

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

life of the world. He thus fulfilled in every particular the typical teaching of the tabernacle service, to which these verses in the Epistle to the Hebrews so pointedly refer, and in elucidating which I have shown the perfect accord that exists between the teaching of our Communion office and the teaching of the Scriptures as concentrated in Heb. xiii. 10-12.

THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL.

ART. III.—SOME ACCOUNT OF THE TREATISE OF THE JESUIT SANCTARELLI, WHICH WAS BURNT IN 1626, BY A DECREE OF THE PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.

THE increasing influence of the Church of Rome in England, and the more aggressive action of the Court of Rome in all the countries of Europe, make it important to all who value the religious liberties which have been acquired for us by our forefathers at so great a cost to examine and estimate carefully the dangers which threaten both our Church and country, and which are fatally increased by the ignorance and indifference which reign around us in all directions on this subject of vital interest. The principles and practice of the Court of Rome, whenever it has been able to carry out its principles into practice, have never been changed, or even mitigated, in the slightest degree. The *semper eadem* remains the rule of all its course; and though the most terrible of the weapons of Rome and of her sanguinary decrees have been prudently hidden from view wherever and whenever it would be dangerous to expose them, they are still ready to be applied at any moment, when the power of applying them is regained.

A great and learned bishop of Italy, Mgr. Pannilini, of Chiusi and Pienza, just a century ago addressed the sovereigns of Europe in words of eloquent warning on the dangers with which the Bulls of Paul IV., and other equally aggressive Popes, threatened every Christian kingdom. Speaking of the Bull *Cum ex apostolatus officio* of that almost insane Pontiff, he writes: "Io prego i Sovrani per il bene de' loro sudditi a riflettere seriamente alle conseguenze di questi principij e di questo sistema, e ad esaminare alquanto l'istoria dei tumulti e delle sedizioni nati da molti secoli fino a poi. Io li prego a considerare che le usurpazioni, i sollevamenti, i tumulti, le depredazione, sono i premj proposti a coloro che *sub nostrâ et successorum nostrorum Romanorum Pontificum obedientiâ fuerint*; e il merito per arrivarvi è lo spogliarsi d' ogni senti-

mento d' Umanita, *omnique humanitatis solatio destituant.*"¹ The Bull from which these passages are taken was signed by thirty cardinals, and declares itself to be a law which can never be repealed ("*nostra haec in perpetuum valitura constitutio*"). It deprives all heretical kings, princes, nobles and rulers of their kingdoms and possessions, and invites all Catholic princes to invade and occupy their territories, condemning all such heretics to perpetual imprisonment and penance *in pane doloris et aqua moestitiae*, commanding that they should "be deprived of every comfort of humanity." We now ask, "Has this climax of Papal barbarity been ever repealed, or even modified?" Far from this, it was re-enacted by the sainted Pope Pius V. in a *Motus Proprius*, beginning "*Inter multiplices curas*," in the year 1567, who willed it *to be observed inviolably and to the letter* ("*inviolabiliter et ad unguem observari volumus*"). We remember that Pius himself carried out its sanguinary injunctions in his own person, by bribing his emissary Ridolfi to assassinate Queen Elizabeth, and by his Bull depriving her of her kingdoms (*Regnans in excelsis*). To him also is properly ascribed the terrible massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, though he did not live to see that inevitable result of his teaching and policy, as his letters to the King and Queen of France plainly indicate. In 1633 Urban VIII. confirms the Bull of Pius V. against heretics, and therewith also that of Paul IV., and republishes the Bull *in Coena Domini*, which, though it fell into a kind of abeyance through the fears of the subsequent Popes, has never been abrogated or officially suppressed.

In 1712 Pius V. was canonized, and his Bulls acquired a new and very suggestive authority. In the collect appointed for his anniversary he is said to have been raised up "to destroy the enemies of the Church" (*ad conterendos ecclesiae hostes*). We have seen the manner in which this mission was carried out, and have instances of its implacable cruelty in the martyrdoms of the noble Carnesecchi, whom he compelled the Duke of Tuscany to surrender to him while he was sitting at the ducal table, the learned Paleario, the brave Count Petiliano, the pious Bartoccio, the accomplished Zanetti, and countless others who were burned alive by his orders.

We now approach the immediate subject of these observations, the famous, or rather infamous, work of Antonio Sanctarelli "On Heresy," which was adopted by the Court of Rome as the orthodox teaching on this important question. It follows the earlier doctrine as laid down in its fullest form by the great advocate Farinacci in 1616, which was published with the

¹ "Atti dell' Assemblea tenuta in Firenze," 1786, tom. iv., p. 301.

authority of Pope Paul V., to whom, and to the College of Cardinals, it was dedicated. This formed the text-book on the subject in Germany, France and Italy, the Emperor of Germany and the King of France authorizing it as such. But the work of Sanctarelli is considerably in advance of that of Farinacci on the treatment of heretical and incapable princes by the Papacy, the legal education of the former having probably given him a more reasonable view of the claims and rights of sovereign princes.

The work of Sanctarelli is now comparatively rare, its condemnation by the Sorbonne, and still severer treatment by the Parliament of Paris, which adjudged it to be burned by the common hangman, leading to its suppression, and perhaps destruction, in France; hence it may be well to give a full account of it here. It was published in Rome, in quarto, by Zannetti in 1625, and is entitled "de Hæresi, Schismate, Apostasiâ, etc., et de potestate Romani Pontificis in his delictis puniendis." It is licensed and authorized by Vitelleschi, the General of the Jesuits; by Victricius, the assessor of the Inquisition and Governor of Rome; by the representatives of the Master of the Apostolic Palace, including the General of the Dominicans, Ridolfi; and is dedicated to the Cardinal of Savoy. It appears from the author's preface to be the first of a projected series of works on the Decalogue, comprising the articles lying within the first commandment. It was, however, both the first and the last contribution of the author to his intended work, and probably its unhappy fate discouraged him from proceeding in so large an undertaking. It would not be within the scope of these lines to give a full *résumé* of the doctrine of heresy laid down in the treatise, which resembles throughout that of Farinacci in all its ordinary features. We will therefore pass at once to its distinctive feature and characteristic—the treatment of heretical princes. This begins at chapter xxx. (p. 290), which is entitled, "De potestate quam habet Summus Pontifex in puniendis Principibus hæreticis."

"All princes," he writes, "are subject to the spiritual power of the Roman Pontiff, as appears from the Nicene Council, Can. 39, where it is said: 'Power is given to the Roman Pontiffs over all Christian princes and all their peoples.'" We need not remind the reader that the Nicene Council only put forth twenty canons, and that none of them gives any power to Rome beyond that of the other Patriarchs, the *πρεσβεία* of all three being preserved in all their original equality. He proceeds to show, on the very doubtful authority of the Constitution, *Unam Sanctam*, that the temporal power is under the spiritual, the one sword being subject to the other, alleging "that the Roman Pontiff is the shepherd of all the flock of

Christ, and therefore also of princes and kings, who otherwise would be outside the fold and church." He proceeds to assert that "the Pontiff, by reason of the power he has over the princes, can direct their temporal affairs to spiritual ends if they should swerve from them."

Thirdly, he alleges that "if a secular prince enjoins laws contrary to morality, the Roman Pontiff can ordain other laws and compel him to retract his legislation."

Fourthly, "he can punish heretical and evil princes by ecclesiastical censures." And here he brings the often-cited instances of Papal excommunications. At this point, however, he advances an argument, which, from its shameless perversion of the words of St. Paul, brought on him the keenest of the shafts of the Sorbonne censure. Quoting 2 Cor. x. 8: "For though I should boast somewhat more of our authority, which the Lord hath given us for edification, *and not* for your destruction," he reads it, "Which the Lord hath given us for edification *and* destruction" ("in ædificationem et destructionem vestram"). The habitual audacity of the members of the Society in misquotation probably never reached a higher point than this.

"Fifthly, I assert," continues Sanctarelli, "the Supreme Pontiff can punish heretical princes even with temporal penalties, wherefore it may not only excommunicate them, but even deprive them of their kingdoms, and release their subjects from obedience to them." And this he extends from heresy to insufficiency, quoting Paludanus, who writes: "The Pope can depose kings, not only for heresy or schism, or any other intolerable crime, but also for insufficiency," and approves of the opinion of another author, who says: "The Pope can depose a king on the ground of iniquity, or uselessness; he can depose an emperor and give his empire to another if he fails to defend the Church. Moreover, he can depose negligent kings." It is curious to trace the argument by which this wily Jesuit arrives at his monstrous conclusions. "The Church cannot err in matters of faith or morals, but it has always been the practice of the Church to inflict temporal penalties upon kings for the crime of heresy, and even of depriving them of their kingdoms, and laws to this effect have been passed and received by Catholics, and approved of as agreeable to the natural and divine law; therefore the Church can act thus, unless we admit that it can err in a matter of the gravest moment." "The Pope, moreover, has the power of punishing princes and kings when they are disobedient and incorrigible, therefore he can punish them by temporal penalties and free their subjects from their allegiance, inasmuch as his authority is not restricted to mere ecclesiastical censures."

Again, it was said to Peter and his successors, 'Feed my sheep.' But it belongs to a shepherd to inflict upon his sheep such punishment as is reasonable; wherefore, if the common good of the Church require the punishment of disobedient and incorrigible princes, they may be punished with temporal penalties, and deprived of their kingdoms by the chief shepherd, inasmuch as they are not beyond the folds of the Church." The same conclusion our author derives from the binding and loosing power given to Peter, which in his usual ignorance of Scripture he supposes to have been exclusively given to a single apostle. Arguing from the power of the Pope to punish ordinary heretics, he concludes that since the injury to the Church is much greater in the rulers than the ruled, the same power must exist in the one case as in the other. Though he holds that the Church has no power to punish infidel kings because of their infidelity, he asserts the authority of the Pope to free their subjects from their allegiance if they should become Christian. The whole argument is a series of variations on the same theme, being as daring an illustration of the *petitio principii* as could well be conceived even in the case of a Jesuit advocate.

In chapter xxxi. the author undertakes to reply to the many objections which he foresees will be raised against his theory. One of these is that, as the infidel princes are admitted to be free from Papal jurisdiction, Christian princes, by a subjection to it, would be in an inferior position to them, so that baptized persons would lose the privilege they enjoyed in an unbaptised state. To this a very long and feeble reply is given, as also to the argument arising out of the priority of the claim of kings and princes to that of the Papacy, which is met by a kind of retrospective claim to universal authority after the organisation of the Christian Church. The disclaimer by our Lord of temporal power is met by the same transparent sophistries, and the conclusion of the reader of this strange argument must be that it would have been wiser for the author to have suppressed the objections of his adversaries than to have attempted to meet them. We now proceed to the history and fortunes of the book itself, the examination of which was assigned by the authorities of the Sorbonne to a select committee of divines on March 16, 1626. They brought in their report on April 1 in the same year. After a Mass of the Holy Ghost, celebrated in the great hall of the Sorbonne, the report of the Masters in the Faculty of Divinity, who had been chosen for the inquiry, was laid before the assembly. After citing in brief the propositions already given from the text of Sanctarelli's work, they declare them "to be worthy of the grave animadversion and censure of the Faculty." After

deliberation, conducted by the Dean, having heard the mature arguments of all and singular the Masters, the Faculty disapproved and condemned the doctrine contained in these propositions and in the corollaries of the chapters, pronouncing them to be "new, false, erroneous, contrary to the Word of God, causing hatred to the Pontifical dignity, giving occasion to schism, derogating from the supreme authority of kings, which depends upon God alone, hindering the conversion of infidel and heretical princes, disturbing the public peace, subversive of kingdoms, states and commonwealths, seducing men from obedience and subjection, and stirring up factions, rebellions, seditious and parricides of princes."¹ Such was the solemn verdict of the greatest school of theology in Europe upon this infamous production.

But did the Court of Rome acquiesce in this just condemnation? Far from it; it never suspended its efforts and intrigues to obtain the removal of the censure; and though it did not entirely succeed, it was able to get it in some degree mitigated and qualified. This is the feature of the subject which most deeply interests ourselves, and proves that the Roman Court has never withdrawn or relaxed the most cruel and sanguinary of her laws against heretics, and that if the opportunity should ever occur, and she should regain her poisonous influence in any country of Europe, she would up to the fullest measure of her ability enforce these laws and maintain her ancient principles. We have not far to look back into our own history or to seek for a distant illustration of our position in order to realize the nearness of our danger. The Irish Parliament of James II., the Nationalist newspapers and demagogues in Ireland, and their truculent utterances, the claims of a priesthood whose arrogance is only equalled by its ignorance, and whose autocratic tyranny has its counterpart only in "Darkest Russia," all these are enough to convince the most sceptical that what has been once may well occur again; that human nature is not so changed as to prevent the very worst incidents of history from repeating themselves, and that the bitter hatred of the Saxon which inspires the priesthood and peasantry of Ireland would give the pretext of a religious duty to every act of bigotry or intolerance which the majority in a Home Rule Parliament might think fit to sanction.

But here we are met by the optimists who believe that Rome has entirely changed its nature, that a series of gentle and patriarchal men have succeeded the Pauls and the Piuses of the days of persecution and the reign of terror. The benevolent Pius IX., and the learned and gentle Leo XIII., are

¹ V. Emund Richer, "Vind. Doctrinæ Scholæ," Paris, l. iv., p. 317.

pointed out to us in proof of this wonderful transformation. Alas! not all the amiable and excellent men in the world could transform the system or alter the working of that vast machinery which is at once the wonder of the political and the dread of the religious world—the Court of Rome—“cette cour qui est toujours la même, et qui ne saurait devenir Chrétienne.”¹ We would remind the reader who is disposed to take the new and ideal view of Romanism of the words of Pope Gregory XVI., in his encyclical “*Mirari vos arbitramur*,” issued in 1832. “From this most corrupt fount of indifference flows that erroneous and absurd opinion, or rather raving, that *liberty of conscience* ought to be asserted and vindicated for everyone. For which most pestilent error, that full and immoderate liberty of opinions, which has lately abounded to the injury of sacred and civil affairs, has strewn the way; and hither also tends that most injurious and never enough to be execrated liberty of the press which some venture with so much opprobrium to demand and promote.”

Pope Pius IX. condemns in the same spirit in his Apostolic letter (“*Multiplices inter*”) the proposition that “everyone is free to embrace and profess the religion which he is led by the light of reason to believe to be the true one”—and also this, “It is laudably provided by law in some Catholic countries that men immigrating into them may enjoy the public exercise of their own religious worship.” This was as late as 1851. In 1889 Leo XIII. pronounced the Beatification of Sir Thomas More, the Jesuit Campian, and various other political martyrs, thus openly sanctioning the treasonable efforts of many of them against the government of England, and virtually recognising the Bull of excommunication of Queen Elizabeth and in a manner assuming its justice. In regard to the extirpation of heretics Sanctarelli gives us this timely warning: “There is no other remedy for coercing heretics, therefore the public authority punishes them with the penalty of death. For many other remedies have been devised, but they profited nothing. First they were excommunicated, but they boasted that excommunications were cold fulminations. Then they were deprived of their property, but they did not fear this, for they had many to give them support. They were cast into prison and sent into exile, but even this was insufficient, for they corrupt those who are with them by their words, and the absent with their books; wherefore Pontiffs, Emperors, Kings, and other supreme Princes have judged the punishment of death to be the most efficacious of all.” Looking back with fond regret on the days when this summary method was in-

¹ “*Mem. de Ricci*,” tom. iii., p. 367.

exorably carried out, the Jesuit Hammerstein (in his work "De Ecclesiâ et Statu," founded upon the lines of the encyclical "Immortale Dei" of the present Pope) exclaims: "O! grief, we see, in fact, in our days the ground of religion vanishing more and more from the penal codes of nations." Leo XIII. in that encyclical denounces the deplorable results of the Reformation, and frames his theory on the relations of Church and State upon the mediæval model. In c. 31, he, too, looks back with a "longing, lingering eye" upon that wretched period, and would fain see it return.

In the face of all these facts, which belong not to ancient, but to modern history, how can we anticipate without horror and anxiety the position of a Protestant minority under the reign of a Home Rule Parliament?

What toleration can they expect from men in whose belief toleration is marked as a crime? who regard heresy as a mortal sin, expiable only by death?

When the Duke of Tuscany prayed for a reprieve for Carnesecchi, the Sainted Pius V. replied to his envoy, Serristori, that "if the Duke had asked for pardon for a man who had murdered a hundred persons, he would have granted it; but this was a matter of too important an example."¹ The projects of laws, which were entertained by the Irish Parliament of James II., were framed on this ideal. Dare we entertain the hope that a Home Rule Parliament under the direct influence of the most ultramontane priesthood in Europe will be animated by a contrary spirit? Human life has been too little held sacred in Ireland to enable us to believe that personal safety and a peaceful possession of property will be appraised at a higher value. The outlook is, indeed, one which might make the stoutest heart beat with fear and anxiety, and the light-heartedness of those who are forcing us to enter upon this path of danger might well remind us of the levity with which the counsellors of the second Napoleon betrayed the interests and almost the existence of their country under the influence of illusions which were soon and ruinously dispelled. No one more clearly foresaw than the illustrious author of the famous Vatican Pamphlet the perils with which the revived pretensions of Rome and our own indifference to them threaten us, and how intolerable would be the position of a minority in an Ultramontane Parliament. Whatever illusions he may have raised in his mind in regard to the graces and charities of the Nationalists in Ireland he

¹ "Se il Duca gli chiedesse uno che avesse morto cento uomini glielo daria; ma che questa era cosa di troppo esempio" ("Legazioni di Serristori," p. 443; Firenze, 1853).

cannot altogether forget the lessons of their past history, or believe on any ground of experience in the safeguards he has provided, the very existence of which is a silent proof of his distrust of those who need their restraints. Let us hope that some plan of extended local self-government may succeed this crude and disintegrating scheme, and that the unity of this glorious empire may be secured while the self-government of its component parts is practically and effectually guaranteed.

R. C. JENKINS.



ART. IV.—THE NEWLY-DISCOVERED LATIN VERSION
OF THE EPISTLE OF S. CLEMENT OF ROME.

TWENTY years ago the genuine Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians was known to us from one manuscript only, the famous uncial Codex Alexandrinus of the fifth century, where it appears as a sort of appendix to the New Testament Canon, but mutilated at the close, as well as illegible in many passages. Then, almost simultaneously, two other authorities for the text were discovered and given to the world. Bryennios in 1875 first printed the Epistle in full from an eleventh-century Greek cursive belonging to the library of the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem at his chief residence in Constantinople, the manuscript from which he subsequently published the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." A few months later a twelfth-century Syriac manuscript was purchased by Cambridge University, and found to contain the Epistle entire embedded in the canonical writings of the New Testament, then first of all discovered complete in the Harklean recension of the Philoxenian Version. All three authorities contained, side by side with the genuine Epistle, the so-called Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which is now generally admitted not to be the work of S. Clement, but an ancient homily by an unknown writer. It did not escape the observation of commentators as a remarkable fact that no Latin version of the genuine Epistle was known to exist. In the case of all the other Apostolic Fathers, one Latin version (at least) was extant; and in this particular instance the phenomenon, though an excellent testimony to the Greek character of the early Roman Church, was all the more noticeable from the circumstance that the writer was one of the earliest Bishops of Rome, and the letter exhibited the Church of Rome in the rôle of peacemaker allaying the factions in the Church of Corinth. Yet hitherto the closest search had failed to discover any trace of such a version, and in his larger edition of this