It is a judicial summing up.

H. B. S.

POPE HONORIUS AND THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL.

First Division.

THE FACTS OF THE CASE.

The question is not, whether Pope Honorius held heterodox opinions in the recesses of his own heart ; but, our first inquiry is : Did Honorius prescribe *ex cathedra*, as a dogma of the faith, what was in fact heretical ? Then comes a second question : Did a General Council claim for itself the right of *passing sentence* on a Pope who had thus decided, and *did it actually condemn him as a heretic* ? In fine, thirdly : How was this condemnation received and judged by contemporaries, especially by the Roman Pontiffs ?

I. *Did Pope Honorius proclaim heresy ex-cathedra ?*

1. In the fifth century, Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, accentuated so sharply the doctrine of *the two natures in Christ* (the divine nature and the human), as to destroy the *unity of Christ's Person*. His heresy was denounced by the Third General Council at Ephesus, A. D. 431.

2. A few years later, the Archimandrite (Abbot) Eutyches, of Constantinople, fell into just the opposite error, affirming that Christ was constituted *from* two natures, which were however so closely united in him as to leave only *one* ; i.e. Christ is *from two* natures, but exists *in* only one ; this is the Monophysitic error, condemned by the Fourth General Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

3. But both these errors, though thus repudiated, did not at once vanish away ; on the contrary there remained very many Monophysites in the Greco-Roman Empire ; and as these religious disputes enfeebled the strength of the empire, many of the emperors tried to restore peace and unity.

4. In the year 627 the Emperor Heraclias, in concert with Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Bishops Cyrus, Theodore and others, made such an attempt in an infelicitous way. The imperial proposition was, that henceforth it should be taught, " that there were in Christ two natures, but *only one will*, and one sphere of working, or *energy*." This experi-

ment for the restoration of concord is called *Monothelism* (*one will*).

This formula was intended to reconcile the Monophysites with the Church. The Church was to be satisfied with the assertion of *two natures*; the Monophysites to be placated by the affirmation of *one will* and "*energy*."

5. Few theologians saw through the true character of this formula of union, else they would have perceived that it led right back to the Monophysitic view.

For the *will* lies on the side of the *nature*, not of the *person*. For example, in the Trinity there are *three* persons but only *one* nature or substance; and hence there are in the Trinity not *three* wills but only *one*.

If now I hold that there are truly in Christ *two natures* then I must likewise recognize in him *two wills*. And as it is with the *will*, so is it with the *activity*, the *mode of operation* or the *energy*.

Christ ate, slept, drank, etc.; here we see one mode of operation, the *human*: but the same Christ also raised the dead, healed the sick, etc.; and in this we see his *other* mode of activity or *energy* (the *Divine*).

6. One of the originators of Monothelism, Archbishop Cyrus of Alexandria, (beforetimes at Phasis in Colchis,) effected a union about the year 633 with a number of the Egyptian Monophysites on the basis of the formula: "There was in Christ only *one energy*," *μία ἐνέργεια*. The Monophysites were justly triumphant, for the formula favored them alone and not the Catholic Church. Just at that time a learned monk, Sophronius of Jerusalem (soon afterwards Patriarch there), was in Alexandria and protested against this formula. As Cyrus paid no heed to him, Sophronius went to Constantinople, seeking help of Sergius, not knowing that the latter also favored the new heresy. Sergius proposed a middle course, viz., that neither should the phrase *two energies* (and *wills*) be used as Sophronius desired, nor yet the formula *one energy*.

Thereupon Sergius appealed by letter to Pope Honorius to obtain his opinion, and also his approval. In this letter

Sergius says, that no one should be allowed to affirm either *one* energy or *two*; for the expression *one* energy was suspicious, as it seemed to deny that there were in Christ *two* natures (i. e. to teach the monophysitic doctrine); in the same manner the assertion of *two* energies was an offense to many, since it might follow from this, that there were in Christ *two* CONTRARY *wills* (ῥελήματα); a false inference!

7. Pope Honorius answered Sergius, and his whole letter is still preserved in the original Latin, and in an old Greek version. (Epistola I.)

The sum of what Honorius says in this epistle is as follows:

(a.) Thou hast done well to forbid the phrase "one energy," for the monophysitic view could be found in it. So too, Nestorianism could be found in the expression "two energies" (δύο ἐνέργειαι); and neither expression is biblical. Besides, the expression "two energies" is false, for Christ (ἐνέργησε πολυτρόπως) "worked in divers ways," (e. g. now he ate, then he drank, he slept, he taught, he healed the sick, etc.)

Hence Honorius confounded the *energy*, or mode of working in itself, with its single manifestations.

His words, bearing on this, read literally: "It is not right to give the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas to opinions which do not seem to have been submitted to the examination of Synods, nor to have the authority of ecclesiastical canons; as is the case with those who presume to predicate *one* energy or *two* energies of Christ, etc." (*Mansi*, Collect. Concil. T. xi. p. 542.)

And afterwards he says: "For we have not learned from the Holy Scriptures that Jesus Christ and his Holy Spirit have one mode of operation, or two, although we have learned that he worked in manifold ways." (*Mansi*, *ubi supra*.)

And at the close: "This, my brother, you will also preach as we do . . . and we exhort you, that, avoiding the new mode of speaking of one or two modes of operation, you proclaim with us one Lord Jesus Christ." (*Mansi*, p. 543).

(b.) Honorius here not only rejects the *orthodox* technical term of *two energies*, but at the same time prescribes a *hereti-*

cal phrase as a rule of faith when he says : " On this account we too confess *one will* (ἓν θέλημα) of our Lord Jesus Christ, since our nature but not our guilt was manifestly assumed by the divinity ; and this nature, too, as it was created before sin and not as it was vitiated by the fall. That is, the corrupted nature was not assumed by the Saviour, for this would be repugnant to the law of the Spirit." (*Mansi*, p. 539.)

Honorius, therefore, argues thus : " Christ assumed true humanity, human nature in full, but yet not the human nature corrupted by sin, but that nature as it was *before* the fall. Hence there was not in Christ a law of the members warring against a law of the mind." So far he is right ; but then he ought to have made the following inference : " Accordingly, there is in Christ no sinful carnal will, but only the GOOD HUMAN *will* wholly conformed to the divine will ; therefore in truth *two* wills, the divine and the human, and the latter good." But Honorius confounds these two wills, or allows the good human will, since it is always conformed to the divine, to be merged into the divine, and hence he says : " Accordingly we confess *one will* of our Lord." Consequently he prescribed to the Church as an article of faith the principal dogma of the Monothelites, their veritable *terminus technicus*.

8. Honorius wrote again sometime afterwards to Sergius. We have only two fragments of this second epistle, and in these Honorius repeats his rejection of the orthodox phraseology of "two energies." He says and ordains, that "the newly introduced expressions about one or two modes of operation should be decidedly banished from the proclamation of the faith," (i.e. nothing should be said of either one or two energies); and he maintains that it is unseemly (*ineptum*) to ascribe to the Redeemer either one mode of operation or two. (*Mansi*, p. 579.) This is in the first fragment.

But in the second fragment, taken from the end of the epistle, it is said : " However, so far as the ecclesiastical dogma (*dogma ecclesiasticum*) is concerned . . . we ought not to affirm or define, that there is either one mode of working, or that there are two, in the Mediator between God and man." (*Mansi*, as above.) It is clear that Honorius meant to give

a dogmatic definition, to announce the doctrine of the Church, and that he in fact rejected the orthodox dogmatic phraseology.

These two fragments of the second epistle do not contain the phrase "one or two *wills*;" it is not known whether the lost part of the second epistle treated of this point.

The result of what precedes is as follows: (*a.*) Honorius rejected the technical orthodox term of *two energies* (δύο ἐνέργειαι); (*b.*) and declared the specific heretical term, *one will* (ἐν θέλημα) to be correct; and (*c.*) prescribed this two-fold error as an article of faith, in this instance to the Church of Constantinople.

At the end of the second section we shall come back to the question whether he spoke *ex cathedra*.

II. *Did a General Council claim to itself the right of passing sentence on a Pontiff who had thus decided; and did it actually condemn him as a heretic?*

These two Epistles of Honorius were read before the Sixth Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, A. D. 680; the first in the twelfth, and the second in the thirteenth general session, in the presence, and under the presidency, of three legates sent by Pope Agatho, (the two cardinal priests, Theodore and George, and the cardinal deacon, John); and also in the presence of the three deputies, whom the great Council held just before in Rome, had added to the Papal legates.

a. At the very beginning of the thirteenth session the Council declared: "Having considered the dogmatic epistles of Sergius to Cyrus and to Pope Honorius, as well as the (first) epistle of Honorius to Sergius, we find that these documents contradict the apostolic dogmas, and also the declarations of holy councils and of the most esteemed Fathers, and follow the false doctrines of heretics; hence we altogether reject and execrate them as soul-destructive. The names too, of these men, whose impious dogmas we execrate, must be expelled from the church, that is, Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter and Theodore, all of whom Pope Agatho has cast out in his letter to the Emperor." (When Pope Agatho sent his Legates to the Sixth General Council he gave

them an epistle to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, in which he denounced the above-named promoters of Monophysitism. He said nothing of his predecessor Honorius. But the Sixth General Council determined to censure him also, and went on thus in its decree): "We anathematize all of these. But together with them, we decree, that the former Pope Honorius, of Old Rome, should also be excluded from the Church and anathematized, since we find, in his letter to Sergius, that he followed the opinions of the latter in all points, and confirmed his impious dogmas."*

The Council was wholly right in not raising the question as to what Honorius might have thought in his heart, but in confining itself to the *fact*, that in his letter he had *sanctioned* heresy.

b. At the end of the same session, the thirteenth, the second epistle of Honorius was read, and it was decreed by the Council that it should be burnt with the other documents as "*animabus nociva*;" which was done. (*Mansi*, as above, p. 582.)

c. At the end of the sixteenth session the Synod proclaimed: "*Sergio hæretico anathema, Cyro hæretico anathema, Honorio hæretico anathema, Pyrro hæretico anathema.*" (*Mansi*, as above, p. 622.)

d. Still more important is what occurred in the eighteenth and last session on the 16th September. In the decree on the faith, then promulgated, which was the chief document of the Synod, we read: "But since the author of all malice al-

* In the old authentic Latin translation of the Greek acts of the Council this passage reads: Sanctum Concilium dixit. . . retractantes dogmaticas epistolas, quæ tanquam a Sergio . . . quam ad Honorium quondam Papam antiquæ Romæ; similiter autem et epistolam ab illo, id est, Honorio, re-scriptam ad eundem Sergium, hasque invenientes omnino alienas existere ab apostolicis dogmatibus. . . sequi vero falsas doctrinas hæreticorum, eas omni modo abjicimus et tanquam animæ noxias execramur. Quorum autem, id est, eorundem impia execramur dogmata, horum et nomina a sancta Dei ecclesia projici judicavimus, id ist, Sergi, etc. . . Cum his vero simul projici a sancta Dei catholica ecclesia, simulque anathematizari prævidimus (*συνειδομεν*) et Honorium, qui fuerat papa antiquæ Romæ, eo quod invenimus, per scripta quæ ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium, quia in omnibus ejus mentem secutus est, et impia dogmata *confirmavit*. (*Mansi*, as above, p. 554, sq.)

ways finds some serpents to help him, through whom he can spread abroad his death-bringing poison, using them as the apt organ of his will,—we mean Theodorus, Bishop of Pharan, Sergius, and moreover Honorius, Pope of Old Rome, and Cyrus of Alexandria . . . he did not refrain from arousing scandals in the Church, through these persons, by the dissemination of heresy.” (*Mansi*, p. 635.)

e. After all the members of the Council, the three pontifical legates coming first, had subscribed the decree, the Synod cried out : “Thus we all believe . . . many years to the Emperor . . . anathema to Theodore of Pharan, anathema to Sergius and Honorius, anathema to Pyrrhus and Paulus . . . anathema to all heretics !” (*Mansi*, p. 659.)

f. Moreover, in a memorial addressed to the Emperor, the papal legates again taking the lead, this anathema against Honorius is repeated : “We put under the anathema, Theodore, Sergius, and with them Honorius, who then presided at Rome, because he followed them in heresy.” (*Mansi*, p. 666.)

From this it follows, that the Sixth General Council

1. Claimed the right of passing judgment on a Pope, speaking *ex cathedra* ; and

2. It condemned the doctrinal decree, given by him *ex cathedra*, because he therein sanctioned heretical doctrine.

How he may have thought in his own mind is irrelevant ; the fact of his erroneous dogmatic decision was judged and condemned.

III. *How was this condemnation actually received at the time, especially by the Roman Pontiffs?*

No one at that time believed that these proceedings of the Sixth General Council against Pope Honorius were unjust or conducted by an incompetent authority. For

a. Not only did all the hundreds of bishops then present find it in order since they subscribed the sentence ; but

b. The Papal Legates also there present and presiding had the same opinion, and did not raise the slightest objection, either

(1) against the competency of the Council, or

(2) against the material (substantial) rectitude of its judgment.

c. This conciliar judgment was not only *confirmed* by the Emperor but also by the reigning *Pope himself*, who *repeated* it in his own terms. Thus Pope Leo II. (Agatho had meanwhile died Jan. 10th, 682) says in his reply to the Emperor: "We in like manner anathematize the inventors of the new error, that is Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius . . . and also Honorius, who did not sanctify this apostolic Church by the doctrine of the apostolic tradition, *but attempted to subvert the immaculate faith by a profane treason, (profana proditiōe immaculatum fidem subvertere conatus est;* the Greek text reads, *allowed—παρεχώρησε—to be perverted,*) and all who died in their error." (*Mansi, ubi supra, p. 731.*)

d. The same Pope Leo II. in his epistle to the Spanish bishops says: "Theodore, Cyrus, Sergius, etc., are punished with eternal condemnation . . . together with *Honorius*, who did not, as became his apostolic authority, extinguish in the beginning the flames of a heretical dogma, but by his negligence nourished it (*negligendo confovit*)." *Mansi, p. 1052.*

e. He writes in the same sense to the Spanish king: "They are condemned . . . and together with them Honorius of Rome, who *consented* that the immaculate rule of the apostolic tradition should be stained (*maculari consensit*)." *Mansi, p. 1057.*

In these very expressions, "*negligendo confovit*," and "*maculari consensit*," Pope Leo II. just hits the right point. From the first epistle of Honorius he saw that the Pope started from the correct doctrine respecting the person of Christ, that is from the Council of Chalcedon; but that he made *false conclusions*; so that, in his heart he did not mean heresy, while in fact he condemned the specific orthodox term, "*two energies*," and sanctioned a specific heretical expression, "*one will*." He did not do this with vicious intent, but from "negligence," and "he *consented* to the perversion of the faith." So that Pope Leo II. acknowledged that the condemnation of Honorius by the General Council was grounded in just reasons; and it did not at all occur to him to doubt about the *competency* of the Council.

f. The anathema imposed upon Honorius was immediately

repeated in the Seventh and Eighth Œcumenical Councils, both of which were held under the presidency of papal legates.

Pope Adrian II., A. D. 867–872, judged that the condemnation of Honorius was just because he “was tried on a charge of heresy, on *which ground alone*, inferiors may resist the ordinances of their rulers.” It is indeed universally known, that even in the middle ages, when the papal power was at its height, it was the universal doctrine of the Church, that the Pope can be deposed for heresy, but only for heresy. This doctrine too, went over into the canon law. (*Corpus Juris Canon.*)*

g. In the *Liber Diurnus*, i.e. the Book of Formularies of the Roman Curia (from the fifth to the eleventh century) is found the old formula for the pontifical oath, undoubtedly prescribed by Gregory II. (at the beginning of the eighth century), according to which every new Pope at his entrance upon his office is bound to declare under oath that, “he recognizes the Sixth General Council, which laid an eternal anathema upon the inventors of the new heresy, (Monotheism) viz., Sergius, Pyrrhus, etc. . . together with Honorius, because he gave encouragement to the depraved assertions of heretics, (*quia pravis hæreticorum assertionibus fomentum impendit*).” *Liber Diurnus*, ed. Eugène de Rozière, Paris, 1869, No. 84.

From this it follows that, up to the eleventh century, every new Pope entering upon his office must take oath :

A. That a General Council can judge a Pope, at least for heresy ;

B. And that Honorius was justly anathematized by the Sixth General Council, because he approved heresy by his dogmatic edict.

* It is indeed said that this has to do only with the heresy of a Pope as a private person ; but if it is possible, in general, for a Pope to become heretical, why may it not also happen that he teach his heretical opinion *ex cathedra* ? For he must certainly hold it to be Catholic doctrine ! Since we cannot presume that he has an evil will ! [“*mala voluntas*.”]

Second Division.

THE ATTEMPTS TO EXPLAIN AWAY THE FACTS.

Various attempts have been made by different writers to diminish as far as possible the pressure of these facts and arguments.

1. The Roman abbot, Johannes, who as scribe wrote the epistle of Honorius to Sergius, asserted in his letters to the Greek Emperor, Constantine Heraclius, that "in that epistle of Honorius nothing at all is said of the *divine will* in Christ, but Honorius meant to deny that Christ had a *sinful* human will, and to assert that he had only a *good* human will. This *last* is the *one will* of which Honorius is speaking; he says nothing about the *divine will*, because he only replies to the question of Sergius." (See *Mansi*, Collect. Concil. vol. x. p. 739.)

In the same way John IV., the second successor of Honorius, endeavored to defend him. (*Mansi*, as above, p. 682.)

a. But this allegation is simply not true, as Sergius expressly says: "The phrase *two energies* gave offense, because it led to the conclusion that we must ascribe to Christ two *antagonistic* wills, a *DIVINE*, which was willing to suffer, and a *human*, which was opposed to suffering." (*Mansi*, vol. xi. p. 534.)

I only ask, is Sergius here speaking of *two sorts of will* in the human nature, or of the human *and* divine will?

So that it is a vain and false expedient on the part of Abbot Johannes to assert that Honorius had nothing to say of the *divine will*, because Sergius did not allude to it.

b. It is true that Honorius denies that there was in Christ a *sinful* human will, and in this he is right; but instead of going on and saying—"consequently there remains in the human nature of Christ only the *good human will*, and this is ever conformed to the will of the divine nature"—he makes a leap and says, "consequently there is only *one will* in Christ," and by this he means the *divine*—as appears from the following:

Honorius thinks that when Christ says, "Not my will, but thine, be done," he is not speaking in a strict personal sense,

but on *our* account, so that we might not follow our will but the will of God.

He could not have interpreted it in this way if he had acknowledged in Christ a good human will besides the divine.

c. In his defense of Honorius, Abbot Johannes has in mind only one *faux pas* of this Pope—the affirmation of *one will*; he is wholly silent about his other error, viz., his *rejection* of the specific orthodox phrase, *two energies*. From this blot he does not presume to purify him.

d. Besides, the above attempt to defend Honorius found little favor at the time, even at Rome.* Otherwise the three papal legates at the Sixth General Council would have attempted by this defense to set aside the anathema pronounced against Honorius, which was such a bitter stroke for Rome. Leo II., too, and his successors who speak of the condemnation of Honorius, manifestly ascribe no value to this mode of excusing him.

II. The same Abbot Johannes further contended, that the (first) epistle of Honorius to Sergius had been falsified; so that the Sixth General Council passed sentence on the basis of false documents.

At this Council, however, not only was there read a Greek translation of the Epistle, but, after this had been done, the Latin original was brought from the Patriarchal archives and the translation compared with the original, and this by a Roman deputy: "So, too, was brought forward . . . the authentic Latin epistle (*epistola authentica Latina*) of the former Roman Pope Honorius to Sergius, together with the translation, and this Latin epistle was compared [with the translation] by the most reverend Johannes, bishop of the City of Porta Rom. (now Ostia,) who was present from the Synod in Old Rome." (*Mansi*, Tom. xi. p. 547.)

Is it possible that the Roman Legates and Deputies did not know the genuine epistle of Honorius, or that they themselves aided in producing a falsified copy? And is it credible that

*We know only one considerable man in those times, who thought this defense valid, the Abbot St. Maximus.

later Popes, as Leo II. and all his successors, never noticed that the acts of the Sixth Council, preserved at Rome, contained a falsified epistle of Honorius, fraudulently interpolated?

But the same abbot, Johannes, adduces a special passage, corrupted by the Greeks? Yes. In the Greek translation, he says, we read, that "in Christ there was *absolutely* one will;" and the word "absolutely" is supposititious. But in the official Greek copy, as it has come down to us, this word is not contained. The Council, too, as we have seen, had the *original text*, and a translation examined by the Papal Deputies.

III. In the sixteenth century, Cardinal Baronius found a new way of purging the memory of Pope Honorius from this stain. His opinion is, that, just before the Sixth General Council, the Patriarch Theodore of Constantinople was deposed on account of his inclination to Monothelism, and George made Patriarch in his place. But after the death of George, soon after the close of the Sixth General Council, Theodore succeeded in being restored to his former dignity. "Undoubtedly" (*procul, dubio!*) the Sixth General Council pronounced this anathema upon Theodore! But when he again became Patriarch he erased his own name from the acts and put instead of it the name of Honorius, that is *ONONION* instead of *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΝ*. At the same time, too, he interpolated in the acts of the Council all the passages which relate to Honorius, viz.: the two epistles of Honorius, and the alleged colloquies of the Council about them (*e. g.* the comparison of the Latin and Greek texts).

Of course Baronius must go on and maintain that the epistle of Pope Leo II. and much else, in fact a large part of the acts of the Council, were also not genuine.

This audacious hypothesis has been long since declared, even by Roman theologians, to be baseless; for example, by Mamachi, Ballerini, and also the late Professor Palma of Rome, who was shot by the Roman revolutionists in the Quirinal standing near the Pope.*

* Mamachi, *Originum et Antiq.* tom. iv, p. 5; Ballerini, *De VI ac Ratione Primatus*, p. 306; Palma, *Prælectiones Hist. Eccl.* tom. ii, P 1. p. 149. Rome, 1839.

One thing more, the Roman Legates, with their copy of the acts of the Sixth Council of Constantinople, returned home *before* Theodore was reinstated. (His predecessor, George, according to Theophanes, the Byzantine historian, lived to the third year after the Sixth Synod, at least till 683.) How, then, could he falsify the acts kept at Rome? He might, indeed, have interpolated the acts preserved in the patriarchal archives at Constantinople, but not those copies already carried to Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, etc. Five copies were completed for the five patriarchal sees.

The *erasure*, too, could not have been so easily made as Baronius would have us believe; for it must have been not of the single word *ONOLPION*, but of whole lines.

To this is to be added, that the notary and deacon Agatho, who was secretary of the Sixth Council, expressly says: "*Sergius and Honorius* were anathematized" (Combesis *Novum Auctuar.* T. ii., p. 204. Mansi, T. xii., p. 190).

After all this, it is not to be wondered at that other learned men, intent upon saving the honor of Honorius, thought themselves obliged to take another course than that of Baronius. Only the Jesuit Damberger in his "*Synchronistic History*," (Vol. ii., p. 119, sq.) which abounds in arbitrary opinions, has revived the hypothesis of Baronius, with modifications that make it still worse, so that nobody has applauded it.

IV. Bellarmine, not satisfied with the theory of Baronius, advanced another adopted by Turrecremata and Joseph Simon Assemani:* "*The Sixth General Council did, indeed, anathematize Honorius as a heretic, but was in error as to the fact (error facti); and this was possible, natural, in truth inevitable, since vitiated copies of the epistle of Honorius were laid before the Council.*"

They thus made a similar distinction to that of the Jansenists between the question of right and the question of fact (*quæstio juris et facti*), adding to this the assertions of the Roman Abbot Johannes, who was the scribe of the epistle of Honorius, as already given.

* Bellarmine, *De Roman Pontif*, lib. iv, c. 2; Turrecremata, *De Ecclesia*, cap. 93; Assemani, *Bibl. Juris Orient.*, tom. iv, p. 113.

But we have already seen (p. 292) that the Latin original of this letter was before the Council, and that the Roman deputies themselves investigated the point whether the Greek translation was accurate. Hence the Sixth General Council pronounced its judgment on the basis of the *genuine* acts.

That which is contained in these acts, viz. ; *a.* Forbidding the specific orthodox phrase, *two energies*; and, *b.* Enjoining the specific heterodox term, *one will*, was decidedly heretical, sounded heretical; and these declarations, but not the *interna opinio* of Honorius, formed the basis of the synodical judgment.

V. M. de Margerie, Professor of Philosophy in Nancy, has lately attempted another solution of the Honorius question, in his pamphlet, "Le Pape Honorius," Paris, 1870, against Gratry. His argumentation runs thus: 1. Pope Agatho in two letters declared that the Roman Pontiff is infallible. 2. The Sixth General Council solemnly recognized these letters, and consequently the infallibility of the Pope. 3. Hence it is quite impossible that the same Council should have condemned Pope Honorius as a heretic, in the proper sense of the word.

Let us look at these points and conclusions in order :

1. In the first epistle addressed to the Emperor, which Pope Agatho delivered to his Legates, departing for Constantinople to attend the Sixth General Council, he says: "By the effectual protection of Peter, this his Apostolic Church (the Roman), has never deflected from the way of truth to have a part in any error. . . . For this is the rule of the true faith (that is Duothelism, the doctrine of Two Wills), which this spiritual Mother (the Roman Church) has vigorously held and defended in prosperity and adversity; and this Church is proved never to have erred from the path of apostolic tradition by the omnipotent grace of God, and never to have submitted to heretical novelties," etc. (*Mansi*, T. xi., p. 239-242).

Accordingly, Agatho claims that the Roman Church has never lapsed into error. He wishes to state an historical fact, and that this steadfastness of the Roman Church in the

orthodox faith is derived from the presidency of Saint Peter. He is not speaking of an absolute infallibility, and does not once touch the question, whether the case of Honorius can be brought into harmony or not with his general thesis of the constant orthodoxy of the Roman Church. We on our side remark, *a.* that the infallibility of the Roman Church can be very well maintained without advocating the *Personal Infallibility* of the Pope; and that, *b.* the two positions that "Honorius expressed a heterodox view," and that "the Roman Church was never Monothelitic," can be easily reconciled.

We add that Agatho himself impugned the doctrine of Honorius directly and definitely by (a) himself teaching the dogma of Two Wills; and (b) by interpreting directly in favor of Duothelism the passage cited by Honorius ("not my will but thine be done"), while Honorius endeavored to weaken its force as a proof of Duothelism. (*Mansi*, T. xi., p. 246).

The same is the case with the second epistle, also addressed to the Emperor, which the Papal Legates took with them, and which was subscribed by Pope Agatho and 125 other bishops. This, too, contains the opinion that the Roman Church has *never* fallen into heresy (*Mansi*, p. 287); and what has already been said applies here. I do not comprehend how M. de Margerie can look upon this second letter as an *instruction* to the Papal legates. Whoever has read it through can hardly have this conception of it.

From all this it appears that M. de Margerie is not correct in trying to make us believe that Pope Agatho maintained the simple infallibility of the Pope.

2. His second assertion is as incorrect as his first, viz.: "The Sixth General Council confirmed Agatho's doctrine of Papal Infallibility." In handling this second point M. de Margerie betrays a remarkable deficiency in exact knowledge of the acts of the Council.

a. He says (p. 31) that the two Papal epistles were first read at the fourth session of the Sixth Council, Nov. 17, 680; but the fourth session was held Nov. 15.

b. Also: "*Three weeks* later, in the sixth session, all the

bishops, with one exception, individually voted for the synodical epistle of Agatho." (Margerie, p. 21).

The sixth session, however, was not held three weeks after the fourth, but at least a quarter of a year afterwards, Feb. 12, 681, and in this session (the sixth) *nothing at all* was done which Margerie reports. The matter came up in the eighth session, March 7, 681. But what was done in this eighth session? Was the letter of Agatho really approved in all its contents by the Council? By no means. For,

a. They first of all *examined* (at this Sixth Council) whether the doctrine of Agatho, Duothelism (Two Wills), was really patristic.

Archbishop George of Constantinople, voting first, testified : "Upon investigating the books of the holy fathers, preserved in my venerable patriarchal residence, I have found all their testimonies agreeing with the citations which Agatho made for Duothelism. . . . I assent to them and so confess."

Accordingly, the opinion of Agatho was not at all esteemed infallible of itself, but they *examined* first to see if it was right.

b. Then, too, the Fathers of the Council did not formally approve the whole contents of this epistle, particularly not its eulogium of the Roman Church, but *only* the doctrine of *Two Wills*, avowed in both epistles.

c. What the Synod may have judged respecting the historical assertion of Agatho, "that the Roman Church had never fallen into error," can, perhaps, be inferred from the fact that, almost in the same breath, it extolled Agatho, and imposed its anathema upon Honorius.

d. When, in fine, Margerie speaks as follows about a declaration of the eighteenth session : "Il est, je pense, impossible d'imaginer une approbation plus solennelle et plus explicite á un énoncé plus distinct de la doctrine infallibiliste,"—so answer, not we, but the acts of the Council.

The Council does not here allude by a word to the Papal Infallibility. It had before its eyes solely the Duothelism espoused by Agatho, and in respect to *this* it says : "Peter has spoken through Agatho," (Mansi, p. 666); and, a few lines before, it had said : "We put under the anathema Theodorus,

Sergius, etc., and with them Honorius . . . because in this he has followed them." Of a confirmation of the Papal claim of infallibility there is nowhere a trace.

Having thus demonstrated the futility of the foundation of the whole argumentation of M. de Margerie, we might here conclude, but it may be worth the trouble to go into details, that we may have a complete knowledge of the genuine character of this *oposculé*.

1. The gravest charge against Honorius is his position that "in Christ there is only one will." In this he positively taught heresy. Now, M. de Margerie would make us believe that this passage is spurious, interpolated. He has not the audacity to affirm this outright, but he does all he can to arouse *suspicion* against the passage, and would make it appear as if he had got possession of a wholly new element in the case, *i. e.* the testimony of Abbot Maximus in the seventh century (p. 29, 45). This Maximus refers to the assertions of the Roman Abbot Johannes, (*a*) that the Greeks had falsified the text of the epistle of Honorius; and (*b*) that Honorius spoke only of *one* human will in Christ, and that good.

As we have seen, the Abbot Johannes, and Maximus after him, do not in the least deny that Honorius actually used the expression *one will*; on the contrary, they confirm the position that this expression stands in his epistles; they confirm this, because they attempt to excuse the *faux pas* by saying that Honorius was speaking only of the *one* (good) *human* will in Christ, while he said nothing of the *divine* will, because Sergius had not alluded to it.

We have already proved that this evasion is groundless; and only add, that if it had been possible to explain the expression "one will" in the epistle of Honorius as interpolated, his many and zealous defenders would have seized upon this mode of defense long before M. de Margerie was born.

2. After Margerie made the discovery that the Sixth General Council decreed infallibility, he must naturally change, interpret *in suavis*, all those statements and words of the Council which contain an anathema upon the *heretic* Hono-

rius. He that seeks, finds. And so Margerie has found that the word *heretic*, when used about Honorius, does not really mean heretic (p. 47). In our first division we have cited the passages in which the Sixth General Council and several Popes, as well as later General Councils, have spoken out about Honorius, and we only ask that these statements be read again.

3. Further on, de Margerie takes much pains to prove that Honorius was not speaking *ex cathedra* (p. 42). Curious! If these epistles do not contain anything erroneous, it were hardly worth the trouble to set on foot such investigations and hypotheses.

Who does not know that it is extremely difficult to determine when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra*? De Margerie propounds two criteria by which this may be known :

a. When the Pope proclaims in *positive* terms an opinion as an article of faith. Honorius, he argues, did not do this. But is not the following dictum *positive*?

“We confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Unam voluntatem fatemur domini Jesu Christi. *Mansi*. T. xi. p. 539.)

Further, Honorius says : “We have not learned from the Holy Scriptures that Jesus Christ . . . has one or two *energies* ; but that he acts in *manifold* modes,” (*multiformiter cognovimus operatum*, *Mansi*. p. 542). And is not Honorius prescribing this as a matter of faith? Toward the close of his epistle he says : “This, my brethren, you will with us proclaim . . . and we *exhort* you (*hortantes vos*) that you *avoid* the new way of talking about one or two energies,” etc. (*Mansi*. xi. p. 543.)

In the second epistle he is still more clear : “As to the ecclesiastical *dogma*, and what we are bound to hold and to teach (*quantum ad dogma ecclesiasticum pertinet quæ tenere vel prædicare debemus*), we are not bound to define that there is in the Mediator either one energy or two.”

Thus Honorius in fact proclaimed his thesis *positively*, and *prescribed* it.

b. But, says Margerie (p. 43), he did not enjoin it upon

the *whole world*, and this is the second requisite of a dogma *ex cathedra*.

I do not know that a formal address to the whole Church is absolutely necessary to an *ex cathedra* definition; for if that be the case, the famous dogmatic epistle of Leo I. to Flavian was not given *ex cathedra*. But there is no doubt about the fact that Honorius would have the whole Church, and not merely the Church of Constantinople, believe what he propounded.

In fine, M. de Margerie concedes that the Sixth General Council judged Pope Honorius, and condemned him in very strong terms; but he thinks that this was only for negligence ("mauvaise administration," p. 47).

How does this agree with the dogma, defended by Margerie as true and *ancient*, that "the First See can be judged of no one," *prima sedes a nemine judicatur* (pp. 24, 60.)? If this doctrine expresses the law that prevailed in the ancient Church, how *could* the Council judge Honorius?

Further: the *Corpus Juris* and the whole mediæval Church hold to the position, that the Pope can be condemned *only for heresy*. Pope Adrian II, in the ninth century says: "Although the Orientals pronounced the anathema upon Pope Honorius after his death, it must be considered that it was because he was accused of heresy (*quia fuerat super hæresi accusatus*), on which ground alone the lower are allowed to resist the decrees of their rulers." What would Pope Adrian have said to the theory of Margerie, that Honorius was condemned by the Council only for *mauvaise administration*?*

Rome, May 5, 1870:

the day of St. Pius. V.

CARL JOSEPH V. HEFELE,

Bishop of Rottenburg.

* There has just appeared in Rome from the press of the *Civiltà Cattolica* a pamphlet entitled "*Monumenta quædam causam Honorii spectantia*." The notes appended are almost worthless and wholly insufficient to justify Honorius; as will be seen by a comparison of them with the evidence we have given. Only one question: Why did the author keep from us the words of the Sixth General Council, "the devil has sowed heresy by means of Honorius?" *Mansi*, p. 635.

NOTE.—Bishop von Hefele appended to the German edition of this essay a criticism of another work in favor of Honorius, "*Liber de Hon-*

orii I, Romani Pontificis Causa," written in a worthier tone by the learned Professor Joseph Pennachi of the Roman University.

Nothing new of any importance is adduced. Prof. Pennachi claims (1) "that the epistles of Honorius are *absolutely* catholic and give no countenance to the Monothelite error;" this is fully refuted in the above essay. (2) He also asserts, what has never before been alleged, "that the epistles of Honorius were condemned by the *Oriental*s of the Sixth Council and not by the General Council itself; and that these Oriental Bishops were in error as to a dogmatic fact." But Hefele replies, that there were present at the Council, besides the Orientals, not only the Papal Legates, but three bishops and four other clerics representing a Synod of Old Rome just before held; and three Greek Papal vicars from Illyria, then belonging to the Roman patriarchate; that these all voted for the condemnation; that there is no evidence at all that the Papal legates were reproved by Pope Agatho for their part in the condemnation; that Leo II. did not condemn Honorius for negligence alone (as Prof. Pennachi asserts), but "because he had perverted the immaculate faith by a profane betrayal" (Mansi, p. 731); and that, even if only the Orientals had condemned him, they were still half of the whole Church—so that at that time at least half of the Church did not know anything about Papal Infallibility.

ART. V.—DR. JACOB'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

By Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, D.D., New York.

PROTESTANTISM, as organized in England during the reign of the Tudors, being in part a political measure and in part an intellectual conviction, was finally a compromise between contending parties. Like all compromises, it carried within itself, both for Church and State, the seeds of discontent and antagonism. Never were these discordant elements more active than now; and never will the contention be allayed till there be a thorough revision of the whole question of English Protestantism, eliminating from it offensive terms and cus-

* The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament: a Study for the Present Crisis in the Church of England. By G. A. Jacob, D.D., late Head Master of Christ's Hospital: Strahan & Co., London: 1871. pp. 421.