The Reception of *Pastor Aeternus* by Jesuit Theologians and the Possibility of Papal Heresy

Christian D. Washburn
Saint Paul Seminary
St. Paul, MN

St. Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621) held two basic positions concerning the extent of the infallibility of the papal magisterium. The first he calls the "fourth view," which held that the pope is infallible when defining a matter pertaining to faith and morals and when certain limiting conditions are met. The second position he calls the "fourth proposition," which held that the pope, even when not defining, is not able to be a pertinacious heretic (although he may teach lower errors). In two recent articles, Emmet O'Regan has argued not only that the First Vatican Council defined dogmatically Bellarmine's "fourth view," but that the Council also elevated Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" to the "dignity of a dogma."[1] This second position is sometimes referred to as the "charism of safety" or "infallible security."

O'Regan's claim is problematic for several reasons. Canon law contains the following canon: "A thing is not understood as dogmatically defined or declared unless this is manifestly established."[2] This article argues that,

---

1 Emmett O'Regan, "The Indefectibility of the Apostolic See: Was the Idea of a Heretical Pope Formally Excluded at the First Vatican Council?," *Theological Studies* 84 (2023): 634–56; O'Regan, "Is Bellarmine's 'Fourth Proposition' Identical with the 'Extreme View' of Albert Pighius?," *Theological Studies* 85 (2024): 317.

2 *The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law: In English Translation with Extensive Scholarly Apparatus*, ed. Edward Peters (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2001), can. 1323, §3; *Code of Canon Law Annotated: Latin–English Edition of the Code of Canon Law and English-language Translation of the 5th Spanish-language Edition of the Commentary*

if Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" had been raised to the level of dogma, then one would expect to see evidence of this new dogma in the works of the great post–Vatican I Jesuit theologians and historians of the Council. Bellarmine was, after all, their theologian. Yet no post-conciliar Jesuit theologian recognized the elevation of this "fourth proposition" to dogma. To this end, this article briefly describes Bellarmine's doctrine of the infallibility of the papal magisterium and the possibility of papal heresy. This article then explains the context of the Jesuit school of theology from the sixteenth century through the nineteenth. Next this article examines pre– and post–Vatican I Jesuit theologians' statements on the relationship between *Pastor Aeternus* and Bellarmine's "fourth proposition," as well as the theological note these theologians attribute to this alleged new dogma. This article will then examine whether they thought that the question of a possible heretical pope remained open after the Council. Finally, this article will draw some conclusions from these facts.

Bellarmine and the Extent of the Infallibility of the Papal Magisterium

In Bellarmine's monumental *Disputations about the Controversies of the Christian Faith against the Heretics of This Time*, he defends the papacy in the third controversy. In the fourth book of this controversy, "On the Spiritual Power of the Pontiff," he treats the infallibility of the papal magisterium. Bellarmine holds two basic positions regarding the infallibility of the papal magisterium.

First, in book IV, chapter 2, Bellarmine presents his "fourth view" which is: "whether the pope is able to be a heretic or not, he is not able in any way to define a heretical proposition that must be believed by the whole Church."[3] Bellarmine assigns the theological note to this proposition as "the most common doctrine of nearly all Catholics."[4] This view was anti-conciliarist or Gallican, since it did not require the consent of the

Prepared under the Responsibility of the Instituto Martín de Azpilcueta (Montréal: Wilson & Lafleur, 1993), can. 749, §3.

3 Robert Bellarmine, S.J., *Disputationes Roberti Bellarmini Politiani Societatis Jesu, de Controversiis Christianae Fidei, adversus huius temporis Haereticos* [*De Controversiis*] 3.4.2: "Pontificem sive haereticus esse possit, sive non, non posse ullo modo definire aliquid haereticum, à tota Ecclesia credendum" (vol. 1 [Paris: Triadelphorum 1613], col. 794).

4 Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, 3.4.2: "communissima sententia ferè omnium Catholicorum" (1:794); Bellarmine, *Recognitio librorum omnium*, in *Opera Omnia*, ed. Justinus Fèvre, vol. 1 (Paris: Ludovicus Vivès, 1870), 12.

whole Church for a definition to be infallible. This "fourth view" is the doctrine that will be defined at Vatican I.

Second, in chapter 6 of book IV, he defends the following "fourth proposition": "Not only is the pope as the supreme pontiff not able to err, but he is not able to be a heretic even as a particular person by pertinaciously believing something false against the faith."[5] Bellarmine thought that this view was only "more probable" than its opposite. He had already taught this fourth proposition in his commentary on Thomas Aquinas's *Summa theologiae*, written in Louvain in the 1570s.[6] This view was novel, first appearing in the first half of the sixteenth century. The first to teach this doctrine was probably Augustin von Alfeld (ca. 1480–1535), although it was Albert Pighius (ca. 1490–1542) and Robert Bellarmine who popularized it.[7] This is the view O'Regan claims is also defined at Vatican I.

There are two things to note about this proposition. First, Bellarmine sharply distinguishes between two ways that a pope can teach: he can teach as the supreme pontiff infallibly defining or as a "particular person" (*persona particularis*) or as a "private doctor" (*doctor privatus*). The terms "particular person" and "private doctor" cover the range of papal teaching from acting magisterially but not infallibly to acting as a private theologian.[8]

Second, Bellarmine's position is not that the pope cannot teach or believe heresy. His position is that the pope cannot *pertinaciously* teach or believe heresy. For Bellarmine there are several aspects to pertinacious heresy. His heresy must be public, manifest, and incorrigible–that is, he is unwilling to be corrected. So, for Bellarmine, the pope can teach heresy, but if he does, he will, upon correction, acknowledge his heresy and repudiate it. Therefore, for Bellarmine, there is no concept of a "charism of safety" or "infallible security" in which the pope is divinely protected

---

5 Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, 3.4.5: "Probabile est, pieque credi potest, summum Pontificem, non solùm ut Pontificem errare non posse, sed etiam ut particularem personam haereticum esse non posse, falsum aliquid contra fidem pertinaciter credendo" (1:804). Unless otherwise attributed, translations in this article are original.

6 Ulrich Horst, *Papst, Konzil, Unfehlbarkeit: D. Ekklesiologie D. Summenkommentare von Cajetan Bis Billuart* (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald, 1978), 174–75.

7 Hubert Jedin, *Studien über die Schriftstellertätigkeit Albert Pigges* (Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1931), 136; Albert Pighius, *Hierarchiae Ecclesiasticae Assertio Per Albertvm Pighivm Campensem, D. Ioannis Vltraiecten[sis] Præpositum, ab ipso autore sub mortem diligenter recognita, nouaq[ue] accessione passim locupletata . . . Vnà cum Indice rerum præcipuarum locupletissimo* bk. 4, chap. 8 (Cologne: Novesianus, 1551), fol. 170r.

8 Christian D. Washburn, "Three 16th-Century Thomist Solutions to the Problem of a Heretical Pope: Cajetan, Cano, and Bellarmine," *Thomist* 83 (2019): 579–80.

when not defining from teaching or believing heresy (although adherents of this position admit he may teach lower errors). In other words, he can teach heresy, but in this theory, he would eventually repudiate it.

Bellarmine's Fourth View and Fourth Proposition at the First Vatican Council

In the sixteenth century, Bellarmine could say that his "fourth view" had not been yet raised to the dignity of a dogma, but he thought it could be defined by the Church. He admits that the conciliarist or Gallican doctrine was still "tolerated" by the Church. In the intervening centuries between Bellarmine's death and Vatican I, however, the papacy repeatedly condemned conciliarist doctrine requiring the consent of the Church for an infallible definition of the pope. Innocent XI (r. 1676–1689) did so in the brief *Paternae Charitati* (1682).[9] Alexander VIII (r. 1689–1691) also did so twice in 1690: once in the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition,[10] and again in the constitution *Inter Multiplices* (1690).[11] Innocent XII (r. 1691–1700) in an allocution, Clement XI (r. 1700–1721) in two briefs, and Pius VI (r. 1775–1799) in *Auctorem Fidei* (1794) all did the same.[12]

Vatican I opened on December 8, 1869. While the infallibility of the papal magisterium was not initially on the agenda, it was announced that papal infallibility was placed on the agenda on April 29.[13] This was largely due to the work of Cardinal Henry Manning.[14] A draft of *Pastor Aeternus* was distributed on December 23, and the Council fathers began discussing it on December 28. During these discussions, some of the minority

---

9 Innocent XI, *Paternae Charitati*. See Pierre Blet, "Innocent XI et l'Assemblée du Clergé de France de 1682: La rédaction du bref *Paternae charitati*," *Archivum Historicae Pontificiae* 7 (1969): 329–63.

10 Henry Edward Manning, *The Centenary of Saint Peter and the General Council: A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy &c.* (London: Longmans and Green, 1867), 46. See Ágoston Roskovány, *Romanus pontifex tamquam primas ecclesiae et princeps civilis e monumentis omnium seculorum demonstratus*, vol. 2 (Nitriae: Siegler, 1867), 239; Charles du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus: Qui ab initio duodecimi seculi post incarnationem Verbi, usque ad annum 1713*, vol. 3 (Lutetiae Parisiorum: Duchesne, 1755), 239.

11 Alexander VIII, *Inter Multiplices* (Denzinger-Hünermann [DH], 43rd ed. [San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012], nos. 2281–85).

12 Pius VI, *Auctorem Fidei* (DH nos. 2699–700). Manning, *Centenary*, 46–49.

13 Gian Domenico Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* [Mansi] (1758–1798; repr. Paris: Welter 1901–1927), vol. 51, col. 467.

14 Christian D. Washburn, "The First Vatican Council, Archbishop Henry Manning, and Papal Infallibility," *Catholic Historical Review* 102 (2016): 712–45.

bishops objected that the Council was attempting to define the opinion of one man— Bellarmine—and was promoting an extreme version of infallibility.[15]

Partly in response to these objections, on July 11, 1870, Bishop Vinzenz Gasser (1809–1879), on behalf of the deputation *de fide*, gave his first *relatio* explaining the second schema of *Pastor Aeternus*.[16] Gasser states explicitly that the schema does not intend to define Pighius's position as presented in *Controversies* II, chapter 6, which Bellarmine describes as only "probable."[17] Instead, Gasser notes that the schema intends to define what Bellarmine calls "most certain and assured" and the "most common doctrine and certain."[18] The only view to which Bellarmine assigns these theological notes is to his "fourth view," in chapter 2 of IV: "Whether he is able to be a heretic or not, he is not able in any way to define a heretical proposition that must be believed by the whole Church."

The Jesuit School of Theology and Papal Infallibility

The Jesuit school of theology consciously worked within the *via Thomae*, and this Thomistic inclination was in part the result of the formation of Ignatius and his first companions. After receiving his master's degree in 1534, Ignatius of Loyola began studying theology at the Dominican convent on the Rue Saint-Jacques, the same convent in which Peter Crockaert, O.P. (ca. 1465–1514) began his renewal of Thomism. Ignatius was followed here by some of his "first companions," such as Claude Le Jay (1504–1552), Peter Faber (1506–1546), Francis Xavier (1506–1552), Diego Laínez (1512–1565), and Alfonso Salmerón (1515–1585).[19] Ignatius would eventually insist in *The Constitutions* of the Society that

---

15 Klaus Schatz, *Vaticanum I, 1869–1870*, vol. 3 (Paderborn: Schoningh, 1992), 344.

16 Schatz, *Vaticanum I*, 3:140.

17 Mansi, 52:1218 (col.). See Vincent Gasser, *The Gift of Infallibility: The Official* Relatio *on Infallibility of Bishop Vincent Gasser at Vatican Council I*, trans. and ed. James T. O'Connor, 2nd updated ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2008), 58–59.

18 "Certissimam et asserendam" and "sententiam communissimam et certam" (Mansi, 52:1218).

19 See Ignatius of Loyola, *The Autobiography of St. Ignatius Loyola: With Related Documents*, introduction and notes by John C. Olin, trans. Joseph F. O'Callaghan (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), 80n13. See also Mary Purcell, *The Quiet Companion: Peter Favre, S.J., 1506–1546* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1981), 54; Georg Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier: His Life, His Times*, trans. M. Joseph Costelloe, vol. 1 (Rome: Jesuit Historical Institute, 1973), 247–53.

scholastics study "the Scholastic doctrine of St. Thomas."[20] Many of the early Jesuits were deeply influenced by the Salamancan reform of Thomism, which emphasized both Scholastic and positive theology.[21] It must be noted that Jesuit Thomism could be eclectic, but on ecclesiological issues it remained consciously and deliberately within the *via Thomae*.

Consequently, early Jesuit theologians retained the basic ecclesiological commitments of Dominican papalists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,[22] including the infallibility of papal definitions without the consent of the Church. It was divided, however, on whether a pope could teach heresy pertinaciously when not issuing a solemn definition. Cardinal Francisco de Toledo, S.J. (1532–1596), Adam Tanner, S.J. (1572–1632), Gregorio de Valencia, S.J. (1549–1603), and Rodrigo de Arriaga, S.J. (1592–1667)[23] retained the view of Dominican papalists like St. Antoninus, O.P. (1389–1459) and Juan de Torquemada, O.P. (1388–1468) that it is possible that a pope could teach heresy pertinaciously when not solemnly defining.[24] These Dominican papalists had lived through the Western Schism and the deposition of several popes and papal claimants who had been accused and deposed for heresy at the Councils of Pisa and Constance.[25] Bellarmine and Francisco Suárez (1548–1617) thought that it is more probable that it is not possible for a pope to teach

---

20 *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms: A Complete English Translation of the Official Latin Texts*, ed. John W. Padberg (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996), nos. 464, 184.

21 Christian D. Washburn, "Schools of Theology at the Council of Trent," *The Cambridge Companion to the Council of Trent*, ed. Nelson H. Minnich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), 64.

22 See Ulrich Horst, *The Dominicans and the Pope: Papal Teaching Authority in the Medieval and Early Modern Thomist Tradition* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006), 23–42.

23 Francisco de Toledo, S.J., *Francisci Toleti . . . In Summam theologiae S. Thomae Aquinatis enarratio*, vol. 2 (Rome: Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 1869), 71. See also Adam Tanner, *Theologiae Scholasticae*, vol. 3, *De Fide, Spe, Charitate, Iustitia* (Ingolstadt: Guilielmi Ederi, 1627), col. 267; Jacques Platel, *Synopsis Totius Cursus Theologici Accuratissima*, vol. 3 (Cologne: Ketteler, 1688), 103; Gregorio de Valencia, *Commentariorvm Theologicorvm Tomi Quatuor: In Qvibvs Omnes Materiae, Qvae Continentvr In Svmma Theologica D. Thomae Aqvinatis*, vol. 3 (Ingolstadt: Sartorius, 1595), col. 310; Rodrigo de Arriaga, S.J., *Disputationes Theologicae in Secundam Secundae D. Thomae*, vol. 5 (Antwerp: ex Officina Plantiniana Balthasaris Moreti, 1649), 118.

24 Washburn, "Three 16th Century Thomist Solutions," 550–52.

25 Ulrich Horst, *Juan De Torquemada und Thomas De Vio Cajetan: Zwei Protagonisten Der Päpstlichen Gewaltenfülle* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012), 91.

heresy pertinaciously when not solemnly defining.[26] These two streams of thought continued among Jesuit theologians until Vatican I. Some early Jesuit theologians do not even touch upon the subject. Martin Becanus, S.J. (1563–1624), for example, while defending and explaining the infallibility of the papal magisterium, does not discuss Pighius's opinion at all either in his *Manuale Controuersiarum* or in his commentary on Aquinas's *Summa theologiae*.[27]

Before, during, and after Vatican I, Jesuit theologians produced many controversial works and ultramontane dogmatic manuals. These manuals were used all over the world in Catholic seminaries and universities. Moreover, many of these texts were granted *nihil obstats* and *imprimaturs* by ecclesiastical authorities and went through many editions. Giovanni Perrone's (1794–1876) *Praelectiones Theologiae*, for example, went through "thirty-four editions between 1835 and the 1870s."[28] Several other Jesuit theologians, like François X. Schouppe (1823–1904), also lived through the Council. Of course, the Jesuits were not completely homogenous even with respect to the infallibility of the papal magisterium. Francesco Quarella (1831–1908) supported Gallican theses, writing an anonymous pamphlet that was distributed to the Council fathers by Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler (1811–1877), bishop of Mainz.[29] One would expect that Jesuit dogmatic theologians would have noticed if the "fourth proposition" of Bellarmine, one of their fellow Jesuits, had been elevated to a dogma.

The Relationship Between *Pastor Aeternus* and Bellarmine's "Fourth Proposition"

While many of these manuals spend considerable time explaining *Pastor Aeternus*'s dogmatic definition on papal infallibility, they spend little or no time discussing the possibility of papal heresy. The reason for this is that there was little to say. The exception to this is the eminent

---

[26] Francisco Suárez, S.J., *De fide*, disp. 10, sec. 6, no. 11, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 12 (Paris: Vivès, 1856), 319.

[27] Martin Becanus, S.J., *R. P. Martini Becanusi Societatis Iesu Theologi Manuale Controuersiarum Huius Temporis* (Herbipoli: Ioannis Volmari and Michaelis Dalii, 1623), 83–116; Becanus, *Summa Theologiae Scholasticae*, vol. 2, *De Fide, Spe, & Charitate* (Lugduni: Sumptibus A. Pillehotte, 1621), 170–201.

[28] C. M. Shea, "Giovanni Perrone's Theological Curriculum and the First Vatican Council," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 110 (2015): 789–816.

[29] Klaus Schatz, *Kirchenbild und papstliche Unfehlbarkeit bei den deutschsprachigen Minoritätbischofen auf dem I. Vatikanum* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1975), 270–71.

nineteenth-century Jesuit theologian Camillo Mazzella, S.J. (1833–1900), who was once described by a student as a "mine of learning, a tower of orthodoxy, a kind of individualized Council of Trent."[30] Mazzella's most important work was his *De religione et ecclesia*, first published in 1876, after the Council. While he spends considerable space explaining the conciliar definition,[31] he alone of the theologians examined explicitly speaks of the relationship between *Pastor Aeternus* and Bellarmine's "fourth proposition." Mazzella writes:

> The council said nothing about this question. Theologians and canonists, however, do not agree with each other. Indeed, some, such as Albertus Pighius (*De eccl. hier*. 1.4.8), deny that the pontiff, even as a private person, can fall into heresy properly so called, that is, knowingly and obstinately adhering to an error contrary to the faith already condemned. Bellarmine inclines more to this opinion (1.4.6); while Suárez judges it more pious and more probable (*De fide*, disp. 10. sec. 6). . . . Others teach the contrary.[32]

There are three things to note about Mazzella. First, he claims the Council did not discuss Bellarmine's "fourth proposition." Second, while he seems inclined to Bellarmine's "fourth proposition," he begins and ends his discussion of this question by noting that others have taught the contrary. He gives no hint that the controversy has been resolved by the Council. Third, he identifies Bellarmine's opinion with that of Pighius. Lastly, he does not elevate the theological note from "more probable" to *de fide*. It must be noted that Mazzella's text went through many editions, but this remained unaltered.[33]

---

30 J. P. Von Arx, *Varieties of Ultramontanism* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1998), 106.

31 Camillo Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia*, 5th ed. (Rome: Foranzi, 1896), 813–26.

32 Camillo Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Foranzi, 1880), 817 (no. 1045).

33 Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia*, 2nd ed., 817 (no. 1045); Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia*, 3rd ed. (Rome: Foranzi, 1885), 817 (no. 1045); Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia*, 5th ed., 813–26.

The Relationship Between Pighius's View and Bellarmine's "Fourth Proposition"

O'Regan claims that Bellarmine's "fourth proposition," which he deems "moderate," is different from Pighius's "extreme" view.[34] If there is a difference between Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" and Pighius's, then both pre- and post-conciliar Jesuit theologians were unaware of it. Before the Council, Jesuit theologians identified Pighius's view with Bellarmine's "fourth proposition," often explaining that Bellarmine "favored" it. Pre-conciliar theologians like Tanner, Jacob Gretser, S.J. (1562–1625), Paul Laymann, S.J. (1574–1635), Dominique Bouix (1808–1870), S.J., and Jacques Platel, S.J. (1608–1681), also made this identification.[35] At the Council, in his *relatio*, as noted above, Gasser explicitly identified Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" with that of Pighius. Gasser's explicit rejection that the Council intended to define Pighius's view should be understood as a rejection also of the intention to define Bellarmine's "fourth proposition." After the Council, Jesuit theologians like Joseph de Boux Guibert, Mazzella, and Hermann van Laak (1863–1941) continued to make this identification.[36]

The Theological Note Assigned to the Possibility of Papal Heresy

Theological notes signify positively the degree of doctrinal certainty that a particular doctrine has.[37] Common theological notes are: *de fide divina*; *fidei proxima*; *fides ecclesiastica*; and *theologice certa*. Theological censures, on the other hand, characterize the degree to which a proposition is

---

[34] O'Regan, "Is Bellarmine's 'Fourth Proposition' Identical with the 'Extreme View' of Albert Pighius?" 318.

[35] Jacob Gretser, *Controversiarum Roberti Bellarmini S.r.e. Cardinalis Amplissimi Defensio*, vol. 2 (Ingolstadii: Sartorius, 1609), fols. 1029–30; Paul Laymann, *Theologia Moralis, Quinque Libros Complectens*, vol. 1, new ed. (Lugdunum: R. Glaize, 1681), 185; Tanner, *Theologiae Scholasticae*, 3:267; Platel, *Synopsis Totius Cursus Theologici Accuratissima*, 3:103; Dominique Bouix, *Tractatus de Papa, Ubi et de Concilio Oecumenico*, vol. 2 (Paris: Jacobus Lecoffre, 1869–1870), 657.

[36] Joseph de Guibert, *De Christi Ecclesia: Breve Schema in Auditorum Usum*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Gregorian University, 1928), 259; Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia*, 2nd ed., 817; Hermann van Laak, *Institutionum Theologiae Fundamentalis Repetitorium: Ad Usum Privatum Auditorum Universitatis Gregorianae* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1921), 506.

[37] Pietro Parente, Antonio Piolanti, and Salvatore Garofalo, *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* (Milwaukee, WI: Bruce, 1951), 45.

contrary to Catholic doctrine.[38] Common theological censures of propositions are: *haeretica*; *falsa*; *scandalosa*; *temeraria*; *piarum aurium offensiva*; and *male sonans*.[39] The rightly famous work on the theological value of notes by Sixtus Cartechini, S.J.'s (1914–1994), lists *de fide* as the highest note and "probable" as the lowest note.[40] There is no necessary assent owed to "probable" propositions, and there is no sin incurred for rejecting them. It should also be noted that it would generally be strange and irresponsible for a doctrine with a theological note as low as "probable" to be elevated directly to the level of dogma (*de fide*), the highest level. If Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" was raised to the "dignity of a dogma," then one should also expect to see this reflected in the theological note assigned to this doctrine in post-conciliar manuals of dogmatic theology.

In the sixteenth century, Bellarmine and Suárez assigned the theological notes of "more piously probable" to this "fourth proposition." From the sixteenth century to the nineteenth, there was no movement in this fourth proposition's theological note. Laymann, Veit Pichler, S.J. (1670–1736), and Platel held this teaching as "probable."[41] Joseph Gautier, S.J. (1703–1755) followed Melchior Cano, O.P. (ca. 1509[?]–1560) in rejecting it altogether, since, if one were to exonerate, for example, Pope Honorius, then you have to admit that the three ecumenical councils and the many popes who condemned Honorius committed error.[42] De Arriaga called the teaching that the pope cannot fall into heresy even as a private man "pious" but said that it had "no solid foundation either in law or in natural reason."[43]

After Vatican I, Jesuit theologians continued to present Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" as only "probable," or they quoted Bellarmine or Suárez to this effect. Some like Emil Dorsch (1867–1934), Joseph de Guibert (1877–1942), Domenico Palmieri (1829–1909), Joachim

---

38 Parente, Piolanti, and Garofalo, *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology*, 45.

39 John Cahill, *The Development of the Theological Censures after the Council of Trent: (1563–1709)* (Fribourg: University Press, 1955), 186–87.

40 Sixtus Cartechini, *De valore notarum theologicarum et de criteriis ad eas dignoscendas* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1951), 135.

41 Laymann, *Theologia Moralis*, 1:185. Veit Pichler, *Papatus Nunquam Errans in Proponendis Fidei Articulis* (Augsburg: Joannis Casparum Bencard, 1709), 256. Platel, *Synopsis Totius Cursus Theologici Accuratissima*, 3:103.

42 Joseph Gautier, *Prodromus Ad Theologiam Dogmatico-Scholasticam: Ad Usum Præcipuè Candidatorum Sacræ Doctrinæ* (Cologne: Joannis Michaelis Josephi Pütz, 1756), 451. Melchior Cano, O.P., *De Locis Theologicis Libri Duodecim*, bk. 6, chap. 8 (Salamanca: Mathias Gastius, 1563), 239–41.

43 Roderigo de Arriaga, *Disputationes Theologicae in Secundam Secundae*, 5:118.

Salaverri (1892–1979), and Hugo von Hurter (1832–1914) continued to ascribe the note of "probable."[44] Some like Palmieri and Anthony Straub also rejected Bellarmine's "more probable" position, since popes repeatedly admitted that a pope could fall into heresy.[45] Other Jesuit theologians, such as Michel D'Herbigny (1880–1957), Hurter, and Salaverri, followed Bellarmine and Suárez's opinion but treated it as an open question.[46] Salaverri writes:

> Whether or not the Pope as private person can fall into heresy? Theologians dispute about this question. It seems to us "more pious and probable" to hold that God in His Providence will see to it "that the Pope will never be a heretic."[47]

Important to O'Regan's claim is that Johannes Franzelin, S.J. (1816–1886) helped to draft *Pastor Aeternus*, and he wrote into that draft his doctrine of "infallible security" (*infallibilis securitas*).[48] If this is true, then Franzelin himself gives no evidence of it. Franzelin proposed his doctrine of "infallible security" at the time of the Council in the first edition of his *Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, published in 1870.[49] Here he shows no evidence that this doctrine is *de fide*. This is forgivable, since it was probably written before the conclusion of the Council. This work, however, went through many editions, and he never cites *Pastor Aeternus* in

---

44 Emil Dorsch, *Institutiones Theologiae Fundamentalis*, vol. 2, *De Ecclesia Christi* (Innsbruck: Feliciani Rauch, 1928), 407; Domenico Palmieri, *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice: cum prolegomeno de ecclesia*, 3rd ed. (Rome: Giachetti, 1902), 708–10; Ioachim Salaverri, *Sacrae Theologiae Summa: Iuxta Constitutionem Apostolicam* Deus Scientiarum Dominus, vol. 1, *Theologia Fundamentalis*, 4th ed. (Matriti: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1958), 718; Hugo von Hurter, *Medulla Theologiae Dogmaticae*, 6th ed. (Innsbruck: Libraria Academica Wagneriana, 1898), 204–5.

45 Palmieri, *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice*, 631. See also Anthony Straub, *De Ecclesia Christi*, vol. 2 (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1912), 479–81.

46 D'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, vol. 2, 3rd ed. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1928), 361. See also Hugo Hurter, *Theologiae Dogmaticae Compendium: In Usum Studiosorum Theologiae*, vol. 1, 7th ed. (Innsbruck: Libraria Academica Wagneriana, 1891), 451–52. Salaverri, *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, 1:718.

47 Joachim Salaverri, *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, vol. IB, *On the Church of Christ, On Holy Scripture*, trans. Kenneth Baker, S.J. (Ramsey, NJ: Keep the Faith, 2015), 240.

48 Bernhard Knorn, "Johann Baptist Franzelin (1816–86): A Jesuit Cardinal Shaping the Official Teaching of the Church at the Time of the First Vatican Council," *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 7 (2020): 592–615.

49 Johannes Franzelin, *Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura* (Rome: Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 1870), 118.

support of this position.[50] Moreover, Franzelin's *Theses De Ecclesia Christi* shows no evidence of this view, even though both editions were published after the Council, first posthumously in 1887 and then reprinted in 1907.[51] In this work, Franzelin holds that, if a pope were to defect from the faith, then he would lose his office. He follows Bellarmine in arguing that the pope has never fallen, even "as a private person," and that divine providence would prevent this from happening. Franzelin cites only Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" as evidence, an odd choice, if *Pastor Aeternus* had in fact solemnly defined this view.[52] Moreover, he does not assign to his theory the theological note of *de fide*.[53] These are strange omissions, if O'Regan is correct.

Other Jesuits, like Dorsch, De Guibert, and van Laak, simply present both Jesuit streams and the arguments for each.[54] Some Jesuit theologians, like Hermann Dieckmann (1880–1928), Sylvester Hunter (1829–1896), Ludwig Lercher (1864–1937), Perrone, Christian Pesch (1853–1925), Schouppe, Bernard Tepe (1833–1904), Wilhem Wilmers (1817–1899), and Zapelena, do not even mention Bellarmine's "fourth proposition," which is surprising if it had just been elevated to dogma.[55]

This is in contrast to the theological note and censure assigned by Jesuit theologians to the doctrine of the infallibility of the papal magisterium. In the sixteenth century, Bellarmine assigned the theological note of "the

---

50 Johannes Franzelin, *Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, 4th ed. (Rome: Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 1896), 118.

51 Johannes Franzelin, *Theses De Ecclesia Christi: Opus Posthumum: Brevi Praemisso De Eiusdem Vita Commentario* (Rome: Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 1887); Johannes Franzelin, *Theses De Ecclesia Christi: Opus Posthumum: Brevi Praemisso De Eiusdem Vita Commentario* (Rome: Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 1907).

52 Franzelin, *Theses De Ecclesia Christi* (1887), 231–32.

53 Franzelin, *Theses De Ecclesia Christi* (1887), 231–32.

54 De Guibert, *De Christi Ecclesia*, 259–60; Dorsch, *Institutiones Theologiae Fundamentalis*, 2:405–7; van Laak, *Institutionum Theologiae Fundamentalis Repetitorium*, 506–9.

55 Hermann Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia: Tractatus Historico-Dogmatici* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1925); Sylvester Joseph Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (London: Longmans and Green, 1898), 441–53; Ludwig Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae: In Usum Scholarum*, vol. 1, 5th ed. (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1951), 294. Giovanni Perrone, *Praelectiones theologicae*, vol. 4 (Paris: A. Roger and F. Chernoviz, 1879), 304–28; François X. Schouppe, *Elementa Theologiæ Dogmaticæ e Probatis Auctoribus Collecta et Divini Verbi Ministerio Accomodata*, vol. 1, 9th ed. (Brussels: H. Goemaere, 1875), 252–55; Bernard Tepe, *Institutiones theologicae in usum scholarum*, vol. 1 (Paris: Lethielleux, 1894), 383–84; Wilhelm Wilmers, *De Christi Ecclesia Libri Sex* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1897).

most common doctrine of nearly all Catholics" to the doctrine of the infallibility of the papal magisterium.[56] He also thought that the doctrine had come to the point, in the sixteenth century, of being ready to be defined. He assigned to the Gallican position the theological censure of "proximate to heresy" but also said that it is "tolerated" by the Church.[57] Bellarmine also held that, as long as the doctrine of the infallibility of the papal magisterium was still an open question, he was willing to grant that the conciliarists were not yet heretics.[58]

After Vatican I, the Jesuit theologians ascribe to the doctrine of the infallibility of the papal magisterium the theological note *de fide*, or they use equivalent terms.[59] The Wirceburgenses, for example, who were Jesuit professors at the University of Würzburg, produced the masterful *Theologia Dogmatica, Polemica, Scholastica et Moralis* in fourteen volumes from 1766 to 1771.[60] Their work was republished in 1852 and did not list the infallibility of the papal magisterium as *de fide*.[61] In 1880, the work was again republished, but this time the Jesuit editors added a paragraph about Vatican I and ascribed the theological note *de fide* to the doctrine.[62]

There are several important things to note about this data. First, if O'Regan is correct, Jesuit theologians and historians were completely unaware that their co-religionist's "fourth proposition" was raised to the

---

56 Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, 3.4.2: "communissima sententio ferè omnium Catholicorum" (1:794).

57 Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, 3.4.2 (1: 794–95).

58 Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, 3.4.2 (1: 795).

59 De Guibert, *De Christi Ecclesia*, 259–60; D'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, 2:349; Dorsch, *Institutiones Theologiae Fundamentalis*, 2:464; Franzelin, *Theses De Ecclesia Christi*, 231–32; D'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, 2:359; Hurter, *Medulla Theologiae Dogmaticae*, 197; Hurter, *Theologiae Dogmaticae Compendium*, 1:451n1; Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia* (1889), 814; Christian Pesch, *Praelectiones Dogmaticae: Institutiones propaedeuticae ad sacram theologiam*, vol. 1, 6th/7th ed. ["editio sexta et septima"] (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1924), 363; Pesch, *Compendium Theologicae Dogmaticae*, vol. 1 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1935), 231; Salaverri, *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, 1:701; Schouppe, *Elementa Theologiæ Dogmaticæ*, 1:252; Straub, *De Ecclesia Christi*, 2:348.

60 Henricus Kilber, Thomas Holtzclau, Ignatz Neubauer, Ulric Munier, and Collegium Societatis Jesu Herbipolense, *Theologia Dogmatico-Polemico-Scholastica Praelectionibus Academicis Accommodata* (Würzburg: Joannis Jacopi Stahel, 1766–1771). On the teaching of the Wirceburgenses on infallibility, see Ulrich Horst, *Unfehlbarkeit Und Geschichte: Studien Zur Unfehlbarkeitsdiskussion von Melchior Cano Bis Zum I. Vatikanischen Konzil* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald, 1982), 150–52.

61 Kilber et al., *Theologia Dogmatica, Polemica, Scholastica et Moralis: Prælectionibus Publicis in Alma Universitate Wircenburgensi Accommodata*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Paris: Julien and Lanier, 1852–1854), 349.

62 Kilber et al., *Theologia Dogmatica, Polemica, Scholastica et Moralis* (1852–1854), 1:345.

"dignity of a dogma." This is particularly significant given that the primary promoters of the idea were in fact Bellarmine and Suárez. There is not a word about this elevation in any of the dogmatic manuals examined in this short study. This includes trained theologians like Franzelin, Perrone, and Schouppe, who lived through the Council. As noted above, Mazzella explicitly stated that the Council said nothing about the issue.

Second, if O'Regan is correct, many Jesuit theologians studied here either assigned the wrong theological note to Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" or treated it as an open question. This is tantamount to denying or calling into doubt a dogma defined definitively by Vatican I. Recall that, if Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" had been defined definitively as divinely revealed, then one must give the assent of faith to it. If one denies this dogma or says that it is still an open question, then one is a heretic. It is hardly believable, in an age when the Catholic Church guarded her doctrine with considerable care, that so many theologians erred without being condemned or at least having their *imprimaturs* revoked even as they were going through multiple editions. A number of these authors were publishing their works at the height of the modernist crisis.

Third, both the 1917 code of canon law and the 1983 code state that "a thing is not understood as dogmatically defined or declared unless this is manifestly established."[63] While these canons cannot anachronistically be applied to Vatican I, they do reflect a traditional way of thinking about how to identify solemn definitions of the magisterium. How manifest could this alleged definition have been if not a single Jesuit theologian held such a view? Recall that this article has dealt with Jesuit theologians. This could be multiplied many times over by looking at non-Jesuit theologians.

Jesuit Theologians and *Pastor Aeternus*'s Use of the *Formula of Hormisdas*

O'Regan cites in his defense of his interpretation the quotation of the *Formula of Hormisdas* in *Pastor Aeternus*. This was a doctrinal statement drawn up by Pope St. Hormisdas in 519, declaring the necessity of adhering to the papal magisterium to preserve the one true faith. Part of the formula states: "The See of St. Peter always remains unblemished by any error."[64] O'Regan argues that this proposition confirms his interpretation

---

[63] *The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law*, 1323, § 3; *Code of Canon Law Annotated*, 749 §3.

[64] See O'Regan, "Indefectibility of the Apostolic See," 652; DH nos. 3070, 3066. See also DH no. 3071: "Charism of truth and never-failing faith was conferred upon Peter and

of the decree, since a pope teaching heresy would mean that the church of Rome would be sullied.

Such expressions have been used for nearly two millennia. The Dominican papalists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries repeatedly used such expressions and still held to the possibility of papal heresy. Both St. Antoninus and Torquemada, for example, repeatedly affirmed not only that the Roman church was "always immaculate" (*semper immaculata*) but also that a pope may teach heresy and be deposed.[65] This formula was known to the Council fathers of Vatican I. In 1868, the ultramontane, Jesuit-run *La Civilta Cattolica* published two articles on St. Antoninus's teaching on papal infallibility.[66] Interestingly, Antoninus's views were used by both the minority and majority bishops of the Council.[67]

Bellarmine himself does not use the *Formula of Hormisdas* to support his "fourth proposition."[68] Post-conciliar Jesuit theologians do not use the *Formula of Hormisdas* concerning the impossibility of papal heresy. Instead, they always use the *Formula of Hormisdas* as evidence for Bellarmine's "fourth view."[69] Moreover, if these propositions were used to support Bellarmine's "fourth proposition," as O'Regan believes, it would almost certainly have driven a wedge in the ultramontane coalition at the

---

his successors in this chair in order that they may perform their supreme office for the salvation of all."

65 St. Antoninus, O.P., *Summa theologica*, vol. 3 (Graz: Akademische Drucku, 1959), cols. 1207, 1277; Juan de Torquemada, *Summa de ecclesia . . . : una cum eiusdem apparatu, nunc primum in lucem edito, super decreto Papae Eugenij IIII. in Concilio Florentino de unione Graecorum emanato* (Venice: Michaelem Tramezinum, 1561), bk. 2, chap. 102; Torquemada, *Oratio synodalis de primatu*, ed. Emmanuel Candal (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1954), fol. 174r.

66 "Fr. Bardinelli, S.J.," (anonymous; cited by Horst), "La dottrina di S. Antonino Arcivescovo di Firenze intorno alla infallibilita de' Papi e la loro superiorita sui Concili," *La Civilta Cattolica* 19 (1868): 181–198, 304–24, 576–80, 688–711; *La Civilta Cattolica* 20 (1869): 45–63.

67 Ulrich Horst, "Papst, Bischöfe und Konzil nach Antonin von Florenz," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 32 (1965): 107–16.

68 Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, 3.4.5 (1:804).

69 Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia*, 2:101; De Guibert, *De Christi Ecclesia*, 251; Dorsch, *Institutiones Theologiae Fundamentalis*, 2:368; Franzelin, *Theses De Ecclesia Christi* (1887), 168; D'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, 2:353; Hurter, *Medulla Theologiae Dogmaticae*, 198; Hurter, *Theologiae Dogmaticae Compendium*, 1:458; Lercher, *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae*, 1:291; Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia*, 2nd ed. (1880), 844; Pesch, *Praelectiones Dogmaticae*, 1:363; Pesch, *Compendium Theologicae Dogmaticae*, 1:235; Salaverri, *Sacrae Theologiae Summa*, 1:701; Straub, *De Ecclesia Christi*, 2:355; Tepe, *Institutiones theologicae*, 1:383–84; Wilmers, *De Christi Ecclesia*, 431; Timotheus Zapelena, *De Ecclesia Christi Summarium*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Gregorian University, 1932), 316.

Council. Those Jesuits and Dominicans that followed the older Dominican papalism would surely have objected strongly against this view of the formula.

Jesuit Historians of the Council and the Possibility of Papal Heresy

After the Council, the meaning of *Pastor Aeternus* was often popularly misunderstood. In Germany, theologians like Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger (1799–1890) and his student Johann Friedrich (1836–1917) expressed opposition to *Pastor Aeternus*. In 1869, Friedrich had gone to Rome as secretary to Cardinal Gustav Adolf Hohenlohe (1823–1896).[70] In 1870, he published *Documenta ad Illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum Anni 1870*.[71] As a result of his post-conciliar opposition, he was eventually excommunicated on April 17, 1871, with his mentor Döllinger.[72] He then published his unflattering diary of the Council in 1871.[73] He eventually produced his *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils* in four volumes.[74] Friedrich attempted to show that the Council was not free and that the process of moving *Pastor Aeternus* through was grossly manipulated by the majority and was ahistorical. These criticisms, he thought, provided a justification for the existence of the Old Catholic Church. These books were all eventually placed on the *Index of Forbidden Books*.[75]

Friedrich and Döllinger's attack on the infallibility of the papal magisterium required a response. Gerhard Schneemann, S.J. (1829–1885), offered a quasi-official response. Prior to the Council Schneemann wanted to bring Jean Hardouin's famous eighteenth-century collection of the acta

---

70 On Friedrich's influence on the minority bishops at Vatican I, see Klaus Schatz, *Kirchenbild und papstliche Unfehlbarkeit bei den deutschsprachigen Minoritàtbischofen auf dem I. Vatikanum* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1975), 453–54.

71 Johann Friedrich, *Documenta ad Illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum Anni 1870*, 2 vols. (Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1871).

72 Ewald Kessler, *Johann Friedrich (1836–1917): Ein Beitrag Zur Geschichte des Altkatholizismus* (Munich: Kommissionsbuchhandlung R. Wölfle, 1975), 310–13; T. A. Howard, *The Pope and the Professor: Pius IX, Ignaz von Döllinger, and the Quandary of the Modern Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 163.

73 Johann Friedrich, *Tagebuch, Während Des Vaticanischen Concils* (Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1871).

74 Johann Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzil*s, 4 vols. (Bonn: P. Neusser, 1877–1887).

75 *Index Librorum Prohibitorum . . . Leonis XIII Iussu et Auctoritate Recognitus et Editus* (Roma: Typis Vaticanis, 1900), 136.

of councils down to his own day.[76] It was an immense task of collecting all those ecumenical and local councils approved by the pope from 1682 onward into the *Collectio Conciliorum Lacensis*.[77] Schneemann died on November 20, 1885, having finished only the first six volumes, which ended before the First Vatican Council. Schneemann wrote several other works prior to the Council on papal infallibility. In 1864, in response to Döllinger, he wrote *Study on the Honorius Question*. The work is primarily historical in nature, explaining why Honorius's two letters were not heretical and were not definitions of faith. He does briefly take up the question of papal heresy and follows Bellarmine's "fourth view" that solemn definitions are divinely protected.[78] In 1868, Schneemann also wrote an article on the indefectibility of St. Peter and his successors. Here he explicitly denies that the pope, when teaching as a private doctor, is divinely protected from heresy. He therefore does not defend Bellarmine's "fourth proposition."[79]

The seventh volume was nearly completed[80] when Theodor Granderath, S.J. (1839–1902), was chosen to complete Schneeman's work.[81] His work on the *acta* of Vatican I made him the leading expert on the Council, and he also published numerous articles on it. These articles show no knowledge of the elevation of this doctrine of the impossibility of papal heresy to *de fide*.[82] In 1892, he published his erudite commentary on the

---

76 Jean Hardouin, *Acta Conciliorum et Epistolae Decretales: Ac Constitutiones Summorum Pontificum* (Paris: Ex Typographia Regia, 1714–1715).

77 Gerhard Schneemann and Theodor Granderath, *Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum: Collectio Lacensis*, 7 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1870–1890).

78 Gerhard Schneemann, *Studien Über die Honorius-Frage* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1864), 34–35.

79 Gerhard Schneemann, "Indéfectibilité de la foi de saint Pierre," *Études religieuses* 20 (1868): 616, 643.

80 Peter Finlay, S.J., "Gerhard Schneemann," *Irish Monthly* 14 (1886): 255; K. Neufeld, "Schneeman, Gerhard," in *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús: biográfico-temático*, ed. Charles E. O'Neill and Joaquín María Domínguez, 4 vols. (Rome: Institutum Historicum, 2001), 4:3529; J. De Blic, "Schneemann, Gerhard," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* [*DThC*], 15 vols. in 24 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1918–1950), 14.1:1513–16(cols.).

81 Konrad Kirch, S.J., "Preface," in Theodor Granderath, S.J., *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils von seiner ersten Ankündigung bis zu seiner Vertagung*, 1:vii. On Granderath see Klaus Schatz, "Granderath, Theodor," in O'Neill and Domínguez, *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús*, 2:1801–2; Friedrich Lauchert, "Granderath, Theodor," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 6 (New York: Encyclopedia Press, 1909), 725; P. Bernard, "Granderath, Theodore," in *DThC*, *6*.2:1693–94.

82 Theodor Granderath, "Vaticanisches Concil," in *Katholicsches Kirchenlexicon von Wetzer und Welte*, ed. Cardinal von Hergenroether and Professor Kaulen, new ed., vol. 12 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1901), 607–33; Granderath, "Der Umfang der

two constitutions of the Council; over half of the work is dedicated to explaining *Pastor Aeternus*.[83] He quotes from Gasser's *relatio* that the Council did not intend to define Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" of book IV, chapter 6, and that, instead, it wanted to define Bellarmine's "fourth view," contained in book IV, chapter 2.[84] Again he quotes Gasser to the effect that the pope's protection is limited: "the pope is *only* infallible when, by a solemn judgment, he defines a matter of faith and morals for the Church universal" (emphasis mine). This protection does not extend to a pope teaching as a private person or private teacher.[85] In Granderath's commentary on the definition of papal infallibility at the end of chapter 4 of *Pastor Aeternus*, he notes that, when it is said that the Roman pontiff is infallible, this infallibility is not to be understood as pertaining to the pope as a "private person."[86] Moreover, he notes that it is not sufficient that the pope propose doctrine; he must have a manifest intention to define.[87]

In 1893, Granderath was assigned to Rome as a professor of theology at the Gregorian University and as a spiritual director at the Germanicum. While there, Granderath continued to work on his *History of the Vatican Council*. Pope Leo XIII allowed him complete access to the Vatican archives to assist him in this endeavor. Leo encouraged him to be historically accurate, saying: "All the documents are at your disposal and We will not conceal a single one. Therefore, make known the progress of the Council as it actually was."[88]

In 1901 Konrad Kirch, S.J. (1863–1942), was assigned to assist the ailing Granderath to finish his work.[89] Unfortunately, in 1902, Granderath died with only the first two volumes ready for printing, and Kirch brought the conciliar history to the third session and the promulgation of *Dei Filius*. He had the third volume almost completely written before he died.[90] In addition to compiling this history, Kirch had to shepherd the first two

---

päpstlichen Unfehlbarkeit nach dem Lehrdrecrete des vatikanischen Concils," *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* y *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 38 (1890): 162–83.

83 Theodor Granderath, *Constitutiones Dogmaticae Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani: Ex Ipsis Eius Actis Explicatae* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1892).

84 Granderath, *Constitutiones Dogmaticae*, 187 (citing Gasser, *Gift of Infallibility*, 46).

85 Granderath, *Constitutiones Dogmaticae*, 176 (citing Gasser, *Gift of Infallibility*, 46).

86 Granderath, *Constitutiones Dogmaticae*, 233.

87 Granderath, *Constitutiones Dogmaticae*, 233.

88 Theodor Granderath, S.J., *Geschichte des Vatikanischen konzils von seiner ersten ankündigung bis zu seiner vertagung*, 4 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1903), 3:10.

89 Klaus Schatz, "Kirch, Konrad," in O'Neill and Domínguez, *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús*, 3:2196.

90 Kirch, "Preface," 1:viii.

volumes to press, while the third volume, which concerned *Pastor Aeternus*, required extensive editing.[91] In the third volume of the history, Granderath had noted that, on May 28, 1870, Bishop Ketteler of Mainz objected that the deputation was attempting to define the view of one school—Pighius's view. Granderath then noted that this was expressly denied, and he explains that von Ketteler simply misunderstood Bellarmine's view.[92]

Conclusion

As observed at the outset, canon law contains the following canon: "A thing is not understood as dogmatically defined or declared unless this is manifestly established." If Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" had been raised to the "dignity of a dogma," none of the Jesuit theologians and historians examined here were aware of it. This is seen in several different ways. First, post-conciliar Jesuit theologians did not raise the theological note of Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" of "probable" to *de fide*. Moreover, Jesuit theologians still treated Bellarmine's "fourth proposition" as an open theological question. The *Formula of Hormisdas* was not used to support it either; rather it was employed in *Pastor Aeternus* as proof of Bellarmine's "fourth view," which the Council defined. Jesuit theologians continued to use it in this fashion after the Council. Finally, the Jesuit historians of the First Vatican Council, Schneeman, Granderath, and Kirch, who were given access to the archival material of the Vatican, are completely unaware of the elevation of Bellarmine's "fourth proposition." N:V

91 Granderath, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen konzils*, 3.2:421–22.

92 Mansi, 52:207.