

Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics,
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel,
and the cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érué me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

“It is required among the dispensers that a man be found faithful.”
(1 Corinthians 4:1-2)

“Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee
that thou shalt not do the office of priesthood to me.”
(Osee 4:6)

“If some of the clergy should rebel and dare to hold the opinions of Nestorius or Celestius either
in private or in public,
it has been judged by the holy synod that they too are deposed.”
(*Council of Ephesus*, 431)

“Thou hast tried them who say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars... For such
false apostles are deceitful workmen,
transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no wonder,
for Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light.”
(Apocalypse 2:2; 2 Corinthians 11:13-14)

Original version: 6/2016; Current version: 3/2022

Mary's Little Remnant
302 East Joffre St.
Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA
Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us
(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	9
THE DOGMA THAT NON-CATHOLICS CANNOT HOLD OFFICES IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.....	12
<i>Ordinary magisterium.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Solemn magisterium</i>	<i>14</i>
431 – Council of Ephesus.....	14
<i>Excommunications and depositions of formal heretics are automatic.....</i>	<i>15</i>
451 – Council of Chalcedon	18
553 – Second Council of Constantinople	18
681 – Third Council of Constantinople	18
683 to 715 – Papal Coronation Oath	19
<i>Nominal Catholics.....</i>	<i>19</i>
Apostate Antipope Paul IV’s Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio.....	19
Canons 188, n4 and 2265, §1 of the invalid and heretical 1917 Code of Canon Law	20
<i>Heretics are removed from the diptychs.....</i>	<i>20</i>
Heretics, including nominal popes, are removed from the diptychs.....	21
<i>The heretics Bishop Acacius’ and Antipope Anastasius II’s names were removed from the diptychs.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>The heretic Antipope Vigilius’ name was removed from the diptychs.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>The heretic Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia’s name was removed from the diptychs.....</i>	<i>22</i>
Manifest heretics are removed from the diptychs before a trial	23
Persons who have been removed or re-added to the diptychs after death.....	25
<i>The heretic Antipope Honorius’ name was removed from the diptychs after he died.....</i>	<i>26</i>
A POPE CAN BECOME AN IDOLATER OR A FORMAL HERETIC AND THUS LOSE HIS OFFICE	26
<i>The dogma.....</i>	<i>27</i>
Pope St. Hormisdas, 517.....	27
Papal Coronation Oath, c. 683-715	27
<i>The Oath was taken until the 11th century and then hidden</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>The Roman Breviary in the 16th century removed the condemnation of Honorius.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>The Papal Coronation Oath resurfaced in the 17th century and was suppressed, edited, or changed</i>	<i>30</i>
Several apostate canonists, theologians, and antipopes.....	31
<i>Some popes and nominal popes who became idolaters or formal heretics.....</i>	<i>33</i>
St. Marcellinus (296-304)	34
<i>He was an idolater for making an offering to a false god</i>	<i>34</i>
Stephen (254-257).....	35
<i>He held the heresy that baptisms outside the Catholic Church are efficacious</i>	<i>35</i>
Liberius (353-366).....	40
<i>Summary</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>In 357 Liberius became a formal heretic and automatically lost his office.....</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>In 357 Felix II became the next pope</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>In the 14th century a miracle confirmed Felix II as pope and martyr</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Beware of those who excuse Liberius.....</i>	<i>46</i>
Anastasius II (496-498)	50
<i>He became a formal heretic and schismatic for entering into religious communion with monophysites and Acacian schismatics.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Suspect of the heresy that sacraments outside the Catholic Church to non-Catholics are fruitful</i>	<i>56</i>
Vigilius (537-555).....	57
<i>Vigilius was never the pope.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>The Three Chapters</i>	<i>58</i>
547 – Emperor Justinian’s Imperial Edict condemns the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia	59
547 – Vigilius privately condemns the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia	60
548 – Vigilius in his Judicatum publicly condemns the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia	61
550 – Vigilius excommunicates Roman clerics who oppose his Judicatum.....	61
550 – Vigilius and Justinian call for a council to resolve conflicts and re-condemn the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia.....	61
551 – Justinian’s second imperial edict resolves the conflicts and re-condemns the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia.....	62
551 – Vigilius in his Damnatio excommunicates anyone who consents to Justinian’s second edict.....	62

552 – Vigilius un-excommunicates those who promise to wait for a council to resolve the conflicts.....	63
553 – Vigilius gives and then recalls his assent to hold the council, and Justinian opens it instead (the Second Council of Constantinople)	64
Vigilius is petitioned several times to attend the council but refuses.....	64
Vigilius in his Constitutum opposes the council, defends the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and thus falls into heresy.....	65
Justinian deposes the formal heretic Vigilius, removes his name from the diptychs, and intends to elect a pope	66
Vigilius repents and abjures and dies shortly after.....	67
This case is one proof that a pope can be judged, sentenced, and punished	69
The dilemma for those who believe that Vigilius was the pope and that popes cannot err	69
Honorius (625-638)	70
He held the heresy that the Incarnate Jesus has only one will	70
Third Council of Constantinople, 681.....	70
Bishops of the Third Council of Constantinople, 680	72
The Emperor, 681.....	72
Pope St. Leo II, 682	73
Papal Coronation Oath, c. 683-715	73
Second Council of Nicea, 787.....	74
Fourth Council of Constantinople, 870	74
Beware of the papal idolaters, heretics, and liars who excuse Honorius.....	75
All the so-called popes from Innocent II in 1130 onward were apostate antipopes	77
Apostate Antipope Innocent II (1130-1143).....	78
His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity	78
Apostate Antipope Alexander III (1159-1181).....	78
His heresy for promoting Peter Lombard and his heretical Sentences	78
Apostate Antipope Innocent III (1198-1216).....	80
His heresy for promoting Peter Lombard and his heretical Sentences	80
His heresy for implying there is a fourth Person of the Holy Trinity	80
Apostate Antipope Martin V (1417-1431).....	81
His heresies of conciliarism and collegiality	81
His heresy for denying that Jesus Christ has two natures in one divine Person.....	83
His heresy that Catholics can be in religious communion with undeclared major excommunicates.....	83
His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity	84
Apostate Antipope Eugene IV (1431-1447)	84
His heresies of conciliarism and collegiality	84
His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity	90
Apostate Antipope Pius V (1566-1572)	91
His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity and glorifying the apostate Thomas Aquinas	91
His heresy that men can do good without God's grace	91
Apostate Antipope Pius IX (1846-1878).....	92
His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity and denying the Salvation Dogma.....	92
Apostate Antipope Leo XIII (1878-1903)	92
His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity	92
His heresy for denying the dogma that slavery is ordained by God for just causes.....	93
His apostasy for promoting religious communion with non-Catholics	93
His apostasy and heresy for glorifying Origen and Tertullian.....	94
Apostate Antipope Pius X (1903-1914).....	95
His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity and glorifying Thomas Aquinas	95
His heresy for allowing Catholics to be in religious communion with non-Catholics	95
His heresy that simony no longer bans offenders from holding offices.....	96
Culpability of bishops, theologians, and canon lawyers.....	97
SECRET FORMAL HERETICS CANNOT HOLD OFFICES	97
Hence the secret sin of simony, which is heresy, bans offenders from offices.....	97
Apparent officeholders in Milan in the 11th century did not hold the offices because of simony	99
Benedict IX lost the papal office because of simony	100
Benedict X did not obtain the papal office because of simony	101
Most of the Renaissance nominal popes were simoniacs.....	102

<i>Most simoniacs, like other occult heretics, keep their sin secret</i>	102
APPARENT OFFICEHOLDERS WHO ARE SUSPECT OF HERESY	105
A POPE CAN BE PUT ON TRIAL, JUDGED, AND SENTENCED	105
<i>The Apostolic See cannot be judged by anyone</i>	105
Does not apply to antipopes and presumed antipopes	112
<i>Fourth Council of Constantinople</i>	112
Does not apply to non-officeholders and presumed non-officeholders	114
<i>Canonists and theologians</i>	115
<i>Common sense examples which prove that popes can be tried, sentenced, and punished</i>	117
<i>Popes and antipopes who were put on trial</i>	120
St. Marcellinus (296-304)	120
St. Damasus (366-384).....	120
St. Sixtus III (432-440).....	121
St. Symmachus (498-514).....	121
Vigilius (537-555).....	122
St. Leo III (795-816)	122
Formosus (891-896)	123
John XII (955-964).....	124
PUTATIVE OFFICEHOLDERS AND THEIR PUTATIVE ACTS	126
OFFICEHOLDERS AND THE TE IGITUR PRAYER OF THE MASS	128
<i>The faithful are praying for and not with those mentioned in the Te Igitur prayer</i>	128
Catholic bishops in 430 who were material heretics due to inculpable ignorance	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY	133
APPENDIX	135
<i>Justinian’s Second Imperial Edict against the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia</i>	135
<i>The Anathema on Pope Honorius, and the Genuineness of the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council</i> .	147
<i>Popes can be tried and deposed for many sins, by apostate Thomas Cajetan</i>	169
<i>Acts of St. Felix, Pope and Martyr</i>	173
<i>Acts of Eusebius, Priest of Rome</i>	177

Summary

In this book whenever I speak of a heretic, the same applies to a schismatic. For the sake of brevity, I do not include the schismatic. To be “juridically judged” means to be put on trial and judged and if found guilty to be sentenced and punished. The following is a summary of some of the dogmas touched upon or taught in this book:

- Only members of the Catholic Church (known as the faithful) can hold offices in the Catholic Church.
- Hence non-Catholics cannot hold an office in the Catholic Church because they are not members of the Catholic Church.
- And even catechumens cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church even though they are Catholic because they are not members of the Catholic Church. They adhere to the Catholic Church as non-members. This book deals primarily with non-Catholics not holding offices in the Catholic Church. Therefore, when I use the word Catholic in this book, I am referring to those who are members of the Catholic Church or so-called Catholics who were members of the Catholic Church, and thus I am not referring to catechumens unless otherwise noted.
- A heretic is a baptized person who doubts or denies a dogma or commits a heretical act by sins of omission, commission, or association.
- A formal heretic is guilty of the mortal sin of heresy and thus is not Catholic. Therefore, a Catholic who becomes a formal heretic gets automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church and thus is no longer Catholic.
- Because a formal heretic is not Catholic, he cannot hold an office in the Catholic Church. Hence a Catholic officeholder who becomes a formal heretic is no longer Catholic and thus automatically loses his office. And a nominal Catholic who was a formal heretic before he was elected or appointed to an office does not obtain the office because he was not Catholic.
- All of the faithful (members of the Catholic Church) are obliged to know and believe in all the basic dogmas with no excuses for ignorance. Hence, a so-called member of the Catholic Church who doubts or denies a basic dogma is a formal heretic and thus is not a member of the Catholic Church.
- Simple laymen are only obliged to know and believe the secondary dogmas and deeper dogmas if the circumstances permit. Therefore, if they doubt or deny a secondary dogma or deeper dogma, they are presumed material heretics until their guilt or innocence due to inculpable ignorance is proved.
- Deacons and simple priests are obliged to know and believe in the secondary dogmas. Therefore, if they doubt or deny a secondary dogma, they are presumed formal heretics until their guilt or innocence due to inculpable ignorance is proved. However, they are only obliged to know and believe in the deeper dogmas if the circumstances permit. Hence if they doubt or deny a deeper dogma, they are presumed material heretics until their guilt or innocence due to inculpable ignorance is proved.
- Popes, cardinals, bishops, and theologians are obliged to know and believe in the secondary dogmas and the deeper dogmas that have been infallibly defined by the solemn magisterium. Therefore, if they doubt or deny any of these

dogmas, they are presumed formal heretics until their guilt or innocence due to inculpable ignorance is proved. However, they are only obliged to know and believe in deeper dogmas that have only been infallibly defined by the ordinary magisterium if circumstances permit. Therefore, if they doubt or deny a deeper dogma that has only been infallibly defined by the ordinary magisterium, they are presumed material heretics until their guilt or innocence due to inculpable ignorance is proved.

- Presumed formal heretics are to be treated as formal heretics until it is certain that they are either formal heretics or material heretics. To be treated as a formal heretic, the heretic is presumed to be under a major excommunication and thus presumed to be non-Catholic. Hence all the penalties that apply to formal heretics are presumed to apply to presumed formal heretics. Therefore, so-called officeholders who are presumed formal heretics are presumed to not hold the office until they either prove their innocence due to inculpable ignorance in which case it would be known for certain that they did not lose the office, or until their guilt is proved due to culpable ignorance in which case it would be known
- Presumed material heretics are to be treated as material heretics until it is certain that they are either formal heretics or material heretics. Hence they are to be treated as material heretics and thus are presumed to be of the faithful and thus presumed to not be under a major excommunication. Once culpability or non-culpability is proved, then there is no longer presumption but fact. Hence it is then certain that the so-called offender is either a formal heretic or was a material heretic. Therefore, so-called officeholders who are presumed material heretics are presumed to hold the office until they either prove their innocence due to inculpable ignorance in which case it would be known for certain that they did hold the office, or until their guilt is proved due to culpable ignorance in which case it would be known for certain that they did not hold the office.
- The faithful who have access to a presumed material heretic in their own religious community or other local are obliged to show him the dogma he doubts or denies and tell him he must abjure the heresy and profess the dogma that opposes the heresy. If he does not believe the dogma and thus still holds to the heresy, then it is certain that he is a formal heretic. If he believes the dogma and thus abjures his heresy and professes the dogma, then it is certain that he was a material heretic.
- Because the pope is subject to the dogmas of the Catholic Church and is an officeholder, all that has been said above regarding heretics and officeholders also applies to the pope.
- The Apostolic See (also known as the First See or the Roman See) is the papacy. Hence the Apostolic See consists of all the *valid* acts of the popes and is free from all error and sin and thus cannot be judged by anyone.
- Papal acts consist of teachings, laws, judgments, and commands.
- Any papal act that is illegal, erroneous, or sinful is invalid, null and void, and thus not part of the Apostolic See. Hence illegal, erroneous, or sinful papal acts must be condemned and disobeyed.

- The only papal acts that are always valid and thus protected from all error and sin are infallible definitions of dogmas, infallible condemnations of heresies, and infallible judgments of sinners. Hence all other papal acts are fallible and thus can be illegal, erroneous, or sinful and thus invalid; such as fallible papal teachings on faith or morals, fallible commands, fallible judgments regarding sinners, judgments regarding the holiness of a person, disciplinary laws, and laws governing the State. Therefore, when the pope is not teaching infallibly, he can teach a heresy or perform an act of heresy.
- While the pope can make infallible judgments regarding sinners, he cannot do the same regarding the holiness of a person because men can hide secret sins; whereas, many sins that men commit are manifest and thus can be easily judged.¹
- Papal acts that are illegal or erroneous but not sinful must be judged and rejected, but the pope himself cannot be juridically judged.
- The only time a pope can be juridically judged is when he sins. When the pope sins, he must be juridically judged (that is, judged, sentenced, and punished) just like any other sinner. The sinful pope is juridically judged not in his capacity as the pope (as the supreme judge) but as a sinner. One proof of this is that the pope must confess his sins to a confessor who judges and sentences the pope in the confessional. However, when the pope is acting as the pope (as the supreme judge) and thus not acting as a sinner, he cannot be juridically judged by anyone. This is the meaning of the dogma that the supreme judge cannot be judged by anyone.
- Hence the pope is the supreme ruler of the Catholic Church on earth and thus no one (such as a cardinal or a Catholic king) or a group of persons (such as a council of bishops or the cardinals) has power to override valid papal acts or to make the pope obey them in matters regarding the Catholic Church and faith except when the pope sins and thus is not acting as the pope but as a sinner.
- Catholic or non-Catholic rulers (such as kings) can command a pope to obey them regarding their non-sinful secular laws that do not deal with the Catholic Church and faith. For example, St. Peter, the first pope, submitted to and obeyed the secular rulers of pagan Rome and their non-sinful laws; such as paying taxes to pagan Rome. But no king, pagan or Catholic, can command the pope in matters regarding the Catholic Church and faith.
- Hence the pope has supreme jurisdiction in governing the Catholic Church but does not have supreme jurisdiction in secular governments that are not governed by him. For example, the King of France has supreme jurisdiction in making the secular laws in his governing of France while the pope has supreme jurisdiction in France regarding the governing of the Catholic Church. Only in States that are governed by the pope, such as the Papal States, does the pope have supreme jurisdiction in the secular government.

¹ “Some men's sins are manifest, going before to judgment: and some men they follow after.” (1 Tim. 5:24)

The Dogma That Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church

It is a deeper dogma of the ordinary magisterium and the solemn magisterium that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church. Non-Catholics are not members of the Catholic Church and hence are outside the Catholic Church, and only members of the Catholic Church and thus those who are inside the Catholic Church can hold offices in Her. Hence catechumens also cannot hold offices because they are not members of the Catholic Church even though they are Catholic.

Consequently, idolaters, formal heretics (which includes baptized men who are publicly and obstinately immoral) and formal schismatics (which includes those who are under major excommunication for disobedience) cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church because they are not Catholic. And catechumens cannot hold offices because they are not members of the Catholic Church even though they are Catholic.

Ordinary magisterium

The unanimous consensus of the apostles and other Church Fathers teaches that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church, and thus this is a dogma of the ordinary magisterium from Pentecost Day in AD 33. And it was a deeper dogma of the ordinary magisterium. And it was also a dogma during the Old Testament era that God's chosen people who did not have the faith or were obstinately immoral were banned from holding offices and from legally functioning as priests:

Church Father Isaias: [Because the High Priest Sobna was very wicked, God deposed and replaced him with Eliacim.] "And the voice of the Lord of hosts was revealed in my ears: Surely this iniquity shall not be forgiven you till you die, saith the Lord God of hosts. Thus saith the Lord God of hosts: Go, get thee in to him that dwelleth in the tabernacle, to Sobna who is over the temple: and thou shalt say to him: What dost thou here, or as if thou wert somebody here? for thou hast hewed thee out a sepulchre here, thou hast hewed out a monument carefully in a high place, a dwelling for thyself in a rock... And I will drive thee out from thy station, and depose thee from thy ministry. And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will call my servant Eliacim the son of Helcias, and I will clothe him with thy robe, and will strengthen him with thy girdle, and will give thy power into his hand: and he shall be as a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Juda. And I will lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder: and he shall open, and none shall shut: and he shall shut, and none shall open." (Isa. 22:14, 16, 19-22)

Church Father Ezechiel: "And when the prophet shall err and speak a word...I will stretch forth my hand upon him and will cut him off from the midst of my people Israel." (Ez. 14:9)

Church Father Ezechiel: "The Levites that went away far from me, when the children of Israel went astray, and have wandered from me after their idols, and have borne their iniquity, ...they shall not come near to me to do the office of priest to me, neither shall they come near to any of my holy things that are by the holy of holies: but they shall bear their shame, and their wickednesses which they have committed." (Ez. 44:10, 13)

Church Father Osee: "My people have been silent because they had no knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee that thou shalt not do the office of priesthood to me; and thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children... Israel hath cast off the thing that is good, the enemy shall pursue him. They have reigned, but not by me: they have been princes, and I knew

not: of their silver and their gold they have made idols to themselves, that they might perish.” (Osee 4:6; 8:3-4)

Church Father Malachias: [Officeholders and priests must have the faith and not be obstinately immoral or else they lose their offices and ability to function as priests.] “My covenant was with him of life and peace; and I gave him fear, and he feared me, and he was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips; he walked with me in peace, and in equity, and turned many away from iniquity. For the lips of the priests shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth because he is the angel of the Lord of hosts. But you have departed out of the way and have caused many to stumble at the law; you have made void the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all people, as you have not kept my ways and have accepted persons in the law. Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us? Why then doth every one of us despise his brother, violating the covenant of our fathers? Juda hath transgressed, and abomination hath been committed in Israel and in Jerusalem: for Juda hath profaned the holiness of the Lord, which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god. The Lord will cut off the man that hath done this, both the master and the scholar, out of the tabernacles of Jacob, and him that offereth an offering to the Lord of hosts.” (Mala. 2:5-12)

Jesus Christ: “I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them that are evil, and thou hast tried them who say they are apostles and are not, and hast found them liars.” (Apoc. 2:2) [Hence those who are obstinately evil are false apostles and thus hold no offices and cannot legally function as bishops or priests.]

Church Father St. Paul: “For such false apostles are deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no wonder, for Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light.” (2 Cor. 11:13-14)

Church Father St. Paul: “Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God. Here now it is required among the dispensers that a man be found faithful.” (1 Cor. 4:1-2)

Church Father St. Paul: “Remember your prelates who have spoken the word of God to you; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation.” (Heb. 13:7) [Hence a man who does not have the faith cannot be a prelate because Catholics must not follow him.]

Church Father St. Paul: “But though we [bishops] or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.” (Gal. 1:8)

Church Father St. Paul: “Receive us. We have injured no man, we have corrupted no man, we have overreached no man.” (2 Cor. 7:2) [Hence receive not officeholders who have corrupted men with their heresies and other crimes.]

Church Father St. Paul: “They could not enter in [to offices] because of unbelief.” (Heb. 3:19)

Church Father St. John: “The sheep follow him, because they know his voice. But a stranger they follow not but fly from him because they know not the voice of strangers.” (Jn. 10:4-5) [Therefore, Catholics fly from heretical apparent officeholders because their voice is the voice of strangers. Because Catholics are forbidden to fly from true officeholders and thus must be in governmental communion with them, this is one proof that heretical apparent officeholders cannot hold offices. For example, if a pope were to become a heretic and remain pope, then

Catholics would be forced to fly from the head of the Catholic Church. The truth is that Catholics, in this case, would be flying from a heretical antipope.]

Church Father St. John: “If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him, God speed you. For he that saith unto him, God speed you, communicateth with his wicked works.” (2 Jn. 1:10-11)
[Hence if an apparent pope, bishop, or priest who does not have the faith comes to you, you must not receive him as a pope, bishop, or priest. Reject him, and be not in religious communion with him.]

Church Father St. Cyprian, *Letter 74*, to Magnus, 3rd century: “No heretics and schismatics at all have any power or right...”

Church Father St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, *Against Parmenian (Against the Donatists)*, c. 372: “[Book 1] X. ...Therefore none of the heretics possess either the Keys, which Peter alone received, or the Ring, with which we read that the Fountain has been sealed, nor is any heretic one of those to whom that Garden belongs in which God plants His young trees... XII. ...Rightly hast thou closed the Garden to heretics; rightly hast thou claimed the Keys for Peter; rightly hast thou denied the right of cultivating the young trees to those who are certainly shut out from the Garden and from the Paradise of God; rightly hast thou withdrawn the Ring from those to whom it is not allowed to open the Fountain.”

During the time of the Machabees, Alcimus the chief priest (the pope) lost his office because of idolatry:

“Now one Alcimus, who had been chief priest, but had wilfully defiled himself in the time of mingling with the heathens, seeing that there was no safety for him nor access to the altar... For I [Alcimus] also being deprived of my ancestors’ glory (I mean of the high priesthood) am now come hither.” (2 Mac. 14:3, 7)

Catholic Commentary on 2 Mac. 14:3: “**Alcimus, who had been chief priest:** This Alcimus was of the stock of Aaron, but for his apostasy here mentioned was incapable of the high priesthood.”

Solemn magisterium

431 – Council of Ephesus

From the information I have, the first time the dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church was infallibly defined by a pope and thus became a solemn magisterium dogma was in 432 by Pope St. Sixtus III when he confirmed the Council of Ephesus which was called by Pope St. Celestine in 431. Pope St. Sixtus III infallibly defines that any officeholder who holds a heretical opinion either privately or publicly “is deprived of all power,” “cast out of ecclesiastical communion” and thus is automatically excommunicated, “deprived of all ecclesiastical authority,” and thus he is “deposed.” The formal heretic incurs all of these penalties automatically and thus before any judgment and declaration from a competent authority. He also decrees that the neighboring bishops, provided they are orthodox, can also degrade the deposed heretic from the very rank of bishop by a condemnatory sentence:

Council of Ephesus, 431, called by Pope St. Celestine and confirmed by Pope St. Sixtus III in 432: “The Judgment against Nestorius: ...If any metropolitan of a province dissents from the holy and ecumenical synod and attaches himself to the assembly of the revolvers, or should do so later, or should he have adopted the opinions of Celestius, or do so in the future, such a one is deprived of all power to take steps against the bishops of his province. He is thereby cast out by the synod

from all ecclesiastical communion and is deprived of all ecclesiastical authority. Instead he is to be subjected to the bishops of his own province and the surrounding metropolitans, provided they be orthodox, even to the extent of being completely deposed from the rank of bishop...

“Canon 4: But if some of the clergy should rebel, and dare to hold the opinions of Nestorius or Celestius either in private or in public, it has been judged by the holy synod that they too are deposed. (D. 127)

“Canon 6: Likewise, if any should in any way attempt to set aside the orders in each case made by the holy Synod at Ephesus, the holy Synod decrees that if they be bishops or clergymen, they shall absolutely forfeit their office; and if laymen, that they shall be excommunicated.”

Excommunications and depositions of formal heretics are automatic

Catholics who become formal heretics incur the penalty of automatic (*ipso facto*) excommunication from the Catholic Church and thus do not need to be sentenced by a judge to incur this penalty. They automatically cut themselves off from the Catholic Church and thus become non-Catholics. Automatic penalties are called *latae sententiae* penalties:

Second Council of Constantinople, 553, confirmed by Pope Pelagius, 556: “The heretic, even though he has not been condemned formally by any individual, in reality brings anathema on himself, having cut himself off from the way of truth by his heresy...”

Second Council of Constantinople, 553, confirmed by Pope Pelagius, 556: “Canon 11. If anyone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches, and Origen, as well as their heretical books, and also all other heretics who have already been condemned and anathematized by the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church and by the four holy synods which have already been mentioned, and also all those who have thought or now think in the same way as the aforesaid heretics... let him be anathema.”

Canon Law: “All apostates from the Christian faith, and all heretics and schismatics: (1) are *ipso facto* [automatically] excommunicated.”

The Council of Ephesus’ “Judgment against Nestorius” and Canons 4 and 6 infallibly define that the excommunication and deposition of heretics from their offices takes place automatically and thus without the need for a trial and condemnatory sentence:

Judgment against Nestorius: “[An apparent officeholder who holds the heresy of Nestorius or Celestius] ‘is deprived of all power... cast out...from all ecclesiastical communion and is deprived of all ecclesiastical authority.’”

Canons 4 and 6: “[Apparent officeholders who hold the heresy of Nestorius or Celestius] ‘are deposed’ and ‘absolutely forfeit their offices.’”

Hence when the following Council of Ephesus’ Canon 7 says that heretical apparent officeholders who fall into heresy “shall be deposed” and “shall be removed,” it means *automatically*, the instant they commit the crime, and also by a declaratory sentence for justice and the common good:

Council of Ephesus, 431, called by Pope St. Celestine and confirmed by Pope St. Sixtus III in 432: “Canon 7: When these things had been read, the holy Synod decreed that it is unlawful for any man to bring forward, or to write, or to compose a different Faith as a rival to that established by the holy Fathers assembled with the Holy Spirit in Nicaea. But those who shall dare to compose a different faith, or to introduce or offer it to persons desiring to turn to the acknowledgment of the truth,

whether from Heathenism or from Judaism, or from any heresy whatsoever, shall be deposed, if they be bishops or clergymen; bishops from the episcopate and clergymen from the clergy; and if they be laymen, they shall be anathematized. And in like manner, if any, whether bishops, clergymen, or laymen, should be discovered to hold or teach the doctrines contained in the exposition introduced by the Presbyter Charisius concerning the Incarnation of the Only-Begotten Son of God, or the abominable and profane doctrines of Nestorius, which are subjoined, they shall be subjected to the sentence of this holy and ecumenical Synod. So that, if it be a bishop, he shall be removed from his bishopric and degraded; if it be a clergyman, he shall likewise be stricken from the clergy; and if it be a layman, he shall be anathematized, as has been afore said.”

One proof that a decree regarding heretics which says “they shall be deposed” or “let them be deposed” means not only by a declaratory sentence but also *automatically* upon committing the mortal sin of heresy is the case of the heretic Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople. Before the Council of Ephesus declared Nestorius deposed, Pope St. Celestine on 8/11/430 wrote a letter to St. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, a letter to the clergy of Constantinople, and a letter to John, bishop of Antioch. In these letters he decreed that the instant Nestorius defected from the faith he was automatically excommunicated and automatically deposed.

In his letter to St. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, Pope St. Celestine decreed that the instant Nestorius defected from the faith, he was condemned and fell out of communion with the pope. Therefore Nestorius was automatically excommunicated and automatically lost his office and thus his acts were null and void. He also decreed that if Nestorius does not abjure within a certain period of time, a declaratory sentence of excommunication must be officially pronounced for the common good:

The Church in Crisis: A History of the General Councils, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1961: “[Chapter 3. The General Council of Ephesus] When this dossier reached Rome, Pope Celestine set it before a specially summoned gathering of bishops, and on August 11, 430, he wrote his judgment. This he sent, in the first place, to Cyril. In this letter the pope speaks of Cyril’s communication as a consolation amid his grief at the sermons Nestorius had been preaching. Already, that is, before receiving Cyril’s letter, the pope had handed over these sermons to one of the great scholars of the day, the bilingual John Cassian, to be the basis of a book against Nestorius. But Cyril’s letter, the pope continues, suggests how to cure this terrible evil. To the question about remaining in communion with the bishop of Constantinople, the pope replies that those whom Nestorius had excommunicated because they opposed him remain, nevertheless, in full communion, and those who obstinately follow the path that leads away from the apostolic teaching cannot be ‘in communion with us.’ i.e., the pope. Nestorius, he instructs Cyril, is to be summoned to make a written recantation of his errors, and to declare that his belief about the birth of Christ is what the Church of Rome believes, the church of Alexandria, and the universal Church. And Cyril is charged with the execution of this decision. He is to act in the pope’s place, and, speaking with all the authority of the pope’s see, is to demand this retraction of Nestorius, to be made in writing, within ten days of the notice given. If within this time Nestorius has not complied, he is to be declared expelled from the Church.... The pope leaves it in no doubt, in this as in the other letter, that Nestorius is already condemned; if the pope consents to the case being discussed once more, this is in the hope that the unfortunate man will retract.”

In his letter to John, bishop of Antioch, Pope St. Celestine decreed that from the instant Nestorius defected from the faith, all his acts were null and void. Therefore, Nestorius had automatically lost his office:

Pope St. Celestine, *Letter to John, Bishop of Antioch*, 8/11/430: “The authority of Our Apostolic See has determined that the bishop, cleric, or simple Christian who

had been deposed or excommunicated by Nestorius or his followers, after the latter began to preach heresy, shall not be considered deposed or excommunicated. For he who had defected from the faith with such preachings cannot depose or remove anyone whatsoever..."²

In his letter to the Clergy of Constantinople, Pope St. Celestine decreed that from the instant Nestorius defected from the faith, he lost his office, "left his position of safety," and thus lost his power and authority and hence his acts were null and void:

Pope St. Celestine, *Letter to the Clergy of Constantinople*, 8/11/430: "The authority of our See has expressly defined that no one, whether bishop or cleric or private Christian, who has been deprived either of place or communion by Nestorius or others like him, since they [Nestorius and his followers] began to preach such things [heresy] are really so deprived: for he could neither depose nor remove any one, who himself, in preaching such things, left his position of safety."³

During the Council of Ephesus, the bishops decreed that Nestorius was already condemned by the Council of Nicea in 325:

The Church in Crisis: A History of the General Councils, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1961: "[Chapter 3. The General Council of Ephesus] It was in the name of Nicea that Nestorius had been condemned."

Hence the sentence of deposition against Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus was a declaratory sentence, merely stating for the record and the common good that Nestorius was automatically excommunicated and deposed the instant he became a formal heretic:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Cyril of Alexandria: "For the council [of Ephesus] was bound *by the canons* to depose Nestorius for contumacy, as he would not appear, and *by the letter of Celestine* to condemn him for heresy, as he had not recanted... The council declared that it was 'of necessity impelled' by the canons and by the letter of Celestine to declare Nestorius deposed and excommunicated."

Excommunication, Its Nature, Historical Developments and Effects, by apostate Rev. Francis Edward Hyland: "A declaratory sentence has place only in *latae sententiae* penalties: it is a sentence which officially proclaims that one has committed a delict and consequently has incurred the penalty attached to the commission of the delict. Since such a sentence has place only in *latae sententiae* penalties, that is, penalties which are incurred *ipso facto* by the commission of the delict, it is clear that it does not inflict or impose a penalty; it merely makes manifest the fact that a penalty has already been incurred. A declaratory sentence is never necessary in order that a penalty be incurred, for a *latae sententiae* penalty *ipso facto* binds the delinquent..."

"A condemnatory sentence has place only in *ferendae sententiae* penalties, that is, penalties which require the intervention of a judge or a superior in order that they be incurred. A condemnatory sentence is one in which a judge, or a superior acting in the capacity of judge, imposes a *ferendae sententiae* penalty upon a delinquent for a delict that has been committed and proved. A condemnatory sentence really inflicts or imposes a penalty; prior to such a sentence, the delinquent was not under the penalty; hence, the penalty takes effect only from the moment in which the sentence was pronounced."⁴

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Ecclesiastical Censures: "(1) Censures *latae sententiae* (of sentence pronounced) are incurred *ipso facto* by the commission of the crime: in other words, the delinquent incurs the penalty in the very act of

² E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*: tome I Concilium universale Ephesinum (5 vols.); tome II Concilium universale Chalcedonense (6 vols.), Berlin and Leipzig, 1927-1932.

³ Ibid.

⁴ pt. 2, sec. 2, pp. 50-51.

breaking the law, and the censure binds the conscience of the delinquent immediately without the process of a trial or the formality of a judicial sentence. The law itself inflicts the penalty in the moment when the violation of the law is complete; this kind of penalty is especially effective in the Church, whose subjects are obliged in conscience to obey her laws. If the crime be secret, the censure is also secret, but it is binding before God and in conscience; if the crime be public, the censure is also public; but if the secret censure thus incurred is to be made public, then a judicial examination of the crime is had, and the formal declaration (declaratory sentence) is made that the delinquent has incurred the censure.”

(See in this book “Catholic bishops in 430 who were material heretics due to inculpable ignorance”, p. [130](#).)

451 – Council of Chalcedon

Pope St. Leo the Great, *The Council of Chalcedon*, 451: “The Definition of Faith of the Council of Chalcedon - These things, therefore, having been expressed by us with the greatest accuracy and attention, the holy Ecumenical Synod defines that no one shall be suffered to bring forward a different faith, nor to write, nor to put together, nor to excogitate, nor to teach it to others. But such as dare either to put together another faith, or to bring forward or to teach or to deliver a different Creed to such as wish to be converted to the knowledge of the truth from the Gentiles, or Jews or any heresy whatever, if they be Bishops or clerics let them be deposed, the Bishops from the Episcopate, and the clerics from the clergy; but if they be monks or laics: let them be anathematized.”

553 – Second Council of Constantinople

Second Council of Constantinople, 553, confirmed by Pope Pelagius, 556: “When then these things have been so confessed, which we have received from Holy Scripture, and from the teaching of the Holy Fathers, and from what was defined with regard to one and the same faith by the aforesaid four holy synods, and from that condemnation formulated by us against the heretics and their impiety, and besides, that against those who have defended or are defending the aforementioned three chapters, and who have persisted or do persist in their own error; if anyone should attempt to transmit [doctrines] opposed to those piously molded by us, or to teach or to write [them] if indeed he be a bishop, or belongs to the clergy, such a one, because he acts in a manner foreign to the sacred and ecclesiastical constitutions, shall be stripped of the office of bishop or cleric, but if he be a monk or a layman, he shall be anathematized.” (D. 228)

681 – Third Council of Constantinople

Third Council of Constantinople, called by Pope St. Agatho, confirmed by Pope St. Leo II in 682: “[Definition of the Two Wills of Christ] ... These things, therefore, having been determined by us with all caution and diligence, we declare that no one is permitted to introduce, or to describe, or to compare, or to study, or otherwise to teach another faith. But whoever presumes to compare or to introduce or to teach or to pass on another creed to those wishing to turn from the belief of the Gentiles or of the Jews or from any heresy whatsoever to the acknowledgement of truth, or who (presumes) to introduce a novel doctrine or an invention of discourse to the subversion of those things which now have been determined by us, (we declare)

these, whether they are bishops or clerics, to be excommunicated, bishops indeed from the bishopric, but priests from the priesthood; but if they are monks or laymen, to be anathematized.”

683 to 715 – Papal Coronation Oath

(See in this book “Papal Coronation Oath, c. 683-715,” p. [27](#).)

Nominal Catholics

Even though the quotes in the section are from apostates and thus are invalid, they are nevertheless true regarding the dogma that a non-member of the Catholic Church cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church.

Apostate Antipope Paul IV's Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio

Apostate Antipope Paul IV's in his Bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* of 1559 teaches the deeper dogma that a formal heretic, and hence even a secret one, cannot hold an office even if all Catholics believe he holds the office:

Apostate Antipope Paul IV, Invalid *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, 1559: 3.
...Bishops, Archbishops, Patriarchs, Primate, Cardinals, Legates, Counts, Barons, Marquis, Dukes, Kings or Emperors, who must teach others and give them good example to keep them in the Catholic Faith, when these prevaricate, they sin more gravely than others; for they not only lose themselves, but drag down with them to perdition and the pit of death countless other peoples entrusted to their care and government or otherwise subject to them. Upon advice and consent concerning such as these, through this Our Constitution, which is to remain forever effective, in hatred of such a crime the greatest and deadliest that can exist in God's Church, We sanction, establish, decree and define, through the fullness of Our Apostolic power, that although the aforesaid sentences, censures and penalties keep their force and efficacy and obtain their effect, all and sundry Bishops, Archbishops, Patriarchs, Primate, Cardinals, Legates, Counts, Barons, Marquis, Dukes, Kings and Emperors who in the past have, as mentioned above, have strayed or fallen into heresy or have been apprehended, have confessed or been convicted of incurring, inciting or committing schism or who, in the future, shall stray or fall into heresy or shall incur, incite or commit schism or shall be apprehended, confess or be convicted of straying or falling into heresy or of incurring, inciting or committing schism, being less excusable than others in such matters, in addition to the sentences, censures and penalties mentioned above, (all these persons) shall also automatically, without any exercise of law or application of fact, be completely and entirely forever deprived of and furthermore disqualified from and incapacitated for their rank; their Cathedrals, even Metropolitan and Patriarchal ones; Primatial Churches; honor as Cardinals; position as any sort of Legate; active or passive voice and all authority; and Monasteries, benefices and Church offices, with or without the care of souls, whether secular or regular of any Order whatever which they may have obtained in any way, by any Apostolic grant or concession by title, life-long tenure as administrators, or otherwise, and in which or to which they have any right; likewise, any yearly fruit, yield or produce reserved or assigned to them or similar fruit, yield or produce; also any County, Barony, Marquisate, Dukedom, Kingdom or Empire.

“6. Further, if ever at any time it becomes clear that any Bishop, even one conducting himself as an Archbishop, Patriarch, or primate; or any Cardinal of the

aforesaid Roman Church, even as mentioned, a Legate; or likewise any Roman Pontiff before his promotion or elevation as a Cardinal or Roman Pontiff, has strayed from the Catholic Faith or fallen into some heresy, or has incurred schism, then his promotion or elevation shall be null, invalid and void. It cannot be declared valid or become valid through his acceptance of the office, his consecration, subsequent possession or seeming possession of government and administration, or by the putative enthronement of or homage paid to the same Roman Pontiff, or by universal obedience accorded him, or by the passage of any time in said circumstances, [nor shall it be held as quasi-legitimate.] It shall not be considered to have given or to give any power of administration in matters spiritual or temporal, to such persons promoted as Archbishops, Patriarchs or primates or elevated as Cardinals or as Roman Pontiff. Rather, each and every one of their statements, deeds, enactments, and administrative acts, of any kind, and any result thereof whatsoever, shall be without force and shall confer no legality or right on anyone. The persons themselves so promoted and elevated shall, *ipso facto* and without need for any further declaration, be deprived of any dignity, position, honor, title, authority, office and power, without any exception as regards those who might have been promoted or elevated before they deviated from the faith, became heretics, incurred schism, or committed or encouraged any or all of these.”

Therefore even secret formal heretics are banned from holding offices in the Catholic Church. Hence, even if a so-called pope is unanimously elected, enthroned, and given “universal obedience” and thus believed to be the pope by every Catholic in the world, he is not the pope if he fell into the mortal sin of heresy and thus was a formal heretic before his election.

Canons 188, n4 and 2265, §1 of the invalid and heretical 1917 Code of Canon Law

Apostate Antipope Benedict XV, invalid and heretical *Code of Canon Law*, 1917: “Canon 188, n. 4: There are certain causes which effect the tacit resignation of an office, which resignation is accepted in advance by operation of law, and hence is effective without any declaration. These causes are: ... (4) if he has publicly defected from the Catholic faith.

“Canon 2265, §1. Every excommunicated person whatsoever... is incapable of acquiring dignities, offices...or any position in the Church.”

Heretics are removed from the diptychs

The diptychs are tablets on which the names of the pope, local bishop, and other prominent Catholics were listed and prayed for during the offertory of the Mass, which now occurs in the *Te igitur* prayer of the Mass. The people whose names were listed in the diptychs were acknowledged as members of the Catholic Church:

American Ecclesiastical Review, edited by apostate Rev. H. J. Heuser, 1890: “The Diptychs, tablets on one of which are inscribed the names of the pope and patriarchs and bishops who govern the various churches, and on the other the names of those who died in communion with the Church.”⁵

Missale Mixtum: “The purpose and chief use of the diptychs was to retain Catholic communion both of the living with one another and of the living with the dead.”⁶

⁵ Published by Fr. Pustet & Co., New York. V. 3, 1890, Variations in the Rites of the Church, p. 83.

⁶ *Missale Mixtum*, PL 85:541, note: “Finis est usus praecipuus diptychorum erat ut retineretur catholic communio tum vivorum inter se, tum vivorum et mortuorum.”

The Fathers of the Church, edited by apostate Roy J. Deferrari, 1955: “Footnote 1: The practice of commemorating the names of the living and dead civil officials and clerics, martyrs and confessors, the faithful departed was well established long before Augustine’s time. Names were sometimes inscribed on ornate tables of wood, metal, or ivory, called diptychs; where the list was long, a book was used. Cf. *Conf.* 9.13.37; *Sermo* 273.7.; Cyprian, *Epistolae* 1,9; also, F. Cabrol, ‘Dyptiques’ *DACL* 4 cols. 1045-1094.”⁷

Heretics, including nominal popes, are removed from the diptychs

One proof of the dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church is the historical fact that officeholders who became heretics or schismatics were removed from the diptychs because they were no longer considered Catholic and thus no longer considered to hold the office:

Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, translation and notes by Richard Price and Michael Gaddis, 2005: “**Diptychs:** Lists of names of the living and the dead read out at the Eucharist. The removal of names of living bishops was the standard way of breaking off communion with them.”⁸

Pope St. Hormisdas, *Libellus Professionis Fidei*, 517: “The names of those separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is, those not agreeing with the Apostolic See, shall not be read during the sacred mysteries.” (D. 172)

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Diptych: “The liturgical use of diptychs offers considerable interest. In the early Christian ages it was customary to write on diptychs the names of those, living or dead, who were considered as members of the Church, a signal evidence of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints... The ‘diptychs of the living’ would include the names of the pope, bishops, and illustrious persons, both lay and ecclesiastical, of the benefactors of a church, and of those who offered the Holy Sacrifice. To these names were sometimes added those of the Blessed Virgin, of martyrs, and of other saints... Whatever their immediate purpose, the liturgical diptychs admitted only the names of persons in communion with the Church; the names of heretics and of excommunicated members were never inserted. Exclusion from these lists was a grave ecclesiastical penalty; the highest dignity, episcopal or imperial, would not avail to save the offender from its infliction.”

Hence the removal of heretics and schismatics from the diptychs applies even to the “highest dignity” and thus to popes:

Apostate Antipope Benedict XIV, *Ex Quo*, 1756: “Wherefore where commemorations are customarily made in the sacred liturgy, the Roman Pontiff should be first commemorated, then one’s own Bishop or Patriarch, provided they are Catholic. But if either or both of them are schismatics or heretics, they should by no means be commemorated.”⁹

Therefore popes who became heretics or schismatics had their names removed from the diptychs and were not mentioned in the *Te Igitur* prayer of the Mass.

⁷ Imprimatur: + Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, 1955. Published by Fathers of the Church, Inc., New York, 1955. V. 27, St. Augustine’s Faith and Works, c. 45, p. 200.

⁸ *Translated Texts for Historians*, Vol. 45. Published by Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 2005. Glossary, p. 206.

⁹ *Ex Quo*, par. 9, *Bullarium* 11:296. He quotes the first admonition from the earlier *Euchologium*: “... ‘Cum igitur in sacra Liturgia commemorationes fieri soleant, oportet primum quidem Romani Pontificis commemorationem agi, deinde proprii Episcopi, et Patriarchae, dummodo Catholici sint. Quod si alter eorum, vel ambo sint schismatici, sive haeretici, eorum commemoratio nequaquam fiat.’”

The heretics Bishop Acacius' and Antipope Anastasius II's names
were removed from the diptychs

Pope St. Felix III condemned the bishop of Constantinople, Acacius, as a schismatic and heretic and had his name removed from the diptychs. Two popes later, Pope Anastasius II became a formal heretic and formal schismatic for entering into religious communion with the Acacian schismatics and the monophysite heretics and thus automatically lost his office and hence was no longer the pope. All Catholics, then, removed his name from the diptychs and Te Igitur prayer of the Mass and separated from him:

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, LII. Anastasius II (496-498): “Anastasius, by nationality a Roman, son of Peter, from the 5th district, Tauma, of the Caput Tauri, occupied the see 1 year, 11 months, and 24 days... He set up the confession of blessed Lawrence, the martyr, of silver, weighing 80 lbs. At that time many of the clergy and of the priests withdrew themselves from communion with him, because without consulting the priests or the bishops or the clergy of all the Catholic Church he had communicated with a deacon of Thessalonica, Photinus by name, who was of the party of Acacius, and because he desired secretly to reinstate Acacius and could not. And he was struck dead by divine will.”

(See in this book “Anastasius II (496-498),” p. [50](#).)

The heretic Antipope Vigilius' name was removed from the diptychs

In 553 the holy Emperor Justinian rightly removed the putative Pope Vigilius' name from the diptychs when Vigilius became a heretic for defending the heretical Three Chapters and thus became a heretical antipope. (See in this book “Justinian deposes the formal heretic Vigilius, removes his name from the diptychs, and intends to elect a pope,” p. [66](#).)

The heretic Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia's name was removed from the diptychs

The heretic Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia's name was removed from the diptychs long before he was condemned at the Second Council of Constantinople. And Theodore was dead when he was condemned at that council. The diptychs of churches were kept over the years so that one could trace the past popes, patriarchs, and local bishops who held the offices and died in communion with the Catholic Church. For example, those who held that the heretic Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia was not a heretic were proved wrong primarily by Theodore's own writings but also by the diptychs of Theodore's dioceses in which his name was not found among the bishops who died in communion with the Catholic Church and thus his name had been removed:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “In preparation for the intended great Council, the Emperor [Justinian] caused a kind of Synod [at Mopsuestia in 550] of the bishops of Cilicia II to be held at Mopsuestia in order to ascertain whether the name of Theodore of Mopsuestia had been entered on the diptychs there. The Acts of this Synod are found in the minutes of the fifth session of the fifth Ecumenical Synod [the Second Council of Constantinople], at which they were read.¹⁰ The first document referring to this assembly is the letter of the Emperor Justinian, dated May 23, 550 (not May 13, as Noris gives it), to Bishop John of Justinianopolis, metropolitan of Cilicia II, to the effect that he would come to Mopsuestia to meet the bishops belonging to his Synod, and then have a meeting with all the aged people there, clergy and laity, in

¹⁰ Footnote 1: “Mansi, t. ix. pp. 274-289; Hardouin, t. iii. pp. 128-134. Cf. Noris, t. i. 605 sqq.”

order to learn whether they could remember the time at which the name of Theodore had been struck from the diptychs. If they could not do this, they might declare that, in their knowledge, the name of Theodore had never been read out at divine service; finally, the diptychs were to be exhibited in their presence, and in the presence of the bishops, in order to see who had been inscribed in them instead of Theodore. A messenger with intelligence of the result of this inquiry should be sent to the Emperor, and another to the Pope...

“Thereupon the Defensor of the Church of Mopsuestia, the deacon Eugenius, presented seventeen aged priests and deacons, and the same number of aged laymen of distinction (among them *comites* and *palatini*) from Mopsuestia; and the Custos of the church effects, the priest John, brought in the diptychs, as well those which were then used in the church as two older which had formerly been used. These diptychs were first publicly read, then each bishop read them individually, and then the presbyter John took oath that he knew of none besides or older than these. In the same way the aged witnesses were required to make declarations on oath, laying their hands upon the book of the Gospels.

The first and oldest, the priest Martyrius, declared: ‘I am now eighty years old, for sixty years in Orders, and do not know and have never heard that Theodore’s name was read from the diptychs;’¹¹ but I heard that, instead of his name, that of S. Cyril of Alexandria had been inscribed, and the name of Cyril does, in fact, occur in the present diptychs... The Theodore, however, whose name is found in two diptychs, in the place before the last, is certainly not the older one, but the bishop of Mopsuestia who died only three years ago, and who was a native of Galatia.’ The like was deposed by all the other witnesses, clergy and laymen; whereupon the bishops, in somewhat prolix discourse, brought together the results of these testimonies and of the examination of the diptychs, namely, that at a time beyond the memory of any living man, the Theodore in question had been struck from the diptychs, and Cyril of Alexandria inscribed in his place. This declaration was subscribed by all the bishops, and also the two documents required of them for the Emperor and Pope, in which they communicated the principal contents of the minutes of the Synod.^{12...13}

“[From the First Session of the Second Council of Constantinople, 553] Direct your attentions to the impious writings of Theodore [of Mopsuestia], and especially to his Jewish Creed which was condemned at Ephesus and Chalcedon. You will thence see that he and his heresies have since been condemned, and that therefore his name has long since been struck from the diptychs of the Church of Mopsuestia... Nor could they say that Theodore had died in the communion of the Church, for only he who held the true faith until death died in Church communion.”¹⁴

Manifest heretics are removed from the diptychs before a trial

In cases where an apparent officeholder’s heresy is public, his name is removed from the diptychs before any trial, judgment, or declaration from a competent authority, which is one proof that formal heretics automatically lose their office and presumed formal heretics are presumed to have automatically lost their office:

Excommunication, Its Nature, Historical Developments and Effects, by apostate Rev. Francis Edward Hyland, 1928: “The faithful have at times separated

¹¹ Footnote 1: “Accordingly the name of Theodore could no longer have stood in the diptychs in the youth of Martyrius, i.e., about A. D. 480.”

¹² Footnote 2: “Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 276-289; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 124-134.”

¹³ v. 4, c. 1, sec. 262 (Synod of Mopsuestia, 550), pp. 265-267.

¹⁴ v. 4, c. 2, sec. 267, pp. 300-301, 310.

themselves from the communion of their pastors, and bishops from the communion of their primates, because of deviations in faith or discipline.^{15,16}

For example, as soon as the heretic Bishop Nestorius manifested his heresy in church during a sermon, St. Eusebius (a layman who later became a priest) and other laymen denounced Nestorius as a heretic, left the church, and removed his name from their diptychs. And others did the same as soon as it was certain that Nestorius was a heretic:

The Liturgical Year, by apostate Abbot Gueranger, 1927: “[February 9, St. Cyril of Alexandria] ...It was then that Satan produced Nestorius, crowned with a fictitious halo of sanctity and knowledge. This man, who was to give the clearest expression to the hatred of the serpent for the woman, was enthroned in the Chair of Constantinople amid the applause of the whole East... The joy of the good was of short duration. In the very year of his exaltation, on Christmas Day 428, Nestorius, taking advantage of the immense concourse which had assembled in honour of the Virgin Mother and her Child, pronounced from the Episcopal pulpit the blasphemous words: ‘Mary did not bring forth God; her Son was only a man, the instrument of the Divinity.’ The multitude shuddered with horror. Eusebius, a simple layman, rose to give expression to the general indignation, and protested against this impiety. Soon a more explicit protest was drawn up and disseminated in the name of the members of this grief-stricken church, launching an anathema against anyone who should dare to say: ‘The Only-begotten Son of the Father and the Son of Mary are different persons.’ This generous attitude was the safeguard of Byzantium, and won the praise of Popes and Councils. When the shepherd becomes a wolf, the first duty of the flock is to defend itself... In the treasure of revelation there are essential doctrines which all Christians, by the very fact of their title as such, are bound to know and defend. The principle is the same whether it be a question of belief or conduct, dogma or morals. [In the face of] treachery like that of Nestorius... it may happen that some pastors keep silence for one reason or another in circumstances when religion itself is at stake. The true children of Holy Church at such times are those who walk by the light of their baptism, not the cowardly souls who, under the specious pretext of submission to the powers that be, delay their opposition to the enemy in the hope of receiving instructions which are neither necessary nor desirable.”

The Supplication to the Emperor of the Monks of Constantinople, 5th century: “Some of the most respected priests have often and openly in public assembly accused Nestorius, who occupies this episcopal see (if, however, it is licit to call him bishop, for the fact that he continues to deny, with obstinate resolve, that Christ by nature is true God and that the holy Virgin is the Mother of God). These same priests have cut off communion with him, and to this day are still not in communion; some have secretly removed themselves from his fellowship; others from among the most sanctified of priests have been denied their faculty to preach for the reason that, in this holy diocese of Irene by the Sea, they attacked the perverse doctrine which was again sprouting forth. It therefore happened that, as the people were seeking the traditional preaching of the Faith, they publicly cried out: ‘An Emperor we have, but no bishop.’”¹⁷

All this was done before Nestorius was brought to trial by a competent authority. If these Catholics had not denounced Nestorius as a heretic and removed themselves from religious communion with him, then they would have been formal heretics themselves and thus not Catholic.

¹⁵ Footnote 111: “Cf. DeSmedt, *Dissertationes Selectae in Primam Aetatem Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, diss. II, cap. III, n. 20.”

¹⁶ *Nihil Obstat*: + Thomas J. Shahan, S.T.D., J.U.L., *Censor Deputatus*, Washington, D.C., die XV Maii, 1928. Imprimatur: + D. Card. Dougherty, Archiepiscopus Philadelphiensis, Philadelphiae, die XXII Maii, 1928. Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies No. 49. Chap. 2, p. 31.

¹⁷ Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Florence, 1760), Tom. IV, col. 1103.

Even though Basil the Great Wretch was an apostate, he and other bishops knew the dogma that Catholics are forbidden to knowingly be in communion with heretics even before any judgment and sentence from a judge:

Apostate Basil the Wretch, *Letter 99*, to Count Terentius, 4th century: “The truest cause is my sins, which always rise before me and always hamper my steps. Then, again, there is the alienation of the bishop who had been appointed to cooperate with me, why, I know not; but my right reverend brother Theodotus, who promised from the beginning to act with me, had cordially invited me from Getusa to Nicopolis. When however he saw me in the town, he was so shocked at me, at me so afraid of my sins, that he could not bear to take me either to morning or evening prayer. In this he acted quite justly so far as my deserts go, and quite as befits my course of life, but not in a manner likely to promote the interests of the churches. His alleged reason was that I had admitted the very reverend brother Eustathius to communion. What I have done is as follows. When invited to a meeting held by our brother Theodotus, and wishful, for love’s sake, to obey the summons, that I might not make the gathering fruitless and vain, I was anxious to hold communication with the aforementioned brother Eustathius. I put before him the accusations concerning the faith, advanced against him by our brother Theodotus, and I asked him if he followed the right faith to make it plain to me that I might communicate with him; if he were of another mind, he must know plainly that I should be separated from him.”

Persons who have been removed or re-added to the diptychs after death

It is a dogma, denied by some at the time of the condemnation of the Three Chapters in the 6th century, that heretics can be condemned after death. In order to try to protect the reputation of the heretic Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia after his death, these heretics did not want him to be condemned even though they knew he believed in heresy until the day he died. The holy Emperor Justinian refuted this heresy:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “Whilst, further, some rejected the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia as impious, but would not anathematise his person, this is contrary to the word of Holy Scripture, which says: ‘For the ungodly and his ungodliness are both alike hateful unto God’ (Wis. 14:9). When, however, they say that Theodore should not be anathematised after his death, they must know that a heretic who persists in error until his end is rightly punished in this manner forever, and even after his death, as it happened with Valentinus, Basilides, and others... Even Judas had communicated with the apostles, notwithstanding which the apostles rejected him after his death, and elected another in his place...

“Finally, we must refer to S. Augustine when, after the death of Cecilian, it was maintained that he had done something contrary to ecclesiastical order and some (the Donatists) had separated themselves from the Church on that account, Augustine wrote to Boniface (Epist. 185, n. 4), ‘If that were true which was charged against Cecilian, I should anathematise him even after his death.’ Moreover, a canon of the African Synod requires that bishops who bequeath their property to a heretic shall be anathematised even after their death (see sec. 84, c. 15). Further, Dioscurus was anathematised by the Church in Old Rome after his death, although he had not offended against the faith,¹⁸ but on account of a violation of ecclesiastical order...

“In order to weaken the further objection of the opponents, that no dead man should be anathematised, the deacon Photinus read several passages from Cyril; and

¹⁸ Footnote 1: “Not Dioscurus of Alexandria, but the antipope of that name, A.D. 580.”

the African bishop, Sextilian, declared that the old African Synods had decreed that those bishops who left their property to heretics should be anathematised even after their death; Augustine, too, had expressed himself in a letter in favour of the lawfulness of anathematising one who is dead (see sec. 263). In proof three passages were read from Augustine, upon which Bishop Benignus of Heraclea remarked that, as a matter of fact, many had been anathematised after their death, e.g. Valentinus, Mercian, Apollinaris, etc., and many Eusebians. In agreement with this, Babulas of Edessa had anathematised Theodore of Mopsuestia after his death, and so had the Roman Church Dioscurus, bishop of Rome (antipope), after his death, although he had never offended against the faith.^{19,20}

If an officeholder is condemned as a heretic after his death, then his name is removed from the diptychs. Similarly, officeholders who in their lifetime were unjustly or wrongly condemned as heretics and thus had their names removed from the diptychs had their names restored to the diptychs after their death when it was discovered that they were innocent:

Pope St. Leo the Great, *The Council of Chalcedon*, 451, Session I, Extracts from the Acts: “Consider the absurd assertion that heretics ought not to be anathematized after their deaths; and we exhort you further to follow in this matter the doctrine of the holy Fathers, who condemned not only living heretics but also anathematized after their death those who had died in their iniquity, just as those who had been unjustly condemned they restored after their death and wrote their names in the sacred diptychs; which took place in the case of John and of Flavian of pious memory, both of them bishops of Constantinople.”

The heretic Antipope Honorius’ name was removed from the diptychs after he died

The heretic Antipope Honorius, who died in 638, is an example of an apparent pope who was condemned after his death in 681 at the Third Council of Constantinople as an excommunicated heretic and whose name was thus removed from the diptychs. Thirty-two years after the end of this council, the heretic Emperor Philippicus Bardanes ordered Honorius’ name to be restored to the diptychs:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “The new Emperor, Philippicus Bardanes, persecuted orthodoxy and the sixth Ecumenical Synod. He had also ordered that the names of Sergius and Honorius, and the others anathematised by the sixth Ecumenical Synod [Greek text] should be restored to the diptychs.”^{21,22}

Hence Honorius’ name had been removed from the diptychs. (See in this book “Honorius (625-638),” p. [70](#).)

A Pope Can Become an Idolater or a Formal Heretic and Thus Lose His Office

A pope can commit any sin that other men commit. If he commits the mortal sin of heresy by culpably doubting or denying a dogma, then he is a formal heretic and thus automatically

¹⁹ Footnote 2: “Mansi, t. ix. pp. 259-263; Hardouin, t. iii. pp. 112-114. Cf. sec. 263.”

²⁰ v. 4, b. 14, c. 1, sec. 263, pp. 276-277; c. 2, sec. 270, p. 309.

²¹ Footnote 2: “Combefis, *Novum Auctuarium*, t. ii. p. 204; Mansi, t. xii. p. 190.”

²² v. 5, b. 16, c. 2, sec. 324, p. 199.

excommunicated from the Catholic Church, is no longer Catholic, and hence automatically loses his office.

The dogma

Pope St. Hormisdas, 517

It is an ordinary magisterium dogma from Pentecost Day in AD 33 and a solemn magisterium dogma from at least AD 431 at the Council of Ephesus that all officeholders (and thus the pope) can become heretics and thus be automatically excommunicated. Pope St. Hormisdas in 517 in his following infallible decree confirmed the dogma that a pope, indeed, can become a formal heretic:

Pope St. Hormisdas, The Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, *Libellus Professionis Fidei*, added to the epistle *Inter ea Quae* to the bishops of Spain, 517: “We anathematize all heresies... But if I [the pope] shall attempt in any way to deviate from my profession, I confess that I am a confederate in my opinion with those whom I have condemned.” (D. 172)

Papal Coronation Oath, c. 683-715

In view of the condemnation of Honorius as a heretic and his heretical teachings at the Third Council of Constantinople, and in order to protect the papacy and Catholics from popes who fall into heresy, an addition was made to the Papal Coronation Oath between 683 and 715 in which the pope condemns Honorius and his heresy and professes that if he (the pope) teaches heresy he will be automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church.²³ Because this is a profession of faith composed by a pope and made mandatory for future popes to take during their coronation, it is infallible:

Papal Coronation Oath, c. 683-715: “We anathematize with perpetual damnation the authors of this error and its favorers. The authors of this new heretical dogma [Monothelitism] were Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, together with Honorius who added fuel to the corrupt assertions of the heretics... whose heretical dogma contradicted the true faith...

“I Vow: ...To guard the holy canons and decrees of the Popes, as likewise the Divine Ordinances of Heaven, because I am conscious of Thee, Whose place I take through the grace of God, Whose Vicarship I possess with Thy support, being subject to the severest accounting before Thy divine tribunal over all that I confess. ...If I should undertake to act in anything of contrary sense, or should permit that it will be executed, Thou wilt not be merciful to me on the dreadful day of Divine Justice. Accordingly, without exclusion, we subject to the severest ban of excommunication anyone, be it ourself or be it another, who would dare to undertake anything new in contradiction to this constituted evangelic tradition and the purity of the Orthodox Faith and the Christian Religion, or would seek to change anything by his opposing efforts, or would concur with those who undertake such blasphemous venture.”²⁴

²³ It is also an ordinary magisterium dogma from Pentecost Day in AD 33 and a solemn magisterium dogma from at least AD 431 that a pope who becomes a non-Catholic (either by idolatry, the mortal sin of heresy, or any other way) automatically loses his office. (See in this book “The Dogma That Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church,” p. 12.)

²⁴ *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*; PL 105, cols. 50-52, 43 [I Vow], 54 [If I should undertake]. Footnote f: “*Second Profession*. This displays three characteristics, by which the author is not improbable to discern. 1) He professes that the one elected is to agree to the vows. 2) The profession is very well written, so clearly handed down by the traditions of the Catholic Councils, he explains, in

This Papal Coronation Oath also contained a profession of faith in all of the previous ecumenical councils and a condemnation of all of the heresies and heretics condemned in those councils. It is said that the first papal coronation oath was composed in the 5th century. Additions were made to it thereafter, the last being added at the end of the 8th century:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum: “It contains models...for the profession of faith... The formularies and models set down are taken from earlier papal documents, especially those of Gelasius I (492-6) and Gregory I (590-604). This collection was certainly compiled in the chancery of the Roman Church, but probably a comparatively small number of the formularies contained in the extant manuscripts were included at first, the remainder being added from time to time. There is no systematic arrangement of the formularies in the manuscripts. In its final form,...the Liber Diurnus dates back to the eighth century. Concerning the more exact determination of the date of its compilation, there is even a still great diversity of opinion. Gamier gives in his edition the year 715... Roziere, to whom we owe the first good edition (see below), decides for the period 685 to 751—the former date, because Emperor Constantine Pogonatus (died 685) is mentioned as dead, and the latter, because in 715 Northern Italy was conquered by the Lombards and the Byzantine administration at Ravenna came to an end (see Introduction, pp. 25 sqq.). Sickel, however, in his ‘Prolegomena’ and in his researches on the Liber Diurnus (see below), has shown that the work possesses by no means a uniform character. He recognizes in it three divisions, the first of which he ascribes to the time of Honorius I (625-38). The second to the end of the seventh century, and the third to the time of Hadrian I (772-95). Duchesne (Bibliothèque de l’Ecole des Chartes, LII, 1891. pp. 7 sqq.) differs from Sickel, and maintains that the original version of most of the formularies, and among them the most important, must be referred to the years after 682, and that only the last formularies (nn. lxxxvi-xcix) were added in the time of Hadrian I, though some few of these may have existed at an earlier date... These investigations have established beyond doubt that the collection had already attained its present form towards the end of the eighth century...”

The Oath was taken until the 11th century and then hidden

This papal coronation oath was taken by all the popes during their coronation until the 11th century:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “In the *Liber Diurnus*, i.e., the Formulary of the Roman Chancery (from the fifth to the eleventh century), there is found the old formula for the papal oath, probably prescribed by Gregory II (at the beginning of the eighth century), according to which every new Pope, on entering upon his office, had to swear that ‘he recognised the sixth Ecumenical Council, which smote with eternal anathema the originators of the new heresy (Monothelism), Sergius, Pyrrhus, etc., together with Honorius, *quia pravis haeticorum assertionibus fomenium impendit*.’^{25,26}

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum: “A miscellaneous collection of ecclesiastical formularies used in the papal chancery until the eleventh century. It contains models...for the profession of faith... The Liber Diurnus was used officially in the papal chancery until the eleventh century, after which time, as it no longer corresponded to the needs of papal administration,

order that we hardly discover anything not handed down by the Ancient Forefathers. 3) It was published after the death of Constantine Pogonati and before the collection of the Diurnum. Constantine died at the end of the year 685, the collection of the Diurnum was in the year 715. After the death of Constantine, the gathering of the Diurnum took thirty years, the established time interval.”

²⁵ Footnote 2: “*Liber Diurnus*, ed. Eugene de Roziere, Paris, 1869, No. 84.”

²⁶ v. 5, b. 16, c. 2, sec. 324, p. 187.

it gave way to other collections. Twelfth century canonists, like Ivo of Chartres and Gratian, continued to use the Liber Diurnus, but subsequently it ceased to be consulted, and was finally completely forgotten.”

History of the Christian Church, by Philip Schaff, 1885: “The condemnation of...Honorius was inserted in the confession of faith which every newly-elected pope had to sign down to the eleventh century, and which is embodied in the Liber Diurnus, i.e., the official book of formulas of the Roman Church for the use of the papal curia.^{27,28}

Hence popes and apostate antipopes from the 11th century onward broke with infallible tradition and started their own tradition, a tradition of men, which ignored or rejected the infallible papal coronation oath taken by all the popes before then in which they professed belief in the previous ecumenical councils and condemned all of the heresies and heretics condemned in these councils. These new popes and apostate antipopes would have nothing of this papal coronation oath and thus did not take it upon their entry or pretended entry into the papacy. From that time forward, the heresies of non-judgmentalism and non-punishmentalism made steady progress. After all, the Great Apostasy began in that century when Satan was released from his prison in 1033.²⁹ Of course, for the Great Apostasy to succeed, the apostate so-called officeholders had to remain in their so-called offices in order to spread their corruption far and wide.

The Roman Breviary in the 16th century removed the condemnation of Honorius

In the 16th century, apostate antipopes removed the condemnation of Honorius contained in the Roman Breviary:

“The Petrine Claims at the Bar of History,” 1879: “In the office of the Roman Breviary for June 28, the feast of S. Leo II, the name of Pope Honorius was included for some centuries in the lessons of the second nocturn amongst those Monothelite heretics who were condemned by the sixth General Council. The lesson has been falsified, ever since the sixteenth century, by omitting Honorius’s name; but the older editions, when not actually mutilated with a knife, exhibit it still.”³⁰

Pope Honorius Before the Tribunal of Reason and History, by apostate Paul Bottalla, S.J., 1868: “Mr. Renouf remarks in his pamphlet that ‘till the seventeenth century the Roman Breviary spoke of the confirmation by Pope Leo II of the holy Sixth Synod, in which were condemned Cyrus, Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, qui unam voluntatem et operationem in Domino Jesu Christo dixerunt et prædicarunt.’³¹ We must warn our readers not to fall into a very possible mistake here: it would be incorrect to suppose that the name of Honorius is mentioned in *all* the old Latin Breviaries among the persons condemned by the Sixth Synod. In some very old Breviaries of this country no name at all is found, either of Honorius or of the others condemned in that Council. In the Sarum Breviary of the fourteenth century we read, in the lessons for the feast of St. Leo: ‘Hic Leo suscepit Sextam Synodum, quæ per Dei providentiam celebrata est, simulque cum eo legati Sedis Apostolicæ et duo Patriarchæ, id est Constantinopolis et Antiochiæ, etiam 150 Episcopi; in qua condemnati sunt hæretici qui unam tantum voluntatem et

²⁷ Footnote 636: “In this Confession the popes are required to anathematize ‘*Sergium ... una cum Honorio, qui pravis eorum assertionibus fomentum impendit.*’ Lib. Diurn, cap. II, tit. 9, professio 2. The oath was probably prescribed by Gregory II at the beginning of the eighth century.”

²⁸ Published by Christian Ethereal Library, Grand Rapids, MI. V. 4, c. 11, §113, p. 505.

²⁹ See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy*.

³⁰ Contained in *Church Quarterly Review*, published by Spottiswoode & Co. London, 1879. V. 8, April, p. 20.

³¹ Footnote 72: “The Condemnation of Pope Honorius, p. 6.”

operationem in Domino Jesu Christo dicebant.³² In the Aberdeen Breviary, which is of the fifteenth century, we find the following words: ‘Leo suscepit Sextam Synodum intra regium palatium Constantini Magni tum viventis, in qua condemnati sunt haeretici qui dixerunt unam tantum esse voluntatem et operationem in Christo.’³³

“As to the Roman Breviary, we think it well to transcribe here the whole passage as it exists in the old Breviary,³⁴ for Mr. Renouf does not give us the entire extract. It runs as follows: ‘In qua [Synodo] condemnati sunt Cyrus, Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, et Petrus, nec non et Macarius, cum suo discipulo Stephano, sed et Polychronius, Novus, et Simon, qui unam voluntatem et operationem in D. N. J. C. dixerunt vel praedicarunt, aut qui denuo praedicaturi fuerint [fuerant] aut dispensaverint [dispensaverant].’³⁵

The Papal Coronation Oath resurfaced in the 17th century and was suppressed, edited, or changed

When the Papal Coronation Oath resurfaced in the 17th century, apostate antipopes were quick to suppress, edit, or change it because it indicted and condemned them as automatically excommunicated antipopes, just as Honorius was:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum: “The Liber Diurnus... was finally completely forgotten. Lucas Holstenius (d. 1661) was the first who undertook to edit the Liber Diurnus. He had found one manuscript of it in the monastery of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme at Rome, and obtained another from the Jesuit College de Clermont at Paris: but as Holstenius died in the meantime and his notes could not be found, this edition printed at Rome in 1650 was withheld from publication, by advice of the ecclesiastical censors, and the copies put away in a room at the Vatican. The reason for so doing was apparently formula lxxxiv. which contained the profession of faith of the newly elected pope, in which the latter recognized the Sixth General Council and its anathemas against Pope Honorius for his Monothelism. The edition of Holstenius was reprinted at Rome in 1658 but was again withdrawn in 1662 by papal authority, though in 1725 Benedict XII permitted the issue of some copies. From the Clermont manuscript, which has since disappeared, Garnier prepared a new edition of the Liber Diurnus (Paris, 1680), but it is very inaccurate and contains arbitrary alterations of the text. In his ‘Museum Italicum’ (I. n, 32 sqq.) Mabillon issued a supplement to this edition of Garner. From these materials, the Liber Diurnus was reprinted at Basle (1741), at Vienna (1762), and by Migne (P. L., CV. Paris, 1851). The first good edition, as stated above, we owe to Eug. de Roziere (Liber Diurnus ou Recueil des formules usitees par la Chancellerie pontificale du V^e au XI^e siecle. Paris, 1869). In the interest of this edition Danenberg and Renan compared Garnier’s text with the Vatican manuscript, then regarded as the only authentic one. From this manuscript Th. von Sickel prepared a critical edition of the text: ‘Liber Diurnus Rom. Pont. ex unico codice Vaticano denuo ed.’ (Vienna, 1889). Just after the appearance of this work, however, Ceriani announced the discovery of a new manuscript, originally from Bobbio. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan; towards the end this was more complete than the Vatican manuscript. This text was published by Achille Ratti (Milan. 1891).”

(See in this book “Beware of the papal idolaters, heretics, and liars who excuse Honorius,” p. [75.](#))

³² Footnote 73: “We quote from a MS. copy of the Sarum Breviary preserved in the library of Stonyhurst College.”

³³ Footnote 74: “Aberdense Breviarium, pars aestiva, fol x.”

³⁴ Footnote 75: “We use the two editions of Rome 1478 and Paris 1511.”

³⁵ Publisher: Burns, Oates, and Company, London, 1868. C. 4, pp. 122-223.

Several apostate canonists, theologians, and antipopes

Several apostate canonists, theologians, and antipopes believed the dogma that a pope can fall away from the faith by heresy or idolatry. And they believed the dogma that if he does, he automatically loses his office. But they only held these dogmas as allowable opinions and thus not as dogmas and hence were heretics on this point alone. And the ones who teach that a pope cannot fall into heresy are not only heretics but also liars because several nominal popes have fallen into heresy (such as Liberius, Honorius, and Vigilius), as well as all of the nominal popes since Innocent II down till today. The canonists, theologians, and antipopes mentioned in the following quotes were not only formal heretics but also idolaters for glorifying philosophy or mythology since they were scholastics and thus also humanists. Nevertheless, their teachings that a pope can fall away from the faith by heresy or idolatry and thus automatically lose his office are true, which all the more indicts them and the nominal officeholders in the days they lived:

Protector of the Faith, by apostate Thomas M. Izbicki, 1981: “[c. 3, p. 61] Canon law included several references to popes who had fallen into heresy... In terms borrowed from the canonist Huguccio [d. 1210], Olivi argued that any pope who contradicted an infallible, irreformable decree of a predecessor fell from his see because of his errors... [c. 4, p. 90] Turrecremata..., adopting the doctrine of Huguccio,... thought that the pope could automatically lose his see through doctrinal deviation... [c. 3, pp. 69-70] Guided by traditional ideas on papal heresy or by his own experience of the Schism, the Dominican [anti-]cardinal did not leave the matter entirely in God’s hands... If the pope attempted to teach false doctrine—Turrecremata’s argument was drawn from Huguccio rather than Terreni—the Pontiff would fall from his see *ipso facto*:

‘If the Roman pontiff becomes a heretic, he falls from Peter’s chair and see by the very fact of falling from Peter’s faith. Consequently, a judgment rendered by such a heretic is not the judgment of the apostolic see.’

“This recourse to Huguccio’s doctrine allowed him to separate the infallible see from the fallible person who might embrace false doctrine.³⁶ And Turrecremata even gave up his flirtation with Terreni’s ideas on papal infallibility, dismissing them as unacceptable:

‘Some say that “God would not permit the pope to fall into heresy, or anything contrary to the faith: but would prevent him by death, by resistance of other believers, by the instruction of others or by internal inspiration, or by other means.” But we give another explanation...namely, that if the Roman pontiff should fall into a condemned heresy, by the very fact that he falls from Peter’s faith, he falls from Peter’s chair and see.’³⁷

³⁶ Footnote 99: “ ‘Si Romanus pontifex efficitur haereticus ipso facto quo cadit a cathedra, et sede Petri, et per consequens iudicium quod faceret talis haereticus non esset iudicium apostolicae sedis immo nec iudicium alicuius auctoritatis est dicendum aut momenti, quia cum per heresim cadisset a praelatione per consequens auctoritate iudicande privatus esset,’ SE 2. 112. 260v. Tierney, *Foundations*, pp. 58-67; Tierney, ‘ “Only the Truth Has Authority,” ’ pp. 75-76.”

³⁷ Footnote 100: “ ‘Rationem assignat quidem dicentes, quia “deus non permetteret eum diffinire haeresim, aut aliquid contra fidem, sed prohibet eum aut per mortem, aut per aliam fidelium resistentiam, aut per aliorum instructionem, aut per internam inspirationem, aut per alios modos secundum quos Dei ecclesie sancte, et fidei unitati multipliciter provided potest” [Terreni, *Quaestio*, p. 26]. Nos vero aliam rationem damus, quare neganda est illa minor, videlicet quia si Romanus pontifex incideret in haeresim damnatum, et ita effectus haereticus, ipso facto *quo* cadat a fide Petri, cadit a cathedra et sede Petri, et per consequens iudicium quod faceret talis haereticus, non esset iudicium apostolicae sedis. Immo nec iudicium alicuius auctoritatis esset dicendum, aut momenti; quia cum per haeresim cecidisset a praelatione, per consequens auctoritate iudicandi privatus esset,’ CSD C24.q1.c14 (3:271). Turrecremata criticized Terreni for trying to exculpate Anastasius II, see CSD D19.c9 (1:174-67). Izbicki, ‘Infallibility and the Erring Pope.’ ”

“[c. 4, p. 85] The pope was not exempt from divine law and natural law³⁸ ... A heretic pope, as Johannes Teutonicus [d. 1252] had noted, fell under any condemnation of false doctrine issued by a previous pontiff³⁹ ...”⁴⁰

Apostate Antipope Innocent III, *Sermon 4*, 1198: “The Roman Pontiff has no superior but God. Who, therefore, (should a pope ‘lose his savor’) could cast him out or trample him under foot—since of the pope it is said ‘gather thy flock into thy fold’? Truly, he should not flatter himself about his power, nor should he rashly glory in his honor and high estate, because the less he is judged by man, the more he is judged by God. Still the less can the Roman Pontiff glory, because he can be judged by men or rather, can be shown to be already judged, if, for example, he should wither away into heresy; because he who does not believe is already judged. In such a case it should be said of him: ‘If salt should lose its savor, it is good for nothing but to be cast out and trampled under foot by men.’ ”

Apostate Antoninus, *Summa Theologica*, 1459: “In the case of the pope becoming a heretic, he would find himself, by that fact alone and without any other sentence, separated from the Church... A pope who would be separated from the Church by heresy, therefore, would by that very fact itself cease to be head of the Church. He could not be a heretic and remain pope, because, since he is outside of the Church, he cannot possess the keys of the Church.”⁴¹

Apostate Thomas Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “[Chapter 17] ... When the pope becomes a heretic, he is deprived of the papacy *ipso facto* by divine law, according to which the distinction between believers and unbelievers is made. When he is deposed by the Church on this account, it is not the pope who is either judged or deposed, rather he who has been judged already because he does not believe (in accordance with what the Lord says in John 3:18) and who already has been deposed, since, having become an unbeliever, he has been removed by his own will from the body of the Church...

“Next, in regard to the consequences of being outside the faith and the Church, many texts can be cited saying that, as a result of being outside the faith and the Church, the sheep become and are outside the communion of the faithful, without the keys, power, honor, the pastoral office. (The following texts) banish heretics from the communion of the faithful. First, the Lord says, *Depart from the tents of these wicked men* (Num. 16:26), namely, the schismatics Dathan and Abiram, for it is obvious that all heretics are schismatics. Then Paul says, *If an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema* (Gal. 1:8), and, *We charge you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly and not according to the tradition which they have received* (2 Thess. 3:6), and *Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. What participation hath justice, with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness? What concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?* (2 Cor. 6:14-15). Finally, John the evangelist says, *If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him, ‘God speed you.’* (2 John 1:10)

³⁸ Footnote 61: “ ‘Papa totius ecclesiae princeps solidus sit legibus quoad vim coartivam . . . Lex autem non habet vim coactivam nisi ex principis potestae,’ JdT, *Proposito ad Dietam Norimbergensis*, Mansi 31A 41-62 at at 57: ‘Cum ergo Romanus pontifex princeps ecclesiae sir nullius ecclesiae legibus coactus sive tenetur obnoxius, notanter dicimus ecclesiae, quia aliud est de legibus iuris divini et naturalis,’ SE 3.51, 336v. See SE 2:64.187v, 3:36.318r, 3:49.333r, 3:51.336v; CSD C25 qlc6 (3:315). See also Norr, *Panormitanus*, pp. 46-50; Thomson, ‘Roselli’s *Monarchia*,’ pp. 448-49; Antony Black, ‘The Political Ideas of Conciliarism and Papalism, 1430-1450,’ *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 20 (1964): 58-59; Brian Tierney, ‘The Prince Is Not Bound by the Laws: Accursius and the Origins of the Modern State,’ in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di studi Arcursiani*, ed. Guido Rossi (Milan, 1968), 3:388-400.”

³⁹ Footnote 62: “ ‘His est casus in quo papa papam ligare potest in quo papa in canonem late sententiae incidit. Nec huic obviat regula: par parem solvere vel ligare non potest: quia si papa haereticus est in eo quod haereticus est minor quolibet catholico, haec glossa,’ SE 2.102.241v. See CSD C25.q1.c1 (3:312-13). Tierney, *Foundations*, p. 253.”

⁴⁰ *Protector of the Faith* (Cardinal Johannes de Turrecremata and the Defense of the Institutional Church), by apostate Thomas M. Izbicki. Publisher: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981.

⁴¹ *Summa Theologica*, cited in Actes de Vatican I. V. Frond pub.

“Ambrose explains the loss of the keys in pastoral matters, found in c. *Verbum* (De poen. D. 1 c. 51), ‘The Lord wished there to be equal power to bind and loose’; and he adds, ‘It is certain that both are licit for the Church; heresy has neither.’ Cyprian proclaims loss of honor and power in c. *Novatianus* (C. 7 q. 1 c. 6), ‘Whoever observes neither the unity of the Spirit nor the communion of peace and separates himself from the bond of the Church and the college of priests can have neither the power nor the honor of a bishop.’ And he says in c. *Didicimus* (C. 24 q. 1 c. 31), ‘All heretics and schismatics entirely lack power and right.’ Gelasius says the same in c. *Achatius* (C. 24 q. 1 c. 1). ... Thomas [Aquinas]⁴² expressly says the same thing, insisting that the power of spiritual jurisdiction does not remain with heretics in respect of either its exercise or its substance, so that, whatever they may have done, nothing is achieved. Augustine⁴³ denies [heretics] the office of feeding sheep in the sermon on the shepherds, dealing with the text *Feed thy goats* (Cant. 1:7), saying, ‘To Peter, who remains, is said, *Feed My sheep* (John 21:17); to the heretic, who departs, *Feed thy goats*.’ And he repeats the same opinion in the letter to Vincentius.^{44, 45}

Apostate Alphonsus de Liguori, 19th century: “If ever a pope, as a private person, fell into heresy, he would at once fall from the pontificate.”⁴⁶

Apostate Antipope Benedict XV, invalid and heretical *Code of Canon Law*, 1917: “Canon 188, n. 4: There are certain causes which effect the tacit resignation of an office, which resignation is accepted in advance by operation of law, and hence is effective without any declaration. These causes are: ... (4) if he has publicly defected from the Catholic faith.

“Canon 2265, §1. Every excommunicated person whatsoever... is incapable of acquiring dignities, offices... or any position in the Church.”

Some popes and nominal popes who became idolaters or formal heretics

The history of the papacy also teaches the dogmas that a pope can become a formal heretic or idolater and that if he does he automatically loses his office, as some popes have done.

Apostate Antipope Hadrian VI (1459-1523): “If by the Roman Church you mean its head or pontiff, it is beyond question that he can err even in matters touching the faith. He does this when he teaches heresy by his own judgement or decretal. In truth, many Roman pontiffs were heretics. The last of them was Pope John XXII (d. 1334).”⁴⁷

Protector of the Faith, by apostate Thomas M. Izbicki, 1981: “The classic cases of papal heresy were those of Anastasius II and Marcellinus, both mentioned in the *Decretum*, and of Pope Honorius I, cited in a *palea*.^{48, 49}

And many nominal popes were never popes at all because they were not Catholic before they were elected or appointed to the papacy, such as all the nominal popes from Innocent II in 1130 onward, all of whom were and are apostate antipopes.

⁴² Footnote 160: “II II, q. 39 a. 3: Opera (Parma), vol. 3, p. 155.”

⁴³ Footnote 161: “Sermon 46, XV, 37: CC 41.565.”

⁴⁴ Footnote 162: “Letter 93, IX, 29: PL 33-336.”

⁴⁵ Contained in *Conciliarism and Papalism*, edited by J. H. Burns and Thomas M. Izbicki, 1997. C. 1 (Cajetan: On the comparison of the authority of pope and council), pp. 74-76.

⁴⁶ *Oeuvres Completes*, 9:232.

⁴⁷ *Quaest. in IV Sent.*; quoted in Viollet, *Papal Infallibility and the Syllabus*, 1908.

⁴⁸ Footnote 98: “Nicholas de Tudeschis (Panormitanus), *Consilia, tractatus, questiones, el practica* (Venice, 1621), fol. 4vb.”

⁴⁹ c. 4, p. 92.

St. Marcellinus (296-304)

He was an idolater for making an offering to a false god

Pope St. Marcellinus (296-304) taught by example that a pope loses his office for public acts of heresy. While he was the pope, he fell into idolatry by offering up two grains of incense to a false god. He knew either by Catholic common sense or by the teachings of the Church Fathers that he was not eligible to retain the office of the papacy and hence deposed himself, submitted to the judgment of a council, abjured, confessed his sin, was re-elected to the papacy, and died as a saint and martyr:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Pope St. Marcellinus: “The biography of Marcellinus in the ‘Liber Pontificalis,’ which probably alludes to a lost ‘passio’ of his, relates that he was led to the sacrifice that he might scatter incense, which he did. But after a few days he was seized with remorse, and was condemned to death by Diocletian with three other Christians, and beheaded... The lost ‘passio’ of Marcellinus written towards the end of the fifth century, which was utilized by the author of the ‘Liber Pontificalis,’ shows that he was honoured as a martyr at that time; nevertheless his name appears first in the ‘Martyrology’ of Bede, who drew his account from the ‘Liber Pontificalis’ (Quentin, ‘Les martyrologes historiques,’ 103, sq.). This feast is on 26 April. The earlier Breviaries, which follow the account of the ‘Liber Pontificalis’ concerning his lapse and his repentance, were altered in 1883.”

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, XXX. Marcellinus (296-304): “He was bishop in the time of Diocletian and Maximian, from July 1 in the 6th consulship of Diocletian and the 2nd of Constantius (A.D. 296) until the year when Diocletian was consul for the 9th time and Maximian for the 8th (A.D. 304). At that time was a great persecution, so that within 30 days 17,000 Christians of both sexes in divers provinces were crowned with martyrdom. For this reason Marcellinus himself was haled to sacrifice that he might offer incense, and he did it. And after a few days, [Footnote 2] inspired by penitence, he was beheaded by the same Diocletian and crowned with martyrdom for the faith of Christ...”

Footnote 2: “A single manuscript contains the following more detailed account. ‘And after a few days a synod was held in the province of Campania in the city of Sessana, where with his own lips he professed his penitence in the presence of 180 bishops. He wore a garment of haircloth and ashes upon his head and repented, saying that he had sinned. Then Diocletian was wroth and seized him and bade him sacrifice to images. But he cried out with tears, saying, “It repenteth me sorely for my former ignorance,” and he began to utter blasphemy against Diocletian and the images of demons made with hands. So, inspired by penitence, he was beheaded,’ etc. Sessana is a corrupt form of the name Sinuessa. The modern town is called Rocca di Mandragone. See on the story of this council and the apostasy of Marcellinus, Introduction, p. ix. Petilianus, a Donatist bishop, with whom Augustine had a controversy, is the earliest authority for Marcellinus’ defection. Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, vol. I, p. lxxiv; Mommsen, *Lib. Pont.*, pp. liv, lv. Petilianus says that Marcellinus not only offered incense but also surrendered the sacred books to be burned. Augustine in reply is non-committal... Augustine, *Contra Litteras Petilianis*; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, vol. 43, cols. 323, 328.”

Jacobus de Voragine’s *The Golden Legend* was banned by name because it favorably quotes banned books, such as apocryphal texts. Nevertheless, it tells the truth about Pope St. Marcellinus’ apostasy, loss of office, repentance, re-election to the papacy, and martyrdom:

The Golden Legend, by Jacobus de Voragine, 13th century: “60. Saint Marcellinus, Pope - Marcellinus ruled the Church of Rome for nine years and four months. By order of Emperors Diocletian and Maximian he was taken prisoner and brought forward to offer sacrifice. At first he refused and was threatened with various kinds of torture, and for fear of the threatened suffering he put down two grains of incense in sacrifice to the gods. This gave great joy to the infidels but caused the faithful immense sadness. However, under a weak head, strong members rise up and make little of the threats of princes; so the faithful came to the pope and reproached him severely. He realized the gravity of his error... The pope, repentant, lamented his fault and deposed himself, but the whole gathering immediately re-elected him. When the emperors heard of this, they had him arrested again. He absolutely refused to offer sacrifice, so they sentenced him to beheading. Then the persecution was renewed with such fury that in one month seventeen thousand Christians were put to death. When Marcellinus was about to be beheaded, he declared himself unworthy of Christian burial and excommunicated all who might presume to bury him. Thus his body lay above ground for thirty-five days. At the end of that time the apostle Peter appeared to Marcellus, who had succeeded as pope, and said: ‘Brother Marcellus, why do you not bury me?’ Marcellus replied: ‘Have you not yet been buried, my lord?’ Peter: ‘I consider myself unburied as long as I see Marcellinus unburied!’ ‘But don’t you know, my lord,’ Marcellus asked, ‘that he laid a curse on anyone who buried him?’ Peter: ‘Is it not written that he who humbles himself shall be exalted? You should have kept this in mind! Now go and bury him at my feet!’ Marcellus went straightaway and carried out the orders laudably.”⁵⁰

Pope St. Marcellinus’ deposition of himself was declaratory in nature, even if he may not have known it, merely declaring what had already automatically occurred as soon as he apostatized. It is certain that he knew that a so-called pope who is a formal heretic or idolater cannot hold the papal office. And it is certain that if he did not repent, the faithful would not have venerated him as the pope nor been in religious communion with him but instead would have condemned as an idolatrous antipope.

Stephen (254-257)

He held the heresy that baptisms outside the Catholic Church are efficacious

Even though Firmilianus was an apostate because he was a follower and glorifier of Origen, he nevertheless has truthful and useful information about Stephen’s heresy regarding the sacrament of baptism.

In their letters St. Cyprian and the apostate Firmilianus say that the so-called Pope Stephen held the heresy that there is remission of sins outside the Catholic Church. They say that Stephen taught the heresy that the sacrament of baptism bestows sanctifying grace when administered outside the Catholic Church by non-Catholic ministers to non-Catholics who are preparing to enter their non-Catholic Churches or sects. If this evidence is true, then Stephen was a formal heretic and hence was not the pope from the time he held this heresy. This heresy is condemned by the ordinary magisterium and the solemn magisterium.

The only evidence against Stephen is from St. Cyprian and Firmilianus because all of Stephen’s letters regarding this topic have been lost or most probably destroyed to protect Stephen’s reputation by covering up his heresy:

⁵⁰ v. 1, pp. 248-249.

History of Dogmas, by apostate J. Tixeront, 1913: “In the letters of St. Cyprian and Firmilian... [to Stephen]... we cannot but regret that Stephen’s reply is lost; it would perhaps lighten up points that are obscure...

“[Footnote 3] Some authors think and say that, although St. Cyprian made a mistake on the subject of the dispute, yet, as far as proceedings go, he played the better part. Perhaps they might be less peremptory in their opinion if they would observe that, as we do not possess the Pope’s answer, we know what was his way of acting, after all, only through his adversaries, St. Cyprian and Firmilian...”⁵¹

What may have led Stephen into this heresy was the legitimate dispute regarding the validity of the sacrament of baptism when administered outside the Catholic Church to non-Catholics. Some, such as St. Cyprian and Firmilianus, held the allowable opinion that the sacrament is not valid outside the Catholic Church and thus those baptized into heretical sects had to be re-baptized in order to enter the Catholic Church. Others held the allowable opinion that the sacrament was valid and thus those baptized in heretical sects were not to be re-baptized when entering the Catholic Church but only the bishop’s hands were to be laid upon them. From the information I have, this dispute was not infallibly settled until 314 at the Council of Arles, when St. Cyprian and Firmilianus were already dead, and again in 325 at the First Council of Nicea, and again in 382 at the First Council of Constantinople. These councils infallibly defined that the sacrament of baptism administered outside the Catholic Church by non-Catholic ministers to non-Catholics is valid provided the proper form and matter are used, but it is not legal and thus does not give the grace of the sacrament nor membership in the Catholic Church. Hence it only gives the indelible mark, also known as the character of baptism:

First Council of Arles, 314: “Canon 8. Concerning the Africans, because they use their own law so as to rebaptize, it has been decided that, if anyone from a heretical sect come to the Church, he should be asked his creed, and if it is perceived that he has been baptized in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, only the hand should be imposed upon him, in order that he may receive the Holy Spirit. But if upon being questioned he does not answer this Trinity, let him be baptized.” (D. 53)

Hence these converts who were validly baptized in their non-Catholic sects did not receive the Holy Spirit and thus did not receive sanctifying grace unless they converted, abjured from their heresy and sect, and a Catholic bishop imposed his hands upon them, at which point they became members of the Catholic Church and received the Holy Spirit and sanctifying grace. Hence their valid baptism outside the Catholic Church did not give them sanctifying grace nor membership in the Catholic Church.

By declaring that the ordinations of the Cathars were valid, the First Council of Nicea declared by implication that their baptisms were also valid. If their ordinations were valid, then their baptisms had to be valid because an unbaptized man cannot become a priest:

Pope St. Sylvester, *First Council of Nicea*, 325: “Canon 8. Concerning those who have given themselves the name of Cathars, and who from time to time come over publicly to the Catholic and Apostolic Church, this holy and great synod decrees that they may remain among the clergy after receiving an imposition of hands...”

And the First Council of Constantinople infallibly decreed that the baptisms of the Arians and several other heretics are valid:

First Council of Constantinople, 382 AD: “Canon 7. Those who embrace orthodoxy and join the number of those who are being saved from the heretics, we receive in the following regular and customary manner: Arians, Macedonians, Sabbatians, Novatians, those who call themselves Cathars and Aristae, Quartodeciman or Tetradites, Apollinarians—these we receive when they hand in statements and

⁵¹ v. 1, c. 11, pp. 372, 369 (footnote 3).

anathematise every heresy which is not of the same mind as the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church of God. They are first sealed or anointed with holy chrism on the forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth, and ears. As we seal them we say: 'Seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit.'”

Hence, by at least 325 it was a dogma that the sacrament of baptism administered outside the Catholic Church to non-Catholics is valid provided the proper form and matter are used and thus it bestows the indelible mark but does not bestow sanctifying grace and membership in the Catholic Church. These gifts are only given when those who are validly baptized outside the Catholic Church convert and enter the Catholic Church.

However, it was always a dogma, and thus from Pentecost Day in AD 33, that there is no remission of sins outside the Catholic Church. Hence it was always a dogma that the sacrament of baptism administered outside the Catholic Church to non-Catholics does not give membership in the Catholic Church, bestow sanctifying grace, and remit sins and the punishment due to sins. The denial of this dogma by the heretic Antipope Stephen caused St. Cyprian and Firmilianus to rightly and justly condemn Stephen. Instead of abjuring his heresy, Stephen got angry with St. Cyprian and Firmilianus and threatened to excommunicate them:

St. Cyprian, *Epistle 73*, to Pompey, 3rd century: “7. ...The birth of Christians is in baptism, while the generation and sanctification of baptism are with the spouse of Christ alone, who is able spiritually to conceive and to bear sons to God; where and of whom and to whom is he born, who is not a son of the Church, so as that he should have God as his Father before he has had the Church for his Mother? But as no heresy at all, and equally no schism, being without, can have the sanctification of saving baptism, why has the bitter obstinacy of our brother Stephen broken forth to such an extent as to contend that sons are born to God from the baptism of Marcion; moreover, of Valentinus and Apelles, and of others who blaspheme against God the Father; and to say that remission of sins is granted in the name of Jesus Christ where blasphemy is uttered against the Father and against Christ the Lord God?”

“8. In which place, dearest brother, we must consider, for the sake of the faith and the religion of the sacerdotal office which we discharge, whether the account can be satisfactory in the day of judgment for a priest of God who maintains, and approves, and acquiesces in the baptism of blasphemers, when the Lord threatens and says, ‘And now, O ye priests, this commandment is for you: if ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart to give glory unto my name, saith the Lord Almighty, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings.’ Does he give glory to God who communicates with the baptism of Marcion? Does he give glory to God who judges that remission of sins is granted among those who blaspheme against God? Does he give glory to God who affirms that sons are born to God without, of an adulterer and a harlot? Does he give glory to God who does not hold the unity and truth that arise from the divine law but maintains heresies against the Church? Does he give glory to God who, a friend of heretics and an enemy to Christians, thinks that the priests of God, who support the truth of Christ and the unity of the Church, are to be excommunicated? If glory is thus given to God, if the fear and the discipline of God is thus preserved by His worshippers and His priests, let us cast away our arms; let us give ourselves up to captivity; let us deliver to the devil the ordination of the Gospel, the appointment of Christ, the majesty of God: let the sacraments of the divine warfare be loosed: let the standards of the heavenly camp be betrayed: and let the Church succumb and yield to heretics, light to darkness, faith to perfidy, hope to despair, reason to error, immortality to death, love to hatred, truth to falsehood, Christ to Antichrist! Deservedly thus do heresies and schisms arise day by day, more frequently and more fruitfully grow up, and with serpents’ locks shoot forth and cast out against the Church of God with greater force the poison of their venom: whilst, by the advocacy of some, both authority and support are afforded them: whilst their baptism is defended, whilst

faith, whilst truth, is betrayed: whilst that which is done without against the Church is defended within in the very Church itself.”

Apostate Firmilianus, Bishop of Caesarea, *Letter 74*, to St. Cyprian against the Letter of Pope Stephen, 3rd century: “8. And as Stephen and those who agree with him contend that putting away of sins and second birth may result from the baptism of heretics, among whom they themselves confess that the Holy Spirit is not; let them consider and understand that spiritual birth cannot be without the Spirit... 12. Moreover, what is the meaning of that which Stephen would assert, that the presence and holiness of Christ is with those who are baptized among heretics?...

“14. But if the baptism of heretics can have the regeneration of the second birth, those who are baptized among them must be counted not heretics, but children of God. For the second birth, which occurs in baptism, begets sons of God. But if the spouse of Christ is one, which is the Catholic Church, it is she herself who alone bears sons of God. For there are not many spouses of Christ, since the apostle says, ‘I have espoused you, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ;’ and, ‘Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people, for the King hath greatly desired thy beauty;’ and, ‘Come with me, my spouse, from Lebanon; thou shalt come, and shalt pass over from the source of thy faith;’ and, ‘I am come into my garden, my sister, my spouse.’ We see that one person is everywhere set forward, because also the spouse is one. But the synagogue of heretics is not one with us because the spouse is not an adulteress and a harlot. Whence also she cannot bear children of God; unless, as appears to Stephen, heresy indeed brings them forth and exposes them, while the Church takes them up when exposed and nourishes those for her own whom she has not born, although she cannot be the mother of strange children. And therefore Christ our Lord, setting forth that His spouse is one, and declaring the sacrament of His unity, says, ‘He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.’ For if Christ is with us, but the heretics are not with us, certainly the heretics are in opposition to Christ; and if we gather with Christ, but the heretics do not gather with us, doubtless they scatter...

“16. But what is the greatness of his error, and what the depth of his blindness, who says that remission of sins can be granted in the synagogues of heretics, and does not abide on the foundation of the one Church which was once based by Christ upon the rock...

“17. And in this respect I am justly indignant at this so open and manifest folly of Stephen, that he who so boasts of the place of his episcopate, and contends that he holds the succession from Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church were laid, should introduce many other rocks and establish new buildings of many churches... Stephen, who announces that he holds by succession the throne of Peter, is stirred with no zeal against heretics when he concedes to them not a moderate but the very greatest power of grace, so far as to say and assert that, by the sacrament of baptism the filth of the old man is washed away by them, that they pardon the former mortal sins, that they make sons of God by heavenly regeneration, and renew to eternal life by the sanctification of the divine laver. He who concedes and gives up to heretics in this way the great and heavenly gifts of the Church, what else does he do but communicate with them for whom he maintains and claims so much grace? And now he hesitates in vain to consent to them, and to be a partaker with them in other matters also, to meet together with them, and equally with them, to mingle their prayers and appoint a common altar and sacrifice.

“18. ‘But,’ says he, ‘the name of Christ is of great advantage to faith and the sanctification of baptism, so that whosoever is anywhere so-ever baptized in the name of Christ immediately obtains the grace of Christ.’...22. ...Stephen is not ashamed to assert and to say that remission of sins can be granted by those who are themselves set fast in all kinds of sins...[and] in the house of death.”

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Firmilian: “It is important that Firmilian enables us to gather much of the drift of...Stephen’s letter... ‘I am justly indignant with Stephen’s obvious and manifest silliness, that he so boasts of his position and claims that he is the successor of St. Peter on whom were laid the foundations of the Church, yet he brings in many other rocks and erects new buildings of many Churches when he defends with his authority the baptism conferred by heretics, for those who are baptized are without doubt numbered in the Church, and he who approves their baptism affirms that there is among them a Church of the baptized... Stephen, who declares that he has the Chair of Peter by succession, is excited by no zeal against heretics’ (c. xvii). ‘~~You have cut yourself off—do not mistake—~~since he is the true schismatic who makes himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity. For in thinking that all can be excommunicated by you, you have cut off yourself alone from the communion of all’ (c. xxiv).”

Firmilianus correctly says that Stephen has cut himself off from the Catholic Church, and he implies that Stephen cannot thus be the pope but only “claims that he is the successor of St. Peter” and “declares that he has the Chair of Peter.” One sign that the heretic Antipope Stephen did not abjure his heresy is that God killed him before he could excommunicate St. Cyprian and Firmilianus and replaced him with Pope St. Sixtus II who was friendly with St. Cyprian. Pope St. Sixtus II did not hold Stephen’s heresy and understood the dilemma regarding the legal dispute over the validity or non-validity of baptisms outside the Catholic Church, which included a proper understanding of the difference between these baptisms being valid but not efficacious, in which some who did not understand the difference could be led into the heresy which Stephen held; that is, that these baptisms bestowed sanctifying grace. Hence Pope St. Sixtus II understood St. Cyprian’s concern while allowing the legal debate on validity or non-validity to continue:

History of Dogmas, by apostate J. Tixeront, 1913: “It is hard to say what might have happened had Stephen survived. But he died on August 2, 257. While maintaining the custom of his Church, his successor Xystus II (August 30, 257- August 6, 258) did not deem it wise to urge, as much as Stephen, its acceptance by the dissenting Bishops; this was also the mind of his advisers, as well as that of Dionysius of Alexandria. Although agreeing on the whole, it seems, with Rome, the latter did not think that the question was such as to justify them to pass by the view of important Councils and break off with half of the Church. He had already written in this sense to Pope Stephen;⁵² he wrote also to Xystus II⁵³ and to two Roman priests, Dionysius and Philemon,⁵⁴ the first of whom was destined soon to ascend St. Peter’s chair...

“Although, as we have said, the question was not solved solemnly in the third century, yet peace was made between the successor of Stephen, Xystus II, and St. Cyprian,⁵⁵ and between the successor of Xystus II, Dionysius, and the Church of Caesarea in Cappadocia.”⁵⁶

I am working on a book titled *The Vindication of St. Cyprian*, but there are many things I must do first and thus do not know when or if it will be completed and published.

⁵² Footnote 1: “EUSEB., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 4; 5, 1, 2.”

⁵³ Footnote 2: “EUSEB., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 5, 3-6; 9.”

⁵⁴ Footnote 3: “EUSEB., *Eccl. Hist.*, VII, 5, 6; 7.”

⁵⁵ Footnote 1: “PONTIUS, *Cypriani vita*, 14 (HARTEL, *S. Cypriani opera*, III, p. cv); cf. *Ep. LXXX*, I”
⁵⁶ v. 1, c. 11, sec. 2, pp. 371, 375.

Liberius (353-366)

Summary

- 353 – Liberius is elected to the papacy and does not hold the Arian heresy.
- 355 – Pope Liberius defends the faith, opposes the Arian Emperor Constantius, refuses to excommunicate St. Athanasius, and is sent into exile.
- 357 – After two years in exile, Liberius falls away from the faith and becomes an Arian and excommunicates St. Athanasius.
- 357 – After Liberius becomes a formal heretic and thus automatically loses his office, Felix II, a Catholic, is elected to the papacy.
- 358 – The Arian antipope Liberius returns to Rome by order of the Arian heretic Constantius, Constantius deposes the Catholic Pope Felix II, Liberius assumes the role of the pope, and both begin a persecution against the Christians.
- 358 – Pope St. Felix II is beheaded and dies as a martyr. He reigned as pope for 1 year, 3 months, and 2 days. Damasus, who would be the next pope, buries his body reverently.
- 358-366 – Liberius dies in 366. Some say that Liberius remained an Arian until his death, others say that he repented and abjured and thus became Catholic. Even if he had abjured and become Catholic, that would not have made him the pope since he would have to have been re-elected to the papacy.
- 366 – The next pope, Damasus I, condemns Liberius as a heretical antipope and declares his acts as an antipope null and void.
- 14th century – Apostate Antipope Gregory XIII revises the Roman Martyrology, and there is an investigation regarding Felix II as to whether he was a pope and martyr or not. If not, his name is to be removed from the martyrology. Theologians hold opposing opinions. During the investigation, a miracle occurs in which Felix II's body is discovered in the church of Cosmas and Damian and on his tomb is inscribed "The Body of St. Felix Pope and Martyr, who condemned Constantius." Those opposing Felix II concede, and Felix II continues to be listed pope and martyr in the Roman Martyrology down till today.

In 357 Liberius became a formal heretic and automatically lost his office

The fact that Liberius fell into the Arian heresy is mentioned not only in the *Liber Pontificalis* but also in the following sources, as well as others:

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, XXXVII. Liberius (352-366): "But after a few days Ursacius and Valens were impelled by zeal to beseech Constantius Augustus to recall Liberius from exile that he might maintain one single communion... Then authority was sent by Catulinus, the commissioner, and Ursacius and Valens went together to Liberius. And Liberius accepted the commands of Augustus I that he should extend the one single communion to the heretics... Then they recalled Liberius from exile. And on his return from exile Liberius dwelt in the cemetery of the holy Agnes... At that time Constantius, in company with Ursacius and Valens,

assembled some men who belonged to the dregs of the Arians and, pretending that he had held a council, sent and recalled Liberius from the cemetery of the blessed Agnes. And that same hour Constantius Augustus entered Rome and held a council with the heretics and likewise with Ursacius and Valens and expelled Felix from the bishopric, for he was Catholic, and reinstated Liberius. From that day forward there was a persecution of the clergy, so that priests and clergy were slain in church and were crowned with martyrdom. But Felix, after he was deposed from the bishopric, dwelt on his own estate on the Via Portuensis and there he slept in peace, July 29. Liberius entered the city of Rome, August 2, and he was in accord with Constantius, the heretic.”

St. Athanasius, *Apology against the Arians*, 4th century: “Sec. 89. Liberius did not endure to the end the sufferings of banishment, but yet stood out two years in exile.”

St. Athanasius, *History of the Arians*, 4th century: “[Part 3] 41. Lapse of Liberius - ...Liberius after he had been in banishment two years gave way, and from fear of threatened death subscribed.”

Apostate Jerome, *Lives of Illustrious Men*, 392-393: “Chapter 97. Fortunatianus - Fortunatianus, an African by birth, bishop of Aquilia during the reign of Constantius, composed brief Commentaries on the gospels arranged by chapters, written in a rustic style, and is held in detestation because, when Liberius bishop of Rome was driven into exile for the faith, he was induced by the urgency of Fortunatianus to subscribe to heresy.”

Peter Damian, *Letter 40*, to Henry, the archbishop of Ravenna, 1047: “...Of Wicked Bishops, Whose Ordination, However, Was Valid: And so it was that all the ordinations performed by Liberius, who was both a heretic and a turbulent man, were considered valid and immutable. Liberius, moreover, who was deceived by error and disbelief, is known to have subscribed to the Arian heresy, and because of his transgression many horrible crimes were committed. Many priests and clerics were killed because of his wickedness, and the remaining Catholics were forbidden to use not only the churches but also the baths. Subsequently, Liberius apostatized and lived on for six more years. Yet whatever he did regarding ordinations remained valid and firmly established in all its vigor.⁵⁷”

In 357 Felix II became the next pope

From the instant Liberius fell away from the faith in 357, he automatically lost his office; and this is when Felix II was elected to the papacy and thus began to reign as the legal and valid pope. The fact that Felix II was a pope and martyr is listed in the *Roman Martyrology*:

Roman Martyrology, July 29: “At Rome, on the Aurelian Way, St. Felix II, pope and martyr. Being expelled from his See by the Arian emperor Constantius for defending the Catholic faith, and being put to the sword privately at Cera in Tuscany, he died gloriously. His body was taken away from that place by clerics, and buried on the Aurelian Way. It was afterwards brought to the Church of the Saints Cosmas and Damian, where, under the Sovereign Pontiff Gregory XIII, it was found beneath the altar with the relics of the holy martyrs Mark, Marcellian, and Tranquillinus, and with the latter was put back in the same place on the 31st of July.”

This is one proof that Liberius lost his office for heresy because Felix II was the pope when Liberius was still alive. You cannot have two popes reigning at the same time. The *Liber Pontificalis* also lists Felix II as a pope and martyr:

⁵⁷ Footnote 157: “Auxilius depends on the *Vita Liberii* (*Liber pontificale* 37.1, 208).”

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, XXXVIII. Felix (355-358): “Felix, by nationality a Roman, son of Anastasius, occupied the see 1 year, 3 months, and 2 days. He declared that Constantius, son of Constantine, was a heretic and had been baptised a second time by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, in the villa which is called Aquilone. And for this declaration, by order of the same Constantius Augustus, son of Constantine Augustus, he was crowned with martyrdom and beheaded...November 11, and thence the Christians with Damasus, the priest, stole away his body by night, and they buried him in his aforesaid basilica on the Via Aurelia, November 20.”

The *Liber* lists Felix’s reign from 355 to 358 (about 3 years) but says he only ruled as pope for 1 year, 3 months, and 2 days, and thus he had to begin his reign in 357 (358 minus 1 year). Hence Felix II could not have begun his reign as pope in 355. Until the sixteenth century, all the official accounts of Pope St. Felix II have him reigning as pope for a little more than a year:

Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, by apostate Dr. Von Dollenger, 1872: “When at last the era of historical criticism and theological investigation came in with the sixteenth century, no small amount of helplessness was exhibited. Hitherto Felix had been regarded as rightful pope, and the time of his pontificate was reckoned at a year and somewhat more.”⁵⁸

This fits perfectly with the timing that Liberius fell into heresy in 357 and automatically lost his office. It was then that Felix II was elected to the papacy and died as a martyr in 358, which fits the span of his reign of 1 year, 3 months, and 2 days:

Dictionary of Christian Biography, edited by Sir William Smith and Henry Wace. 1880: “An expedient for justifying the position of Felix as well as that of Liberius among the lawful popes is that of supposing that the see having become vacant on the banishment or fall into heresy of the latter, the former was legally elected in his place, and continued lawful pope till his death, when Liberius again became so by virtue of a second election (Bellarmine, de Rom. Pontif., 1. 4. c. 17). But of any such second election there is no intimation, whether in any existing record. Baronius dispenses with its necessity, supposing Liberius to have resumed his old position, on the next vacancy of the see, after breaking with the Arians (Baron., ad Liber, lxvi).”⁵⁹

If Liberius abjured and became Catholic, there is no record of a second election; and a non-pope does not become pope simply because the Holy See falls vacant. Hence the apostates Bellarmine and Baronius are wrong regarding this. However, they both correctly teach that Liberius automatically lost his office when he became an Arian heretic and that Felix II became the next pope. It is most probable that Liberius never abjured but remained an Arian heretic until the day he died.

It is certain that when the heretic antipope Liberius returned to Rome in 358 and was put on the papal throne by the Arian Emperor Constantius, he deposed Felix II and began to persecute the Catholics. Beware of the liars who pretend that Liberius’ persecution of Felix was only about schism, about who was the true pope. The persecution was over the faith. It was between the Arians and the Catholics and thus between the Arian antipope Liberius, who was in league with the Arian Emperor Constantius, and the Catholic Pope St. Felix II and those who were on his side, such as Damasus (who would be the next pope) and the Roman priest Eusebius:

Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, by apostate Dr. Von Dollenger, 1872: “There are three documents in which the...history was incorporated, and from which all later ones have been made: the biographies of Liberius and of Felix in the *Liber Pontificalis*; the *Acts of Felix*, first edited by Mombritius; and the *Acts of*

⁵⁸ pt. 1, c. 6 (Liberius and Felix), pp. 204-205.

⁵⁹ Published by John Murray, London, 1880. V. 2, Felix II, p. 482, col. 1.

Eusebius.⁶⁰ These *Acts* ... make pope Damasus condemn Liberius in a synod of twenty-eight bishops and twenty-five priests immediately after Liberius' death. ...

"The biography of Felix begins with a statement, made with affected precision, to the effect that he had declared the emperor Constantius, son of Constantine, a heretic, who had got himself baptized a second time by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, in the villa Aquila (Achyro), near to Nicomedia... Ursacius and Valens...persuade Constantius, and with his consent go to Liberius and offer him return from banishment on these terms:—that there should be communion between Arians and orthodox, but that the latter should not be required to be re-baptized. Liberius consents, comes back, and takes up his abode in the cemetery of St. Agnes... Constantius...summons Liberius to Rome without the intervention of his sister by the advice of the Arians, gets together a council of heretics, and with its help deposes the Catholic Felix from his episcopal office. The very same day a bloody persecution commences, conducted by Constantius and Liberius in concert. The presbyter Eusebius (who distinguishes himself by his courage and Catholic zeal, and gathers the people together in his house) reproaches the emperor and Liberius with their crime, declares to the latter that he is no longer in any way the rightful follower of Julius [the previous pope] because he had fallen from the faith, and to both, that, in satanic blindness, they have driven out the Catholic blameless Felix. Whereupon Constantius, by the advice of Liberius, has him shut up in a deep hole only four feet broad, in which he is found dead at the end of seven months. The presbyters, Gregory and Orosius, relations of Eusebius, bury him; upon which the emperor gives orders to shut up Gregory alive in the same vault in which they had placed the corpse of Eusebius. Orosius drags him out from the vault by night half dead; he dies, however, in his arms, whereupon the other, Orosius, records the whole history. Felix, who had reproached the emperor with his re-baptism, is beheaded by the emperor's command. The persecution rages in Rome until the death of Liberius. Constantius publishes an edict that everyone who does not join Liberius shall be executed without trial. Clergy and laity are now murdered in the streets and in the churches. At last Liberius dies, and Damasus brands his memory with infamy in a synod.

"The description in the *Acts* of Eusebius is considerably more highly coloured than the representation in the *Liber Pontificalis*, where the circumstances are toned down somewhat; but the object in view, viz., to quash Liberius and make him appear as Constantius' companion in guilt, shines through it all from beginning to end...

"Thus, then, Felix was gradually thrust into the lists of the popes, the liturgies, and martyrologies, as rightful pope and a holy martyr...

"In the later Gregorian *Sacramentarium*...the day is given as the birthday of the four saints, but in such a way that in the *Oratio* Felix alone is celebrated, and that as 'martyr et pontifex.' ...

"All the following writers of papal history have therefore naturally followed this account:—Pseudo-Luitprand, Abbo of Fleury, the anonymous chronographer in Pez,⁶¹ Martinus' Polonus, Leo of Orvieto, Bernard Guidonis, Amalricus Augcrii. Felix is set forth as the thirty-ninth rightful pope. The revelation of the secret, that Constantius had caused himself to be re-baptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia, costs him his life, and Liberius reigned for five years, as an Arian, and by his Arianism caused the martyrdom of many clergy and laity. Nevertheless, all that he did and ordered was declared null and void after his death by Damasus. Bernard Guidonis makes the addition of a martyrdom, which Eusebius is made to endure because he proclaimed Liberius to be a heretic.⁶²

⁶⁰ Footnote 1: "They are to be found in the Baluze-Mansi Collection, i., 33, and throughout the whole of the Middle Ages were constantly used and copied."

⁶¹ Footnote 1: "*Thes. Anecd.*, I., p. 343."

⁶² Footnote 2: "In Mai, *Spicileg.*, VI., 60."

“From that time onwards the theologians accommodated themselves to the prevailing view, especially in Rome itself. Who does not know, says the Roman presbyter Auxilius, the defender of Formosus, that Liberius gave his assent to the Arian heresy, and that at his instigation the most horrible abominations were practised?⁶³ And towards the middle of the twelfth century Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, reproaches the Greeks because Constantius had caused Felix to be put to death for revealing the fact of his second baptism. But he makes excuses for Liberius, who no doubt had allowed much that was heretical, but had nevertheless steadfastly refused to allow himself to be re-baptized.⁶⁴

“The Abbot Hugo of Flavigny (1090-1102) goes a step farther in his chronicle; he makes Liberius also receive baptism a second time as a thorough⁶⁵ Arian. Eccard, in his most influential chronicle,⁶⁶ Romuald of Salerno, the papal historian Tolomeo of Lucca, the Eulogium of the monk of Malmesburg, all follow the usual...tradition, that Liberius remained till the day of his death—six, or (according to Tolomeo⁶⁷) eight years—persistently heretical, while Felix is the Catholic martyr.”⁶⁸

The divisions regarding the election of the next pope after the death of Liberius are one proof that Liberius was an Arian until the day he died. Damasus, who during his whole life was orthodox and resisted the Arians (such as Liberius and Constantius) and was a friend to Pope St. Felix II, was elected the next pope. But the Arian party that followed the Arian Liberius greatly opposed the election of Damasus and elected their own pope, the Arian Ursinus:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Pope St. Damasus: “...He was elected pope in October, 366, by a large majority, but a number of over-zealous adherents of the deceased Liberius rejected him, chose the deacon Ursinus (or Ursicinus)... Many details of this scandalous conflict are related in the...‘*Libellus Precum*’ (P.L., XIII, 83-107). A petition [was made] to the civil authority on the part of Faustinus and Marcellinus, two anti-Damasan presbyters (cf. also Ammianus Marcellinus. *Rer. Gest.*, XXVII, c. iii). Valentinian recognized Damasus and banished (367) Ursinus to Cologne, whence he was later allowed to return to Milan, but was forbidden to come to Rome or its vicinity. The party of the antipope (later at Milan an adherent of the Arians and to the end a contentious pretender) did not cease to persecute Damasus...”

In the 14th century a miracle confirmed Felix II as pope and martyr

In the 14th century when apostate Antipope Gregory XIII was revising the Roman Martyrology, there was an investigation of Felix II as to whether he was a pope and martyr or not. If not, his name was to be removed from the martyrology. Theologians held opposing opinions. During the investigation a miracle occurred in which Felix II’s body was discovered in the Church of Cosmas and Damian, and on his tomb was inscribed “The Body of St. Felix Pope and Martyr, who condemned Constantius.” Those who opposed Felix II as pope and martyr conceded, and Felix II continues to be listed as a pope and martyr in the Roman Martyrology down till today⁶⁹:

Dictionary of Christian Biography, edited by Sir William Smith and Henry Wace. 1880: “Felix II – ...In the Roman Church, however, his claim to the position given him appears to have remained unquestioned till the 14th century, when, an

⁶³ Footnote 3: “*De ordin.*, I., 25.”

⁶⁴ Footnote 1: “*Dialog.*, III., 21, in D’Achery, *Specil.*, I., 207.”

⁶⁵ Footnote 2: “In Pertz, X., 301.”

⁶⁶ Footnote 3: “Pertz, VIII., 113.”

⁶⁷ Footnote 4: “‘Vixit in hoc errore annis octo.’—Muratori, *SS. It.*, XI, p. 833.”

⁶⁸ pt. 1, c. 6 (Liberius and Felix), pp. 192-204.

⁶⁹ See in this book “Acts of St. Felix, Pope and Martyr,” p. 173.

emendation of the Roman Martyrology having been undertaken in 1582, under Pope Gregory XIII, the question was raised and discussed. Baronius, who was an actor in what took place, relates the circumstances. He himself was at first adverse to the claims of Felix, and wrote a long treatise against them; a cardinal, Sanctorius, defended them. The question was finally decided by the accidental discovery, in the Church of SS. Cosmas and Damian in the forum, of a coffin bearing the inscription, ‘Corpus S. Felicij papae et martyris, qui damnavit Constantium.’ In the face of this, which seemed like a personal reappearance of the calumniated saint to vindicate his own claims, Baronius was convinced in spite of his own arguments and retracted all that he had written. (Baron., ad Liberium, c. lxii.)⁷⁰

The Lives and Times of the Popes, 1909: “37. St. Felix II (A.D. 359) – ... In the reign of Pope Gregory XIII there arose a question between the Cardinals Baronius and Santorio as to whether the name of Felix should be retained in the Roman Martyrology as pontiff and as martyr. Santorio maintained that it was clearly right, and on the 22d of July, 1582, the evening of the feast of Saint Felix, that saint’s body was found in the above-mentioned Church of Saint Cosmo and Saint Damian, and the inscription described him as having been pontiff and martyr. Many modern critics erase him from the list of pontiffs on the grounds that that inscription is not authentic... Even in our own day there are different opinions as to the legitimacy of the papacy of Felix II. Various authors consider him a legitimate pope, and Bellarmine even wrote an apologetical dissertation in support of that view.”⁷¹

Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, by apostate Dr. Von Dollenger, 1872: “When at last the era of historical criticism and theological investigation came in with the sixteenth century, no small amount of helplessness was exhibited. Hitherto Felix had been regarded as rightful pope, and the time of his pontificate was reckoned at a year and somewhat more. According to this view, Liberius would be deprived of his office by sentence of the church, on account of his lapse into Arianism, and then Felix came in as rightful pope until at the end of a year he suffered martyrdom. Liberius, however, is said to have survived him by several years and to have remained an Arian till his death. He could not therefore again become lawful pope after the death of Felix. Nor was the hypothesis of a vacancy of the see for several years either admissible or attempted. On the contrary, an interregnum of thirty-eight days is all that the Liber Pontificalis records after the death of Felix. This created a difficulty for the theologians, of which they did not know how to dispose, if Felix was to be retained in his position as pope and saint; and the historians could not deny the irreconcilable contradiction to all contemporary information. Cardinal Baronius had already composed a treatise to show that Felix was neither a saint nor a pope. Gregory XIII had appointed a special congregation to decide the question. And then (1582) during some excavations under an altar dedicated to SS. Cosmo and Damian, a body was found with an inscription on stone—‘Corpus S. Felicis Papae et Martyris qui condemnavit Constantium.’ ... [Hence] Baronius and the congregation thought Felix kept his place as pope and martyr in the corrected Roman martyrology... Even such a man as Bossuet could allow himself... to represent Liberius as an obstinate heretic and bloody persecutor of true⁷² Catholics.”⁷³

The below opinions are also proved false:

⁷⁰ v. 2, Felix II, p. 481, col. 2.

⁷¹ *The Lives and Times of the Popes*, reproduced from “Effigies Pontificum Romanorum Dominici Basae,” by Giovanni Baptista Cavalieri, MDLXXX. Retranslated, revised, and written up to date from *Les Vies Des Papes*, by The Chevalier Artaud De Montor, 1772-1849. In ten volumes. *Nihil Obstat*: Remigius Lafort, S.T.L., *Censor*. Imprimatur: + John M. Farley, D.D., Archbishop of New York, New York, December 16, 1909. Published by The Catholic Publication Society of America, New York, 1910. Lateran Edition. Limited to one thousand numbered, registered, and signed sets, Set No. 330 or 390 or 380. Page 101.

⁷² Footnote 3: “*Defens. Decl. Gall.*, p. 3, l. 9, c. 33.”

⁷³ pt. 1, c. 6 (Liberius and Felix), pp. 204-206.

- The opinion that Liberius never fell into the Arian heresy is proved false by the fact that the Arian heretic Constantius freed him, brought him to Rome, and placed him on the papal throne. He would never have done this if Liberius had remained orthodox, remained anti-Arian.
- The opinion that Felix II was made pope right after Pope Liberius was exiled is proved false because the Catholic Felix II would have likewise been exiled by the Arian heretic Constantius. This proves he was made pope shortly before he was banished and martyred in 358 (a little over one year from 357 when he was made pope), as the Emperor Constantius would not have allowed him to remain as pope and un-persecuted for long.
- The opinion that Felix II was made pope right after Pope Liberius was exiled is also proved false because no one ever attempted to make a man a pope while another pope, who the whole Catholic world believed was the pope, was reigning, which was the case with Pope Liberius from 353 to 357 before he fell into heresy.
- The opinion that Felix II was an Arian heretic is proved false because he was deposed and martyred by the Arian heretic Constantius.

Beware of those who excuse Liberius

Beware of those, especially from the 16th century onward, who excuse Liberius from becoming a formal heretic because they are papal idolaters⁷⁴ or for some other reason. What follows are refutations of some of these excuse makers, these liars:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “Appendix: Note on the Fall of Pope Liberius. The following is the note referred to at p. 246, taken from Mr. P. Le Page Renouf’s treatise on the *Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (Longmans, 1868), pp. 41, sqq., and which is here reprinted with his sanction. It will be seen that Mr. Renouf’s opinion differs from our Author’s in some important details of historical criticism, and especially as regards the genuineness of the disputed Fragments of S. Hilary. The closing paragraph, which discusses the official or *ex cathedra* character of the act of Liberius, has been purposely omitted, as dealing with a question Bishop Hefele does not touch upon, and which it would therefore be out of place to introduce here.

“The history of Arianism is full of historical and chronological difficulties, and those connected with the case of Pope Liberius are quite sufficient to have furnished opportunities to his apologists of extenuating, and even utterly denying, his fall. But although the precise details cannot be discovered from the evidence now existing, there is, on the other hand, very positive evidence that the Pope officially subscribed a heterodox creed, that he signed the condemnation of S. Athanasius, and that he entered into communion with the Arian leaders and admitted their orthodoxy. All this is explicitly stated in the letters of Liberius himself, but before quoting them I shall speak of the other evidence.

“S. Athanasius, in his *Arian Hist.*, sec. 41, says: “Liberius, after he had been in banishment two years, gave way, and from fear of threatened death was induced to subscribe.”

“And in his *Apology against the Arians*, sec. 89, Liberius “did not endure to the end the sufferings of banishment, but yet stood out two years in exile.” Although

⁷⁴ At this point in time, all the so-called popes were idolaters and formal heretics and thus apostate antipopes. Hence it would be to their benefit to hide the dogma that popes can and have become idolaters or formal heretics and thus been denounced, avoided, and resisted, and to hide the deeper dogma that non-Catholics are banned from holding offices in the Catholic Church.

Athanasius speaks with most noble tenderness of the fall both of Liberius and of Hosius, he has himself quoted the memorable words of Constantius: “Be persuaded, and subscribe against Athanasius; for whoever subscribes against him, thereby embraces with us the Arian cause.”

‘S. Hilary of Poitiers says (Fragm. 6) that the Sirmian Creed signed by Liberius was the “perfidia Ariana” (that is the *second* Sirmian,⁷⁵ a thoroughly Arian confession), and for this he anathematizes him over and over again: “Iterum tibi anathema et tertio, prævaricator Liberi!” In his letter to Constantius (c. 11), S. Hilary says: “Nescio utrum majori impietate relegaveris quam remiseric.”

‘The meaning of these words of S. Hilary is clear enough. But the best commentary upon them is to be found in the statement of Faustinus and Marcellinus, contemporaries of Liberius, that when Constantius was petitioned by the Romans for the restoration of the Pope, he answered, “Habetis Liberium, qui qualis a vobis profectus est melior revertetur.” They add: “Hoc autem de consensu ejus quo manus *perfidia* dederat indicabat.”

‘The Arian historian Philostorgius (*Epit.* iv. 3) says that Liberius and Hosius wrote openly against the term “consubstantial,” and against Athanasius himself when a synod had been convened at Sirmium, and had brought over the aforementioned prelates to its own opinion. The synod here mentioned is intended (rightly or wrongly) for the second Sirmian.

‘Sozomen (*Hist.* iv. 15) says that Constantius, having summoned Liberius to Sirmium from Beroea, forced him (*ἐβιάζετοαύτην*), in presence of the deputies of the Eastern bishops, and of the other priests at the Court, to confess that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father. He adds that Liberius and other bishops were persuaded to assent to a document drawn up by Basil, Eustathius, and Eleusius. This document must have identified the ‘One in Substance’ with the doctrine of Paul of Samosata.

‘...Jerome, in his Chronicle, says that “Liberius tædio victus exsilii, et in *hæreticam pravitatem subscribens* Romam quasi victor intravit.” And in his *Liber de Viris Illustribus* (c. 97), he says that Fortunatianus, bishop of Aquileia, “in hoc habetur detestabilis quod Liberium, Romanæ urbis episcopum . . . primus sollicitavit ac fregit, et ad *subscriptionem hæreseos* compulit.” The words of Jerome are repeated by many ecclesiastical authors.

‘The fall of Liberius is related by more recent writers, and sometimes even grossly exaggerated in consequence of the fables current about the anti-Pope Felix, who, although intruded into the Holy See by the Arians, was for many centuries held as a saint, and is probably still so held by many, on the authority of Benedict XIV. The *Liber Pontificalis* represents Felix as having been canonically elected Pope with the consent of Liberius, when the latter went into exile for the faith, and as having suffered martyrdom when Liberius returned from exile, after having consented to the heresy of Constantius.

‘Auxilius, a Roman priest (*De Ordin. a Formoso factis*, i. 25), says: “Quis nesciat quod Liberius, heu proh dolor! Arianae hæresi subscripserit et per ejus transgressionem nefan-dissima scelera sint commissa.”

‘Without accumulating an immense mass of similar evidence, it will be sufficient to say that till the sixteenth century the fall of Liberius was accepted as one of the simply indisputable facts of Church history. The Acts of S. Eusebius of Rome were considered authentic, and they represent the saint as a victim of the heretical Pope whose communion he called upon everyone to avoid.

⁷⁵ Footnote 1: “One of the principal historical difficulties of the question lies in the contradiction between these words of S. Hilary, and a note, giving the names of the authors of the confession. I do not believe S. Hilary to be the author of this note. He would not have called the *first* Sirmian confession the ‘perfidia Ariana.’ Nor would the Emperor have been satisfied with a subscription to the first Sirmian, which was already obsolete. Petavius (*Animad. in Epiph.* p. 816) says, ‘Hoc *certissimum est* neque priori illi contra Photinum editæ subscripsisse, et si ex tribus Sirmiensibus aliquam admiserit, non aliam quam secundam, cui et Osius assensus est comprobasse.’ That Liberius did sign one of them seems to be not less manifest from the evidence.”

‘Bede’s Martyrology (19 Kal. Sept.), and that of Rabanus Maurus says: “Natale Sancti Eusebii ...qui sub Constantio Imperatore Ariano, machinante Liberio præsule, *similiter hæretico*, confessionem suam complevit.” The Martyrology of Ado (14 Aug.) speaks of S. Eusebius, “qui præsente Constantio, cum fidem Catholicam constantissime defenderet et Liberium Papam doleret *Arianæ perfidia consensisse*,” etc. These words occur in other mediaeval martyrologies, and they were formerly in the Roman Breviary, from which they were only struck out in the sixteenth century.

‘Of all the early testimonies which have been quoted, that of the Fragments of S. Hilary is the only one about which an honest doubt can be entertained. I have myself not the least doubt about it. Its genuineness is admitted by every critic of authority except Hefele, who also doubts the genuineness of certain epistles of Liberius, in the midst of which the words of Hilary occur as indignant interpolations. But there is even less reason for a doubt about the letters of Liberius; and Hefele’s arguments against them are exceedingly weak. The letters, like most other documents of the Arian controversy, contain historical difficulties which may not be easy to explain, particularly if a history like that of Dr. Hefele has been written without regard to them; but the question of style is quite out of place here. Popes, as we have seen in the history of Honorius, do not always write the letters for which they are responsible. Liberius may not have been the real author of the letter to Constantius which he admires, any more than of those letters which he considers unworthy of a pope. The conversation of Liberius with the Emperor in Theodoret’s history, to which Dr. Hefele refers, is probably not more authentic than the speeches in Livy; and a discourse of Liberius, in S. Ambrose’s works, has always been considered as thrown by S. Ambrose into his own language. The great Protestant critics admit the genuineness of the epistles in question; and among Catholic authorities⁷⁶ Dr. Hefele stands alone in opposition to Natalis Alexander, Tillemont, Fleury, Dupin, Ceillier, Montfaucon, Constant, Möhler, Döllinger, and Newman.

‘The first of these letters is addressed to the Eastern bishops, and informs them of the Pope’s consent to the...condemnation of Athanasius (‘amato Athanasio a communionem omnium nostrum’). It announces his acceptance of their confession drawn up at Sirmium, and proposed to him by the Arian bishop Demophilus. ‘Hanc ego libenti animo suscepi, in nullo contradixi, consensum accommodavi, hanc sequor, hæc a me tenetur.’ And it adds: ‘Jam pervidetis *in omnibus* me vobis consentaneum esse.’ A second letter is written to the Arian chiefs Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius, as being children of peace who love the concord and unity of the Catholic Church, to tell them that Athanasius had been condemned by him and ‘separated from the communion of the Roman Church, as all the Roman clergy can bear witness.’ He wishes them to inform their brethren Epictetus and Auxentius, Arian bishops, ‘pacem me et communionem ecclesiasticum cum ipsis habere.’ Liberius concludes: ‘Qui-cumque autem a pace et concordia nostra quæ per orbem terrarum, volente Deo, formata est, dissenserit, sciat se separatam esse a nostra communionem.’

‘A third letter, addressed to Vincent of Capua, who had formerly been the legate of Liberius but had already in the year 352 signed the condemnation of Athanasius, is written in the same sense.

‘Now, even if these letters were undoubtedly spurious, it would be idle to oppose the *silence* of Socrates and Theodoret to the positive testimonies of Athanasius, Faustinus, and Jerome. “Athanasius, Hilarius, et Hieronymus,” says Bellarmine, who is certainly not a prejudiced judge in this matter, “rem non ut dubiam sed ut certain et exploratam narrant.” Theodoret, it is argued, never speaks of Liberius but

⁷⁶ Footnote 1: “Among these I do not reckon Stilling, the Bollandist, whose article on Liberius I consider one of the most mischievous productions ever written. It is, no doubt, extremely able; but it has no more solid value than Whately’s Historic Doubts, and it is calculated to impose upon precisely those who have no notion of the difference between sophistical subtlety and accurate reasoning, Pyrrhonism and sound criticism. It will be time to consider its arguments when they have convinced a single impartial Protestant, like Gieseler or Neander, or a learned Jew, like the editor of the *Regesta*.”

as of a glorious confessor for the faith. But the same argument would hold good with reference to Hosius, about whose fall no one can possibly entertain a doubt. The conduct of Liberius after the Council of Sirminum rehabilitated him in the esteem of the orthodox; and Theodoret, no doubt, knew the whole truth, though he was unwilling to publish it.”⁷⁷

The Lives and Times of the Popes, 1630: “Saint Felix II—A.D. 359. In a single ordination he created nineteen bishops, twenty-seven priests, and five deacons. While he held the supreme authority in the Church, he had the courage to condemn Constantius as an Arian; and on the return of Liberius, the emperor in revenge condemned Felix II to exile in the little town of Cori, on the Aurelian Way, seventeen miles from Rome. There he suffered martyrdom with great courage. It may not be superfluous to add that even after the triumph of the Church great cruelties were inflicted upon the Christians. As the chief of the State was himself a Christian, there was no longer even the wretched excuse of a mistaken religious zeal; but heretics pursued those whom they deemed enemies as fiercely as any pagans could.

“The body of Felix, being brought to Rome, was interred at the baths of Trajan, and subsequently placed by Saint Damasus in the basilica which Felix himself had caused to be constructed on the Aurelian Way, two miles from Rome. From this the body was removed into the Church of Saints Cosmo and Damian. In the reign of Pope Gregory XIII there arose a question between the Cardinals Baronius and Santorio [16th century] as to whether the name of Felix should be retained in the Roman Martyrology as pontiff and as martyr. Santorio maintained that it was clearly right, and on the 22d of July, 1582, the evening of the feast of Saint Felix, that saint’s body was found in the above-mentioned Church of Saint Cosmo and Saint Damian, and the inscription described him as having been pontiff and martyr. Many modern critics erase him from the list of pontiffs on the ground that that inscription is not authentic.

“Some writers maintain that the body is preserved at Padua, in the Church of the Cordeliers, and that the coffin bears an inscription with the title of saint, placed on it in 1503.

“Even in our own day there are different opinions as to the legitimacy of the papacy of Felix II. Various authors consider him a legitimate pope, and Bellarmine even wrote an apologetical dissertation in support of that view. On the other hand, there are not wanting some who deny that he was either saint, or pope, or martyr, and consider that he was an antipope, and even erroneous in his doctrines; of this opinion are Natalis Alexander, Sangallo, Fleury, and Christianus Lupus. The celebrated Monsignor Borgia, afterwards cardinal, said upon this subject: ‘The legitimacy of Felix is demonstrated to those who believe in the fall of Liberius.’” (pp. 100-101)

A Narrative of the Reformation at Birr, in the King’s County, Ireland, by Michael Crotty, 1850: “To the Right Rev. Dr. McMahon, Titular Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese of Killaloe. MY LORD, . . . Nor have they [popes] erred only in points of small importance, but even in matters of faith. St. Athanasius, St. Hilary, and Jerome inform us that Pope Liberius, though he had for a while nobly resisted the threats of the Emperor Constantius, either wearied out with the hardship of his exile or moved by the desire of recovering his see possessed by Felix, subscribed the Arian heresy and the sentence against St. Athanasius. Bellarmine says that the fault of Liberius consisted only in condemning St. Athanasius and communicating with heretics; that he himself neither taught heresy nor was an heretic but in external action; that the confession which he subscribed was orthodox, although the word $\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ was wanting; and that, according to Sozomen, before his departure from

⁷⁷ Translated from the German and edited by William R. Clark, M.A. Published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1894. Volume 2, Appendix, pp. 483-488.

Sirmium he published a confession wherein he condemned the Heterousians. This is the sum and substance of Bellarmine's defence of Pope Liberius; but it is a very lame apology; for, my lord, in the first place, his admission that Liberius was an heretic only in external act, proves that a pope may be influenced by his passions to pronounce in matters of faith against his own knowledge and judgment. In the second place, if he condemned Athanasius, it was not because he was induced by the false accusations of the Arians to believe Athanasius guilty, but only that he might free himself from the miseries of banishment, and the fears of death. In the third place, to communicate with known heretics, as Bellarmine acknowledges Liberius to have done, is to favour heresy [RJMI: and thus be a formal heretic], and add the sanction of authority to it. Besides, Liberius himself, in his Epistle to the Eastern bishops (who were Arians), tells them that he is convinced the condemnation of Athanasius was just, whom therefore he looked upon as excommunicated, and would maintain peace and unanimity with them. That he subscribed at Sirmium their Catholic faith expounded unto him by Demophilus (an Arian bishop). And in his Epistle to Valens, Ursacius, and Germinius, (the heads of the Arian party), he says, 'I profess to hold communion with all you bishops of the Catholic Church, and excommunicate all those which shall dissent from this our blessed concord.' [RJMI: Hence Liberius was a formal heretic by sins of association and for being in religious communion with heretics]. St. Hilary denounces a threefold anathema against Liberius for this subscription, and calls him a prevaricator of the faith; and in another place says, that the heresy penned at Sirmium, which Liberius calls Catholic, was expounded to him by Demophilus, &c.; and tells the Emperor Constantius, 'that he sent back Liberius to Rome with no less impiety than wherewith he had before banished him:' intimating that he had made him an heretic. Jerome, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, says, 'Fortunatianus is to be detested, for that he first brake the courage of Liberius, and persuaded him to subscribe to heresy'; and in his Chronicle he relates how Liberius, 'worn out with the toils of banishment, and having subscribed to heretical pravity, entered Rome a conqueror.' Auxilius takes it for a thing most certain: 'Who knows not,' says he, 'that Liberius subscribed the Arian heresy?' which he repeats in another place. The old Roman Breviary, in the festival of St. Eusebius the Confessor, says, 'Liberius consented to the Arian heresy.' To these produced by Launoy, we shall add the three following testimonies. Philostorgius affirms that Liberius and Hosius subscribed against the Consubstantiality, and against Athanasius."⁷⁸

(See in this book, "Acts of Eusebius, Priest of Rome," p. [177](#).)

Anastasius II (496-498)

He became a formal heretic and schismatic for entering into religious communion with monophysites and Acacian schismatics

For the sake of temporal peace between the Catholics and the monophysites and Acacian schismatics (who were also heretics), Pope Anastasius II entered into religious communion with the monophysite heretics⁷⁹ and Acacian schismatics and thus became a formal heretic and formal schismatic and hence automatically lost his office and was no longer the pope. All Catholics, then, removed his name from the diptychs and Te Igitur prayer of the Mass and separated from him:

⁷⁸ Published by Thomas Hatchard, London, 1850. C. 5, pp. 272-288.

⁷⁹ The monophysites hold the heresy that the Incarnate Jesus Christ is only God and thus not also man, not also human, and thus deny the Incarnate Jesus Christ's human nature.

Foundations of the Conciliar Theory, by apostate Brian Tierney, 1955: “Texts...in the *Decretum*...implied quite clearly that a Pope could be guilty of heresy, and which even cited specific examples of Popes who were alleged to have erred in matters of faith. Pope Marcellinus was said to have committed idolatry... The case that was most frequently quoted in Decretist discussions was that of Pope Anastasius II:

‘Anastasius secundus, natione Romanus fuit temporibus Theodorici regis. Eodem tempore multi clerici et presbyteri se a communione ipsius abegerunt, eo quod communicasset sine concilio episcoporum vel presbyterorum et cleri cunctae ecclesiae catholicae diacono Thessalonicensi, nomine Photino qui communicaverit Acacio, et quia voluit occulte revocare Acacium et non potuit, nutu divino percussus est’.⁸⁰

“Repeatedly, when the question of the indefectibility of the Roman church arose, the Decretists cited the case of Anastasius to prove that, whatever the relevant texts might mean, they could not mean that the Pope personally was divinely preserved from error. Anastasius had been deserted by the Church and smitten by God precisely because he had erred... It would have been quite within his competence, as Huguccio pointed out, to have declared that Photinus was not guilty of the heresy charged against him; the Pope’s offence was that he entered into communion with Photinus knowing him to be guilty and so condoned his heresy.”^{81,82}

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, LII. Anastasius II (496-498): “Anastasius, by nationality a Roman, son of Peter, from the 5th district, Tauma, of the Caput Tauri, occupied the see 1 year, 11 months, and 24 days... He set up the confession of blessed Lawrence, the martyr, of silver, weighing 80 lbs. At that time many of the clergy and of the priests withdrew themselves from communion with him, because without consulting the priests or the bishops or the clergy of all the Catholic Church he had communicated with a deacon of Thessalonica, Photinus by name, who was of the party of Acacius, and because he desired secretly to reinstate Acacius and could not. And he was struck dead by divine will.”

What made Anastasius’ heresy and schism even worse is that he entered into religious communion with heretics, schismatics, and the Acacian sect whom the two previous popes, St. Felix III and St. Gelasius, had condemned and excommunicated by name, such as Acacius who was the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Acacian sect that he founded. Even though Acacius may not have held the monophysite heresy himself, he was a formal heretic nevertheless. And he was also a formal schismatic. Acacius was a formal heretic for denying the infallibility of the Council of Chalcedon and for not condemning the monophysite heretics and for being in religious communion with them, as stated in a decree that Acacius and Emperor Zeno wrote called the *Henoticon*. This earned him a sentence of excommunication by Pope St. Felix III and placed him in formal schism, a schism which he wholeheartedly embraced by removing Pope Felix III’s name from the diptychs:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople: “Patriarch of Constantinople: Schismatic: d. 489... When the usurping Emperor Basiliscus allowed himself to be won over to Eutychian teaching by Timotheus Aelurus, the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, who chanced at that time to be a guest in the imperial capital, Timotheus, who had been recalled from exile only a short time

⁸⁰ Footnote 3: “*Dist.* 19 c. 9. Döllinger long ago pointed out that Anastasius acquired a legendary reputation in the Middle Ages (and a place in Dante’s *Inferno*) on the strength of this quotation of Gratian from the *Liber Pontificalis*. See his *Fables Respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages* (transl. A. Plummer, London, 1871), pp. 207-20.”

⁸¹ Footnote 1: “*Summa ad Dist.* 19 c. 9, MS. P. 72 fol. 129rb, ‘Nota quod si voluisset ostendere quod ille nunquam fuisset in alia heresi et quod ecclesia decepta eum inde damnaverit et ita eum post mortem revocare ad ecclesie communionem, non esset malus...sed hoc noluit ipse facere, sed voluit eum in errore suo defendere...’”

⁸² pt. 1, sec. I, ii, pp. 38-39.

previously, was bent on creating an effective opposition to the decrees of Chalcedon: and he succeeded so well at court that Basiliscus was induced to put forth an encyclical or imperial proclamation (egkyklios) in which the teaching of the Council was rejected. Acacius himself seems to have hesitated at first about adding his name to the list of the Asiatic bishops who had already signed the encyclical: but warned by a letter from Pope Simplicius, who had learned of his questionable attitude from the ever-vigilant monastic party, he reconsidered his position and threw himself violently into the debate. This sudden change of front redeemed him in popular estimation, and he won the regard of the orthodox, particularly among the various monastic communities throughout the East, by his now ostentatious concern for sound doctrine. The fame of his awakened zeal even travelled to the West, and Pope Simplicius wrote him a letter of commendation...

“The...monastic promoters and of the populace at large...sincerely detested Eutychian theories [heresies] of the Incarnation: but it may be doubted whether Acacius, either in orthodox opposition now, or in unorthodox efforts at compromise later on, was anything profounder than a politician seeking to compass his own personal ends. Of theological principles he seems never to have had a consistent grasp. He had the soul of a gamester, and he played only for influence.

“Basiliscus was beaten. He withdrew his offensive encyclical by a counter-proclamation, but his surrender did not save him. His rival Zeno, who had been a fugitive up to the time of the Acacian opposition, drew near the capital. Basiliscus, deserted on all sides, sought sanctuary in the cathedral church and was given up to his enemies, tradition says, by the time-serving Patriarch. For a brief space there was complete accord between Acacius, the Roman Pontiff, and the dominant party of Zeno, on the necessity for taking stringent methods to enforce the authority of the Fathers of Chalcedon: but trouble broke out once more when the Monophysite party of Alexandria attempted to force the notorious Peter Mongus into that see against the orthodox claims of John Talaia in the year 482. This time events took on a more critical aspect, for they gave Acacius the opportunity he seems to have been waiting for all along of exalting the authority of his see and claiming for it a primacy of honour and jurisdiction over the entire East, which would emancipate the bishops of the capital not only from all responsibility to the sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, but to the Roman Pontiff as well. Acacius, who had now fully ingratiated himself with Zeno, induced that emperor to take sides with Mongus. Pope Simplicius made a vehement but ineffectual protest, and Acacius replied by coming forward as the apostle of reunion for all the East. It was a specious and far-reaching scheme, but it laid bare eventually the ambitions of the Patriarch of Constantinople and revealed him, to use Cardinal Hergenrdier’s illuminating phrase, as ‘the forerunner of Photius.’

“The first effective measure which Acacius adopted in his new role was to draw up a document, or series of articles, which constituted at once both a creed and an instrument of reunion. This creed, known to students of theological history as the *Henoticon*, was originally directed to the irreconcilable factions in Egypt. It was a plea for reunion on a basis of reticence and compromise... The *Henoticon* affirmed the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (i.e. the Creed of Nicaea completed at Constantinople) as affording a common symbol or expression of faith in which all parties could unite. All other symbols or mathemata were excluded: Eutyches and Nestorius were unmistakably condemned, while the anathemas of Cyril were accepted. The teaching of Chalcedon was not so much repudiated as passed over in silence: Jesus Christ was described as the ‘only-begotten Son of God...one and not two’...and there was no explicit reference to the two Natures. Mongus naturally accepted this accomodatingly vague teaching. Talaia refused to subscribe to it and set out for Rome, where his cause was taken up with great vigour by Pope Simplicius. The controversy dragged on under Felix II (or III) who sent two legatine bishops, Vitalis and Misenus, to Constantinople to summon Acacius before the Roman See for trial. Never was the masterfulness of Acacius so strikingly

illustrated as in the ascendancy he acquired over this . . . pair of bishops. He induced them to communicate publicly with him and sent them back stultified to Rome, where they were promptly condemned by an indignant synod which reviewed their conduct. Acacius was branded by Pope Felix as one who had sinned against the Holy Ghost and apostolic authority (*Habc ergo cum his . . . portionem S. Spiritus iudicio et apostolica auctoritate damnatus*); and he was declared to be perpetually excommunicate — *nunquamque anathematis vinculis exuendus*. Another envoy, inappropriately named Tutus, was sent to carry the decree of this double excommunication to Acacius in person: and he, too, like his hapless predecessors, fell under the strange charm of the courtly prelate, who enticed him from his allegiance. Acacius refused to accept the documents brought by Tutus and showed his sense of the authority of the Roman See, and of the synod which had condemned him, by erasing the name of Pope Felix from the diptychs. Talaia equivalently gave up the fight by consenting to become Bishop of Nola, and Acacius began by a brutal policy of violence and persecution, directed chiefly against his old opponents the monks, to work with Zeno for the general adoption of the Henoticon throughout the East. He thus managed to secure a political semblance of the prize for which he had worked from the beginning. He was practically the first prelate throughout Eastern Christendom until his death in 489. His schism outlived him some thirty years, and was ended only by the return of the Emperor Justin to unity, under Pope Hormisdas in 519.”

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Pope St. Felix III: “Born of a Roman senatorial family and said to have been an ancestor of Saint Gregory the Great. Nothing certain is known of Felix, till he succeeded St. Simplicius in the Chair of Peter (483). At that time the Church was still in the midst of her long conflict with the Eutychian heresy. In the preceding year, the Emperor Zeno, at the suggestion of Acacius, the perfidious Patriarch of Constantinople, had issued an edict known as the *Henoticon* or Act of Union, in which he declared that no symbol of faith, other than that of Nice, with the additions of 381, should be received. [Hence it denied the infallibility of the Council of Chalcedon.] The edict was intended as a bond of reconciliation between Catholics and Eutychians, but it caused greater conflicts than ever, and split the Church of the East into three or four parties. As the Catholics everywhere spurned the edict, the emperor had driven the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria from their sees. Peter the Tanner, a notorious heretic, had again intruded himself into the See of Antioch, and Peter Mongus, who was to be the real source of trouble during the pontificate of Felix, had seized that of Alexandria. In his first synod Felix excommunicated Peter the Tanner, who was likewise condemned by Acacius in a synod of Constantinople. In 484, Felix also excommunicated Peter Mongus — an act, which brought about a schism between East and West, that was not healed for thirty-five years. This Peter, being a time-server and of a crafty disposition, ingratiated himself with the emperor and Acacius by subscribing to the *Henoticon*, and was thereupon, to the displeasure of many of the bishops, admitted to communion by Acacius.

“Felix, having convened a synod, sent legates to the emperor and Acacius, with the request that they should expel Peter Mongus from Alexandria and that Acacius himself should come to Rome to explain his conduct. The legates were detained and imprisoned: then urged by threats and promises, they held communion with the heretics by distinctly uttering the name of Peter in the readings of the sacred diptychs. When their treason was made known at Rome by Simeon, one of the ‘Acaemeti’ monks, Felix convened a synod of seventy-seven bishops in the Lateran Basilica, in which Acacius as well as the papal legates were also excommunicated. Supported by the emperor, Acacius disregarded the excommunication, removed the pope’s name from the sacred diptychs, and remained in the see till his death, which took place one or two years later. His successor Phravitus sent messengers to Felix, assuring him that he would not hold communion with Peter, but, the pope learning

that this was a deception, the schism continued. Peter, having died in the meantime, Euthymus, who succeeded Phravitus, also sought communion with Rome, but the pope refused, as Euthymius would not remove the names of his two predecessors from the sacred diptychs. The schism, known as the Acacian Schism, was not finally healed till 518 in the reign of Justinian.”

The Reign of Anastasius I, 491-518, by Fiona K. Nicks, 1998: “The Acacian Schism – Acacius, as the figure behind the Henoticon, obviously signed it. Peter Mongus, leader of the monophysites in Egypt, also accepted it and became patriarch of Alexandria. Calendion, the patriarch of Antioch, opposed it and, suspected of fraternising with Ulus and Leontius against Zeno, was deposed, and replaced by Peter Fuller, a supporter of the Henoticon. Martyrius, patriarch of Jerusalem, eventually accepted it too. Rome was most shocked, not only at the over-ruling of the Chalcedonian definition of faith, but especially because the faith of the Church was now imposed by imperial edict. On taking up office after the death of Simplicius in March 483, Pope Felix III, alerted to the seriousness of the situation by the Sleepless Monks of Constantinople, demanded the ejection of Peter Mongus, the restoration of the definition of Chalcedon, and sent a legation under Misenus, bishop of Cuma, and Vitalis, to make enquiries about the conduct of Acacius. The legation fell into a trap and took communion with Acacius during which the names of Dioscorus and Peter Mongus were read from the diptychs. Meanwhile, on 28th July, 484, Felix III held a synod at which Acacius and Peter Mongus were excommunicated. In retaliation, Acacius removed the pope’s name from the diptychs, and thus began the Acacian schism that was to endure thirty-five long years...

“The Accession of [Emperor] Anastasius – ...By the beginning of the 490s, the most significant partisans of the Henoticon, including Peter Fuller, Peter Mongus, Acacius and Zeno, had died... Euphemius was a convinced Chalcedonian, and on his consecration he wrote to Pope Felix III... He refused communion with the monophysite Peter Mongus of Alexandria and removed his name from the diptychs. But while Euphemius fought battles with the monophysite east, he himself was not accepted by Rome; Felix demanded the removal of Acacius’ name from the diptychs, and Euphemius, refusing to allow the slight on the authority of the see of Constantinople, would not comply⁸³.

“[Emperor] Anastasius and the West: Relations with the Popes: a) Gelasius – Throughout [the Emperor] Anastasius’ reign there were sporadic attempts to end the deadlock in relations between the imperial capital and the apostolic see. 492 saw the start of the negotiations to end the schism. However, the new pope, Gelasius, was even more intransigent on the subject of Acacius than his predecessor. Indeed, there is reason to believe that it was Gelasius who used to encourage Felix III in a hardline stance against the pretensions of the east. He was also responsible for several works against Acacius, such as the *De damnatione nominum Petri et Acacii*...

In his correspondence with the bishops of Dardania and Illyricum, he encouraged eastern heretics to return to the true faith. He broke off communion with the bishop of Thessalonica who would not condemn Acacius⁸⁴ and despatched a letter, justifying why Acacius had been condemned by Rome, for

‘etiam sine ullo synodo precedente et absolvendi, quos synodos inique damnaverat, et damnandi nulla existente synodo, quos oportuit, habuerit facultatem⁸⁵.’⁸⁶

⁸³ Footnote 27: “cf. Theod. Lect. 442, Theoph. AM 5983, Niceph. Cal. XVI. 19.”

⁸⁴ Footnote 32: “Mansi (1762), VIII.46f, Thiel (1868), pp. 382ff and Jaffe (1885-1888), no.638.”

⁸⁵ Footnote 33: “Mansi (1762), VIII.50ff, 63ff, Thiel (1868), pp. 392ff, 414ff, Jaffe (1885-1888), no.664.”

⁸⁶ St. Hilda’s College, Oxford, 1998. C. 4, pp. 152-157.

Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, by apostate Dr. Von Dollenger, 1872: “VII. Anastasius II – [p. 212] Many persons in Rome separated themselves from the company of Pope Anastasius because he had entered into church communion with the deacon Photinus of Thessalonica, and intended secretly to bring Acacius again into honour in the Church. For which reason God had punished him with sudden death... The memory of Pope Anastasius II has come down to posterity as that of a man prone to heresy, from whose communion in the Church it was right to withdraw oneself... And only by his sudden death was still greater mischief warded off from the Church...

“The emperor Zeno, advised by Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, had published the *Henoticon* (482), which declared the binding authority and dogmatic decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, so hateful to all Monophysites, to be an open question. This ended in Pope Felix II [Felix III] calling a synod, and declaring Acacius anathema. Acacius...sacrificed the council of Chalcedon for the sake of peace, and entered into church communion with all Monophysites who had accepted the *Henoticon*. Acacius had almost the whole East on his side, and as Rome broke off from everyone who remained in communion with Acacius, a schism in the Church between East and West for thirty-five years was the consequence.

“The successors of Acacius were bidden to strike his name off the diptychs as one who had died under excommunication; and the popes Felix and Gelasius demanded this as a condition of communion. This, however, the patriarchs dared not do, for fear of a popular commotion; and Rome would not give way, although Gelasius himself confessed that the expectation that the Orientals would prefer communion with the See of Rome to every other consideration had proved⁸⁷ a delusion.

The separation had lasted already eleven years when pope Anastasius ascended the papal throne. He had peace with the Eastern Church more at heart than his two predecessors had had. He did, therefore, what Gelasius had refused to do, even at the request of the patriarch Euphemius; he sent two bishops as his legates to Constantinople, still, however, contending that the name of Acacius must no more be mentioned at the altar. In a contemporaneous Roman fragment, mention is made of the letter which the pope sent at the time to the emperor. The reader will thence see on what worthless grounds the still continuing schism between the East and the West¹ rested. At this point Photinus arrived in Rome, a man who seems to have been active in ecclesiastical negotiations, and who probably had received a commission from the Orientals to win the pope over to the cause of union. Anastasius admitted him to communion, although from the Roman point of view he belonged to the schismatical party, that is to say, remained in alliance with those who honoured the memory of Acacius. And the pope showed himself [Footnote 2] ready to give way in the question of mentioning Acacius at the altar...

Footnote 2: “The expression of the biographer in the Pontifical book, ‘occulte voluit revocare Acacium,’ is to be understood of the re-insertion of his name in the diptychs. ‘Id nonnisi de illius nomine sacris diptychis restituendo Intelligi potest,’ says Vignoli (*Liber. Pontif.*, 1, 171) quite rightly... [The anathema against Acacius was pronounced by Felix in an unusually strong form. It was declared to be irreversible by any power, even by Felix himself: ‘Nunquamque anathematis vinculis eruendus.’—*Epist. Felic. ad Acacium*. In a subsequent letter to Zeno, Felix maintains this inexorable position: ‘Unde divino judicio nullatenus potuit, *etiam quum id mallemus*, absolvi.’—*Epist. xi*. Writing to Fravitta, who succeeded Acacius in a brief patriarchate of four months, Felix intimates that Acacius [who died in 490] is doubtless with Judas in hell. But the anathema was almost a *brutum fulmen* in the East. Acacius maintained his patriarchate till his death, and the other three patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria,

⁸⁷ Footnote 1: “*Concilia*, ed. Labbe, iv, 1113.”

and Jerusalem remained in communion with him. —Milman's *Latin Christianity*, bk. iii., c.i.]”

“But in Rome, where it was considered a duty and point of honour [RJMI: a point of dogma] not to depart from the path of Felix and Gelasius, this excited great displeasure; and it came to a formal separation from Anastasius, for being willing to sacrifice the righteous cause of the Roman See, the authority of his predecessors, and the validity of the Chalcedonian decrees for the sake of an insecure peace. The premature and unexpected death of the pope at this position of affairs was regarded by those who had separated from him as a providential deliverance of the Church from very great danger...

“It was Gratian therefore, mainly, who fixed the judgment of the Middle Ages respecting Anastasius. This pope,⁸⁸ he says, is rejected by the Church of Rome. So says also the anonymous writer of Zwetl in his History of the Popes. ‘The Church⁸⁹ rejects him and God smote him.’... Alvaro Pelayo, who, next to Augustine of Ancona, furthered the aggrandisement of the papal power with the greatest zeal beyond all previous bounds, and almost beyond all limits whatever, in his great work on the condition of the Church, makes mention of the judgment⁹⁰ which came upon Anastasius, in order to prove his dictum, that a heretical pope must receive a far heavier sentence than any other... ‘The pope,’ says Domenicus dei Domienici, bishop of Torcello, somewhat later, in a letter addressed to Pope Calixtus III, (1455-1458), ‘the pope by himself alone is not an infallible rule of faith, for some popes have erred in faith, as, for example, Liberius and Anastasius II, and the latter was in consequence punished by God.’⁹¹ After him the Belgian John le Maire, also, says (about 1515), Liberius and Anastasius are the two popes of ancient times, who, subsequent to the Donation of Constantine, obtained an infamous reputation in the Church as heretics.^{92,93}

Suspect of the heresy that sacraments outside the Catholic Church to non-Catholics are fruitful

When the Antipope Anastasius II was a heretic and schismatic, he wrote a letter to the monophysite heretic and schismatic Emperor Anastasius regarding ordinations by heretics and schismatics. That letter is suspect of containing the heresy that sacraments administered outside the Catholic Church by non-Catholics to non-Catholics are fruitful and thus bestow grace. Hence he is suspect of holding this heresy. While he teaches that certain sacraments administered outside the Catholic Church by non-Catholic ministers are valid, which is true, he seems to teach that these sacraments are always fruitful and thus bestow grace and all the other gifts of these sacraments upon the recipients, which is not true but heresy:

The heretic and schismatic Antipope Anastasius II, Epistle *Exordium Pontificatus Mei*, to Anastasius Augustus, 496, On the Ordinations of Schismatics: “(7) According to the most sacred custom of the Catholic Church, let the heart of your serenity acknowledge that no share in the injury from the name of Acacius should attach to any of these whom Acacius the schismatic bishop has baptized, or to any whom he has ordained priests or Levites according to the canons, lest perchance the grace of the sacrament seem less powerful when conferred by an unjust [person]... For if the rays of that visible sun are not stained by contact with any pollution when

⁸⁸ Footnote 1: “‘Ideo ab Ecclesia Romana repudlatur.’—Distinc., 19, c. 8.”

⁸⁹ Footnote 2: “Ap. Pez, *Thesaur. Anecd.*, i., pp. 3, 351.”

⁹⁰ Footnote 2: “*Opera*, ed. Cordes. Constantia (Parisiis), 1632, p. 96.”

⁹¹ Footnote 1: “*De Cardinalium Legit. Creat. Tract.*, in M. A. de Dominis, *De Republ. Eccl.*, Londini, 1617, i., 767 ss.”

⁹² Footnote 2: “‘In haeresin prolapsus est, et reputatur pro sectundo Papa infami ‘post donationem Constantini.’”—*De Schismatum et Concil. Differ.* Argentor, 1609, p. 594.”

⁹³ pt. 1, c. 7, pp. 210-222.

they pass over the foulest places, much less is the virtue of him who made that visible [sun] fettered by any unworthiness in the minister.

“(8) Therefore, then, this person has only injured himself by wickedly administering the good. For the inviolable sacrament, which was given through him, held the perfection of its virtue for others.” (D. 169)

Hence he teaches that certain sacraments administered by the Acacian schismatics and heretics are not only valid, which is true, but also fruitful and thus bestow grace and all the other gifts upon the recipients because, he says, “the *grace* of the sacrament...is [not] less powerful” and that these sacraments hold “the perfection of virtue for others [the recipients].” He makes no distinction regarding the recipients. Does he mean all recipients and thus non-Catholic recipients who belong to or are preparing to enter the non-Catholic Church or sect? If so, then he is a heretic. Or does he mean only recipients who belong to or are preparing to enter the Catholic Church and are inculpably ignorant that they are receiving these sacraments from those who are outside the Catholic Church. If so, then he is not a heretic on this point. But the mere fact that he is ambiguous would make him a heretic if his ambiguity is willful. To determine this, the rest of the letter must be read in order to see if he makes any distinctions in it. If he did hold the heresy that baptisms outside the Catholic Church to non-Catholics bestow sanctifying grace, then he held the same heresy as the heretic Antipope Stephen. (See in this book “Stephen (254-257),” p. [35](#).)

Vigilius (537-555)

Vigilius was never the pope

Vigilius was never the pope for two reasons: (1) because he was elected by simony, and (2) because he was elected in place of the unjustly deposed Pope St. Silverius. Hence Pope St. Silverius was the true pope and Vigilius was a simoniacal and schismatic antipope. Pope St. Silverius died shortly after Vigilius was elected. Hence to be the true pope, Vigilius would have to have been re-elected to the papacy and to have abjured from his heresy of simony, neither of which he did. Hence Vigilius was never the pope for these two reasons:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vigilius: “Vigilius...came to the Eastern capital. Empress Theodora sought to win him as a confederate, to revenge the deposition of the Monophysite Patriarch Anthimus of Constantinople by Agapetus and also to gain aid for her efforts in behalf of the Monophysites. Vigilius is said to have agreed to the plans of the intriguing empress who promised him the Papal See and a large sum of money (700 pounds of gold). After Agapetus’s death on 22 April, 536, Vigilius returned to Rome equipped with letters from the imperial Court and with money. Meanwhile Silverius had been made pope through the influence of the King of the Goths. Soon after this the Byzantine commander Belisarius garrisoned the city of Rome, which was, however, besieged again by the Goths. Vigilius gave Belisarius the letters from the Court of Constantinople, which recommended Vigilius himself for the Papal See. False accusations now led Belisarius to depose Silverius. Owing to the pressure exerted by the Byzantine commander, Vigilius was elected pope in place of Silverius and consecrated and enthroned on 29 March, 537. Vigilius brought it about that the unjustly deposed Silverius was put into his keeping where the late pope soon died from the harsh treatment he received. After the death of this predecessor, Vigilius was recognized as pope by all the Roman clergy.”

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, LX. Silverius (536-537): [Footnote 1, p. 150] “The intrigue of Theodora, by means of which Silverius was deposed, is described by Liberatus even more minutely than it is here. Liberatus says: ‘Augusta summoned Vigilius,

deacon of Agapitus, and asked him secretly to promise her that if he were made pope he would annul the synod of Chalcedon, where the dual nature of Christ had been maintained, and would write to Theodosius, Anthemius, and Severus and in his letters approve their faith, and she offered to give him an order to Belisarius to make him pope and to bestow on him seven hundred thousand sesterces. So Vigilus gladly gave his promise, desiring the bishopric and the gold, and after making his pledge he went to Rome; but when he arrived there he found that Silverius had been ordained pope. Also he found Belisarius at Ravenna (this should be Naples), besieging and capturing the city, and he delivered to him the command of Augusta and promised to give him two hundred thousand sesterces of gold if he would remove Silverius and ordain him (Vigilius) instead.’ *Breviarium*, 22; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, vol. 68, col. 1039. Quoted by Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 294, n. 18.”

Here, then, is a case when a pope, Silverius, was judged and deposed, and in this case unjustly. But those who favored Vigilus as the pope believed that the judgment and deposition of Pope St. Silverius was just. There was never an argument that a pope cannot be judged, sentenced, or deposed but only if the judgment, sentence, or deposition was just or not and thus valid and legal or not.

The Three Chapters

Even if Vigilus had been the pope (which he was not), he would have automatically lost his office in 553 for defending the heretical Three Chapters and for not condemning Theodore of Mopsuestia as a heretic. The Three Chapters are the heretical writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia in favor of Arianism, the heretical writings of Theodoret of Cyrus in favor of Nestorius and Nestorianism and against Cyril and the Council of Ephesus, and a heretical letter attributed to Bishop Ibas of Edessa to the Nestorian Persian Bishop Maris. These works contained the heresy that Jesus Christ was only a man and thus not also God, the same heresy that Arius and Nestorius held. Theodore of Mopsuestia held it before Nestorius:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “Theodore of Mopsuestia was the real father of that heresy which received its name from one of his disciples, Nestorius. Theodore had died before the Nestorian controversy broke out (A.D. 428), and this is undoubtedly the reason why the third Ecumenical Synod at Ephesus condemned Nestorius and made no reference to Theodore of Mopsuestia (see vol. iii., sec. 134). In the same way his writings were spared when the Emperor Theodosius II had those of Nestorius burnt. Taking advantage of this circumstance, the confessed and secret Nestorians hastened to circulate the books of Theodore and those of the still earlier Diodorus of Tarsus, his master, and to translate them into Syriac, Armenian, and Persian. The principal seat of this movement was Edessa in Mesopotamia, in consequence of which, in the year 435, the bishop of this city, Nabulas, felt himself obliged to point out Theodore of Mopsuestia publicly as the real father of the Nestorian heresy, and to draw the attention of all his colleagues to this fact.”⁹⁴

Not only were the Three Chapters condemned but Theodore of Mopsuestia was also condemned as a heretic because he never abjured his heresy. Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas abjured their heresy at the Council of Chalcedon and thus were not to be condemned as heretics, but their heretical works were condemned.

⁹⁴ v. 4, b. 14, c. 1, sec. 258, pp. 233-234.

547 – Emperor Justinian’s Imperial Edict condemns the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “When Justinian was occupied with the notion of drawing up an extensive document with the view of reuniting the Acephali, a sect of the Monophysites, to the Church (see vol iii., sec. 208), Ascidas, together with some friends, represented to him that there was a much shorter and surer way to that end, and it might spare him the trouble of a lengthy treatise if he would only pronounce an anathema on Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings, on the letter of Bishop Ibas of Edessa to the Persian Maris, and, finally, on those writings of Theodoret which had been put forth in defence of Nestorius and against Cyril and the Synod of Ephesus... The Emperor entered into the proposal and issued an edict in which he pronounced the threefold anathema required and thus provoked the controversy of the Three Chapters.”⁹⁵

What follows is the condemnation of the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia from the Second Council of Constantinople in 553, which is the same as found in Justinian’s Imperial Edict of 547. Canon 12 condemns the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Canon 13 condemns the heretical writings of Theodoret of Cyrus, and Canon 14 condemns the heretical letter which Ibas is said to have written to Maris the Persian:

Second Council of Constantinople, 553, confirmed by Pope Pelagius, 556: “Canon 12. If anyone defends the impious Theodore of Mopsuestia, who said that one was God the Word, and another the Christ, who was troubled by the sufferings of the soul and the longings of the flesh, and who gradually separated Himself from worse things, and was improved by the progress of His works, and rendered blameless by this life, so as to be baptized as mere man in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and on account of the baptism received the grace of the Holy Spirit, and was deemed worthy of adoption as a son, and according to the likeness of the royal image is worshipped in the person of God the Word, and after the resurrection became unchangeable in thoughts and absolutely unerring, and again the same impious Theodore having said that the union of God the Word with the Christ was such as the Apostle (spoke of) with reference to man and woman: ‘They shall be two in one flesh’ [Eph. 5:31]; and in addition to his other innumerable blasphemies, dared to say that after the resurrection, the Lord when He breathed on His disciples and said: ‘Receive ye the holy ghost’ [Is. 20:22], did not give them the Holy Spirit, but breathed only figuratively. But this one, too, said that the confession of Thomas on touching the hands and the side of the Lord, after the resurrection, ‘My Lord and my God’ [Is. 20:28], was not said by Thomas concerning Christ, but that Thomas, astounded by the marvel of the resurrection, praised God for raising Christ from the dead; and what is worse, even in the interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles made by him, the same Theodore comparing Christ to Plato and Manichaeus, and Epicurus, and Marcion, says that, just as each of those after inventing his own doctrine caused his disciples to be called Platonists, and Manichaeans, and Epicureans, and Marcionites, and Christ invented His own way of life and His own doctrines [caused His disciples] to be called Christians from Him; if, then, anyone defends the aforementioned most impious Theodore and his impious writings, in which he sets forth the aforesaid and other innumerable blasphemies against the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ, but does not anathematize him and his impious writings, and all those who accept or even justify him, or say that he preached in an orthodox manner, and those who wrote in his defense or in defense of his wicked writings, and those who think the

⁹⁵ v. 4, sec. 258, pp. 230-231.

same things, or have thought them up to this time and acquiesced in such heresy until their deaths, let such a one be anathema. (D. 224-225)

“Canon 13. If anyone defends the impious writings of Theodoritus, which are against the true faith and the first holy synod (held) in Ephesus, and (against) Cyril in the number of the saints, and his twelve chapters, and defends all that he has written on behalf of the impious Theodore and Nestorius, and on behalf of others who think the same as the above-mentioned Theodore and Nestorius, and accepts them and their godlessness; and because of them calls the teachers of the Church impious, who believe in the union of the Word of God according to subsistence; and if he does not anathematize the said impious writings, and those who have thought or think similarly with these, and all those who have written against the true faith, or against Cyril among the saints and his twelve chapters, and have died in such impiety, let such a one be anathema. (D. 226)

“Canon 14. If anyone defends the epistle which Ibas is said to have written to Maris the Persian, which denied that God the Word became incarnate of the holy Mother of God and ever virgin Mary, was made man, but which said that a mere man was born of her, whom he calls a temple, so that God the Word is one, and the man another; and which slandered as a heretic Cyril in the number of the saints for having proclaimed the right faith of the Christians; and as one who wrote in a manner like that of the wicked Apollinaris, and blamed the first holy synod (held) in Ephesus, because it condemned Nestorius without an inquiry; and the same impious letter stigmatizes the twelve chapters of Cyril in the number of the saints as wicked and opposed to the true faith, and justifies Theodore and Nestorius and their impious doctrines and writings; if anyone then defends the said letter, and does not anathematize it, and those who defend it, and say that it is true, or part of it is, and those who have written and are writing in its defense, or in defense of the wicked (ideas) included in it, and dare to justify it or the impiety included in it in the name of the holy Fathers, or of the holy synod (held) in Chalcedon, and have persisted in these (actions) until death, let such a one be anathema.” (D. 227)

547 – Vigilius privately condemns the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia

After the Emperor Justinian condemned the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia, Vigilius also condemned them privately after he arrived in Constantinople in 547:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “When Vigilius arrived in Constantinople, January 25, 547, he was received by the Emperor with many honours... After some time, however, Vigilius first gave privately a promise that he would anathematise the three chapters... To this time probably belong also the two letters, containing these promises, from Vigilius to the Emperor and the Empress. They are short, and have almost verbally the same contents. The one to the Emperor runs: ‘We never were heretical, and are not so. But I demand the rights which God has granted to my see. But your Piety must not infer from this that I defend heretics. Behold, I respond to your irresistible command, and anathematise the letter of Ibas, and the doctrines of Theodoret, and of Theodore formerly bishop of Mopsuestia, who was always foreign to the Church, and an opponent of the holy Fathers. Whoever does not confess that the one only-begotten Word of God, that is, Christ, is one substance, and one person, we anathematise,’ etc. These letters were read subsequently in the seventh session of the fifth and in the third session of the sixth Ecumenical Synod [in 553].”⁹⁶

⁹⁶ v. 4, sec. 259, pp. 249-250.

548 – Vigilius in his *Judicatum* publicly condemns the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “Soon afterwards, on Easter Eve, April 11, 548, Vigilius issued his *Judicatum*, addressed to Mennas, which, as its title indicates, professed to give the result obtained by him as *Judex* through the conferences and votes (the *judicium and exarrum*). Unfortunately this important document is also lost, and up to the present day it has been generally maintained, that only a single fragment of it has been preserved, which is found in a letter of the Emperor Justinian to the fifth Ecumenical Synod, according to the text edited by Baluze. It was overlooked that five such fragments exist in another contemporaneous document.

“First of all, let us examine closely that first fragment. After the Emperor had said that the *Judicatum* issued by the Pope (first to Mennas) had been made known to all the bishops, he gives the anathema, contained in it, on the three chapters, with Vigilius’s own words: “ Et quoniam quae Nobis de nomine Theodori Mopsueatini scripta porrecta sunt, multa contraria rectae fidei releguntur, Nos monita Pauli sequentia apostoli dicentis: *Omnia probate, quod bonum est retinete*, ideoque anathematizamus Theodorum, qui fuit Mopsueatiae episcopus, cum omnibus suis impiis scriptis, et qui vindicant eum. Anathematizamus et impiam epistolam, quae ad Marim Persam scripta esse ab Iba dicitur, tamquam contrariam rectae fidei Christiana; et omnes, qui eam vindicant, vel rectam esse dicunt. Anathematizamus et scripta Theodoretii, quae contra rectam fidem et duodecim Cyrilli capitula scripta sunt...”⁹⁷

550 – Vigilius excommunicates Roman clerics who oppose his *Judicatum*

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “We learn from Vigilius himself that at an early period some in Constantinople so strenuously opposed him and his *Judicatum*, that he had been obliged to excommunicate them... If this sentence of excommunication was sent forth after March 18, 550, as we shall shortly show, we can also see: (a) that immediately after the appearance of the *Judicatum*, some of those at Constantinople opposed the Pope so violently that he was obliged to excommunicate them; (b) that two monks, Lampridius and Felix of Africa, came to Constantinople and opposed the *Judicatum* by speech and by writing; (c) that the Pope’s nephew Rusticus and other Roman clergy joined these opponents, and circulated detrimental reports concerning the Pope in all the provinces; (d) that the Pope gave them repeated warnings before proceeding to extremities; and that (e) in many provinces parties arose for and against the *Judicatum*, and there arose between them bloody frays even in the churches.”⁹⁸

550 – Vigilius and Justinian call for a council to resolve conflicts and re-condemn the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia

Because of apparent conflicts between the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon and the condemnation of the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia, both Vigilius and Justinian agreed to call a council to resolve the apparent conflicts and re-condemn the Three Chapters and Theodore. The only problem was the apparent conflicts with these councils. That the Three Chapters were heretical and Theodore was a heretic was beyond question. Hence anyone who did not condemn the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia after seeing the evidence was a

⁹⁷ v. 4, sec. 259, pp. 253-254.

⁹⁸ v. 4, sec. 259, pp. 261-262.

formal heretic, regardless of the un-resolved conflicts with the councils. Thus Vigilius promised to uphold the condemnation of the Three Chapters and Theodore:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “For the appeasing of the disputes which had arisen over the *Judicatum*, the Pope and Emperor, about the year 550, agreed...to have the question of the three chapters decided anew by a great Synod... Vigilius...took an oath to him [Justinian] in writing, on the 15th of August 550, to the effect that he would be of one mind with the Emperor, and labour to the utmost to have the three chapters anathematised.”⁹⁹

551 – Justinian’s second imperial edict resolves the conflicts and re-condemns the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia

Before the council, the Emperor Justinian passed a second imperial edict, *Edict on the True Faith*, in which he thoroughly and diligently resolved the apparent conflicts between the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon and the condemnation of the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia and re-condemned the Three Chapters and Theodore. Anyone who had access to this edict would be culpable for continuing to say there was a conflict between these councils and the condemnation of the Three Chapters and Theodore:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “The Second Imperial Edict against the Three Chapters – ...The second edict of the Emperor against the three chapters was drawn up...probably in the year 551, was addressed to the whole of Christendom, and is still extant.¹⁰⁰ Nothing is so calculated, the Emperor says, to propitiate the gracious God, as unity in the faith; therefore he lays down here the orthodox confession. Then follows a kind of creed, in which, first the doctrine of the Trinity, principally in opposition to Sabellius and Arius, is defined; but much more completely is the doctrine of the Person of Christ explained, in opposition to the Nestorians and Monophysites.”¹⁰¹

Regarding the Emperor Justinian’s refutation of the false claim that Theodore of Mopsuestia was never condemned when he was alive, see in this book “The heretic Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia’s name was removed from the diptychs,” p. [22](#).

And regarding his refutation of the heresy that dead men cannot be condemned or anathematized after death, see in this book “Persons who have been removed or re-added to the diptychs after death,” p. [25](#). The holy Emperor Justinian’s edict is a most excellent, diligent, sublime, and thorough defense of the Catholic faith, refutation of the Three Chapters, and resolution of the apparent contradictions between the Three Chapters and the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. (See in this book “Justinian’s Second Imperial Edict against the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia,” p. [135](#).)

551 – Vigilius in his *Damnatio* excommunicates anyone who consents to Justinian’s second edict

In the seventh month of 551 in his *Damnatio*, Vigilius decreed that anyone who consented to Justinian’s second imperial edict was excommunicated. And he excommunicated those who did. His reason was not because the edict was heretical or erroneous but because Justinian did not wait for a council in which he, the bishops, and Justinian would resolve the conflicts together:

⁹⁹ v. 4, sec. 261, p. 265.

¹⁰⁰ Footnote 1: “Mansi, *l.c.* p. 59 sq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 8 sq.”

¹⁰¹ v. 4, sec. 263, p. 270.

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “After issuing this imperial edict, a great conference was held in the residence of the Pope [in 551], the Placidia Palace. Greek and Latin bishops of different neighbourhoods, and the priests, deacons, and clerics of Constantinople, were present. Even Theodore Ascidas was present. Both Vigilius and Dacius of Milan warned them against receiving the new imperial edict; and the former, in particular, said: ‘Beseech the pious Emperor to withdraw the edicts which he has had drawn up, and await the (projected) ecumenical decree on the matter in question, until the Latin bishops, who have taken offence (at the condemnation of the three chapters), shall be either personally present at a Synod, or send their votes in writing. If he should not listen to your petitions, then you ought to give your assent to nothing which tends to a rending of the Church. If, however, you should do so, which I do not believe, you must know that, from that day, you are excommunicated from the apostolic see of Peter.’”¹⁰²

552 – Vigilius un-excommunicates those who promise to wait for a council to resolve the conflicts

Those whom Vigilius excommunicated promised to wait for the council to resolve the conflicts, and Vigilius lifted their excommunication:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “So far goes the Encyclical of the Pope, dated February 5, 552. What immediately followed upon this is not reported in the original document. We may suppose, however, that, by the negotiations of Dacius and the others, the matter took this turn, that Mennas, Ascidas, and their friends should present a confession of faith to the Pope that should be satisfactory to him, and that the Synod, long resolved upon, should finally be held for the settlement of the controversy. What is certain is, that now Mennas, Theodore Ascidas, Andrew of Ephesus, Theodore of Antioch in Pisidia, Peter of Tarsus, and many other Greek bishops, presented a confession of faith to the Pope, who was still in the Church of S. Euphemia; and that Vigilius was satisfied with it. . . They declared in this that they desired the unity of the Church, and therefore had set forth this document, to the effect that they, before everything, held fast inviolably to the four holy Synods of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, as well to their decrees on the faith as to their other ordinances, without adding or subtracting anything; and that they would never do, or allow anything to be done, to the blame, or to the alteration, or to the reproach of these Synods under any pretext whatever; but, on the contrary, would accept everything which, by general decree, in agreement with the legates and of the apostolic see, had then been pronounced. In like manner, they were ready to give a complete assent to the letters of Leo, and to anathematise everyone who acted against them. As regarded, however, the matter now coming in question respecting the three chapters, none of them had prepared a statement on this subject in opposition to the agreement between the Emperor and the Pope (A.D. 550, sec. 262B); and they were agreed that all writings should be given over to the Pope (i.e., should first be put out of operation—until the decision of a Council). As for the injuries which the Pope had experienced, they were not in fault, yet they would ask forgiveness as though they had themselves committed them. So, too, they would ask forgiveness for having, during the time of division, held communion with those whom the Pope had excommunicated.”^{103,104}

¹⁰² v. 4, sec. 264, p. 278.

¹⁰³ Footnote 1: “Mansi, t. ix. p. 62 sq.; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 10 sq.”

¹⁰⁴ v. 4, sec. 265, pp. 285-286.

553 – Vigilius gives and then recalls his assent to hold the council, and Justinian opens it instead (the Second Council of Constantinople)

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “Vigilius replied, January 8, 553, in several letters, ...he says, ‘he is thoroughly in accord with this, that a general consultation, under his presidency, *servata equitate*, on the subject of the three chapters, should be held, and that by a common decision, in accordance with the four holy Synods, all division should be taken away.’ ... The Pope prepared to bring only three bishops from his side with him, and so from the Greek side there should be only four persons selected, the three patriarchs and one other bishop besides. But the Emperor demanded that each Greek patriarch might bring three to five bishops with him. As the Pope would not agree to this, and on the other side the Emperor and the Greek bishops rejected the Pope’s proposal, Vigilius paid no regard to the repeated request that he would, without further delay, appear at the Synod, but declared that his intention was to express his judgment in writing and for himself; and the Synod was therefore opened without his presence, in order to advance the *via facti*, and by the *fait accompli* to make the Pope compliant.¹⁰⁵

“In accordance with the imperial command, but without the assent of the Pope, the Synod was opened on the 5th of May 553, in the Secretarium of the Bishop’s Church at Constantinople.”¹⁰⁶

Vigilius is petitioned several times to attend the council but refuses

Several times the Emperor Justinian petitioned Vigilius to attend the council and sent him a record of each session when it was completed. But Vigilius obstinately refused to attend:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “[During the First Session 5/5/553] The bishops then declared that although several of them and the imperial officials had already frequently exhorted Vigilius to enter into common consultation with them, yet it was reasonable to do this once more; and thereupon, whilst the rest remained assembled, there went a highly distinguished and numerous deputation, among them the three Oriental patriarchs, to the Pope, to invite him to take part in the Synod. They returned with the intelligence that Vigilius had stated that, on account of being unwell, he was unable to give them an immediate answer, and he requested the deputies to come again next day in order to receive his answer. In expectation of this they closed the first session...”¹⁰⁷

“On the 8th of May 553, the same bishops came together again in the same place, and on request the deputies sent in the first session to Vigilius gave an account of their second visit to the Pope.

‘As the Pope of Old Rome,’ they said, ‘appointed the next day for us, so we betook ourselves again to him on the 6th of May, two days ago, reminded him of the letters already exchanged between us and him, and requested him, in accordance with his promise, now to declare whether he would take council in common with us on the subject of the three chapters. He refused to take part in the Synod... As he persevered in his refusal, we added, that, as the Emperor had commanded us, as well as him, to deliver an opinion on the three chapters, we, on our part, should assemble without him and express our view. He then declared: I have asked the Emperor for a delay of twenty days, within which time I will answer his written question. If I have not by that time expressed my

¹⁰⁵ v. 4, sec. 266, pp. 287-288.

¹⁰⁶ v. 4, sec. 267, p. 289.

¹⁰⁷ v. 4, sec. 267, p. 302.

opinion, then I will accept all that you decree on the three chapters. We replied: In the correspondence between us and you there was nothing said of a separate, but of a common declaration on the three chapters. If your Holiness only wishes for delay, it is to be considered that the matter has already lasted seven years, since your Holiness came into this city. Moreover, you are perfectly informed on the subject, and have already frequently anathematised the three chapters, both in writing and orally. Vigilius refused to give any further answer. He promised to send some State officials (Judices) and bishops to him, in order to admonish him anew.’

“Diodorus, the Archdeacon and Primicerius of the Notaries, now declared that yesterday, May 7, the Emperor had actually sent several State officials, together with a number of bishops, to the Pope, and the former were ready to give a report concerning their mission. They related:

‘At the command of the Emperor, we had recourse to Pope Vigilius on the 1st of May in the company of Belisarius and others, and again on the 7th of May in company with Theodore, bishop of Cesarea, and others, and presented to him both times the same command of the Emperor, that he would either negotiate with all the bishops in common, or, if he did not like this, that he would first with the patriarchs and some other bishops consider the question of the three chapters, so that the judgment of this commission might then be received by the other bishops. He refused, however, both the consultation with all and that with the patriarchs, and demanded delay in order that he might give his answer alone. We told him that he had already frequently anathematised the three chapters alone, both in writing and orally, but that the Emperor desired a common sentence upon them. Vigilius, too, had already himself communicated to the Emperor his wish for a delay; and had received for answer, that, if he were really ready for a common consultation with the bishops or patriarchs, then he should receive a still longer delay. As, however, he was now visibly trying to put the matter off, it was necessary that the other bishops should give their judgment in a Synod... We presented this to him, and besought him repeatedly to take part in the Synod. But he persisted in his refusal.’

“This report of the imperial officials was confirmed by the bishops who went with them to Vigilius.”¹⁰⁸

Vigilius in his *Constitutum* opposes the council, defends the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and thus falls into heresy

On 5/15/553, after the fourth session and before the fifth session of the council, Vigilius promulgated his letter titled the *Constitutum* in which he opposed the Second Council of Constantinople and for the first time defended the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia and thus fell into heresy and lost his office:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “The *Constitutum* of Vigilius, May 14, 553. During the sessions of the Synod heretofore described, Pope Vigilius prepared that comprehensive memorial to the Emperor, of the composition of which he had already informed the commissaries sent to him in the words: He would within twenty days set forth his view of the three chapters separately from the Synod (sec. 268). It is headed *Constitutum Vigili Papae de tribus capitulis*, and therefore is called *Constitutum*, and is dated May 14, 553, from Constantinople, and is subscribed by sixteen other bishops besides Vigilius...

¹⁰⁸ v. 4, sec. 268, pp. 302-304.

“[In] the *Constitutum*...the Pope said he did not venture to pronounce anathema on the person of the departed Theodore of Mopsuestia, and did not allow that others should do so... In the second place, as regarded the writings circulated under the name of Theodoret, he wondered that anything was undertaken to the dishonour of this man, who, more than a hundred years ago, had subscribed without hesitation the sentence of Chalcedon... For this reason also nothing should now be undertaken to the dishonour of Theodoret...

“The Pope says he had instituted inquiries with respect to the letter of the venerable Ibas... and declared that...the letter of Ibas must remain inviolate...

“The *Constitutum* finally closes with the words:

“We ordain and decree that it be permitted to no one who stands in ecclesiastical order or office, to write or bring forward, or undertake, or teach anything contradictory to the contents of this *Constitutum* in regard to the three chapters, or, after this declaration, begin a new controversy about them. And if anything has already been done or spoken in regard of the three chapters in contradiction of this our ordinance, by any one whomsoever, this we declare void by the authority of the apostolic see.”¹⁰⁹

Vigilius' *Constitutum* is the act in which it became known that Vigilius was not only a heretic but a formal heretic. He was a formal heretic because he could not claim inculpable ignorance of the evidence against the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the heretical writings of Theodoret of Cyrus, and the heretical letter that was said to have been written by Ibas to Maris. Not only did he know about the Three Chapters previous to defending them in 553 in his *Constitutum* but he correctly condemned the Three Chapters in 547 in his *Judicatum*. Hence Vigilius condemned himself. Either way he turned, he was a formal heretic. If his *Judicatum* was erroneous, then he would have been a formal heretic in 547. If his *Constitutum* was erroneous, then he would have been a formal heretic in 553, which was the case.

Justinian deposes the formal heretic Vigilius, removes his name from the diptychs, and intends to elect a pope

It is an ordinary magisterium dogma from Pentecost Day in AD 33 and a solemn magisterium dogma from at least AD 431 that heretics must not be listed in the diptychs nor prayed for in the Te Igitur prayer of the Mass and that they lose their offices if they are formal heretics, or are presumed to lose their offices if they are presumed formal heretics. This dogma was also taught after the last Canon, Canon 14, in the Second Council of Constantinople, which infallibly teaches that officeholders who do not condemn the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia are stripped of their offices:

Second Council of Constantinople, 553, confirmed by Pope Pelagius, 556: “When then these things have been so confessed, which we have received from Holy Scripture, and from the teaching of the Holy Fathers, and from what was defined with regard to one and the same faith by the aforesaid four holy synods, and from that condemnation formulated by us against the heretics and their impiety, and besides, that against those who have defended or are defending the aforementioned three chapters, and who have persisted or do persist in their own error; if anyone should attempt to transmit [doctrines] opposed to those piously molded by us, or to teach or to write [them] if indeed he be a bishop, or belongs to the clergy, such a one, because he acts in a manner foreign to the sacred and ecclesiastical constitutions, shall be stripped of the office of bishop or cleric, but if he be a monk or a layman, he shall be anathematized.” (D. 228)

¹⁰⁹ v. 4, sec. 272, pp. 316-323.

Hence when the Emperor Justinian, during the seventh session of the council, was informed of Vigilius' *Constitutum* in which Vigilius defended the heretical Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia, he promptly and correctly removed Vigilius' name from the diptychs, began the process of procuring another pope, and banished Vigilius because it was then known beyond a doubt that Vigilius was a heretic for defending, instead of condemning, the Three Chapters and Theodore:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: "The papal subdeacon Servus-Dei was now standing at the door of the Emperor, in order to convey that document [Vigilius' *Constitutum*] to him. The Emperor, however, did not admit the subdeacon, but sent him, by his minister, the following answer to Vigilius:

"I invited you to take measures in common with the other patriarchs and bishops with respect to the three chapters. You have refused this, and now wish, for yourself alone, to give a judgment in writing (in the *Constitutum*). But, if you have, in this, condemned the three chapters, I have no need of this new document, for I have from you many others of the same content. If, however, you have, in this new document, departed from your earlier declarations, you have condemned yourself.' ...

"The Synod declared that from this the zeal of the Emperor for the true faith was clearly to be recognised, and promised daily to pray for him. As, however, they wanted to close the session, the quaestor Constantine presented one other letter of the Emperor, containing the command that the name of Vigilius should be struck from all the diptychs, because, through his defence of the three chapters, he had participated in the impiety of Nestorius and Theodore.¹¹⁰ ...

"It is probable that the Pope and the bishops who were faithful to him, and were about him in Constantinople, suffered the punishment of exile. That the Emperor had demanded, even during the fifth Synod, that the name of Vigilius should be struck from the diptychs, we have already seen; and we found it probable that the edict in reference to this was published generally on July 14, 553. About the same time occurred what Anastasius and the author of the additions to the Chronicle of Marcellinus relate, that Vigilius and his clergy were banished into different places, and that they had been condemned to labour in the mines... The liberation, however, was dependent upon the condition that Vigilius would recognise the fifth Synod.¹¹¹ ...

"Vigilius...died at Syracuse towards the end of the year 554, or in January of 555. His body was conveyed to Rome, and, as Anastasius relates, was entombed in the Church of S. Marcellus on the Salarian Way. His successor was his previous deacon Pelagius I (from April 555 to March 560)... [When] Vigilius declared himself for the three chapters...Justinian intended to raise him [Pelagius I] to the Roman see in place of Vigilius, if Anastasius tells the truth. The Pope's compliance, however, altered the case."¹¹²

Vigilius repents and abjures and dies shortly after

A little more than seven months after the end of the Second Council of Constantinople, Vigilius repented and abjured on 12/8/553. He admitted his guilt, accepted the Second Council of Constantinople, and again, for the second and final time, condemned the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia and condemned all who defend the Three Chapters and Theodore:

¹¹⁰ Footnote 1: "Mansi, *l.c.* p. 366; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 186."

¹¹¹ v. 4, sec. 272, pp. 324-326 and sec. 275, p. 343.

¹¹² v. 4, sec. 277, pp. 351-352.

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “The liberation, however, was dependent upon the condition that Vigilius would recognise the fifth Synod; and he did so, as in the meantime he had come to the conviction, certainly a right one, that the Council of Chalcedon was thereby in no ways infringed upon... That Pope Vigilius had given his assent to the fifth Synod sometime after its close, has long been known from Evagrius and Photius,¹¹³ and from the Acts of the sixth Ecumenical Synod, eighteenth session. In the seventeenth century, however, Peter de Marca and Baluze discovered the two edicts in which the Pope expressed this assent.¹¹⁴ The first of these documents, discovered by Peter de Marca in a codex in the Royal Library in Paris, is addressed to the Patriarch Eutychius of Constantinople, and dated December 8, 553. We see from this that more than seven months had passed since the end of the Synod when Vigilius arrived at his new resolve. Here he says:

‘The enemy of the human race, who sows discord everywhere, had separated him from his colleagues, the bishops assembled in Constantinople. But Christ had removed the darkness again from his spirit, and had again united the Church of the whole world... There was no shame in confessing and recalling a previous error... Thus he had found that Theodore of Mopsuestia had taught error, and therefore had been opposed in the writings of the Fathers (here he inserts several heretical expressions of Theodore, almost verbally taken from the twelfth anathematism of the Synod, sec. 274). The whole Church must now know that he rightly ordained the following: We condemn and anathematise, together with all the heretics who have been already condemned and anathematized at the four holy Synods and by the Catholic Church, also Theodore, formerly bishop of Mopsuestia, and his impious writings; also that which Theodoret impiously wrote against the right faith, against the twelve anathematisms of Cyril, against the first Synod of Ephesus, and in defence of Theodore and Nestorius. Moreover, we anathematise and condemn also the impious letter [attributed to Ibas], etc. (here are the very same words which the Synod employed in their sentence, sec. 274). Finally, we subject to the same anathema all who believe that the three chapters referred to could at any time be approved or defended, or who venture to oppose the present anathema. Those, on the contrary, who have condemned, or do condemn, the three chapters, we hold for brethren and fellow-priests. Whatever we ourselves or others have done in defence of the three chapters we declare invalid. Far be it from anyone to say that the before-mentioned blasphemies (from the books of Theodore and Theodoret, etc.), or those who teach the like, have been approved by the four holy Synods, or by one of them. On the contrary, it is well known that no one who was in any way under suspicion was received by the Fathers named, especially by the holy Synod of Chalcedon, unless he first had anathematized the said blasphemies, or the heresy of which he was suspected.’¹¹⁵

“The second document, discovered by Baluze in the Colbert Library, dated February 23, 554, is in Latin, and has no superscription, and the beginning is also wanting. It bears the title ‘*Vigilii Papae Constitutum de damnatione trium capitulorum*’ (thus the second *Constitutum*), was perhaps addressed to the bishops of the West, and at great length took in hand to set aside their doubts of the

¹¹³ Footnote 1: “Evagrius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. c. 88; Photius, *De Synodis*, in his first letter to the Bulgarian Prince Michael, in Mansi, t. ix. p. 655; Hardouin, t. v. p. 1471.”

¹¹⁴ Footnote 2: “They are reprinted in Mansi, t. ix. pp. 414-420, and pp. 457-488; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 218 sqq. and p. 217 sqq. On these documents, their history and genuineness, cf. Marca’s dissertation on the first of them, in his *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, in the appendix, p. 207 sqq., ed. Francof. 1708; and in Mansi, t. ix. p. 419 sqq. Further, Noris, *De Synodo V.*, in the Ballerini edition of his works, t. i. p. 667 sq.; and Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. viii. S. 310. Garnier (*De quinta Synodo*, in Schulze’s edition of the works of Theodoret, t. v. p. 587) endeavours to throw suspicion upon the first of these two papal documents (he could not do so with the second); but the Ballerini (in Noris, *Opp.* t. iv. p. 1042 sq.) opposed him, and recognised the genuineness of both these newly discovered documents. So also Pagi, *ad ann.* 554, n. 4.”

¹¹⁵ Footnote 1: “Cf. on this document, Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. viii. S. 108, 302, 821.”

condemnation of the three chapters... Vigilius...relates the historical facts in connection with Ibas and then endeavours to show that the letter to Maris, ascribed to him, had never been approved by the Synod of Chalcedon, but, on the contrary, that its contents stood in contradiction to the teaching of the Council... He further, in the new edict, pronounces a full anathema on the letter in question, and on all who maintain that it was declared orthodox by anyone at Chalcedon; he then proceeds to Theodore of Mopsuestia, whom, together with the writings of Theodoret against Cyril, he declares worthy of condemnation, and finally closes with an anathema on all the three chapters together, on their defenders, and on everyone who should maintain that that letter was declared to be orthodox by the Synod of Chalcedon, or by any member of it.^{116,117}

Hence, Vigilius admitted that he had defected from the faith, fallen out of communion with Catholics, and his acts during that time were invalid. However, if he had been the pope (which he never was), this abjuration would not have given him back the papacy that he would have lost when he fell into heresy in 553. He would have needed to be re-elected to the papacy after his abjuration. This never happened, and he died about one year after he abjured:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: "Vigilius...died at Syracuse towards the end of the year 554, or in January of 555."¹¹⁸

Vigilius' abjuration made him a Catholic if it was sincere and there were no other sins he was guilty of that would make him a non-Catholic. Hence after his death, he was listed among the faithful departed. But that does not mean he was saved, as he may have been guilty of some other mortal sin. Jesus tells us that not only all those who die as non-Catholics are not saved but most who die as Catholics are not saved. "For many are called, but few chosen." (Mt. 20:16) But, nevertheless, Vigilius is to be commended for his abjuration which prevented an even greater schism and scandal and more souls falling into heresy.

This case is one proof that a pope can be judged, sentenced, and punished

If Vigilius had been the pope (which he was not), then the trial and deposition of Pope St. Silverius would have been legal and valid.

And even though Vigilius was never the pope, the Emperor Justinian and many others believed he was the pope. And thus for them Vigilius was a putative pope. Here, then, is an example of an inferior, the Emperor, judging, denouncing, and deposing a man he believed was the pope. And for this, Justinian goes down in history as a hero and defender of the faith. Not only were Justinian's actions praised by the very so-called pope he judged, sentenced, and deposed, but they were praised by future popes, especially those who re-confirmed the Second Council of Constantinople, which would never have succeeded if it had not been for the holy Roman Emperor Justinian.

The dilemma for those who believe that Vigilius was the pope and that popes cannot err

For those who wrongly believe that Vigilius was a pope and heretically believe that popes cannot err when teaching on faith or morals are faced with a dilemma. Either Vigilius erred in 548 in his *Judicatum* in which he condemned the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia, or he erred in 553 in his *Constitutum* in which he defended the Three Chapters and Theodore, or he

¹¹⁶ Footnote 1: "Mansi, t. ix. pp. 457-488; Hardouin, t. iii. pp. 217-254."

¹¹⁷ v. 4, sec. 276, pp. 345, 347, 349, 351.

¹¹⁸ v. 4, sec. 277, pp. 351.

erred again in 553 in his two edicts in which he again condemned the Three Chapters and Theodore. And his error was heresy, and hence this would be yet more proof that a pope can teach heresy.

For a thorough history of the events mentioned in this section on Vigilius, see *A History of the Councils of the Church*, apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894, Volume 4, Book 14, Sections 258 to 277 (pages 229-354).

Honorius (625-638)

He held the heresy that the Incarnate Jesus has only one will

Even though the heretic Honorius correctly held the dogma that the Incarnate Jesus Christ has two natures, that of God and that of man, he held the heresy that the Incarnate Jesus Christ has only one will. This is known as the monothelite heresy. The dogma is that since the time of Jesus Christ's Incarnation, He has two natures and thus two wills, that of God and that of man.

Third Council of Constantinople, 681

In 634 Honorius wrote two letters, *Scripta fraternitatis vestrae* and *Scripta dilectissimi filii*, to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople. These letters could be taken in an orthodox or a heretical sense regarding the two wills of Christ. There was much dispute as to whether or not Honorius taught the monothelite heresy in these letters and thus whether or not he was a monothelite heretic. Forty-four years after Honorius' death, the Catholic Church finally and infallibly settled the dispute in the Sixth Ecumenical Council, which was the Third Council of Constantinople, called by Pope St. Agatho, held from 680 to 681, and confirmed by Pope St. Leo II in 682. It infallibly condemned Honorius' two letters as heretical, infallibly condemned him as a monothelite heretic, and declared him to be excommunicated:

Third Council of Constantinople, 680-681, called by Pope St. Agatho and confirmed by Pope St. Leo II in 682, Thirteenth Session, 3rd month, 28th day, 681: "After we had read the doctrinal letters of Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus of Phasis and to Pope Honorius, as well as the letter of the latter to Sergius, we find that these documents are quite foreign to the apostolic dogmas, also to the declarations of the holy Councils, and all the Fathers of repute, and follow the false teachings of the heretics; therefore we entirely reject them, and execrate them as hurtful to the soul. But the names of these men must also be thrust forth from the Church, namely, that of Sergius, who first wrote on this impious doctrine; further, that of Cyrus of Alexandria, of Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, and of Theodore of Pharan, all of whom Pope Agatho rejected in his letter to the Emperor. We anathematise them all. And along with them, it is our unanimous decree that there shall be expelled from the Church and anathematised Honorius, formerly Pope of Old Rome, because we found in his letter to Sergius that in all respects he followed his view and confirmed his impious doctrines."

What follows is a quote that describes the burning of Honorius' heretical letters at the end of the thirteenth session:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: "Towards the end of the same session [the thirteenth] the second letter of Pope Honorius to Sergius was presented for examination, and it was ordered that all the documents brought by George, the keeper of the archives in Constantinople, and

among them the two letters of Honorius, should immediately be burnt, as hurtful to the soul (see p. 169)...

“[p. 169] The Judges [Judges] were satisfied with the proof alleged, and drew attention to the successors of Peter, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Thomas, John, and Constantine. Of these, too, letters and synodal epistles were presented (they are not received into the Acts), but the Synod found in them nothing contradictory to the orthodox doctrine, and George, the keeper of the archives at Constantinople, finally declared that he had discovered in the archives no document which could make the bishops named suspected of Monothelism. It was therefore resolved to retain their names in the diptychs. Finally, the keeper George made over all further documents found in the patriarchal archives, letters and confessions of several, among them the Latin original of the second letter of Honorius, from which some fragments were now communicated (see above, p. 49). Further, there was a fragment from a letter of the Patriarch Pyrrhus to Pope John, and something else read, and the Synod caused all these documents, even the letters of Pope Honorius, to be burnt, as hurtful to the soul.^{119,120}

The fact that the names of bishops who were cleared of heresy were kept in the diptychs is one proof that Honorius’ name was removed because his letters did contain heresy. More proof that Honorius’ name was removed from the diptychs and thus he was no longer referred to as a pope and hence proof that formal heretics lose the papal office is that thirty-two years after the end of the council the heretic Emperor Philippicus Bardanes ordered Honorius’ name to be restored to the diptychs:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “The *ἐπίλογος* of the Constantinopolitan notary and deacon Agatho [was] first published by Combefis (see p. 177, note 2). This official declares that, about thirty-two years before, he had served the sixth Ecumenical Synod as secretary, and had written the minutes and the five copies of the decree of the faith intended for the five patriarchs. He is now urged to draw up this paper by the rage with which the new Emperor, Philippicus Bardanes, persecuted orthodoxy and the sixth Ecumenical Synod. He had also ordered that the names of Sergius and Honorius, and the others anathematised by the sixth Ecumenical Synod [Greek text] should be restored to the diptychs.^{121,122}

The heretic Honorius and his heretical letters were also condemned and declared to be cast out of the Catholic Church in the eighteenth and final session of the council:

Third Council of Constantinople, 680-681, Eighteenth and Final Session, 9th month, 16th day, 681: “Exposition of Faith. This pious and orthodox creed of the divine favour was enough for a complete knowledge of the orthodox faith and a complete assurance therein. But since from the first, the contriver of evil did not rest, finding an accomplice in the serpent and through him bringing upon human nature the poisoned dart of death, so too now he has found instruments suited to his own purpose—namely Theodore, who was bishop of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, who were bishops of this imperial city, and further Honorius, who was pope of elder Rome, Cyrus, who held the See of Alexandria, and Macarius, who was recently bishop of Antioch, and his disciple Stephen, and has not been idle in raising through them obstacles of error against the full body of the Church, sowing with novel speech among the orthodox people the heresy of a single will and a single principle of action in the two natures of the one member of the holy Trinity, Christ our true God, a heresy in harmony with the evil belief, ruinous to the mind, of the impious Apollinarius, Severus and Themistius... We foresaw that, together with

¹¹⁹ Footnote 2: “Mansi, t. xi. pp. 550-582; Hardouin, t. iii. pp. 1327-1354.”

¹²⁰ v. 5, b. 16, c. 2, sec. 324, pp. 182-183; sec. 320, p. 169.

¹²¹ Footnote 2: “Combefis, *Novum Auctuarium*, t. ii. p. 204; Mansi, t. xii. p. 190.”

¹²² v. 5, b. 16, c. 2, sec. 324, p. 199.

them, also Honorius, before Pope of Old Rome, is cast out of the Holy Catholic Church of God and anathematized, for we have found by his writings sent to [the heretic] Sergius, that he followed the thinking of the latter in everything, and continued his impious principles. ...To Sergius, the heretic, anathema! To Cyrus, the heretic, anathema! To Honorius, the heretic, anathema!"

Dead men do not get excommunicated when they are dead because they no longer belong to the Church militant. Hence the excommunication of a dead man by the Catholic Church is a declaratory sentence declaring that he was an automatically excommunicated formal heretic the moment he was guilty of the mortal sin of heresy and thus while he lived. By this sentence, then, Honorius was now known to have been an automatically excommunicated heretic and thus to have automatically lost his office from the time he authored his two heretical letters. And after this sentence his name was removed from the diptychs.

Bishops of the Third Council of Constantinople, 680

After the council ended, the bishops sent the following letter to Pope St. Agatho:

Letter of the Council to Pope St. Agatho: "And by his help we have overthrown the error of impiety, having as it were laid siege to the nefarious doctrine of the heretics. And then tearing to pieces the foundations of their execrable heresy, and attacking them with spiritual and paternal arms, and confounding their tongues that they might not speak consistently with each other, we overturned the tower built up by these followers of this most impious heresy; and we slew them with anathema, as lapsed from the faith and as sinners, in the morning outside the camp of the tabernacle of God, that we may express ourselves after the manner of David, in accordance with the sentence already given concerning them in your letter, and their names are these: Theodore, bishop of Pharan, Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter."¹²³

And the bishops sent a letter to the Emperor:

The Proshoneticus to the Emperor (Letter of the Bishops to the Emperor), 680: "Therefore we declare that in him there are two natural wills and two natural operations, proceeding commonly and without division: but we cast out of the Church and rightly subject to anathema all superfluous novelties as well as their inventors: to wit, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius and Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter (who were archbishops of Constantinople), moreover Cyrus, who bore the priesthood of Alexandria, and with them Honorius, who was the ruler of Rome, as he followed them in these things...

"Theodore, a humble priest of the Holy Roman Church, and of Agatho, blessed and universal Pope who governs the city of Rome, subscribes to this Proshoneticus, praying, etc. (165 other names of subscribing Bishops follow)"¹²⁴

The Emperor, 681

And the Emperor posted an edict condemning Honorius as a heretic:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: "Immediately after the end of the Synod, the Emperor caused to be posted in the third atrium of the great church in the neighbourhood of Dicymbalon the following edict: 'The heresy of Apollinaris, etc., has been renewed by Theodore of Pharan and confirmed by Honorius, who contradicted himself. Also Cyrus, Pyrrhus,

¹²³ Mansi, t. xi, p. 683 sqq.

¹²⁴ Labbe and Cossart, *Sacrosancta Concilia*, from 649 to the year 787, tom. vi, col. 1047 ff, above quote in col. 1053.

Paul, Peter; more recently, Macarius, Stephen, and Polychronius had diffused Monothelitism. He, the Emperor, had therefore convoked this holy and Ecumenical Synod, and published the present edict with the confession of faith, in order to confirm and establish its decrees. (There follows here an extended confession of faith, with proofs for the doctrine of two wills and operations.) As he recognised the five earlier Ecumenical Synods, so he anathematised all heretics from Simon Magus, but especially the originators and patrons of the new heresy, Theodore and Sergius; also Pope Honorius, who was their adherent and patron in everything, and confirmed the heresy...¹²⁵

Pope St. Leo II, 682

Pope St. Agatho died before he confirmed the council. The next pope, St. Leo II, confirmed the council in 682 and condemned Honorius as harshly as the council did:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “Pope Leo II responded to the wish of the Emperor in a letter addressed to him, which at the same time contains the papal confirmation of the sixth Ecumenical Synod. The Pope, in this letter...confirmed and recognised, therefore, the sixth Ecumenical Council in the same way as the five preceding, and anathematised all heretics, Arius, etc.; also the originators of the new heresy, Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, etc.; also Honorius... As Pope Leo II in this document confirmed the sixth Ecumenical Council, so did he zealously endeavour to bring about its recognition throughout the entire West. We see this from his letters to the Spanish bishops still extant, to Bishop Quiricius in particular, to the Spanish King Ervig,¹²⁶ and to Count Simplicius.^{127,128}

Pope St. Leo II, *Letter to Emperor Constantine*, 682: “Moreover the successors of those who preside over the church of Constantinople, and also Honorius, who presided over the Apostolic Church, did not teach the pure doctrine of the apostolic tradition but he betrayed the immaculate faith and attempted to subvert it.”¹²⁹

Pope St. Leo II, *Decretal to the Bishops of Spain*, 682: “Honorius...did not with his apostolic authority extinguish the flames of heretical dogma as he should have but instead neglecting to do so cherished it instead.”¹³⁰

Pope St. Leo II, *Letter to the Spanish King Ervig*, 682: “The Church of God hath taken away...all authors of heretical assertion... that is, the bishop Pharanitanus Theodore, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter, formerly of Constantinople, and one with them Honorius the Roman, consented to be stained the stainless rule of the apostolic tradition he received from his predecessors...”¹³¹

Papal Coronation Oath, c. 683-715

In view of the Third Council of Constantinople’s condemnation of Honorius as a heretic and his heretical teachings, an addition was made to the Papal Coronation Oath between 683 and 715 in which the pope condemns Honorius and his heresy. Because this is a profession of faith

¹²⁵ v. 5, b. 16, c. 2, sec. 323, p. 178.

¹²⁶ Footnote 3: “The letter to King Ervig is in many MSS. ascribed to the succeeding Pope, Benedict II.”

¹²⁷ Footnote 2: “Mansi, *l.c.*, p. 1050 sqq.; Hardouin, *l.c.*, p. 1730 sqq. As in all these letters of Leo to the Spaniards, the anathema on Honorius is mentioned...”

¹²⁸ v. 5, b. 16, c. 2, sec. 232, pp. 180-181.

¹²⁹ Mansi, vol. 11, col. 726 sqq; Migne PL 96, col. 408. “Constantinopolitanae ecclesiae successores magis quam praesules, nec non et Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed persana proditione immaculatam fidem subverteri conatus est.”

¹³⁰ Mansi, tom. xi, col. 1050-1052; Migne PL 96, col. 414.

¹³¹ Mansi, tom. 11, col 1057; Migne PL 96, col. 419.

composed by a pope and made mandatory for future popes to take during their coronation, it is infallible:

Papal Coronation Oath, c. 683-715: “We anathematize with perpetual damnation the authors of this error and its favorers. The authors of this new heretical dogma [Monothelitism] were Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, together with Honorius who added fuel to the corrupt assertions of the heretics...whose heretical dogma contradicted the true faith...”¹³²

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “In the *Liber Diurnus*, i.e., the Formulary of the Roman Chancery (from the fifth to the eleventh century), there is found the old formula for the papal oath, probably prescribed by Gregory II (at the beginning of the eighth century), according to which every new Pope, on entering upon his office, had to swear that ‘he recognised the sixth Ecumenical Council, which smote with eternal anathema the originators of the new heresy (Monothelitism), Sergius, Pyrrhus, etc., together with Honorius, *quia pravis haeticorum assertionibus fomentum impendit*.’^{133,134}

“The Petrine Claims at the Bar of History,” 1879: “A formal Profession of Faith, to be made by each Pope at his coronation, was inserted in the *Liber Diurnus*, itself drawn up, as is believed, by Pope Gregory II, one clause of which, in condemnation of heresies, mentions Honorius by name, along with Sergius, Pyrrhus, and others, with the special remark that he ‘added fuel (fomentum) to their corrupt statements.’”¹³⁵

Second Council of Nicea, 787

As the Catholic Church does with famous and influential heretics, She condemns them several times in future councils. Hence the heretic Honorius was again condemned in the Seventh Ecumenical Council, which was the Second Council of Nicea, called and confirmed by Pope Hadrian in 787:

Pope Hadrian, *Second Council of Nicea, 787*: The Letter of the Synod to the Emperor and Empress: And now having carefully traced the traditions of the Apostles and Fathers, we are bold to speak. Having but one mind by the inbreathing of the most Holy Spirit, and being all knit together in one, and understanding the harmonious tradition of the Catholic Church, we are in perfect harmony with the symphonies set forth by the six, holy and ecumenical councils; and accordingly we have anathematised the madness of Arius, the frenzy of Macedonius, the senseless understanding of Appolinarius, the man-worship of Nestorius, the irreverent mingling of the natures devised by Eutyches and Dioscorus, and the many-headed hydra which is their companion. We have also anathematised the idle tales of Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius; and the doctrine of one will held by Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, and Pyrrhus, or rather, we have anathematised their own evil will.”

Fourth Council of Constantinople, 870

And the heretic Honorius was again condemned in the Eighth Ecumenical Council, which was the *Fourth Council of Constantinople*, confirmed by Pope Hadrian II in 870:

¹³² *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*; PL 105, cols. 50-52.

¹³³ Footnote 2: “*Liber Diurnus*, ed. Eugene de Roziere, Paris 1869, No. 84.”

¹³⁴ v. 5, b. 16, c. 2, sec. 324, p. 187.

¹³⁵ Contained in *Church Quarterly Review*, published by Spottiswoode & Co., London, 1879. V. 8, April, p. 20.

Pope Hadrian II, *Fourth Council of Constantinople*, 869-870: “Further, we accept the sixth, holy and universal synod (Constantinople III), which shares the same beliefs and is in harmony with the previously mentioned synods in that it wisely laid down that in the two natures of the one Christ there are, as a consequence, two principles of action and the same number of wills. So, we anathematize Theodore who was bishop of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, the unholy prelates of the church of Constantinople, and with these, Honorius of Rome, Cyrus of Alexandria as well as Macarius of Antioch and his disciple Stephen, who followed the false teachings of the unholy heresiarchs Apollinarius, Eutyches, and Severus and proclaimed that the flesh of God, while being animated by a rational and intellectual soul, was without a principle of action and without a will...”

Hence the highest authority of the Catholic Church on earth, an ecumenical council approved by popes, has infallibly condemned Honorius, not only in one ecumenical council but in three, as a heretic who is cast out of the Catholic Church. Even based upon the evidence of one ecumenical council, no other proof is necessary. Based on this evidence alone, all Catholics must condemn Honorius as an excommunicated formal heretic or else they become automatically excommunicated formal heretics and thus are no longer Catholic.

Beware of the papal idolaters, heretics, and liars who excuse Honorius

The papal idolaters who try to excuse Honorius from teaching heresy and thus from being a heretic have actually undermined the very papacy they pretend to be defending. If Honorius did not teach heresy and was not a heretic, then the three popes who infallibly condemned Honorius’ teachings as heretical and condemned him as a heretic were heretics themselves for condemning something as heretical that was not heretical and condemning a man as a heretic who was not a heretic. Hence the highest authority in the Catholic Church (a pope teaching in an ecumenical council) is made fallible and undermined. And this applies not only to the three popes that confirmed these three ecumenical councils but to every pope after that who professed belief in these three ecumenical councils and took the Papal Coronation Oath in which Honorius and his heresy are condemned.

Hence beware of the papal idolaters especially from the 11th century onward, such as the apostate Baronius, who lie about and try to cover up the fact that Honorius was an excommunicated heretic. For example, the Papal Coronation Oath that condemned Honorius and his heresy was withdrawn in the 11th century and hidden and when it resurfaced in the 17th century it was suppressed, edited, or changed. And in the 16th century, the Roman Breviary removed its condemnation of Honorius as a heretic.¹³⁶

Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, by apostate Dr. Von Dollenger, 1872: “Through the whole of the Middle Ages, the view still prevailed that a pope could certainly apostatize from the faith and become heretical, and in such a case both could and ought to be deposed.

“Not until after the middle of the sixteenth century did any one occupy himself seriously with the question of Honorius. The fact of the condemnation was irreconcilable with the system then developed by Baronius, Bellarmine, and others. Attempts were accordingly made to set it aside. It was pretended, that is to say, that the Acts of the sixth council had been falsified by the Greeks of a later age, and all therein that concerned Honorius had been interpolated by them in order that the disgrace of so many Oriental patriarchs being condemned for heresy might be lessened by the shame of a pope being found in the same predicament. Then it became necessary to declare that the letter of Leo II was also interpolated. And on this, Baronius, Bellarmine, Hosius, Binius, Duval, and the Jesuits Tanner and

¹³⁶ See in this book: The dogma: “Papal Coronation Oath, c. 683-715,” p. [27](#).

Gretser determined. But when the *Liber Diurnus* came to light, the nullity of this attempt was disclosed. Another mode of getting out of the difficulty proved still more untenable; this was to deny the condemnation of Honorius at the sixth council, and transfer it to another purely Greek synod (the quinisext council of A.D. 692 is apparently the one meant), the Acts of which were then inserted in those of the sixth council. This was the device resorted to by Sylvius Lupus, and the Roman oratorian Marchese, who has set forth this idea in a book of his own.

“That the letters of Honorius were forgeries, or that they had been interpolated, was somewhat more conceivable; at least the supposition demanded no such immense and elaborate apparatus of falsification as Baronius and Bellarmine pictured to themselves, or at any rate to their readers. This mode of escape therefore was chosen by Gravina and Coster; Stapleton also and Wiggers were inclined towards it.

“Seeing, however, that the letters of Honorius were laid before the council, examined, and condemned in the presence of the papal legates, who at any rate must have known their contents, it was found necessary to abandon this method of getting out of the difficulty also. Several, therefore, preferred to maintain that Honorius himself had taught what was orthodox, and had only been condemned by the council because he had shown leniency to heresy from an ill-timed love of peace, and had favoured it by rejecting a dogmatic expression which had become indispensable. So De Marca, Natalis Alexander, Gamier, Du Hamel, Lupus, Tamagnini, Pagi and many others.

“This method of defending Honorius became a very favourite one after the outbreak of the Jansenite troubles. It is chiefly owing to the Jansenists that the question of Honorius has become a *quaestio vexata*, in which every effort has been made to confuse and set aside the facts, and with which since 1650 almost every theologian of note has occupied himself. So that within a period of about 130 years one may say that more has been written on this one question of ecclesiastical history than on any other in 1500 years.”¹³⁷

Beware also of heretics like the apostate Bishop Hefele who disobeys and rejects infallible papal condemnations which infallibly decreed three times that Honorius taught heresy. These heretics say that Honorius did not teach heresy but only allowed heresy to be taught and favored it and thus did not fight against it. But even if this were true, Honorius would still be a heretic by sins of omission and association, which Hefele does admit. Therefore, while Hefele believes Honorius did not teach heresy, he did believe that Honorius was a heretic for sins of omission and association. The worst of these heretics, like Baronius and Bellarmine, do not even admit that Honorius was a heretic. But all of the heretics who believe that Honorius did not teach heresy (such as Hefele, Baronius, and Bellarmine) think they know better than popes' infallible condemnations and judgments which infallibly decreed that Honorius did teach heresy. Hefele even admits that these councils do condemn Honorius for teaching heresy, but he does not accept these councils' infallible judgments. Consequently, these heretics think they know better than God the Holy Spirit who infallibly guides popes when they make infallible definitions, condemnations, and judgments. If Catholics do not have to believe and obey infallible papal definitions, condemnations, and judgments, then they do not have to believe or obey anyone at all and thus are free to do and believe whatever they want, just like Protestants. Who has more authority, popes speaking infallibly or theologians? In fact, theologians have no authority whatsoever! Good theologians teach what has been infallibly decreed, give opinions on allowable opinions, and give counsel but they do not have any binding authority. And if they deny or doubt a dogma or infallible judgment, it is they and their works that are cast out of the Catholic Church—not the dogmas, judgments, and the popes who infallibly decreed them.

¹³⁷ pt. 1, c. 8, pp. 248-251.

However, because the apostate Bishop Hefele correctly believes that the Third Council of Constantinople did condemn Honorius for teaching heresy and as a heretic, he is able to refute apostates like Baronius who believe that the decrees of the Third Council of Constantinople were corrupted and thus the true decrees did not condemn Honorius for teaching heresy nor as a heretic.¹³⁸

All the so-called popes from Innocent II in 1130 onward were apostate antipopes

There have been no popes or cardinals since 1130 AD. All of the so-called popes and so-called cardinals from Innocent II (1130-1143) until today were and are apostate antipopes and apostate anticardinals for supporting or allowing the following crimes or criminals. Supporting the crimes or criminals means they favored or promoted the crimes or criminals. Allowing the crimes and criminals means they did not sufficiently condemn the crimes or did not sufficiently denounce or punish the criminals or were in religious communion with them.

1. All of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals supported or allowed the desecration of Catholic places with images against the Catholic faith and morals. The desecrations consist of the glorification of images of devils, idols, false gods, false religions, pagans, immorality, immodesty, and grotesque deformity. And most of the desecrations remain to this day. For this crime alone all of them are idolaters and formal heretics and thus banned from holding offices even if they did not hold any other heresy or idolatry. From the information I have, twenty-one places were desecrated from the 11th to the 12th century; the first desecrated place in Rome was St. Paul Outside the Walls in 1170; and the first time St. Peter's Basilica was desecrated was on 6/26/1445, by its idolatrous and immoral doors, with many more desecrations following shortly after.¹³⁹
2. Most, if not all, of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals explicitly supported the Hellenization of Christianity, the mixing of philosophy or mythology with Christianity, which made steady progress from the 11th century onward. Philosophy and mythology are glorified in three ways: 1) By using philosophy or mythology to edify or enlighten oneself or others on faith or morals; 2) by using methods unique to philosophy; 3) by using terminologies unique to philosophy (scholastic babble). Scholasticism, which is the glorification of philosophy, corrupted not only theology but also canon law.¹⁴⁰
3. All of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals were guilty of the heresies of non-judgmentalism or non-punishmentism. They either did not sufficiently condemn sin or did not sufficiently denounce or punish sinners and thus the crimes and criminals remained in so-called good standing and hence continued to corrupt Catholic teaching instruments, Catholic places, and Catholics. And thus they enabled the Great Apostasy to make steady progress and succeed.
4. Many of the apostate antipopes and anticardinals held other heresies.

The four main crimes of the Great Apostasy, which began in the 11th century and made steady progress, are 1) the glorification of philosophy (aka scholasticism); 2) the glorification of the false gods and false religions of mythology; 3) the glorification of immorality; and 4) non-judgmentalism and non-punishmentism, which was necessary for the success of the Great Apostasy. And these crimes led to many other heresies and other crimes.

¹³⁸ See in this book "The Anathema on Pope Honorius, and the Genuineness of the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council," p. [147](#).

¹³⁹ See RJMI book *The Desecration of Catholic Places*.

¹⁴⁰ See RJMI books *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics* and *The Great Apostasy*.

The primary blame falls upon the men who had the authority and power to punish the criminals and eradicate the crimes but did not because they were guilty of either the same crimes or sins of omission. “Unto whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required: and to whom they have committed much, of him they will demand the more.” (Lk. 12:48) “If any one sin and hear the voice of one swearing and is a witness either because he himself hath seen or is privy to it: if he do not utter it, he shall bear his iniquity.” (Lev. 5:1)

What follows is a brief list of some of the other heresies held by some of the apostate antipopes from Innocent II onward.

Apostate Antipope Innocent II (1130-1143)

His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity

Apostate Antipope Innocent II visited and blessed places in France that were desecrated with images against the faith and morals:

How France Built Her Cathedrals, by Elizabeth Boyle O’Reilly: “Autun’s chief church, one of the few cathedrals in France which is Romanesque, was begun in 1120 and consecrated in 1132 by Innocent II. In that same year he blessed Cluny’s nave and Vezelay’s narthex.”¹⁴¹

In 1125 in his Apologia to Abbot William of Thierry, the apostate Bernard of Clairvaux testifies that the cloister of Cluny Abbey was desecrated with images against the faith and morals:

Apostate Bernard of Clairvaux, 1125: “...What excuse can there be for these ridiculous monstrosities in the cloisters where the monks do their reading, extraordinary things at once beautiful and ugly? Here we find...fearful centaurs, harpies,... Here is one head with many bodies, there is one body with many heads. Over there is a beast with a serpent for its tail, a fish with an animal’s head, and a creature that is horse in front and goat behind, and a second beast with horns and the rear of a horse...”

Hence when Innocent II visited and consecrated Cluny in 1132, it was desecrated with images against the faith and morals. And Sainte-Madeleine Abbey Basilica at Vézelay was likewise desecrated in 1130; therefore when Innocent II visited it and blessed its narthex in 1132, it was already desecrated. Innocent II lived and traveled extensively in France when he was an apostate antipope and in exile from Rome, and thus he had first-hand access to many of the other desecrated places in France.¹⁴²

Apostate Antipope Alexander III (1159-1181)

His heresy for promoting Peter Lombard and his heretical Sentences

Apostate Antipope Alexander III was a formal heretic for not denouncing and punishing the notorious heretic Peter Lombard. He knew that Lombard taught heresy, and he eventually condemned Lombard’s heresy but after much apprehension because he himself at one time held the same heresy. But Alexander did not denounce Lombard as a heretic, nor declare him to have

¹⁴¹ *How France Built Her Cathedrals*, by Elizabeth Boyle O’Reilly. A Study in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. Publisher: Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York and London, 1921. Chapter IX (The Gothic Art of Burgundy): The Romanesque Cathedral of Autun, p. 423.

¹⁴² See RJMI book *The Desecration of Catholic Places: The Evidence: France*.

been automatically excommunicated, nor ban him from religious communion with Catholics, nor ban his works. Hence the notorious heretic Lombard remained in so-called good standing and his heretical works have continued to corrupt Catholics down till today:

A History of the Church, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1934: “Peter Lombard’s success, for all the merits of his work, was hardly won. Opposition to the method of his book showed itself immediately, and opposition also to some of his teaching. The first weak point which hostile critics seized was the defective [RJMI: heretical] theory, which he had inherited from Abelard, to explain how Jesus Christ Our Lord is both divine and human. This theory [RJMI: heresy] taught, in accordance with the tradition, that He is perfect man and truly God, but it failed to understand all that is meant by the truth that that union is hypostatic, that the Humanity with the Divinity is one person. Concerned to avoid the Nestorian error that makes the humanity itself a person, the Abelardian theory denied that the humanity is a substantial reality...

“The question, eagerly debated in the rising schools for thirty years, was raised at the Council of Tours in 1163. A hundred and twenty-seven bishops were present and the pope himself, Alexander III, presided, who, in his own works, written while a master in the schools, had shown himself also a defender of the new theory [RJMI: heresy]. It was in connection with this controversy that the first attempt was made to bring about the condemnation of the *Liber Sententiarum* [Lombard’s *Four Books of Sentences*]. It failed, however, as did the related endeavour to secure a decision on the dogmatic question. At a second great council, held at Sens in the following year, the pope contented himself with a strong prohibition of idle and useless discussions. But six years later, owing perhaps to the writings of John of Cornwall, the pope reopened the matter. A letter of May 28, 1170, renewed a command, already given, to the Archbishop of Sens charging him to see that ‘the erroneous opinion of Peter Lombard, one-time Bishop of Paris’ is abandoned, the opinion, namely, that Christ according to His humanity is not a substantial reality. The masters are, on the contrary, to teach that as Christ is perfect God, so is He perfect man and truly man formed of body and soul. A further letter, of June 2 of the same year, repeated this instruction; and finally a third, dated February 2, 1177, ended the controversy, establishing sanctions to enforce the teaching.

“The history of this so-called Adoptionist controversy is interesting for many reasons. It affords the spectacle of a pope condemning as pope the theories he had taught years before as a private individual, and, more important by far, it witnesses to a considerable theological progress since the comparatively crude controversies that centered around Berengarius.

“The decree of 1177 was, of course, for the enemies of Peter Lombard’s work an opportunity not to be lost. They took advantage of the change in Alexander III to attempt yet once again, at the General Council of 1179, what they had failed to secure in 1163. The story of the maneuver is extremely obscure. Walter of St. Victor, here our one source, represents the pope as willing to condemn the master of the Sentences, and only deterred by the wholesale opposition of his cardinals. Walter was, at any rate, one of the most bitter of Peter’s critics, as his pamphlet—provoked by Peter of Poitiers, great commentary on the Lombard, the first of hundreds—shows. It is called *Against the Four Labyrinths of France*, and attacks with a violence that knows no limits Abelard, Gilbert of la Porree, Peter Lombard, and Peter of Poitiers... The propositions censured by Alexander III were quietly set aside...”¹⁴³

¹⁴³ *A History of the Church*, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1934. *Nihil Obstat*: Reginal Phillips, S.T.L., Censor. Imprimatur: E. Morrogh Bernard, Vicar General, Westminster, 15 February 1947. Publisher: First published 1934, revised edition 1948. Printed and bound in Great Britain for Sheed & Ward Ltd. Vol. 2, 2. *The Progress of Catholic Thought: Abelard - Gilbert of La Porree - Hugh of St. Victor - Peter Lombard - Gratian - Roland Bandinelli*.

And apostate Antipope Alexander III never condemned Lombard's scholastic method, and thus Alexander was a formal heretic on this point also.

Apostate Antipope Innocent III (1198-1216)

His heresy for promoting Peter Lombard and his heretical *Sentences*

All of the apostate antipopes after Alexander III likewise did not denounce Lombard as a heretic nor ban his works. Instead they promoted or at least allowed Lombard's heretical works and scholastic method, and many of them praised Lombard. In fact, the very next apostate antipope, Innocent III, glorified Lombard in Chapter 2 of the invalid and heretical Fourth Lateran Council, which put an end to any major opposition to the apostate Lombard and his heretical works:

A History of the Church, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1934: "The General Council of 1215 [the invalid and heretical Fourth Lateran Council]...marked the end of the maneuvers to condemn the *Sentences*, for not only did this council condemn the latest of Peter's foes, but it paid Peter the greatest compliment any Catholic writer has ever known, of associating him by name with the decree on the Faith, 'We, the sacred and universal council approving, believe and confess, with Peter Lombard...' The propositions censured by Alexander III were quietly set aside, and in the course of time others went to join them. They were listed, a score of them, at the beginning or the end of the manuscripts and a simple, 'Here the Master is not followed' marked that, without any solemn condemnation on these points Peter's opinions had been abandoned. By 1220 he was established in the position he was to hold until, nearly three hundred years later,... Thomas displaced him, as the inevitable, universal text on which the teaching of theology was built; and in all the new colleges the 'Bachelor of the *Sentences*' was as permanent an institution as the 'Bachelor of Sacred Scripture.'" (Ibid.)

Why is the so-called Master not to be followed? Were his erroneous teachings allowable opinions or heresies? If they were allowable opinions, then they should not have been condemned and censured in any way. Hence the fact that they were condemned and banned is one proof that Lombard's teachings were heretical. Therefore apostate Antipope Innocent III and all who praise Lombard or support or allow his works are formal heretics. And they are also formal heretics for not condemning his scholastic method.

His heresy for implying there is a fourth Person of the Holy Trinity

In the very Chapter 2 of the invalid and heretical Fourth Lateran Council in which the scholastic apostate Innocent III praised Lombard, God allowed him to fall into an absurd, stupid, and foolish heresy to prove that the scholastics are not truly wise but are actually very stupid: "Be not more wise than is necessary lest thou become stupid." (Ectes. 7:17) In that chapter Innocent III not only praised Lombard but also defended Lombard's heresy which implies that there is a fourth Person of the Holy Trinity, and thus Innocent III was guilty of the same heresy. Although Joachim of Fiore was guilty of heresy, his condemnation of Lombard as a heretic regarding this point was correct:

Apostate Antipope Innocent III, invalid and heretical *Fourth Lateran Council*, 1215: "Chapter 2 (On the error of Abbot Joachim). We therefore condemn and reprove that small book or treatise which abbot Joachim published against master Peter Lombard concerning the unity or essence of the Trinity, in which he calls Peter

Lombard a heretic and a madman because he said in his *Sentences*, ‘For there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and it neither begets nor is begotten nor does it proceed.’ He asserts from this that Peter Lombard ascribes to God not so much a Trinity as a quaternity, that is to say three persons and a common essence as if this were a fourth person... We, however, with the approval of this sacred and universal council, believe and confess with Peter Lombard that there exists a certain supreme reality, incomprehensible and ineffable, which truly is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, the three persons together and each one of them separately. Therefore in God there is only a Trinity, not a quaternity, since each of the three persons is that reality—that is to say substance, essence, or divine nature—which alone is the principle of all things, besides which no other principle can be found. This reality neither begets nor is begotten nor proceeds; the Father begets, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds.”

While apostate Antipope Innocent III pays lip service to the dogma of the Holy Trinity, his heretical theology denies it and implies a fourth Person of the Holy Trinity. To teach that “there is a certain supreme reality which is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and it neither begets nor is begotten nor does it proceed” implies that there is a fourth Person of the Holy Trinity and thus is heresy. The three Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity either beget or are begotten or proceed. The Father begets, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds. So this other so-called reality that neither begets nor is begotten nor proceeds cannot be the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit and thus is a fourth Person of the Holy Trinity, which is heresy. Here we see how the scholastics fall into one stupid heresy after another. This heresy alone proves that the Fourth Lateran Council was not valid and that Innocent III was an apostate antipope because the Holy Spirit would never let a true pope teach heresy while teaching in his infallible capacity. (See RJMI book *The Heresy That the Divine Essence Does Not Beget, Is Not Begotten, and Does Not Proceed.*)

Apostate Antipope Martin V (1417-1431)

His heresies of conciliarism and collegiality

Before his invalid election, Martin V denied the basic dogma of papal supremacy and thus was a formal heretic on this point alone. He held the conciliarist and collegiality heresies, which he promoted in 1409 at the heretical Council of Pisa which taught and practiced these heresies:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Martin V: “He [Martin V] deserted the lawful pope, Gregory XII, was present at the council of Pisa, and took part in the election of the antipopes Alexander V and John XXIII.”

Martin V was invalidly elected in 1417 after Session 41 of the Council of Constance. He then confirmed Sessions 42 to 45 (the last session) of the council:

A History of the Councils of the Church, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: “The Gallicans were very anxious to prove the Council of Constance to be ecumenical. It is true that it was assembled in a regular manner; but, according to the principles we have explained above, it necessarily lost its ecumenical character as long as it was separated from the head of the Church. The sessions, however, which were held after the election of Pope Martin V, and with his consent and approbation—that is, sessions 42 to 45—must be considered as those of an ecumenical council.”¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ v. 1, Intro., sec. 10, p. 58.

In Session 44, Martin V confirmed Session 39 and taught the conciliarist heresy, which states that a council of bishops has power over the pope in making certain laws and decrees:

Apostate Antipope Martin V, invalid and heretical *Council of Constance*, Session 44, 1418: “Martin, etc. We wish and desire to put into effect a decree of this general council [Session 39’s *Frequens*] which lays down, among other things, that general councils must always be held in the place which the supreme pontiff, with the consent and approval of the council, is bound to depute and assign, within the month before the end of this council, as the place for the next council after the end of the present one. With the consent and approval of this present council, we therefore, by this present decree, depute and assign the city of Pavia for this purpose, and we ordain and decree that prelates and others who ought to be summoned to general councils are obliged to go to Pavia at the aforesaid time. Let nobody therefore... If anyone however... Given and enacted at Constance, in the place of this public session...”

Here is the heretical Session 39, *Frequens*, that Martin V confirmed:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Constance*, Session 39, *Frequens* (On general councils), 1417: “The frequent holding of general councils is a pre-eminent means of cultivating the Lord’s patrimony... For this reason we establish, enact, decree and ordain, by a perpetual edict, that general councils shall be held henceforth in the following way. The first shall follow in five years immediately after the end of this council, the second in seven years immediately after the end of the next council, and thereafter they are to be held every ten years for ever. They are to be held in places which the supreme pontiff is bound to nominate and assign within a month before the end of each preceding council, with the approval and consent of the council, or which, in his default, the council itself is bound to nominate. . . Moreover, he [the Roman Pontiff] may not change the place assigned for the next council without evident necessity. If an emergency arises whereby it seems necessary to change the place—for example, in the case of a siege, war, disease, or the like—then the supreme pontiff may, with the consent and written endorsement of his aforesaid brothers or of two-thirds of them, substitute another place which is suitable and fairly near to the place previously assigned. It must, however, be within the same nation unless the same or a similar impediment exists throughout the nation. In the latter case he may summon the council to another suitable place which is nearby but within another nation, and the prelates and other persons who are customarily summoned to a council will be obliged to come to it as if it had been the place originally assigned. The supreme pontiff is bound to announce and publish the change of place or the shortening of time in a legal and solemn form within a year before the date assigned, so that the aforesaid persons may be able to meet and hold the council at the appointed time.”

In Session 43 he taught the collegiality heresy, which teaches that for some of the pope’s laws and decrees to be valid and binding, his inferiors must give their consent and approval. In this session he teaches the heresy that a pope cannot impose tithes unless he has the approval of the cardinals and other inferiors:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Constance*, Session 43, 1418: “Martin, etc. We command and order the strict observance of the laws which forbid tithes and other dues to be imposed on churches and ecclesiastics by persons lower than the pope. For ourselves, moreover, we shall in no way impose them generally on the whole clergy unless there is a grave and serious reason and an advantage for the universal church in doing so, and then with the advice, consent, and written endorsement of our brothers, the cardinals of the holy Roman church, and the prelates whose advice can conveniently be obtained. This should not happen especially in any kingdom or province where the prelates in question, or the majority of them, have not been consulted or have not consented...”

His heresy for denying that Jesus Christ has two natures in one divine Person

In that same council and while condemning positions held by the notorious heretic John Hus, Martin V condemned the following orthodox proposition:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Constance*, Session 15, 1415: “Condemned proposition 4: Two natures, divinity and humanity, are one Christ.” (D. 630)

This proposition is true. Jesus Christ has two natures, a divine nature and a human nature, and both of these natures are the one Christ, the one Divine Person of Christ. Hence Martin V is a formal heretic for condemning this basic dogma. Even though Martin V was not the apostate antipope during Session 15, he did confirm the condemnations against Hus in Session 43 when he was the apostate antipope:

Apostate Antipope Martin V, invalid and heretical *Council of Constance*, Session 43, *Inter Cunctas* (Questions to be Proposed to the Wycliffites and Hussites): “Article 11. Likewise, let the especially learned person be asked, whether he believes that the decision of the sacred Council of Constance passed concerning the forty-five articles of John Wycliffe and the thirty of John Hus described above would be true and Catholic: namely, that the above mentioned forty-five articles of John Wycliffe and the thirty of John Hus are not Catholic, but some of them are notably heretical, some erroneous, others audacious and seditious, others offensive to the ears of the pious.”

It must also be mentioned that this way of censuring propositions is incompetent, illogical, and meaningless. There are several different censures that can apply to each condemned proposition (from heretical, to simply erroneous, to audacious, to seditious, to offensive to the ears of the pious) and with no way of knowing which censure applies to which proposition because the censures are not attached to each proposition but only grouped together at the end of the condemned propositions. And if a proposition is censured only as erroneous or as audacious or as offensive to pious ears, does this mean it is not heretical because the heresy censure is not attached? If the heresy censure is not attached, then it is an allowable opinion no matter how erroneous or audacious or offensive it is to pious ears. And these censures also contain propositions in which it is impossible to know for sure what is being condemned. There are many other meaningless and invalid condemned propositions authored by apostate antipopes, as well as by the sacred congregations.

His heresy that Catholics can be in religious communion with undeclared major excommunicates

And apostate Antipope Martin V, in his infamous *Ad Evitandi Scandala*, taught the heresy that Catholics are allowed to be in religious communion with major excommunicates as long as the excommunicates have not been sentenced by a judge:

Apostate Antipope Martin V, invalid and heretical *Ad Evitanda Scandala*, 1418: “To avoid scandals and many dangers and relieve timorous consciences by the tenor of these presents we mercifully grant to all Christ’s faithful that henceforth no one henceforth shall be bound to abstain from communion with anyone in the administration or reception of the sacraments or in any other religious or non-religious acts whatsoever, nor to avoid anyone nor to observe any ecclesiastical interdict, on pretext of any ecclesiastical sentence or censure globally promulgated whether by the law or by an individual unless the sentence or censure in question has been specifically and expressly published or denounced by the judge on or against a definite person, college, university, church, community, or place...” (Fontes I, 45)

This is heresy because it denies the basic dogma that a Catholic is banned from religious communion with all major excommunicates whether they were sentenced and excommunicated by a judge or automatically (*ipso facto*) sentenced and excommunicated by the Church law itself. Martin V's heretical law was never followed and was actually condemned shortly after in the invalid and heretical Council of Basel.

His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity

Apostate Antipope Martin V also favored and allowed humanists in his papal court,¹⁴⁵ men who glorified philosophy, the false gods and false religions of mythology, and immorality, and thus was an immoral idolater on this point alone:

The History of the Popes, by Dr. Ludwig Pastor, 1891: "The Humanists who, during the time of the Schism, had made their way into the Papal Court, formed a distinct, and in many ways incongruous, element in a body composed of ecclesiastics... In order to understand the position which the representatives of the literary Renaissance...attained at his [Martin V's] Court, we must remember that the Council of Constance had given an immense impulse to Humanism... The Council of Constance, as the Historian of Humanism observes, inaugurates a new epoch in the history of the search throughout Europe for Manuscripts... The dawn of Humanism, north of the Alps, dates from this period. Among the Papal Secretaries present at the Council of Constance were many Humanists. The most remarkable of them were the learned Greek, Manuel Chrysoloras,...Leonardo Bruni, who was but a short time at the Council, and Poggio. Among the non-official Humanists who came to Constance, we may mention the Poet Benedetto da Piglio, Agapito Cenci, and the jurists, Pier Paulo Vergerio and Bartolomeo da Montepulciano... He [Martin V] certainly says that they [the Humanists] were necessary to him, and employed many of them in his service, which Poggio entered in the year 1423..."¹⁴⁶

Apostate Antipope Eugene IV (1431-1447)

His heresies of conciliarism and collegiality

Before his invalid election, Eugene IV denied the basic dogma of papal supremacy and thus was a formal heretic on this point alone. He held the conciliarist and collegiality heresies. During the election process in 1431, Eugene IV consented to a heretical capitulation which promoted the conciliarist and collegiality heresies. His election depended upon his acceptance of this heretical capitulation, which he had no problem consenting to because he held these heresies. And after his invalid election, he signed and promulgated this heretical capitulation:

The History of the Popes, by Dr. Ludwig Pastor, 1891: "[p. 284] The Capitulation of 1431 went, in some respects, even further than that which had been framed before the election of Innocent VI. The Pope, according to its terms, was to reform the Roman Court 'in its Head and its members,' and not to transfer it to another place without the consent of the majority of the Sacred College; he was to hold a General Council, and by its means to reform the whole Church; in the appointment of Cardinals, he was to observe the prescriptions laid down at Constance; he was not to proceed against the person or property of any one of the Cardinals without the consent of the majority of the body, nor to diminish their power of testamentary disposition. Moreover, all vassals and officials of the States of the Church were to

¹⁴⁵ See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: Humanism*.

¹⁴⁶ v. 1, b. 2, c. 1, pp. 256-259.

swear fealty to the Sacred College, which was to possess the half of all the revenues of the Roman Church, and the Pope was not to undertake any important measure in regard to the States of the Church without its assent.¹⁴⁷ These articles, which Eugenius IV immediately published in a Bull, gave a new government to the States of the Church and materially limited the temporal power of the Pope...¹⁴⁸

Hence Eugene's conciliarist and collegiality heresies alone made him a formal heretic and thus would have invalidated his election to the papacy, which is beside the fact that he was also an apostate for glorifying philosophy and mythology before his attempted election.

It was not until he was an apostate antipope at the Council of Basel that Eugene repented of his conciliarist and collegiality heresies after realizing that these heresies made it impossible for the pope to actually rule the Church. The Council of Basel upheld the conciliarist and collegiality heresies that were taught in the Council of Constance and by apostate Antipope Martin V. Hence Eugene, after his abjuration, dissolved the heretical Council of Basel during the second session. But Eugene's abjuration of these heresies did not give him the papacy for two reasons: 1) he held these heresies before he was elected and thus his election was invalid, and 2) he held other heresies and idolatries not only before his invalid election but also after it and never repented of them.

The members of the Council of Basel and many princes condemned Eugene for dissolving the council and put pressure on him to annul his dissolution of the council. In the 8th month of 1433, Eugene, in his first Bull *Dudum Sacrum*, annulled his dissolution of the Council of Basel and accepted all of its decrees except the anti-papal decrees; that is, the decrees that contained the conciliarist and collegiality heresies. The members of the council and many princes did not accept this and put more pressure on Eugene until he finally caved in and amended his first Bull *Dudum Sacrum* and promulgated his second Bull *Dudum Sacrum*, in the 12th month of 1433, in which he unconditionally accepted all the decrees of the Council of Basel and thus even the anti-papal ones. And Eugene's decree was included in the Council of Basel's sixteenth session in the 2nd month of 1434.¹⁴⁹ Hence he again became guilty for holding the conciliarist and collegiality heresies:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Eugene IV: "Martin V had convoked the Council of Basle which opened with scant attendance 23 July, 1431. Distrusting the spirit which was reigning at the council, Eugene, by a Bull dated 18 Dec., 1431, dissolved it, to meet eighteen months later in Bologna... The prelates at Basle refused to separate, and issued an encyclical to all the faithful in which they proclaimed their determination to continue their labours. In this course they had the assurance of support from all the secular powers, and on 15 Feb., 1432, they reasserted the Gallican doctrine of the superiority of the council to the pope (see Council of Constance). All efforts to induce Eugene to recall his Bull of dissolution having failed, the council, on 29 April, formally summoned the pope and his cardinals to appear at Basle within three months, or to be punished for contumacy. The schism which now seemed inevitable was for the time averted by the exertions of Sigismund, who had come to Rome to receive the imperial crown, 31 May, 1433. The pope recalled the Bull and acknowledged the council as ecumenical, 15 Dec., 1433."

Apostate Antipope Eugene IV, *Council of Basel*, Session 16, Description of the Contents: "This session declares the adherence of Pope Eugenius to the council, with the usual ceremonies; Eugenius's bull *Dudum Sacrum*, and three other bulls abrogated by that bull, are incorporated into the acts."

¹⁴⁷ Footnote *: "Raynaldus, ad an. 1431, N. 5-7."

¹⁴⁸ v. 1, c. 2, p. 284.

¹⁴⁹ Mansi. 29, cols. 78-79.

A History of the Church, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes: “The conclave was short, and its choice (March 3) was unanimous, the Venetian cardinal, Gabriele Condulmaro; he took the name Eugene IV... The Church had in him a pope whose action would not be hampered by any memories of a past in which he had patronised the new [RJMI: heretical] conciliar doctrines and used them as a whip to chastise unworthy popes. But while Eugene IV faced the approaching crisis with this undoubted advantage, he had unhappily inherited something of the vacillation which had ruined the career of his uncle, Gregory XII. And not only had he, like the rest of the cardinals, signed and sworn the pact drawn up in the conclave, but as pope he publicly renewed his promises, pledging himself thereby to increase the importance of the cardinals, and to give the Sacred College, as such, a real share in the direction of the Church, making it almost an organ of government. The curia was to be reformed in head and members; cardinals would only be chosen according to the decrees of Constance; the pope would ask their advice about the new General Council and would be guided by it; and, as well as guaranteeing them a half of the main papal revenues, he would not, without their consent, make treaties and alliances nor any declaration of war; finally, all vassals of the Holy See would henceforth swear allegiance not only to the pope, but to the Sacred College too...

“When, in January 1432, it had come to the knowledge of the council at Basel that Eugene IV had issued a bull dissolving it, the council did not refuse to obey him, nor simply ignore his act, but in a solemn general session (February 15) it re-enacted the decree of Constance which laid it down that it is the pope’s duty to obey a General Council, and the council’s duty to punish his disobedience, and that without its own consent a General Council cannot be dissolved nor transferred to another place. Eleven days later, the bishops of France came together (under the king’s patronage) at Bourges; their meetings continued for six weeks, and they begged and exhorted the pope to continue the good work being done at Basel. The emperor, Sigismund, also intervened strongly on the council’s behalf, only to draw from the pope a curt reminder that this was an ecclesiastical affair. And the council pressed on to beg the pope to withdraw his decree of dissolution, and also to cite him to take his place at Basel. The cardinals, too, were ‘invited’ and given three months in which to appear.¹⁵⁰ These citations were nailed to the doors of St. Peter’s on June 6, and on June 20 the council made special regulations to provide for an election should the pope chance to die, and it also forbade the pope to create any new cardinals while the present misunderstanding continued.

“On August 20, 1432, the council was given the pope’s reply. Eugene granted practically everything the council had demanded, but he did not grant it in the way they demanded. The council was allowed to continue its negotiations with the Hussites, and to plan the reformation of clerical life in Germany, and it could choose another city for the coming council instead of Bologna. But the council wanted an explicit withdrawal of the decree dissolving it, and an acknowledgment that without its own consent it could not be dissolved (September 3). General Councils alone, the pope was told, were infallible. At this moment the council consisted of three cardinals and some thirty-two other prelates, though the lower clergy (and especially the doctors) were there in great numbers. England too, however, had joined with France and the emperor to support the council, and—what must have weighed very heavily indeed with a pope who recalled the crisis of 1408—out of the twenty-one cardinals only six were securely on his side. Then, in the last week of 1432, the council gave Eugene sixty days to withdraw his decree, and to approve, without any reservation, all it had enacted; and the council declared null all nominations made by him until he obeyed it.

“The sixty days went by, and Eugene did not surrender; but in a bull of December 14, 1432, he explained that the coming council at Bologna would really be a continuation of that at Basel, and that only in this sense did he intend to

¹⁵⁰ Footnote 574: “Session III, 29 April, 1432.”

dissolve the Council of Basel. But this did not relieve the situation at all, and the council grimly persisted that the pope must acknowledge that what had been going on at Basel continuously since the beginning was a General Council, guided by the Holy Spirit. There were, again, long and impassioned discussions between the pope's envoys and the council (March 7-10, 1433), and then, on April 27, the eleventh general session published eight new decrees which completed the fettering of the papacy that Constance had begun.

"The pope next appointed new presidents for the council—a tacit recognition that it still existed—but the council would not recognise them: the pope must be explicit in his withdrawal of the decree of dissolution. The powers he gave the new legates were too wide for the council's liking; and his act was, in fact, a reassembling of the Council. On July 13 the council took away from the Holy See forever all right to appoint bishops and abbots, and decreed that all future popes must swear to obey this law before being installed. Eugene was threatened with punishment, and reminded how patient the council had been so far and he was now ordered to withdraw the decree and to announce solemnly his acceptance of all that the council had done.

"Eugene meanwhile prepared two bulls, the first of which annulled whatever had been done against the rights of his see (July 29), while the second (August 1) [his first Bull *Dudum Sacrum*] accepted the council as a lawful General Council and formally withdrew the decree of December 18, 1431, that had dissolved it. This still did not satisfy the council. It was not enough that the pope recognised it now, and as from now; he must say that his own decree had never any force, could never have had any force. On the very day that the council made this retort, Eugene, at Rome, was making his formal reply to the acts of July 13, quashing and reprobating this mass of anti-papal legislation.

"And now, political necessity cast its shadow over the isolated pope's defiance. The Milanese—at war with Venice, the pope's homeland, and, because of that, the pope's ally—invaded the Papal State in force. They won over the pope's own vassals and commanders and he was soon forced out of Rome, a fugitive. What relation there really was between the invaders and the council we do not know—but they gave out that they came in its name to chastise the pope. Eugene now made a further concession to the council (December 15, 1433). He re-issued the bull of surrender of August 1, 1433, but with the changes which the council had demanded; he admitted now that he had decreed a dissolution in 1431, and that his act had been the cause of grave dissensions; he decreed that the council had been conducted in a canonical way ever since it opened and, as it were, now ordered it to continue its good work, and amongst other things, to reform the papacy. The dissolution then was null, and all sentences against the council are annulled; and the pope no longer demands that the council shall retract its anti-papal decrees. This bull [his second *Dudum Sacrum*] was read in the council on February 5, 1434, and the council declared itself satisfied. The council now had the ball at its feet. Eugene was presently an exile, in Florence, and on June 26, 1434, at the eighteenth general session, the declaration of Constance was published once again, that a General Council derives its power immediately from God and that the pope is bound to obey it in all matters of faith and of the general reform of the Church, and that he is subject to its correction should he disobey."¹⁵¹

Protector of the Faith, by Thomas M. Izbicki, 1981: "The weakened pope [apostate Antipope Eugene IV] was forced to temporize with the growing power of the council [of Basel], and as early as February of 1433, Eugenius offered the fathers limited powers to negotiate with the Hussites. He tried next to bribe King Sigismund, who once more wished to direct a general council, by crowning him emperor. Then, in the spring of 1433, Eugenius tried to take control of the council

¹⁵¹ v. 3, c. 4, sec. 1.

by replacing its president, Cesarini, with a committee led by the canonists Juan de Mella and Panormitanus. But the fathers refused to let these legates share the presidency and, instead, threatened to depose the pope. Another legation, which was led by the archbishop of Taranto, was treated similarly. Eugenius found this combination of conciliar threats and local reverses too powerful to resist; in the bull *Dudum* (August 1, 1433) he conditionally approved the council's continuation and past acts. This did not satisfy the fathers, whom Cesarini barely restrained from further threats of deposition. Finally, Eugenius gave way entirely, issuing on December 14, 1433, a new version of *Dudum* that gave an unqualified approval to the acts of the council. (Eugenius was later to maintain that this was an invalid concession made under duress, and that he had mentally reserved his own rights from being affected by this concession.)^{152,,153}

A History of the Christian Councils, by apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894: "Those who are absolutely opposed to the Council of Basle, and refuse the ecumenical character to all its sessions, give the following reasons... d. Eugene IV did certainly at a later period, after the fifteenth session, confirm all that had been done in the preceding [decrees of the Council of Basel]; but this confirmation was extorted from him when he was ill, and by threat that, if he did not consent to give it, he should lose the adherence of the princes and cardinals, and be deposed from the papal chair."^{154,,155}

Hence apostate Antipope Eugene IV knew that what he consented to in his second Bull *Dudum Sacrum* of 12/1433 was heresy but consented to it anyway for fear of persecution. No amount of persecution can make a faithful Catholic deny the faith. Any Catholic who denies the faith for any reason, and thus no matter how much he is persecuted or tortured, becomes a formal heretic or idolater and thus is no longer Catholic. Many Christians in the early days of the Catholic Church lapsed and fell outside the Catholic Church for denying the faith under persecution or torture. They were called the Lapsed or *Lapsi*. Such was Eugene IV in this case. Because of ill treatment and fear of losing the allegiance of heretical princes and so-called cardinals and of being deposed, he denied the faith.

Apostate Antipope Eugene IV again supposedly repented and abjured from his conciliarist and collegiality heresies when he taught the dogma of papal supremacy in the invalid Council of Florence:

Apostate Antipope Eugene IV, invalid *Council of Florence*, "Laetentur Coeli," 1439: "We also define that the holy apostolic see and the Roman pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world and the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter prince of the apostles, and that he is the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church and the father and teacher of all Christians, and to him was committed in blessed Peter the full power of teaching, ruling and governing the whole Church, as is contained also in the acts of ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons." (D. 694)

Yet in this same Council of Florence, Eugene IV was again guilty of the conciliarist and collegiality heresies by sins of omission for not condemning these heresies that are contained in the Council of Constance and approved by Martin V and for not denouncing Martin V as a heretic for holding these heresies. While he condemned these heresies in the Council of Basel and denounced the heretics who adhered to that council, he pretended that these heresies were not taught in the Council of Constance and that Martin V did not approve these heresies in Sessions 43 and 44¹⁵⁶:

¹⁵² Footnote 16: "Valois, *Le pape et le concile*, 1:215-310."

¹⁵³ c. 1, p. 6.

¹⁵⁴ Footnote 4: "Cr. Turrecremata, in Roncaglia, *l.c.* p. 463 A."

¹⁵⁵ v. 1, Intro., sec. 10, p. 60.

¹⁵⁶ See in this book "Apostate Antipope Martin V: "His heresies of conciliarism and collegiality," p. [81](#).

Apostate Antipope Eugene IV, invalid *Council of Florence*, Session 7, 1439: “Finally, those leaders of scandal [at the Council of Basel]...held a so-called session on 16 May last asserting that they were obeying certain decrees, although these were passed at Constance by only one of the three obediences after the flight of John XXIII, as he was called in that one obedience, at a time of schism. Alleging obedience to those decrees, they proclaimed three propositions which they term truths of the faith, seemingly to make heretics of us and all princes and prelates and other faithful and devout adherents of the apostolic see. The propositions are the following:

‘The truth about the authority of a general council, representing the universal church, over a pope and anyone else whatsoever, declared by the general councils of Constance and this one of Basel, is a truth of the Catholic faith. The truth that a pope cannot by any authority, without its consent, dissolve a general council representing the universal church, legitimately assembled for the reasons given in the above-mentioned truth or for any of them, or prorogue it to another time or transfer it from place to place, is a truth of the Catholic faith. Anyone who persists in opposing the aforesaid truths is to be considered a heretic.’

“In this, those utterly pernicious men, masking their malice with the rosy colour of a truth of the faith, gave to the Council of Constance an evil and mischievous meaning completely opposed to its true teaching, imitating in this the teaching of other schismatics and heretics who always amass for their support fabricated errors and impious dogmas drawn from their perverse interpretation of the divine scriptures and the holy fathers.”

Neither Martin V nor Eugene IV nor any other following apostate antipope ever specifically condemned the heretical decrees in Sessions 4, 5, 39, 43, 44, and 45 of the Council of Constance. And Martin V explicitly confirmed the heresy in Session 39 and taught the conciliarist and collegiality heresies himself in Sessions 43 and 44. Hence apostate Antipope Eugene IV lied by pretending that the Council of Constance and Martin V did not teach these heresies and thus were orthodox. And by not professing the faith as he was bound to, he sinned by omission for not condemning the heresies in the Council of Constance nor denouncing Martin V as a heretic. Hence Eugene IV was a formal heretic on this point alone for sins of omission.

It is ironic that the conciliarist and collegiality heretics who adhered to the Council of Basel were less dishonest than Eugene IV. They were right when they invoked the Council of Constance and Martin V to defend the conciliarist and collegiality heresies that they taught and obeyed in the Council of Basel:

Protector of the Faith, by apostate Thomas M. Izbicki, 1981: “In Turrecremata’s troubled age, the Basel conciliarists used many arguments to prove council superior to pope. But it was on the precedent set at the Council of Constance—which ended the Schism, condemned Wycliff, executed Hus, and tried to reform the Church—that their case rested solidly. In the decree *Haec sancta*, Constance had claimed a common responsibility for the welfare of the Church and made a council superior to a pope in matters of heresy, schism, and reform... It was widely understood to be the definitive statement of conciliar supremacy in ecclesiastical government. Its claim was implemented in the decree *Frequens*, which provided for a regular series of councils to watch over the Church. Throughout its troubled history, the Council of Basel acted with these decrees in mind; and Cesarini and his colleagues, when they cited them in open debate to defy Eugenius IV, reaffirmed the Constance decrees as binding upon the whole Church.”¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁷ c. 5, pp. 95-96.

Apostate Antipope Eugene IV then continued on in the next paragraph from the invalid Council of Florence by rightly denouncing the men who adhered to the heretical Council of Basel as heretics and schismatics; but he again forgot to include Martin V and himself, who as early as that same council held the conciliarist and collegiality heresies. And he again lied by pretending that the Council of Constance and Martin V were orthodox and thus did not teach these heresies:

Apostate Antipope Eugene IV, invalid *Council of Florence*, Session 7, 1439:
“Finally, completely perverting their mind and turning away their eyes from looking to heaven or remembering righteous judgments, after the manner of Dioscorus and the infamous synod of Ephesus, they proceeded to a declaratory sentence of deprivation, as they claimed, from the dignity and office of the supreme apostolate, a poisonous and execrable pronouncement involving an unforgivable crime. Here we will take the tenor of that sentence, abhorrent to every pious mind, as sufficiently expressed. They omitted nothing, as far as was in their power, that might overthrow this incomparable good of union...

“With the approval of the sacred council we condemn and reject, and we proclaim as condemned and rejected, those propositions quoted above as understood in the perverse sense of the men at Basel, which they demonstrate by their deeds, as contrary to the sound sense of sacred scripture, the holy fathers and the council of Constance itself; and likewise the aforesaid so-called sentence of declaration or deprivation, with all its present and future consequences, as impious and scandalous and tending to open schism in God’s Church and to the confusion of all ecclesiastical order and Christian government. Also, we decree and declare that all of the aforesaid persons have been and are schismatics and heretics, and that as such they are assuredly to be punished with suitable penalties over and above the penalties imposed at the aforesaid council of Ferrara, together with all their supporters and abettors, of whatever ecclesiastical or secular status, condition or rank they may be, even cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops or abbots or those of any other dignity, so that they may receive their deserts with the aforesaid Korah, Dathan and Abiram...”

If the men at Basel were heretics and schismatics, and they certainly were, then so was Eugene when he held the same heresies before and after his invalid election and when he promulgated his second Bull *Dudum* in 12/1433.

His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity

Eugene IV also promoted the Hellenization of Christianity. He was an avid supporter of the glorification of philosophy and the false gods and false religions of mythology. He, too, had many humanists in his court:

The History of the Popes, by Dr. Ludwig Pastor, 1891: “To give an account of all the Humanists who entered the Papal service during the Pontificate of Eugenius IV does not fall within the scope of the present work.¹⁵⁸ We need only remark that their number was surprisingly great and that...little or no regard was paid in their selection to Christian conduct or to religious sentiments... Humanistic studies were warmly encouraged in this Pontificate, as they had been in the preceding one...”¹⁵⁹

And from the information I have, Eugene IV was the first idolatrous criminal to desecrate St. Peter’s Basilica with images against the faith and morals when he put up the Filarete Doors¹⁶⁰ on 6/26/1445:

¹⁵⁸ Footnote †: “See Voigt, ii, 2nd ed., 32-44.”

¹⁵⁹ v. 1, b. 2, c. 2, pp. 305-308.

¹⁶⁰ See RJMI book *The Desecration of Catholic Places*: St. Peter’s Basilica: The central bronze doors.

The History of the Popes, by Dr. Ludwig Pastor, 1891: “We have already spoken of the influence which his prolonged sojourn at Florence, the centre of the Renaissance, exercised on Eugenius IV, but to complete the picture of his life we must again return to the subject.

“In Florence, Eugenius saw the first gate made by Ghiberti for the Baptistry, and it seems most probable that the sight of this masterpiece suggested to him the idea of ordering a similar work for the principal church in Rome. Accordingly the Florentine architect, Antonio Averulino surnamed Filarete, was commissioned to make new bronze gates for St. Peter’s. They were put up on the 26th June, 1445, and still adorn the central entrance. Although their workmanship cannot bear comparison with that of Ghiberti, they are worthy of notice as clearly exhibiting that evil influence of the Renaissance, of which we shall hereafter have to speak. In his work, which was destined for the principal entrance of the noblest church in the world, Filarete had, to use the mildest term, the bad taste¹⁶¹ to place, together with the figures of our Saviour, His Virgin Mother and the Princes of the Apostles, and amid representations of the great religious acts of Eugenius’ Pontificate, not only busts of the Roman Emperors, but also the forms of Mars and Roma, of Jupiter and Ganymede, Hero and Leander, of a Centaur leading a nymph through the sea, and even of Leda and the swan; the composition is in keeping with the contemporary poems of the Humanists, where the names of Christian Saints and of heathen gods¹⁶² are promiscuously intermingled.”¹⁶³

Apostate Antipope Pius V (1566-1572)

His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity and glorifying the apostate Thomas Aquinas

Apostate Antipope Pius V glorified scholasticism and the apostate Thomas Aquinas. He also glorified the false gods and false religions of mythology and glorified immorality by not condemning the desecration of Catholic places with images against the faith and morals and by not denouncing his humanist predecessors or the humanists who were rampant during his reign as an apostate antipope.¹⁶⁴

His heresy that men can do good without God’s grace

Pius V also condemned the dogma which states that “men cannot do good without God’s grace” and thus was a heretic on this point alone:

Apostate Antipope Pius V, *Ex Omnibus Afflictionibus* (Errors of Michael du Bay (Michel Baius)), 1567: “Condemned proposition 27. Free will, without the help of God’s grace, has only power for sin.” (D. 1027)

It is a dogma that freewill without the help of God’s grace has only the power to sin, to choose this evil or that evil, and thus Pius V is a heretic for condemning this dogma.¹⁶⁵ This dogma was

¹⁶¹ Ludwig Pastor is an immoral idolater himself for only referring to the idols and immodest pictures on the doors as “bad taste.” It is much more than that. It is idolatry because of the glorification of false gods and false religions, and it is grossly immoral because of the nudes and depiction of acts of immorality.

¹⁶² Footnote *: “Hettner, 73, 171. See Piper, Christl. Mythologie, i., 292 *et seq.*, 362, 425, 435, 444; ii., 542, 644. Meyer, Künstlerlexikon, i., 472. Müntz, Précurseurs, 90-94; and H. v. Tschudi, ‘Filarete’s Mitarbeiter an den Bronzethüren von St. Peter,’ in Janitschek’s Repertorium (1884), vii., 291-294. We must, however, bear in mind that, in the days of which we are writing, people were not shocked, as they would now be, with incongruities of this kind.”

¹⁶³ v. 1, b. 2, sec. 2, pp. 360-361.

¹⁶⁴ See RJMI book *The Desecration of Catholic Places*: ...Apostate Antipope Pius V disallowed some desecrations but allowed others.

¹⁶⁵ See RJMI article “Good-without-Grace Heresy Taught by Aquinas and Apostate Antipopes.”

infallibly defined by Pope St. Zosimus in 418, by Pope St. Celestine I in 431, and by Pope Boniface II in 531:

Popes St. Zosimus and St. Celestine I, 418 and 431: “For no one is good of himself, unless He gives [him] a participation of Himself, who alone is good... That all the zeal and all the works and merits of the saints ought to be referred to the glory and praise of God; because no one pleases Him with anything except with that which He Himself has given... That God thus operates in the hearts of men and in the free will itself, so that a holy thought, a pious plan, and every motion of good will is from God, because we can do anything good through Him, without whom we can do nothing (Jn. 15:5)... Whoever says...that what we are ordered to do through free will, we may be able to accomplish more easily through grace, just as if, even if grace were not given, we could nevertheless fulfill the divine commands without it, though not indeed easily, let him be anathema.”¹⁶⁶

Pope Boniface II, *Second Council of Orange*, 529: “Canon 22. Concerning those things that belong to man. No man has anything of his own but untruth and sin. But if a man has any truth or righteousness, it is from that fountain [grace] for which we must thirst in this desert, so that we may be refreshed from it as by drops of water and not faint on the way.”¹⁶⁷

Apostate Antipope Pius IX (1846-1878)

His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity and denying the Salvation Dogma

Apostate Antipope Pius IX glorified scholasticism. He also glorified the false gods and false religions of mythology and glorified immorality by not condemning the desecration of Catholic places with images against the faith and morals. From the information I have, apostate Antipope Pius IX was the first so-called pope that denied the Salvation Dogma¹⁶⁸ while acting as pope:

Apostate Antipope Pius IX, *Singulari Quidem*, 1856: “4. ...Outside of the Church, nobody can hope for life or salvation unless he is excused through ignorance beyond his control.”

The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity, John McManners: “In the nineteenth century, when Catholicism was centralizing itself ever more in Rome, Pope Pius IX admitted that men might be saved outside the Church by reason of ‘invincible ignorance’ of the true faith. This was a large concession of charity in the tradition of thought.”¹⁶⁹

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII (1878-1903)

His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII glorified scholasticism. He also glorified the false gods and false religions of mythology and glorified immorality by not condemning the desecration of Catholic places with images against the faith and morals. He even restored the idolatrous and immoral

¹⁶⁶ *Sixteenth Council of Carthage*, Can. 5, 418 AD (D. 105); *Council of Ephesus*, 431 AD, Catalog of Authoritative Statements, Chap. 2 (D. 131), Chap. 5 (D. 134), Chap. 6 (D. 135), Chap. 7 (D. 138).

¹⁶⁷ *Second Council of Orange*, 529 (D. 195); Confirmed by Boniface II, *Per Filium Nostrum*, 531 (D. 200).

¹⁶⁸ See RJMI books *The Salvation Dogma* and *Bad Books on Salvation*.

¹⁶⁹ *The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity*, by John McManners, cap. 10, “The Ecumenical Movement.” Oxford University Press, Oxford, NY. 1990. P. 373.

Borgia Apartments. He was an Americanist heretic for not denouncing and punishing the Americanist heretics.

His heresy for denying the dogma that slavery is ordained by God for just causes

He denied the dogma that slavery is ordained by God for just causes:

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *On Slavery in the Missions*, 1890: “The maternal love of the Catholic Church embraces all people. As you know, venerable brother, the Church from the beginning sought to completely eliminate slavery, whose wretched yoke has oppressed many people... This zeal of the Church for liberating the slaves has not languished with the passage of time; on the contrary, the more it bore fruit, the more eagerly it glowed... We have taken every occasion to openly condemn this gloomy plague of slavery.”

It is a dogma of the ordinary and solemn magisterium of the Catholic Church that slavery is not intrinsically evil and hence there are just reasons for slavery. Slavery that is ordained by God to punish and humble the wicked and their offspring is good and righteous slavery, but slavery that is not ordained by God is evil and unjust slavery. Here are a few of the many quotes from the true Catholic Church’s teachings that support slavery:

“Exhort slaves to be obedient to their masters, in all things pleasing, not gainsaying.” (Titus 2:9)

“Slaves, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh, not serving to the eye, as pleasing men, but in simplicity of heart, fearing God.” (Col. 3:22)

“Servants, be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your heart, as to Christ.” (Eph. 6:5)

“Slaves, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.” (1 Pt. 2:18)

Council of Gangra, 325: “Canon 3. If any one shall teach a slave, under pretext of piety, to despise his master and to run away from his service, and not to serve his own master with good-will and all honour, let him be anathema.”

Pope St. Leo the Great, *Council of Chalcedon*, 451: “Canon 4. ...No slave is to be taken into the monasteries to become a monk against the will of his own master. We have decreed that anyone who transgresses this decision of ours is to be excommunicated, lest God’s name be blasphemed...”

St. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Rule*, 590: “Slaves are to be admonished that they despise not their masters, lest they offend God, if by behaving themselves proudly they gainsay His ordinance.”¹⁷⁰

(See RJMI book *Justified and Unjustified Slavery: ...Apostate Antipope Leo III*, In Plurimus, 1888.)

His apostasy for promoting religious communion with non-Catholics

He denied the dogmas that Catholics are banned from ecumenical gatherings and from religious communion with those who do not adhere to the Catholic Church when he did not sufficiently condemn the idolatrous and heretical World’s Parliament of Religions of 1893 in

¹⁷⁰ b. 3, c. 5.

which several prominent nominal Catholics attended and prayed in communion with the non-Catholics present.¹⁷¹

His apostasy and heresy for glorifying Origen and Tertullian

And apostate Antipope Leo XIII was an apostate for glorifying the apostate Origen and heretic Tertullian, who were condemned by several true popes:

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris*, August 4, 1879: “...Origen, who graced the chair of the school of Alexandria, and was most learned in the teachings of the Greeks and Orientals. He published many volumes, involving great labor, which were wonderfully adapted to explain the divine writings and illustrate the sacred dogmas; which, though, as they now stand, not altogether free from error, contain nevertheless a wealth of knowledge tending to the growth and advance of natural truths. Tertullian opposes heretics with the authority of the sacred writings...”

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus*, November 1893: “7. And here, in order to strengthen Our teaching and Our exhortations, it is well to recall how, from the beginning of Christianity, all who have been renowned for holiness of life and sacred learning have given their deep and constant attention to Holy Scripture... In the Eastern Church, the greatest name of all is Origen—a man remarkable alike for penetration of genius and for persevering labor; from whose numerous works and his great Hexapla almost all have drawn that came after him. ...In the Western Church there were many names as great: Tertullian...”

Tertullian was condemned as a formal heretic by Pope St. Zephyrinus (198-217). Origen was condemned as an apostate in 401 by Pope St. Anastasius; in 553 at the Second Council of Constantinople, which was confirmed by Pope Pelagius in 556; in 649 by Pope Martin in the Lateran Council; and in 870 by Pope Hadrian II in the Fourth Council of Constantinople:

Pope St. Simplicius, *Quantum Presbyterorum*, to Acacius, Bishop of Constantinople, 476: “May the mercy of Christ our God (and) Savior avert this, it must be made known, abominable [as it is], that [the purpose is] to restore [to their former positions] in opposition to the opinions of the priests of the Lord of the whole world and of the principal rulers of both worlds those who have been condemned.” (D. 159)

Pope Anastasius I, *Letter to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, Concerning the Character of Rufinus*, 401 AD: “I cannot pass over in silence an event which has given me great pleasure, the decree issued by our Emperors, by which everyone who serves God is warned against the reading of Origen, and all who are convicted of reading his impious works are condemned by the imperial judgment. In these words my formal sentence was pronounced.”¹⁷²

A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers, by Lewis Ellies du Pin, Doctor of the Sorbon, 1693: “Anastasius was chosen Bishop of Rome after the death of Pope Siricius, Anno. 398. ...The business of the Origenists making a great noise in the Church, he thought it his duty to declare his sense of that matter: He therefore made a decree after the example of Theophilus, whereby he condemned both the works and the person of Origen... Being informed that Ruffinus the Priest was his chief defender,...he condemned him as an heretic in the year 40... That he could not but condemn Ruffinus his conduct because he had translated the books of Origen’s Principles with a design that the people should read them as Catholic books; that the

¹⁷¹ See RJMI book *Idolatrous World’s Parliament of Religions of 1893*.

¹⁷² *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, by Schaff, Series 2, v. 3.

fear he was in lest they should corrupt the doctrine of the faithful in his Church obliged him to condemn them; that he was informed that the Emperors had made an edict to forbid the reading of Origen's works; that Ruffinus having approved in his translation the opinions of Origen deserved to be treated after the same manner as he that first published them. Lastly, he declares, that he will hear no more of him; that he might seek for absolution where he pleased, for his part he looked upon him as an excommunicated person."¹⁷³

Second Council of Constantinople, 553, confirmed by Pope Pelagius in 556:
"Capitula or Anathema 11. If anyone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches, and Origen, as well as their heretical books, and also all other heretics who have already been condemned and anathematized by the holy, catholic, and apostolic church and by the four holy synods which have already been mentioned, and also all those who have thought or now think in the same way as the aforesaid heretics and who persist in their error even to death: let him be anathema."¹⁷⁴

Pope St. Martin I, *Lateran Council, 649*: "Canon 18: If anyone according to the holy Fathers, harmoniously with us and likewise with the Faith, does not with mind and lips reject and anathematize all the most abominable heretics together with their impious writings even to one least portion, whom the holy Catholic and apostolic Church of God, that is, the holy and universal five Synods and likewise all the approved Fathers of the Church in harmony, rejects and anathematizes, we mean Sabellius, Arius, ... Origen, ... and briefly all the remaining heretics, who have been condemned and cast out by the Catholic Church; whose teachings are the fruit of diabolical operation..., let such a person be condemned." (D. 271 and D. 272)

Apostate Antipope Pius X (1903-1914)

His apostasy for Hellenizing Christianity and glorifying Thomas Aquinas

Apostate Antipope Pius X glorified scholasticism and the apostate Thomas Aquinas. He was the first to make scholasticism and philosophy mandatory for priests, theologians, and canonists.¹⁷⁵ He also glorified the false gods and false religions of mythology and glorified immorality by not condemning the desecration of Catholic places with images against the faith and morals.

His heresy for allowing Catholics to be in religious communion with non-Catholics

From the information I have, he was the first so-called pope while acting as pope who taught the heresy that Catholics are allowed to be in religious communion with those who do not adhere to the Catholic Church, in this case with the Orthodox Schismatics:

¹⁷³ v. 3, p. 58, "Anastasius."

¹⁷⁴ Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia*, Tom. V., col. 568; Hefele, *History of Councils*, v. 4, p. 336.

¹⁷⁵ See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: ...Apostate Antipope Pius X.*

Exemplar.

Romae 17. 2. 1908

BEATISSIME PATER!

Andreas Szeptycki Metropolitanus Halicensis, Metropoliae Kijoviensis ac totius Russiae Administrator ad pedes Sanctitatis Suae provolutus humillime rogat, ut ipsi concedatur facultas etiam confessariis communicabilis dispensandi fideles saeculares a lege, qua vetita est communicatio in sacris cum orthodoxis, quoties opportunum esse in conscientia judicabunt.

Quod Deus...

Documentum originale a me scriptum Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X. propria manu dignatus est signare verbis: „Tollerari posse.“

Translation:

“Most Blessed Father!

“Andrew Szeptycki, Metropolitan of Halycz, Metropolitan of Kiev and Administrator of all Russia at the foot of His Holiness most humbly asks that faculties may be conceded to himself and also to confessors in communion (capable of being communicated) for dispensing secular faithful from the law which forbids communicatio in sacris with the Orthodox as many times as they will judge it in conscience to be opportune.

“*Our Most Holy Father Pope Pius X deigned to sign with his own hand this document written by me with the words ‘May be tolerated.’*”

His heresy that simony no longer bans offenders from holding offices

Apostate Antipope Pius X also taught the heresy that simony no longer bans offenders from holding offices:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Simony: “To uproot the evil of simony so prevalent during the Middle Ages, the Church decreed the severest penalties against its perpetrators. Pope Julius II declared simoniacal papal elections invalid, an enactment which has since been rescinded, however, by Pope Pius X (Constitution ‘Vacante Sede.’ 25 Dec., 1904, tit. II. cap. vi. in ‘Canoniste Contemp.’, XXXII. 1909. 291).”

Culpability of bishops, theologians, and canon lawyers

All bishops in control of a diocese with notoriously desecrated places were apostates and thus held no office, as well as all bishops who were guilty of any of the crimes against the faith. All of the theologians and canon lawyers from 1250 onward were apostates. Many theologians and canon lawyers before 1250 were also apostates, but each case must be studied individually.

Secret Formal Heretics Cannot Hold Offices

Because it is a dogma that all non-Catholics are banned from holding offices in the Catholic Church, this also includes secret (aka occult) formal heretics because they are not Catholic. Canon 4 of the Council of Ephesus in 431, which was confirmed by Pope St. Sixtus III in 432, infallibly defines that private heretics “are...deposed” and thus automatically lose their office:

Council of Ephesus, 431, called by Pope St. Celestine and confirmed by Pope St. Sixtus III in 432: “Canon 4: But if some of the clergy should rebel, and dare to hold the opinions of Nestorius or Celestius either in private or in public, it has been judged by the holy synod that they too are deposed.” (D. 127)

Protector of the Faith, by apostate Thomas M. Izbicki, 1981: “Turrecremata insisted... without membership in the Church through faith, it was impossible to hold the power of the keys, and thus a heretic pope ceased to be head of the Church. Fallen from the rock of Peter’s faith..., he lost... his tenure of office... This was true even in a case of secret heresy...^{176,,177}

Foundations of the Conciliar Theory, by apostate Brian Tierney, 1955: “Joannes Teutonicus... held that a Pope could be deposed for any notorious crime and for heresy even if it was secret.^{178,,179}

Papal Immunity and Liability in the Writings of the Medieval Canonists, by James M. Moynihan, 1961: “The *Commentum Atrebatense* [states] what the later *Glossa Palatina* and *Gloss Ecce uicit leo* explicitly affirmed: that a pope could be accused of occult heresy as well.¹⁸⁰ ...As an argument that a pope could be judged even for occult heresy, Guido [de Baysio] cited D. XVII, dict. p. c. 6, which records, among other things, the words of the bishops who had been summoned in a synod to judge Pope Symmachus...¹⁸¹”

Hence the secret sin of simony, which is heresy, bans offenders from offices

Simony is the buying or attempted buying of sacred things, such as the sacraments, sacramentals, blessings, and offices in the Catholic Church. Simony was always condemned as a

¹⁷⁶ Chap. 4, Footnote 95: “‘Si vero hoc papa agere noluert, cum tunc videatur esse pertinax, et incorrigibilis, et haereticus formatus, tunc concilium praelatorum congregatum debet iuris auctoritate procedere ad depositionem illius,’ CSD D17 ante c1.q3 (1:149); *S.E.* II c.112 fol.260v, ‘Si Romanus pontifex efficitur haereticus ipso facto quo cadit a fide Petri cadet a cathedra, et sede Petri,’ SE 2.112.260v; ‘Claves sunt datae ecclesiae...ergo existens extra ecclesiam non habet eas...Haereticus est ab ecclesiae corpore separatus ergo ipso facto quod est haereticus est privatus honore et potestate ecclesiasticae iurisdictionis,’ SE 4 (pt. 2) 18 .391v-392r. See SE 4 (pt. 2) 18 .390v, 392v. On occult heresy, see SE 4 (pt. 2) 20. 394r. See also Antoninus de Florentia, *Summa theologica* (Verona, 1740), vol. 3, cols. 1207-9; Mario Midali, *Corpus Christi mysticum apud Dominicum Bañez eiusque fontes* (Rome, 1967), p. 207. A mad pope could be removed as though he were dead, see SE 3.8 .283r.”

¹⁷⁷ c. 4, p. 91.

¹⁷⁸ Footnote 2: “*Glossa Ordinaria ad Dist.* 40, c. 6, ‘Certe credo quod si notorium est crimen eius quandocumque, et inde scandalizatur ecclesia et incorrigibilis sit, quod inde possit accusare...Hic tamen specialiter fit mentio de haeresi ideo quia et si occulta esset haeresis de illa posset accusare. Sed de alio occulto crimine non posset.’”

¹⁷⁹ pt. 1, sec. 2, p. 65.

¹⁸⁰ c. 3, pt. 2, sec. 1, pp. 57-58.

¹⁸¹ c. 4, pt. 2, sec. 2, p. 119.

heresy during the Old Testament era and New Testament era. It is an ordinary magisterium and solemn magisterium dogma that simoniacs are automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church and thus banned from holding offices. Hence a Catholic officeholder who becomes a simoniac is automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church and hence is no longer Catholic and thus automatically loses his office. And a Catholic who attempts to obtain an office by simony is automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church and hence is no longer Catholic and thus does not obtain the office. And priests and bishops who are simoniacs are illegal and thus cannot effectively function as priests and bishops.

Therefore the ordination of a bishop by simony is invalid in relation to obtaining the office and illegal in relation to becoming a bishop. This simoniac does not obtain the office. And even though he becomes a bishop, he does not have the legal right to function as a bishop and hence his rank of bishop is rendered ineffective as long as he remains outside the Catholic Church.

The first simoniac on record during the New Covenant era was Simon Magus. The sin was named after him. He offered money to Pope St. Peter to become a bishop and obtain the office of bishop. But St. Peter condemned Simon and told him that a rank and office cannot be bought:

“And when Simon saw that by the imposition of the hands of the apostles the Holy Spirit was given, he offered them money, saying: Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I shall lay my hands, he may receive the Holy Spirit. But Peter said to him: Keep thy money to thyself to perish with thee because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast no part nor lot in this matter. For thy heart is not right in the sight of God.” (Acts 8:18-21)

Catholic Commentary on Acts 8:18: “**Offered them money:** Simony, this wicked sorcerer Simon is noted by St. Irenaeus (li. 1 c. 20) and others to have been the first heretic and father of all heretics to come in the Church of God. He gave the onset to purchase with his money spiritual functions; that is, to buy the office of bishop, for to have power to give the Holy Spirit by imposition of hands is to be a bishop, and to buy the priesthood, for to have power to remit sins and to consecrate Christ’s body is to be a priest. He attempted to buy the authority to minister Sacraments, to preach, to have cure of souls, to buy a benefice, and likewise in all other spiritual things, whereof either to make sale or purchase for money or money’s worth, which is a great horrible sin called simony and is named ‘Simonical Heresy’ of this detestable man who first attempted to buy a spiritual function or office. (See D. Greg. *apud Ioan. Diac. in vir.* li. 3, c. 2, 3, 4, 5).”

Here, then, is the ordinary magisterium deeper dogma (because St. Peter was an apostle and thus a Church Father) and the solemn magisterium deeper dogma (because St. Peter was the pope and hence this is an infallible papal definition) that anyone who attempts to get a rank or an office by simony does not legally get the rank and does not validly obtain the office. St. Peter says that their “heart is not right in the sight of God” for believing “that the gift of God may be purchased with money.” Emphasizing this, St. Peter says, “Thou hast no part nor lot in this matter.” And thus thou cannot have any legal part of a bishop or any valid possession of an office because of your sin of simony:

Pope St. Gregory the Great, Book 11, *Letter 46*, to Isacius, the Bishop of Jerusalem, 6th century: “But, inasmuch as it has come to our ears that in the churches of the East no one attains to sacred orders but by giving of bribes, if your Fraternity finds that this is the case, you should offer as your first oblation to Almighty God the restraining of the error of simoniacal heresy in the Churches subject to you. For, not to speak of other things, what sort of men can they be when in sacred orders who are advanced to them not by merit but by bribes? Now we know with what animadversion the Prince of the apostles attacked this heresy, having pronounced the first sentence of condemnation against Simon, when he said, Thy money be with thee unto perdition, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased

with money (Acts 8:20). Our Lord God Himself also, the Creator and Redeemer of the human race, having made a scourge of small cords, overthrew and cast out of the temple the seats of them that sold doves (Mt. 21). For to sell doves in the temple, what else is it but to give for a price in holy Church that imposition of hands whereby the Holy Spirit is given? But the seats of them that sold doves were overthrown, because the priesthood of such is not accounted as priesthood.”

In 451 in the Council of Chalcedon’s Canon 2, it was infallibly defined again by Pope St. Leo I that simoniacs cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church:

Pope St. Leo I, *Council of Chalcedon*, 451: “Canon 2. If any bishop gives ordination in return for money and puts up for sale that which cannot be sold and ordains for money a bishop or chorepiscopus or presbyter or deacon or any other of those who are reckoned among the clergy; or who for money shall appoint anyone to the office of oconomus, advocate, or paramonarius; or, in a word, who hath done anything else contrary to the canon, for the sake of filthy lucre—he who hath undertaken to do anything of this sort, having been convicted, shall be in danger of losing his degree. And he who has been ordained shall derive no advantage from the ordination or promotion thus negotiated; but let him remain a stranger to the dignity and responsibility which he attained by means of money. And if any one shall appear to have acted as a go-between in so shameful and godless a traffic, he also, if he be a cleric, shall be removed from his degree; if he be a layman or a monk, let him be excommunicated.”¹⁸²

Hence a candidate who attempts to obtain an office by simony does not obtain the office: “Let him remain a stranger to the dignity and responsibility which he attained by means of money.” And upon being convicted, he should be degraded, lose his degree (rank). And an officeholder who commits the sin of simony by accepting money or any other favor to put a man in office automatically loses his office and should be degraded from his degree (rank) by a condemnatory sentence if he does not repent. Neither the giver nor the taker can have part or lot with officeholders in the Catholic Church. The deeper dogma, then, is that the sin of simony renders one automatically incapable of holding an office in the Catholic Church. Hence as soon as it is certain that one obtained an office by simony, he can then be juridically sentenced and deposed for the common good. However, the sentence and deposition would be declaratory in nature. Therefore, a convicted person’s official removal from the office does not mean the person held the office before his simony was manifest but only that he is now formally deposed from the office. Apostate Antipope Innocent II teaches this truth in the invalid Second Lateran Council:

Apostate Antipope Innocent II, invalid *Second Lateran Council*, 1139: “Canon 1. We decree that if anyone has been ordained simoniacally, he is forfeit entirely of the office which he illicitly usurped.”

Apparent officeholders in Milan in the 11th century did not hold the offices because of simony

In the days of Peter Damian in the 11th century, almost every priest in Milan was illegal and all the so-called officeholders did not actually hold the offices because they were guilty of simony. Peter Damian, acting as papal legate, had the simoniacs abjure in order to enter the Catholic Church, which is one proof that their crime of simony automatically placed them outside the Catholic Church. He then reinstated the so-called officeholders to their offices if they were worthy, which is one proof that simony automatically bans offenders from holding offices:

¹⁸² Contained in *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, by Philip Schaff, 19th century. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series II, Volume 14. Publisher: Christian Ethereal Library, Grand Rapids, MI. It quotes the Council of Chalcedon’s Canon 2 in the Second Nicene Council’s Canon 5, p. 1092.

Peter Damian, *Letter 65*, to the Archdeacon Hildebrand, 1059: (2) ...It happened providentially, I think, that I was commissioned to travel to Milan as the legate of blessed Pope Nicholas. (3) Because of the two heresies, namely, simony and that of the Nicolaitans, rather violent fighting broke out, involving the clergy and the people.¹⁸³ (9) ...There was this large gathering of clerics, and after thoroughly investigating them as a group, and each one singly, hardly anyone in the whole assembly was found to have been promoted to orders without payment. It was the authentic and clearly irregular practice, and the inescapable rule of this church, that anyone who approached ordination to any rank, even to be consecrated bishop, must without any discussion first pay the prescribed tax... (14) This damnable graft, forever worthy of condemnation, that flowed from the heresy of simony, and all pernicious trafficking of this kind, was customarily practiced in this holy church, so that anyone who came forward to be promoted to clerical orders would give, as by a previously ordained condition, twelve pennies for the subdiaconate, eighteen for the diaconate, and lastly, twenty-four for receiving the priesthood. In this way, alas, Simon Magus converted the holy church of St. Ambrose into his perverted workshop. This forger and evil master of the mint was equipped with bellows, hammers, and anvil, and forged nothing more than universal peril for the souls of all men...

“(25) After all had been reconciled in this fashion [by abjuration from their heresy of simony], it was decreed that all would not then indiscriminately be returned to office, but only those who were well educated, chaste, and were considered to be upright and serious in their behavior. For the others, however, it would suffice that by the grace of God they be again brought into the Church from which, by the pruning knife of divine punishment, they had previously been cut off. Both the former and the latter, to whom permission to function was returned, recovered their lost position, not from the former ordination they had so evilly purchased, but rather from that most efficacious authority of the blessed prince of the apostles with which he suddenly addressed the blessed Apollinaris, when he said, ‘Arise and receive the Holy Spirit, together with the office of bishop.’¹⁸⁴”

Benedict IX lost the papal office because of simony

Simony was so rampant in all of Italy in the days of Peter Damian that only a few dioceses were not guilty of it, one of them being the diocese of Ravenna in which Gebhard was the Archbishop. Damian also accuses so-called Pope Benedict IX of simony. He says that if he is indeed guilty, then he is a robber and thus not the pope, which is another proof that simony bans offenders from all offices, even the papacy:

Peter Damian, *Letter 3*, to Archbishop Gebhard of Ravenna, 1043: “To you the see of Ravenna, which you rule by God’s authority, to you all of Christ’s holy Church gives thanks. While the dragon of simony, after binding the arms of those trafficking wretches in its intricate coils of avarice, is spewing forth its venom, you were almost the exception in standing unconquered and unshaken as the knight of Christ, piercing the throat of the evil beast with the javelin of Peter and keeping your church free from its foul contagion. What the See of the teacher [Footnote 10] lost through the fault of its shepherds, or rather, of its robbers, the see of his noble disciple preserved inviolate.”

Footnote 10: “In this reference to ‘the master’s see in the hands of hirelings or thieves,’ it becomes obvious that the charge of simony against Benedict IX dates back to the year 1043, and did not originate only in the hindsight of later reformers.

¹⁸³ See Dressier, *Petrus Damiani* 1 30ff.

¹⁸⁴ Footnote 52: “Cf. *Passio sancti Apollinaris*, AA SS July 5-744. On this source and its authenticity, see Reindel, *Briefe* 2 (1988) 246, n. 64.”

On which see R. L. Poole, 'Benedict IX and Gregory VI,' *Proceedings of the British Academy* 8 (1917/18), 199-235. See also O. Capitani, 'Benedetto IX,' *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 8 (1966), 354-366; Lucchesi, *Vita* no. 65; Fuhrmann, *Falschungen* 336. In trying to rescue Benedict's reputation, Herrmann, *Tuskulanerpapsttum* 166f., did not cite this letter."

Pope Benedict IX became a simoniac around 1043 and hence automatically lost his office. Benedict IX was deposed and driven from Rome in 1045. Other popes and antipopes reigned while he was still alive. Some papal chronologies have Benedict IX gaining and losing his office three times:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, List of Popes: "Benedict IX (1032-1045); Sylvester III (1045); Benedict IX (1045); Gregory VI (1045-1046); Clement II (1046-1047); Benedict IX (1047-1048); Damasus II (1048); Leo IX (1049-1054)."

Benedict IX died sometime during the reign of Pope Leo IX.

Benedict X did not obtain the papal office because of simony

Benedict X was never the pope because he was elected by simony and thus never obtained the papal office. He was a heretical antipope. Nicholas II was elected instead and became the true pope:

Peter Damian, *Letter* 58, to Henry, archbishop of Ravenna, 1058: "(2) ...Regarding the matter that you added at the end of your letter, that I write to you giving my opinion of the man who now occupies the Apostolic See [Benedict X], and of him [Nicholas II] who was elected to that see; even though you could earlier have gotten this information from various clerics of your own diocese, in view of your command, I shall also put in writing my conclusions about the differences between these two men.

"(3) The former [Benedict X], it seems to me, is a simonist, unable to clear himself of this crime; for in the face of the outcry, the objections, and the terrible anathemas of all of us cardinal bishops of that city, he was enthroned at night with armed mobs rushing about in a furious uproar.¹⁸⁵ Thereafter he managed to acquire the tainted patronage of wealthy men, disbursed money to the people in every ward, alley, and lane of the city, broke into the ancient treasury of Saint Peter, and thus having made the whole city into a workshop of the evil forger, Simon, hardly any other sound was heard, so to speak, but the clang of hammers on the anvil. And what a crime and monstrous portent! Peter, as we know, who had condemned Simon and all his trafficking to everlasting hell, was forced to pay from his own resources for all of Simon's mongering. But that he concealed this crime in every way he could and used the excuse that he was dragged into it and was forcibly compelled to act as he did, even though I am not certain of the facts, still I do not altogether deny it. For he is so obtuse and lazy, and is a man of so little talent, that one might believe that he would not know how to plan these events himself. But yet he is guilty, because he willingly wallowed in this dirty mess into which he was early violently thrown, and delighted to carry on in this adultery which unwillingly he had previously committed...

"(5) But that I may further satisfy your request in my reply, it seems to me that the pontiff-elect [Nicholas II] is well educated, a man of brisk intelligence, chaste above all suspicion, and generous in giving alms. I will not say more so as not to appear amenable to everything he has done, but only as an advocate for specific

¹⁸⁵ Footnote 5: "On the election of Benedict X in Rome on 5 April 1058, seven days after the death of Stephen IX in Florence on 29 March 1058, cf. *Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, ed. H. Hoffmann, MGH SS 34 (1980), 2.99, 356, for which the present letter is the source. For full bibliographical treatment, see Reindel, *Briefe* 2.192. n. 4."

items. Regarding his opponent, on the other hand, if he were able to explain fully for me—I will not say just one psalm, but even one line of a homily—I would no longer mutter a word against him; I would take his hand and kiss his feet and, if you should say so, would call him not merely apostolic, but verily an apostle.”

Most of the Renaissance nominal popes were simoniacs

All of the Renaissance nominal popes were apostate antipopes for many crimes. Many of them, such as the Borgia Alexander VI, were guilty of simony. And many of them were guilty of simony when they were bishops and anti-cardinals. This one crime of simony alone would have made them formal heretics and thus banned them from holding offices. (For a list of some of the apostate antipopes who were guilty of simony, see RJMI book *The Great Apostasy: Simony*.)

Hence an apparent pope who is guilty of simony does not hold the office, just like an apparent pope who is guilty of any other heresy:

Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More, by apostate Rev. T. E. Bridgett, 1892: “It is admitted by all that simony invalidates a Pope’s election. Could it be proved against him, he would not, strictly speaking, be deposed, but he would be declared never to have been Pope. Again, if manifest and obstinate heresy were proved against a Pope, a Council might declare his See vacant, since he would be deposed by the invisible Head of the Church, the everlasting Truth.”¹⁸⁶

Most simoniacs, like other occult heretics, keep their sin secret

Simony is a sin that by its very nature is kept secret in most cases. It is kept secret among the giver, the accomplices, and the receiver. Yet an apparent officeholder who is a secret simoniac, as well as any other secret formal heretic, does not hold the office even if every Catholic thinks he does. Even though the Fifth Lateran Council in 1517 is invalid because only apostate antipopes confirmed it, the first being Julius II, it nevertheless teaches the deeper dogma that simony bans offenders from holding offices and hence also the papal office. It teaches that any so-called pope elected by simony does not obtain the office even if unanimously elected, enthroned, and honored by all Catholics as the pope. And it teaches that any cardinal guilty of simony automatically loses his office:

Apostate Antipope Julius II, Invalid *Fifth Lateran Council*, Session 5, 1513: “With the advice and unanimous consent of our brothers, cardinals of the holy Roman Church, by means of this our constitution which will have permanent validity, we establish, ordain, decree and define, by apostolic authority and the fulness of our power, that if it happens...that by the efforts of the enemy of the human race and following the urge of ambition or greed, the election of the Roman pontiff is made or effected by the person who is elected, or by one or several members of the college of cardinals, giving their votes in a manner that in any way involves simony being committed—by the gift, promise or receipt of money, goods of any sort, castles, offices, benefices, promises or obligations—by the person elected or by one or several other persons, in any manner or form whatsoever, even if the election resulted in a majority of two-thirds or in the unanimous choice of all the cardinals, or even in a spontaneous agreement on the part of all, without a scrutiny being made, then not only is this election or choice itself null and does not bestow on the person elected or chosen in this fashion any right of either spiritual or temporal

¹⁸⁶ *Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More*, by Rev. T. E. Bridgett. *Nihil Obstat*: Eduard O’Lavery, C.S.S.R., *Censor Deputatus*. Imprimatur: + Henricus Eduardus, Card. Archiep. Westmon., Feb. 6, 1891. Published by Burns and Oates, Limited, and Benzinger Brothers, 1892. Chapter XVIII, Before the Council, p. 348.

administration, but also there can be alleged and presented, against the person elected or chosen in this manner, by any one of the cardinals who has taken part in the election, the charge of simony, as a true and unquestionable heresy, so that the one elected is not regarded by anyone as the Roman pontiff. A further consequence is that the person elected in this manner is automatically deprived, without the need of any other declaration, of his cardinal's rank and of all other honours whatsoever... And that the elected person is to be regarded as, and is in fact, not a follower of the apostles but an apostate and like Simon a magician and a heresiarch and perpetually debarred from each and all of the above-mentioned things. A simoniacal election of this kind is never at any time to be made valid by a subsequent enthronement or the passage of time, or even by the act of adoration or obedience of all the cardinals."

Simony, then, does not need to be public for the simoniac to be banned from holding an office. Hence an apparent officeholder who is a simoniac does not hold the office even if all the Catholics believe he holds the office because they are inculpably ignorant of his sin of simony. The same applies to the mortal sin of heresy, which renders a formal heretic incapable of holding an office even if his heresy is secret (occult) and thus even if all Catholics believe he holds the office. Even though Paul IV's Bull *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio* of 1559 is invalid because he was an apostate antipope, it nevertheless teaches the deeper dogma that a formal heretic, and hence even a secret one, cannot hold an office even if all Catholics believe he holds the office:

Apostate Antipope Paul IV, Invalid *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, 1559: 3.
...Bishops, Archbishops, Patriarchs, Primate, Cardinals, Legates, Counts, Barons, Marquis, Dukes, Kings or Emperors, who must teach others and give them good example to keep them in the Catholic Faith, when these prevaricate, they sin more gravely than others; for they not only lose themselves, but drag down with them to perdition and the pit of death countless other peoples entrusted to their care and government or otherwise subject to them. Upon advice and consent concerning such as these, through this Our Constitution, which is to remain forever effective, in hatred of such a crime the greatest and deadliest that can exist in God's Church, We sanction, establish, decree and define, through the fullness of Our Apostolic power, that although the aforesaid sentences, censures and penalties keep their force and efficacy and obtain their effect, all and sundry Bishops, Archbishops, Patriarchs, Primate, Cardinals, Legates, Counts, Barons, Marquis, Dukes, Kings and Emperors who in the past have, as mentioned above, have strayed or fallen into heresy or have been apprehended, have confessed or been convicted of incurring, inciting or committing schism or who, in the future, shall stray or fall into heresy or shall incur, incite or commit schism or shall be apprehended, confess or be convicted of straying or falling into heresy or of incurring, inciting or committing schism, being less excusable than others in such matters, in addition to the sentences, censures and penalties mentioned above, (all these persons) shall also automatically, without any exercise of law or application of fact, be completely and entirely forever deprived of and furthermore disqualified from and incapacitated for their rank; their Cathedrals, even Metropolitan and Patriarchal ones; Primatial Churches; honor as Cardinals; position as any sort of Legate; active or passive voice and all authority; and Monasteries, benefices and Church offices, with or without the care of souls, whether secular or regular of any Order whatever which they may have obtained in any way, by any Apostolic grant or concession by title, life-long tenure as administrators, or otherwise, and in which or to which they have any right; likewise, any yearly fruit, yield or produce reserved or assigned to them or similar fruit, yield or produce; also any County, Barony, Marquisate, Dukedom, Kingdom or Empire.

"6. Further, if ever at any time it becomes clear that any Bishop, even one conducting himself as an Archbishop, Patriarch, or primate; or any Cardinal of the aforesaid Roman Church, even as mentioned, a Legate; or likewise any Roman Pontiff before his promotion or elevation as a Cardinal or Roman Pontiff, has

strayed from the Catholic Faith or fallen into some heresy, or has incurred schism, then his promotion or elevation shall be null, invalid and void. It cannot be declared valid or become valid through his acceptance of the office, his consecration, subsequent possession or seeming possession of government and administration, or by the putative enthronement of or homage paid to the same Roman Pontiff, or by universal obedience accorded him, or by the passage of any time in said circumstances, [nor shall it be held as quasi-legitimate.] It shall not be considered to have given or to give any power of administration in matters spiritual or temporal, to such persons promoted as Archbishops, Patriarchs or primates or elevated as Cardinals or as Roman Pontiff. Rather, each and every one of their statements, deeds, enactments, and administrative acts, of any kind, and any result thereof whatsoever, shall be without force and shall confer no legality or right on anyone. The persons themselves so promoted and elevated shall, *ipso facto* and without need for any further declaration, be deprived of any dignity, position, honor, title, authority, office and power, without any exception as regards those who might have been promoted or elevated before they deviated from the faith, became heretics, incurred schism, or committed or encouraged any or all of these.”

Therefore even secret formal heretics are banned from holding offices in the Catholic Church. Hence, even if a so-called pope is unanimously elected, enthroned, and given “universal obedience” and thus believed to be the pope by every Catholic in the world, he is not the pope if he fell into the mortal sin of heresy and thus was a formal heretic before his election. Not only secret simoniacs, then, but also secret formal heretics are banned from holding offices. This is emphasized by the similar words used by apostate Antipope Julius II regarding simoniacs and by apostate Antipope Paul IV regarding formal heretics:

On Secret Simony	On Secret Formal Heresy
<p>Apostate Antipope Julius II, invalid <i>Fifth Lateran Council</i>, Session 5, 1513: “We establish, ordain, decree and define, by apostolic authority and the fullness of our power, that if...the election of the Roman Pontiff is made...in any way [that] involves simony being committed...even if the election resulted in a majority of two-thirds or in the unanimous choice of all the cardinals, or even in a spontaneous agreement on the part of all, without a scrutiny being made, then...is this election or choice itself null, and does not bestow on the person elected or chosen in this fashion any right of either spiritual or temporal administration...so that the one elected is not regarded by anyone as the Roman Pontiff... A simoniacal election of this kind is never at any time to be made valid by a subsequent enthronement or the passage of time, or even by the act of adoration or obedience of all the cardinals.”</p>	<p>Apostate Antipope Paul IV, invalid <i>Cum ex Apostolatus Officio</i>, 1559: “We sanction, establish, decree and define, through the fullness of Our Apostolic power that... If ever at any time...any Bishop...or likewise any Roman Pontiff before his promotion or elevation as a Cardinal or Roman Pontiff has strayed from the Catholic Faith or fallen into some heresy...then his promotion or elevation, even if made in full concord and with the unanimous consent of all the Cardinals, shall be null, invalid and void. It cannot be declared valid or become valid through his acceptance of the office, his consecration, subsequent possession or seeming possession of government and administration, or by the putative enthronement of or homage paid to the same Roman Pontiff, or by universal obedience accorded him, or by the passage of any time.”</p>

Therefore, a so-called pope who got his office by the secret sin of simony or was a secret formal heretic is not the pope even if the public has no way of knowing he is not the pope. He does not hold the office no matter how secret his sin of simony or heresy is. To those who are inculpably ignorant of the antipope’s sin of simony or heresy, he is a putative pope and thus his laws are putative laws and the persons he bestows offices upon are putative officeholders. And the unsuspecting Catholics are bound under pain of sin to obey putative officeholders as long as

their laws are not sinful or erroneous. This is necessary for law and order and the common good.¹⁸⁷

Beware of apostates, such as Cajetan and Robert Bellarmine, who hold the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold an office but deny the basic dogma that secret formal heretics are not members of the Catholic Church and are not Catholic. They hold the heresy, introduced by scholastics, that secret formal heretics are Catholic and thus members of the Catholic Church and Catholic:

Apostate Robert Bellarmine, *Romano Pontifice*, 16th century: “This principle is most certain. The non-Christian cannot in any way be Pope, as Cajetan himself admits... The reason for this is that he cannot be head of what he is not a member; now he who is not a Christian is not a member of the Church, and a manifest heretic is not a Christian... Occult heretics are still of the Church, they are parts and members, and therefore the Pope who is an occult heretic is still Pope... Occult heretics are united and members [of the Church]...” (Bk. 2, c. 30)

Hence these apostate scholastics hold the heresy that an apparent pope who is a secret formal heretic is Catholic and thus a member of the Catholic Church and hence holds the office. (See RJMI article *Cajetan’s and Bellarmine’s Heresies on Formal Heretics and Loss of Papal Office*.)

Apparent Officeholders Who Are Suspect of Heresy

Suspicion of heresy means that there is a suspicion (some probability but no certain evidence) that a person believes in heresy. Hence an apparent Catholic who is suspect of heresy may or may not believe in heresy and thus may or may not be a heretic, unlike formal heretics and material heretics in which there is certain evidence that they believe in heresy and thus are heretics. Because there is no certain evidence of heresy regarding those who are suspect of heresy, they must be considered Catholic until their guilt or innocence is proved. If their guilt is proved, then it is certain that they are heretics. If their innocence is proved, then it is certain that they are not heretics. The primary way a Catholic who is suspect of heresy removes the suspicion is by condemning the heresy he is suspect of.

Hence apparent officeholders who are suspect of heresy are considered Catholic and thus presumed to hold the office until their guilt or innocence is proved. This applies even to those who are gravely suspect of heresy, which is the third and highest degree of suspicion. He too is presumed to be Catholic because there is no certain evidence that he is a heretic.

A Pope Can Be Put on Trial, Judged, and Sentenced

The Apostolic See cannot be judged by anyone

The Apostolic See, also known as the First See or Roman See, is the papacy. Hence all the valid acts of the popes are part of the Apostolic See. Papal acts consist of teachings, laws, judgments, and commands. All of the valid papal acts, and thus all the acts of the Apostolic See, are free from all error and sin:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Apostolic See: An Apostolic see is any see founded by an Apostle and having the authority of its founder; *the* Apostolic See is the seat of authority in the Roman Church, continuing the Apostolic functions of

¹⁸⁷ See in this book “Putative Officeholders and Their Putative Acts,” p. [126](#).

Peter, the chief of the Apostles... The authoritative acts of the popes, inasmuch as they are the exercise of their Apostolical power, are styled acts of the Holy or Apostolic See. The See is thus personified as the representative of the Prince of the Apostles, as in Pope Leo II's confirmation of the Sixth General Council (Constantinople, 680-681): 'Therefore We also and through our office, this venerable Apostolic See, give assent to the things that have been defined, and confirm them by the authority of the Blessed Apostle Peter.'"

Pope St. Innocent, *In requirendis*, to the African bishops, 417: "(1) In seeking the things of God...preserving the examples of ancient tradition...you have confirmed that reference must be made to our judgment, realizing what is due the Apostolic See, since all of us [popes] placed in this position desire to follow the Apostle [St. Peter], from whom the episcopate itself and all the authority of this name have emerged. Following him we know how to condemn evils just as (well as how) to approve praiseworthy things. Take this as an example, guarding with your sacerdotal office the practices of the fathers you resolve that (they) must not be trampled upon, because they made their decisions not by human, but by divine judgment, so that they thought that nothing whatever, although it concerned separated and remote provinces, should be concluded, unless it first came to the attention of this See, so that what was a just proclamation might be confirmed by the total authority of this See, and from this source (just as all waters proceed from their natal fountain and through diverse regions of the whole world remain pure liquids of an uncorrupted source), the other churches might assume what [they ought] to teach, whom they ought to wash, those whom the water worthy of clean bodies would shun as though defiled with filth incapable of being cleansed." (D. 100)

Pope St. Zosimus, *Quamvis Patrum Traditio*, to the African bishops, 418: "Although the tradition of the Fathers has attributed such great authority to the Apostolic See that no one would dare to disagree wholly with its judgment, and it has always preserved this judgment by canons and rules, and current ecclesiastical discipline up to this time by its laws pays the reverence which is due to the name of PETER, from whom it has itself descended...; since therefore PETER the head is of such great authority and he has confirmed the subsequent endeavors of all our ancestors, so that the Roman Church is fortified...by human as well as by divine laws, and it does not escape you that we rule its place and also hold power of the name itself, nevertheless you know, dearest brethren, and as priests you ought to know, although we have such great authority that no one can dare to retract from our decision, yet we have done nothing which we have not voluntarily referred to your notice by letters...not because we did not know what ought to be done, or would do anything which by going against the advantage of the Church, would be displeasing." (D. 109)

Pope St. Boniface, *Retro Maioribus Tuis*, to Rufus, Bishop of Thessaly, 422: "(2) ...To the Synod [of Corinth]...we have directed such writings that all the brethren may know...that there must be no withdrawal from our judgment. For it has never been allowed that that be discussed again which has once been decided by the Apostolic See." (D. 110)

Pope St. Gelasius, *Epistle 42* or Decretal *De Recipiendis et Non Recipiendis Libris*, 495: "(1) ...The holy Roman Church has not been preferred to the other churches by reason of synodical decrees, but she has held the primacy by the evangelical voice of the Lord and Savior saying: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.' (Mt. 16:18 f.)... Accordingly the See of PETER the Apostle

of the Church of Rome is first, 'having neither spot, nor wrinkle, nor anything of this kind.' (Eph. 5:27)." (D. 163)

Pope St. Hormisdas, *Libellus Professionis Fidei*, 517: "[Our] first safety is to guard the rule of the right faith and to deviate in no wise from the ordinances of the Fathers; because we cannot pass over the statement of our Lord Jesus Christ who said: 'Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church.' (Mt. 16:18) These [words] which were spoken, are proved by the effects of the deeds, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved without stain. Desiring not to be separated from this hope and faith and following the ordinances of the Fathers, we anathematize all heresies, especially the heretic Nestorius..." (D. 171)

Pope Hadrian, Letter to the Holy Roman Emperor St. Charlemagne, 8th century: "Be it far from us to doubt your royal power which has striven not for the diminishing, but for the exaltation of your spiritual mother, the holy Roman Church, and which extended among all nations will remain consecrated and exalted until the end. For we do not raise the question as to any one being ignorant of how great authority has been granted to the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles and to his most holy see, inasmuch as this church has the divine right of judging in all things, nor is it permitted to any to pass judgment on its judgment, for the right of absolving those bound by the decisions of any belongs to the pontiffs of the See of the blessed Apostle Peter, through whom the care of the whole church devolves upon the one See of Peter, and nothing ever can be separated from its head. For as your divinely preordained and supreme excellency has shown such love for the head of the whole world, the holy Roman Church and its ruler and chief, so the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, has granted you, together with your most excellent queen, our daughter, and your most noble children, to enjoy the rule of a long reign and in the future the unbroken serenity of victory."¹⁸⁸

Hence all of the acts of the Apostolic See and thus all valid papal acts cannot be judged by anyone because they are free from all error and sin. However, any papal teaching, law, judgment, or command that is illegal, erroneous, or sinful is invalid, null and void, and thus not part of the Apostolic See. It is a non-teaching, non-law, non-judgment, or non-command. Hence the following infallible decree applies only to valid papal acts and thus not to invalid papal acts:

Pope St. Nicholas, *Roman Council* of 860 and 863: "Chapter 5. If anyone condemns dogmas, mandates, interdicts, sanctions or decrees, promulgated by the one presiding in the Apostolic See, for the Catholic faith, for the correction of the faithful, for the emendation of criminals, either by an interdict of threatening or of future ills, let him be anathema." (D. 326)

An illegal, erroneous, or sinful papal teaching, mandate, interdict, sanction, or decree is invalid and thus is no teaching, no mandate, no interdict, no sanction, and no decree, and thus not part of the Apostolic See and hence must be condemned and disobeyed. God did not give the popes the right and authority to act illegally, to teach heresy or other errors, or to make erroneous or sinful laws, judgments, or commands:

"The Lord hateth all abomination of error... [And the Lord] hath commanded no man to do wickedly, and he hath given no man license to sin." (Eccus. 15:13, 21)

An example of an invalid papal act was when the first pope, St. Peter, made an erroneous judgment. When Pope St. Peter made an erroneous judgment to not eat with Catholic Gentiles, St. Paul did not obey the erroneous judgment but rejected and condemned it and rebuked St. Peter to his face:

¹⁸⁸ Footnote 1: "Jaffe, vol. iv., pp. 285-292; Ep. 98, 784-791 A.D."

“But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that some came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?” (Gal. 2:11-14)

Catholic Commentary on Gal. 2:1: **But when Cephas:** Most interpreters take notice that St. Peter’s fault was only a lesser or venial sin in his conduct and conversation. The opinion of St. Augustine is commonly followed, that St. Peter was guilty of a venial fault of imprudence. In the meantime, no Catholic denies but that the head of the Church may be guilty even of great sins. What we have to admire is the humility of St. Peter on this occasion, as St. Cyprian observes, who took the reprehension so mildly without alleging the primacy which our Lord had given him. Some held that St. Peter did not sin at all, which may be true, if we look upon his intention only, which was to give no offence to the Jewish converts; but if we examine the fact, he can scarce be excused from a venial indiscretion. **I withstood:** The fault that is here noted in the conduct of St. Peter was only a certain imprudence in withdrawing himself from the table of the Gentiles for fear of giving offence to the Jewish converts: but this in such circumstances, when his so doing might be of ill consequence to the Gentiles, who might be induced thereby to think themselves obliged to conform to the Jewish way of living to the prejudice of their Christian liberty. Neither was St. Paul’s reprehending him any argument against his supremacy; for in such cases an inferior may, and sometimes ought, with respect, to admonish his superior.”

St. Peter corrected his error which may have been a sin. If it were a sin and he did not confess it and amend his life, then he would have been liable to being tried, judged, sentenced, and punished. Because of this confrontation, it was subsequently defined that Catholic Jews must not be banned from eating with Catholic Gentiles. So here is one example of an invalid papal act, St. Peter’s erroneous judgment that Catholic Jews must or should not eat with Catholic Gentiles.

The only papal acts that are protected from error or sin are infallible papal definitions of dogmas, infallible condemnations of heresies, and infallible condemnations of sinners, such as heretics. But when the pope is not acting in his infallible capacity, he could make illegal laws, teach heresy and other errors, make erroneous or sinful laws and judgments, and give illegal, sinful, or erroneous commands. Because these papal acts are invalid and thus not part of the Apostolic See, they must be condemned and disobeyed.

Even though invalid papal acts must be condemned and disobeyed, the pope himself cannot be juridically judged unless his papal acts are sinful. In this case, the pope is not juridically judged as a pope but as a sinner. There is a difference between a pope acting as a pope and a pope acting as a sinner:

Papal Immunity and Liability in the Writings of the Medieval Canonists, by apostate James M. Moynihan, S.T.D., J.C.D., 1961: “The judicial primacy is concerned with the pope as exercising supreme jurisdiction in judicial matters... The principle of the pope’s immunity, on the other hand, concerns the pope personally as the object of a judicial trial and examination. The distinction is not always clearly made, thus resulting in considerable confusion...”¹⁸⁹

One proof that a pope can be juridically judged as a sinner is when he goes to confession. In this case, the pope’s confessor and inferior judges, sentences, and punishes the pope. But as long

¹⁸⁹ c. 1, pt. 1, sec. 1, p. 5.

as the pope is acting as the pope (as the supreme judge) and thus not as a sinner, he cannot be juridically judged by anyone. This is the meaning of the dogma that the supreme judge on earth cannot be judged by anyone:

Pope St. Sylvester, 4th century: “[Final Canon of a Roman Synod] ‘No one will judge the first See, since all sees desire justice to be moderated by the first See. Nor by Augustus, nor by any cleric, nor by kings, nor by the people will the judge be judged.’ And it was subscribed to by 284 bishops with some priests and deacons, and even by Augustus Constantine himself.”¹⁹⁰

Pope St. Nicholas, *Epistle 8, Proposueramus quidem*, On the Immunity and Independence of the Church,¹⁹¹ to Michael the Emperor, 865: “Neither by Augustus, nor by all the clergy, nor by religious, nor by the people will the judge be judged... ‘The first seat will not be judged by anyone.’” (D. 330)

When a pope sins, he is not acting as the pope, as the supreme judge. Instead, he is acting as a sinner and thus must be juridically judged as a sinner, just like any other sinner. In this case, he is a sinner who happens to be the pope. The only time a pope can be juridically judged is when he sins. Hence when the pope makes a *non-sinful* teaching, law, judgment, or command that is illegal or erroneous, he is nevertheless acting as the pope and not as a sinner and thus he cannot be juridically judged even though the teaching, law, judgment, or command must be condemned and disobeyed because it is invalid. Therefore, as long as the pope is acting as the pope (as the supreme judge) and thus not as a sinner, he cannot be juridically judged.

For example, because of lack of evidence, misinformation, or being deceived, popes have made non-sinful erroneous judgments by declaring heretics to be orthodox. Because these papal judgments are erroneous, they are invalid, null and void, and thus not part of the Apostolic See. Hence Catholics who know that these men are heretics must condemn and disobey these papal judgments and do their best to get the correct information to the pope so that he can change his judgment. If the pope is given evidence that proves the person is a heretic and still does not change his judgment and thus continues to declare the heretic to be orthodox, then the pope’s judgment is not only erroneous but also sinful. Consequently, he must be juridically judged as a sinner. And in this case, he is juridically judged as a formal heretic who had automatically lost his office.

When a pope sins, he is to be judged, sentenced, and punished even more than his inferiors who commit the same sin because the higher the office the more responsible is the person who holds it and thus the more culpable he is when he sins and the more scandal, damage, and corruption he causes if not judged, sentenced, and punished:

“Unto whomsoever much is given, of him much shall be required: and to whom they have committed much, of him they will demand the more.” (Lk. 12:48)

“For God will not except any man’s person, neither will he stand in awe of any man’s greatness: for he made the little and the great, and he hath equally care of all. But a greater punishment is ready for the more mighty.” (Wis. 6:8-9)

“For he that doth wrong shall receive for that which he hath done wrongfully: and there is no respect of persons with God.” (Col. 3:25)

Apostate Antipope Paul IV, *Cum ex Apostolatus Officio*, 1559: “3. We likewise consider it fitting that those who do not refrain from evil through love of virtue should be deterred therefrom through fear of penalties. Bishops, Archbishops, Patriarchs, Primate, Cardinals, Legates, Counts, Barons, Marquis, Dukes, Kings or Emperors, who must teach others and give them good example to keep them in the

¹⁹⁰ Contained in *Defense of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith against the Errors of Anglicanism*, by the apostate Francisco Suarez, 1613. Book 3 (On the Excellence and Power of the Supreme Pontiff Over Temporal Kings), Chapter 15.

¹⁹¹ Footnote 3: “Msi XV 196 D ff.; cf. Jf 2796 c. Add; Hrd V 154 C ff.; ML 119, 938 D ff.; cf. Hfl IV 334 f.”

Catholic Faith—when these prevaricate, they sin more gravely than others; for they not only lose themselves, but drag down with them to perdition and the pit of death countless other peoples entrusted to their care and government or otherwise subject to them.”

The way subjects deal with a sinful pope is the same way they deal with a sinful monarch. Neither pope nor monarch, no matter how absolute their power is, is granted immunity when he sins. If a king were to make sinful laws or judgments, he is not to be obeyed. And if his sinful laws or judgments are extremely dangerous or harmful to his subjects and law and order, then his subjects can rightly try, judge, sentence, and depose him. It is the same with a father. He has supreme power and authority in his household over his wife and children. Yet if he commands something erroneous or sinful, he is not to be obeyed and must be condemned. If he is obstinately sinful and a danger to his family, then his family has the right and duty to judge and condemn him and remove themselves from his power and authority. But as long as the father’s laws are not erroneous or sinful, he must be obeyed. Hence men with absolute or supreme power on earth in their sphere of influence are not granted immunity from judgment or punishment when they err or sin.

Therefore when an apparent pope obstinately sins, he can and must be put on trial, judged, sentenced, and punished. His inferiors are only judging him as a sinner in regard to the sin he committed and hence are not usurping his power to rule and govern the Catholic Church—to teach and command and make laws and judgments. If the apparent pope who sins is tried, judged, and found guilty, he must be denounced and punished accordingly:

- If the apparent pope is found guilty of a mortal sin of heresy that he has been holding *secretly* or whose guilt was not known because he doubted or denied a deeper dogma, it would then be known for certain that he is a formal heretic and thus had been automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church and automatically lost his office. He must then be punished with a declaratory sentence of deposition from office for the record and common good. This sentence is declaratory in nature, merely making official what has already occurred.
- If the apparent pope is found guilty of the mortal sin of heresy that he has *publicly* committed, then those who were inculpably ignorant of the fact that he was a formal heretic would now know that he is a formal heretic and thus had been automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church and automatically lost his office. He must then be punished with a sentence of deposition from office for the record and common good. This sentence is declaratory in nature, merely making official what has already occurred.
- If the apparent pope is found guilty of sins of immorality that he has been publicly and obstinately committing, then he must be denounced as a public obstinate immoral mortal sinner and thus as a formal heretic. As such, those who were inculpably ignorant of his public and obstinate mortal sins would then know that he is a formal heretic who thus had been automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church and automatically lost his office. He must then be punished with a sentence of deposition from office for the record and common good. This sentence is declaratory in nature, merely making official what has already occurred.
- If the apparent pope is found guilty of sins of immorality that he has been *privately* and obstinately committing, then he must be denounced as an obstinate immoral mortal sinner and punished with a sentence of deposition

from office. This sentence is a condemnatory sentence and not a declaratory sentence. Hence this sentence actually deposes the pope, prior to which he held the office.¹⁹² “When he is judged, may he go out condemned; and may his prayer be turned to sin. May his days be few: and his bishopric let another take.” (Ps. 108:7-8) The Holy Roman Emperor St. Charlemagne decreed the following: “We forbid, under pain of sacrilege, the seizure of the goods of the Church, and injustices of whatsoever sort, adultery, fornication, incest, illicit marriage, unjust homicide, &c., for we know that by such things kingdoms and kings, yea and private subjects, do perish... Be it, therefore, known to all our subjects, that he who shall be taken and convicted of any of these crimes, shall be deposed of all his honours, if he have any; that he shall be thrown into prison till he repent and make amends by a public penitence; and, moreover, that he shall be cut off from all communication with the faithful; for we shall grievously fear the pit whereinto we see others be fallen.”¹⁹³

One proof that not all papal acts are free from illegality, error, or sin and that popes can be juridically judged when they sin is the historical fact that popes have made illegal laws; taught heresy and other errors; made erroneous or sinful laws and judgments; given illegal, erroneous, or sinful commands; and have been juridically judged:

- Popes have acted illegally by making secular laws for countries that are not ruled by them. Papal acts that are illegal are invalid and thus not part of the Apostolic See because the pope does not have the jurisdiction and legal right to make secular laws or secular judgments in Catholic countries that are not ruled by him unless they pertain to the Catholic faith or the salvation of souls. Hence a pope cannot usurp the secular laws and secular judgments of a Catholic king unless those laws or judgments violate or threaten the Catholic Church, Catholic faith, or the salvation of souls. Therefore in a Catholic country that is ruled by a Catholic king, any papal secular law or secular judgment that does not involve the Catholic Church, Catholic faith, or the salvation of souls is illegal and thus invalid and hence not part of the Apostolic See.
- Popes have made erroneous judgments by declaring heretics to be orthodox because of lack of evidence, misinformation, or being deceived by the heretics. Because these papal judgments are erroneous, they are invalid, null and void, and thus not part of the Apostolic See. Hence Catholics who know that these men are heretics must condemn these papal judgments and do their best to get the correct information to the pope so that he may change his judgment. If the pope is given evidence that proves the person is a heretic and still does not change his judgment and thus continues to declare the heretic to be orthodox, then the pope’s judgment is not only erroneous but also sinful. Consequently, he becomes a formal heretic by sins of omission and association and thus automatically loses his office. And he must be juridically judged, convicted, and deposed by a declaratory sentence for justice and the common good.
- Popes have taught erroneous doctrines which in their day were not yet infallibly condemned. These papal acts are not part of the Apostolic See.

¹⁹² It is also an allowable opinion that such a pope once convicted of secret obstinate sins of immorality automatically loses his office because he is guilty of heresy for defending his immoral sin as not sinful either by his words or deeds. In this case the pope would be automatically deposed and thus the sentence of deposition is a declaratory sentence.

¹⁹³ *The Liturgical Year*, by the apostate Abbot Guéranger, 1927. V. 3, b. 2, pp. 433a-433p, January 28, “Blessed Charlemagne.”

- Popes have taught heresy by words or deeds and lost their offices, such as popes Liberius, Anastasius II, and Honorius. And popes, such as Pope St. Hormisdas, have taught that popes could teach heresy. Heretical so-called papal acts are invalid and thus not part of the Apostolic See. I say so-called papal acts because if the so-called pope is a formal heretic, then he does not hold the office and thus his heretical act is not a papal act but an act of a heretical antipope. But if he is a material heretic, then he holds the papal office but his heretical act is an invalid papal act and thus not part of the Apostolic See.¹⁹⁴
- Popes have been brought to trial. Popes and nominal popes have submitted to trials in which those who judged the popes were not condemned for doing so.¹⁹⁵ And popes have taught that they can be brought to trial and sentenced if any of their acts are sinful, and some decreed that the best way to accomplish this is by a trial held by a universal council of bishops.

Therefore the Apostolic See consists only of valid papal acts and thus does not contain invalid papal acts; that is, papal acts that are illegal, sinful, or erroneous. This preserves the Apostolic See from any stain of sin or error. And popes can be juridically judged, not as popes but as sinners.

Does not apply to antipopes and presumed antipopes

The dogma that the First See cannot be judged by anyone on earth applies to popes, not to antipopes. An apparent pope who is a formal heretic is a heretical antipope and thus does not occupy the First See. All his works and acts are invalid. Therefore the dogma that no one can judge the First See does not apply to them because they are antipopes. Nevertheless, apparent popes who are antipopes should be brought to trial for the record and the common good. If a sinful pope can be tried and sentenced, how much more can a sinful antipope be tried and sentenced.

Fourth Council of Constantinople

Canon 21 of the Fourth Council of Constantinople is partly dogmatic and partly disciplinary. The dogmatic part infallibly teaches that a sinful pope can be tried, judged, and sentenced by his inferiors, in this case a universal synod of bishops:

Pope Hadrian II, *Fourth Council of Constantinople*, 869: “Canon 21. . . . If a universal synod is held and any question or controversy arises about the holy church of Rome, it should make inquiries with proper reverence and respect about the question raised and should find a profitable solution; it must on no account pronounce sentence rashly against the supreme pontiffs of old Rome.”

Hence, a universal synod of bishops can try, judge, and sentence a sinful pope as long as the sentence is not rash—“it must on no account pronounce sentence rashly against the supreme pontiffs of old Rome.” This, then, is one proof that a pope can be tried, judged, and sentenced.

The disciplinary part of Canon 21 decrees that *only* a universal synod of bishops can try, judge, and sentence a sinful pope, and thus anything or anyone else who tries to juridically judge a pope is anathema. And it warns against rash judgments by men of bad will. The following part of Canon 21 comes before the above part:

¹⁹⁴ See in this book “A Pope Can Become an Idolater or a Formal Heretic and Thus Lose His Office,” p. 26.

¹⁹⁵ See in this book “Popes and antipopes who were put on trial,” p. 120.

Pope Hadrian II, *Fourth Council of Constantinople*, 869: “Canon 21. We believe that the saying of the Lord that Christ addressed to his holy apostles and disciples, Whoever receives you receives me, and whoever despises you despises me, was also addressed to all who were likewise made supreme pontiffs and chief pastors in succession to them in the Catholic Church. Therefore we declare that no secular powers should treat with disrespect any of those who hold the office of patriarch or seek to move them from their high positions, but rather they should esteem them as worthy of all honour and reverence. This applies in the first place to the most holy pope of old Rome, secondly to the patriarch of Constantinople, and then to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Furthermore, nobody else should compose or edit writings or tracts against the most holy pope of old Rome, on the pretext of making incriminating charges, as Photius did recently and Dioscorus a long time ago. Whoever shows such great arrogance and audacity, after the manner of Photius and Dioscorus, and makes false accusations in writing or speech against the see of Peter, the chief of the apostles, let him receive a punishment equal to theirs. If, then, any ruler or secular authority tries to expel the aforesaid pope of the apostolic see, or any of the other patriarchs, let him be anathema.”

Because this part of Canon 21 is a disciplinary law, Catholics can be exempted from it in emergency situations in which a universal synod of bishops is not possible or is unwilling to juridically judge and sentence a sinful pope. Upholding this law of epikeia (that is, legal exemptions from disciplinary laws), the Bible teaches that Catholics, under certain circumstances, can take authority unto themselves as long as they do so justly:

“He that taketh authority to himself unjustly shall be hated.” (Eccus. 20:8)

Conversely, he who taketh authority unto himself *justly*, shall act within the spirit of the law and will be loved by good Catholics. Hence, any Catholic or group of Catholics who has the power to juridically judge a sinful pope can and must do so and thus is exempted by the law of epikeia from the part of Canon 21 which says that only a universal synod of bishops can sentence a sinful pope. But even this decree does not condemn others, even laymen, from judging a sinful pope. It only condemns them when they make false accusations:

“Whoever shows such great arrogance and audacity, after the manner of Photius and Dioscorus, and makes false accusations in writing or speech against the see of Peter, the chief of the apostles

The primary way, then, that a sinful pope is to be judicially judged, tried, and sentenced is by a universal synod of bishops. However, if this is not possible or a synod of bishops is unwilling to try an obstinately sinful pope, then Catholics are exempt from the disciplinary law of Canon 21. Hence, the duty would then fall to Cardinals to try, judge, and sentence a sinful pope. If they refuse or cannot, then to the Catholic Emperor; if he refuses or cannot, then a Catholic king; if he refuses or cannot, then Catholic priests; if they refuse or cannot, then Catholic laymen if they have the power to do so:

Protector of the Faith, by apostate Thomas M. Izbicki, 1981: “The pope [before being brought to trial] should be allowed every opportunity to clear himself of the charges... But the Roman pontiff could not merely dismiss the charges. It was best for the accused to consult responsible individuals or, preferably, to call a general council. If the pope failed to clear himself voluntarily, the cardinals could demand convocation of a council to inquire into the case. Turrecremata could hardly believe that an accused would fail to call a council, since a refusal would lend credibility to the charges. If, however, the pope also refused to call a council, the power or convocation devolved on the cardinals, who could, as true guardians of the Church, provide for its welfare in such a crisis. The Sacred College could confer upon a council’s proceedings its own immense prestige. (Should even the cardinals fail to act, the power of convocation devolved on the emperor, other Christian princes, or

even lesser prelates, for the Church's safeguards against papal heresy could not be allowed to fail because someone shirked his duty.) [Footnote 89]

Footnote 89: "SE 3.8 .282r. Some conciliarists¹⁹⁶ extended this power to almost any Christian; see, e.g., Franciscus de Zabarella, 'De schismatibus autoritate imperatoris tollendis.' in Simon Schard, *De iurisdictione, autoritate et praeeminencia imperiale, ac potestate ecclesiastica* (Basel, 1566), pp. 690-95."¹⁹⁷

If no one is willing or has the power to try and sentence a sinful pope, Catholics are still bound to denounce the sinful pope, warn others, and avoid him in religious matters if necessary. If this were not so, then an obstinately sinful pope could go on committing his crimes and other sins un-denounced and un-opposed and thus do great harm to the Catholic Church, faith, and Catholics and cause great scandal.

Does not apply to non-officeholders and presumed non-officeholders

It is very important to note that Canon 21 of the Fourth Council of Constantinople is speaking about a pope and other officeholders and thus not about apparent officeholders who do not hold the office or are presumed to not hold the office. Hence it is speaking about judging and sentencing a pope, not an antipope or a presumed antipope. An apparent pope who is a formal heretic or a presumed formal heretic is either an antipope or a presumed antipope and thus Canon 21 does not apply to him or to any apparent officeholder who is a formal heretic or presumed formal heretic.

Canon 21, then, deals with officeholders who are accused of crimes or other sins that do not make them automatically lose their offices. Some sins that do not ban offenders from holding offices are suspicion of heresy, sins of immorality that are not public, or sins of gross injustice.

One proof that Canon 21 does not apply to apparent officeholders who are formal heretics or presumed formal heretics is the dogma that Catholics must denounce these offenders as non-Catholics and not be in religious or governmental communion with them, even *before* any judgment or sentence from a competent authority. Hence these offenders must be removed from the diptychs and thus Catholics must not mention them as officeholders in the *Te Igitur* prayer of the Mass. For example, the Council of Ephesus infallibly decreed that from the time the heretic Nestorius began to publicly teach his heresy, it was then known that he had automatically lost his office and thus lost all the power, authority, and jurisdiction that comes with the office. Hence all Catholics who knew about his heresy were bound to denounce him as a heretic, avoid him in religious and governmental matters, remove his name from the diptychs, and not mention him as an officeholder in the *Te Igitur* prayer of the Mass—and all this before any judgment or sentence from a judge, just as the laymen Eusebius had done.¹⁹⁸

However, even heretical non-officeholders (such as a heretical antipope) and heretical presumed non-officeholders (such as a heretical presumed antipope) can and must be brought to trial in the same manner described in Canon 21; for if a sinful pope can be brought to trial by a universal synod of bishops, all the more can a heretical antipope or presumed antipope be brought to trial by a synod of bishops; and if that is not possible or a synod of bishops is unwilling, then by any other Catholic who has power to do so.

¹⁹⁶ Some wrongly believed that the conciliarist heresy included the juridical judgment of a sinful pope by a council of bishops. While it is the conciliarist heresy for a council of bishops to juridically judge a pope when he is acting as the pope, it is not the conciliarist heresy for a council of bishops to juridically judge a sinful pope when he is acting as a sinner. Instead, it is a dogma that a sinful pope must be juridically judged when he sins.

¹⁹⁷ c. 4, pp. 89-93.

¹⁹⁸ See in this book "Manifest heretics are removed from the diptychs before a trial," p. 23. And see in this book "The Solemn Magisterium: "431 – Council of Ephesus," p. 14.

Canonists and theologians

Even though the following apostate canonists and theologians were heretics for presenting as an allowable opinion, instead of a dogma, the dogma that popes can be tried, judged, and punished for heresy and immorality, they nevertheless do teach this truth:

Protector of the Faith, by apostate Thomas M. Izbicki, 1981: “[c. 4, pp. 87-88] As we have seen, for Turrecremata the papal office was the true Roman Church, and tenure of that office made the pope the highest ecclesiastical authority, one with a right to command princes to certain correct actions. But tenure of that office also imposed limits on the pope’s actions. If the pontiff passed these bounds—violating natural or divine law, teaching heresy, or otherwise threatening the welfare of the Church—he was a tyrant who could lose his see and be punished.¹⁹⁹ ...Huguccio believed that the pope was subject to punishment for heresy and other crimes that, because they scandalized the faithful, were tantamount to heresy... Huguccio’s doctrine described the pope as automatically falling from his see when he erred grievously: the erstwhile Vicar of Christ became less than any Christian and subject to punishment since his errors had cost him the papal judicial immunity... Huguccio’s doctrine...found advocates in diverse figures like the Franciscans Peter Olivi and Michael of Cesena, who feared abuse of papal power, and papal apologists like Augustinus Triumphus and Petrus de Palude.²⁰⁰

“[c. 4, p. 89] He [Turrecremata] permitted denunciation of the pope for any crime which, by its very nature, deprived him of his immunity.²⁰¹ According to Turrecremata, the chief of these crimes was heresy, the stubborn contradiction of Scripture or defined dogma; an erroneous pronouncement violated the pope’s duty of teaching the truth to the faithful.²⁰² Further, the pope was supposed to maintain the *status ecclesiae*, the good order of the ecclesiastical institution, so that it could function for the salvation of souls. Included under this rubric was the observation of all divine ordinances: divine law, natural law, the order of the sacraments, and the fundamental principles of Christian morality. A pope could never deliberately contradict any of these without harming the Church and making himself liable to judgment.²⁰³ ...Turrecremata thought that the papal office itself also had limiting effects. The pope could not act contrary to the saving purpose for which his office existed without risking loss of his judicial immunity.²⁰⁴ ...

“[c. 4, pp. 89-93] The pope [before being brought to trial] should be allowed every opportunity to clear himself of the charges by making a profession of faith and, if necessary, doing penance; to obviate scandal, he could even resign his see. But the Roman pontiff could not merely dismiss the charges. It was best for the accused to consult responsible individuals or, preferably, to call a general council. If the pope failed to clear himself voluntarily, the cardinals could demand convocation

¹⁹⁹ Chap. 4, Footnote 72: “SE 2.23 .137r-v; JdT, *Apparatus*, p. 9.”

²⁰⁰ Chap. 4, Footnote 74: “Tierney, *Foundations*, pp. 58-65, 199-219, 248-50; idem, ‘Pope and Council: Some New Decretist Texts,’ *Medieval Studies* 19 (1957): 197-218; Moynihan, *Papal Immunity*, pp. 94-102; Wilks, *Problem of Sovereignty*, pp. 502-3; Petrus de Palude, *Tractatus de potestate papae*, p. 194.”

²⁰¹ Chap. 4, Footnote 76: “Non potest denunciari praelatus qui superiorem non habet nisi sit late peccatum eius quod a superioritate cadat,” SE 2.102.242v, 2.98.234v. MC 70; Hus, *Tractatus de ecclesia*, pp. 149-55.”

²⁰² Chap. 4, Footnote 77: “Inferior non potest aliquid constituere contra determinata per superiorem...sed sacra scriptura est inspirata a spiritu sancto...interpretari quippe evangeliorum ad sensum bonum et catholicum non contradicendo veritati fidei, et scripturae sanctae, hoc licet summo pontifici, sed per hoc non dispensat in evangelio,” CSD C25.q1.c6 (3:315). JdT, *Oratio synodalis*, pp. 58-59.”

²⁰³ Chap. 4, Footnote 78: “Si dicitur quae dicantur ad generalem statum ecclesiae pertinere, videtur nobis quod inter alia sunt ista quae omnes fideles tangere possunt, ut sunt illa ex quorum alteratione tota ecclesia turbaretur, sicut ponitur exemplum de depositione omnium episcoporum simul,” SE 3.57.342v. Gaines Post, ‘Copyists’ Errors and the Problem of Papal Dispensations *contra statutum generale ecclesiae* or *contra statum generale ecclesiae* According to the Decretists and Decretalists, ca. 1150-1234,’ *Studia Gratiana* 9 (1966): 359-405; Yves Congar, ‘Status Ecclesiae,’ *ibid.*, 15 (1972): 1-31; John H. Hackett, ‘State of the Church: A Concept of the Medieval Canonists,’ *Jurist* 23 (1963): 259-90.”

²⁰⁴ Chap. 4, Footnote 80: “Papa non potest facere aliquid quod vigat in potestatis suae diminutionem, aut derogationem dignitatis apostolicae suae,” SE 2.104.245r. 70; Ullmann, *Principles*, pp. 102-3.”

of a council to inquire into the case. Turrecremata could hardly believe that an accused would fail to call a council, since a refusal would lend credibility to the charges. If, however, the pope also refused to call a council, the power or convocation devolved on the cardinals, who could, as true guardians of the Church, provide for its welfare in such a crisis. The Sacred College could confer upon a council's proceedings its own immense prestige. (Should even the cardinals fail to act, the power of convocation devolved on the emperor, other Christian princes, or even lesser prelates, for the Church's safeguards against papal heresy could not be allowed to fail because someone shirked his duty.) [Footnote 89]

Footnote 89: 'SE 3.8 .282r. Some conciliarists extended this power to almost any Christian; see, e.g., Franciscus de Zabarella, 'De schismatibus autoritate imperatoris tollendis.' in Simon Schard, *De iurisdictione, autoritate et prerogativa imperiale, ac potestate ecclesiastica* (Basel, 1566), pp. 690-95.'

"Nor was a council, despite its emergency powers, to become the highest ecclesiastical tribunal: that would make the council the pope's rival when in session, turning the Church into a two-headed monster. Rather, Christ's law lent authority to the council to deal with specific crises. Under this law, the very fact of accusation made a pope, even if innocent, subject to proceedings to determine his true status...

"Turrecremata treated crimes against the *status ecclesiae* in the same way that he treated papal heresy... But Turrecremata's approach to other crimes was more cautious in that it encouraged resistance to tyrannical acts without infringing on the pope's judicial immunity. Papal commands dangerous to the welfare of souls, those which violated divine law or natural law, could be ignored because the pope had exceeded his powers. If the pontiff persistently issued such commands, the cardinals could call him to account, offering fraternal correction and insisting that he swear an oath purging himself of the charges. If these actions failed to secure amendment of the pope's conduct, the cardinals could renounce obedience. Their resistance would be virtuous, since it served the welfare of the Church, and could be reinforced through convocation of a council to win support of other prelates and the secular arm. If even this... did not end the crisis, the Church had one further hope, short of a providential event. The pope could persevere in his wrong actions but not defend them: should he do that, he would fall into the heresy of describing evil as good, for which he could lose his see! This, Turrecremata said, was the true meaning of Johannes Teutonicus's declaration that a scandalous pope was a heretic in the eyes of God.²⁰⁵ ...

"[c. 6, p. 119] The princes could employ force against an antipope or coerce an evil pope to amend his life. And if the pope fell from his see through heresy, he could be seized by the princes.²⁰⁶"

Papal Immunity and Liability in the Writings of the Medieval Canonists, by apostate James M. Moynihan, S.T.D., J.C.D., 1961: "The Summa of Stephen [of Tournai, 12th century]... Stephen had already stated that a pope could be judged for heresy or schism. Here, in linking the commission of any notorious crime with the crime of heresy, Stephen would hardly be making a point if he merely intended to say that a person might legitimately cast doubts on the sanctity of a Roman Pontiff who was guilty of such offenses. What Stephen implies rather is that a pope who has committed not only the crime of heresy, but any notorious crime, may actually be brought to trial and condemned... Danger to the well-being of the Church is, in the final analysis, the real reason from which a pope can be brought to trial. Certainly a

²⁰⁵ Footnote 103: "'Papam esse incorrigibilem potest intelligi dupliciter uno modo continuatione criminis... Secundo modo per ipsius criminis pertinacem defensionem ut dicat et defendat tale crimen: quod manifestum circum voluntari habet maliciam non esse peccatum gloss, autem habet locum in secundo modo... Non autem habet locum, et in primo modo incorrigibilitas,' CSD D40.c6 (1:353). Horst, 'Konziliare Elemente,' pp. 368-69. Tierney, *Foundations*, pp. 251-52. See Thomson, 'Roselli's *Monarchia*,' p. 450."

²⁰⁶ Chap. 6, Footnote 78: "SE 4, pt. I, 9 .365r-367v, 4. pt. 1, 10 .368v-369r, 2.103 .244r, 2.106 .247r-v. See Nörr, *Panormitanus*, pp. 92, 128."

notorious crime, committed by the Roman pontiff, because of the great scandal and perhaps even loss of faith which it would entail among the members of the faithful, could easily be said to harm the general welfare of the Church, just as much as crimes of heresy and schism... Thus Stephen, elaborating on this point to the extent that he made the danger to the welfare of the whole Church the ultimate criterion for bringing a pope to trial, would logically have been led to assert that a pope could be judged not only for heresy, but for notorious crimes as well...

“The Commentum Atrebatense²⁰⁷: This work, like the Summa Parisiensis and the Summa of Stephen of Tournai, asserted the need for protecting the well-being of the Church... He first of all asks the question whether or not a pope who is manifestly guilty of the sin of fornication, and who after being admonished fails to put a stop to his actions, ought not to be accused and condemned by his subjects. He responds in the affirmative. The reason which he offers is the fact that...the pope[’s] perverse conduct is the cause of others straying from the faith. Obviously the author merely offered this particular crime by way of example, for he then mentions in passing, as it were, that any manifest mortal sin on the part of a pope has the same effect, namely of causing others to stray from the faith.”²⁰⁸

(See in this book “Popes can be tried and deposed for many sins, by apostate Thomas Cajetan,” p.169.)

Common sense examples which prove that popes can be tried, sentenced, and punished

The following example proves by common sense and the natural law that a pope who obstinately sins can be tried, judged, and punished. Take the example of an apparent pope who sodomizes little boys in public in the town square in view of all the citizens. What should the citizens do? If they believe in the heresy that popes are above the law, or the heresy that popes cannot be tried, judged, sentenced, and punished, they would do nothing! They would let him take one boy after another, day after day, and sodomize them in the town square. They would keep feeding their boys to this monster day after day. This has been happening for one thousand years—and even more so in these days. Apostate clerics are raping little boys and no one judges, denounces, and punishes them, or at least not sufficiently so. And the laymen sit back in silence or ineffective action and keep feeding their boys to these apostate clerics. If anyone asks them why they do not judge, denounce, avoid in religious matters, and punish these clerics, they answer, “We cannot judge priests, let alone denounce and punish them. We can only pray for them.” Hence they are guilty of the same sins of these clerics by sins of omission and sins of association. They are partners in their crimes.

Any so-called pope who does not judge, condemn, and punish pedophile clerics and laymen is a pedophile himself and a formal heretic also and thus is a heretical antipope. He is no different from a so-called pope who rapes little boys in the town square for all to see, day after day, because he allows those under him to rape little boys day after day and go unpunished and unstoppable. What’s even worse is that this is known to the public and thus nominal Catholics know this but keep feeding their children to these immoral, perverted, apostate monsters. These parents are worthy of this crime against their children because they are apostates also and thus God has punished them and their children:

“My people have been silent because they had no knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee, that thou shalt not do the office of priesthood to me: and thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children.”

²⁰⁷ Footnote 49: “Partly a commentary of Gratian, partly a didactical work in the form of Quaestiones, this work of the Bolognese school was composed sometime during the 1170’s. It may have been a source for Huguccio—Kuttner, Repertorium, pp. 146-147.”

²⁰⁸ Imprimatur: + Aloysius, Card. Provicarius, E Vicariatu Urbis, die 22 Septembris 1961. Publisher: Gregorian University Press, Rome, 1961. C. 3, sec. 1, pp. 52-57.

According to the multitude of them so have they sinned against me: I will change their glory into shame. They shall eat the sins of my people, and shall lift up their souls to their iniquity. And there shall be like people like priest: and I will visit their ways upon them, and I will repay them their devices. And they shall eat and shall not be filled: they have committed fornication, and have not ceased: because they have forsaken the Lord in not observing his law.” (Osee 4:6-10)

If citizens have some good will and common sense and thus do not believe in the heresy that popes cannot be tried, sentenced, and punished, they would arrest an apparent pope who rapes boys in the town square, put him in jail, put him on trial, condemn him as guilty, and punish him with the death sentence. And if all the police and judges in the town are guilty of this heresy and thus do not stop the apparent pope from sodomizing little boys day after day, then the common citizen has the right and duty to seize the apparent pope and kill him, preferably without being caught by the corrupted police and judges. This all true Catholics would do, as well as non-Catholics who have some good will and have not lost common sense. The dogma that all men, popes and kings included, who commit sins must be judged, sentenced, and punished according to the severity of the sin is part of the natural law and hence is a natural law dogma and thus not only a solemn and ordinary magisterium dogma.

The following canonists, even though they are apostates, correctly teach this natural law dogma that an apparent pope or other cleric that commits notorious crimes must be tried, judged, sentenced, and punished. And they teach the deeper dogma that public and obstinate sins of immorality are heresy:

Foundations of the Conciliar Theory, by apostate Brian Tierney, 1955: “There was a steady development of this doctrine from the time of Gratian to the composition of the *Glossa Ordinaria* and, eventually, a widespread belief that the Pope could be brought to trial and deposed for any notorious crime that gave scandal to the Church... Huguccio... presented a long and complex gloss reviewing every aspect of the problems involved in the trial and deposition of a Pope. Most important of all he posed the very pertinent question of why heresy should be mentioned as the one crime that could be brought against a Pope, and in reply he quoted the generally accepted opinion that heresy in the Pope was peculiarly injurious to the Church as a whole... Huguccio, however, did not agree that heresy was the only crime of the Pope that was likely to injure the whole Church, and he went on to present a catalogue of all the most heinous offenses that could occur to a twelfth century bishop—notorious fornication, robbery, sacrilege. Was all this to be tolerated in a Pope?

[...] nunquid non accusabitur... nunquid sic scandalizare ecclesiam non est quasi heresim committere? Pretera contumacia est crimen ydolatrie et quasi heresis... unde et contumax dicitur infidelis ut *Dist.* xxxvii, *nullus*. Et sic idem est in alio crimine notorio quasi heresi...’

“In Huguccio’s view, to scandalize the Church by contumacious persistence in notorious crimes was tantamount to heresy and could be punished as such... Joannes Teutonicus... held that a Pope could be deposed for any notorious crime and for heresy even if it were secret.”^{209,210}

Papal Immunity and Liability in the Writings of the Medieval Canonists, by apostate James M. Moynihan, S.T.D., J.C.D., 1961: “Huguccio says, ‘I believe that in the case of any notorious crime the pope who is guilty of such may be accused and

²⁰⁹ Footnote 2: “*Glossa Ordinaria ad Dist.* 40, c. 6, ‘Certe credo quod si notorium est crimen eius quandocumque, et inde scandalizatur ecclesia et incorrigibilis sit, quod inde possit accusare... Hic tamen specialiter fit mentio de haeresi ideo quia et si occulta esset haeresis de illa posset accusare. Sed de alio occulto crimine non posset.’”

²¹⁰ pt. 1, sec. 2, pp. 56, 58-59, 65.

condemned if, having been duly admonished, he refuses to reform.’²¹¹ Continuing his argument he exclaims: ‘What! suppose that the pope should publicly commit a theft, publicly commit fornication, publicly keep a concubine, publicly have relations with her in a church, even close to the altar, and suppose, having been admonished he should continue to act in this way: does anyone mean to say that such a pope ought not to be accused, ought not to be condemned? To scandalize the Church in such a way—is it not in itself heresy? Besides, contumacy is equated with the crime of idolatry and is a quasi-heresy as is seen from D. LXXXI, c. 15, and one who is contumacious is already a pagan (D. XXXVII, c. 16). Therefore, he concludes, a notorious crime presents the same situation as does the crime of heresy.’^{212,213}

The heretics who believe that a pope cannot be tried, judged, sentenced, and punished would attend the Mass of an apparent pope who fornicates on the altar during Mass and not judge or denounce him. They would say, “No one can judge the pope!” Hence they would have to witness this sacrilegious abomination every time the apparent pope says Mass, and say and do nothing, or at least not say or do anything effective.

This is all part of the heresy of non-judgmentalism. This heresy is so prevalent in these days that even superiors do not judge their inferiors. For example, in his airplane flight to Brazil on 7/28/2013, apostate Antipope Francis was asked by a journalist what he intended to do about Apostate Monsignor Ricca who was part of a “gay lobby” at the Vatican. He responded by saying the following:

Apostate Antipope Francis: “If a person is gay and seeks the Lord and has good will, well who am I to judge them? The Catechism of the Catholic Church explains this in a very beautiful way...it says, these persons must not be marginalized for this, they must be integrated into society.”

That, folks, is the end of the road of the heresy of non-judgmentalism! If an apparent pope cannot judge and denounce a sinner, then no one on this whole corrupted, perverted, and putrified earth can! Yet, this apostate Antipope Francis says he will take care of the pedophile problem. But if he cannot judge and denounce homosexuals, how can he judge and denounce pedophiles—let alone punish them! Indeed, in God’s eyes he is a pedophile at least by sins of omission and association if not also by sins of commission. And his following heresy that “no one can be condemned for ever” is the end of the road of the heresy of non-punishmentalism:

Apostate Antipope Francis I, *Amoris Lætitia*, (On Love in the Family), 3/19/2016: “297. ...No one can be condemned for ever, because that is not the logic of the Gospel! Here I am not speaking only of the divorced and remarried, but of everyone, in whatever situation they find themselves.”²¹⁴

One wonders what gospel he is talking about. The Satanic gospel! The true Gospel teaches that most men are condemned and damned to hell forever:

²¹¹ Footnote 98: “Huguccio, *Summa*, at D. XL, c. 6, Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 7, fol. 57rb., s.v. *Nisi deprehendatur devius a fide*: ‘Sed nunquid de simonia uel alio crimine potest papa accusari? Dicunt quidam quod non siue sit notorium siue non, quia quod canon non excipit non debemus excipere; et isti assignant rationem diuersitatis quare potius de heresi potest accusari quam de alio crimine, quia si papa esset hereticus non sibi soli noceret sed toti mundo, presertim quia simplices et idiote facile sequerentur illam heresim cum credent non esse heresim. Sed si papa committit heresim simoniam uel fornicationem uel furtum et huiusmodi sibi soli uidetur nocere cum omnes sicant quod nulli licet fornicari uel furari uel simoniam committere et huiusmodi. Ego autem credo quod idem sit de quolibet crimine notorio quod papa possit accusari et condempnari si admonitus non uult cessare.’”

²¹² Footnote 99: “Ibid.: ‘Quid enim? Ecce publice furatur, publice fornicatur publice committit simoniam, publice habet concubinam, publice eam cognoscit in ecclesia iuxta uel super altare, admonitus non uult cessare, numquid non accusabitur... nunquid non condempnabitur, nunquid sic scandalizare ecclesiam non est quasi heresim committere? Preterea contumacia est crimen ydolatrie et quasi heresis ut di. lxxx. *si quis presbyteri* (D. LXXXI. c. 15), unde et contumax dicitur infidelis ut xxxviii. *nullus* (D. XXXVIII, c. 16). Et sic idem est in alio crimine notorio quam in heresy.’”

²¹³ c. 3, sec. 2, pp. 77-78.

²¹⁴ c. 8, sec. 2, p. 226.

“How narrow is the gate and strait is the way that leadeth to life: and few there are that find it!” (Mt. 7:14)

“Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand: Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels.” (Mt. 25:41)

“But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, they shall have their portion in the pool burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.” (Apoc. 21:8)

“Know you not that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God? Do not err: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor liars with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extortioners shall possess the kingdom of God.” (1 Cor. 6:9-10)

On this point alone, apostate Antipope Francis is anathema for teaching another gospel:

“I wonder that you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel [the gospel of apostate Antipope Francis]. Which is not another, only there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.” (Gal. 1:6-8)

Popes and antipopes who were put on trial

Empirical evidence of the dogma that popes and apparent popes can be tried, judged, sentenced, and deposed is the fact that popes and apparent popes who were antipopes have been tried, judged, sentenced, punished, and deposed. In order to avoid or end a trial, some popes, such as Pope St. Leo III, swore a canonical oath of innocence which cleared them from the accusations against them and restored their good name and standing.

St. Marcellinus (296-304)

Pope St. Marcellinus, after he apostatized, resigned the papal office and submitted to a council of bishops in which he abjured, was given a penance, and was re-elected to the papacy. He then died as a martyr.²¹⁵

St. Damasus (366-384)

Pope St. Damasus was accused of adultery and tried by either a council of bishops or by the Emperor Gratian and was declared innocent:

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, Damasus (366-384): “He was accused spitefully, and charged with adultery and a synod was called and he was justified by 44 bishops, who also condemned Concordius and Callistus, the deacons, his accusers, and expelled and ejected them from the church. [Footnote 2]”

Footnote 2: “Pope Damasus was accused in his old age of some grave offence, but the charge was brought by a converted Jew, not by his deacons, and the case was tried before the prefect of Rome, not before a church council. The emperor Gratian

²¹⁵ See in this book “Some popes who became idolaters or formal heretics: St. Marcellinus (296-304),” p. [34](#).

intervened and Damasus was acquitted. The nature of the indictment is not known, but it seems unlikely to have been adultery. Damasus was about seventy-five years old at the time. Duchesne, op. cit., p. 214, n. 15.”

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Pope St. Damasus: “An accusation of adultery was laid against him [Pope St. Damasus] (378) in the imperial court, but he was exonerated by Emperor Gratian himself (Mansi, Coll. Conc., III, 628) and soon after by a Roman synod of forty-four bishops (Liber Pontificalis, ed. Duchesne, s.v.; Mansi, op. cit., III, 419) which also excommunicated his accusers.”

St. Sixtus III (432-440)

Pope St. Sixtus III was accused of crimes and tried by a council of bishops who declared him innocent:

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, XLVI. Xystus III (432-440): “Xystus, by nationality a Roman, son of Xystus, occupied the see 8 years and 19 days. After one year and 8 months he was accused by a man called Bassus. Then Valentinian Augustus heard it and ordered a holy synod to be called together as a council; and when it was convened there was a great trial and the synodical judgment was given and he was acquitted by 56 bishops, and Bassus was condemned by the synod but with the provision that at his death the viaticum should not be denied him for the sake of mercy and the compassion of the church.” (p. 93.)

St. Symmachus (498-514)

Pope St. Symmachus was accused of crimes and tried by a council of bishops who declared him innocent:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Pope St. Symmachus: “The Byzantine party, headed by the two senators Festus and Probinus, did not abandon its hostility and hope of overthrowing the pope [Symmachus] and gaining the papal see for Laurentius. The opportunity occurred in the following year, 501. Pope Symmachus celebrated Easter on 25 March, following the old Roman cycle, while the Byzantines and others observed the feast on 22 April, according to a new reckoning. The Laurentian party appealed to King Theodoric against the pope, making other accusations besides this digression in the celebration of Easter... The opposing party...accused him of squandering the property of the Church and other matters [such as adultery]... His opponents requested the king to call a synod for the investigation of the accusations... Not long after Easter, between May and July, 502, the synod met in the basilica of Julius (Santa Maria in Trastevere). The pope declared before the synod that it had been called with his consent and that he was ready to answer the accusations before it... Theodoric...demanded, first of all, an investigation of the accusations against the pope. A second session of the synod was held...on 1 September 502, in the Sessorian basilica (Santa Croce in Gerusalemme), and the minority had the indictment made by the Laurentian party read aloud... The majority of the clergy and people sided indeed with Symmachus, but a minority of the clergy and a majority of the Senators were at that time partizans of Laurentius. A fourth session, therefore, was held on 23 October 502, called the ‘Synodus Palmaris’ (Palmary synod) either from the place where it was held (*ad Palmata Palma*), or because it was the most important session (*palmaris*). At this session it was decided that...Symmachus was to be regarded as free from all the crimes of which he was accused, and therefore entitled to the full exercise of his episcopal office: the whole property of the Church was to be transferred to him: whoever

returned to his obedience should escape punishment, but whoever undertook ecclesiastical functions at Rome without papal permission was to be regarded as a schismatic. The decision was signed by seventy-five bishops, among them the bishops of Milan and Ravenna.”

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, LIII. Symmachus (498-514): “After 4 years some of the clergy and some of the senate, in particular Festus and Probinus, full of zeal and craft, brought charges against Symmachus and suborned false witnesses whom they sent to King Theodoric, the heretic, at Ravenna to accuse the blessed Symmachus; and they recalled Laurentius stealthily to Rome, after the accusation had been drawn up at Rome; and they created a schism and the clergy was divided again and some communicated with Symmachus and some with Laurentius... Then the blessed Symmachus assembled 115 bishops and in the synod was acquitted of the false accusation; and Peter of Altinum, the intruder upon the apostolic see, and Laurentius of Nuceria were condemned, because during the lifetime of the bishop Symmachus they had invaded his see. Then the blessed Symmachus was reinstated with glory in the apostolic see by all the bishops, priests and deacons and all the clergy and the people, to sit as bishop in the church of the blessed Peter.”

Liber Pontificalis, 1916, XXIII. Lucius (253-254): [Page 28, Footnote 4] “The system of private attendance upon the pope by members of the clergy, regular or secular, seems to have been first instituted by the council of 595 under Gregory I. Until that time the pope received personal service from laymen. Duchesne suggests that in ascribing this ordinance to Lucius, our author may have been animated by the memory of the charge of adultery brought against Pope Symmachus later and the difficulty which that pope experienced in clearing himself for lack of witnesses. Cf. *infra*, p. 117, n. 2; Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, vol. I, p. 153, n. 2.”

Vigilius (537-555)

Vigilius was never the pope. But most Catholics were inculpably ignorant that his election to the papacy was invalid and thus believed he was the pope. While they believed he was the pope, Vigilius was rightly tried and convicted as a heretic and deposed.²¹⁶

St. Leo III (795-816)

Pope St. Leo III was accused of crimes and brought to trial but proved his innocence and ended the trial by a solemn oath, a canonical oath of innocence:

Alcuin: His Life and His Work, by C. J. B. Gaskoin, 1904: “On Christmas Day, 795, Pope Hadrian died, and Leo III, elected on the following day, was consecrated as his successor on December 27...²¹⁷

“On April 25 the Pope, Leo III, going in procession to recite the Greater Litany, had been set upon by Paschalis and Campulus, two high officers of his house hold, dragged from his horse, beaten—an attempt being made, it was said, to mutilate him—and finally imprisoned in the monastery of St. Erasmus on the Coelian Hill. A few days later he escaped, sought the protection of Winigis, the Frankish Duke of Spoleto, and then—whether spontaneously or not does not appear—crossed the Alps, and came to meet the Frankish King at Paderborn. It was from the King himself that Alcuin heard of the first of these events, and in his reply, the most famous of all his letters, he insisted that everything else should be postponed and Charles’ whole attention devoted to the crisis... Though Leo did indeed return to

²¹⁶ See in this book “A Pope Can Become an Idolater or Formal Heretic and Thus Lose His Office: Vigilius (537-555),” p. 57.

²¹⁷ c. 6, p. 90.

Rome, it was in company with royal envoys commissioned to examine into the charges brought against him...

"In the autumn Charles marched into Italy... He deemed it essential that Leo III should once and for all meet the charges against him which Arno and his fellow-commissioners had been investigating. For to Charles, the Pope as Pope was not necessarily righteous, nor to be treated as if he were righteous. It could not indeed be tolerated that a ruffianly assault should vacate the papal chair; it might be politically necessary that its present occupant should be securely reestablished; but at least there must be a show of investigation and acquittal. King and Pope met at Nomentum on November 23. On the following day they made a triumphal entry into Rome, and just a week later a great Council of Franks and Romans, laymen and ecclesiastics, assembled at St. Peter's.

"Charles opened the proceedings. The accusations against Leo were recited, but the accusers, who indeed were probably absent, failed to substantiate them. A long and acrimonious discussion followed. The proposal to depose the Pope was heard once more,²¹⁸ but Leo's supporters, among whom were Riculf of Mainz and Theodulph of Orleans²¹⁹, won the day. It was decided however that he should formally deny on oath the truth of the allegations against him. Accordingly on December 23 he solemnly swore that he was innocent, as Pope Pelagius had done in 555..."²²⁰

Formosus (891-896)

Depending on which side was right, Formosus was either a pope or never the pope if his election was invalid. After Formosus' death, his successor Pope Stephen VI had Formosus' body taken from the grave and put on a throne. And Formosus was then tried, condemned, his election declared invalid, and all of his acts were declared invalid:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Pope Formosus: "After his death, Stephen VI lent himself to the revolting scene of sitting in judgment on his predecessor, Formosus. At the synod convened for that purpose, he occupied the chair; the corpse, clad in papal vestments, was withdrawn from the sarcophagus and seated on a throne; close by stood a deacon to answer in its name, all the old charges formulated against Formosus under John VIII being revived. The decision was that the deceased had been unworthy of the pontificate, which he could not have validly received since he was bishop of another see. All his measures and acts were annulled, and all the orders conferred by him were declared invalid.²²¹ The papal vestments were torn from his body; the three fingers which the dead pope had used in consecrations were severed from his right hand; the corpse was cast into a grave in the cemetery for strangers, to be removed after a few days and consigned to the Tiber. In 897 the second successor of Stephen had the body, which a monk had drawn from the Tiber, reinterred with full honours in St. Peter's. He furthermore annulled at a synod the decisions of the court of Stephen VI, and declared all orders conferred by Formosus valid. John IX confirmed these acts at two synods, of which the first was held at Rome and the other at Ravenna (898). On the other hand Sergius III (904-911) approved in a Roman synod the decisions of Stephen's synod against Formosus; all who had received orders from the latter were to be treated as lay persons, unless they sought re-ordination. Sergius and his party meted out severe treatment to the bishops consecrated by Formosus, who in turn had meanwhile conferred orders on

²¹⁸ Footnote 1: "Cf. *Ep.* 212 [157], and Hauck, ii. 103, n. 4."

²¹⁹ Footnote 2: "Cf. *Epp.* 212 [157] and 225 [166], praising their conduct."

²²⁰ M.A. Published by C. J. Clay and Sons, London, 1904. Chap. 7, pp. 113-114, 117, 121-122.

²²¹ RJMI comment: If Formosus was not the pope, then the orders conferred by him were illegal but not invalid. Hence this part of the sentence is incorrect, as the orders conferred by him would have been valid. However, all of his other so-called papal acts would have been not only illegal but also invalid, null and void.

many other clerics, a policy which gave rise to the greatest confusion. Against these decisions many books were written, which demonstrated the validity of the consecration of Formosus and of the orders conferred by him.”

A History of the Church, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1934: “Sergius renewed all the censures against Formosus, and honoured the tomb of...Stephen VI with an epitaph that exalted the infamous trial in words that defy translation. Next, annulling all the ordinations made by Formosus and the ‘Formosan’ popes, John IX and Benedict IV...”²²²

Whichever side was right, true popes and antipopes were put on trial, sentenced, punished, and their acts declared invalid. The argument was not whether a pope could be put on trial but only if the trial was just or unjust.

John XII (955-964)

The so-called pope, John XII, was guilty of many sins, some of which banned him from holding the papal office, such as sins of idolatry, simony, and public and obstinate immorality. The apostate Antipope John XII was eventually brought to trial by the Holy Roman Emperor Otto I and rightly judged, condemned, and deposed. Another pope was elected in his place, Leo VIII. Otto’s deposition of John was a declaratory sentence because John was a formal idolater and heretic before this deposition and thus did not hold the office:

The Holy Roman Empire, James Bryce, D.C.L., 1902: “After his coronation Otto had returned to North Italy, where the partizans of Berengar and his son Adalbert still maintained themselves in arms. Scarcely was he gone when the restless John the Twelfth, who found too late that in seeking an ally he had given himself a master, renounced his allegiance, opened negotiations with Berengar, and even scrupled not to send envoys pressing the heathen Magyars to invade Germany. The Emperor was soon informed of these plots, as well as of the flagitious life of the pontiff, a youth of twenty-five, the most profligate if not the most guilty of all who have worn the tiara. But he affected to despise them, saying, with a sort of unconscious irony, ‘He is a boy, the example of good men may reform him.’ When, however, Otto returned with a strong force, he found the city gates shut, and a party within furious against him. John the Twelfth was not only Pope, but as the heir of Alberic, the head of a strong faction among the nobles, and a sort of temporal prince in the city. But neither he nor they had courage enough to stand a siege: John fled into the Campagna to join Adalbert, and Otto entering convoked a synod in St. Peter’s. Himself presiding...he began by inquiring into the character and manners of the Pope. At once a tempest of accusations burst forth from the assembled clergy. Liudprand, a credible although a hostile witness, gives us a long list of them:

‘Peter, cardinal-priest, rose and witnessed that he had seen the Pope celebrate Mass and not himself communicate. John, bishop of Narnia, and John, cardinal-deacon, declared that they had seen him ordain a deacon in a stable, neglecting the proper formalities. They said further that he had defiled by shameless acts of vice the pontifical palace... All present, laymen as well as priests, cried out that he had drunk to the devil’s health; that in throwing the dice he had invoked the help of Jupiter, Venus, and other demons; that he had celebrated matins at uncanonical hours, and had not fortified himself by making the sign of the cross.’

“After these things the Emperor, who could not speak Latin, since the Romans could not understand his native, that is to say, the Saxon tongue, bade Liudprand bishop of Cremona interpret for him, and adjured the council to declare whether the

²²² v. 2, c. 5, sec. 5.

charges they had brought were true, or sprang only of malice and envy. Then all the clergy and people cried with a loud voice,

‘If John the Pope hath not committed all the crimes which Benedict the deacon hath read over, and even greater crimes than these, then may the chief of the Apostles, the blessed Peter, who by his word closes heaven to the unworthy and opens it to the just, never absolve us from our sins, but may we be bound by the chain of anathema, and on the last day may we stand on the left hand along with those who have said to the Lord God, “Depart from us, for we will not know Thy ways.”’

“The solemnity of this answer seems to have satisfied Otto and the council: a letter was dispatched to John, couched in respectful terms, recounting the charges brought against him, and asking him to appear to clear himself by his own oath and that of a sufficient number of compurgators. John’s reply was short and pithy.

‘John the bishop, the servant of the servants of God, to all the bishops. We have heard tell that you wish to set up another Pope: if you do this, by Almighty God I excommunicate you, so that you may not have power to perform Mass or to ordain no one.’

“To this Otto and the synod replied by a letter of humorous expostulation, begging the Pope to reform both his morals and his Latin. But the messenger who bore it could not find John... and after a search had been made in vain, the synod resolved to take a decisive step. Otto, who still led their deliberations, demanded the condemnation of the Pope; the assembly deposed him by acclamation, ‘because of his reprobate life’ and having obtained the Emperor’s consent, proceeded in an equally hasty manner to raise Leo, the chief secretary and a layman, to the chair of the Apostle.”²²³

A History of the Church, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1934: “John XII... was like his father before him prince and senator of all the Romans. It was already a serious disadvantage that the person in whom these offices were combined was so young; it was another that he did not in the least realise the obligations which his spiritual rank entailed. The most serious thing of all was that the older he grew the less he seemed to care. He was master as no pope had been master since the Papal State began. How he used his power is most decently told in the spare and reticent lines of Mgr. Duchesne.”²²⁴

‘We know, too, in what other fashion his youthful spirits overflowed, and how Rome was soon the witness of truly appalling scandals. The young pope took little pleasure in the ritual ceremonies of the Church. Matins scarcely ever saw him present. His nights, no less than his days, were spent in the company of women and young men, in hunting and in banqueting. His sacrilegious love affairs were flaunted unashamedly. Here no barrier restrained him, neither the rank of the women for whom he lusted nor even his kinship with them. The Lateran was become a bad house. No decent woman was safe in Rome. This debauchery was paid for from the Church’s treasury, a treasury filled by a simony utterly regardless of the character of those who paid. We hear of a boy of ten consecrated bishop, of a deacon ordained in a stable, of high dignitaries deprived of their eyes or castrated. Cruelty crowned the debauchery. That nothing might finally be lacking, impiety, too, was given its place, and men told how, in the feasting at the Lateran, the pope used to drink to the health of the devil.’...

²²³ Publisher: Macmillan and Co., Limited, London, 1902. C. 9, pp. 134-137.

²²⁴ Footnote: “DUCHESNE *Les premiers temps de l’état pontifical*, 3rd. ed. 1911, p. 335. It would be rash to ignore the judgement of such a scholar on the evidence for the case against John XII. On the other hand, one of the principal witnesses against the pope is Liutprand of Cremona, not only an enemy and a strong partisan of the pope’s political adversaries, but surely, one of the classic gossips of all time: cf. the admirable translation, due to Professor Wright, of *The Works of Liutprand of Cremona* (London, 1930).”

“Otto...hastily gathered [a] council [and] listened to the numerous complaints of the pope’s scandalous life. He was summoned to appear and then, after a month’s delay, solemnly deposed (December 4, 963). In his place, with the emperor’s consent, they elected one of the lay officers of the State, Leo VIII.”²²⁵

Some say that because Leo VIII was uncanonically elected he was not the pope. But other popes have been uncanonically elected and were popes. These election laws are disciplinary laws that can be dispensed of or exempted from by epikeia in emergency situations. In many lists of popes, Leo VIII is listed as a pope. In these lists of popes, John XII’s reign ends in the 12th month of 963 when he was deposed and Leo VIII’s reign begins:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, The List of Popes: “Pope John XII (955-963); Pope Leo VIII (963-964); Pope Benedict V (964)...”

John XII died in the 5th month of 964, about five months after Leo VIII became pope in 963. Hence this list of popes acknowledges John XII’s deposition as legal and valid because it has Leo reigning as pope while John was still alive.

But even if Leo VIII were not the pope because his election was invalid, that would not invalidate the legal and valid deposition of John XII. One proof that God approved Otto’s deposition of John XII and his choice of Leo VIII as the next pope is that God killed John in an act of adultery shortly after John entered Rome and deposed Leo VIII and excommunicated all of Leo’s followers:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Pope John XII: “With the imperial consent the synod deposed John on 4 December, and elected to replace him the *protoscriniarius* Leo, yet a layman. The latter received all the orders uncanonically without the proper intervals (*interstitia*), and was crowned pope as Leo VIII... Most of the imperial troops now departing from Rome, John’s adherents rose against the emperor, but were suppressed on 3 January, 964, with bloodshed. Nevertheless, at Leo’s request, Otto released the hundred hostages whom he had called for, and marched from Rome to meet Adalbert in the field. A new insurrection broke out in the city against the imperial party; Leo VIII fled, while John XII re-entered Rome, and took bloody vengeance on the leaders of the opposite party. Cardinal-Deacon John had his right hand struck off, Bishop Otgar of Speyer was scourged, a high palatine official lost nose and ears. On 26 February, 964, John held a synod in St. Peter’s in which the decrees of the synod of 6 November were repealed; Leo VIII and all who had elected him were excommunicated; his ordination was pronounced invalid; and Bishop Sico of Ostia, who had consecrated him, was deprived forever of his dignities. The emperor, left free to act after his defeat of Berengarius, was preparing to re-enter Rome when the pope’s death changed the situation. John died on 14 May, 964, eight days after he had been, according to rumour, stricken by paralysis in the act of adultery. Luitprand relates that on that occasion the devil dealt him a blow on the temple in consequence of which he died.”

Putative Officeholders and Their Putative Acts

If a true pope is murdered and replaced with an imposter who looks just like the true pope, most of your Catholics would believe he is the true pope. To these Catholics who are inculpably ignorant of the fact that he is not the true pope, he is a putative pope and thus must be obeyed as if he were the true pope.

Hence an apparent officeholder who does not hold the office, such as an antipope, is a putative officeholder to Catholics who are inculpably ignorant of the fact that he does not hold the office.

²²⁵ v. 2, c. 5, sec. 5.

Consequently these unsuspecting Catholics are bound to obey him under pain of sin, just as they are bound to obey a true officeholder. Even though most of his putative acts are invalid, null and void, (with the exception of his baptisms, confirmations, ordinations, and consecrations of the Holy Eucharist), these unsuspecting Catholics must obey his legal, non-sinful, and non-erroneous putative acts, just as they must obey the acts of a true officeholder.

This is similar to a putative marriage. A putative marriage is not a true marriage. The marriage is invalid (null and void) but at least one of the spouses or both have good reason to believe it is a true marriage because they are inculpably ignorant of the obstacle that invalidated their marriage. Hence when they come together to have children, they do not commit the sin of fornication and their children are not bastards. However, once they become aware of the obstacle that made their marriage invalid, then under pain of mortal sin they must separate from one another and not live as if they are married; or they must remove the obstacle, if possible, in order to make their marriage valid:

Canon Law: “Matrimonium putativum is an invalid marriage in which at least one of the parties contracted marriage in good faith; it remains putativum until both parties become certain of its invalidity.”

Likewise, once Catholics know or should know that an apparent officeholder cannot hold the office, they are bound to denounce the officeholder as a non-officeholder and no longer obey him or any of his acts. If they do not, then they are formal schismatics and thus not Catholic.²²⁶

For example, to Catholics who are inculpably ignorant that a so-called pope is an antipope and thus have good reason to believe he is the pope, he is a putative pope, his teachings are putative teachings, his laws are putative laws, his judgments are putative judgments, his commands are putative commands, and the men given offices by him are putative officeholders. As such, these unsuspecting Catholics must obey him and his acts as they would a true pope.

Every person that is made a Cardinal by an antipope is not a real Cardinal. However, he is a putative Cardinal to Catholics who have good reason to believe he is a true Cardinal. For the sake of the common good and law and order, these unsuspecting Catholics must obey under pain of sin the putative pope, his legal, non-sinful, and non-erroneous putative acts, and the putative officeholders he installs until they realize that the so-called pope is an antipope and thus realize that his acts and the offices bestowed by him are null and void. This was the case during the Western Schism when for forty years two to three men claimed to be the pope and none were. Hence many Catholics followed and obeyed a putative pope (an antipope), his putative acts, and the putative officeholders appointed by the putative pope.

The sacraments of baptism, confirmation, the Holy Eucharist, and Holy Orders administered by antipopes and other putative officeholders are valid and efficacious for unsuspecting catechumens and members of the Catholic Church. And the sacraments of penance and extreme unction administered by antipopes or other putative officeholders to unsuspecting Catholics are made valid and efficacious by supplied jurisdiction.²²⁷ If the antipope is Catholic and not in mortal sin, then he does not commit sin by administering the sacraments.²²⁸ If the antipope is *not* Catholic or is a Catholic in mortal sin, then he commits mortal sin for every sacrament he

²²⁶ And if Catholics know or should know that an apparent officeholder does not hold the office because he is a formal heretic or idolater or formal schismatic, then the Catholics must denounce him not only as a non-officeholder and not obey him or any of his acts but must also denounce him as a formal heretic, idolater, or formal schismatic, and avoid him in religious matters. If they do not, then they become formal heretics, idolaters, or formal schismatics.

²²⁷ If the so-called priest was not validly ordained, then the only sacrament he can validly confect is the sacrament of baptism because he is a layman. And if a priest was invalidly ordained as a bishop, then he is no bishop and thus cannot validly confect the sacrament of orders.

²²⁸ An antipope who is Catholic is in material schism and thus is not guilty of the sin of schism. There have been times when good Catholics were confused over who was the validly elected pope and thus spilt into opposing camps. The dispute was over the validity of the election not over dogmas of faith or morals. Hence even though both sides were in material schism from one another, both were of the faithful and thus could be in a state of grace.

administers. And in both cases the unsuspecting Catholics do not commit sin for receiving sacraments from putative officeholders.

What, then, are the consequences to the purity of the Catholic Church, faith, and Catholics because there were no true popes but only apostate antipopes pretending to rule the Catholic Church for almost 1000 years? None for a Catholic who was inculpably ignorant that they were antipopes and thus had good reason to believe they were popes. As such, these unsuspecting Catholics were bound to obey these putative popes just as they are bound to obey true popes. And if they did not when they were bound to, then they would sin, just as they would sin if they disobeyed a true pope.

Officeholders and the Te Igitur Prayer of the Mass

The faithful are praying for and not with those mentioned in the Te Igitur prayer

In the Te Igitur Prayer of the Mass, the faithful pray for the Catholic Church, officeholders, and the faithful:

Roman Rite of the Mass, Te Igitur Prayer, Diptychs: “We therefore beg and beseech Thee, most clement Father, through Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord, (*he kisses the altar*) that Thou wouldst vouchsafe to accept and to bless these ✠ gifts, these ✠ offerings, these ✠ holy and unspotted sacrifices, which in the first place we offer to Thee for Thy holy Catholic Church, that Thou wouldst deign to pacify, guard, unite, and govern her throughout the whole world, together with Thy servant our Pope N. and our Bishop N. and all who are orthodox in belief and profess the Catholic and apostolic faith.”

Note that the faithful are not praying with the Catholic Church, officeholders, and the faithful but are praying for them. They are praying that God would pacify, unite, and govern not only the Catholic Church, but also (along with the Church) the pope and the local bishop. And they are also praying the same for all of the faithful. In the oldest extant Mass, the faithful also prayed for catechumens and unbelievers in the Te Igitur prayer:

Apostolic Constitutions, between the 1st and 5th centuries, Book 8, Chapter 10 (the Te Igitur prayer for the Catholic Church, officeholders, Catholics, unbelievers, and others): “Let us pray for the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is spread from one end of the earth to the other; that the Lord may preserve and keep it unshaken, and free from the waves of this life until the end of the world, as founded upon a rock; and let us pray for this holy parish, that the Lord of the universe may deem us worthy, without failure, to follow after the heavenly hope, and, without ceasing, to pay him the debt of our prayer. Let us pray for every Episcopate which is under the whole heaven, of those that rightly divide the word of thy truth. And let us pray for our bishop James, and his parishes...”

“And let us pray for our Presbyters, that the Lord may deliver them from every unreasonable and wicked action, and afford them a Presbyterate in health and honor. Let us pray for all the Deacons and subordinate servants of the Church, that the Lord may grant them an unblamable reputation. Let us pray for the Readers, Singers, Virgins, Widows, and Orphans.

“Let us pray for those that are in marriage and child-bearing; that the Lord may have mercy upon them all. Let us pray for the eunuchs, leading a life of sanctity. Let us pray for those persons that are in a state of continency and religious abstinence. Let us pray for those that bear fruit in the holy church, and give alms to the needy. And let us pray for those who offer sacrifices and oblations to the Lord our God; that God, the fountain of all goodness, may recompense them with his heavenly

gifts, and give them in this world a hundred fold, and in the world to come life everlasting; and bestow upon them, for their temporal things, those that are eternal; for earthly things, those that are heavenly.

“Let us pray for our brethren newly enlightened, that the Lord may strengthen and confirm them. Let us pray for our brethren afflicted with sickness, that the Lord may deliver them from every disease and every malady, and restore them sound to his holy church. Let us pray for those that travel by water or by land. Let us pray for those that are in the mines, in banishment, in prisons, and in bonds, for the name of the Lord. Let us pray for those that are worn down with toil in bitter servitude.

“Let us pray for our enemies, and those that hate us. Let us pray for those that persecute us for the name of the Lord, that the Lord may pacify their anger, and cause their wrath against us to pass away. Let us pray for those that are without, and have wandered out of the way, that the Lord may convert them.”

Note that the faithful are praying for these things and not with them. If they were praying with the people mentioned in it, then they would be praying with catechumens and unbelievers and thus would be in religious communion with them, which would have been heretical. Therefore, this is more proof that the prayers in the Te Igitur are not acts of religious communion with the people mentioned in it. Hence, in the Te Igitur the faithful pray for the officeholders and profess to be in governmental communion with them but do not profess one way or another of being in religious communion with them.

Another proof that the faithful do not pray with the persons mentioned in the Te Igitur prayer is the example of an officeholder (such as a local bishop) who is under a minor excommunication and banned from being in religious communion with the faithful. This bishop is still of the faithful and thus holds the office. Hence the faithful must pray for him as the officeholder in the Te Igitur prayer since he holds the office. Yet Catholics cannot be in religious communion with him and thus they must not pray with him. Hence the Te Igitur prayer is not an act of religious communion with those mentioned in it. It is a prayer for those mentioned in it and also an act of governmental communion with the pope and local bishop mentioned in it. In this case, the faithful are in governmental communion with their local bishop who is under a minor excommunication but they are not in religious communion with him. And they are praying for him.

The same applies to the faithful who are inculpably ignorant of the deeper dogma that a formal heretic cannot hold an office in the Catholic Church and the deeper dogma that a presumed formal heretic is presumed to not hold an office in the Catholic Church. If the faithful know or should know that a so-called officeholder (such as the so-called pope or their local bishop) is a formal heretic or presumed formal heretic, they are bound under pain of the mortal sin of heresy to denounce him as a formal heretic or presumed formal heretic and to not be in religious communion with him. However, they must still pray for him in the Te Igitur prayer of the Mass because they inculpably believe he holds the office even though he does not. However, once the faithful know or should know the deeper dogma that formal heretics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church and presumed formal heretics are presumed to not hold offices in the Catholic Church, they are bound under the mortal sin of schism to not pray for the so-called officeholder in the Te Igitur prayer.

Hence, in context, the following quotes are referring to governmental communion and not religious communion:

Apostate Adrian Fortescue, 1913: “To read the name of a living bishop in the diptychs was always a recognized sign of [governmental] communion with him.”²²⁹

Apostate Canon Croegaert: “To pray for the Pope is to give witness that you live in [governmental] communion with the Head of the true Church.”²³⁰

²²⁹ *The Formula of Hormisdas*, A. Fortescue, CTS 102 (London: Catholic Truth Society 1913), 12.

Apostate Antipope Benedict XIV, *Ex Quo*, 1756: “It suffices Us to be able to state that a commemoration of the supreme pontiff and prayers offered for [the pope] during the sacrifice of the Mass is considered, and really is, an affirmative indication which recognizes him as the head of the Church, the vicar of Christ, and the successor of blessed Peter. . . [This commemoration of the pope is, moreover] the profession of a mind and will which firmly espouses Catholic unity. This was rightly noticed by Christianus Lupus in his work on the Councils: ‘This commemoration is the chief and most glorious form of [governmental] communion.’”²³¹

Catholic bishops in 430 who were material heretics due to inculpable ignorance

In 430 when the deeper dogma that non-members of the Catholic Church cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church was only an ordinary magisterium dogma, some Catholic bishops were inculpably ignorant of this dogma and hence did not want to remove themselves from governmental communion with their supposed bishop and Patriarch, Nestorius, even though they did condemn him as a heretic and were not in religious communion with him. They believed that a pope’s judgment was necessary in order for them to break off governmental communion with Nestorius. In Pope St. Celestine’s answer to this question, he teaches this deeper dogma. He says that officeholders who defect from the faith are automatically not in communion with the pope and thus Catholics are to break off all communion with them and thus break off governmental communion with them as soon as they are sure that they are heretics. Hence they automatically lost their offices. The pope says, “those who obstinately follow the path that leads away from the apostolic teaching cannot be ‘in communion with us,’ i.e., the pope.”

The Church in Crisis: A History of the General Councils, by apostate Rev. Philip Hughes, 1961: “[Chapter 3. The General Council of Ephesus] The next move was a council in Egypt, sometime after Easter 430, and an elaborate report to the pope on the part of Cyril—his answer to the Roman query whether certain sermons that have come to the pope were really Nestorius’ sermons. Cyril’s reply was a ‘skilfully written letter’ describing the situation at Constantinople, saying that all the bishops of the East are united in their anxiety about these errors [heresies] of Nestorius. He is quite isolated in his denial that the Virgin is Theotokos [Mother of God], but flatters himself that he will bring the rest round, ‘so greatly has the power of his see infatuated him.’ The bishops will not publicly break off relations with Nestorius without consulting the pope. ‘Deign then to make known to us what seems good to you, and whether we ought either to remain in communion with him or to declare publicly that no one should remain in communion with a man who thinks and teaches so erroneously.’ The pope’s reply, Cyril recommends, should be sent to all the bishops of the East. . . To the question about remaining in communion with the bishop of Constantinople, the pope replies that those whom Nestorius had excommunicated because they opposed him remain, nevertheless, in full communion; and those who obstinately follow the path that leads away from the apostolic teaching cannot be ‘in communion with us,’ i.e., the pope.”

These bishops who condemned Nestorius as a heretic and were not in religious communion with him but remained in governmental communion with him and thus included him in the Te

²³⁰ *Les Rites et les Prières du Saint Sacrifice de la Messe* (Paris: Casterman n.d.), A. Croegaert, 2:106. “Prier pour le Pape c’est témoigner qu’on vit en communion avec le Chef de la vraie Eglise.”

²³¹ Bull *Ex Quo* (1 March 1756), par. 12 in *S.D.N. Benedicti Papae XIV Bullarium* (Malines: Hanicq 1827) 4:299. “Nobis satis est affirmare posse, commemorationem Romani Pontificis in Missa, fusasque pro eodem in Sacrificio preces, censerī, et esse, declarativum quoddam signum, quo idem Pontifex tanquam Ecclesiae Caput, Vicarius Christi, et B. Petri Apostoli Successor agnoscitur. . . ac professio fit animi et voluntatis Catholicae unitati firmiter adhaerentis; ut etiam recte advertit Christianus Lupus, super Concilii scribens [cite omitted] *Haec commemoratio est suprema et honoratissima Communionis species.*”

Igitur prayer were material heretics because they were inculpably ignorant of the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church. It was this dilemma that led Pope St. Celestine to be the first pope to infallibly define this dogma in 431 and thus make it a solemn magisterium deeper dogma.²³²

Bishop Eulalius may have been one of the material heretic Catholic bishops who in 430 condemned Nestorius as a heretic and was not in religious communion with him but remained in governmental communion with him until he received Pope St. Celestine's reply in 430. Before this reply, Eulalius rebuked St. Hypatius, a monk who removed Nestorius' name from the diptychs as soon as Hypatius knew that Nestorius was a heretic and referred to Nestorius as no longer his bishop and thus as having lost his office. St. Hypatius correctly did not obey his Bishop, Eulalius, in this matter, but both remained in full communion with one another:

Life of Hypatius, by Callinicus, disciple of Hypatius, c. 450: "When Saint Hypatius understood what opinions Nestorius held, immediately, in the Church of the Apostles, he erased his name from the diptychs, so that it should no longer be pronounced at the Oblation. This was before Nestorius' condemnation by the Third Ecumenical Council. When the most pious Bishop Eulalius learned of this, he was anxious about the outcome of the affair. And seeing that it had been noised abroad, Nestorius also ordered him to reprimand Hypatius. For Nestorius was still powerful in the city. Bishop Eulalius spoke thus to Hypatius: 'Why have you erased his name without understanding what the consequences would be?' Saint Hypatius replied: 'From the time that I learned that he said unrighteous things about the Lord, I have no longer been in communion with him and I do not commemorate his name; for he is not a bishop.' Then the bishop, in anger, said: 'Be off with you! Make amends for what you have done, for I shall take measures against you.' Saint Hypatius replied: 'Do as you wish. As for me, I have decided to suffer anything, and it is with this in mind that I have done this.' ... A few days after the deposition against him [Nestorius] was revealed [in 431 at the Council of Ephesus], and publicly read before all the clergy and people in church, Eulalius and Hypatius were present."²³³

The reason I say that Bishop Eulalius denounced Nestorius as a heretic and was not in religious communion with him, even though this is not explicitly mentioned in the above quote, is that St. Hypatius remained in religious and governmental communion with Bishop Eulalius because they were together in church when the Council of Ephesus declared that Nestorius was deposed. St. Hypatius would not have remained in religious and governmental communion with Eulalius if Eulalius had not denounced Nestorius as a heretic and was in religious communion with Nestorius. Instead, St. Hypatius would have denounced and treated Eulalius as he denounced and treated Nestorius and hence would not have been in religious or governmental communion with Bishop Eulalius.

Presuming, then, that Bishop Eulalius did denounce Nestorius as a heretic and was not in religious communion with him, Eulalius would have been a material heretic for remaining in governmental communion with Nestorius if he were inculpably ignorant of the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church. However, if Eulalius knew the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church, or was culpably ignorant of it, then he was a formal heretic.

St. Hypatius, who held the position that Nestorius lost his office and thus did not remain in governmental communion with him, would have been a material heretic if he were inculpably ignorant of the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church and thus held his position by Catholic common sense and as an allowable opinion but not as a dogma.

²³² See in this book "431 – Council of Ephesus," p. 14.

²³³ The Latin is contained in the *Acta Sanctorum*, by the Bollandists Godfrey Henschen, et al. Publisher: Apud Victorem Palmé, 1867. June, Tom. 4, 17th Day, p. 267, §44; the English translation is from *The Life of our Holy Father, Maximus the Confessor: Based on the life by his disciple Anastasius*, translated by Father Christopher Birchall and published by Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 1982, p. 64, translated from the French source *Sources Chretiennes*, No. 177, pp. 210-214.

If he were a material heretic for this, it was because he held the dogma as an allowable opinion instead of a dogma because he was inculpably ignorant of the deeper dogma. If he truly were a saint, then he was only a material heretic and hence the case just mentioned would have applied to him. However, if he knew the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church or were culpably ignorant of it, then he would have been a formal heretic for not denouncing his bishop, Eulalius, as a heretic and for not removing himself from religious and governmental communion with him. To not be a heretic at all regarding this matter, St. Hypatius would have had to know the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church and thus not hold the dogma as an allowable opinion and would have had to denounce Bishop Eulalius as a heretic and not be in religious or governmental communion with him.

It is possible, then, that both Bishop Eulalius and St. Hypatius were both material heretics and thus both Catholic if they were inculpably ignorant of the deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church and hence held their positions based upon what they believed were allowable opinions and if both denounced Nestorius as a heretic and were not in religious communion with him, even though Eulalius was in governmental communion with Nestorius and St. Hypatius was not.

Bibliography

Acts of the Council of Chalcedon.

—Translation and notes by Richard Price and Michael Gaddis, *Translated Texts for Historians*, Vol. 45. Published by Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 2005.

Augustine, Chas., O.S.B., D.D.

— *A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law. Nihil Obstat:* Sti. Ludovici, die 18 Nov. 1920, F. G. Holweck, *Censor Librorum*. Imprimatur: Sti. Ludovici, die 22 Nov. 1920, + Joannes J. Glennon, Archiepiscopus, Sti. Ludovici. Published by B. Herder Book Co., 1921.

Burns and Izbicki.

— *Conciliarism and Papalism*, edited by J. H. Burns and Thomas M. Izbicki. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Publisher: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Contains the English translation of selected works of Cajetan, Almain, and Mair.

Catholic Encyclopedia.

—1913 English version. Actual work was begun in January 1905. It was completed in April 1914. However, it is referred to as the 1913 English *Catholic Encyclopedia*. It contains 15 volumes.

Damian, Peter.

—*Letters*, translated by Owen J. Blum, O.F.M. The Fathers of the Church Mediaeval Continuation. Publisher: The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 1989.

Dollinger, Dr. J. J. I.

—*Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, the Prophetic Spirit, and Prophecies of the Christian Era*. Publisher: Dodd & Mead, New York, 1872.

Guéranger, Abbot.

—*The Liturgical Year*, translated from the French by Dom Laurence Shepherd, O.S.B. *Nihil Obstat:* Eduardus Mahoney, S.T.D., *Censor Deputatus*. Imprimatur: Edm. Can. Surmont, Vicarius generalis, Westmonasterii, die 3 Januarii, 1927.

Hefele, Bishop Joseph, D.D.

— *A History of the Christian Councils*, translated from the German and edited by William R. Clark, M.A. Published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1894.

Hyland, Francis Edward, J.C.L.

— *Excommunication, Its Nature, Historical Developments and Effects. Nihil Obstat:* + Thomas J. Shahan, S.T.D., J.U.L., *Censor Deputatus*, Washington, D.C., die XV Maii, 1928. Imprimatur: + D. Card. Dougherty, Archiepiscopus Philadelphiensis, Philadelphiae, die XXII Maii, 1928. Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies No. 49.

Hughes, Rev. Philip.

—*A History of the Church*, 1934. *Nihil Obstat:* Reginal Phillips, S.T.L., *Censor*. Imprimatur: E. Morrogh Bernard, Vicar General, Westminster, 15 February 1947. Publisher: First published 1934, revised edition 1948. Printed and bound in Great Britain for Sheed & Ward Ltd.

—*The Church in Crisis: A History of the General Councils*, 1961. *Nihil Obstat:* James A. Reynolds, Ph.D., *Censor Deputatus*. Imprimatur: + Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, September 28, 1960.

Izbicki, Thomas M.

—*Protector of the Faith* (Cardinal Johannes de Turrecremata and the defense of the institutional Church). Publisher: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981.

Liber Pontificalis.

— *The Books of the Popes*, contained in *Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies*, edited by James T. Shotwell, Ph.D. Published by Columbia University Press, New York, 1916. V. 1, To the Pontificate of Gregory I.

Lives and Times of the Popes, The.

—Reproduced from “Effigies Pontificum Romanorum Dominici Basae,” by Giovanni Baptista Cavalieri MDLXXX. Retranslated, revised and written up to date from Les Vies Des Papes, by The Chevalier Artaud De Montor, 1772-1849. In ten volumes. *Nihil Obstat:* Remigius Lafort, S.T.L., *Censor*. Imprimatur: + John M. Farley, D.D., Archbishop of New York, New York, December 16, 1909.

Published by The Catholic Publication Society of America, New York, 1910. Lateran Edition, Limited to one thousand numbered, registered, and signed sets, Set No. 330 or 390 or 380. Page 101.

MacKenzie, Rev. Eric, A.M., S.T.L., J.C.L.

— *The Delict of Heresy*, “In Its Commission, Penalization, Absolution, a Dissertation.” *Nihil Obstat*: Patrick J. Waters, Ph.D., *Censor Deputatus*. Imprimatur: + William Cardinal O’Connell, Archbishop of Boston, Boston, June 3, 1932. Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies No. 77.

Mansi, Gian Domenico.

— *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 vols., folio, Florence and Venice, 1758-98.

Migne, Fr. J. P.

— *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, Series Latina, Paris, 1855.

Moynihan, James M., S.T.D., J.C.D.

— *Papal Immunity and Liability in the Writings of the Medieval Canonists*. Imprimatur: + Aloysius, Card. Provicarius, E Vicariatu Urbis, die 22 Septembris 1961. Publisher: Gregorian University Press, Rome, 1961.

Pastor, Dr. Ludwig, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck.

— *The History of the Popes*. Written from 1891 to 1898. Drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican and other original sources. Edited by Fredrick Ignatius Antrobus. Publisher: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & CO., LTD. London, 1901.

Tierney, Brian.

— *Foundations of Conciliar Theory*, The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism. Catholic University of America. Publisher: Cambridge at the University Press, 1955, reprinted 1968.

Tixeront, J.

— *History of Dogmas*, translated from the Fifth French edition by H.L.B. *Nihil Obstat*: Sti. Ludovici, die 17, Nov. 1913, F.G. Holweck, *Censor Librorum*. Imprimatur: + Joannes J. Glenon, Archiepiscopus St. Ludovki, die 19 Nov. 1913. Herder Book Co., 1923.

Woywod, Stanislaus, O.F.M., LL.B.

— *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, revised by Rev. Callistus Smith, O.F.M., J.C.L. *Nihil Obstat*: Fr. Felician Berkery, O.F.M. *Imprimi Potest*: Fr. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., Minister Provincialis. *Nihil Obstat*: John Goodwine, J.C.D., *Censor Librorum*. Imprimatur: + Francis Cardinal Spellman, D.D., Archbishop of New York, Nov. 14, 1957. Published: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York, 1957; B. Herder, London.

Appendix

Justinian's Second Imperial Edict against the Three Chapters and Theodore of Mopsuestia

From *A History of the Christian Councils*, by apostate Bishop Charles Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894, Volume 4, Book 14, Chapter 1, Section 263, Pages 269-278.

SEC. 263. *The Second Imperial Edict against the Three Chapters.*

How little the Emperor and his party really wanted a new synodal examination of the whole question is shown not only by what has already been mentioned, but also by the strange conduct of Theodore Ascidas. In the harshest contradiction to the union between the Pope and Emperor already mentioned (sec. 261), at his suggestion a document was read aloud in the imperial palace, in which the three chapters were anathematised, and to which the subscriptions of several Greek bishops were demanded. Vigilius remonstrated on the subject with him and his friends, and they asked forgiveness with specious excuses. In spite of this, Theodore Ascidas circulated that document still more widely, irritated the Emperor, and made him discontented with Vigilius, and brought it about that, without waiting for the Synod, edicts

¹ We obtain this information from Victor. Tunun. *l.c.* (Galland. t. xii. p. 230), and from the letter of the Italian clergy in Mansi, t. ix. p. 153 sq.; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 47.

were drawn up, containing an anathema on the three chapters. Vigilius himself tells this;¹ and the new edicts in question were certainly nothing else, in several places, than passages taken from the complete *ὁμολογία πίστεως Ἰουστινιανοῦ αὐτοκράτορος κατὰ τῶν τριῶν κεφαλαίων*. This second edict of the Emperor against the three chapters was drawn up between 551 and 553, probably in the year 551, was addressed to the whole of Christendom, and is still extant.² Nothing is so calculated, the Emperor says, to propitiate the gracious God, as unity in the faith; therefore he lays down here the orthodox confession. Then follows a kind of creed, in which, first, the doctrine of the Trinity, principally in opposition to Sabellius and Arius, is defined; but much more completely is the doctrine of the Person of Christ explained, in opposition to the Nestorians and Monophysites. For example, "He who was born of Mary is one of the Holy Trinity, according to His Godhead of one substance with the Father, and according to His manhood of one substance with us, capable of suffering in the flesh, but incapable of suffering in the Godhead; and no other than the Word of God subjected Himself to sufferings and death. It is not one Word (Logos) that worked miracles, and another Christ who suffered; but one and the same Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, became flesh and man. . . . If we say that Christ is composed (*σύνθετος*) of two natures, Godhead and manhood, we bring no confusion (*σύγχυσις*) into this unity (*ἔνωσις*), and since we recognise in each of the two natures the one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God made man, we bring no separation nor partition nor division into the one personality; but we designate the natures of which He is composed, and this difference is not denied by the *ἔνωσις*, since each of the two natures is in Him. . . . The divine nature is not changed into the human, nor the human into the divine; rather, whilst each remains within its bounds, the unity of personality (hypostatic unity) is produced by the Logos. This hypostatic unity means that God the Word, this one Hypostasis (Person) of the Trinity, united Himself not with a previously existing

¹ Mansi, *l.c.* p. 59 sq.; Hardouin, *l.c.* p. 8 sq.

² Mansi, *l.c.* pp. 537-582; Hardouin, *l.c.* pp. 287-322.

man, but in the body of the blessed Virgin, HE took flesh for Himself of her own person, animated by the reasonable and rational soul,—and this is human nature. This hypostatical union of the Word with flesh is taught also by the Apostle Paul. . . . Hence we acknowledge two births of the Logos: the one from all eternity of the Father, incorporeal; the other in the last days, when HE became flesh and man from the holy God-bearer (*θεοτόκος*). . . . He is Son of God by nature, we are so by grace; He has, for our sakes and *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, become a Son of Adam, whilst we are by nature sons of Adam. . . . Even after the Incarnation HE is one of the Holy Trinity, the only-begotten Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, composed (*σύνθετος*) of both natures. This is the doctrine of the Fathers. . . . Confessing this, we accept also the expression of Cyril, that there is *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*, . . . for as often as he used the expression, he made use of the word *φύσις* in the sense of *ὑπόστασις*, for in the books in which this mode of speech occurs, he speedily uses again, instead of this, the expressions *λόγος* and *υἱός* and *μονογενής* (as identified with *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*), and thereby indicates the *Person* or *Hypostasis*, and not the *Nature*. . . . And he who confesses Christ as God and as man, cannot possibly say that there is only one nature or substance (*οὐσία*) in Him. That Cyril, in those places, really took *φύσις* in the sense of *person*, is shown by his two letters to Succensus and the thirteenth chapter of his *Scholia*. . . . Christ is thus one Hypostasis or Person, and HE has in Himself the perfection of the divine and uncreated nature, and the perfection of the human and created nature.”

Further, those are combated who, misusing a simile of the Fathers, would teach only one nature of Christ. Some Fathers, particularly Athanasius, had compared the union of the Godhead and manhood in Christ with the union of body and soul in man. Then the Monophysites said: As body and soul constitute only one human nature, so the Godhead and manhood in Christ also combine into one nature. On the contrary, the imperial edict declares: “If there were only one nature in Christ, then were it necessary that HE should be

either without flesh, and only of one substance with God, or pure man, and only of one substance with us; or that the united natures should constitute one new nature different from both; but then Christ would be neither God nor man, and consubstantial neither with God nor with us. Such an assumption, however, were impious."

Another objection of the Monophysites ran: We must not assume a number of natures in Christ, otherwise we should bring in a division in Christ, which would be Nestorian. To this the imperial edict replied: "If there was a reference to a number of different *persons*, then this would imply a division into parts; but if we speak of a number in united objects, the division is made only in thought, as, for example, in the distinction of soul and body in the unity of the human person. There, too, there are two *φύσεις*, that of the soul and that of the body, but the man is not thereby himself divided into two. So in Christ we have to recognise a number of natures, but not a number of persons.

This is proved from Gregory of Nazianzus, from Cyril, and from Gregory of Nyssa, and then the difference between *φύσις* (= *ουσία*) and *ὑπόστασις* is explained, particularly in the Holy Trinity. "We may therefore," the Emperor proceeds, "speak of one compound Hypostasis (Person) of God the Word (*διὰ τοῦ εὐσεβῶς εἰποῖ τις ἂν μίαν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σύνθετον*), but not of one composed of one nature. The nature is, in itself, something indefinite (*ἀόριστον*), it must inhere in a person. When, however, they say: The human nature in Christ must also have its own personality, this is as much as to say that the Logos has become united with a man already existing by himself; but two persons cannot become one. . . . Whoever says that before the union there were two natures, like Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, means that there was first a man formed, and then he was united with the Logos. But whoever says that after the union we must no longer speak of two, but only of one nature of Christ, introduces a *σύγχυσις* and *φαντασία*, like Apollinaris and Eutyches. Before the Incarnation there were not two Lords, and after the Incarnation there is not merely one nature." The four Œcumenical Synods, including that of

Chalcedon, are then adduced, and then the edict goes on: "As this is the truth, we will append *κεφάλαια*, which contain in brief the true faith and the condemnation of heretics." The principal contents of these are as follows:—

1. Whoever does not confess the Father, Son, and Spirit as one Godhead or nature, to be worshipped in three hypostases or persons, let him be anathema.

2. Whoever does not confess that the eternal Son of God was made man, and so had two births, an eternal and a temporal, let him be anathema.

3. Whoever says that the wonder-working Logos is another than the suffering Christ, and that the Logos united Himself with one born of a woman, and is not one Lord, etc., let him be anathema.

4. Whoever does not confess an hypostatical union of the Logos with the flesh, *μίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν σύνθετον*, but, like Nestorius, merely a union of the Godhead and manhood, *κατὰ χάριν*, or, as the heretic Theodore of Mopsuestia says, *κατὰ εὐδοκίαν*, let him be anathema.

5. Whoever does not name Mary the Godbearer in the full sense, let him be anathema.

6. Whoever does not confess that the crucified Christ is true God and One of the Holy Trinity, let him be anathema.

7. Whoever accepts two natures but not one Lord, but allows a *διαίρεσις ἀνὰ μέρος*, as if each nature were a proper hypostasis, like Theodore and Nestorius, let him be anathema.

8. Whoever, speaking of two natures in Christ, assumes not merely a *διαφορὰ τῆ θεωρίας*, but a numerical division into parts (*διαίρεσιν ἀνὰ μέρος*), let him be anathema.

9. Whoever, speaking of a *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*, does not understand this so that of the divine and human natures there has come one Christ, but that Godhead and manhood coalesced into one nature, like Apollinaris and Eutyches, let him be anathema.

10. The Catholic Church anathematizes both those who separate and those who mix (*διαιροῦντας καὶ συγχέοντας*). Whoever does not anathematise Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, and Eutyches, and all who teach as they do, let him be anathema.

11. Whoever defends Theodore of Mopsuestia, who says :
 (a) That God the Word is one, and another is the Christ tormented by sufferings of the soul and *ἐπιθυμίας τῆς σαρκός*, Who grew in virtue, was baptized in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, through baptism received the grace of the Holy Spirit and Sonship, and is revered as the image of God the Word, like the image of an Emperor, and after the resurrection became unchangeable in disposition and quite sinless ; (b) who (Theodore) further says : The union of God the Word with Christ is of the same kind, according to the Apostle Paul (Eph. v. 31), as that between man and wife, the two become one flesh ; (c) who, besides countless other blasphemies, dared also to say : When the Lord, after the resurrection, breathed upon the disciples with the words : "Receive the Holy Ghost" (S. John xv. 28), He had given them not the Holy Ghost Himself, but breathed upon them *σχήματι μόνον* (only to point to the Holy Ghost) ; (d) he said further : The words which Thomas, after feeling Him, spoke : "My Lord and my God" (S. John xx. 28), had reference not to Christ, but to God who raised Christ up ; (e) and, what is worse, in his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, Theodore compares Christ with Plato, Manichæus, Epicurus, and Marcion, and says that, as each of these invented his own doctrine, and thus gave to his disciples the name of Platonists, Manichæans, etc., in the same way Christians were named after Christ, who invented a new doctrine. Whoever defends Theodore thus blaspheming, and does not anathematise him and his adherents, let him be anathema.

12. Whoever defends those writings of Theodoret, which he composed in opposition to the right faith, against the Synod of Ephesus, and against Cyril and his twelve anathematisms, and in which Theodoret teaches and maintains only a *σχετικὴ ἔνωσις* of the Word with a man, saying that Thomas had touched the Risen One, but adored Him who raised Him up ; and in which he calls the teachers of the Church impious because they maintain an hypostatic union, and finally refuses to call the Virgin Mary the Godbearer,— whoever defends these writings of Theodore, and does not rather anathematise them, let him be anathema. For, on

account of these blasphemies, he was deposed from his bishopric, and was subsequently compelled by the holy Synod of Chalcedon to maintain the opposite of these writings of his, and to confess the true faith.

13. Whoever defends the impious letter which Ibas is said to have written to the Persian heretic Maris, in which the Incarnation of the Logos is denied, and it is maintained that not God the Word, but a mere man, named Temple, was born of Mary; in which, moreover, the first Synod of Ephesus is reviled, as though it had condemned Nestorius without examination and judgment; in which, finally, S. Cyril is called a heretic, and his twelve propositions designated as impious,— whoever defends this impious letter, and in whole or in part declares it to be right, and does not anathematise it, let him be anathema.

The edict then proceeds thus: “The adherents of Theodore and Nestorius maintain that this letter was accepted by the holy Council of Chalcedon. They thus do injustice to the holy Synod, and endeavour thereby to protect Theodore, Nestorius, and the impious letter from anathema, the letter which Ibas, when often questioned on the subject, never ventured to acknowledge as his. Thus, *e.g.*, Ibas at Tyre (more correctly, at Berytus, see secs. 196 and 169) declared, that, since the union of the Antiochenes with Cyril, he had never written anything against the latter, whilst, in fact, the letter to Maris is plainly composed after that union, and is full of insults against Cyril. Ibas thus denied the authorship. His judges (at Tyre and Berytus) therefore demanded that he should take action against that letter (*i.e.* anathematise Nestorius, etc.); and, as he did not comply, he was deposed, and Nonnus raised to his place.¹ When Ibas was subsequently again accused at Chalcedon, he did not venture to acknowledge that letter, but, immediately after its being read, said that he was far from that which was imputed² to

¹ We have already seen (sec. 196) that Ibas was declared innocent at Tyre. But he was deposed at the Robber-Synod. On Nonnus, see sec. 196.

² The Emperor concludes from this that Ibas did not acknowledge the letter as his; but he certainly meant only to declare the other accusations as false. The passage is in Mansi, t. vii. p. 250; Hardouin, t. ii. p. 531.

him as an offence; but the Synod, not satisfied with this denial of the letter, compelled him to do the reverse of that which was contained in the letter, namely, confess the true faith, accept the Synod of Ephesus, agree with S. Cyril, and anathematise Nestorius. It was therefore impossible that the Synod of Chalcedon should have approved of that letter. Even when in this letter mention is made of two natures and one Dynamis, one Prosopon, even here there is a mixture of the impiety of the author. Here, as in other writings, he regards the natures as hypostatized, but the *ἐν πρόσωπον* he refers to the unity of dignity and honour. That his opinions generally are heretical, he shows at the end of the letter, where he says: We must thus believe in the Temple, and in Him Who dwells in the Temple. . . . Like Him, Nestorius also united with expressions of orthodox sound an heretical meaning. . . . We, however, in all ways following the doctrine of the Fathers, have set forth as well the union of the two natures, of which our Lord Jesus Christ, one of the Trinity, the incarnate Word of God, is composed, as the difference (*διαφορά*) of these natures, which is not removed by that union.

“That would suffice, but the opponents also maintain that the letter of Ibas itself should not be rejected, because it is found in some copies of the Acts of Chalcedon. This objection is invalid, for we also find in the Acts of the Council passages from Nestorius and others. Besides, this letter is not found in the authentic Acts of Chalcedon;¹ and besides, anything brought forward by this or that member of a Synod has no force, but only that which is decreed by the assembly.² Whilst, further, some rejected the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia as impious, but would not anathematise his person, this is contrary to the word of Holy Scripture, which says: ‘For the ungodly and his ungodliness are both alike hateful unto God’ (Wisd. xiv. 9). When, however, they say that Theodore should not be anathematized after his death, they must know, that a heretic who persists in error until his end, is rightly punished in this manner for ever,

¹ It is found complete in the Acts we now possess. See sec. 196.

² An allusion to some utterances let fall at Chalcedon in favour of the letter. See secs. 196 and 258.

and even after his death, as it happened with Valentinus, Basilides, and others. . . . But that Theodoret was anathematised even in his lifetime, is shown distinctly by the letter of Ibas (sec. 196). They say further, that he should not be anathematised, because he died in Church communion. But only those die properly in Church communion who hold fast the common faith of the Church until the end; and the Mopsuestians themselves, as the Synod there (recently) showed, had long ago struck Theodore from the diptychs. Even Judas had communicated with the apostles, notwithstanding which the apostles rejected him after his death, and elected another in his place. . . .

“When they further adduce, in favour of Theodore, that Cyril had once commended him, this by itself proves nothing, for there are other heretics, who, before they were properly known, had been commended by holy Fathers, *e.g.* Eutyches by Leo, and besides, Cyril had, in many other places, expressed the strongest condemnation of Theodore. The allegation was false that Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzus had written letters full of the praise of Theodore. Gregory’s letter referred, not to Theodore of Mopsuestia, but to Theodore of Tyana; and the letter of Chrysostom is not full of praise, but full of blame, because Theodore had left the monastic life. If, then, John of Antioch and an Oriental Synod commended Theodore, these men had also (at Ephesus) condemned Cyril and defended Nestorius. Finally, we must refer to S. Augustine. When, after the death of Cecilian, it was maintained that he had done something contrary to ecclesiastical order, and some (the Donatists) had separated themselves from the Church on that account, Augustine wrote to Boniface (Epist. 185, n. 4), ‘If that were true which was charged against Cecilian, I should anathematise him even after his death.’ Moreover, a canon of the African Synod requires that bishops who bequeath their property to a heretic, shall be anathematised even after their death (see sec. 84, c. 15). Further, Dioscurus was anathematised by the Church in Old Rome after his death, although he had not offended against the faith,¹ but on account of a violation

¹ Not Dioscurus of Alexandria, but the antipope of that name, A.D. 530.

of ecclesiastical order. . . . Whoever, after this true confession and this condemnation of heretics, . . . separates himself from the Church, as though our piety consisted only in names and expressions, has to give account, for himself and for those led astray by him, on the day of judgment, to the great God and our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen."

SEC. 264. *Protest, Persecution, and two Flights of the Pope.*

After issuing this imperial edict, a great conference was held in the residence of the Pope, the Placidia Palace. Greek and Latin bishops of different neighbourhoods, and the priests, deacons, and clerics of Constantinople, were present. Even Theodore Ascidas was present.¹ Both Vigilius and Dacius of Milan warned them against receiving the new imperial edict; and the former, in particular, said: "Beseech the pious Emperor to withdraw the edicts which he has had drawn up, and await the (projected) œcumenical decree on the matter in question, until the Latin bishops, who have taken offence (at the condemnation of the three chapters), shall be either personally present at a Synod, or send their votes in writing. If he should not listen to your petitions, then you ought to give your assent to nothing which tends to a rending of the Church. If, however, you should do so, which I do not believe, you must know that, from that day, you are excommunicated from the apostolic see of Peter."² In a similar sense spoke Bishop Dacius of Milan: "I and a part of those bishops in whose neighbourhood my church lies, namely, from Gaul, Burgundy, Spain, Liguria, Æmilia, and Venetia, testify that whoever assents to those edicts, loses the Church communion of the bishops of the forenamed provinces, because I am convinced that those edicts infringe the sacred Synod of Chalcedon and the Catholic faith."³

¹ So relates Vigilius in his *Damnatio Theodori* (Ascidas), in Mansi, t. ix. p. 60; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 9.

² So relates Vigilius in his *Encyclica*, Mansi, t. ix. p. 50 sq.; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 3.

³ This speech of Dacius is preserved in the letter which the Italian clergy addressed to the Frankish envoys who were going to Constantinople. In Mansi, t. ix. p. 154; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 49.

The Anathema on Pope Honorius, and the Genuineness of the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council

From *A History of the Councils of the Church*, by the apostate Bishop Joseph Hefele, D.D., 1894, Volume 5, Book 16, Chapter 2, Section 324, Pages 181-205.

Because the apostate Bishop Hefele correctly believes that the Third Council of Constantinople did condemn Honorius for teaching heresy and as a heretic, he is able to refute apostates like Baronius who believe that the Third Council of Constantinople's decrees were corrupted and thus Honorius was not condemned for teaching heresy or as a heretic. However, Hefele was a heretic himself regarding this matter because he did not accept the councils' infallible judgments that Honorius taught heresy. (In this book, see the last paragraph in the section "Beware of the papal idolaters, heretics, and liars who excuse Honorius," p. [75](#).)

SEC. 324. *The Anathema on Pope Honorius, and the genuineness of the Acts of the sixth Œcumenical Council.*⁴

If we have so far given extracts from the Acts of the sixth Œcumenical Council, we are now required to examine more closely the question respecting the anathematising of Pope Honorius. It is in the highest degree startling, even scarcely credible, that an Œcumenical Council should punish with anathema a *Pope* as a heretic! In order to get rid of all the difficulties resulting from such a fact, Baronius and his followers have maintained that the Acts of the Council which speak of the anathema on Honorius are *forged*, whilst others have thought that the Acts indeed are genuine, but that the Council condemned Honorius, not for heresy, but for *negligence* (because he was silent at the wrong time). Both of these attempts at explanation have recently been quite decidedly opposed by Professor Pennacchi in Rome, the most distinguished of the later *defenders* of Pope Honorius.

⁴ This section receives many alterations and additions in the second edition.

He has most distinctly maintained that the Acts of the sixth Ecumenical Council are genuine, and that in them Pope Honorius was anathematised as a real heretic (*formalis*).¹

That, however, the sixth Ecumenical Synod actually condemned Honorius on account of *heresy*, is clear beyond all doubt, when we consider the following collection of the sentences of the Synod against him.

(1) At the entrance of the thirteenth session, on March 28, 681, the Synod says: "After reading the doctrinal letter of Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus of Phasis (afterwards of Alexandria) and to Pope Honorius, and *also the letter of the latter to Sergius, we found that these documents were quite foreign (omnino alienas) to the apostolic doctrines, and to the declarations of the holy Councils and all the Fathers of note, and follow the false doctrines of heretics. Therefore we reject them completely, and abhor (βδελυττόμεθα) them as hurtful to the soul. But also the names of these men must be thrust out of the Church, namely, that of Sergius, the first who wrote on this impious doctrine. Further, that of Cyrus of Alexandria, of Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, and of Theodore of Pharan, all of whom also Pope Agatho rejected in his letter to the Emperor. We punish them all with anathema. But along with them, it is our universal decision that there shall also be shut out from the Church and anathematised the former Pope Honorius of Old Rome, because we found in his letter to Sergius, that in everything he followed his view and confirmed his impious doctrines (κατὰ πάντα τῇ ἐκείνου [of Sergius] γνώμη ἐξακολουθήσαντα καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβῆ κυρώσαντα δόγματα).*"²

(2) Towards the end of the same session the second letter of Pope Honorius to Sergius was presented for examination, and it was ordered that all the documents brought by George, the keeper of the archives in Constan-

¹ Pennacchi remarks (p. 275), in opposition to me: "Secundam doctissimi episcopi quæstionem prætermittere possem: siquidem et ego fateor (*et fateri id etiam omnes illi debent qui veritatem amant*) Honorium in vi. synodo ut hæreticum damnatum fuisse. Further remarks on Pennacchi's attempt at a solution of the question of Honorius will be found below in this section, p. 188.

² Mansi, t. xi. p. 554 sq.; Hardouin, t. vi. p. 1332 sq.

tinople, and among them the two letters of Honorius, should immediately be burnt, as hurtful to the soul (see p. 169).

(3) Again, the sixth Œcumenical Council referred to Honorius in the sixteenth session, on August 9, 681, at the acclamations and exclamations with which the transactions of this day were closed. The bishops exclaimed: "Many years to the Emperor, many years to the Roman Pope Agatho, many years to the Patriarch George of Constantinople, etc. Anathema to the heretic Sergius, to the heretic Cyrus, to the *heretic Honorius*, to the heretic Pyrrhus," etc., etc. (see p. 173).

(4) Still more important is that which took place at the eighteenth and last session, on September 16, 681. In the decree of the faith which was now published, and forms the principal document of the Synod, we read: "The creeds (of the earlier Œcumenical Synods) would have sufficed for knowledge and confirmation of the orthodox faith. Because, however, the originator of all evil still always finds a helping serpent, by which he may diffuse his poison, and therewith finds fit tools for his will, we mean Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, former bishops of Constantinople, also *Honorius, Pope of Old Rome*, Cyrus of Alexandria, etc., so he failed not, by them, to cause trouble in the Church by the scattering of the heretical doctrine of one will and one energy of the two natures of the one Christ" (see p. 173 f.).

(5) After the papal legates, all the bishops, and the Emperor had received and subscribed this decree of the faith, the Synod published the usual *λόγος προσφωνητικός*, which, addressed to the Emperor, says, among other things: "Therefore we punish with exclusion and anathema, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter; also Cyrus, and with them *Honorius, formerly bishop of Rome, as he followed them*" (see p. 176 f.).

(6) In the same session the Synod also put forth a letter to Pope Agatho, and says therein: "We have destroyed the fort of the heretics, and slain them with anathema, in accordance with the sentence spoken before in your holy letter, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, *Honorius*, Cyrus," etc. (see p. 178).

(7) In closest connection with the Acts of the sixth Œcumenical Synod stands the imperial decree confirming their resolutions. The Emperor writes: "With this sickness (as it came out from Apollinaris, Eutyches, Themistius, etc.) did those unholy priests afterwards again infect the Church, who before our times falsely governed several churches. These are Theodore of Pharan, Sergius the former bishop of this chief city; also *Honorius, the Pope of Old Rome* (ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ Ὀνώριος ὁ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ρώμης πάπας γενόμενος), the *strengtheners* (confirmer) of *heresy* who contradicted himself (ὁ τῆς αἵρέσεως βεβαιωτῆς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ προσμαχόμενος).¹

"We anathematise all heresy from Simon (Magus) to this present, . . . besides, we anathematise and reject the originators and patrons of the false and new doctrines, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, . . . also Honorius, who was Pope of Old Rome, who in everything agreed with them, went with them, and strengthened the heresy (ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ Ὀνώριον τὸν τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης πάπαν γενόμενον, τὸν κατὰ πάντα τούτοις συναϊρέτην καὶ σύνδρομον καὶ βεβαιωτὴν τῆς αἵρέσεως" (see p. 178 f.).

Following Pighius and others, Baronius negatived this with a great expenditure of words, and some have followed him.¹

The passages in which the sixth Ecumenical Synod pronounces anathema on Honorius, are partly such as consist of only a few words, partly longer and made up in part from several propositions. To get rid of the first of these, Baronius assumed that some words had been *erased* from the genuine minutes, and others introduced in their place. In order, however, to set aside the longer passages, he united with the first hypothesis a second, that several forged leaves had been inserted in the genuine minutes. Erasure and interpolation were assumed, and Archbishop Theodore of Constantinople was declared to be the author of this great falsification.

If we put the scattered fragments of Baronius closely and clearly together, we get the following result: Shortly before the beginning of the sixth Ecumenical Council, Theodore of Constantinople, on account of his leaning to Monothelitism, was cast from the patriarchal chair, and George was raised to it (see p. 148). But after George's death, soon after the end of the sixth Council, Theodore succeeded in getting reinstated, after he had set forth a confession which — in appearance — was orthodox. Certainly this Theodore was not passed over in silence by our Synod, but, like his predecessors, Sergius, Pyrrhus, etc., he was smitten with anathema. Only *three* among the later patriarchs of Constantinople, Thomas, John, and Constantine, were exempted from anathema in the thirteenth session; from which it follows that they pronounced the same upon Theodore, whom they did not exempt. But after Theodore

¹ Albert. Pighius, *Diatriba de Actis vi. et vii. Concilii*. Baron. *ad ann.* 680, 34; 681, 19-34; 682, 3-9; 683, 2-22. Barrual, *Du Pape et de ses droits*, pt. i. c. 1. Roisselet de Saucières, *Histoire des Conciles*, Paris 1846, t. iii. p. 117. The hypothesis of Baronius was received with modifications by Boucat, *Tract. de Incarnatione*, Diss. iv. p. 162, and recently by Damberger, *Synchronist. Gesch. des Mittelalters*, Bd. ii. S. 119 ff.

had again become Patriarch, he naturally planned to remove his name from the Acts of the Synod, and as he had control of the original of the Acts,¹ he was in a position to carry out his plan. He found, then, his own name anathematised along with that of Sergius in four places: in the minutes of the sixteenth and eighteenth sessions, in the *λόγος προσφωνητικός*, and in the letter of the Synod to Agatho (see above, p. 183, Nos. 3-6). As there were only a few words which testified against him, he erased these from the original, and instead of his own name inserted the name of Honorius, which was about the same size, and in the uncial writing looked very much the same, *ΟΝΩΡΙΟΝ* instead of *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΝ*. He could at the same time, by this means, give satisfaction to his hatred against Rome. But the anathema on Honorius must not be allowed to fall into the Acts like a *Deus ex machina*. On the contrary, as foundation and introduction, a kind of examination must be inserted before it, and with this end in view Theodore invented the fiction, that, in the twelfth session, the letters of Honorius were presented for examination (read), and then the condemnation followed at the thirteenth. This fiction could best be introduced into the minutes of the eleventh session, for towards the end of this session a passage was read from a writing of Macarius, the Monothelite patriarch of Antioch, in which he declared that the departed Pope Honorius held his opinions. Against this assertion the papal legates certainly protested immediately; but Theodore struck out this protest, re-wrote the Acts of the twelfth and thirteenth sessions, added his fiction to the genuine part thus treated, and then inserted the new leaves or sheets in the synodal Acts, instead of the genuine ones which he cut out.

Thus Baronius. But, apart from the synodal Acts, as we know, many other ancient documents testify of the anathema on Honorius. And these, too, must be set aside. First of all, among these are found the two edicts of confirmation, the

¹ But the original was not in the patriarchal archives, but in the imperial palace, as we are assured by the deacon and notary Agatho, who wrote it, in his *ἐπίλογος*, in Combesis, *Hist. Monothel.*, in vol. ii. of his *Auctuarium Novum*, p. 199.

imperial and the papal (see pp. 184 and 185). Of the former, that of the Emperor, Baronius says not a syllable; he seems not to have known it. That of Pope Leo, on the other hand, he declares spurious, and in the same way all the other letters of Leo that refer to this matter (see above, p. 185).

But the *Quinisextum* also, of A.D. 692, the seventh and the eighth Œcumenical Councils, and different Popes and other authorities, speak of the anathema on Honorius (see p. 186). Certainly, says Baronius; but Theodore practised his deception so early, that even the first copies of the synodal Acts which were sent out from Constantinople were falsified, particularly the copy which the papal legates took back to Rome. Thus those later Synods and Popes had merely falsified Acts before them, and, not suspecting the deception, they drew from these the information respecting the anathema on Honorius.

I admit that one might believe that not Baronius, but a great master of the new *critica mordax*, must have invented this highly complicated and more than bold hypothesis, this great and heavy structure standing upon such weak feet. A series of learned men of name have already exposed its groundlessness, particularly Combefis,¹ Pagi,² Garnier,³ Natalis Alexander,⁴ Mamachi,⁵ the Ballerini,⁶ Joseph Simon Assemani,⁷ Palma,⁸ Chmel,⁹ and others. On account of the importance of the subject, however, the following new examination may not be superfluous, which will make use of the material brought together by previous scholars, bring out

¹ Combefis (French Dominican), *Dissert. apologetica pro Actis sextæ Synodi*, p. 66 sqq. in the Appendix to his *Historia Monothelit.* in his *Auctuarium Novum*, t. ii. An extract from it is given by Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, t. vi. p. 67 sqq.

² Pagi, *ad ann.* 681, 7 sqq.; 683, 4 sqq.

³ Garnier, *De causa Honorii*, in the Appendix to his edition of the *Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontif.* p. 1680.

⁴ Nat. Alexander, *Historia Eccles.* Sec. vii. Diss. ii. Propos. i. p. 514 sqq., ed. Venet. 1778.

⁵ Mamachi, *Originum et Antiquitatum*, t. vi. p. 5.

⁶ Ballerini, *De Vi ac ratione Primatus*, p. 306.

⁷ *Biblioth. juris orient.* t. iv. p. 119 sqq.

⁸ Palma, *Prælectiones Hist. Eccl.* t. ii. pt. i. p. 149, Romæ 1839.

⁹ Chmel (Prof. Prag.), *Vindiciæ Concilii Œcum. Sexti*, Pragæ 1777.

that which is important and striking in a condensed form, point out the objections with greater exactness, and add some useful new contributions.

(1) To begin, it is suspicious that Baronius is unable to bring forward a single witness from antiquity on his side. In no single Greek MS. of the Acts of the sixth Council, in no single ancient version, are the passages relating to Honorius lacking, and not one scholar, not one critic, not one prince of the Church, not one defender and commender of the Roman see, before Baronius and Pighius, has even dreamt that the Acts of the sixth Synod and the letters of Leo II. have all, conjointly and severally, been shamefully falsified.

(2) The foundation-stone on which Baronius builds is not merely rotten, it is only apparent; for the assertion that "the letters of Honorius are thoroughly orthodox, and therefore an anathema upon them would not be possible,"—this fundamental assumption is inadmissible, and we have already pointed out the truth of this matter (see above, p. 55).

(3) Apart from this, Baronius opines that, on the old principle, *Prima sedes non judicatur a quoquam*,¹ such a condemnation, especially of a Pope who was dead, could only be the result of an extended and thorough examination. Even in the case of Theodore of Mopsuestia, it was thought necessary to hold an (Ecumenical Synod (the fifth), and to have very full discussion at this, before they pronounced anathema upon him after his death. As, however, the matter is represented in the Acts of the sixth (Ecumenical Synod, Honorius appears to have been condemned almost *en passant*, after his letters had been read, and without careful examination of their contents. Indeed, the first anathema on him was pronounced in the thirteenth session, even before his second letter had been presented. Besides, it was not credible that the Roman legates should have concurred in the condemnation of a Pope without protest. That would certainly have rendered necessary lengthy negotiations, at least between them and the holy see, of which there is nowhere any trace. Besides this, the Synod, in the thirteenth session and in the letter to Pope Agatho, as well as the

¹ Cf. on this, *Hist. of Councils*, vol. i. p. 128.

Emperor in his letter to Leo II., represented the matter as though, with the exception of Macarius, only those men had been anathematised whom Pope Agatho had designated in his letter as deserving condemnation, and among those the name of Honorius was certainly not found. On the contrary, Agatho said that his predecessors had *semper* strengthened their brethren in the faith, and when some bishops of Constantinople had introduced the innovation, they had never failed (*nunquam neglexerunt*) to admonish them.¹

To this we answer—

(a) That the proposition *Prima sedes*, etc., which occurs in a forged synodal Act of A.D. 303, had universal prevalence in antiquity, is a statement which is greatly in need of proof. Pope Hadrian II. himself allows that in the matter of heresy the higher may be judged by the lower (see p. 187); and there has actually happened, in the course of centuries, much which does not agree with that principle. How they thought and acted in this respect at Pisa and Constance, it is not necessary to discuss.

(b) When Baronius speaks of a condemnation of Honorius *en passant*, he forgets that the public sessions, whose Acts we possess, were preceded by many preliminary discussions. The result of these appeared in the public sessions. Thus there was certainly much debate held on the subject of the decree of the faith, which seems to have been accepted at the eighteenth session without any consultation, and in consequence of this *the* formula, on which they agreed, was presented in the public session. This was the practice at many Synods, and, as is well known, at Trent.

(c) Baronius maintains that the papal legates at the sixth Synod could not possibly, without permission from Rome, have consented to the condemnation of Honorius; but it does not follow, because the synodal Acts give us no information on the point, that the legates had no authority. In fact, several scholars are of opinion that Pope Agatho had, in his private instructions to the legates, imparted

¹ Mansi, t. xii. p. 242 sq.; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 1082 sq.

to them this authority.¹ Moreover, as is well known, it has often happened that papal legates overstepped their authority, thus, *e.g.*, in a very remarkable manner in the negotiations with Photius, A.D. 861, and in the case of the marriage of King Lothar of Lotharingia, A.D. 863, nay, only a few years before the sixth Ecumenical Council, Roman legates twice overstepped their powers, A.D. 649 and 655 (see pp. 118 and 128 f.). If, however, the legates made no attempt to ward off the anathema from Honorius, that probably was because the Greeks had also wanted to free from anathema their departed patriarchs, who were more guilty than Honorius. They certainly attempted this at the sixteenth session.

(d) Moreover, it is by no means surprising, as Baronius thinks, that the name of the deposed patriarch, Theodore of Constantinople, is not found among those anathematised by the Synod. This anathema extended *nominatim* only to the dead, and to those among the living who now still decidedly opposed the orthodox doctrine. Who can, however, assert this of Theodore, of whom we know that soon after this he was restored to the patriarchal chair, and gave in an orthodox confession of faith? The Emperor declares, in his letter to Leo II: "Solus cum iis, quibuscum abreptus est, defecit Macarius";² thus only Macarius of Antioch and his associates fell decidedly away. The names of the latter are repeatedly specified, also by Anastasius, in his *Vita Agathonis* (Mansi, t. xi. p. 168), to which Baronius willingly appeals. But Theodore's name is not found there. They were sent to Rome, and delivered to the Pope for their improvement, as the same Anastasius tells us; and again, Theodore is not there. We may surely assume that the former patriarch of Constantinople, being higher in rank, would hardly have been included among the mere adherents of one lower in rank, the (former) patriarch of Antioch, without special mention of his name.

(4) The assumption that several leaves or sheets were

¹ Pagi, *ad ann.* 681, 8, 9; Walch, *Ketzerhist.* Bd. ix. S. 423.

² Mansi, t. xi. p. 715; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 1462. I know well that Baronius contests this letter also. But more of this hereafter.

inserted between the minutes of the eleventh and fourteenth sessions is thoroughly arbitrary, a mere imitation of that which happened with the Acts of the fifth Œcumenical Synod. Into these, two entirely or partially forged letters of Pope Vigilius, representing them as favourable to the Monothelites, had been inserted by later hands.¹ Although so long a period as one hundred and thirty years had elapsed since Vigilius, the papal legates protested directly at the sixth Council quite energetically against these two letters, and obtained their rejection. The same would certainly have happened at the seventh Œcumenical Synod in regard to the documents regarded by Baronius as spurious; for

(a) The honour of Pope Honorius was thereby much more assailed than the memory of Vigilius by those two letters; and nevertheless the papal legates at the seventh Œcumenical Council did not raise the slightest scruple against them when the anathema on Honorius was renewed. If they had not been convinced of the historical fact, they would certainly have contested, they would have been obliged to contest, the statement, that a hundred years ago even a Pope was anathematised.

(b) In the case of Vigilius, the question was concerned with two brief letters, each with one false word, *unam operationem*, with letters written far away (at Constantinople), and yet they knew at Rome, after one hundred and thirty years, so many had elapsed between the fifth and sixth Œcumenical Synods, that these had been falsified. Now, however, the question had regard to a quite different and more significant fact, whether the Pope had been anathematised; and, in connection with this, is it possible that so soon they should have been without accurate information at Rome? Baronius supposes that the falsification of the Acts took place soon after the close of the sixth Œcumenical Council, and that falsified Acts were even given to the Roman legates to take home with them. Certainly the oral testimony of the returned legates would immediately have brought the forgery to light; but no! the Romans believed the falsified Acts and not the legates, and good-naturedly accepted the

¹ See above, pp. 154, 156, 170 ff.; and vol. iv. p. 265.

hoax, that last year the Pope had been anathematised! What would Baronius have said if anyone had in the same way expected him to believe that Pope Leo x. was anathematised at the Council of Trent?

(5) As it is with the insertion of Acts, so also is it with the pretended erasures. The one is as pure an invention as the other, and nowhere is there even the slightest trace of a proof or testimony for it. Here, too, the oral information of the legates must have discovered the deceit.

Besides, the erasure would not have extended merely to a single word, as Baronius represents the matter, but to sentences. In the eighteenth session we have it once, *ἐπὶ καὶ τὸν Ὀνώριον τὸν γενόμενον Πάπαν τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης*; in the other passage, *καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς Ὀνώριον τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης γενόμενον πρόεδρον, ὡς ἐκείνοις ἐν τούτοις ἀκολουθήσαντα*; and in the edict of confirmation of the Emperor, "he anathematised the originators and patrons of the new heresy, . . . *ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ Ὀνώριον τὸν τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης πάπαν γενόμενον, τὸν κατὰ πάντα τούτοις συναιρέτην καὶ σύνδρομον καὶ βεβαιωτὴν τῆς αἵρέσεως.*" Almost the same words are found in this letter of confirmation once more (see p. 177). Here an alteration from *ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΝ* to *ΟΝΩΡΙΟΝ* was by no means sufficient.

(6) In the interest of his hypothesis, Baronius makes the falsifier Theodore to be restored to the chair of Constantinople about a year earlier than this actually took place (682 instead of 683),¹ so that he may have time to exercise his act of erasure and interpolation before the departure of the papal legates. If this chronology is incorrect, and it is so according to the testimony of the Chronography of Theophanes (*ad ann. 676, secundum Alexandrinos*), which relates that the Patriarch George lived after the sixth Œcumenical Synod, even into the third year, and so into the year 683, then the hypothesis of Baronius falls of itself. The papal legates returned to Rome with the Acts of the Council in the year 682, *before* the restoration of Theodore. But even if the chronology of Baronius were true, the *oral* testimony of the legates would have brought the falsification to light.

¹ This is proved by Pagi, *ad ann. 682, 7.*

Yes, even if the legates had all been faithless, and had helped the deception, information as to the truth would have found its way into the world by the many other members of the Synod, Greeks and Latins. Or if they all, about two hundred, and also the excellent Emperor, had unanimously agreed to the deception, that would not have availed them! Even if the truth had found nothing but enemies, and the falsifier nothing but friends and helpers of helpers, not only in all Asiatics, Egyptians, Greeks, etc., but even in the Latins present! Combefis, moreover (*l.c.* p. 145), attaches importance to this, that even *before* the multiplication of the whole contents of the Acts of the sixth Synod, five copies of its decree of the faith were signed in the presence of the bishops by the Emperor, and were sent to the five patriarchs (see above, p. 177). These copies, however, were older than the restoration of Theodore, and yet there is found in them the anathema on Honorius.¹

(7) Baronius was not acquainted with the *ἐπίλογος* of the Constantinopolitan notary and deacon Agatho, first published by Combefis (see p. 177, note 2). This official declares that, about thirty-two years before, he had served the sixth Œcumenical Synod as secretary, and had written the minutes and the five copies of the decree of the faith intended for the five patriarchs. He is now urged to draw up this paper by the rage with which the new Emperor, Philippicus Bardanes, persecuted orthodoxy and the sixth Œcumenical Synod. He had also ordered that the names of Sergius and *Honorius*, and the others *anathematised* by the *sixth Œcumenical Synod* (*καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου ἐκβληθέντων καὶ ἀναθεματισθέντων*), should be restored to the diptychs.² This notary who drew up the minutes of the sixth Œcumenical Synod must have known whether the Synod anathematised Honorius or not. His

¹ This argument is not quite stringent, for it were possible that the copy destined for Rome might be given to the legates, and might have remained with them in Constantinople until the year 682, and so until the restoration of Theodore (according to the chronology of Baronius).

² Combefis, *Novum Auctuarium*, t. ii. p. 204; Mansi, t. xii. p. 190.

book was composed long after the death of Theodore, and so was certainly not falsified by him.

(8) A principal evidence against the theory of Baronius is given by the letters of Leo II. He was obliged, therefore, to declare them to be falsified, piling up chance upon chance, castle in the air upon castle in the air. Why he also objected to the letter of the Emperor against Leo¹ is not quite clear. There is nothing said there of Honorius, and it could embarrass him only so far as the letter of Leo to the Emperor, which he was positively obliged to set aside, is an answer to it. Against the letter of Leo to the Emperor, however, the passage in which testifying against Honorius we gave above (p. 179), Baronius (683, 13-17) brings two objections :

(a) In a Latin translation from the Greek text of the letter there is added at the end the chronological note: *Datum Nonis Maii indictione x.* (= May 7, 682). In the letter itself, however, it is said that the papal legates who were at the Synod had come back in July 682 to Rome. This is a plain contradiction, and therefore the letter is spurious. But it is more probable that there is a slip of the pen in that chronological note, and that Indict. xi. should be read instead of x.; indeed, it were better to pay no attention to it, as it stands only in one translation.

(b) In the same letter it is twice said: "We anathematise Honorius, etc., and all who died in their error." This, exclaims Baronius, is clearly a mark of falsification, for that Honorius did not die in heresy is proved by the solemn celebration of his funeral in Rome. But Honorius died before the final decision on the theological controversy was arrived at: he died as legitimate Pope, accused of heresy by no one; on the contrary, justified and commended by his contemporaries, especially in Rome (see pp. 52-60).

(9) Against the *Epistola Leonis II. ad Hispanos* (see p. 185), Baronius remarks (638, 18): The Pope says therein: "*Archiepiscopi sunt a nobis destinati,*" in order to be present at the sixth Œcumenical Synod. As a matter of fact, however, it was Agatho, and not Leo, who sent the legates, and among these there was no archbishop. We answer: (a) *Nobis*

¹ Baronius, *ad ann.* 683, 6.

is not to be translated, "I in my person," but, *We = the Roman see*. Quite in this manner does Gregory II. write to the Emperor Leo the Isaurian: "The Emperor Constantine Pogonatus wrote *to us* on the holding of the sixth Synod.¹ (b) It is incorrect to say that no archbishop was present as deputy of the Pope and of the West at the sixth Synod. Among the legates proper there was certainly none such, but besides them Archbishop John of Thessalonica and Stephen of Corinth subscribed the Acts, the former as *βικάριος* and *ληγατάριος*, the latter as *ληγάτος τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου Ῥώμης*; and Archbishop Basil of Gortyna in Crete subscribed as *ληγάτος τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης*.² All these three bishops belonged to *Illyricum Orientale*, thus to the patriarchate of Rome, and therefore to the Roman Synod (until Leo the Isaurian), and if they did not *personally* appear at the Roman Synod of 680, which preceded the sixth Ecumenical Council and appointed legates for it, yet they might have received authority either from this Synod or from the Pope *in specie*. In the case of Basil of Gortyna, the former seems to have been the case, hence his subscription, *ληγάτος τῆς συνόδου*, the latter with the two others, particularly as, without this, they were permanent vicars of the Pope, the archbishop of Thessalonica a long time back for Illyricum, the archbishop of Corinth for Hellas and Achaia, since the Emperor Justinian I. had separated those provinces from Illyricum.³ The statement objected to is now freed from all fault, if we will only read: "Archiepiscopi et episcopi." If we do not, we may either hold that *archi* is an addition of the *librarius*, or assume that the title of archbishop is not used here in the sense of metropolitan, but in the wider meaning, and one which at an early period was very common, of a *specially venerable bishop*. To this day there is a clear distinction in the Greek Church between archbishop and metropolitan. The former is only a title of honour.

¹ Mansi, t. xii. p. 968; Hardouin, t. iv. p. 10.

² See above, p. 150.

³ Cf. Petr. de Marca, *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii*, lib. v. c. 19, 2, 3; and c. 29, 11.

Baronius further (693, 22) throws suspicion upon the letter of Leo *ad Hispanos*, for this reason, that in it is said that the Pope temporarily sent to the Spaniards only some passages of the Acts of the sixth Council, the decree of the faith, the *λόγος προσφωνητικός*, and the Emperor's edict of confirmation. The rest was not yet translated into Latin. The fourteenth Synod of Toledo, however, says distinctly: The Pope sent a transcript of the *gesta synodalia*.—But might not the three principal documents of the sixth Œcumenical Council be named the *gesta synodalia*? There is nothing said of "*integra gesta*," although Baronius represents the matter as though the Synod of Toledo had used that expression.¹

(10) Finally, the letter of Leo II. to the Spanish Ervig is declared to be spurious by Baronius (*ad ann.* 683, 20, 21), because it asserts that the Emperor wrote in Indiction ix. to Pope Agatho respecting the summoning of the sixth Œcumenical Synod. It was not to Agatho, but to his predecessor Donus that the imperial letter was addressed, and it belonged, not to the 9th, but to the 6th Indiction.—This objection has already been answered by Combefis and Pagi: (a) The chronological error is easily explained by a slip of the pen; (b) the naming of Agatho, however, instead of Donus is only a so-called *compendium historicum*, since Donus was no longer alive when the imperial letter was despatched, so that it was delivered to Agatho, and by him answered.²

(11) Assemani is surprised³ that Baronius has not brought in a striking utterance of Pope Nicolas I. in defence of his hypothesis. Nicolas writes, in his eighth letter to the Emperor Michael III. of Constantinople: "His (the Emperor's) predecessors had for a long time been sick with the poison of different heresies, and in regard to those who wanted to bring them deliverance, they had *either made them participators in their error, as at the time of Pope Conon, or had persecuted them.*"⁴

The allusion here made by Pope Nicolas, Assemani supposes, must have been to the Synod of Constantinople held by

¹ Combefis, *l.c.* p. 138; Pagi, *ad ann.* 683, 14.

² Combefis, *l.c.* pp. 154, 164; Pagi, *ad ann.* 683, 13.

³ *Biblioth. juris orient.* t. iv. p. 549; t. v. p. 39.

⁴ Baron. *ad ann.* 686, 4; Pagi, *ad ann.* 686, 7.

Justinian II., in the year 686, at which Justinian, in the presence of the papal representative and many patriarchs and archbishops, etc., had the original minutes of the sixth (Ecumenical Synod read, and sealed by them.¹ On this occasion, Assemani supposes, a deception might well have been practised, as Baronius assumes.—But Baronius saw quite correctly, when he did not use this as favouring his hypothesis; for a falsification of the Acts in the year 686 was for him about *four* years too late. He would then have had to allow that the genuine Acts had come to Rome before, even four years before,—that is, he would have annihilated his own hypothesis.

(12) What has so far been said in opposition to Baronius is also partially valid against Boucaut,² who felt compelled to introduce a modification into the hypothesis of Baronius. After the eleventh session, he supposes, the Synod ceased to be a *legitima*, and therefore the condemnation of Honorius did not result from the sentence of a valid Ecumenical Synod. In proof he adduces these facts: (*a*) After the eleventh session the papal legates left; and (*b*) after the end of the eleventh session, one of the papal legates, Bishop John of Portus, in the presence of the Emperor, etc., celebrated in the Church of S. Sophia a solemn Mass, according to the Latin rite, in thanksgiving for the happy ending of the Synod.

Both assertions are entirely groundless; for (*a*) it is a fact, and a glance at the synodal Acts show, that the papal legates were also present at the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, in short, at all the eighteen sessions until the close of the Synod, and at the last subscribed the Acts; (*b*) what Boucaut says of the high celebration of the papal legate John, he borrowed from the *Vitæ Pontificum* of Anastasius;³ but here it is expressly said that the solemn service was celebrated at the Easter festival, and thus, not after the eleventh, but after the fourteenth session.⁴ That it was sup-

¹ Mansi, xi. p. 737; Hardouin, t. iii. p. 1478.

² Anton Boucaut, *Tractat. De Incarnatione*, Diss. 4, p. 162. Cf. Chmel, *l.c.* p. 101.

³ In the *Vita Agathonis*, printed in Mansi, t. xi. p. 168.

⁴ Easter fell on April 14 in the year 681. The eleventh session was held on March 20; the fourteenth, April 5; the fifteenth, April 16, 681.

posed to be a service of thanksgiving for the happy ending of the Synod—of this Anastasius knows not a syllable; but he certainly says: In order to do honour to the Roman legates, one of them was permitted to celebrate the Easter festival divine service.

(13) More recently, Damberger has suggested a way of his own, yet one which in its chief principle is akin to that of Baronius, in his synchronistic history of the Middle Ages (Bd. ii. S. 119 ff.). The first half of the synodal Acts, he says, which are fairly (!) beyond suspicion, extends only to the ninth session *inclusive*. The Acts of the later sessions have been falsified. The Greeks could not bear that a number of patriarchs of proud Constantinople should be anathematised, and therefore in order, so to speak, to restore the equilibrium, *plainly without the knowledge of the papal legates* (!), inserted the name of Honorius into the anathematizations of the Acts. As the Acts now lie before us, they show, onwards from the tenth session, everywhere “the cunning of the Byzantine spirit of falsehood,” and Damberger “is *astonished* that Western Church writers, and not mere compilers of compendia but genuine investigators, accepted the Acts in question as genuine.” Only Gallicans, he thinks, have contended for the genuineness of this “Greek chaos of Acts,” because they could nowhere else find proof for the superiority of an Œcumenical Council over the Pope.¹ In the further development of his view, Damberger departs very widely from Baronius, maintaining that (a) the genuine Acts of the sixth Synod were certainly sent to Rome, but the present Acts are a falsified extract from the genuine; (b) the seventh and eighth Synods, and the Popes Leo II. and Hadrian II., had certainly lauded the Acts of the sixth Œcumenical Council, *i.e.* the genuine Acts which lay before them; of this, however, that the sixth Œcumenical Synod had pronounced anathema on Honorius, nothing was known to them; (c) indeed, this was never mentioned until Michael Cerularius renewed the schism in the eleventh century; (d) the genuine Acts have been lost in Rome; but Leo II. and Hadrian II. still possessed them.

¹ But even decided Curialists, like Pennacchi, *l.c.* p. 193 sqq., defend the genuineness of the Acts of the sixth Œcumenical Council.

We have now a series of surprises.—The seventh and eighth Œcumenical Synods knew nothing of the anathema on Honorius! But in the decree of the faith of the seventh Synod, it is said: “We therefore declare two wills and energies according with the properties of the natures in Christ, as also the sixth Synod in Constantinople taught, *anathematising* Sergius, *Honorius*, Cyrus, etc.” (*ἀποκηρύξασα Σέργιον, Ὁνώριον, Κύρον, κ.τ.λ.*).¹ And the eighth Œcumenical Synod says: “*Sanctam et universalem sextam synodum suscipientes . . . anathematizamus . . . Theodorum, qui fuit episcopus Pharan, et Pyrrhum, et Sergium, . . . atque cum eis Honorium Romæ, una cum Cyro Alexandrino, etc.*”²

Whether Pope Leo II. and Hadrian II. knew anything or nothing of the anathema on Honorius, everyone can answer who has read their utterances (pp. 180–185). They speak in the most forcible manner of the anathematising of Honorius, and lived several hundred years before Michael Cerularius. If Damberger finally asserts that Leo II. and Hadrian II. had before their eyes the genuine Acts of the sixth Council, Baronius will never forgive him, for everything in the past has taught us that, if Leo II. and Hadrian II. possessed the genuine Acts of the sixth Synod, then not the slightest doubt can be raised as to the anathema on Honorius.

¹ Mansi, t. xiii. p. 377 ; Hardouin, t. iv. p. 454.

² Mansi, t. xvi. p. 181 ; Hardouin, t. v. p. 914.

The apostate Hefele left out the main reason that condemns the apostate Baronius' lie because Hefele denies papal infallibility, just as Baronius does. Even if the decrees of the Third Council of Constantinople (681) were corrupted and thus Honorius was not condemned in it for teaching heresy or as a heretic (which is a huge lie!), infallible decrees in two future ecumenical councils (the Second Council of Nicea in 787 and the Fourth Council of Constantinople in 870), which Baronius does accept as authentic, did infallibly decree that Honorius taught heresy and was a heretic. Yet Baronius nevertheless believes that Honorius did not teach heresy and was not a heretic. Consequently, by denying and rejecting these infallible decrees in these two ecumenical councils, Baronius denies papal infallibility and has God the Holy Spirit (who cannot be deceived) lying, deceiving, or being deceived. Yet he would have us believe that his teachings and judgments, a man with no power to teach or judge infallibly, have more authority and credibility than popes' infallible teachings and judgments and thus have more authority and credibility than the teachings and judgments of God the Holy Spirit.

This is just more proof that the modern theologians from the 11th century onward have replaced the magisterium of the Catholic Church; that is, infallible papal decrees, which is the solemn magisterium, and the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers, which is the ordinary magisterium. Since 681 when the Third Council of Constantinople infallibly condemned Honorius for teaching heresy and as a heretic, no one until the 11th century even questioned these judgments in obedience to and respect for the magisterium. (See in this book "Beware of the papal idolaters, heretics, and liars who excuse Honorius," p. [75](#).)

Popes can be tried and deposed for many sins, by apostate Thomas Cajetan

Typical of the scholastics, the apostate Thomas Cajetan presents a dogma as an allowable opinion and thus not as a dogma and hence was a heretic on this point alone. He presents as an allowable opinion the dogma that a pope can be tried, sentenced, and deposed not only for heresy but also for any obstinate sin. And, even worse, he does not hold this opinion, this dogma. Therefore he is a formal heretic on this point for two reasons. Nevertheless, he presents the truth of the dogma in the following quote:

Apostate Thomas Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “[Chapter XXIV: The opinion that a pope proving incorrigible in any notorious offense causing scandal to the Church is subject to the power of the council and can be deposed by it.] Having dealt with the pope’s relationship to the council in a case of heresy, it is necessary to determine in cases other than of heresy if the pope is subject to the council’s deposing power in any such case. First, then, cases which truly are sins must be treated. Afterwards we shall speak of cases arising from certain circumstances.

“It is, therefore, the opinion of many that the pope can be deposed by a general council apart from a case of heresy,²³⁴ and this is proved under seven headings.

“First, by reason of crime: the pope can be deposed for the crime of heresy; therefore, for any other [crime]. The conclusion is proved: first of all, because either this is peculiar to the case of heresy on account of its gravity, and this [is] not [so], because hatred of God is a worse crime than heresy, as is obvious in Thomas;²³⁵ or on account of the harm to the Church, and this [is] not [so], because the pope could harm the Church more by selling all benefices, exalting the wicked, suppressing the good, exercising tyranny, a conspicuous example of vice, of blasphemy, avarice, etc., than by obstinately thinking that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, while he lives rightly otherwise and he alone holds this heresy. Second, because it is not found specifically stated in sacred Scripture that the pope can be deposed more for heresy than for any other crime, it remains, therefore, a matter for interpretation by the doctors and canon law. Just as Pope Boniface [I], pope and martyr,²³⁶ expounded the case of heresy in c. *Si papa* [D. 40 c. 6], so a case of crime incorrigible, notorious and scandalizing the Church can be excepted, as the [ordinary] gloss opines there. Third, because one who can [act] on the greater can [act] on the lesser, as in c. *Ex parte* [x 3.30.27]; but the council can judge the pope for the greater crime, namely, heresy; therefore, [it can do so] for the lesser, notorious simony, etc.

“Second, on account of abuse of power: for it is obvious that a sword can and should be taken from the hand of a madman, and one who attacks and kills bodies [can and should] be seized and, if he persists in his purpose, be placed in custody. How much more can a pope, whose rage leads to the damnation of souls, abusing the sword of papal power, be deprived of it like a madman and a drunk man, who are moved by the turmoil of their passions. He drives others to do evil by his example, as the apostle witnesses, saying to Peter, *How dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?* [Gal. 2:14]. The [ordinary] gloss [says], ‘by the example of conduct.’ And this is confirmed: if the pope wished to [unjustly] oppress or [unjustly] kill a woman, he could be repelled, struck and killed according to the standard of blameless response [cf. Cod. 8.4.1]. *A fortiori*, if he oppresses the Church and kills souls, he must first be resisted; and, if it is necessary, he must be ‘killed’ by deposition. This is confirmed by reference to the end of the power he received, because it is for edification not destruction.

“Third, on account of the obligation of the pope himself: the pope is bound to clear himself when he is charged with a scandalous crime, as is obvious in the cases of Damasus, who was

²³⁴ Footnote 197: “See Jean Gerson, *De ecclesiastica potestate*, Consideration 8: OC 6.223-5.”

²³⁵ Footnote 198: “II^o II^o q. 34 a. 2: *Opera* (Parma), vol. 3, p. 142.”

²³⁶ Footnote 199: “Actually, the text derived from Boniface, the apostle to the Germans.”

accused of adultery, as Jerome²³⁷ witnesses, and of Sixtus [III],²³⁸ and of Leo [IV] and of Symmachus in C. 2 q. 7 [c. 41 and p. c. 41 ¶ 10]. It also is proved by reason, because he is bound to feed his sheep, and it is obvious that scandal starves the sheep. Failing in his duty to clear himself, he must be judged; therefore, the pope can be judged by the Church for a crime other than heresy. It also is confirmed by the authority of Gregory [VI], who says in c. *Si quis* [C. 2 q. 7 c. 42], ‘If he wishes to accuse us about this or contends that we act outside our authority, let him come to the apostolic see, so that he may dispute justly with me there before blessed Peter’s confession,²³⁹ until, at last, one of us will receive his sentence.’ Gerson says²⁴⁰ that Gregory did this not from humility but from duty.

“Fourth, on account of the Church: because, just as the pope, the husband, can present a bill of divorcement to the Church, his spouse, by renouncing the papacy, so, conversely, since they should not be judged to have unequal rights in this regard. A more powerful argument is presented for her against her husband, either because he seeks to prostitute her in so far as he can, [treats] her with savage tyranny by rending or [flogging] her, by dissipating her goods, or because he strives to abuse her to the detriment of [her] children. This is confirmed because the correction or deposition of the prince belongs to the whole community..., if he persists in being incorrigible. This power cannot be removed or abdicated by a free community. How much more will the Church have it?

“Fifth, on account of divine providence: for, since *The works of God are perfect* [Deut. 32:4], and the Church is His immediate work, much more than the synagogue, to which He said, *What is there that I ought to do more...that I have not done it?* [Is. 5:4], it is necessary that the Church’s government and body be provided for perfectly. It is obvious that a body which cannot cut off or heal rotten members is not perfect but must sustain [them] with great harm evidently being done to the whole. Similarly, a government which cannot preserve the common and necessary good by cutting off those who notoriously usurp the common good, despoil it, etc., is not perfectly disposed. A pope who gives notorious scandal by simony, luxury, blasphemies, tyranny, promotion of the unworthy, etc., does all these things manifestly against the common good of the Church Militant, [which is] charity, and against the good of the [Church] Triumphant.

“Sixth, on account of the decrees and acts of the Councils of Constance and Basel: for, in the Council of Constance, John XXIII, whom they held to be the true pope, was deposed; and [so was] Benedict XIII, with the consent of his obedience. Also, in the Council of Basel, Eugenius IV was deposed; and Felix [V] was elected. Of old, many pontiffs were deposed, and not for heresy, like...Stephen [VI], Christopher, Benedict [IX], Gregory VI, John XII. This opinion is confirmed by the authority of many doctors taking the same view as those councils, as is obvious from the [ordinary] gloss on c. *Si papa* [D. 40 c. 6] and the following chapters.

“Seventh, on account of the nature of human judgment, namely, according to what is cited and proved or presumed by a judge, whence it results that, on account of presumption of heresy, a pope who is not a heretic can be deposed in many cases: when he is presumed to be a heretic on account of contumacy, according to c. *Cum contumaciam* [vi 5.7.3]; or by remaining in excommunication for a year for want of clearing himself, according to c. *Excommunicamus* [x 5.7.13]; or when, in fear of death, he acted heretically only in outward appearance, as is said of Marcellinus; or when he uttered heretical words unintentionally out of similar fear; or if he is convicted as a relapsed heretic by false witnesses; or when he could not prove his defense in a case concerning the faith.

²³⁷ Footnote 200: “This accusation is recorded not by Jerome but by Anastasius the Librarian; see C. 2, q. 7, p. c. 41 ¶ 9.”

²³⁸ Footnote 201: “See D. 1 c. 7.”

²³⁹ Footnote 202: “The shrine of Peter’s tomb in the old Vatican basilica.”

²⁴⁰ Footnote 203: “*De auferibilitate papae ab ecclesia*, Consideration 12: OC 3.301-2.”

“For these and similar [reasons] it is believed that the pope is subject to the general council’s judgment in many incorrigible cases, so that he can be deposed by it.”²⁴¹

²⁴¹ Contained in *Conciliarism and Papalism*, edited by J.H. Burns and Thomas M. Izbicki, 1997. C. 1 (Cajetan: On the comparison of the authority of pope and council), pp. 105-108.

Acts of St. Felix, Pope and Martyr

From *Sanctuarium*, by Mombritius, 1477, Volume 1, fols. 298b (col. 2), 299a (col. 1).

ris apud Germanā Constantiā constantiā
augustā : ut quasi per eius interuentiōē
rogatus : rediret liberius in ciuitatē Ro
manā, Tunc constantia augusta quæ fide
lis erat in dño Iesu christo : noluit rogare
Cōstantiū augustum Germanū suū: eo q̄
senferat consiliū eius; Eodē autem tem
pore Cōstantius augustus una cū Vrsatio
& Valente cōuocauerūt aliquos: qui ex
fide arrhyana erāt: & miserūt & reuoca
runt Liberium papam de cimiterio sanctæ
Agnētis martyris: & Ingressus est Ro
mā, In ipsa autem hora Cōstantius augu
stus fecit cōciliū cū hæreticis: simul etiā
cū Vrsatio & Valēte: & eiecit sanctū Feli
cem urbis episcopum de episcopatu suo:
qui erat catholicus & timens deum: & iu
stus homo: & reuocauit Liberiū in uicem
suam. Ab eodem uero die fuit persecutio
magna in clero: ita ut itra ecclesiā præby
teri & clerici necarent: & martyrio cor
onarētur; Quo depositus est sanctus
ac beatissimus papa Felix de episcopatu
suo: & habitauit in prædiolo suo: qui
est uia portuense: & leuatus exinde &
ductus i ciuitatem Corauā: passus est ibi
capite truncato: & martyrio coronatus
quarto idus nouembris; Ex inde raptū ē
corpus eius a præbyteris & clericis: & se
pultū in basilica: quā ipse cōstruxerat uia
aurelia q̄ntodecimo calēdas decēbres millia
rio secundo: cuius nataliciū celebratur.
Quarto calēdas augustas ad laudem &
gloriam nominis dei usq; in præsentē diē:
cui est honor & gloria in sæcula sæculorū

Passio factorum Felicis & Adacti Mar
tyrum.

ROmæ uia Ostiēsi mil
liario secundo ab urbe
sub Dioclitiano & Ma
ximiano imperatorib;
pfecto & iudice Draco
fuerūt duo fratres no
mine & ope Felices an bo p̄byteri. Ho
rū senior ex iussione Imperatoris: cū ad se
cretariū iudicis esset p̄ductus iuxta tēplū
Serapis dū cogere ad sacrificādū exulā

uit i faciē statue æræ: & statim cecidit.
Itē ductus ad Mercurii statuā in ædiculā
aliā: simili modo illā exulāuit: & corruit.
Itē ad simulacrū Dianæ: quod pari modo
defecit. Reductus ad p̄fectū iponif ecu
leo: inquisitusq; quibus hoc fecisset ma
leficiis: beatus Felix respōdit: Nō male
ficiis diaboli sed beneficiis omnipotentis
dei mei hoc egi. Furore itaq; accessus præ
fectus iussit eum duci extra urbem uia
ostiensis: quia illic arbor excellentissima
stabat dæmonibus consecrata: iuxta quā
erat templū: ut ibi ad sacrificandū impel
leretur: quo perductus oratione facta:
dixit ad arborē: Præcipio tibi in nomine
dñi mei Iesu christi: ut radicitus corru
as: & tēplū ac simulacrū uel aram eius
funditus cōminuas: ut amplius cultu tuo
animæ nō decipiantur: quæ statim ad uer
bum ipsius ita uersa est: ut & templū &
simulacrū cōminueret: & quod fuerat:
non appareret. quod ubi nuntiātū fuisset
p̄fecto: statim iussit eū decollari & c
rpus eius i humatū lupis & canibus dereli
qui. lata sententia obitus ei fuit quidā uir
christianus hominibus quidē abscondus
deo autē manifestus: hic cum didicisset:
beatum Felicē duci iussum esse: coepit cla
mare: & dicere: Et ego ex eadē lege sū:
& ipsum: quē hic p̄byter factus cōfitef:
dñm Iesū christum colo. Mox & ipse ab
officio p̄fecti cōphesus p̄ter dato sibi o
sculo cū beato Felice decollat⁹ ē. Hui⁹ no
men: quia nō iuenerūt christiani: post mo
dū Adactū eū appellauerunt: quod sã
cto martyri Felici auctus sit ad coronam:
ipsiq; pro fidei sue cōfessiōe corona mar
tyrii aucta sit. Christiani itaq; hos iueniē
tes ibi in eodem loco ubi arbor steterat: q̄
cadens nimā terræ altitudinē apuerat: q̄
eos sepelierūt: Quoꝝ corpora uolētes
pagani exinde effodere: cū manus appo
suerūt: a diabolo correpti sunt. Vbi po
stea pacis tempore basilica fabricata est:
& martyrū memoria digne exulta. Com
pleuerunt autē martyriū suū tertio ca
lendas septembres. Ad laudem & gloriā
dñi nostri Iesu christi: qui cum patre &
spiritu sancto uiuit & regnat in sæcula
f iii

From *Miscellanea*, by Stephan Baluzii, 1761, Volume 1, p. 33. Also contained in *Sanctuarium*, by Mombricitus, 1477, Volume 1, fols. 248a (col. 2), 248b (col. 1-2).

factum fuisset, sanctus ac venerabilis Pontius martyr-
ium suum Domino consummavit, & cum palma
victoriae anima ejus caelos petiit.

XXIV. Non inulto post tempore completus est
fermo quem sanctus Pontius praedixerat. Valerianus
scilicet Imperator in captivitate ductus a Sapore
Rege Persarum, non gladio, sed ludibrio omnibus
diebus vitae suae merita pro factis percepit, ita ut
quotienscunque Rex Sapor equum conscendere vel-
let, non manibus ejus, sed incurvato dorso & in cer-
vice ejus pede posito, equo membra locaret. Gal-
lienus vero cum Mediolanum intrare vellet, a mili-
tibus suis comprehensus, gladiis est confossus. Clau-
dius autem Praefes & Anabius assessor eadem hora
qua sanctus Pontius decollatus est, arrepti a daemo-
nibus suffocabantur. Nam Claudius linguam sibi mor-
sibus minutatim incidit. Anabij vero oculi e suis con-
cavis vi doloris evulsi, pellibus tenuissimis per ora
pendebant. Sicque factum est ut in momento tem-
poris uterque expiraret. Ob hoc factus est timor ma-
gus Iudaeis ac gentibus & omni illi civitati, ac se-
pulchrum sancti Pontij martyris admirabili venera-
batur honore.

vide Laet.
c. 5. de per-
sec.

XXV. Juvenis quidam Valerius, qui cum eo fue-
rat nutritus, timens corpus ejus metu gentilium au-
ferre, per noctem in eo quo jacebat sepelivit loco.
Gesta vero martyris ab exceptoribus pecunia redimens
& secum tollens, reperta navicula in Libyae partes
causa persecutionis declinavit. Dominus autem suscep-
it martyrem suum in pace, cui est honor, gloria,
potestas, & imperium in secula seculorum. Amen.

Explicit phisio beati Pontij martyris.

VITA SANCTI EVSEBII

Presbyteri Romani.

Anno Chri-
sti 317.

Eodem tempore quo Liberius de exilio revocatus
fuerat a Constantio Augusto haeretico, in eod-
em tantum dogmate ut non rebaptizarent populum,
sed una communione contaminarent plebem, Euse-
bius Presbyter urbis Romae coepit declarare Libe-
rium haeticum & amicum Constantij. Cumque mul-
ti sancta confessione & catholica fide vitarent com-
munionem Liberij per Eusebij Presbyteri doctrinam,
occupantur Ecclesiae a Liberio, eicitur Felix de epi-
scopatu, subrogatur Liberius, tenetur Eusebius Pre-
sbyter, & quod in domo sua, quam ipse constru-
xerat, populum congregaret, & quia confortaret ple-
bem sanctam. Tunc Constantius Imperator aggre-
ditur cum Liberio Eusebium Presbyterum dicens. Tu

solus Christianus es in urbe Roma? Eusebius Presby-
ter respondit: Sic confidimus in Domino, quia fi-
deles nos inveniet Christus, sicut & baptizati sumus
& benedictionem quam a beato Iulio suscepimus te-
nemus. Liberius dixit: Nos cujus fungimur vice?
Nonne Iulij anterioris nostri? Eusebius Presbyter di-
xit: Si perseverasses in fide quam in persecutione pri-
mo tenere visus fueras. Liberius dixit: Praesente Au-
gusto tam contumacem me existimas? Eusebius di-
xit: Res ipsa te docet & declarat. Imperator Con-
stantius dixit: Et quid est inter fidem & fidem? Eu-
sebius Presbyter respondit: Quantum ad nos pecca-
tores, integrè tenentes sumus. Quantum ad vos, in-
fania diaboli & invidia superstitionis vestrae, ut Fe-
licem Episcopum, quem vos non tacuitis catholi-
cum & Dominum Iesum Christum invocantem pu-
rum sacerdotem ab omnibus declaratum, in damna-
tionis causam exilio direxistis; qui tamen in praedio-
lo suo orationibus vacat. Et quidem jussu tuo Chri-
stianis occisionem & necem praecepisti inferri, maxi-
me Clericis & Presbyteris & Diaconibus. Tunc ira-
tus Constantius subrogatu Liberij includit Eusebium
Presbyterum in quodam cubiculo domus suae quod
humile erat in latitudine pedibus quatuor, & ibi mul-
tis mensibus in oratione constanter perseverans, in-
clusus tamen, post menses septem dormitionem ac-
cepit nonodecimo Kalendas Septembris. Cujus cor-
pus collegerunt Gregorius & Orosius Presbyteri pa-
rentes ejus, & sepelierunt in crypta juxta corpus beati
Sixti martyris & Episcopi via Appia in cimiterio
Calisti; ubi & titulum ejus scribentes posuerunt pro
commemoratione ejus: *Eusebio homini Dei*. Eodem
tempore auditum est a Constantio Imperatore eo
quod Gregorius & Orosius Presbyteri collegerunt
corpus Eusebij Presbyteri, & in eadem crypta vivum
praecepit includi Gregorium. Tunc Orosius Presby-
ter collegit semivivum beatum Gregorium noctu,
occulte propter Constantium Augustum, & emisso
spiritu, sepelivit eum juxta corpus sancti Eusebij Pre-
sbyteri. Qui etiam Orosius haec gesta conscripsit.
Ab eodem die intra Ecclesias jussu Constantij Im-
peratoris quisquis inventus fuisset non sic confiteri
vel participari sicut Liberius, indiscussus gladio pu-
niretur. Quapropter in plateis & in vicis & in Ec-
clesiis sive in balneis gladio trucidabantur, persequen-
te Constantio Christianos una cum Liberio. Mor-
tuo autem Liberio, levatur Damasus, qui voce pu-
blica damnavit Liberium facta synodo cum Episco-
pis viginti & octo & Presbyteris viginti & quinque;
& cessavit persecutio, non tamen inultum tempus,
donante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui vivit &
regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.