

Church is necessarily involved, in these things, though they be temporal, the Church may by right exert its power, and the civil state ought to yield<sup>73</sup>"-In this proposition is contained the full explanation of the indirect spiritual power of the Church over the state." The proposition is proved: 1. *From reason*.-Either the Church has an indirect power over the state, or the state has an indirect power over the Church. **Then is no alternative.** For, as experience teaches, conflicts may arise between Church and state." Now, in any question as to the competence of the two powers," either there must be some judge to decide what does and what does not fall within their respective spheres, or they are delivered over to perpetual doubt and to perpetual conflict. But who can define what is or is not within the jurisdiction of the Church in faith and morals, except a judge who knows what the sphere of faith and morals contains and how far it extends? <sup>7</sup> It is clear that the civil power cannot define how far the circumference of faith and morals extends. To do this it must know the whole deposit of explicit and implicit faith. . Therefore, the Church alone can fix the limits of its jurisdiction; and if the Church can fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, it can fix the limits of all other jurisdiction- at least, so as to warn it off its own domain.<sup>77</sup> Hence, **the Church is supreme in matters of religion and conscience:** she knows the limits of her own jurisdiction, and, therefore, also the limits of the competence of the civil power. Again, if it be said that the state is altogether independent of the Church, **it would follow <sup>7</sup> that the state would also be independent of the law of God in things temporal;** for the divine law must be promulgated by the Church. **It is unmeaning to say that princes have no supe-**

rior but the law of God; <sup>7</sup> for a law is no superior without an authority to judge and to apply it. II. We next prove our thesis *from authority*. We refer to the famous bull *Ullam Sallctam*, issued by Pope Boniface VIII. in 13<sup>o</sup>2. This bull declares that there is but one true Church, . . and therefore but one head of the Church-the Roman Pontiff; that there are two swords-i.e., two powers-the spiritual and the temporal; the latter must be subject to the former. **The bull finally winds up with this definition:** "And this we declare, affirm, *define (definimus)*, and pronounce, that it is necessary for the salvation of every human creature that he should be subject to the Roman Pontiff." <sup>s</sup> This is undoubtedly a *de fide* definition-i.e., an utterance *ex cathedra*." In fact, the bull, though occasioned by and published during the contest between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair, King of France-who held that he was in no sense subject to the Roman Pontiff-had for its object, as is evident from its whole tenor and wording, this: to define dogmatically the relation of the Church to the state-*in general* that is, universally, not merely the relations between the Church and the particular state or nation-France. Now, what is .the meanIng of this *de fide* definition? There are two interpretations: *one*, given by the enemies of the Papacy, is that the Pope, in this bull, claims, "not merely an indirect, **but a direct and absolute, power over the state,** thus completely subordinating it to the Church; <sup>s</sup> that is, **subjecting it to the Church, even in *purely temporal things*.** This explanation, given formerly by the partisans of Philip the Fair, by the Regalists in the reign of Louis XIV., and at present by Janus, Dr. Schulte,

f. Card. Tarqu., l. c. lib. i. . p. 56, n. 55. <sup>78</sup> Manning, l. c., pp. 7<sup>o</sup>, 71. . \* Craiss., n. 69<sup>8</sup>. . Cfr. Phillips, Kirchenr., vol. iL, pp. 54<sup>o</sup>, 547. . \* Manning, l. c., pp. 54, 55. <sup>7</sup> Cfr. Syllab. r8<sup>o</sup>4, prop. 19, 20, 39, 4<sup>2</sup>, 54'. Cra,ss .. n. 698.

<sup>7</sup> Manning, l. c., p. 51.

• Phillips, l. c., vol. iii., pp. 256, 257; cfr. Darras, Hist., vol. iii., p. 454.

" Fessler, True and False Infallibility, p. 81.

• Manning, l. c., p. 51

<sup>82</sup> Phillips, l. c., vol. iii., pp. 255, 256.

• Cfr. ib., p. 206 .

• Cfr. Manning, l. c., pp. 61-64.