

**THE CONDEMNATION OF POPE  
HONORIUS: AN ESSAY, REPUBLISHED  
AND NEWLY ARRANGED FROM THE  
"DUBLIN REVIEW.", WITH A FEW NOTES  
IN REPLY TO REV. E.F. WILLIS, OF  
CUDDSDON THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649743988

The condemnation of Pope Honorius: an essay, republished and newly arranged from the "Dublin review.", with a few notes in reply to Rev. E.F. Willis, of Cuddesdon Theological College. by William George Ward

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**WILLIAM GEORGE WARD**

**THE CONDEMNATION OF POPE  
HONORIUS: AN ESSAY, REPUBLISHED  
AND NEWLY ARRANGED FROM THE  
"DUBLIN REVIEW.", WITH A FEW NOTES  
IN REPLY TO REV. E.F. WILLIS, OF  
CUDDESDON THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.**



C. F. Wallcut.

THE  
CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS.

An Essay,

*Republished and newly-arranged from the "DUBLIN REVIEW."*

WITH  
A FEW NOTES IN REPLY TO REV. E. F. WILLIS,  
OF CUDDESDON THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE.

BY  
WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, D.Ph.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.  
1879.

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS,  
GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS  
LONDON, W.C.

## PREFACE.

---

THE three articles, on which this Essay is founded, appeared in the "Dublin Review" for July, 1868; January, 1869; and April, 1870. They were very far from being connected with each other in the way of orderly arrangement; being in fact successive reviews of three successive pamphlets. I have always looked forward therefore to combining them at some future date into one consecutive Essay, and at the same time disentangling them from the particular controversy which occasioned their original appearance. I am now led to undertake this task without further delay, because an Anglican clergyman — Rev. E. F. Willis, of Cuddesdon Theological College—has just published a pamphlet on the subject.\* I can find however no argument in that pamphlet, which has not (it seems to me) been answered by anticipation, in various Catholic treatises, and in my own articles inclusively. I have done nothing more therefore, as regards Mr. Willis himself, beyond appending a few notes, in reference to this or that statement which he has made.

The Essay contains hardly anything, which is not virtually included in the original articles. Mr. Willis's pamphlet contains no doubt various incidental remarks, which it would be interesting to discuss. In particular a great deal might probably be said concerning Pennachi's work, to which

\* "Pope Honorius and the New Roman Dogma." Rivingtons.

Mr. Willis draws prominent attention, but which I have not seen. I am too busy however with other writings to attempt anything of the kind, even if I were competent to effect it. I have found it no great trouble, to re-arrange materials which I had already collected; and I have been obliged to content myself with this quasi-mechanical task. This task has (of course) necessarily led me to reconsider the whole subject. And I am bound to say I am quite as confident as I was in 1868-70, that no kind of theological difficulty is presented to a Catholic, by Honorius's condemnation and its attendant circumstances.

So large a portion of the Essay being a mere republication from the "Dublin Review," it has been a kind of necessity to retain the use of the first person plural. But in all which follows, the word "we" must be understood as simply synonymous with "Dr. Ward."

In conclusion I should explain, that the original articles were of course submitted to the three contemporary censors of the "Dublin Review"; and that the present Essay also, as it stands, has been submitted to competent censorship.



## CONTENTS.

---

SECTION	Page
I. The real point of controversy . . . . .	7
II. Pontifical <i>ex cathedrâ</i> Definitions were familiar facts at the time of the Sixth Council . . . . .	9
III. No authority, which Catholics account infallible, has condemned Honorius for teaching falsely <i>ex cathedrâ</i> . . . . .	13
IV. It is certain that his Letters were not issued <i>ex cathedrâ</i> . . . . .	16
V. No authority, which Catholics account infallible, has condemned Honorius for heresy . . . . .	25
VI. It is certain that his Letters are not heretical . . . . .	37
VII. The anathema, pronounced on Honorius by S. Leo II., was most justly merited . . . . .	56
VIII. Remarks on the whole controversy . . . . .	58



## THE CONDEMNATION OF POPE HONORIUS.

### I.

WE cannot for a moment admit, that the Honorius case presents any real difficulty against the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Nevertheless it involves so many circumstances *primâ facie* startling to a Catholic, that we cannot be surprised at the stress laid on it, whether by Gallicans in time past, or by non-Catholics since the Vatican Council. Our purpose in this Essay is to exhibit the facts in what we believe to be their true light ; and to show that they cannot, without paradox and extravagance, be adduced against the dogma which they are alleged as disproving.

Now firstly, what is the defined dogma of Papal Infallibility ?

“ We teach and define that it is a divinely-revealed dogma, that the Roman Pontiff—when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, when, fulfilling his office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, in virtue of his supreme Apostolical authority he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church—through the Divine assistance promised him in Blessed Peter, is endowed with that Infallibility, with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be furnished in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals.”\*

No infallibility is here ascribed to the Pope, except where he defines some doctrine to be held by the universal Church ; or (in other words) where he purports to teach the whole Church obligatory doctrine. Those who allege that the

\* This Definition had not of course been drawn up, when our articles were written. But the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, assumed throughout our articles, was in most entire accordance with that subsequently defined.