

cumulus of evidence for the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff outweighs all such doubts.

2. Because the argument of the fourth chapter necessarily excludes all discussion of detailed facts. Had they been introduced into the text, our antagonists would have evaded the point, and confused the argument by a discussion of details. I will, nevertheless, here affirm, that the following points in the case of Honorius can be abundantly proved from documents :

- (1) That Honorius defined no doctrine whatsoever.
- (2) That he forbade the making of any new definition.
- (3) That his fault was precisely in this omission of Apostolic authority, for which he was justly censured.
- (4) That his two epistles are entirely orthodox; though, in the use of language, he wrote as was usual before the condemnation of Monothelitism, and not as it became necessary afterwards. It is an anachronism and an injustice to censure his language, used before that condemnation, as it might be just to censure it after the condemnation had been made.

To this I add the following excellent passage from the recent Pastoral of the Archbishop of Baltimore :

“The case of Honorius forms no exception; for 1st, Honorius expressly says in his letters to Sergius, that he meant to define nothing, and he was condemned precisely because he temporized and would not define; 2nd, because in his letters he clearly taught the sound Catholic doctrine, only enjoining silence as to the use of certain terms, then new in the Church; and 3rd, because his letters were not addressed to a general council of the whole Church, and were rather private, than public and official; at least they were not published, even in the East, until several years later. The first letter was written to Sergius in 633, and eight years afterwards, in 641, the Emperor Heraclius, in