

AN INSIDE VIEW
OF THE
VATICAN COUNCIL,
IN THE SPEECH
OF THE MOST REVEREND
ARCHBISHOP KENRICK,
OF ST. LOUIS.

EDITED BY
LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON,
WITH NOTES AND ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS,

INCLUDING:

THE SYLLABUS OF HIS HOLINESS PIUS IX.
THE PROTEST OF FATHER HYACINTHE.
THE PROTEST AND SPEECHES OF BISHOP STROSSMAYER.
THE APOCRYPHAL "SPEECH OF A BISHOP."
THE ACTS OF THE COUNCIL.
THE APPEAL OF FATHER HYACINTHE.
THE DECLARATION OF DR. DÜLLINGER AND HIS ASSOCIATES.
THE PROGRAMME OF THE ANTI-INFALLIBILITY LEAGUE.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY,
150 NASSAU-STREET, NEW YORK.

1870

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL.

Secrecy of Proceedings—Contradictory Statements—A Decisive Document-----PAGES 5-13

CHAPTER II.

THE OBJECT OF THE COUNCIL.

The "Liberal Catholic" Party—Its Principles and its Men—Speeches of Montalembert—The Absolutist Party—Its Principles as defined by the Prince de Broglie—ENCYCLICAL "QUANTA CURA," AND SYLLABUS -----14-49

CHAPTER III.

THE PREPARATION OF THE COUNCIL.

Hopeful Expectations of the Liberal Catholics—Packing of Preparatory Committees—Manipulating of Public Opinion—Plan of Acclamation—Publication of *Janus*—Muzzling of the Press at Rome—Gratry's Letters—FATHER HYACINTHE'S PROTEST- 50-60

CHAPTER IV.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE COUNCIL.

Modern Revolution in the Constitution of the Episcopate—Present Dependence of the Bishops on "the Nod" of the Pope—Insignificant Minority in the Church represented by an Overwhelming Majority in the Council ----- 61-65

CHAPTER V.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COUNCIL.

First Code of Rules imposed on the Council—Second Code—Extinction of Conciliar Liberty—Protest of the Minority-- 66-70

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL.

First *Schema* submitted, attacked by Conolly and Strossmayer, and withdrawn—Schwarzenberg's Desires for Reformation—

Strossmayer's Second Speech—Decree for Infallibility proposed—GREAT SPEECH OF STROSSMAYER—Immense Uproar—Deceitful Trick of the Managers—"OBSERVATIONS" OF THE BISHOPS—Decree passed by a Majority—PROTEST OF THE MINORITY ----- 71-87

CHAPTER VII.

THE SPEECH OF ARCHBISHOP KENRICK.

[See Contents and Analysis on pp. 93, 94] -----88-174

CHAPTER VIII.

AN APOCRYPHAL SPEECH.

Italian Origin of the Document—Relations of the Imposture to the Example and Moral Teachings of the Roman-catholic Church—THE PRETENDED "SPEECH OF A BISHOP IN THE COUNCIL"—No Papacy in the New Testament—Nor in Early Church History—Is Peter the Rock?—Former Popes Fallible—Peril of the Church-----175-195

CHAPTER IX.

THE ACTS OF THE COUNCIL.

The two Dogmatic Constitutions—CANONS ON THE CATHOLIC FAITH—Constitution on the Church—CHAPTER III.: ON THE POWER AND NATURE OF THE PRIMACY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF—CHAPTER IV.: CONCERNING THE INFALLIBLE TEACHING OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF—Retroactive Effect of these Decrees—Former *ex cathedrâ* Teachings now declared Infallible—I. Bull, *Unam Sanctam*—II. Bull, *Cum ex Apostolatûs Officio*—III. Bull, *In Cœnâ Domini*—IV. Encyclical, *Quantû Curâ*, and *Syllabus*—Former Atrocities of Popes now justified ----- 196-215

CHAPTER X.

THE SEQUEL OF THE COUNCIL.

Temporary Distraction of Men's Minds from Religious Subjects—Measures of the Court of Rome for conciliating or whipping in the Minority—The Quinquennial Faculties—FATHER HYACINTHE'S APPEAL TO THE BISHOPS—Döllinger's Letter to his Archbishop—Political Bearings of the Infallibility Decree—DECLARATION OF DÖLLINGER AND HIS ASSOCIATES—Anathema and Excommunication—PROGRAMME OF THE ANTI-INFALLIBILITY LEAGUE—The Conflict Begun----- 216-250

THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

CHAPTER I.

THE MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

THE Vatican Council of the year 1870, an event of interest to all, and especially to those of every Christian communion, who love the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ on the earth, is nevertheless the one event of recent times, the history of which is most disputed and most studiously concealed from the knowledge of the public.

The Council was organized as a "*secret society*." At the opening of it an awful obligation was imposed, under severe penalty, "*sub pœnâ gravi*," on all its members, binding them to absolute secrecy in everything pertaining to the Council. The members were not allowed to communicate even with each other in print. Meetings for consultation of members speaking the same language, were interdicted. Owing to the extraordinary acoustical properties of the hall of the Council, it was rare that the transactions were heard, except by a small

part of the members. The stenographic reports of daily proceedings, transacted in an unfamiliar language, were not printed, nor otherwise submitted to the members of the Council, whether for their information or for the correction of the record.*

In view of these facts, the bitter complaints of the bishops belonging to the majority, and in particular of Archbishop Manning, of Westminster, † of the incorrectness of the published accounts of the assembly, seem actually childish. To stimulate public curiosity and interest by every device of advertising—by announcements and manifestoes, by parades, processions, costumes, tableaux, and fireworks, attracting a crowd from every part of the world to the doors of the Council, and then complain that the event was reported in the newspapers; to lock the doors in the face of the public and shut off access to information by oaths of secrecy, and then complain that the reports are not exact—is “like children crying in the market-place.” If they wanted no reports, why all this advertising of a free show of parades, pantomimes, and pyrotechny to gather the loungers of two hemispheres in the piazza of St. Peter’s? Why not go quietly about their business, and have done with it? If they wanted to be correctly reported, why not admit witnesses, or remove the seal of secrecy? The

* *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, 48, 59, 62. The trustworthiness of this work is disputed by interested parties, and indorsed by others. The above statements, however, as well as most other statements made in it, do not depend on the authority of the writer, but are sustained by reference to unimpeachable authorities.

† See his Pastoral, “The Vatican Council,” pp. 1-33. *Petri Privilegium*, 3. One of the last acts of the Council was to adopt a violent protest against the reports in circulation concerning its doings. *Ibid.* 181. This protest, says Dr. Manning, was adopted “by an immense majority:” implying that a minority more or less considerable declined to impugn the correctness of the reports.

conclusion is inevitable : what the managers of the Council wanted was to be *incorrectly* reported. The thing which they had taken pains to secure was the wide circulation of partial information about their proceedings. The thing which they had studied to prevent was the statement of the whole truth.

And yet, in the sweeping denunciation of all reports, of the Council as utterly untrustworthy and misleading, is to be remarked one significant exception. While the correspondence of the British newspapers is declared to be simply imaginative, founded on no authentic knowledge of the facts whatever, it is confessed that "the journals of Catholic countries," and especially the *Augsburg Gazette*, "understood what they were perverting ; and that they had obtained their knowledge from sources which could only have been opened to them by violation of duty."* By this admission, the defenders of the Council against the charges of contemporaneous history waive the claim of superior knowledge, and resolve the question at issue into a simple question of veracity between themselves and certain of their colleagues and associates. The number of the witnesses is understood to be "by an immense majority" in favor of the Council. But the weight of their testimony is inevitably affected by the two facts : first, that interests which they deem infinite are pending on their being believed ; and secondly, that authority which they hold to be infallible justifies them in acts of deception for the advantage of the Church.†

* Archbishop Manning, of Westminster, *Petri Privilegium*, 3, pp. 2, 4.

† S. Alphonsi de Lig. Compend. Theologiæ Moralis, auct. Neyraguet, 141. "*De æquivocatione.*" It is certified by the pope, *ex cathedrâ*, that the writings of this saint contain nothing contrary to sound doctrine. The distinguished Father Newman has, in his

Having these considerations in view, we may fairly weigh the various external testimonies to the character of the Vatican Council. These may be represented on the one side by two famous volumes "*Ce qui se passe au Concile*,"* (Doings in the Council,) and the "Letters of Quirinus;"† on the other side by the pastoral letter of Archbishop Manning, one of the ablest leaders of the majority of the Council.‡

The former are full and detailed histories, not impartial indeed, but accurate and exact for the most part, in speaking of matters on which we have the means of testing them, and affording thus a fair presumption in their favor as to matters on which the more than Masonic secrecy of the Council refuses us access to testimony. They show, citing authority wherever it is possible, that the Council was deprived of the freedom of originating measures and of consultation and discussion upon those measures which had been secretly prepared in advance, and enforced upon the Council; that in many ways unprecedented in such bodies, the power of the pope was brought to bear, both upon the Council as a whole and upon its individual members, so depriving it of the liberty which, according to the traditions of the Roman-catholic church, is essential to the authority of a gen-

Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ, frankly purged himself, personally, of complicity with such morality. But this is not sufficient to protect his fellow-ecclesiastics from the irresistible inference that what they are required to accept as doctrine will be put in practice by them when occasion demands.

* Published by Henri Plon, Paris, 1870. It is greatly to be regretted that no translation of this work is extant in English.

† Rivingtons, London. Pott, Young & Co., New York.

‡ *Petri Privilegium*: Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese, 1867-1871. By Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster. London: Longmans.

eral council : and that at the same time, by processes utterly foreign to the genius and antecedents of that church, an outside pressure had been created by the systematic arts of the Jesuits and other orders centering at Rome, the lower orders of clergy and the laity having been stirred up to affect and control the votes of the bishops set over them. Furthermore, the statements of these books concur with each other and with the common course of public report, in representing that within the council-chamber the course of the majority towards the minority was in like manner domineering and tyrannical, and that the attempt of certain bold speakers of the minority to compel a hearing gave rise to scenes of outrageous disorder and confusion ; finally, that the result sought by the papal court and the subservient majority was reached only by the sudden and peremptory shutting off of debate on the main question.

Against these statements, made in the most circumstantial manner, by persons admitted by their opponents to have had access to the facts, the defence set up is a sweeping negative and a general denunciation of “*all* such things as have been uttered in the aforesaid newspapers and pamphlets, as altogether false and calumnious, whether in contempt of our holy father and of the apostolic see, or to the dishonor of this holy synod, and on the score of its asserted want of legitimate liberty.”* Archbishop Manning declares, with many bitter words concerning gainsayers, that, “setting aside this one question of opportuneness, there was not in the Council of the Vatican a difference of any gravity, and certainly *no difference whatsoever on any*

* Protest of the Council, signed by the cardinals president, *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 34, 181.

doctrine of faith." "Never was there a greater unanimity than in the Vatican Council." "I have never seen such calmness, self-respect, mutual forbearance, courtesy, and self-control as in the eighty-nine sessions of the Vatican Council." "Occasionally murmurs of dissent were audible; now and then a comment may have been made aloud. In a very few instances, and those happily of an exceptional kind, expressions of strong disapproval and of exhausted patience at length escaped. But the descriptions of violence, outcries, menace, denunciation, and even of personal collisions, with which certain newspapers deceived the world, I can affirm to be calumnious falsehoods, fabricated to bring the Council into odium and contempt."*

* *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 26-28.

The writer proceeds to denounce as sheer, deliberate fabrication, the representation of the Council as a "scene of indecent clamor and personal violence, unworthy even in laymen, criminal in bishops of the church;" and to deny "that a tyrannical majority deprived the minority of liberty of discussion." These expressions receive great light from the speech of Archbishop Kenrick in this volume. The form of expression, "*I can affirm*," etc., is worthy of notice, in view of the approved principle of Roman-catholic morals thus stated by St. Alphonsus de Liguori: "If a man is asked about something which it is his interest to conceal, he can answer, *No, I say*: that is, *I say the word No*. Cardenas doubts about this; but saving his better counsel, he seems to do so without reason, for the word *I say* really has two senses; it means *to utter* and *to assent*. We here employ it in the sense of *utter*." *Theol. Moralis*, 4. 151. A full exhibit of the teaching of this approved and authorized treatise of St. Alphonsus on this point may be found in Meyrick's "*Moral Theology of the Church of Rome*," republished with an introduction by the Rev. A. C. Coxe, Baltimore, 1856.

Archbishop Manning is believed by those who know him to be a man whose natural generosity and dignity of character would restrain him from such subterfuge. It is all the more important to be assured of this, as it becomes manifest that the religious teachings which he is required to accept do not so restrain him,

In view of these flat contradictions and mutual impeachments of veracity, it becomes most desirable, in order to come at the true history of the Council, to find some witness or document of decisive authority. The shorthand reports of its transactions and debates (if such speech-making as was permissible under the extraordinary rules imposed upon the Council by the pope may be called debate) are secreted in its archives, to be—not quoted, but mysteriously alluded to as something that *would be* very decisive if it were allowed to quote them.* The lips of the multitude of witnesses are sealed with bonds of secrecy, which can be relaxed only by the dispensing authority of the pope, and will therefore be relaxed only in favor of the pope's own party; so that "the bishops of the minority are bound to secrecy for all their lives, and the history will never be written except by those whose passions have precipitated the issue." †

ONE DOCUMENT, however, of remarkable character and unimpeachable authenticity, has providentially escaped from the secrecy that has been wrapped around most of the doings of the Council. It is from the pen of the ablest of the American bishops—Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis. It was not intended to be seen by the public, much less by the Protestant public; but was prepared, first, to be spoken in the secret assembly; and when that was prevented by the sudden and

but have, in fact, the contrary tendency. What can we believe from men who, on the question in hand, stand confessed before the public as being *forbidden to tell the truth*, under the most awful sanctions, and as having a standing license to deceive the public "for a good reason"—"and any honest object, such as keeping our goods, spiritual or temporal, is a good reason."

* *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 32.

† *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, p. 62.

unanticipated shutting off of debate, was printed, still in the Latin language, for private circulation among the bishops of the Council. Its testimony on the questions of fact now in dispute before the public is entirely incidental, being in the form of allusions to facts of which the persons to whom it was addressed had been eye-and-ear witnesses. For this reason, its testimony is all the more impressive—is, in fact, decisive. It is possible to imagine one of the members of the Council, at a distance, in time and space, from the events of which he speaks, under the excitement of public discussion, under the influence of a most unhappy system of perverted morality commended to him by “infallible” authority, in the presence of readers who have no means of testing his statements, to make sweeping general assertions not corresponding with the truth. But it is not possible to imagine one of the members of the Council laying in print, privately, under the eyes of his colleagues, detailed statements or distinct and circumstantial allusions which they personally knew to be false.

What bearing, then, has this decisive document on the questions of fact at issue between the bishops of the majority as represented by Archbishop Manning, and those of the minority as represented in the “Letters of Quirinus,” and in “*Ce qui se passe au Concile?*” The question is one of so much moment to a large part of the religious world, that the entire pamphlet of Archbishop Kenrick is now for the first time laid before the public, in this volume,* that every one may decide for

* We had translated this speech from the private edition printed at Naples for circulation in the Council. But since this work was commenced, a copy has reached us of the “*Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum,*” published at Nördlingen by Professor Friedrich of Munich, which contains Kenrick’s speech,

himself. It is sufficient for the immediate purpose of this Introduction to say that on all those points (and they are many) of disputed fact between these parties, on which it gives light, it discredits the declarations of the archbishop of Westminster and the solemn protest of the majority of the Council, and approves the substantial accuracy of the writings which they denounce as mendacious.

This point being established, we may proceed with more confidence in our brief history.

in Latin, together with other documents of the interior history of the Council, which tend still further to confirm all the allegations hitherto made of the oppression of the Council by the court of Rome, and of its entire lack of that liberty which, according to the traditions of the Roman-catholic church itself, is essential to the authority of an Œcumenical Council.

Only the first part of this important work is yet published. It contains :

1. The pamphlet on infallibility distributed in the Council by Bp. Ketteler, of Mayence, entitled *Quæstio*.

2. "*La Liberté du Concile et l'Infaillibilité*," by one of the highest ecclesiastics of France, printed about June 1, 1870, to the number of only 50 copies, for distribution to the Cardinals exclusively.

3. The Speech of Archbishop Kenrick.

4. Eight Protests by bishops of the minority, presented at different times in the Council.

5. The Order and Mode of proceedings in the Council of Trent.

6. Correspondence between Cardinals Schwarzenberg and Antonelli ; and the former's "*Desideria patribus Concilii Œcumenici proponenda*."

7. A Dissertation (in French) on a point of casuistry on which the writer seeks relief, at the hands of the Council, from the common rules imposed by Romish writers of Moral Theology.

CHAPTER II.

THE OBJECT OF THE COUNCIL.

By one of the leading spirits of the Council it has been emphatically denied that "its one object was to define the infallibility of the pope."* And justly; for the definition of infallibility was obviously not so much an end, as the means to an end. What was the definite purpose in the minds of those who projected and controlled the Council was for a long time concealed from the knowledge of the public, and even of the bishops of whom the Council was to be composed. The Bull of Indiction of June 29, 1868, dealt in the vaguest generalities of promised blessings to the church and the world. It was not long before simultaneous operations in all quarters, directed from a common centre, for the creation of a factitious public sentiment in favor of the notion of the infallibility of the pope, confirmed in the minds of that party in the church whose overthrow was contemplated, their suspicions of the real object of the convocation. Since the close of the Council all disguise has been dropped, and the triumphant majority acknowledges that the object all along has been to crush the "Liberal Catholic" party in the Roman-catholic church.†

What is, or was, the Liberal Catholic party? It

* *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 34.

† See (out of many examples) the *Catholic World* for August, 1871, in an article on "Infallibility." It alleges as the present reason for the definition of the new dogma that "numbers of good and loyal Catholics were beginning to go astray after a so-called *Catholic liberalism*, and a cliqué of secret traitors was plotting a

may be described as the fruit of that *revival of religion* in the Roman-catholic church of Europe, and especially of France, which followed the transient stupor in which that church was left by the shock of the French Revolution. It was led by certain men whose nobleness and purity of character, whose single-minded zeal for truth and righteousness, and whose unfeigned affection towards the Roman-catholic church, (which, to their minds, represented the kingdom of Christ upon earth,) none but the most audacious partisans have ever dared to question. Such a one, in statesmanship and literature, was the late Count de Montalembert: such, in the pulpit, were Lacordaire and Hyacinthe; and in the domain of theology, such was the foremost scholar of the Roman church, the illustrious Döllinger. The eulogists of Rome had no prouder names than these to boast in all their prodigious roll.

What made these men *liberals* in the Catholic church was their serious, earnest apprehension of the fact—so painful, yet so prevalent throughout Roman-catholic countries—of the alienation of the great mass of thoughtful men from the only form of Christianity which they know.* It seemed to them a fact of sad and fearful significance, that all the interests of liberty and social improvement should have been unnaturally revolt against the holy see, disguised under the ambiguities and reservations of Gallicanism," p. 593. The significance of this allegation cannot be fully appreciated without considering that for several years the *Catholic World* had been diligently commending the men and the principles of the Liberal Catholic party to the American public, as representing the real liberality of the Roman-catholic church, and its accordance with free government and American sentiment.

* See the confession of Cardinal Schwarzenberg, in his "*Desideria Patribus Concilii Œcumenici proponenda*," in *Doc. ad illustr. Conc. Vat.*, p. 285.

divorced from the gospel; and that the church of Christ should have come to be identified, by its ministers and by the mass of the public, with abhorred systems of civil and religious despotism, with the obsolete horrors of the Inquisition and the dragonnades, and with certain modern abuses and corruptions which seemed to them to have no necessary connection with the church upon which they had fastened themselves. The voices of these eloquent and earnest men, as they sounded forth from the press, from the rostrum, and from the historic pulpit of Notre Dame, while they bore brave witness for God and Christ and duty, were affected with something of human and Christlike sympathy with the ills and the aspirations of the society in which they lived. "Their voice was to the sons of men." It seemed a strange thing to hear from under the Dominican or Carmelite frock any word of generous sympathy towards those who were seeking, even in a wandering and hopeless way, for liberty and social improvement—any assurance that Christianity and the church were not necessarily committed to the side of despotism and public ignorance, of religious persecution, the oppression of the conscience, the muzzling of the press, the gagging of public speech. There was a power in such utterances from the lips of Lacordaire and Hyacinthe, which not even the matchless splendor of their rhetoric could account for. The people who had learned to regard the church and clergy as their natural enemies, came in vast throngs about the pulpit of Notre Dame, eager to listen to a gospel which, while it rebuked and refuted their errors, and had no tolerance for their vices, nevertheless refused to ally itself with the advocates of hereditary tyranny, or with the apologists of obsolete cruelty.

The three characteristic aims of the Liberal Catholic party can hardly be better defined than in the terms in which the illustrious Hyacinthe summed up the tendencies of his own preaching :

1. The reconciliation of the Roman-catholic church with modern society.

2. Not by compromise of convictions, but by points of common belief and practice, and by the spirit of charity, to draw together the various communions of Christian believers ; emphasizing the doctrine of "the soul of the church,"* which includes all holy and believing souls, as distinguished from the body or corporation of the church, which "holds many of the wolves within its fold, and keeps many of the lambs without."†

3. To endeavor to bring back the Roman-catholic church toward the spirit of its early days.‡

These liberal sentiments were associated, nevertheless, not only with Christian faith, but with a most hearty and loyal affection towards the Roman-catholic church, its theology and government. The liberal party was far removed from sympathy with that "Gallicanism" which would limit the authority of the church, in its proper sphere, by the interference of any political power whatever. That famous maxim of Cavour, which is but the condensed expression of the universal American sentiment, "A free church in a free state," was an echo from the lips of Montalembert.

And yet so ardent was the loyalty of this band of fervid Catholics towards the see and the person of the

* St. Augustine.

† Idem.

‡ Father Hyacinthe's Discourses, vol. 1, p. 37. Putnam & Sons.

pope, that they braved the reproach of inconsistency that they might maintain with tongue and pen and sword that petty principality of the Roman state which both in theory and in administration was the most absolute contradiction to all their principles. It was due to Montalembert and his associates that the temporal power of the pope was restored to him by the arms of France, after its overthrow in 1848 : it was due to the same party that when later the same temporal power was threatened with something more formidable than revolution—with bankruptcy—the contribution of Peter's pence was organized which stayed the doomed and tottering throne a few brief seasons longer.

Notwithstanding the fervent devotion of the Liberal Catholics to the Church of Rome, which they sincerely held to be the embodiment of the kingdom of Christ on the earth ; notwithstanding the fact that within their slender number they embraced the most illustrious names of contemporary catholicism ; notwithstanding the eminent services which they had rendered to the pope and see of Rome ; it was impossible for their principles of civil and religious liberty to be conspicuously taught in a Roman-catholic country, without drawing forth against them the outcries and the organized opposition of the hierarchy and of the religious orders.

It is difficult for us in America to comprehend the indignation which was roused, throughout the Roman-catholic hierarchy, by the enunciation in a "Catholic Congress," by a French nobleman, of doctrines of the rights and dignity of conscience, of religious liberty, of hatred to persecution and the Inquisition, which are familiar to American citizens as axioms of universal acceptance. The words of Montalembert in an assembly of Catholics at Malines were these :

“Of all liberties which I have undertaken to defend, the most precious in my view, the most sacred, the most legitimate, the most necessary, is liberty of conscience. . . . I must confess that this enthusiastic devotion of mine to religious liberty is not general among Catholics. They are very fond of it for themselves—which is no great merit. Generally speaking, everybody likes every sort of liberty for himself. But religious liberty for its own sake, the liberty of other men’s consciences, the liberty of that worship which men denounce and repudiate—this is what disturbs and enrages many of us. . . . Are we at liberty, now-a-days, to demand liberty for the truth—that is, for ourselves (for every honest man believes what he holds to be the truth) and refuse it to error—that is, to persons who differ from us? I answer flatly, No. . . . I feel an invincible horror at all punishments and all violences inflicted on mankind under pretence of serving or defending religion. The fagots lighted by the hands of Catholics are as horrible to me as the scaffolds on which Protestants have immolated so many martyrs. The gag in the mouth of any sincere preacher of his own faith, I feel as if it were between my own lips, and it makes me shudder with distress.”*

In the United States it was possible for such sentiments from Roman-catholic presses or platforms to pass without official rebuke, or even to stand unchallenged, and be ostentatiously put forward as the accepted doctrine of the Church of Rome. But in countries where opinion was divided, where great political inter-

* The entire passage, which is full of genuine eloquence, is quoted in De Pressensé’s article on Parties in the Catholic Church in France, appended to volume I. of the Discourses of Father Hyacinthe.

ests involved in the maintenance of the grossest doctrines of absolutism and persecution, were wont to count on the undivided support of the Romish hierarchy, it was not possible. The most that the Roman-catholic friends of civil and religious liberty in Europe could have hoped, for their opinions, was that they should be tolerated. But even this hope was disappointed.*

* We have given above the position of the Liberal Catholic party, as defined by themselves. It is well to add their account of the position of the opposite party, as briefly summed up in an article in the *Correspondant*, a few years since, by the Prince de Broglie. According to him the position of the ultramontane party is, "that the Church is the declared enemy (1) of human reason, (2) of modern society, (3) of religious liberty, (4) of political liberty."

1. *Enmity to Human Reason.*—"This enmity does not display itself merely by the tone of detraction and irony with which it pursues all the efforts and acts of human reason, by its shouts of triumph on every occasion when reason stumbles and goes wrong. There are besides whole systems of philosophy connected, which stop short of nothing less than denying reason the faculty of investigating even a shadow of truth without the aid of faith; and these are systems around which ultramontaniam throws all its credit and affection. In a word, whenever these new champions of the church speak of reason, one would say that they saw passing before their eyes an enemy whom they menace with every hostile look and gesture, and upon whom they are ever ready to precipitate themselves headlong."

2. *Enmity to Modern Society.*—"The same doctrines which inculcate enmity to human reason, profess unmitigated hostility to the constitution of modern society as based on that reason. No one can therefore flatter himself that he can remain a member of the spiritual communion of Christians, and of temporal society as at present constituted in France, on the principles of 1789. And this hostility between modern society and the church, so eagerly pointed out and insisted on by the infidel, the party we speak of accepts without the smallest hesitation, in all its bearings, and follows out into all its applications. In its eyes, all modern society comes excommunicated into the world—no baptism can wash away the stain on its first origin. All is bad, anti-Christian, anti-Catholic, in the principles of modern society."

3. *Enmity to Religious Liberty.*—"In all that infidelity has repeated on the subject, I do not remember ever to have met with any-

The speeches of Montalembert at Malines were pronounced in August, 1863. On the 8th of December, 1864, was issued from the Vatican the Encyclical Letter entitled "*Quanta Cura*," to which was appended the famous "*Syllabus*" of propositions condemned by Pope Pius IX. in various pontifical documents. In its terms, this edict applies to all liberal thought and opinion in thing so precisely and accurately laid down, as what we may now read every day in the columns of the contemporary religious press. It has cut short all debate by a summary process, and has declared dogmatically civil intolerance to be an article of faith for every Catholic, and religious liberty to be heresy. The church chastises heretics by force, when she can—where she can—as much as she can. If she tolerates them anywhere, it is as one tolerates a necessary evil, with the intention only of freeing oneself from it on the first opportunity; but she never can accept religious liberty as a principle of Christian duty. Intolerance is her right the moment it becomes possible. No lapse of time can raise prescription against her—no promise bind her; witness Louis XIV. and the edict of Nantes. Such is the theory we may now see every day professed by these religious controversialists."

4. *Enmity to Political Liberty*.—"A stale calumny, which infidelity itself blushed for, and now only ventured to whisper, consisted in representing the church as the natural ally of tyranny and the born adversary of all public liberty. . . . The new style of religious controversy of which we speak has resuscitated it, and in our day of storms and disaster, hastened voluntarily to proclaim a solemn divorce between religion and national liberty. . . . Ultramontane controversy has excommunicated liberty from the tribunal of religion herself, has preached absolute power as a dogma, has equally proscribed every guarantee of individual and civil liberty as the fruit of human pride, and abandoned every restriction preservative of public right."

Allowance may be made for this statement of the questions at issue, as proceeding from one of the parties to the controversy. But the manifesto of the opposite party, in the "*Encyclical and Syllabus*," substantially accepts this statement. The issue made up between the two parties, to be tried in general council, was whether those sentiments which are the universal sentiments of American society and American Christianity are to be tolerated within the pale of the Roman-catholic church.

all parts of the world. It condemns all those convictions concerning human rights and duties which underlie the best results of modern civilization, and which are incorporated with all the habits of American thought and the fabric of American government. But the time of its issue and the forms of expression used in it made it clear to men of every party that it was aimed at the Liberal party in the Catholic church.

It was unfortunate that a document in which the American people have so practical an interest should have been published at a time when all our minds were absorbed in the pending question of our national existence. If it had been issued in a time of peace and quiet, its astounding enunciations would have produced a wholesome shock upon the public mind. But amid the excitements of that critical period, it slipped into its place among the documents of past history, with so little attention from the community that it is important for us to reproduce it here.

ENCYCLICAL "QUANTA CURA," AND SYLLABUS.

To Our Venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Universal Church having Grace and Communion of the Apostolic See,

PIUS PP. IX.

HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BENEDECTION.

It is well known unto all men, and especially to you, venerable brethren, with what great care and pastoral vigilance our predecessors, the Roman pontiffs, have discharged the office intrusted by Christ our Lord to them in the person of the most blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and have unremittingly discharged the duty of feeding the lambs and sheep, and have diligently nourished the Lord's entire flock with the words

of faith, imbued it with salutary doctrine, and guarded it from poisoned pastures. And those, our predecessors, who were the assertors and champions of the august Catholic religion, truth and justice, being as they were chiefly solicitous for the salvation of souls, held nothing to be of so great importance as the duty of exposing and condemning, in their most wise letters and constitutions, all heresies and errors which are hostile to moral honesty and to the eternal salvation of mankind, and which have frequently stirred up terrible commotions and have damaged both the Christian and civil commonwealths in a disastrous manner. Wherefore those our predecessors have, with apostolic fortitude, continually resisted the nefarious attempts of unjust men, who, like raging waves of the sea foaming forth their own confusion and promising liberty whilst they are the slaves of corruption, endeavored by their false opinions and most pernicious writings to overthrow the foundations of the Catholic religion and of civil society, to abolish all virtue and justice, to deprave the souls and minds of all men, and especially to pervert inexperienced youth from uprightness of morals, to corrupt them miserably, to lead them into snares of error, and finally to tear them from the bosom of the Catholic church.

And now, venerable brethren, as is also very well known to you—scarcely had we (by the secret dispensation of Divine Providence, certainly by no merit of our own) been called to this chair of Peter, when we, to the extreme grief of our soul, beheld a horrible tempest stirred up by so many erroneous opinions, and the dreadful, and never-enough-to-be-lamented mischiefs which redound to Christian people from such errors: and we then, in discharge of our apostolic ministerial

office, imitating the example of our illustrious predecessors, raised our voice, and in several published encyclical letters, and in allocutions delivered in consistory, and in other apostolical letters, we condemned the prominent, most grievous errors of the age, and we stirred up your excellent episcopal vigilance, and again and again did we admonish and exhort all the sons of the Catholic church, who are most dear to us, that they should abhor and shun all the said errors as they would the contagion of a fatal pestilence. Especially in our first encyclical letter, written to you on the 9th of November, anno 1846, and in two allocutions, one of which was delivered by us in consistory on the 9th of December, anno 1854, and the other on the 9th of June, anno 1862, we condemned the monstrous and portentous opinions which prevail especially in the present age to the very great loss of souls, and even to the detriment of civil society; and which are in the highest degree hostile, not only to the Catholic church and to her salutary doctrine and venerable laws, but also to the everlasting law of nature engraven by God upon the hearts of all men, and to right reason; and out of which almost all other errors originate.

Now although hitherto we have not omitted to denounce and reprove the chief errors of this kind, yet the cause of the Catholic church and the salvation of souls committed to us by God, and even the interests of human society, absolutely demand, that once again we should stir up your pastoral solicitude to drive away other erroneous opinions which flow from those errors above specified, as their source. These false and perverse opinions are so much the more detestable by how much they have chiefly for their object to hinder and banish that salutary influence which the Catholic church,

by the institution and command of her Divine Author, ought freely to exercise, even to the consummation of the world, over not only individual men but nations, peoples, and sovereigns—and to abolish that mutual coöperation and agreement of counsels between the priesthood and governments which has always been propitious and conducive to the welfare both of church and state. (Gregory XVI. Encyclical, 13th August, 1832.)

You are well aware that at this time, there are not a few who apply to civil society the impious and absurd principle of *naturalism*, as they term it, and dare to teach that “the welfare of the state and political and social progress require that human society should be constituted and governed irrespective of religion, which is to be treated just as if it did not exist, or as if no real difference existed between true and false religions.” Contrary to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, of the church, and of the holy fathers, these persons do not hesitate to assert that “the best condition of human society is that wherein no duty is recognized by the government of correcting by enacted penalties the violators of the Catholic religion, except when the maintenance of the public peace requires it.” From this totally false notion of social government, they fear not to uphold that erroneous opinion most pernicious to the Catholic church and to the salvation of souls; which was called by our predecessor Gregory XVI., above quoted, the insanity, (Encycl., 13th August, 1832,) (*deliramentum*), namely, that “liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man; and that this right ought, in every well-governed state, to be proclaimed and asserted by the law; and that the citizens possess the right of being unrestrained in the exercise of every kind of liberty, by any law, ecclesiastical or civil, so that

they are authorized to publish and put forward openly, all their ideas whatsoever, either by speaking, in print, or by any other method." But whilst these men make these rash assertions, they do not reflect or consider that they preach the liberty of perdition, (St. Augustine, Epistle 105, al. 166,) and that, "if it is always free to human arguments to discuss, men will never be wanting who will dare to resist the truth, and to rely upon the loquacity of human wisdom, when we know from the command of our Lord Jesus Christ how faith and Christian wisdom ought to avoid this most mischievous vanity." (St. Leo, Epistle 164, al. 133, sec. 2, Boll. ed.)

And since religion has been banished from civil government; since the teaching and authority of divine revelation have been repudiated, the idea inseparable therefrom of justice and human right is obscured by darkness and lost, and in place of true justice and legitimate right material force is substituted, whence it appears why some, entirely neglecting and slighting the most certain principles of sound reason, dare to proclaim "that the will of the people, manifested by public opinion, (as they call it,) or by other means, constitutes a supreme law independent of all divine and human right; and that, in the political order, accomplished facts, by the mere fact of their having been accomplished, have the force of right." But who does not plainly see and understand that human society, released from the ties of religion and true justice, can have no other purpose than to compass its own ends, and to amass riches, and can follow no other law in its actions than the indomitable wickedness of a heart given up to the service of its selfish pleasures and interests? For this reason also these same men persecute with such bitter hatred the religious Orders who have deserved so

well of religion, civil society, and letters; they loudly declare that the Orders have no right to exist, and, in so doing, make common cause with the falsehoods of the heretics. For, as was most wisely taught by our predecessor of illustrious memory, Pius VI., "the abolition of religious Orders injures the state of public profession of the evangelical counsels; injures a mode of life recommended by the church as in conformity with apostolical doctrine; does wrong to the illustrious founders whom we venerate upon our altars, and who constituted these societies under the inspiration of God." (Epistle to Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, March 10, 1791.)

And these same persons also impiously pretend that citizens should be deprived of the liberty of publicly bestowing on the church their alms for the sake of Christian charity, and that the law forbidding "servile labor on account of divine worship" upon certain fixed days should be abolished upon the most fallacious pretext that such liberty and such law are contrary to the principles of political economy. Not content with abolishing religion in public society, they desire further to banish it from families and private life. Teaching and professing those most fatal errors of socialism and communism, they declare that "domestic society or the family derives all its reason of existence solely from civil law, whence it is to be concluded that from civil law descend and depend all the rights of parents over their children, and, above all, the right of instructing and educating them." By such impious opinions and machinations do these most false teachers endeavor to eliminate the salutary teaching and influence of the Catholic church from the instruction and education of youth, and to miserably infect and deprave by every pernicious error and vice the tender and pliant minds of youth.

All those who endeavor to throw into confusion both religious and political affairs, to destroy the good order of society, and to annihilate all divine and human rights, have always exerted all their criminal schemes, attention, and efforts upon the manner in which they might, above all, deprave and delude unthinking youth, as we have already shown : it is upon the corruption of youth that they place all their hopes. Thus they never cease to attack by every method the clergy, both secular and regular, from whom, as testify to us in so conspicuous a manner the most certain records of history, such considerable benefits have been bestowed in abundance upon Christian and civil society and upon the republic of letters ; asserting of the clergy in general, that they are the enemies of the useful sciences, of progress, and of civilization, and that they ought to be deprived of all participation in the work of teaching and training the young.

Others, reviving the depraving fictions of innovators, errors many times condemned, presume with extraordinary impudence, to subordinate the authority of the church and of this apostolic see, conferred upon it by Christ our Lord, to the judgment of civil authority, and to deny all the rights of this same church and this see with regard to those things which appertain to the secular order. For these persons do not blush to affirm " that the laws of the church do not bind the conscience if they are not promulgated by the civil power ; that the acts and decrees of the Roman pontiffs concerning religion and the church require the sanction and approbation, or at least the assent, of the civil power ; and that the apostolic constitutions (Clement XII., Benedict XIV., Pius VII., Leo XII.) condemning secret societies, whether these exact or do not exact an oath of

secrecy, and branding with anathema their followers and partisans, have no force in those countries of the world where such associations are tolerated by the civil government." It is likewise affirmed "that the excommunications launched by the council of Trent and the Roman pontiffs against those who invade and usurp the possessions of the church and its rights, strive, by confounding the spiritual and temporal orders to attain solely a mere earthly end ; that the church can decide nothing which may bind the consciences of the faithful in the temporal order of things ; that the right of the church is not competent to restrain with temporal penalties the violators of her laws ; and that it is in accordance with the principles of theology and of public law for the civil government to appropriate property possessed by the churches, the religious orders, and other pious establishments." And they have no shame in avowing openly and publicly the heretical statement and principle from which have emanated so many errors and perverse opinions, "that the ecclesiastical power is not by the law of God made distinct from and independent of civil power, and that no distinction, no independence of this kind can be maintained without the church invading and usurping the essential rights of the civil power." Neither can we pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, assert that "the judgments and decrees of the holy see, the object of which is declared to concern the general welfare of the church, its rights, and its discipline ; do not claim acquiescence and obedience under pain of sin and loss of the Catholic profession, if they do not treat of the dogmas of faith and of morals."

How contrary is this doctrine to the Catholic dogma of the plenary power divinely conferred on the sover-

eign pontiff by our Lord Jesus Christ, to guide, to supervise, and govern the universal church, no one can fail to see and understand clearly and evidently.

Amid so great a perversity of depraved opinions, we, remembering our apostolic duty, and solicitous before all things for our most holy religion, for sound doctrine, for the salvation of the souls confided to us, and for the welfare of human society itself, have considered the moment opportune to raise anew our apostolic voice: Therefore do we by our apostolic authority reprobate, denounce, and condemn generally and particularly all the evil opinions and doctrines specially mentioned in this letter, and we wish that they may be held as reprobated, denounced, and condemned by all the children of the Catholic church.

But you know further, venerable brethren, that in our time the haters of all truth and justice and violent enemies of our religion have spread abroad other impious doctrines by means of pestilent books, pamphlets, and journals, which, distributed over the surface of the earth, deceive the people and wickedly lie. You are not ignorant that in our day men are found who, animated and excited by the spirit of Satan, have arrived at that excess of impiety as not to fear to deny our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and to attack his divinity with scandalous persistence. And here we cannot abstain from awarding you well-merited praise, venerable brethren, for all the care and zeal with which you have raised your episcopal voice against so great an impiety.

And therefore in this present letter, we speak to you with all affection ; to you who, called to partake our cares, are our greatest support in the midst of our very great grief, our joy and our consolation, by reason of the excellent piety of which you give proof in main-

taining religion, and the marvellous love, faith, and discipline with which, united by the strongest and most affectionate ties to us and this apostolic see, you strive valiantly and accurately to fulfil your most weighty episcopal ministry. We do then expect from your excellent pastoral zeal that, taking the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, and strengthened by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, you will watch with redoubled care, that the faithful committed to your charge “abstain from evil pasturage, which Jesus Christ doth not till, because his father hath not planted it.” (St. Ignat. M. ad Philadelph. St. Leo, Epist. 156, al. 125.) Never cease, then, to inculcate on the faithful that all true happiness for mankind proceeds from our august religion, from its doctrines and practice, and that that people is happy who have the Lord for their God. (Psalm 143.) Teach them “that kingdoms rest upon the foundation of the Catholic faith, (St. Celest. Epist. 22, ad. Syn. Eph.,) and that nothing is so deadly, nothing so certain to engender every ill, nothing so exposed to danger, as for men to believe that they stand in need of nothing else than the free will which we received at birth, if we ask nothing further from the Lord—that is to say, if forgetting our Author, we abjure his power to show that we are free.” And do not omit to teach “that the royal power has been established not only to exercise the government of the world, but, above all, for the protection of the church, (St. Leo, Epist., 156 al. 125,) and that there is nothing more profitable and more glorious for the sovereigns of states and kings than to leave the Catholic church to exercise its laws, and not to permit any to curtail its liberty ;” as our most wise and courageous predecessor, St. Felix, wrote to the Emperor Zeno. “It is certain that it is advantageous for sovereigns,

when the cause of God is in question, to submit their royal will according to his ordinance, to the priests of Jesus Christ, and not to prefer it before them." (Pius VII. Epist. Encycl., *Diu satis*, 15th May, 1800.)

And if always, so, especially at present, is it our duty, venerable brethren, in the midst of the numerous calamities of the church and of civil society, in view of the terrible conspiracy of our adversaries against the Catholic church and this apostolic see, and the great accumulation of errors, it is before all things necessary to go with faith to the Throne of Grace to obtain mercy and find grace in timely aid. We have therefore judged it right to excite the piety of all the faithful in order that, with us and with you all, they may pray without ceasing to the Father of lights and of mercies, supplicating and beseeching him fervently and humbly ; in order also that in the plenitude of their faith they may seek refuge in our Lord Jesus Christ who has redeemed us to God with his blood, that by their earnest and continual prayers they may obtain from that most dear heart, victim of burning charity for us, that it would draw all by the bonds of his love, and that all men being inflamed by his holy love may live according to his heart, pleasing God in all things and being fruitful in all good works.

But, as there is no doubt that the prayers most agreeable to God are those of the men who approach him with a heart pure from all stain, we have thought it good to open to Christians, with apostolic liberality, the heavenly treasures of the church confided to our dispensation, so that the faithful, more strongly drawn towards true piety and purified from the stain of their sins by the sacrament of penance, may more confidently offer up their prayers to God and obtain his mercy and grace.

By these letters emanating from our apostolic authority, we grant to all and each of the faithful of both sexes throughout the Catholic world, a plenary indulgence in the manner of a jubilee, during one month, up to the end of the coming year 1865, and not longer, to be carried into effect by you, venerable brethren, and the other legitimate local ordinaries, in the form and manner laid down at the commencement of our sovereign pontificate by our apostolical letters, in form of a brief, dated the 20th of November, anno 1846, and sent to the whole episcopate of the world, commencing with the words, "*Arcano divinæ providentiæ concilio,*" and with the faculties given by us in those same letters. We desire, however, that all the prescriptions of our letters shall be observed, saving the exceptions we have declared are to be made. And we have granted this, notwithstanding all which might make to the contrary, even those worthy of special and individual mention and derogation; and in order that every doubt and difficulty may be removed, we have ordered that copies of those letters should be again forwarded to you.

"Let us implore, venerable brethren, from our inmost hearts, and with all our souls, the mercy of God. He has encouraged us so to do, by saying: 'I will not withdraw my mercy from them.' Let us ask and we shall receive; and if there is slowness or delay in its reception, because we have grievously offended, let us knock, because to him that knocketh it shall be opened—if our prayers, groans, and tears, in which we must persist and be obstinate, knock at the door—and if our prayer be united. Let each one pray to God, not for himself alone, but for all his brethren, as the Lord hath taught us to pray." (St. Cyprian, Epistle 11.) But, in order that God may accede more easily to our and

your prayers, and to those of all his faithful servants, let us employ in all confidence as our mediatrix with him, the Virgin Mary, mother of God, who "has destroyed all heresies throughout the world, and who, the most loving mother of us all, is very gracious . . . and full of mercy . . . allows herself to be entreated by all, shows herself most clement towards all, and takes under her pitying care all our necessities with a most ample affection," (*St. Bernard, Serm. de duodecim prerogativis B. M. V., ex verbis Apocalyp. ;*) and who, "sitting as queen upon the right hand of her only begotten son our Lord Jesus Christ in a golden vestment clothed around with various adornments," there is nothing which she cannot obtain from him. Let us implore also the intervention of the blessed Peter, chief of the apostles, and of his co-apostle Paul, and of all those saints of heaven, who, having already become the friends of God, have been admitted into the celestial kingdom, where they are crowned and bear palms, and who henceforth certain of their own immortality, are solicitous for our salvation.

In conclusion, we ask of God from our inmost soul the abundance of all his celestial benefits for you, and we bestow upon you, venerable brethren, and upon all faithful clergy and laity committed to your care, our apostolic benediction from the most loving depths of our heart, in token of our charity towards you.

PIUS PP. IX.

Given at Rome from St. Peter's, this 8th of December, 1864, the tenth anniversary of the Dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the nineteenth year of our Pontificate.

The Syllabus of the principal errors of our time, which are stigmatized in the Consistorial Allocutions, Encyclicals, and other Apostolical Letters of our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius IX.

I. PANTHEISM, NATURALISM, AND ABSOLUTE RATIONALISM.

1. There exists no divine power, supreme being, wisdom, and providence distinct from the universe, and God is none other than nature, and is therefore mutable. In effect, God is produced in man and in the world, and all things are God, and have the very substance of God. God is therefore one and the same thing with the world, and thence spirit is the same thing with matter, necessity with liberty, true with false, good with evil, justice with injustice. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

2. All action of God upon man and the world is to be denied. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

3. Human reason, without any regard to God, is the sole arbiter of truth and falsehood, of good and evil; it is its own law to itself, and suffices by its natural force to secure the welfare of men and of nations. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

4. All the truths of religion are derived from the native strength of human reason; whence reason is the master rule by which man can and ought to arrive at the knowledge of all truths of every kind. (Encyclical Letters, *Qui pluribus*, 9th November, 1846; *Singulari quidem*, 17th March, 1856; and the Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

5. Divine revelation is imperfect, and, therefore, subject to a continual and indefinite progress, which corresponds with the progress of human reason. (Encyclical *Qui pluribus*, 9th November, 1846, and the Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

6. Christian faith is in opposition to human reason,

and divine revelation not only does not benefit, but even injures the perfection of man. (Encyclical *Qui pluribus*, 9th November, 1846, and the Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

7. The prophecies and miracles, uttered and narrated in the Sacred Scriptures, are the fictions of poets ; and the mysteries of the Christian faith are the result of philosophical investigations. In the books of the two Testaments there are contained mythical inventions, and Jesus Christ is himself a mythical fiction. (Encyclical *Qui pluribus*, 9th November, 1846, and the Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

II. MODERATE RATIONALISM.

8. As human reason is placed on a level with religion, so theological matters must be treated in the same manner as philosophical ones. (Allocution *Singulari quâdam perfusi*, 9th December, 1854.)

9. All the dogmas of the Christian religion are, without exception, the object of natural science or philosophy, and human reason, instructed solely by history, is able, by its own natural strength and principles, to arrive at the true knowledge of even the most abstruse dogmas : *provided* such dogmas be proposed as subject matter for human reason. (Letter *ad Archiep. Frising. Gravissimas*, 11th December, 1862—to the same, *Tuas libenter*, 21st December, 1863.)

10. As the philosopher is one thing, and philosophy is another, so it is the right and duty of the philosopher to submit himself to the authority which he shall have recognized as true ; but philosophy neither can nor ought to submit to any authority. (Letter *ad Archiep. Frising. Gravissimas*, 11th December, 1862—to the same, *Tuas libenter*, 21st December, 1863.)

11. The church not only ought never to animadvert

upon philosophy, but ought to tolerate the errors of philosophy, leaving to philosophy the care of their correction. (Letter *ad Archiep. Frising.* 11th December, 1862.)

12. The decrees of the apostolic see and of the Roman congregation fetter the free progress of science. (Id. *Ibid.*)

13. The method and principles by which the old scholastic doctors cultivated theology, are no longer suitable to the demands of the age and the progress of science. (Id. *Tuas libenter*, 21st December, 1863.)

14. Philosophy must be treated of without any account being taken of supernatural revelation. (Id. *Ibid.*)

N. B. To the rationalistic system belong, in great part, the errors of Anthony Gunther, condemned in the letter to the cardinal archbishop of Cologne, *Eximiam tuam*, June 15, 1857; and in that to the bishop of Breslau, *Dolore haud mediocri*, April 30, 1860.

III. INDIFFERENTISM, LATITUDINARIANISM.

15. Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason. (Apostolic Letters, *Multiplices inter*, 10th June, 1851; Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

16. Men may in any religion find the way of eternal salvation, and obtain eternal salvation. (Encyclical Letter, *Qui pluribus*, 9th November, 1846; Allocution, *Ubi primum*, 17th December, 1847; Encyclical Letter, *Singulari quidem*, 17th March, 1856.)

17. We may entertain at least a well-founded hope for the eternal salvation of all those who are in no manner in the true church of Christ. (Allocution *Singulari quâdam*, 9th December, 1854; Encyclical letter, *Quanto conficiamur*, 10th August, 1863.)

18. Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion, in which it is possible to be equally pleasing to God as in the Catholic church. (Encyclical letter, *Noscitis et nobiscum*, 8th December, 1849.)

IV. SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, SECRET SOCIETIES, BIBLICAL SOCIETIES, CLERICO-LIBERAL SOCIETIES.

Pests of this description are frequently rebuked in the severest terms in the Encyc. *Qui pluribus*, Nov. 9, 1846 ; Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, April 20, 1849 ; Encyc. *Noscitis et Nobiscum*, Dec. 8, 1849 ; Alloc. *Singulari quâdam*, Dec. 9, 1854 ; Encyc. *Quanto conficiamur mœrore*, Aug. 10, 1863.

V. ERRORS CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND HER RIGHTS.

19. The church is not a true, and perfect, and entirely free society, nor does she enjoy peculiar and perpetual rights conferred upon her by her Divine Founder, but it appertains to the civil power to define what are the rights and limits with which the church may exercise authority. (Allocution *Singulari quâdam*, 9th December, 1854 ; *Multis gravibusque*, 17th December, 1860 ; *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

20. The ecclesiastical power must not exercise its authority without the permission and assent of the civil government. (Allocution, *Meminit unusquisque*, 30th September, 1861.)

21. The church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic church is the only true religion. (Apostolic Letter, *Multiplices inter*, 10th June, 1851.)

22. The obligation which binds Catholic teachers and authors applies only to those things which are proposed for universal belief as dogmas of the faith, by

the infallible judgment of the church. (Letter *ad Archiep. Frising. Tuas libenter*, 21st Dec., 1863.)

23. The Roman pontiffs and œcumenical councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals. (Apost. Letter, *Multiplices inter*, 10th June, 1851.)

24. The church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power. (Letter Apost. *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d Aug., 1851.)

25. In addition to the authority inherent in the episcopate, a further and temporal power is granted to it by the civil authority, either expressly or tacitly, which power is on that account also revocable by the civil authority whenever it pleases. (Letter Apost. *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d Aug., 1851.)

26. The church has not the innate and legitimate right of acquisition and possession. (Allocution *Nunquam fore*, 15th Dec., 1856. Encyclical *Incredibili*, 17th Sept., 1863.)

27. The ministers of the church and the Roman pontiff ought to be absolutely excluded from all charge and dominion over temporal affairs. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

28. Bishops have not the right of promulgating even their apostolical letters, without the permission of the government. (Allocution *Nunquam fore*, 15th December, 1856.)

29. Dispensations granted by the Roman pontiff must be considered null, unless they have been asked for by the civil government. (Id. *Ibid.*)

30. The immunity of the church and of ecclesiastical persons derives its origin from civil law. (Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10th June, 1851.)

31. Ecclesiastical courts for temporal causes, of the clergy, whether civil or criminal, ought by all means to be abolished, even without the concurrence and against the protest of the holy see. (Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th September, 1852 ; Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15th December, 1856.)

32. The personal immunity exonerating the clergy from military service may be abolished, without violation either of natural right or of equity. Its abolition is called for by civil progress, especially in a community constituted upon principles of liberal government. (Letter to the archbishop of Montreal, *Singularis nobisque*, 29th September, 1864.)

33. It does not appertain exclusively to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, by any right, proper and inherent, to direct the teaching of theological subjects. (Letter *ad Archiep. Frising. Tuas libenter*, 21st December, 1863.)

34. The teaching of those, who compare the sovereign pontiff to a free sovereign acting in the universal church, is a doctrine which prevailed in the middle ages. (Letter Apost. *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d August, 1851.)

35. There would be no obstacle to the sentence of a general council, or the act of all the universal peoples, transferring the pontifical sovereignty from the bishop and city of Rome to some other bishopric and some other city. (Id. *Ibid.*)

36. The definition of a national council does not admit of any subsequent discussion, and the civil power can regard as settled an affair decided by such national council. (Id. *Ibid.*)

37. National churches can be established, after being withdrawn and plainly separated from the authority of the Roman pontiff. (Alloc. *Multis gravibusque*, 17th Dec., 1860 ; *Jamdudum cernimus*, 18th March, 1861.)

38. Roman pontiffs have, by their too arbitrary conduct, contributed to the division of the church into eastern and western. (Letter Apost. *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d August, 1851.)

VI. ERRORS ABOUT CIVIL SOCIETY, CONSIDERED BOTH IN ITSELF
AND IN ITS RELATION TO THE CHURCH.

39. The republic is the origin and source of all rights, and possesses rights which are not circumscribed by any limits. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

40. The teaching of the Catholic church is opposed to the well-being and interests of society. (Encyclical *Qui pluribus*, 9th November, 1846 ; Allocution *Quibus quantisque*, 20th April, 1849.)

41. The civil power, even when exercised by an infidel sovereign, possesses an indirect and negative power over religious affairs. It therefore possesses not only the right called that of *exequatur*, but that of the (so-called) *appellatio ab abusu*.* (Apostolic Letter, *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d August, 1861.)

42. In the case of conflicting laws between the two powers, the civil law ought to prevail. (Letter Apost. *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d August, 1851.)

43. The civil power has a right to break, and to declare and render null the conventions (commonly called concordats) concluded with the apostolic see, relative to the use of rights appertaining to the ecclesiastical immunity, without the consent of the holy see, and even contrary to its protest. (Allocution *In consistoriali*, 1st November, 1850. *Multis gravibusque*, 17th December, 1860.)

* The power of authorizing official acts of the papal power, and of correcting the alleged abuses of the same.

44. The civil authority may interfere in matters relating to religion, morality, and spiritual government. Hence it has control over the instructions for the guidance of consciences issued, conformably with their mission, by the pastors of the church. Further, it possesses power to decree, in the matter of administering the divine sacraments, as to the dispositions necessary for their reception. (Allocution *In consistoriali*, 1st November, 1850 ; Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

45. The entire direction of public schools, in which the youth of Christian states are educated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of episcopal seminaries, may and must appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far, that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the taking of degrees, or the choice and approval of the teachers. (Allocution *In consistoriali*, 1st Nov., 1850 ; Allocution *Quibus luctuosissimis*, 5th Sept., 1851.)

46. Much more, even in clerical seminaries, the method of study to be adopted is subject to the civil authority. (Allocution *Nunquam fore*, 15th December, 1856.)

47. The best theory of civil society requires, that popular schools open to the children of all classes, and generally, all public institutes intended for instruction in letters and philosophy, and for conducting the education of the young, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, government, and interference, and should be fully subject to the civil and political power, in conformity with the will of rulers and the prevalent opinions of the age. (Letter to the archbishop of Fribourg. *Quum non sine*, 14th July, 1864.)

48. This system of instructing youth, which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and from the power of the church, and in teaching exclusively, or at least primarily, the knowledge of natural things and the earthly ends of social life alone, may be approved by Catholics. (Id. Ibid.)

49. The civil power has the right to prevent ministers of religion, and the faithful, from communicating freely and mutually with each other, and with the Roman pontiff. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

50. The secular authority possesses, as inherent in itself, the right of presenting bishops, and may require of them that they take possession of their dioceses, before having received canonical institution and the apostolic letters from the holy see. (Allocution *Nunquam fore*, 15th December, 1856.)

51. And further, the secular government has the right of deposing bishops from their pastoral functions, and it is not bound to obey the Roman pontiff in those things which relate to episcopal sees and the institution of bishops. (Letter Apost. *Multiplies inter*, 10th June, 1851 ; Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th Sept., 1852.)

52. The government has of itself the right to alter the age prescribed by the church for the religious profession, both of men and women ; and it may enjoin upon all religious establishments to admit no person to take solemn vows without its permission. (Allocution *Nunquam fore*, 15th Dec., 1856.)

53. The laws for the protection of religious establishments, and securing their rights and duties, ought to be abolished : nay more, the civil government may lend its assistance to all who desire to quit the religious life they have undertaken, and break their vows. The government may also suppress religious orders, colle-

giate churches, and simple benefices, even those belonging to private patronage, and submit their goods and revenues to the administration and disposal of the civil power. (Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th Sept., 1852; Allocution *Probe meminertis*, 22d January, 1855; Allocution *Cum sæpe*, 26th July, 1855.)

54. Kings and princes are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the church, but are superior to the church, in litigated questions of jurisdiction. (Letter Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10th June, 1851.)

55. The church ought to be separated from the state, and the state from the church. (Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th September, 1852.)

VII. ERRORS CONCERNING NATURAL AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

56. Moral laws do not stand in need of the divine sanction, and there is no necessity that human laws should be conformable to the law of nature, and receive their sanction from God. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

57. Knowledge of philosophical things and morals, and also civil laws, may and must be independent of divine and ecclesiastical authority. (Allocution *Mari-ma quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

58. No other forces are to be recognized than those which reside in matter; and all moral teaching and moral excellence ought to be made to consist in the accumulation and increase of riches by every possible means, and in the enjoyment of pleasure. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862; Encyclical *Quanto conficiamur*, 10th August, 1863.)

59. Right consists in the material fact, and all human duties are but vain words, and all human acts have the force of right. (Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

60. Authority is nothing else but the result of numerical superiority and material force. (Allocution *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862.)

61. An unjust act, being successful, inflicts no injury upon the sanctity of right. (Allocution *Jamdudum cernimus*, 18th March, 1861.)

62. The principle of *non-intervention*, as it is called, ought to be proclaimed and adhered to. (Allocution *Novos et ante*, 28th September, 1860.)

63. It is allowable to refuse obedience to legitimate princes : nay more, to rise in insurrection against them. (Encyclical *Qui pluribus*, 9th November, 1846 ; Allocution *Quisque vestrum*, 4th October, 1847 ; Encyclical *Noscitis et nobiscum*, 8th December, 1849 ; Letter Apostolic *Cum Catholica*, 26th March, 1860.)

64. The violation of a solemn oath, even every wicked and flagitious action repugnant to the eternal law, is not only not blamable, but quite lawful, and worthy of the highest praise, when done for the love of country. (Allocution *Quibus quantisque*, 20th April, 1849.)

VIII. ERRORS CONCERNING CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

65. It cannot be by any means tolerated, to maintain that Christ has raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament. (Apostolical Letter, *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d August, 1851.)

66. The sacrament of marriage is only an adjunct of the contract, and separable from it, and the sacrament itself consists in the nuptial benediction alone. (Id. *Ibid.*)

67. By the law of nature, the marriage tie is not indissoluble, and in many cases divorce, properly so called, may be pronounced by the civil authority. (Id. *Ibid* ; Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th September, 1852.)

68. The church has not the power of laying down what are diriment impediments to marriage. The civil authority does possess such a power, and can do away with existing impediments to marriage. (Let. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10th June, 1851.)

69. The church only commenced in later ages to bring in diriment impediments, and then availing herself of a right not her own, but borrowed from the civil power. (Let. Apost. *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d Aug., 1851.)

70. The canons of the Council of Trent, which pronounce censure of anathema against those who deny to the church the right of laying down what are diriment impediments, either are not dogmatic, or must be understood as referring only to such borrowed power. (Let. Apost. *Ibid.*)

71. The form of solemnizing marriage prescribed by the said Council, under penalty of nullity, does not bind in cases where the civil law has appointed another form, and where it decrees that this new form shall effectuate a valid marriage. (*Id. Ibid.*)

72. Boniface VIII. is the first who declared, that the vow of chastity pronounced at ordination annuls nuptials. (*Id. Ibid.*)

73. A merely civil contract may, among Christians, constitute a true marriage ; and it is false, either that the marriage contract between Christians is always a sacrament, or that the contract is null if the sacrament be excluded. (*Id. Ibid.*, Letter to King of Sardinia, 9th September, 1852 ; Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th Sept., 1852 ; *Multis gravibusque*, 17th Dec., 1860.)

74. Matrimonial causes and espousals belong by their very nature to civil jurisdiction. (Let. Apost. *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d August, 1851 ; Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th September, 1852.)

N. B. Two other errors may tend in this direction, those upon the abolition of the celibacy of priests, and the preference due to the state of marriage over that of virginity. These have been proscribed; the first in the Encyclical *Qui pluribus*, Nov. 9, 1846; the second in the Letters Apostolical *Multiplices inter*, June 10, 1851.

IX. ERRORS REGARDING THE CIVIL POWER OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF.

75. The children of the Christian and Catholic church are not agreed upon the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power. (Let. Apost. *Ad Apostolicæ*, 22d August, 1851.)

76. The abolition of the temporal power, of which the apostolic see is possessed, would contribute in the greatest degree to the liberty and prosperity of the church. (Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20th April, 1849.)

N. B. Besides these errors, explicitly noted, many others are impliedly rebuked by the proposed and asserted doctrine, which all Catholics are bound most firmly to hold, touching the temporal sovereignty of the Roman pontiff. These doctrines are clearly stated in the Allocutions *Quibus quantisque*, 20th April, 1849; and *Si semper antea*, 20th May, 1850; Letter Apost. *Quum Catholica Ecclesia*, 26th March, 1860; Allocutions *Novos*, 28th Sept., 1860; *Jamdudum*, 18th March, 1861, and *Maxima quidem*, 9th June, 1862

X. ERRORS HAVING REFERENCE TO MODERN LIBERALISM.

77. In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the state, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship. (Allocution *Nemo vestrum*, 26th July, 1855.)

78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in

some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship. (Allocution *Acerbissimum*, 27th September, 1852.)

79. Moreover it is false, that the civil liberty of every mode of worship, and the full power given to all of overtly and publicly manifesting their opinions and their ideas, of all kinds whatsoever, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to the propagation of the pest of indifferentism. (Allocution *Nunquam fore*, 15th December, 1856.)

80. The Roman pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with progress, liberalism, and civilization as lately introduced. (Allocution *Jam dudum cernimus*, 18th March, 1861.)

The Encyclical and Syllabus were felt on all hands, as we have remarked, to be a blow struck at the convictions of the party which included some of the noblest men in the Roman-catholic church. But the blow was not necessarily a fatal one. The *authority* of the pope was acknowledged on all hands, so that his utterance had to be received with outward deference. But so long as his *infallibility* was, as it had always been held to be, a matter of open question, it could not be required that his *dicta* should control the inward conviction. The lovers of civil and religious freedom throughout Roman-catholic Christendom bent their heads in silence until this sirocco blast from the Vatican should be overpast. By-and-by there appeared, from the pen of one of the most vehement but unstable of the adherents of the Liberal Catholic party—Bishop Dupanloup

of Orleans—a laborious attempt to prove that the Encyclical and Syllabus did not mean what they said ; that they were aimed not at liberty but at license ; and that the errorists condemned in them were not the intelligent advocates of a free press, free schools, and a free conscience, but only the crazy adherents of lawless socialism. This interpretation was utterly untenable ; but it was convenient ; in fact, it was indispensable to avert from the head of the Roman church the abhorrence of free men and free nations. Consequently, it was adopted and defended by many ; and in the United States especially, the Syllabus was promulgated only under such glosses and protestations on the part of the hierarchy as quite turned the edge of it. The Liberal Catholic party began to pluck up heart again ; and the friends of absolutism in church and state felt the necessity of some new device which should effectually and finally crush their antagonists within the church.

CHAPTER III.

THE PREPARATION OF THE COUNCIL.

THE first announcement by the pope of his intention to convoke a general Council was made in an address of his to an assembly of five hundred bishops at Rome, June 26, 1867. Twelve months from that time, June 29, 1868, the bull *Æterni Patris* was published, convoking the Council for the 8th of December, 1869.

The proposal of a Council was by no means unacceptable to the Liberal party. Confident in the reasonableness and righteousness of their cause, they welcomed the prospect of submitting it to the judgment, not of the knot of Italians in the unhappy city of Rome that were the power behind the papal throne, but to the assembly of bishops from every country, who, knowing from their practical experience what are the difficulties which their church is subject to in its relation with earnest, devout, and thoughtful men, what are the scandals that bring odium upon it, what the almost universal suspicions of its hatred to human liberty and science, would be free to consider the remedies for these things. Thoughts and plans of reform began to take shape in their minds.* But they were not long in discovering their mistake.

To get business in readiness for the Council, special committees of theologians were nominated by the

* See *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, chap. 1. Pastoral of Bp. Dupanloup of Orleans. (Transl. in *Catholic World* of September, 1870.) Lord Acton in *North British Review* of October, 1870. Cardinal Schwarzenberg's *Desideria Patribus Concilii Œcumenici proponenda*, in *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium*, p. 280.

pope, who assembled at Rome during the winter of 1868-9. The Liberal party perceived, to their dismay, that these had been selected, not only without care to represent the various phases of opinion within the church, but with an apparent design to unite the most extravagant advocates of the pope's favorite opinions.* Contrary to usage and to fitness in such cases, the subjects to be brought before the body were kept profoundly secret from those who were to be called to pronounce upon them.

Besides this direct preparation for the Council, a more remote preparation had long been in progress. For years, the question of the candidate's "soundness" on points at issue between the parties of absolutism and of liberty, had been considered at Rome, in the appointment of bishops; and the theological seminaries, in which historical studies had a strong tendency to discourage belief in infallibility, had been steadily manipulated in the interest of absolutism.† For years, encouragement had been given to the holding of provincial synods, the transactions of which, in the first place, were managed with undue influence from the representative of the pope, and then the record of them having been garbled by the expert hands of papal politicians at Rome, sent back to be published in the respective countries as the personal work of the bishops themselves.‡ Religious associations were organ-

* Quirinus, p. 78. *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, p. 10.

† Catholic World, August, 1871, p. 593.

‡ This astounding charge, presented by the author of *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, (p. 18,) as "sustained by certain and authentic facts in the history of the church of France of late years," is corroborated letter for letter from the history of the Roman church in America, by the personal testimony of Archbishop Kenrick, given below, p. 167.

ized under papal sanction among the laity of various regions to pray and labor for the prevalence of the doctrine of the pope's infallibility. By-and-by books in favor of this doctrine began to appear in regions where it had not obtained currency, and influences were used to draw even Liberal bishops into good-natured commendation of them.* As the time of the Council approached, appliances of every sort were multiplied to manufacture a factitious public opinion in the dioceses of unwilling bishops, such as would constrain them at least to withhold their opposition from the designs of the absolutist party. The organization of the monastic orders, and especially the Jesuits, afforded unbounded facilities for this. The convents and clergy of each of these orders are not subject to the bishops of the dioceses in which they are situated, but report to separate hierarchies of their own, each culminating in a general who resides at Rome and is under the immediate orders of the pope. Thus, in a contest in which the few remaining independent prerogatives of the bishops were sought to be extinguished at last by the exorbitantly increasing power of the pope, the latter had at his immediate disposal in every diocese a force of "regular" clergy, the natural rivals and enemies of episcopal authority from which they were themselves exempt.†

* See Abp. Kenrick, p. 140.

† The author of *Ce qui se passe au Concile* gives, in long and amusing detail, an account of the various devices used to bring the Liberal bishops to terms of submission in advance of the Council. The farewell letter of Bishop Dupanloup to his clergy, on setting out for the Council, adverts to the same "effort made" (by the pope's party) "to create a current in public opinion favorable to their desires, and to bear down upon the assembled bishops with all the pressure of this anticipatory judgment. Shall I go so far," the bishop adds, "as to mention the pious artifices resorted to for the same object? Some have gone to the point of distribu-

When the time seemed ripe, the purpose and programme of the Council were announced in a formal manifesto in the acknowledged newspaper organ of the pope—the *Civiltà Cattolica*. In an article published February 6, 1869, were set forth not only the points to be accomplished, but the method of coming at them. The doctrines of the *Syllabus* were to be promulgated, the “four articles” of Gallicanism were to be anathematized, and the infallibility of the pope to be declared. It was easy to see that the last act, if performed, would render the other two superfluous. Accordingly the way of achieving this is laid out with great frankness. The Council was to be *very short*—six weeks would be long enough; the minority, however eloquent, should not be suffered to hinder the plan; it was hoped that without speeches or discussions, under an immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the Council would define the dogma of infallibility *by acclamation*.* The ting in the streets—I saw it myself two years ago; they are keeping it up to this day—thousands of little handbills, with the vow to believe in the personal and separate infallibility of the pope.” The letter may be found in the Appendix to vol. 2 of the Discourses of Father Hyacinthe.

* In his Pastoral on the Council, Archbishop Manning, with an effrontery which is absolutely overwhelming in view of such a document as that above cited, treats the apprehension in the minds of the Liberals of such a *coup d'état* on the part of the absolutists, as mere causeless panic, the product of imagination. “The truth is, that *nobody*, so far as my knowledge reaches, and I believe I may speak with certainty, *ever for a moment dreamed of this definition by acclamation*. All whom I have ever heard speak of these rumors were unfeignedly amused at them.” One is bewildered in the attempt to answer this language of Archbishop Manning; for the very documents which he quotes in this Pastoral show him to have been acquainted with the facts of which he denies the existence. See *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 37; “Janus,” p. 5; *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, pp. 25-29; Lord Acton in *North British Review*, October, 1870.

suggestion was simultaneously reduplicated, as if by preconcert, by Bishop Plantier of Nîmes, in an official charge, as big as a book, on *General Councils*.

Everything seemed to favor the designs of the absolutists. The press seemed to be occupied with uttering their manifestoes, and to have no voice for the other side. One ponderous pastoral after another rolled forth from such prelates as Manning of Westminster and Dechamps of Malines, in commendation of the proposed dogma of infallibility, as being the universally accepted dogma of the Roman-catholic church, and men began to wonder whether the other side was to have a hearing at all. So ill were the Liberal party prepared for the debate, that it was not till June, 1870, that the first demonstration was made in their behalf. The first official word spoken by any bishop against the proposed dogma was in the letters of Dupanloup of Orleans, less than a month before the opening of the Council.*

Meanwhile, a book which will be memorable in the history of literature, as one of the most crushing blows ever struck in any controversy, had come forth, in August, from a Catholic university in Germany, entitled "The Pope and the Council, by Janus." It is the work of more than one learned theologian of the Roman-catholic church, and deals with the question of infallibility from the root. It shows that the theological opinion in favor of papal infallibility, as it has been held by many in other ages, was the offspring of sheer imposture and wholesale forgery, sustained and repeated from generation to generation; and that many other of the claims of the papacy rest on like foundation. It

* The chronology of this discussion is given in *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, pp. 28-38.

touches on the cases of alleged heresy and mutual contradiction on the part of certain popes. And finally, it exhibits the character of some of the former papal decrees, which the retrospective force of the new dogma would certify to be infallible—too insulting to the intelligence of the present day to be tolerated by any thinking man—and warns the bishops what are the consequences of the act to which they are urged. The warning has been disregarded, and the little book of Janus needs only to be translated into another mood and tense, to be the most convenient manual extant of the present tenets now professed as infallible by the church of Rome.*

After the arrival of the bishops at Rome, further preparatory discussion in print was interdicted by the pope, just as the bishop of Orleans was about to publish a reply to the ultramontanes. The interdict held good against the minority till the close of the Council; but it was not found difficult for the partisans of infallibility to get permission to print, on their side, whatever might seem conducive to the success of their plans.†

* The authorized English translation of Janus (a beautiful specimen of clear, neat, idiomatic translation into English) is published in America by Roberts Brothers, Boston. Dr. Hergenröther in his book called *Anti-Janus*, (Catholic Publication Society, New York,) attempts to answer Janus in detail; but does not appreciably weaken the tremendous force of his main arguments. Dr. Manning has hit upon the only really effective way of answering Janus, in his fine argument, that if historical facts are opposed to a dogma, it is all the worse for the facts. "The true and conclusive answer to this objection consists . . . in a principle of faith; namely, that whensoever any doctrine is contained in the divine tradition of the church, all difficulties are excluded by prescription." *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 119.

† *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, p. 38. This statement, which seemed one of the hardest to believe against the pope and his party, is incidentally confirmed by Archbishop Kenrick, p. 109.

But though the bishops were silenced, except so far as they would consent to speak on the pope's side, other voices continued to be heard in behalf of history misrepresented and society imperilled. The most notable and effective pamphlets issued, perhaps, were those of the learned and courageous Father Gratry. His four letters to the archbishop of Malines were an unrefuted and irrefutable exposition not only of the fact that Pope Honorius was condemned and anathematized as a heretic by the Sixth General Council, but also of the long succession of frauds and forgeries by which the authorities of the church of Rome had sought to suppress this fact from the knowledge of its devotees.*

But the progress of events was not, on the whole, such as to encourage the hope of a free Council. The undisguised intervention of the pope himself, with the use of every kind of influence, official and personal, to secure the adoption of the proposed dogma, and the arrogance of the party of his adherents, increased daily as the time for opening the Council drew near. This party was emboldened, at last, to strike at the foremost figure in the Roman-catholic pulpit—long the object of its special hatred. The matchless eloquence of Father Hyacinthe, his illustrious services to the church of Rome, his devotion to the pope as the spiritual head of the church, the ascetic purity of his life, his faith and piety, were all of no account, in view of the one crime of his devotion to liberty and human rights. The influence of "the party omnipotent at Rome" secured, from the head of his monastic order, a letter of rebuke and instruction, which was equivalent, for any honest

* The Letters of Father Gratry are published in an English translation, in pamphlet, by Pott, Young & Co., New York. They constitute a document of permanent value.

preacher, to an interdict from further preaching. The protest uttered by him in reply signalized and intensified the feelings of the two parties whose final conflict was impending.

THE PROTEST OF FATHER HYACINTHE.

TO THE REVEREND, THE GENERAL OF THE ORDER OF BAREFOOTED CARMELITES, ROME :

VERY REVEREND FATHER : During the five years of my ministry at Notre Dame, Paris, notwithstanding the open attacks and secret misrepresentations of which I have been the object, your confidence and esteem have never for a moment failed me. I retain numerous testimonials of this in your handwriting, which relate as well to my preaching as to myself. Whatever may occur, I shall hold this in grateful remembrance.

To-day, however, by a sudden shift, the cause of which I look for not in your heart, but in the intrigues of a party omnipotent at Rome, you find fault with what you have encouraged, blame what you have approved, and demand that I shall use such language or keep such a silence as would no longer be the entire and loyal expression of my conscience.

I do not hesitate a moment. With speech falsified by an order from my superior, or mutilated by enforced reticences, I would not again enter the pulpit of Notre Dame. I express my regret for this to the brave and intelligent bishop* who placed me and has maintained me in it against the ill-will of the men of whom I have just been speaking. I express my regrets for it to the imposing audience which there surrounded me with its attention, its sympathies—I had almost said, its friendship. I should be worthy neither of the audience, nor

* Archbishop Darboy of Paris.

of the bishop, nor of my conscience, nor of God, if I could consent to play such a part in their presence.

At the same time, I withdraw from the convent in which I dwell, and which, in the new circumstances which have befallen me, has become a prison to my soul. In acting thus, I am not unfaithful to my vows. I have promised monastic obedience—but within the limits of an honest conscience, and of the dignity of my person and ministry. I have promised it under favor of that higher law of justice, the “royal law of liberty,” which is, according to the apostle James, the proper law of the Christian.

It was the most untrammelled enjoyment of this holy liberty that I came to seek in the cloister, now more than ten years ago, under the impulse of an enthusiasm pure from all worldly calculation—I dare not add, free from all youthful illusion. If, in return for my sacrifices, I now am offered chains, it is not merely my right to reject them, it is my duty.

This is a solemn hour. The church is passing through one of the most violent crises—one of the darkest and most decisive—of its earthly existence. For the first time in three hundred years, an Œcumenical Council is not only summoned, but declared “necessary.” It is the word used by the holy father. Not at such a moment can a preacher of the gospel, were he the least of all, consent to hold his peace like the “dumb dogs” of Israel—treacherous guardians, whom the prophet rebukes because they could not bark.

The saints are never dumb. I am not one of them ; but yet I know that I am come of that stock—*filii sanctorum sumus*—and it has ever been my ambition to place my steps, my tears, and, if need were, my blood in the track of theirs.

I lift up, then, before the holy father and before the Council, my protest as a Christian and a priest against those doctrines and practices which call themselves Roman but are not Christian, and which, making encroachments ever bolder and deadlier, tend to change the constitution of the church, the substance as well as the form of its teaching, and even the spirit of its piety. I protest against the divorce, as impious as it is mad, which men are struggling to accomplish between the church, which is our mother for eternity, and the society of the nineteenth century, whose sons we are for time, and toward which we have both duties and affections.

I protest against that opposition, more radical and frightful yet, which arrays itself against human nature, attacked and revolted by these false teachers in its most indestructible and holiest aspirations. I protest, above all, against the sacrilegious perversion of the gospel of the Son of God himself, the spirit and the letter of which are alike trodden under foot by the Pharisaism of the new law.

It is my most profound conviction that if France in particular, and the Latin races in general, are delivered over to anarchy, social, moral, and religious, the principal cause of it is to be found, not certainly in Catholicism itself, but in the way in which Catholicism has for a long time been understood and practised.

I appeal to the Council now about to assemble, to seek remedies for our excessive evils, and to apply them at once with energy and with gentleness. But if fears which I am loath to share should come to be realized—if that august assembly should have no more liberty in its deliberations than it now has in its preparation—if, in a word, it should be robbed of the characteristics

essential to an Œcumenical Council, I would cry out to God and man to demand another that should be truly "assembled in the Holy Spirit," and not in party spirit—that should truly represent the universal church, and not the silence of some and the constraint of others. "For the hurt of the daughter of my people am I hurt; I am black; astonishment hath taken hold on me. Is there no balm in Gilead? is there no physician there? why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?" Jer. 8 : 21, 22.

Finally, I appeal, Lord Jesus, to thy bar. *Ad tuum, Domine Jesu, tribunal appello.* In thy presence I write these lines. At thy feet, having much prayed, much pondered, much suffered, and waited long—at thy feet I subscribe them. And I have this trust concerning them, that, however men may condemn them upon earth, thou wilt approve them in heaven. Living or dying, this is enough for me.

BROTHER HYACINTHE,

Superior of the Barefooted Carmelites of Paris,

Second Definitor of the Order in the province of Avignon.

PARIS—Passy, September 20, 1869.

CHAPTER IV.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE COUNCIL.

It is a very striking remark of Archbishop Kenrick,* that the church, which was of old the model of representative government to which civil society is indebted for its rights and liberties, is transformed, by the ultramontane theories, to the most complete type of an absolute despotism.

In the earlier councils, the bishops were the elective officers of the local churches which they represented. In later ages, when the liberties of the local and national churches were in danger of being lost in the encroachment of the Roman see, they were taken under the protection of the several civil governments. It was an unhappy relation for the state to hold towards religion; but it had, nevertheless, this advantage, that it secured a certain measure of independence to these churches and their bishops, and so gave a corresponding measure of authority to their acts when assembled

* *Infra*, p. 121, note.

The same double antithesis has been stated by other writers. That impressive little pamphlet, *La Dernière Heure du Concile*, (said by Quirinus to be by an eminent member of the Council,) puts it thus: "The church which once furnished to civil society the model of a monarchy in which the aristocratic and popular element effectively tempered the excesses of the supreme power—the church which was the first to present to the modern world the example of great assemblies discussing in freedom the rights of truth and justice—is now presenting the spectacle of a Council without liberty, and the menace of an absolutism without limit," p. 15.

in council. If the bishops assembled at Trent had been the mere appointees of the pope, removable at his nod, representing the choice neither of the clergy, nor of the people and rulers of the different countries of Christendom, there would have been, doubtless, a much greater unanimity in that Council, and it would have reached its conclusions without protracted debate ; but the conclusions, when reached, would have had exactly the value, and no more, of a decree of the master who created and convoked it.

By the silent revolution alluded to by the archbishop of St. Louis, the Roman-catholic church had been transformed, in the three hundred years between the Council of Trent and the Council of the Vatican, to just such an organization as we have described. A scanty minority only represented the poor remains of the early autonomy of the churches.

According to an official statement published at Rome, the number of the fathers then* sitting at the Vatican with a voice in the deliberations was 759, seven having died and four received leave of absence since the Council opened. Out of these 759 prelates there are reckoned in round numbers :

50 cardinals ;

100 vicars-apostolic “revocable *ad nutum* ;”

50 generals of orders and mitred abbots ;

* The statement was published some weeks after the opening of the Council. The above analysis of the composition of the Council is taken from *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, pp. 44-48. Like many of the most damaging revelations and arguments of that book, it is too well attested to be weakened by the violent denunciations of the majority of the Council. On the contrary, the proved accuracy of the book, wherever we are able to test it, gives us reason to believe that its statements concerning the secret transactions of the Council are true, and the passionate contradictions of them false.

100 and more bishops of the Propaganda ;
 276 Italians, 143 of whom belonged to the Papal states.*

Outside of this enormous majority of 580 out of 759 votes evidently secured for the Vatican, only 180 bishops could be found whose churches still retained till lately some measure of autonomy. These are the Germans, the French, the Spanish, the Portuguese, and those Orientals who are not of the Latin rite.

To appreciate the full bearing of these figures, it must be remarked :

1. That the number of vicars-apostolic and functionaries of the Roman curia (bishops *in partibus*†) was never so large in any former Council ; and yet protests of the most earnest character were repeatedly made against their presence, especially at Trent and Constance.

2. That the Propaganda, the discipline of which is like that of an army in the field, was founded by Gregory XIII., in 1585, and is consequently later than the Council of Trent. It includes the episcopates of England, Holland, the United States, and various other countries.

3. That in consequence of revolutions, episcopates once regularly organized in such a way as to possess some independence, find themselves at present without resources, persecuted by their governments, and com-

* That is, according to the former boundaries, which included 2,600,000 souls. The states of the church at the opening of the Council included only 672,000 souls.

† Bishops *by brevet*, having no dioceses or churches. When for any reason it seems desirable to the court of Rome to raise any person to the rank of bishop, without putting him into an actual see, he is appointed nominally to some extinct church *in partibus infidelium*, that is, in regions now occupied by heathen.

pletely given up to the discretion of the court of Rome, which is their only reliance. Such is the condition of the bishops of South America since the revolutions of the last twenty years, of the Italian bishops since 1861, and the Spanish since 1869.

4. That formerly the immense majority of the bishops held their sees by the concurrence of the civil and spiritual powers, which explains the jealous care with which, in the deliberations of Councils, they stood out for national independence and the peculiar traditions of their several churches. At present, out of eleven hundred episcopal titles in existence* there are scarcely two hundred in the conferment of which the Catholic nations retain any right whatever of interfering, whether through the prince, or through the chapters of cathedrals, or through the suffragans or the metropolitan. *Nine hundred are absolutely at the disposition of the pope alone.* The efforts are notorious which the Roman curia has put forth to annihilate the last privileges still retained by France and the East.

5. That out of 180,000,000 of Catholics in the world, France, Germany, and Portugal reckon 83,000,000—that is, nearly one half; while, out of the 770 prelates coming to the Council, these three nations—the last who retain anything of their religious independence—are represented by only 156 bishops, or scarcely more than one-fifth of that assembly.

As we have just seen, Italy, with the Papal states, the population of which hardly reaches 25,000,000 of Catholics, has 276 bishops in the Council.

The States of the Church, which included, even with their earlier frontiers, only 2,600,000 souls, have 143 bishops, or nearly thirty times more, in proportion,

* Only 981 sees are filled.

than France, Germany, and Portugal. And if we consider that the greater part of the bishops belonging to the annexed provinces remained at Rome in absolute dependence on the Holy See, it brings us to the enormous proportion of *one hundred and ten to one*.

6. That more than one-half of the prelates assembled at the Vatican were lodged and entertained, with their suites, at the pope's own expense.

With these materials, it might have seemed that the party of absolutism were sufficiently secure of "a good working majority," to leave the Council free to conduct its own business. But the papal court did not so judge.

CHAPTER V.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COUNCIL.

AMONG the conservative traditions of the canon law are these two: first, that while a majority vote may suffice, in council, to enact decrees of discipline, which bind only the outward conduct, and are repealable, "moral unanimity" is necessary to the definition of articles of faith, which are irrevocable and bind the soul and conscience to an inward assent, under pain of everlasting damnation; secondly, that *freedom* of deliberation and action are necessary to the "œcumenicity" and authority of a General Council.

The dilemma of the Absolutist party was this: Either they must concede liberty to the Council, in which case free discussion and a free vote would result in a manifest diversity of sentiment on the main question; or they must secure an apparent unanimity by the sacrifice of conciliar liberty. The choice between liberty and unanimity was a perilous one to their plans; but it was boldly made. They decided to sacrifice liberty for the sake of unanimity—and failed of both.

We have seen that the preliminary discussion of the matter to be submitted to the Council was prevented by the secrecy in which this matter had been prepared by committees of theologians appointed by the pope with reference to their partisan views. Arrived at Rome, the bishops found themselves bound under injunctions of secrecy, forbidden to communicate with each other in print, and forbidden to hold meetings of those of the same language, for conference.

At the first meeting of the Council, the rules of the Council were announced in the bull *Multiplices inter*. In this, "the pope* assumed to himself the sole initiative in proposing topics, and the exclusive nomination of the officers of the Council. He invited the bishops to bring forward their own proposals, but required that they should submit them first of all to a commission which was appointed by himself, and consisted half of Italians. If any proposal was allowed to pass by this commission, it had still to obtain the sanction of the pope, who could therefore exclude at will any topic, even if the whole Council wished to discuss it. Four elective commissions were to mediate between the Council and the pope. When a decree had been discussed and opposed, it was to be referred, together with the amendments, to one of these commissions, where it was to be reconsidered with the aid of divines. What the Council discussed was to be the work of unknown divines; what it voted was to be the work of a majority in a commission of twenty-four. . . . It was further provided that the reports of the speeches should not be communicated to the bishops; and the strictest secrecy was enjoined on all.

The means of information allowed to the bishops on the business on which they were to act, were confined to the personal study which they were able to give to the *schema* during the several days—from four to eight days generally, but sometimes less—between the distribution of the papers and the discussion.

Anything like *debate* was precluded. Off-hand remark was out of order. The speakers must give notice in advance of their wish to be heard, previous to

* We take this summary of the bull from that eminent Catholic, Lord Acton's, article on the Council, *ubi supra*.

the day of the session. They must speak in order of their rank, without reference to the relevancy of any speaker's remarks to those of his predecessors. No reply was permitted.

The hall of the Council was so constructed—purposefully, as many believed*—as to make it almost impossible for speakers to be heard. The use of a dead language, which few of the members could readily use or understand, aggravated this difficulty.

The difficulty might have been relieved by allowing the reports of the proceedings to be printed and submitted to the members; but this, too, was not allowed. Stenographic reports were made by official stenographers, to be locked up with the secret archives of the Council. Something might have been done by means of printed discussion, or by allowing the speakers to print their speeches at their own expense. But this, too, was forbidden.† In short, the members of the Council were “forbidden to hear, forbidden to read, forbidden to answer.”‡

Obviously, the only place where the Council could have any opportunity of taking part in the shaping of its own business was in the committees of revision, to which *schemata* that should be objected to at their first introduction were to be referred for amendment. If these could be properly constituted, by a free vote, in such a way as to represent the various parties in the Council, the acts of the Council might be framed to express its views; otherwise, not.

The pages of “Quirinus” and *Ce qui se passe au*

* One of the Roman courtiers confessed this. Quirinus, p. 144.

† *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, pp. 59-61. All these statements are amply fortified by references.

‡ *Ibidem*, p. 62. One of the bishops declared the Council to have been made *deaf, dumb, and blind*.

Concile charge that the appointment of these committees was carried by devices familiar to the less reputable forms of politics. But the charge had been thrown into suspicion, by a sweeping denunciation of falsehood against these volumes. The testimony of Archbishop Kenrick shows that their gravest allegations are true, and that the only one of these committees that reported any business, was unscrupulously packed with partisans of infallibility.*

It might surely have seemed now that the Council was sufficiently tied up by restrictions to be secure against doing any harm to the plans of its managers. But they were so far from being satisfied of this, that on the 22d of February, 1870, after the Council had been for more than two months in session, a new code of fourteen rules was imposed upon it by a papal decree. Four of these rules are worthy of note :

1. Originally, the bills, or *schemata*, reported by the preparatory commissions, were liable to be discussed in the Council before being referred to the Committee of the Council for amendment. Under the new *regolamento*, all bills were to be referred without debate, and instead of speaking thereupon, the bishops were at liberty to send their observations upon the bill in writing to the committee, who would make a synopsis of the various observations, at their discretion, and submit it in print to the members of the Council.

2 By Article X. of the new code it was provided that any speaker might be called to order by the papal legates for wandering from the question, and at their discretion might be refused liberty to proceed. Of course, no appeal from the decision of the chair was allowed.

* See *infra*, p. 171.

3. By Article XI., the "previous question" might be ordered by a sheer majority, and all debate cut off.

4. But the most important of these new rules was that which, in defiance of all the precedents of ecclesiastical history, set aside the principle that decrees of faith could be enacted only by the "moral unanimity" of the bishops, and provided that—" *id decerneretur quod majori patrum numero placuerit*"—i. e., any decree might be carried by a mere numerical majority.

When the edict imposing these new rules was read, it was felt on all hands that further opposition to the plans of the Absolutist party was desperate. "The majority was omnipotent."*

The minority could only protest; and this they did in a very humble address to the pope's legates, which concluded thus :

"As to the provisions concerning the number of votes requisite to the settlement of questions of dogma, which in fact is the main point, and that on which the whole Council hinges, it is a matter of such grave importance, that unless our reverent and most earnest petition should be granted, the burden on our consciences would be unendurable. We should be afraid that the character of this body as an Œcumenical Council would be called in question, and a handle given to our enemies for attacking the holy see and the Council, and that thus in the end the authority of this Council would be impaired with the Christian public, as 'wanting in truth and liberty'—a calamity so direful, in these uneasy times, that a greater could not be imagined."†

* Lord Acton's Article.

† Cited in the original by Quirinus, pp. 327-330. The entire Protest is given in the *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium*.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL.

THE Council was opened with great pomp on the 8th of December, 1869.

A fortnight later,* the first part of a voluminous draft of a decree was distributed, under the injunction of secrecy, and on the 28th of December the debate on it began. From the beginning, it seems to have been admitted that the strength of the argument was with the minority. The "schema" or draft was at once severely handled; Archbishop Conolly of Halifax recommended that it should be "decently buried."† But the foremost figure in this and in all the subsequent debates was a bishop from the remote province of Croatia, on the frontier of Turkey, whose name, Strossmayer, soon became famous throughout the civilized

* In this very brief chronicle of the transactions of the Council, which is intended only as a setting for the documents here presented, many matters of importance to the history are necessarily omitted. At this point the promulgation, just after the opening of the Council, of the significant bull "*Apostolicæ Sedis*," in which many of the most offensive claims of the papacy, such as its American apologists have been accustomed to repudiate or disavow, should, in a full history of the Council, have been recorded at large. Those who would inform themselves more fully on the events here briefly mentioned, are referred to the notable Article by the Catholic Lord Acton, in the *North British Review*, October, 1870, (the best of the brief accounts of the Council, from one whose opportunities of information were the best possible to an outsider, and all whose important statements of fact are confirmed by unimpeachable documents,) and to the more voluminous *Letters of Quirinus*.

† "*Censeo Schema cum honore esse sepeliendum.*"

world for the vehemence and copiousness of his Latin eloquence, which could neither be repressed by the rigor of the cardinal-presidents, nor made wholly inaudible by the excessively poor acoustic properties of the Council-chamber, nor shut from the world by the injunctions of secrecy. On the 30th of December he inveighed in the following terms against the *Schema*, as being a *brutum fulmen* against errors long ago condemned, and not likely to be extinguished by new edicts :

“Of what use is it to condemn what has been condemned already? What satisfaction can we take in proscribing errors which we all know to have been proscribed beforehand? . . . I admit that the false doctrines of sophists, blown about like ashes in a whirlwind, have corrupted multitudes, have infected the genius of this age ; but does anybody believe that the contagion of this kind of errors would not have spread, if only they had been crushed with conciliary anathemas? For the support and safeguard of the Catholic faith, no means and powers are committed to us, in addition to groans and prayers to God, except Catholic learning, which is always in harmony with right faith. With the utmost assiduity, learning hostile to the faith is cultivated among errorists ; for that reason it is high time that true learning, the friend of the church, should be cultivated and advanced by every means among Catholics. . . . Let us stop the mouths of the detractors who are constantly bringing against us the false accusation that the Catholic church is the oppressor of learning, and that it so trammels all free movements of thought, that neither learning nor any other freedom of the mind can exist or flourish within it. . . . On this account it needs to be shown, and to be made

manifest both by words and deeds, that there is in the Catholic church real popular liberty, real progress, real light, real prosperity.”*

The first month of the Council was closing. A “solemn session” had been appointed for the 6th of January, 1870, at which it had been hoped that something—perhaps even the great doctrine of infallibility itself—would have been ready to be publicly proclaimed “with the approbation of the holy Council.” But the course of the debate had been too damaging to the *Schema* that had been introduced, and the hope of introducing and carrying the declaration of infallibility by acclamation had been disappointed.† The solemn session had to be filled up with dumb shows of ceremony, especially with the renewal of the public oath that every bishop had already been compelled to take at his consecration, in which he “promises and swears true obedience to the pope of Rome, the vicar of Jesus Christ.”‡ It was not unreasonable to suppose that the

* Quoted in the original Latin by Lord Acton, p. 112, note, American edition.

† Lord Acton declares that the purpose of “acclaiming” infallibility in time to promulgate it on the 6th of January, was foiled by the resoluteness of Archbishop Darboy of Paris, who threatened that in that case a hundred bishops stood ready to quit Rome under protest, and, as he put it, to “carry away the Council in the soles of their shoes,” p. 112. See also Quirinus, p. 134. Archbishop Manning’s sneer at this statement in his Pastoral is of no account, inasmuch as his testimony, and, as we are forced to add, his veracity, on this subject are shamefully discredited by unimpeachable documents.

‡ The Profession of Faith, or Oath, of Pius IV. may be found in full in that very valuable book of reference on Tridentine Romanism, entitled “Elliott on Romanism,” published by the Meth. Epis. Book Concern, vol. 1, p. 26. Those who wish to study the Romish system as it was before the Vatican Council, will find this book the best delineation of it extant. The late Council, however,

public renewal of this vow, in the midst of overawing solemnities, might have an influence on the future course of the Council.

Shortly after this solemn session of January 6th, the draft of the Decree on the Faith, having suffered severe damage in the debate, was withdrawn, by the managers of the Council, from further discussion, and referred to the elected Committee of the Council on Doctrine, for reconstruction. In its place was introduced the draft of a decree on Discipline, which met no kinder reception from men of liberal sympathies than its predecessor. Already, at the beginning of the Council, Cardinal Schwarzenberg, in a paper distributed by him to the bishops, had signified the hope of many of the most earnest men in the hierarchy that the Council, instead of narrowing the limits of free opinion, and intensifying the rigor of administration, might rather adapt the church, by wise modifications, to the changed condition of the world, the prevailing liberty of thought and speech and printing, the prog-

makes all former statements of the Roman system inadequate, by incorporating with its infallible standards ten centuries of papal edicts. Still, by adding to this scholarlike and accurate account of Romanism as it was, the prophecy, now realized, of Romanism as the doctrine of infallibility would make it, given in the work of *Janus*, one will be furnished with a good beginning of information on the subject-matter of the Roman-catholic controversy.

The oath of Pius IV., above quoted, should not be confounded with the bishop's oath of allegiance, *temporal and spiritual*, to the pope, which may also be found in Elliott, p. 30. In this oath, the bishop elect swears: "I will help to keep and defend the Roman papacy and the *regalities* of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. . . . The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman church, of our lord the pope and his successors aforesaid, I will endeavor to preserve, defend, *increase, and advance*. . . . Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord or his successors aforesaid, I will, to the best of my power, persecute and resist."

ress of science, and the almost universal establishment of constitutional instead of absolute governments. In particular, he deprecated the enactment of the dogma of infallibility as sure to be the occasion of grave evils to the church; he entreated that the abuses attendant upon keeping up the index of prohibited books might be abated; that some of the mischiefs connected with the usual mode of dealing with the subject of marriage might be relieved; that steps might be taken to adapt the constitution of the clergy to the impending universal separation of church and state, and that, by some other process than the absorption by Rome of all the powers now held by civil governments; and finally, that something might be done to remedy the lamentable fact of the almost universal indifference of intelligent laymen, in Catholic countries, to religion and the church, by admitting them to some share in the work and care of the parishes, and in the promotion of popular education.*

The provisions of the proposed decree on discipline, tending in the opposite direction from any such reform, roused again the fiery eloquence of Strossmayer, whose speech of the 24th of January† struck boldly at that overgrown centralization and absolutism of government which was the root of abuses in administration. He protested against vesting the absolute government of Christendom in a knot of Italians. He claimed that others than Italians should be eligible to the papacy, and that the "Roman congregations" which constitute the bureaucracy of the church, and the college of car-

* The paper is quoted by Lord Acton, p. 109, and may be found in full in Prof. Friedrich's *Documenta ad Illustr. Conc. Vat.*, p. 280.

† So Lord Acton, p. 113. Quirinus dates it on the 25th, and gives a full abstract of it.

dinals, which is the close corporation that elects the pope, should be made up of a proportionate representation from all Catholic countries. "The supreme authority of the church," he said, "should have its throne where the Lord had fixed his own, in the hearts and consciences of the people, and that would never be while the papacy was an Italian property." He demanded the frequent holding of Councils, open and free, and cited the decree of the Council of Constance, which required that they should be held every ten years.

In view of the fact that the appointment of bishops, formerly limited in various ways, is rapidly falling under the absolute control of the pope, to the incalculable peril of the church, he urged that provincial synods should be invested with influence in the matter. "He lashed with incisive words and brilliant arguments those who preach a crusade against modern society, and openly expressed his conviction that henceforth the church must seek the external guarantees of her freedom solely in the public liberties of the nations, and the internal by intrusting the episcopal sees to men filled with the spirit of Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Anselm."*

This speech does not appear to have been answered. It might not have been easy to answer it, and it certainly was not necessary. There was little danger that in that assembly would be found many to sympathize with the position or the spirit of the speaker. And while they were sure that the voting would go mainly

* "The speech lasted an hour and a half, and the impression produced was overwhelming. Bishops affirm that no such eloquence in the Latin tongue has been heard for centuries. Strossmayer does not indeed always speak classical Latin, but he speaks it with astonishing readiness and elegance." Quirinus, p. 170.

in one way, the managers of the Council were willing enough that the argument should go altogether the other way.

While this discussion was in progress, the document was preparing which was to introduce the real work of the Council. It was felt on all sides that the matters in debate were only secondary to the one great object for which the Council had been called. Said one of the leading organs of the papal party: "In fact, there is only one question, and that is urgent and inevitable; the decision of it would facilitate the progress and settlement of all the rest; the delay of it paralyses everything. Without it there is no beginning, nor the chance of any."*

The document which was designed to precipitate this question upon the Council was a petition to that effect to the pope, signed by more than four hundred bishops. Counter-addresses, deprecating the introduction of the question of infallibility, were signed by one hundred and thirty-seven bishops. But the form in which these counter-addresses were drawn gave evidence of that fatal weakness of the minority which marked all its movements as a body from first to last, and proved the ruin of its cause: with the exception of a comparatively few bold spirits, the minority meant constantly so to conduct their opposition as to leave a good chance to back down from it in case it was not successful. Consequently the only common ground of opposition on which the minority could be brought to unite, was not that the proposed dogma was false, (though many of them believed this,) but that the definition of it was *inopportune*.

Meanwhile, a third *schema*, on the church, and a

* The *Univers*, February 9, 1870.

fourth, providing for a universal catechism, were introduced, and debate dragged wearily on. Things were not working well. In close and consecutive relation, the monstrous system of Parliamentary rules of the 22d of February was imposed, and on the 6th of March the draft of the infallibility decree was distributed to the bishops, and the discussion of it postponed, in order to consider the first schema, which was reported from the committee toward the end of March, amended in such a way as to avoid the objections that had been urged against it in the former debate. It seemed to meet general acceptance, but for an expression in the preamble, in which Protestantism is made responsible for the various forms of modern unbelief—"the monstrous systems that go by the names of mythism, rationalism, indifferentism." It was not only this objectionable clause, but the obnoxious regulations under which it was about to be put to the vote, that set several bishops in opposition, and on the 22d of March brought Strossmayer again to the rostrum in a speech memorable for itself and for the storm of violent interruptions which it encountered. A considerable portion of this speech is extant in the Latin text, from which we translate :

"With all respect for these very learned men, let me say that to my mind these assertions seem to be in accordance neither with truth nor with charity. Not with truth : it is true indeed that the Protestants have committed a very grave fault in contemning and overruling the divine authority of the church, and subjecting the everlasting and unchangeable truths of faith to the judgment and decision of the subjective reason. This incitement to the pride of man has given occasion to evils unquestionably very grave, such as rationalism,

criticism, etc. But in respect to this also, it ought to be said that while Protestantism exists in connection with rationalism, nevertheless the germ of rationalism was already in existence in the sixteenth century, in the so-called humanism and classicism which had been unadvisedly fostered and nurtured in the very sanctuary by certain men of the highest authority. And unless this germ had existed beforehand, it would be impossible to conceive how so small a spark could have kindled in the midst of Europe a conflagration so great that to this day it has been found impossible to quench it. And this other fact must be added : that contempt of faith and religion, of the church, and of all authority, originated independently of all relation or kindred to Protestantism, in the midst of a Catholic nation, in the eighteenth century, in the time of Voltaire and the encyclopedists. . . . Whatever since that time may be true of rationalism, I think the venerable committee are entirely mistaken when, in tracing the genealogy of naturalism, materialism, pantheism, atheism, etc., they assert that all these errors are exclusively the offspring of Protestantism. . . . The errors above enumerated are an abhorrence and abomination to the Protestants themselves, as they are to us ; insomuch that the church and we Catholics are beholden to them for help and coöperation in resisting and refuting these errors. Thus Leibnitz was a man of unquestionable learning, and in every respect preëminent ; a man fair in judging of the institutes of the Catholic church ; a man brave in battling against the errors of his age ; a man of the best spirit and worthy of the best reward as a restorer of peace between Christian communions. [Loud cries of 'Oh! oh!' The president, Cardinal de Angelis, rang the bell, and said, 'This is no place for

praising Protestants.’] Such men as these (and there are many such in Germany and England and North America) are followed by a great multitude among the Protestants, to all of whom we may apply these words of the great Augustine: ‘They err, but they err in good faith; they are heretics, but they consider us heretics. They did not invent the error, but inherited it from parents misled and brought up in error, and are ready to give it up the moment they are convinced.’ [Here there was a long interruption and ringing of the bell, with cries of ‘Shame! shame!’ ‘Down with the heretic!’] All these, although they do not belong to the body of the church, do nevertheless belong to its soul, and are partakers in the blessings of redemption. All these, in the love they bear toward Jesus Christ our Lord, and in those positive truths which they have saved from the shipwreck of the faith, are in possession of so many means of divine grace, which the mercy of God may use to bring them to the ancient faith and church, unless we, by our excesses and short-sighted offences against the charity we owe them, shall put far away the time of the divine mercy. As to charity, it certainly forbids to meddle with the wounds of another with any other object than to cure them—an object which this enumeration of the errors to which Protestantism might have given rise, does not seem to me adapted to accomplish. . . .

“By the decree which has recently been communicated to us as a supplement to the internal regulations of the Council, it is determined that in this Council questions shall be settled by the majority of votes. Against this principle, which overthrows from the foundation all the practice of former Councils, many bishops have protested, but have received no reply.

But in a matter of such moment, there should be given a reply clear, perspicuous, and void of all ambiguity. It looks to the uttermost calamity of this Council, for it certainly will give occasion to this and to future generations to say that this Council lacked liberty and truth. For my part, I am convinced that the eternal and unchangeable rule of faith and tradition has always been, and must always continue to be the rule of common consent—of at least moral unanimity. The Council which, overriding this rule, should undertake to define dogmas of faith by a numerical majority, according to my inmost conviction would by that fact forfeit the right of binding the conscience of the Catholic world under the sanction of life and death eternal.”

All the latter part of this speech was delivered in the midst of a great uproar, with furious demonstrations of excitement from the bishops and continual ringing of the president's bell, by which, at last, the speaker was silenced.*

* The accounts of this scene are given through many different channels, and are strikingly confirmatory of each other's accuracy. The account in *Ce qui se passe au Concile* is as follows :

“In the general congregation of March 23d, Bishop Strossmayer asked for the softening of some violent expressions of the *schema* ‘De Fide,’ which made the Protestants responsible for atheism, materialism, and rationalism. In support of his point, he cited Leibnitz in the seventeenth century and Guizot in the nineteenth, as having been even useful auxiliaries to the church. At these words, violent interruptions and groans broke out. They were redoubled when the speaker said that there might be Protestants who were such in good faith. But the uproar reached its highest pitch when Bishop Strossmayer demanded that questions of dogma should be decided only by moral unanimity.

“The president, who had before interrupted him, called him to order, and forbade him to continue.

“Confused cries broke out on all sides: ‘*Descendat ab ambone! descendat! Hæreticus! Hæreticus! Damnamus eum! Damnamus!*’

On the next day the silenced speaker sent in his protest to the presidents of the Council in these terms :

. . . . "Yesterday, when I had stated this question from the platform, and had offered some remarks on the necessity of morally unanimous consent in defining matters of faith, I was interrupted, and in the midst of a *very great uproar and severe threats* [inter maximum tumultum et graves comminationes] I was deprived of the power of continuing my speech.* And this very serious circumstance adds proof more clear than ever of the necessity of having an answer to this question that shall be clear and void of all ambiguity. I therefore most humbly petition that such an answer may be given at the next general congregation. Otherwise I should be in doubt whether it would be possible to remain in a Council where the liberty of the bishops is so oppressed as it was yesterday oppressed in my person,

"One bishop having said, '*At ego non damno!*' the cry was repeated more violently than before, '*Dannamus! Dannamus!*' Bishop Strossmayer was forced to descend from the tribune without finishing, but as he left it he repeated energetically three times, '*Protestor! protestor! protestor!*' The noise of the tumult penetrated into the interior of St. Peter's church; and some supposing that they were dealing with infallibility, shouted, 'Long live the infallible pope!' others, 'Long live the pope—but not infallible!'"

Quirinus compares the hall of the Council to a "bear-garden of demoniacs," and declares that "several bishops sprang from their seats, rushed to the tribune, and shook their fists in the speaker's face." Pp. 385, 426.

On the other hand, the account of Archbishop Manning is in serene and beautiful contrast with all other testimonies: "Occasionally murmurs of dissent were audible; now and then a comment may have been made aloud. In a very few instances . . . expressions of strong disapproval and of exhausted patience at length escaped. But," etc. *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 27.

* Compare Archbishop Manning, *ubi supra*. "But the descriptions of violence, outcries, menace, denunciation, . . . *I can affirm to be calumnious falsehoods.*"

and where dogmas of faith are to be defined in a manner new and hitherto unheard-of in the church of God.”*

The argument, though interrupted and silenced, was not entirely in vain. At the last moment, the obnoxious preamble was withdrawn, and a conciliatory substitute, dexterously drawn by the hand of an eminent Jesuit, was offered in its place. With exquisite adroitness, the managers took advantage of the reaction of good feeling consequent on their act of conciliation, to introduce a little addition to the *schema*, “just to round it off handsomely,” to the effect that all papal edicts ought to be observed, even when they proscribe errors not defined as heretical. The fathers of the minority made wry faces over the new amendment, and it required extraordinary efforts, public and private, and the most formal and solemn assurance from the committee that reported it, that it had no doctrinal application whatever—that in fact it was meant rather for ornament than for use—to induce them to vote for it. With grave misgivings they suffered themselves, Strossmayer alone excepted, to be led into the trap that had been laid for them; and when it had been sprung by their own reluctant vote at the public session of April 24th, and they were helplessly fastened, they were openly and impudently twitted by Archbishop Manning that they had now, to all intents and purposes, admitted the doctrine of infallibility, and that there was no room left for backing down—“*nec ab eâ recedere nunc licere.*”† With this act “the opposition was at an end.”‡

* For the original text of speech and protest, see Lord Acton’s Article, pp. 115, 116.

† Quirinus, pp. 436, 460; Lord Acton, p. 116. But for the details of this successful plot, see the testimony of Archbishop

Kenrick, below, p. 163.

‡ Lord Acton, p. 117.

The remaining history of the Council may be briefly told.

The draft of the decree of infallibility which had been for many months in process of incubation in the pope's committee of theologians, was distributed to the members of the Council on the 8th of May, and their written observations on it called for, delivered to the committee of the Council, digested into a synopsis, and this printed and distributed to the members within a week's time.* The debate on the general subject began

* The following extracts from the *Synopsis* are given in the Latin text by Lord Acton, p. 118. One bishop averred "that it was perfectly clear to his mind that if infallibility were once dogmatically defined, there would be, in his own diocese, in which not a vestige of the tradition of the infallibility of the Holy Father had ever been found, and in other regions, a defection from the faith on the part of many persons, and not only those of small account, but those held in the highest estimation."—"If the dogma is promulgated, the progress of conversions in the confederate provinces of America will be completely extinguished. Bishops and priests, in their discussions with Protestants, will have nothing to say in reply." [This observation is doubtless founded on the fact that in almost every considerable discussion extant between Romanists and Protestants, some Protestant argument is evaded by disclaiming the *ex cathedrâ* utterances of the popes as being of no binding authority in the church, and denouncing the alleged doctrine of papal infallibility as "a Protestant invention."] "By this definition, non-Catholics, among whom not a few, and those the best, especially at this time, are craving a firm basis of faith, would find their return to the church rendered difficult, and indeed impossible."—"Those who would wish to obey the decrees of the Council will find themselves entangled in the greatest difficulties. Civil governments will consider them (and not without the show of probability) to be subjects of doubtful loyalty. Enemies of the church will not be slow to annoy them by flinging at them the errors which popes are said either to have taught, or by their actions to have sanctioned, and the only replies which it is possible to offer will be received with ridicule."—"The decree, of itself, defines in bulk everything that has ever formerly been defined in papal instruments. . . . If the definition is admitted, [the pope]

on the 14th of May. At the close of exactly *three weeks*, on the 3d of June, while forty-nine bishops were still waiting to be heard, all further discussion was abruptly interdicted, and the majority of the Council pressed forward to the new and hazardous experiment, in the Roman-catholic church, of proclaiming as a dogma, to be received under pain of eternal damnation, that which part of the episcopate did not believe.*

After some supplementary debate on the details of the decree, a private vote was taken, which showed 88 negative votes ; 61 votes in a qualified affirmative ; and 91 bishops who abstained from voting, although present in Rome.†

will have power to decide on temporal dominion, or the extent of it, on the power of deposing kings, on the usage of coercing heretics.”—“The doctrine of papal infallibility seems to me to have no foundation whether in the Holy Scripture or in church tradition. Indeed, unless I mistake, Christian antiquity held the contrary doctrine.”—“The phraseology of the *schema* implies the existence, in the church, of a double infallibility—that of the church itself and that of the pope—which is absurd and unheard-of.”—“If I were to use the subterfuges which have been used by not a few theologians in the case of Honorius, I should make myself a laughing-stock. To resort to sophistries seems to me unworthy both of the episcopal office and of the nature of the subject, which ought to be treated in the fear of God.”—“Many of the authorities which are quoted in proof of it, even by the most esteemed of the class of theologians called ultramontane, are mutilated, falsified, interpolated, garbled, spurious, twisted out of their proper meaning.”—“I venture to assert that the opinion [of infallibility] as it lies in the schema, is not a doctrine of the faith, and cannot be made such by any definition whatever, even definition by a Council.”

* Parts of the speeches of Archbishops Purell of Cincinnati and Conolly of Halifax are given by Quirinus and Lord Acton ; and the speech of Archbishop Darboy is given in full in the Appendix to Quirinus, pp. 819, 833. Part of the Latin original is given by Acton, pp. 118, 119, *note*.

† The names of these 240 bishops are given by Quirinus, pp. 778-785. A slight discrepancy of figures will be remarked between this and the statement in the next note.

The voters in the negative left Rome in a body on the 17th of July, the day before the public vote was to be taken, leaving behind them a sorrowful protest,* in

* The document is given, in Latin, in Quirinus, pp. 797-799, and is as follows :

MOST BLESSED FATHER : In the general congregation held on the 13th instant, we gave our votes on the *schema* of the first dogmatic constitution *de Ecclesiâ Christi*.

Your Holiness is aware that there were 88 fathers who, moved by stress of conscience and by love for the holy church, voted by the words "*non placet*," 62 others who voted by the words "*placet juxta modum*," and finally, about 70 who absented themselves from the congregation, and abstained from voting. To these are to be added others who, on account of illness or other weighty reasons, have returned to their dioceses.

For this reason, our votes have been known and manifest to Your Holiness and to all the world, and it has been made plain how many bishops approve of our opinion, and in this way we discharge the duty and office incumbent upon us.

Since that time, nothing certainly has occurred to change our views, but on the other hand many things, and those of the gravest character, have taken place, which have settled us in our determination. We therefore declare that we renew and confirm our votes already given.

Confirming, then, our votes, by this writing, we have decided to absent ourselves from the public session to be holden on the 18th instant. For that filial piety and reverence which, but a brief time since, brought our representatives to Your Holiness' feet, do not suffer us, on a question so closely concerning the person of Your Holiness, to say "*non placet*" openly to the pope's face.

And furthermore, the votes to be given in the solemn session would be only a repetition of the votes already elicited in the general congregation.

Without delay, then, we return to our flocks, where, after so long an absence, we are very greatly needed, on account of the alarms of war, and especially on account of their extreme spiritual wants ; lamenting that in consequence of the unhappy circumstances with which we are surrounded, we are likely to find the peace and repose of consciences among our believing people broken up.

Commending, meanwhile, with all our heart, the church of God and Your Holiness (to whom we profess unfeigned faith and

the hands of the pope. Two only, one of whom was Bishop Fitzgerald of Little Rock in the United States, had the courage to be present at the public session on the 18th of July, and boldly give their public votes in the negative.

The new doctrine was promulgated July 18, 1870, in the midst of a storm which darkened the church of St. Peter's. Within a few hours there burst over Europe a storm of war, which stayed not until it had swept away the throne of the infallible pope from underneath him.

obedience) to the grace and keeping of our Lord Jesus Christ, we remain

Your Holiness' most devoted and obedient sons.

ROME, July 17, 1870.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SPEECH OF ARCHBISHOP KENRICK.

WHEN, on the third day of June, 1870, the debates of the Council on the main question were suddenly silenced, there remained on the list of those who had signified their intention to speak, the names of some forty bishops who were still unheard. They were forbidden by the rules of the Council even to print their views so much as for private circulation among the bishops; and the spiritual prohibition was reinforced by police arrangements which locked every printing-office in Rome against them. An American prelate, however, Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, refused to be thus gagged. Claiming a "*divine right* to express his convictions on this most important question to his fellow-bishops," he sent the carefully prepared manuscript of his Latin speech to a printer in Naples, where under the flag of an excommunicated king, might be found that liberty for the bishops of the church which was denied them in the States of the Church itself.

The solid octavo pamphlet of one hundred pages which was the result of this enterprise, was distributed among the members of the Council with scrupulous care, lest, becoming known to outsiders, it might reveal with an undeniable mark of authenticity those facts in the interior history of the Council, which, when reported by irresponsible correspondents, it was so easy to deny with a show of indignation. Furthermore, that fatal forethought with which the opposition, by looking out constantly for a line of retreat, had constantly

weakened their own cause, was an additional motive for keeping the speech private. In case its earnest arguments should be disregarded or overborne by the majority, and the dogma be adopted, it was important to keep the bold statements of this "unspoken speech" hushed up, in order that the author of it might, if worst should come to worst, by-and-by avoid the embarrassment of publicly repudiating his own printed words, and of accepting under constraint, what he could not be brought to accept by argument.

It was vain to suppose that documents confidentially printed in editions of 700 could always be kept from the public. One of the copies of this speech has come, by a roundabout course, to our hands. For its intrinsic ability and its incidental historical value, it is entitled to be spread before the public without abridgment.*

* Since this translation was written, a second Latin copy of the speech has come to hand, in Professor Friedrich's *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*. The original having been thus made accessible to scholars, we are excused from the necessity of cumbering this edition in English with the entire Notes and Appendix attached by the author to his work.

CONCIO
PETRI RICARDI KENRICK

ARCHIEPISCOPI S. LUDOVICI

IN STATIBUS FÆDERATIS

AMERICÆ SEPTENTRIONALIS

IN

CONCILIO VATICANO

HABENDA AT NON HABITA

O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas
vorum novitates et oppositiones falsi nominis
scientiæ, quam quidam promittentes circa
fidem exciderunt. 1 Tim. vi. 20. 21.

Non super uno Petro verum super omnes aposto-
los apostolorumque successores, Ecclesia Dei
ædificatus. PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS.

Lib. viii. in Matt. xvi.

NEAPOLI
TYPIS FRATRUM DE ANGELIS
IN VIA PELLEGRINI 4

MDCCCLXX

SPEECH

OF

PETER RICHARD KENRICK,

ARCHBISHOP OF ST. LOUIS

IN

THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA,

PREPARED FOR SPEAKING BUT NOT SPOKEN

IN THE

VATICAN COUNCIL.

O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith. 1 Tim. 6 : 20, 21.

Not on Peter only, but on all the apostles and their successors, is built the Church of God. PASCHASIUS RADBERT.

Book viii, on Matt. 16.

NAPLES,
DE ANGELIS BROTHERS, PRINTERS,
4 VIA PELLEGRINI.

1870.

NOTE.

THE reason why this speech was not delivered, although prepared for that purpose, is this—that on the third day of June, at the close of the general congregation, a stop was unexpectedly put to the general discussion on the first *schema* concerning Catholic faith. Among forty bishops, more or less, who had entered their names as desiring to be heard, was the writer of the following. He has deemed best that his divine right of expressing his views on this momentous business to his fellow-bishops, and to others who are entitled to an interest in the Council, should be exercised through the press. But he has retained the form of a speech, and some matters that would be pertinent only in a spoken discourse.

ROME, June 8, 1870.

CONTENTS OF THE SPEECH.

INTRODUCTION : The occasion of the speech.

I. The writer's "Observations" vindicated.

[1. To allege that all the apostles, as well as Peter, are styled the *foundation*, does not impair the argument in favor of the primacy of the pope.

2. There is no argument for papal supremacy in John 21:16, 17.

3. The word *faith* in Luke 22:32 means only *trust*, and therefore yields no argument for infallibility.]

II. The universal jurisdiction of the apostles still continues in the whole body of bishops.

[The argument of the archbishop of Dublin is suicidal. If the promise made to *all* the apostles is not fulfilled in their successors the bishops, then the promise made to Peter does not hold good to *his* successors in the see of Rome.]

III. The scriptural proofs of the primacy of the Roman pontiff brought to the test.

[1. The primacy of the Roman see is proved by tradition.

2. It cannot be proved by Scripture : Exegesis of Matt. 16:18, 19 ; John 21:16, 17 ; Luke 22:32.

3. Resumé of the argument.]

IV. Views of the late F. P. Kenrick, archbishop of Baltimore.

V. The assent of "the Church Dispersed."

[1. The assent has a negative value.

2. Not sufficient for the definition of new dogmas.

3. Instance of the bull *Unam Sanctam* which proclaimed *ex cathedrâ* the doctrine of the subjection of temporal governments to the pope, and had universal assent, but is now generally, though not universally, repudiated,]

VI. Former views of M. J. Spalding, present archbishop of Baltimore.

VII. Speech of the archbishop of Westminster. No substantial distinction between *doctrine of faith* and *doctrine of the Catholic faith*.

[Distinction between theology and faith.

Councils are infallible in testifying, not in alleging reasons of opinion.

This distinction has been lost sight of.

OBJECTION : This argument impeaches the doctrine of the immaculate conception.

ANSWER : This doctrine is not *de fide*.]

VIII. The Infallibility of the Pope has not been taught as a doctrine of faith in England, or Ireland, or the United States of America.

[Whether true or false, it never can be made an article of faith, even if the Council should define it.

1. It has never been so taught by the church ;
2. But has been impugned by her, almost everywhere but in Italy, and especially in England, Ireland, and the United States.
3. Even by the Ultramontanes it has been taught only as free opinion.

Instances : "Roman-catholic Principles;" Archbishop Spalding's Sermons.

It is mentioned only to disclaim it, when alleged by Protestants.

Testimony of Irish tradition.

It was solemnly disclaimed when Catholic emancipation was in question.]

IX. A Case of Conscience.

X. The "Charisma" of Infallibility.

XI. The addition to the first Decree *de Fide*.

[The trick played upon the minority.

Sinister influences in the Council.

CONCLUSION : The precipitation of the question a calamity to the church and the world.]

APPENDIX.

A. Second Plenary Council of Baltimore.

[Undue influence of the papal legate, and tampering with the record.]

B. The Committee on Faith.

[Manipulation of Elections. Packing of the Committee. Servitude of the Council.]

MOST EMINENT PRESIDENTS ; MOST EMINENT AND
RIGHT REVEREND FATHERS :

The Most Reverend the Archbishop of Dublin, in his speech from this platform, has said some things by which my honor is sorely wounded. It was in vain that I begged permission of His Eminence the president to reply at once, at the close of his speech, or at least at the close of that day's general congregation. Therefore it is that, contrary to my previous purpose, I take the floor to-day to speak on the *schema* in general that is offered for our adoption; for I had taken for granted that everything pertinent to the subject would be more fully and forcibly said by others than I could say it. I entreat your pardon, most eminent and right reverend fathers, if I seem to weary you with a longer speech than I am wont to make. I only ask that you will grant me that liberty which (as Bossuet says) well becomes a bishop addressing bishops in Council, and having respect rather to the future than to the present—in the confidence that I will not wander from the scope of the *schema*, nor say anything which can give just offence to any one—least of all to the most eminent the archbishop of Dublin, to whom I acknowledge my very great obligations, to whom I have always looked up with respect, for these thirty years and more, and whom I hope and trust I shall continue to respect to my latest breath. With which preliminary words I come to the subject.

I. The observations numbered one hundred and thirty-eight in the synopsis, on which His Eminence of Dublin so severely reflects, I acknowledge to be mine. I wrote in them nothing but what I thought, and (except so far as may appear to the contrary from the present speech) nothing but what I still think. Three points thereof have been attacked in terms of special severity by the most reverend prelate. First, that I said, on page 217, that all the other apostles were designated by the same name of *foundation* which was applied to Peter; which seemed to him to impair the proof of the primacy of the Roman pontiff deduced by theologians from that word. The blame of this, to be sure, should not be laid on me, but on St. Paul and St. John. But that this was the furthest possible from my intention is proved by the words which I used, as follows: "The words of Christ, *Thou art Peter*, etc., certainly show that a privilege was conferred by Christ on Peter above the other apostles, so that he should be the primary foundation of the church; which the church has always acknowledged, by conceding to him the primacy both of honor and of jurisdiction." I denied, indeed, that by virtue of that word *foundation* the gift of infallibility was conferred upon Peter above the other apostles; since no mortal ever thought of claiming this privilege for the other apostles and their successors from the mere fact that they too had been honored with the same title of *foundation*. I then showed it to be a false inference that the stability of the church was derived from the

strength of the foundation, since Christ had signified that he would provide for each of these in some other way; that is, in the words, addressed to all the apostles, Peter with the rest, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." It is hardly fair to say that by this line of reasoning I had either assailed or meant to assail the common arguments for the primacy derived from Christ's words, "Thou art Peter," etc. But I shall show, by-and-by, that the most reverend archbishop himself, by the line of reasoning which he adopts in speaking of the other apostles, and their successors the bishops, not only impeaches this argument for the primacy, but utterly destroys it.

Secondly, the archbishop of Dublin asserted, and that with emphasis, that what I had written about John 21 : 16, 17, was not true; to wit, that the words *lambs* and *sheep* which there occur in the Vulgate version—from the distinction between which, by an argument more subtle than solid, some were wont to infer that both bishops and simple believers are committed to the pastoral care of the Roman pontiff as Peter's successor—corresponded to one and the same word, *προβάτια*, in the Greek text; and that therefore the argument was groundless. I cannot sufficiently wonder that the most reverend archbishop should have ventured to put forth such an assertion; especially, as in talking about it, he seemed to get the word *προβάτια* changed for *πρόβυτα*. The Greek text revised a few years since, in accordance with the oldest manuscripts, by Tischendorf, (to

whom, if I remember correctly, the pope sent a letter of approval for the work which, after vast labor, he had so successfully accomplished,) shows that I was right. I have here the seventh edition, published in 1859, from which I will read the entire passage, adding to the successive answers of Christ, the Vulgate version of them,* so that you may plainly perceive that His Eminence of Dublin has been affected in this matter by some measure of human fallibility. Let me add, that on the arch over the pope's throne in St. Peter's church, where these verses are displayed in Greek, you may read *προβάτια*, but not *πρόβατα*.

In the little work *De Pontificiâ Infallibilitate*, almost of the same tenor as the *Observations* aforesaid, which I had printed lately at Naples, by a typographical error the word *πρόβατα* occurs instead of *προβάτια*, as it was in my manuscript, and as it appears in the Synopsis. But, after all, it is a fact that in the Greek text of Hahn the same word *πρόβατα* does correspond to both the words, *lambs* and *sheep*, in the place cited. But the only difference produced by the variation of reading is this: In Tischendorf's text there is nothing whatever to correspond to the word *sheep*; for *προβάτια* means either *little lambs* or *little sheep*, but not *sheep* at all. But in the other text, of Hahn, the word *πρόβατα* signifies *sheep*; notwithstanding which the author of the Vulgate version chose to make a variation, by rendering the same word *πρόβατα* in one case

* John 21:15. Βόσκει τὰ ἰρνία μου—Pasce agnos meos.

16. Ποίμαινε τὰ προβάτιά μου—Pasce agnos meos.

17. Βόσκει τὰ προβάτιά μου—Pasce oves meas.

by *lambs* and in the other by *sheep*.* My assertion, which the archbishop of Dublin over and over again declared with such emphasis to be untrue, is shown to be absolutely true, whichever of the two readings is adopted. As to the Oriental versions cited by His Eminence, I do not care to speak, being satisfied to have demonstrated the truth of my assertion. But from what I shall say by-and-by, it will appear that it is of trifling consequence what sense we attribute to these words, since I shall easily show that (contrary to what I had said in the *Observations*) no inference can be derived from them in support of the infallibility, or even of the primacy, of the pope.

In the third place, the most reverend archbishop calls me to account for what I said concerning the word *faith* in Luke 22:32;† that that word was never used by our Lord to mean the system of doctrines, (in which sense alone it can afford any ground for an argument in support of papal infallibility,) and not more than once or twice to mean that act of supernatural virtue with which we believe in God making revelation of himself. I asserted that by that word

[* There is a decree of the Council of Trent in these terms: "The sacred and holy Synod . . . doth ordain and declare that the said old and Vulgate edition . . . be, in public lectures, disputations, preachings, and expositions, held as authentic; and that no one is to dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatsoever." *Act. Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 4. How Archbishop Kenrick justifies himself in rejecting the Vulgate version of this text, in favor of the true reading and correct translation, we are not prepared to say; but it is probably on the ground that this was not intended as a public exposition, but as a private and confidential communication to his fellow-bishops. TRANSLATOR.]

† "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not."

(as may be gathered from the discourses of the Lord) was almost always meant *trust* or *confidence*. I showed that, in the passage cited, the word had this sense and no other, holding to the rule that the customary meaning of a word is to be retained, unless the context requires a different one—and in the present case the context favors the usual meaning. The most reverend archbishop said—perhaps not measuring the force of his words—that this assertion of mine smacked of the Calvinistic heresy; in proof of which he adduced John 11 : 27, the words in which Martha professes her belief in Christ, which we are compelled to understand concerning faith in the Catholic sense of the word.

But the excellent bishop did not notice that in my Observation the question was not how to define the true nature of gracious faith as a “theological virtue,” but only as to the force of the word *faith* in its customary usage in the discourses of Christ. Out of twenty-nine passages in the gospels in which this word occurs, (which may be easily seen by consulting the concordance of the Latin Bible,) there are only two—Matt. 23 : 23,* and Luke 18 : 8†—in which the word *faith* can possibly be taken in the sense of the theological virtue of faith. All the other passages give the meaning of *trust* or *confidence*, or *faith of miracles*. In Luke 22 : 32,‡ which is the passage in

* . . . “The weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith.”

† “When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?”

‡ “I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.”

question, this seemed, and still seems, to me to be proved to be the true meaning, both by the customary usage of the word and by the context. And the most reverend archbishop has brought forward nothing in disproof of this statement.*

II. I now proceed to show that the archbishop of Dublin, by his course of reasoning, has emptied the words, "Thou art Peter," etc., of all the force which theologians have commonly thought them to contain. He denies that the bishops, as successors of the apostles, have that universal jurisdiction in the church which the apostles received from Christ; which indeed is true if we speak of the individual

[* It is pretty clear that Archbishop Cullen took the measure of his words more accurately than Archbishop Kenrick gives him credit for. On the one hand, Kenrick is unmistakably and unanswerably right in the definition he gives of the word *faith* as used in the gospels. On the other hand, his antagonist is right in declaring that this definition smacks of Protestantism. For the authorized Roman-catholic definition of faith is the intellectual assent to certain dogmas as revealed. Now when Archbishop Kenrick shows that the faith to which our Lord Jesus Christ promised eternal life is *not* that act which the Roman church exacts as the condition of salvation, but is really that act of committing oneself in *trust* and *confidence* to the Saviour, which is set forth by evangelical preachers as the way of salvation, he does certainly pull out one of the foundation stones on which the whole fabric of the Romish system is built.

It is hardly possible to overrate the importance of this point. It is a cardinal point in the whole controversy. Grant the Romish definition of faith, and the Romish doctrine of justification easily follows; for the mere intellectual receiving of dogmas does of itself neither justify nor sanctify. Grant this definition, and the figment of an infallible tribunal of dogma, constantly sitting and emitting decrees, is necessitated. On the other hand, if the gospel definition of faith, as stated by Dr. Kenrick, is admitted, the gospel system of truth naturally follows. TRANSLATOR.]

bishops outside of a general council, but is not true if understood of the body of bishops, whether in council or not. If the power given to the apostles, of preaching the gospel in the whole earth, is to be restricted to themselves, although it was given by Christ to continue "to the end of the world," it is impossible to prove that the privilege, whatever it may have been, conferred upon Peter in the words, "Thou art Peter," etc., descended to his successors, the popes. The argument, therefore, derived from these words in Matthew 16:18, 19, falls to the ground from the fact that the words of Christ in the 28th chapter, verses 18, 20, of the same evangelist, receive a less literal interpretation; for the question, in both passages, is on the power belonging to the sacred ministry, and not on any sign of their divine mission, such as working miracles, speaking with tongues, or some other such gift. Either, then, the whole of this power of the ministry passed to their successors, or none of it; and surely this last cannot be said. I have not, therefore, infringed upon the proof of the primacy from the words, "Thou art Peter," etc.; on the contrary, I have explicitly acknowledged that proof. But the archbishop, by denying that the universal jurisdiction granted to the apostles has descended to their successors, has done that very thing himself.

I thus prove that all the ministerial privileges granted, whether to Peter or to the rest of the apostles, have descended to their successors; making no inquiry at present what was the nature of these priv-

ileges, or by what sort of evidence they are proved to have been conferred.

Whatever belongs to the sacred ministry in the church of Christ by the institution of its Founder, must belong to it always; otherwise the church would not be such as he instituted it. Therefore those privileges granted to the apostles which concern the function committed to them, are the same now as when they were first conferred. This is equally true of those which were given to all, including Peter, and of that which was granted to Peter individually. On the day of the resurrection, Christ gave commission to all the apostles, always including Peter, in the words, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you," John 20:21; and afterwards, when he was about to ascend into heaven, in the words, "Go, teach all nations," etc., Matt. 28:19, 20. But these words, addressed to all, concern them, not as if spoken to them individually, but to them, as constituting a sort of college of apostles; which is clear from the fact that Thomas, though absent when Christ appeared to the apostles on the resurrection day, received (as all admit) the same commission and the same power of remitting sins as the rest. This apostolic college is constituted a *moral person*, which is to continue to the end of the world; whose identity is no more diminished by the perpetual succession of its members, than our personal identity is affected by the constant change of the elements that compose our bodies. Thus it stands ever before men a living eye-and-ear witness of those things

which Christ did and taught; so that it may always use the words of John, (1st epistle, 1 : 3,) "What we have seen and heard declare we unto you." Whatever power, then, it had at its origin it has now: divine commission ("as the Father hath sent me") and universal jurisdiction ("Go, teach all nations") must be acknowledged to belong now to the apostolic college. And if this be denied or even weakened, the whole Christian religion falls to the ground.

From which I infer that the successors of Peter and the rest of the apostles, constituting the apostolic college, have every power now which they had when the college was first instituted by Christ. The individual bishops, taken singly, receive, by the ordinances of the college itself, only an ordinary local jurisdiction in their several dioceses. But the bishops, taken universally, have a universal jurisdiction; not in that sense exactly that the universal jurisdiction is made up by the sum of the local jurisdictions; but that the bishops universally, whether dispersed and separated from each other, or united in a general council, constitute the apostolic college. Hence the words of Cyprian, "There is one episcopate, an undivided part of which is held by every bishop,"* receive light and a ready explanation. If the most reverend archbishop of Dublin is not prepared to admit all this, at least he must confess that the several bishops united in General Council have

[* "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." The phrase is one often quoted from the treatise *De Unit. Eccl.*, and much disputed as to its rendering. Tr.]

universal jurisdiction. This jurisdiction the illustrious archbishop of Nisibis,* at the end of the second volume of the French translation of his History of General Councils, tries to show is derived by the bishops directly from the Holy Ghost, by virtue of their consecration, while he refers their local jurisdiction to the Roman pontiff. But the school of theologians to which I adhere considers all episcopal jurisdiction to be held by the bishops by immediate derivation from Christ, but that the ordinary local restriction of it had no other origin than the ordinance of the church, in due subordination, nevertheless, to the Roman pontiff as the head alike of the apostolic college and of the universal church. I say, therefore, that the words of Christ spoken to the apostles lose none of their force to the successors of the apostles; and in this I lay down nothing which tends to weaken the argument which theologians are accustomed to deduce from Matt. 16 : 18, in proof of the primacy of the Roman pontiff. This argument I now proceed to examine.

III. I beg you so far to indulge me, most eminent and reverend fathers, as to give me your calm attention while I say things which doubtless will not be agreeable to many of you. I am not about to set forth anything heretical or savoring of heresy, (as the remarks of the archbishop of Dublin may have led you to fear,) nor anything opposed to the principles of the faith, nor anything but what, so far as my slender abilities permit, I shall endeavor

[* Cardoni, one of the pope's theologians.]

to sustain with solid argument. One thing I wish to give warning of: I speak for myself only, not for others; and I do not know but that what I am about to say may give dissatisfaction even to those with whom I take sides in the discussion of this question. If, in the course of my speech, I happen to speak too sharply on any point, remember and imitate the example of those leaders who were persuaded to patience by the famous saying, "Strike, but hear." I shall pay due respect to Their Eminences the moderators of the congregation; but I will not be put down by commotions.*

The primacy of the Roman pontiff, both in honor and in jurisdiction, in the universal church, I acknowledge. Primacy, I say, not *lordship*. But that the primacy is vested in him as the successor of Peter, all the tradition of the church testifies, from the beginning. And on the sole strength of this testimony I accept it as an absolutely certain principle and dogma of faith. But that it can be proved from the words of Holy Scripture, by any one who would be faithful to the rule of interpretation prescribed to us in that profession of faith which we have uttered at the opening of this Council,† and so often on

[* *Motibus autem non cedam.* The fact that the writer, preparing his speech in advance, should deem it needful to announce this determination, suggests obvious inferences concerning the character of the sessions of the Council, and calls for explanation from Archbishop Manning.]

[† The "Creed of Pius IV." (see above, p. 73, *note*) declares: "I will never take nor interpret the Holy Scripture except in accordance with the unanimous consent of the fathers." Archbishop Kenrick goes on to say, with truth, that there never is any

other occasions, I deny. It is true that, following the principles of exegesis, I held the opposite view when I was writing the *Observations* which the archbishop of Dublin has attacked so sharply. But on a closer study of the subject, I judge that this interpretation must be abandoned. My reason for this change of opinion is the following :

The rule of Biblical interpretation imposed upon us is this : that the Scriptures are not to be interpreted contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers. It is doubtful whether any instance of that unanimous consent is to be found. But this failing, the rule seems to lay down for us the law of following, in their interpretation of Scripture, the major number of the fathers, that might seem to approach unanimity. Accepting this rule, we are compelled to abandon the usual modern exposition of the words, "On this rock will I build my church."

In a remarkable pamphlet "printed in *fac-simile* of manuscript," and presented to the fathers almost two months ago, we find five different interpretations of the word *rock*, in the place cited ; "the first of which declares" (I transcribe the words) "that the church was built on *Peter* ;" and this interpretation is followed by *seventeen* fathers—among them, by Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo the Great, Augustine.

"The second interpretation understands from such unanimous consent. Literally, then, the creed is a vow not to receive nor interpret the Scriptures at all—in which sense, there is no doubt that it is sometimes fulfilled with great faithfulness and consistency.]

these words, 'On this rock will I build my church,' that the church was built on *all* the apostles, whom Peter represented by virtue of the primacy. And this opinion is followed by *eight* fathers—among them, Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret.

"The third interpretation asserts that the words, 'On this rock,' etc., are to be understood of the *faith* which Peter had professed—that this faith, this profession of faith, by which we believe Christ to be the Son of the living God, is the everlasting and immovable foundation of the church. This interpretation is the weightiest of all, since it is followed by *forty-four* fathers and doctors; among them, from the East, are Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Theophylact; from the West, Hilary, Ambrose, Leo the Great; from Africa, Augustine.

"The fourth interpretation declares that the words, 'On this rock,' etc., are to be understood of that rock which Peter had confessed, that is, *Christ*—that the church was built upon Christ. This interpretation is followed by *sixteen* fathers and doctors.

"The fifth interpretation of the fathers understands by the name of *the rock*, the *faithful* themselves, who, believing Christ to be the Son of God, are constituted living stones out of which the church is built."

Thus far the author of the pamphlet aforesaid, in which may be read the words of the fathers and doctors whom he cites.

From this it follows, either that no argument at

all, or one of the slenderest probability, is to be derived from the words, "On this rock will I build my church," in support of the primacy. Unless it is certain that by *the rock* is to be understood the apostle Peter in his own person, and not in his capacity as the chief apostle speaking for them all, the word supplies no argument whatever, I do not say in proof of papal infallibility, but even in support of the *primacy* of the bishop of Rome. If we are bound to follow the majority of the fathers in this thing, then we are bound to hold for certain that by *the rock* should be understood the faith professed by Peter, not Peter professing the faith. And here I must be allowed to bring forward a signal example of a less ingenuous interpretation, presented in the little volume lately published here at Rome, by an exceptional privilege, by the reverend archbishop of Edessa, which, by the leave of that venerable man, I wish to speak of; for in a matter of this importance we are bound to use the plainest words, if they are but true. The book is commended by a squad of eleven eminent theologians under the command of the learned Father Perrone, to the supreme pontiff, by whose permission, doubtless, it is excepted from the rule which prevents the bishops from communicating their views to each other through the press, unless they are willing to get the use of the press somewhere else than in Rome.

The two principal interpretations, which understand by *the rock* Peter, and Peter's faith, having been cited, and the observation being made that the

former was common before the Arian heresy, but that the other gained ground afterwards on account of the rise of the controversy on the divinity of Christ, the most reverend author proceeds with his lucubration in the following words, pp. 7 and 8 :

“ But it will be obvious to any one who will take the following things into consideration, how mutually consistent are both these expositions of the gospel text. For the establishment and preservation of unity, Christ sets the person of Peter and his successors in the primacy, as the centre, that all believers might be conjoined at once in unity of faith and of fellowship. But since unity consists not only in the fellowship of all believers, but especially in the oneness of faith, which is greater than fellowship, it was absolutely necessary both that the foundation of the ecclesiastical structure should be laid, and that the centre of unity should be established, not in the mere person of Peter, but also in the faith which he preached. For if the foundation of the church were laid only in the person of Peter, and not also in the solidity of his faith, then, the faith of Peter failing, the unity of the church would be lost, and a plurality of churches would be formed upon the variation in the profession of faith. If therefore Christ wished the church to be one, in the unity of faith and fellowship; if, in order to the perpetual preservation of this unity, he set the person of Peter in the relation of foundation and centre, it behoved him also to set Peter's most solid faith, which he professed and preached, as the foundation; otherwise he would not

have attained the end which he had set before himself in establishing the church. Wherefore, since both Peter's person and the faith which he preached are the foundation of the church, it is clear that that same rock-like firmness which is the glory of Peter's person is also to be ascribed to his faith, lest, without it, the whole building should tumble. Therefore both expositions of these words of Christ are happily in accordance with his intention in founding the church, and one of them serves to throw light on the other. Therefore the fathers of the earlier centuries, applying these words to the person of Peter, not only do not exclude the second interpretation, but by implication presume it; for, admitting the person of Peter to be the immovable foundation-rock of the whole structure of the church, they are bound by implication to admit at the same time his faith also as standing in the same relation of foundation; since identity of faith is the foundation of the unity of the whole building. On the other hand, they who hold that Peter's faith is the rock laid by Christ for the foundation of the church, do not exclude Peter's person, but only teach more explicitly in what way Peter is to be understood as the rock and foundation of the church. Hence there are several of them who give both expositions, as may be seen in St. Augustine."

To say nothing of the fact that the author takes for granted, in these observations, the thing in question, namely, that Christ founded his church on Peter's personal faith, and that a consequence of this

is the infallibility of Peter's successors, I remark only on one point. Out of the passages of the fathers which he quotes through six or seven pages, there are many which are capable of being understood either of Peter professing his faith, that is, of Peter's subjective faith, or of the faith professed by Peter, that is, of Peter's faith taken objectively. But to make his argument good for anything, the author had to prove that the fathers cited by him spoke of the subjective and not the objective faith of Peter—which he has quite neglected to do.

It seems to me, after some thought upon the diversity of interpretations, that they may all be resolved into one, by taking into consideration the distinction between the foundation on which a house is built, and the foundation which is laid in the building of it. The builder of a house, especially if it is to be a great house, and to stand a long time, begins with digging down until he comes, as the phrase goes, "to the live rock;" and on this he lays the foundations, that is, the first course of the building. If we admit this double meaning of foundation, all the diversity of interpretations disappears; and many passages of Scripture, which at first might seem difficult to reconcile with each other, receive great light. The natural and primary foundation, so to speak, of the church, is Christ, whether we consider his person, or faith in his divine nature. The architectural foundation, that laid by Christ, is the twelve apostles, among whom Peter is eminent by virtue of the primacy. In this way we reconcile those passages of

the fathers, which understand him on this occasion, (as in the instance related in John 6, after the discourse of Christ in the synagogue of Capernaum,) to have answered in the name of all the apostles, to a question addressed to them all in common; and in behalf of all to have received the reward of confession.*

In this explanation of the word *rock*, the primacy of Peter is guarded, as the primary ministerial foundation; and the fitness of the words of Paul and John is guarded, when they call all the apostles by the common title of the foundation; and the truth of the expression used with such emphasis by Paul, is guarded: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, even Christ Jesus," 1 Cor. 3:2; and the adversaries of the faith are disarmed of the weapon which they have so effectively wielded against us, when they say that the Catholics believe the church to be built, not on Christ, but on a mortal man; and (a matter of no small account in the present discussion) the underpinning is taken out from the argument which the advocates of the infallibility of the pope by himself alone are wont to derive from a figurative expression of doubtful meaning—riding the metaphor to death—to prove that he received from Christ an authority not only supreme, but absolute. But whatever may be thought of this opinion of mine, it is obviously impossible to deduce from

* S. HIERONYMUS, in Matt. 16:15, 16. S. AUGUSTINUS, Enarr. in Psa. 108, n. 1. IDEM, in Joannis Evangelium, 118, n. 4. S. AMBROSIVS, in Psa. 38:37.

the words, "Thou art Peter," etc., a peremptory argument in proof even of the primacy.*

As to the other words of Christ to Peter, "Feed my lambs," and "Feed my sheep," it may be said that by that threefold commission Christ showed that Peter had not fallen, by his threefold denial, from the privilege by which he had been called to partnership with the apostles; and that this was continued to him in reward for the greater love he bore towards his Lord above the rest. As Augustine says, "The triple confession answers to the triple denial, so that his tongue might give no less service to his love than to his fear, and so that impending death should not seem to have drawn out more from him than present life."* The argument adduced by Bellarmine, that the words "my sheep" and "my lambs" include the whole flock of Christ, and therefore show that the power conferred by them extends to all, proves nothing at all. For they are no more general, nor do they any more express the idea of government, than those which Paul addressed to the elders at Miletus collectively: "Take heed to yourselves and to *all the flock*† over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to rule‡ (ποιμαίνειν) the church

* After the above had been sent to the printer, I happened on a passage in Paschasius Radbert, which expresses the same idea in advance of me: "Licet super eodem fundamento primus ac si caput Petrus recté positus credatur, tamen in eâ petrâ de quâ nome. i sibi ex dono traxit, et super eam tota construitur, et constabilitur: illa cœlestis Jerusalem, id est, super Christum, ut firma permaneat in æternis." Expos. in Matt., lib. 8, ch. 16.

† In Joann. Evang., ch. 123, n. 5.

‡ Vulgate, Universo gregi.

§ Vulgate, Regere.

of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts 20 : 28.*

That the words, "I have prayed for thee," etc., do not have the sense commonly attributed to them, but are to be understood of Peter's fall at the time of the passion, and his subsequent conversion, I have tried to show in my Observations.† "This in-

* See S. BASIL., *Constit. Monastic*, ch. 22, n. 5. S. AUGUSTIN., *De Agone Christiano*, ch. 30.

† The following is an extract from the Observations alluded to:

"Neither is there any more value as a proof of papal inerrancy in those words of Christ to Peter (Luke 22 : 31, 32) in which the advocates of this opinion think to find their main argument. Considering the connection in which Christ uttered them, and the words which he proceeded to address to all the apostles, it does not appear that any gift pertaining to the government of the church was then granted or promised to Peter, much less that the gift of inerrancy in the government of it was declared to him. It was a warning by which the Lord exhorted him to overcome the impending temptation to which he was going to be exposed, and at the same time an intimation that after his fall he should be converted and strengthen the rest of the apostles. Christ prayed therefore for Peter, who, as he was distinguished above the other apostles in his work, was sought above the rest to be sifted by Satan, and was foreseen to be above the rest liable to lapse. Christ prayed for him that his faith might not fail—that is, that he might not wholly or for ever lose that trust by which thus far he had clung to Christ; and that after his fall, coming to himself again, that is, being converted, he should add courage to the rest. This Peter did after the Lord's resurrection, when he announced the fact to the other disciples, as appears from the words, 'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Peter.' Luke 24:34. The words of Christ, then, are to be understood, not of faith as a body of doctrine, in which sense it is never used by the Lord; nor yet of faith, the theological virtue by which we believe in God. in which sense it occurs in his discourses no more than once or twice, but of that trust by which, thus far, he had clung to him as a Master. And if a few of the early interpreters, and the crowd of the moderns, have understood these words differently, and have found them to contain the conferring upon Peter of the office of

terpretation," says the author of the pamphlet printed in *fac-simile*, "is one of great reputation and authority, given by forty-four fathers and doctors both of the most ancient and of later times." For so the words were understood through the first six centuries of the church. The fact that they afterwards received another meaning, seems to have grown out of the common usage of ecclesiastical writers, of interpreting the words of Scripture in an accommodated sense instead of the literal sense.

In addition to the remarks on this subject in my Observations, I take pleasure in adding some things which seem to confirm my view of the meaning of Christ's words. From the fact that the Saviour, after speaking to all the apostles and informing them that Satan had sought them, to sift them as wheat, turns then to Peter with the words, "I have prayed for *thee*"—which must necessarily be understood of him alone, to the exclusion of the rest, since, after being converted, he was to strengthen the others—it is inferred that some peculiar thing was promised to Peter in these words. In fact this is true, but something considerably different from the extraordinary gift commonly understood to have been promised to Peter in them.

Can it be said that Christ prayed for Peter alone, but that he provided no safeguard for the others, about to encounter so great a peril? How then does confirming in the faith his brethren, that is, the rest of the apostles and their successors the bishops, this does not impose upon other people any necessity of abandoning the simple and literal meaning."

it come to pass that the others stood firm, unsustained by any extraordinary assistance, while Peter, for whom singly Christ prayed, so grievously fell? The true reason why the Saviour addressed the words to him alone seems to be this: He prayed indeed for all, as we cannot but take for granted. But to Peter he intimated, by directing his words exclusively to him, (just as, after Peter's answer in verse 33, he proceeded to say it more plainly in verse 34,) that he would deny his Master. Thus he warned him of his approaching fall, and foretold his conversion, and that by him the rest were to be confirmed. The Lord's words so understood give a clear sense. Beside the repeated warning given to Peter, they contain the prophecy of his conversion; so that when Peter, having come to himself, clearly recollected it, it left no doubt in his mind of the pardon which he should obtain, and thus saved him, it may be, from despair in view of his most grievous sin.

Besides, the successive words addressed by Christ to Peter cannot be understood of his successors without involving an extraordinary absurdity. The words, "When thou art converted," certainly refer to Peter's conversion. If the foregoing words, "I have prayed for thee," and the following, "Strengthen thy brethren," prove that the Divine assistance and the office have descended to his successors, it does not appear why the intermediate words, "when thou art converted," should not belong to them too, and in some sense be understood of them.*

[* There is an extremely telling stroke of covert sarcasm here,

In saying these things, I am not greatly affected by the accusation lately levied against me, without mentioning my name, by the right reverend bishop of Elphin (treading in the footsteps of the archbishop of Dublin) when he gave vent to his grief of heart that there should be any among the bishops who would not scruple to take the texts of Holy Scripture and other citations in proof of papal infallibility, and interpret them in the sense accepted by heretics! "If these things," said that excellent man, "are done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" My answer to him and to others is this: Following the example of Irenæus, Tertullian, Augustine, and Vincent of Lerins, I believe that the proofs of the Catholic faith are to be sought rather in tradition than in the interpretation of the Scriptures.* "Interpretation of Scripture," says Tertullian, "is better adapted to befoe the truth than to demonstrate it." Of the testimonies derived from tradition, there are some which, I think, will have to be given up; as in the phrase of Irenæus on the superior authority which he is commonly thought to have

as well as a substantial argument. It is more than implied that if the words impute to the popes Peter's commission and Peter's grant of divine grace, they must impute to them also Peter's conversion and therefore Peter's apostasy. It was quite unnecessary for the author to do more than suggest to his intended audience, that the popes might perhaps succeed better in vindicating their succession to Peter by the signs of apostasy than by the signs of grace.]

[* This frank and unreserved acknowledgment would perhaps hardly have been made in a document intended for the promiscuous public. But it is sustained by weighty authorities in Roman theology. Some of these may be found cited by Lord Acton, p. 104.]

claimed for the Roman church. But I have taken the responsibility of this concession, alleging substantial reasons, which ought to be met, not with abuse, but with other reasons.

It has seemed to me that nice refinements upon figures of speech had better be laid aside; but I have appealed to the faith of the Councils and the fathers, which shows that such subtleties do not agree with the ancient doctrine and practice of the church universal, but rather contradict them. This method of reasoning is better fitted for bringing back Protestants into the bosom of the church, than arguments the very principles of which they reject; and which, although they may seem impregnable to less intelligent Catholics, nevertheless are proved by the experience of the last three centuries to be ill adapted for putting an end to controversies.

I close this part of my speech with a brief summing up of the argument:

We have in the Holy Scriptures perfectly clear testimonies of a commission given to all the apostles, and of the divine assistance promised to all. These passages are clear, and admit no variation of meaning. We have not even one single passage of Scripture, the meaning of which is undisputed, in which anything of the kind is promised to Peter separately from the rest. And yet the authors of the *schema* want us to assert that to the Roman pontiff as Peter's successor is given that power which cannot be proved by any clear evidence of holy Scripture to have been given to Peter himself except just so far

as he received it in common with the other apostles; and which being claimed for him separately from the rest, it would follow that the divine assistance promised to them was to be communicated only through him, although it is clear from the passages cited that it was promised to him only in the same manner and in the same terms as to all the others. I admit indeed, that a great privilege was granted to Peter above the rest; but I am led to this conviction by the testimony, not of the Scriptures, but of all Christian antiquity. By the help of this testimony it appears that he is infallible; but on this condition, that he should use the counsel of his brethren, and should be aided by the judgment of those who are his partners in this supreme function, and should speak in their name, of whom he is head and mouth. And yet there is no one but sees how far this privilege falls short of the desires of those who, not without abuse of their opponents that stand in the old paths of the church, desire that the papal power, great by its divine origin, and since that, in the course of ages, enormously augmented, should be the *sole* power in the church.*

* In his Letter to the Archbishop of Paris, dated October 24, 1865, the pope claims for himself the ordinary power in the particular dioceses. In the schema *De Romano Pontifice* it is said that he has ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in the universal church. Since this is said without making any distinction between ordinary or episcopal power and ordinary patriarchal or primatial power, it would seem to follow that the pope is actually ordinary or bishop of each several diocese of the Christian world. According to the author of the book *On the Roman Curia*, who lived at Rome for fifteen years, the pope is the *exclusive* ordinary of all the missions under the sacred congregation *de Propagandâ*

IV. At the opening of his speech, the archbishop of Dublin spoke in terms of the highest praise of an English work by my late brother archbishop of Baltimore, on "The Primacy of the Apostolic See;" for which I made due acknowledgments. But in the course of his speech it appeared to me that his commemoration of the dead was a reproach to the living; for he related how that thirty years ago, more or less, he learned by the reading of it, that the doings of the Sixth Council in the condemnation of Honorius were nowise opposed to the notion of papal infallibility. The most reverend the present archbishop of Baltimore afterwards made honorable mention of him, and quoted somewhat from his dogmatic theology, from which it might appear that there was no difference between the opinion which he himself so stoutly defends, and that which, in my letter to him, I asserted to have been my brother's

Fide, so that there is no difference between vicars apostolic and the titular bishops set over those missions, except that the latter are *ordinary* and the former *extraordinary* vicars of the pope. *Die Römische Curie*. BANGEN. Munster, 1854. Page 263. After the Concordats have been done away, which will not be long after the infallibility of the pope is established, all episcopal sees will be at the disposal of the pope alone, *ad nutum*; and thenceforth all bishops will be vicars of the pope, liable to be removed at his nod—*ad nutum ejus*. Thus the church, from which civil society borrowed the form of representative government to which it owes the rights it has acquired, will exhibit an example of absolutism, both in doctrine and administration, carried to the highest pitch. A right reverend orator said, no long time since, that the papal power is, in government, absolute indeed, but not arbitrary; because it is always guided by reason—which evidently implies that the pope is *impeccable*. In fact, this is necessarily inferred from his infallibility; for infallibility is a quality of the intellect, and the intellect is affected by the character.

opinion. I have a few things to say of each of these bishops.

I might prefer a serious complaint against the archbishop of Baltimore for having presented in a garbled and mutilated form, from this rostrum, the passage which has lately so often been brought before the public. My brother's complete sentence is as follows:

“On the other hand, that way of speaking is not to be approved, according to which the pope is declared to be infallible *of himself alone*; for scarcely any Catholic theologian is known to have claimed for him as a private teacher the privilege of inerrancy. Neither as pope is he alone, since to him teaching, the college of bishops gives its adhesion, which, it is plain, has always happened.”

Thus far the archbishop of Baltimore quotes. The words immediately following on these he thinks best to omit, although, as will at once be manifest, they are absolutely necessary to the full expression of the writer's meaning:

“But no orthodox writer would deny that pontifical definitions accepted by the college of bishops, whether in council or in their sees, either by subscribing decrees, or by offering no objection to them, have full force and infallible authority.”

These words leave no doubt of the mind of the writer. Hereafter they should not be omitted when the previous sentence is quoted, lest a false impression of his sentiments be conveyed.

It is clear that this is no chance utterance of his

opinion, from what he says in that English work of his from the reading of which his eminence the archbishop of Dublin testified that he had derived such great profit. I read from the work itself belonging to the library of the English college in this city. I give a closely literal Latin version, lest I weaken the force of it by being ambitious of elegance:

[The extract, as it here follows, is from the original English.]

“The personal fallibility [of the pope] in his private capacity, writing or speaking, is freely conceded by the most ardent advocates of papal prerogatives; but his official infallibility *ex cathedrâ* is strongly affirmed by many:* while some, as the French Assembly of 1682, contend that his judgment may admit of amendment, as long as it is not sustained by the assent and adhesion of the great body of bishops. Practically there is no room for difficulty, since all solemn judgments hitherto pronounced by the pontiff have received the assent of his colleagues; and in the contingency of a new definition it should be presumed by the faithful at large that it is correct, AS LONG AS THE BODY OF BISHOPS DO NOT REMONSTRATE OR OPPOSE IT.”†

V. Before proceeding to other points, I feel bound to say that I do not agree in all respects with my brother's opinion, which, I am aware, is the common opinion of theologians. The assent of the church

[* In a foot-note, the writer here presses additional charges of misquotation, which it seems unnecessary to reproduce here.]

† KENRICK. *Primacy of the Apostolic See*, Philadelphia, 1845, p. 357.

dispersed, as the phrase is, I consider to have a negative rather than a positive authority. The church, whether dispersed or assembled in Council, can not assent to any error that *contradicts* revealed truth; otherwise, the gates of hell might be said to have prevailed against it. Nevertheless it has the divine assistance, in THOSE THINGS ALONE which were taught by Christ to the apostles, all which things—that is, all revealed truth—“all things whatsoever I have told you”—the Holy Spirit brought to their recollection by illuminating their minds with his own divine light (for this is the end to which he is given) rather than by revealing new things. In order that the apostles and their successors may bear testimony of these things as ear-witnesses, it is necessary that they should be unable to approve, even by silence, of any opinion contradictory to them.

But when the question is on a new definition of faith, I consider that a Council which truly represents the church universal is of necessity required. For it is there alone that inquiry can be made, in case any doubt should arise. In certain matters only, and in these only under favorable circumstances, may silence be taken for assent; but not in all matters, especially when dissent might turn out to be either useless or perilous. Take the present controversy, for example. If the pope had thought fit to define himself as infallible in the sense of the *schema*, there would have been no opportunity given for the great investigation which we have seen instituted, now that the Council is convened and the

bishops assembled, affording light and courage to each other. Very few of those who have stood out so stoutly against the new definition, in the most difficult circumstances, would have ventured to resist the pope, or, if they had had the courage for that, would have known where to lay their hands on weapons fit and effective for the protection of their rights, so gravely imperilled.

A signal instance in proof that the silence of the church is not, at least in all cases, to be taken for consent, is supplied by the history of the opinion concerning the power of the Roman pontiff against realms not subject to his government. For four centuries after the bull *Unam Sanctam*,* this opinion prevailed. I am not aware that any document is extant which shows that there was any remonstrance against it except on the part of persons who suffered some damage from it; and these must be considered as having demurred not so much to the power as to the exercise of it to their injury. From the fulmination of the bull of Boniface VIII., down to the beginning of the seventeenth century—for four whole centuries—this definition of the papal power seems to have been in force, and was said even by the most learned theologians of the seventeenth century to be matter of faith. I once used to think that the language of the bull *Unam Sanctam* was capable of being reconciled with the view I then held of papal infallibility. But I do not now think so. It used to seem to me a special act of divine providence which

[* Fulminated A. D. 1302.]

had kept the pope from declaring all mankind to be subject to him in temporals, by reason of sin ; but on more mature reflection I saw that this explanation was a mere subterfuge, utterly unworthy of an honest man. Words derive their meaning from the intent of the speaker and the acceptation of the hearers. No man can deny that the purpose of Boniface in that bull was to claim for himself temporal power, and to propound this opinion to the faithful, to be held under pain of damnation. No man can deny that the words of the bull were received in this sense by all then living. If it was withstood by the subjects of Philip the Fair, these were extremely few in number compared to the whole of Christendom, for it was only a little part of modern France that was under his sceptre, and these few may be considered as having opposed rather the exercise of the power than its divine right. The church, then, through all that period seems to have approved by its assent the bull *Unam Sanctam*, hardly a single bishop having objected to it.

But at the present time the opinion so solemnly enunciated in that bull is repudiated by all, not excepting even the most ardent advocates of papal infallibility. I summon certainly a most unimpeachable witness in this case, namely, his grace the most reverend Martin John Spalding, archbishop of Baltimore, who, in a work (of which I shall have more particular occasion to speak hereafter) printed at Baltimore in 1866, after three other editions of the same had been exhausted and this fourth edition

had been issued to meet the demand of the faithful, speaks as follows :

“ But the papacy invested itself with temporal power ; and in the middle ages it claimed the right to depose princes, and to absolve their subjects from the oath of allegiance. Be it so ; what then ? Was this accession of temporal power ever viewed as an essential prerogative of the papacy ? Or was it not considered merely as an accidental appendage, the creature of peculiar circumstances ? Are there any examples of such alleged usurpations during the first ten centuries of its history ? Has this power been exercised, or even claimed, by the Roman pontiffs for the last three centuries ? If these two facts are undoubted—as they certainly are—then how maintain that a belief in the papacy involves a recognition of its temporal power ? The latter was never, certainly, a *doctrine* of the church. If it was, where is the proof ?—where the church definition that made it a doctrine ?* Five leading Catholic universities (Sorbonne, Louvain, Douay, Alcalá, and Salamanca) when officially called on by Mr. Pitt, prime minister of Great Britain, (1788,) solemnly and unanimously disclaimed this opinion and maintained the contrary. Did the Catholic church, did the popes, ever rebuke them for the disclaimer ? Do not Catholics all over

* Here the author is certainly mistaken. It does not require a definition to constitute a doctrine. It is enough that there should be truth divinely revealed, and propounded as such to the faithful by the ordinary magistracy of the church. But that power was propounded as a doctrine by Boniface VIII., when he declared that it must be held by all “*sub salutis dispendio.*” Furthermore, Suarez has it for a defined doctrine.

the world now almost unanimously disclaim it? and are they the less Catholic for this? I fearlessly assert—and I do so advisedly—that there are very few Catholics at the present day who do not reject this opinion; that there are still fewer who maintain it; and that it is not defended, at least publicly,* even in Rome itself.†”

The tacit assent of the bishops, therefore, for no less than four centuries, did not have the effect to constitute the opinion of the power of the popes in temporals into a doctrine of the Catholic faith, which is obvious of itself, since otherwise the rejection of it now would be equivalent to defection from the unity of the Catholic church.

In this opinion two things are to be distinguished: the power itself, and the reason of the power. The power itself had its ground in circumstances; and for the most part it tended to the public good. The reason of the power was not, as the popes asserted, divine authority, divinely granted to them as holding the primacy in the church; but it originated in circumstances, by the consent of Christendom. It was recognized by public law, and was, so far, legitimate. It was vested in the popes, not because as popes they had received it from Christ, but because there was no one else who could exercise it at that time, when the need for it arose. In ascribing it to the ordinance of God, the popes were laboring under

* The expression is too incautious.

† Lectures on the Evidences of Catholicity. By M. J. Spalding, D. D., Archbishop of Baltimore. Fourth edition, 1866, pp. 377, 378.

something of human infirmity—a fact with which it would be unjust to reproach them. That it has now fallen into desuetude is admitted by all. Few persons think of it as a thing possible to be revived; although this may not be impossible, if the pope is to be held infallible, and if we may put confidence in the words of the most reverend archbishop of Westminster, in a speech delivered by him at London some years ago, before his promotion to the episcopate.

This distinguished man asserted in that speech—if I remember correctly what I read in the newspapers, and I certainly am not mistaken as to the substance of it—that the pope, as Christ's vicegerent, ought to be a king; and that the fact of his having been for centuries without secular dominion was no argument against this assertion, for he had always possessed the right to it. If this is true, (which I vehemently deny) it follows that the pope possesses not only the petty domain of his Roman territory, but a sort of universal right over the whole world. Since Christ is king of kings, the pope, who as his representative ought to be a king (according to the archbishop of Westminster,*) ought to repre-

[* The opinions of Abp. Manning, as the representative and leader of the now victorious party in the Roman Catholic church, are of some interest to American citizens. A more recent utterance of his is quoted by Quirinus (p. 832) from a sermon of his in 1869. Speaking in the pope's name, he says: "I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men; of the peasant that tills the field, and the prince that sits on the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms—I am the sole last supreme judge of what is right and wrong."]

sent him throughout the whole realm of Christ himself : that is, throughout the entire world. We know what a happy talent for drawing inferences, even out of figures of speech, is shown by the advocates of papal authority. What if they have for a premise so pregnant a principle as this of the archbishop of Westminster? It can be no more of an objection to this right that for a number of centuries it was never claimed, than that for many centuries from the beginning it was not possessed, and even that no one dreamed of its belonging to the pope. I refer to this not to excite prejudice against this eminent man, but in order to show him that the consequence which necessarily follows from a principle evidently erroneous, the falsity of which I shall try to prove in the course of this speech—a consequence which he himself would reject—ought to make him cautious not to know more than it is worth while to know about papal infallibility.

For these reasons I am compelled to differ from what is at least a common way of speaking, when the question rises about defining some new dogma of the Catholic faith. It is my opinion that this can not be done without a Council truly representing the church universal.

I now return to the subject, with which, after all, what I have said is by no means disconnected.

VI. There is no great difference, if perchance there is any, between my brother's opinion and that expressed by the most reverend Martin John Spalding, archbishop of Baltimore, in his History of the

Reformation ; from the fifth edition of which, revised by the author and published at Baltimore in 1866, I quote the following, which I translate into Latin with the same fidelity as I did my brother's language. I premise that it had first appeared twenty-six years before, and that it was originally written in reply to the History of the Reformation by D'Aubigné. This book is to be found in the hands of almost all the Catholics in the United States, not only on account of the amount of information which it contains and the familiar style in which it is written, but also on account of the high esteem in which the author is held among us, as the occupant of the primatial see, and as a man of wide celebrity for learning and genius. This fifth edition appeared in the same year in which he drew up, in the name of the Council of Baltimore, a letter to the pope, from which both he and others would have it inferred that the bishops of the United States favor the designs of the infallibilists. It is contained in the library of the American College in this city, having been presented by the author, with his name in it in his own handwriting, in 1867, when he was at Rome ; on which occasion he, with the other bishops, signed a letter to the pope, surely with no intention of settling or enunciating a doctrine, but only of manifesting their own veneration and affection towards the pope. The archbishop of Baltimore's words are as follows :

“ In what, in fact, consists the difference between the authoritative teaching of the first body of Christ's ministers, the apostles, and that body of pastors who

by divine commission succeeded them in the office of preaching, teaching, and baptizing, and who in the discharge of these sacred duties were promised the divine assistance all days, even to the consummation of the world? And if the latter was opposed to rational liberty, why was not the former? Besides, we learn, for the first time, that the Roman Chancery* decided on articles of faith. We had always thought that this was THE EXCLUSIVE PROVINCE OF GENERAL COUNCILS, and when they were not in session, of the Roman pontiff's WITH THE CONSENT OR ACQUIESCENCE OF THE BODY OF BISHOPS DISPERSED OVER THE WORLD. We had also in our simplicity believed that even these did not always decide on controverted points, but only in cases in which the teaching of revelation was clear and explicit; and that in other matters they wisely allowed a reasonable latitude of opinion. But D'Aubigné has taught us better! He would have us to believe that Roman Catholics are bound hand and foot, body and soul, and that they are not allowed even to reflect."†

It remains to say a few words of my brother's

* Perhaps D'Aubigné wrote *Curia* and the mistake occurred in the translation. [Abp. Kenrick's note.]

† History of the Reformation by Martin John Spalding, Archbishop of Baltimore. Fifth revised edition. Baltimore, 1866. Vol. I., page 318. [The quotation as above given is from the original English. Early in the Council a misfortune befell Abp. Manning, in all respects similar to this of Abp. Spalding. The following extract was produced from a catechism widely used and authorized in England, and praised by Manning's own journal, *The Tablet*: "Q. Are not Catholics bound to believe that the pope is in himself infallible? A. This is A PROTESTANT INVENTION, and is no article of Catholic belief." Quirinus, 97.]

views about the case of Honorius. It is no wonder that, educated at the College of Urban, and being full of zeal for the Holy See, he should have judged him very mildly. For the case was not of any such importance before the rise of the present controversy, and therefore had not been so thoroughly cleared up as it now is. I take this opportunity to say a word of the bishop of Rottenburg's * opinion expressed in his profoundly learned History of Councils. The archbishop of Dublin, who has perhaps acquired his information from the French translation instead of from the work itself, says that there will be some difficulty in reconciling this opinion with that which the bishop of Rottenburg now advocates. A year ago I read the original work, and it was from that that I first learned—what my own examination has since confirmed—that the letters of Honorius to Sergius do contain some things which cannot be reconciled with sound doctrine.

VII. It was with great delight that I listened to the recent speech of the archbishop of Westminster in this assembly. I was at a loss which most to admire, the eloquence of the man, or his fiery zeal in moving, or rather commanding us to enact the new definition. The lucid arrangement of topics, the absolute felicity of diction, the singular grace of elocution, and the supreme authority and candor of mind which were resplendent in his speech, almost extorted from me the exclamation, "*Talis cum sis, utinam noster esses!*" And yet, while I listened, I

[* Bishop Hefele.]

could not help thinking of what used to be said of the English settlers in Ireland—that they were more Irish than the Irishmen. The most reverend archbishop is certainly more Catholic than any Catholic I ever knew before. He has no doubt himself of the infallibility—personal, separate, and absolute—of the pope, and he is not willing to allow other people to have any. He declares it to be a doctrine of faith, and he does not so much demand as he does predict, that the Vatican Council shall define it as such; something perhaps in the style of those prophets who go to work to bring about the fulfilment of their own predictions. As for myself—whom the experience of well nigh sixty years, since I first began to study the rudiments of the faith, may perhaps have made as well informed upon this subject as one who has been numbered with the church for some twenty years—I boldly declare that that opinion, as it lies in the *schema* is not a doctrine of faith, and that it cannot become such by any definition whatsoever, even by the definition of a Council. We are the keepers of the faith committed to us, not its masters. We are teachers of the faithful intrusted to our charge, in just so far as we are witnesses.

The great confusion of ideas which prevails throughout this controversy seems to me to arise from an inaccurate notion of certain terms, and from the neglect of the distinction, which should never be lost sight of, between theology as a science, and the revealed truths of which it treats, as an object of our faith. Let me briefly explain my meaning.

All truths divinely revealed are to be believed with divine faith, which are propounded as such to the faithful by the church, whether in councils or through its ordinary government. Among these truths some are explicitly revealed, others implicitly. These last are to be restricted to those truths only which are necessarily connected with truths explicitly revealed, so that one who should deny the former would be held to have denied the latter also. Thus the church in its acts of definition is always a *witness*, and formulates a judgment only by witnessing. It condemns errors which openly *contradict* doctrines explicitly revealed, and besides these, errors opposed to corollaries *necessarily* deduced from such doctrines. It is the general opinion of theologians that it may happen that arguments of doubtful value shall be adduced in proof of truths of faith, even in General Councils; although in declaring the faith itself, the Councils cannot err. The reason is, that in *declaring* the faith—an act of which all bishops, learned and unlearned alike, are capable—the church acts as witness: in *proving* the faith, whether from reason or from Scripture, she sustains the part not so much of a witness as of a theologian.

It is within the limits above enunciated that that faith divinely revealed is contained, concerning which the church as witness is capable of pronouncing a formal judgment, and of anathematizing gainsayers as heretics. Among these truths explicitly or implicitly revealed, those which have been defined by a solemn judgment of the church are said to belong

to the Catholic faith, in distinction from those which, although revealed, and necessary to be believed, have not been enunciated or defined by decree of Council. But this distinction is merely scholastic, and implies no difference at all between the two kinds of truth, so far as respects the obligation of believing them.

Theology as a science is to be carefully distinguished from faith or the body of *credenda*. It sets forth the truths of faith in systematic order, and proves them, in its way of proving, either positively or scholastically, and deduces sundry conclusions from truths explicitly or implicitly revealed, which, for distinction's sake, are called theological conclusions. These conclusions, not being immediately and necessarily connected with revealed truths, so that the denial of them would be deemed a denial of those truths themselves, cannot be elevated to the rank of truths of faith, or propounded as such to the faithful at cost of their everlasting salvation. Propositions contradictory of them may be condemned as erroneous, but not as heretical.

In the Vatican Council, this distinction does not seem to have been observed. The result—a thing unknown hitherto in Councils—has been that the bishops are divided among diverse opinions, disputing, certainly not about doctrines of faith of which they are witnesses and custodians, but about opinions of the schools. The Council-chamber has been turned into a theological arena, the partisans of opposite opinions, not only on this question of the infal-

libility of the pope, but on other subjects, exchanging blows back and forth with the hot temper which is more common in theologians than in bishops, and is not becoming to either;* for all acknowledge the Roman pontiff, united with the body of bishops, to be infallible. Here we have a doctrine of faith. But not all acknowledge him to be infallible by himself alone; neither do all know what is meant by that formula; for different parties offer different interpretations of it. Here we have the opinions or views of the schools, about which (as is fair enough) there are all sorts of mutual contradictions.

It may be objected that by this line of argument I assail the definition of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin by the bull *Ineffabilis Deus*; since this opinion was for centuries freely denied by many, and was afterwards erected into an article of faith by the bull aforesaid, with the consent and applause of the body of bishops, as appears from their acts and writings, many of them having been present at the pontifical definition. Speaking for myself alone, I give the following frank reply, which perhaps will meet the approval neither of my friends nor of others. For a fuller reply, I refer to my Observations, in the Synopsis,† the sum of which is as

[* Compare with this expression Archbishop Manning's solemn declaration as to what did *not* occur—"scenes of indecent clamor and personal violence, *unworthy even in laymen, criminal in bishops of the church.*" *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 28. The coincidence of expression is curious, one bishop giving the facts as they happened, and the other the facts as they did not happen.]

† *Synopsis Observationum*, pp. 234-238.

follows: I admit that the blessed Virgin Mary through the singular favor of God, and in view of the merits of her Son Jesus Christ, was kept in her conception from all guilt of Adam's sin. I do not deny that this sentiment belongs to the deposit of faith; nevertheless, I have never been able to discover it therein, so far as that deposit is set forth in the Scriptures and the writings of the fathers; neither have I ever found the man who could show it to me there. The assent of "the Church Dispersed" (as it is called) proves that the definition to which that assent is given is not in contradiction to any revealed truth; since, as I have already remarked, the church, whether in council or dispersed, can tolerate nothing which contradicts the faith. The pious opinion was always cherished among the faithful—an affection which the church encouraged, and by the institution of the Feast of the Conception, almost sanctioned. But it never delivered it as a doctrine of faith, and popes have strictly forbidden that the opposite opinion should be branded with the mark of heresy by its opponents. If any one should deny that it is a doctrine of faith, I do not see what answer could be made to him; for he would reply that the church could not so long have tolerated an error contrary to truth divinely revealed, without seeming either ignorant of what the deposit of faith contained or tolerant of manifest error.

VIII. I now proceed to show that the opinion of the infallibility of the pope in the sense of the *schema*, whether true or false, is not a doctrine of faith, and

cannot be propounded as such to the faithful, even by the definition of a Council.

Definitions of faith are not incitements to devotion, much less are they the triumphal exaltation of the opinions of schools of theology, according as one or another of these gets the upper hand. They are authoritative expositions of the doctrines of faith, generally designed to guard against the subterfuges of innovators, and they never impose upon believers a new faith.

This being settled, I say that the infallibility of the pope is not a doctrine of faith.

1. It is not contained in the symbols of the faith; it is not presented as an article of faith in the catechisms; and it is not found as such in any document of public worship. Therefore the church has not hitherto taught it as a thing to be believed of faith; as, if it were a doctrine of faith, it ought to have delivered and taught it.

2. Not only has not the church taught it in any public instrument, but it has suffered it to be impugned, not everywhere, but, with the possible exception of Italy, almost everywhere in the world, and that for a long time. This is proved by a witness above all impeachment—the approbation of Innocent XI. twice conferred upon Bossuet's Exposition of the Faith, a work in which not only no mention of this doctrine occurs, but in which the notion is plainly referred to in the remarks upon matters in dispute among theologians, on which opinion is free.

To speak only of the English-speaking nations, it

may be observed that in no one of their symbolical or catechetical works is this opinion found set down among truths of faith.

The whole supply of books treating of faith and piety, down to the beginning of the present century, and later, has been imported into Ireland and the United States from England. In many of them the opposite opinion is given. In none of them is the opinion itself found as a matter of faith. A year ago, indeed, in England and the United States, there came out sundry books—two or three of them to my knowledge—intended to prepare men's minds to receive the opinion as belonging to the faith. As for that one which was published in the United States, and afterwards translated into French and German,* written by a pious and extremely zealous but ignorant man, I may say that it abounded in such grave blunders, at least in the first edition in English, as to excite more laughter than indignation in others beside me, holding different opinions on the pending question. When I was solicited by the author to give some sort of commendation to the little book, which is measurably damaging to the bishops, I did not wish to trouble the good man with a debate, and so, in an unguarded moment, I promised him the charity of silence.

It was known, indeed, among us that the school of theologians commonly called by us *Ultramontanes*, upheld the opinion of papal infallibility in a sense

[* The writer here refers to a work on *The Infallibility of the Pope* by the Rev. Father Weninger, S. J., of Cincinnati.]

more favorable to papal privileges than the other theologians. And that opinion, after the translation into English of the distinguished Joseph De Mais-tre's work on The Pope, widely prevailed among among clergy and laity, and still prevails, yet not as a doctrine of faith, but as a free opinion which seems to have in its favor important reasons and weighty names. But to return to the point.

For almost two centuries there has been in use among English-speaking Catholics a little book entitled, "*Roman-catholic Principles in Reference to God and the King.*" So widely circulated is this little book, that from 1748 to 1813 were printed thirty-five editions of it, in a separate form; besides that, being very brief, it was often appended to other works. The Very Reverend Vicar Apostolic Coppinger, in England, at the opening of the present century, had it printed twelve times over; and another vicar apostolic, Walmesley, a man of the highest erudition, left his written opinion of this book, commending it to his friends for its clearness and good judgment. On the present question it speaks as follows:

"It is no matter of faith to believe that the pope is in himself infallible, separated from the church, even in expounding the faith. By consequence papal definitions or decrees, in whatever form pronounced, taken exclusively from a General Council or universal acceptance of the church, oblige none, under pain of heresy, to an interior assent."*

* *Roman-catholic Principles. etc.* Kirk's edition, Butler's Historical Memoirs, vol. 4, Appendix, p. 501.

The work is printed in full in the Appendix to Charles Butler's Historical Memoirs, which may be found in the library of the English college in this city.

We have with us a witness from the United States of North America, in the person of the most reverend archbishop of Baltimore, who has expressed his opinion on this point, not in the historical work from which I have quoted, which, as likely to meet the eye of other than Catholic readers, might seem, perhaps, to permit a more liberal explanation of the subject; but in a lecture delivered to the faithful in his own cathedral church, while he was bishop of Louisville. To the great benefit of the church, he collected the lectures into a volume, and published them. The volume has been often reprinted, and a copy of the fourth edition, printed at Baltimore in 1866, is preserved in the library of the American college in this city, having been presented to the library by the author, with an inscription in his own handwriting, in the year 1867, when he was here.

He delivers many admirable arguments on the infallibility of the church; then, refuting the objections commonly made against it, he says:

“Do we mean to say that even the pope is impeccable or infallible in his private and individual capacity? No Catholic divine ever so much as dreamed of saying or thinking so. Do we mean to say that the pope, viewed in his public and official capacity, when he speaks out as the organ and visible head of the church, is gifted with infallibility?

No Catholic divine ever defended his infallibility, even under such circumstances, unless when the matters on which he uttered his definitions were intimately connected with the doctrines of faith and morals, and when, if he should be permitted by God to fall into error, there would be danger of the whole church being also led astray. Those numerous and learned Catholic theologians who maintain the infallibility of the Roman pontiff in this particular case, consider it as if matter of *opinion* more or less certain, not as one of Catholic *faith*, [the Italics are by the archbishop himself,] defined by the church and obligatory on all. Though not an article of Catholic faith, it is, however, the general belief among Catholics; and I myself am inclined strongly to advocate its soundness, chiefly on account of the intimate connection between the pontiff and the church, as will be shown in a subsequent lecture. Still, it is an opinion, for all this, and no Catholic would venture to charge the great Bossuet, for example, with being wanting in orthodoxy for denying it, while he so powerfully and so eloquently established the infallibility of the Church.”*

It is scarcely necessary to remark that the scholastic distinction between “doctrines of the faith” and “doctrines or dogmas of the Catholic faith,” cannot be brought in to break the force of the conclusion, derived from sources so numerous and so important,

* Lectures on the Evidences of Catholicity, delivered in the Cathedral of Louisville, by M. J. Spalding, D. D., Archbishop of Baltimore. Fourth edition, revised and enlarged. Baltimore, 1866. Pp. 263-4.

that the opinion of the infallibility of the pope has not been delivered to the faithful as a thing to be believed with divine faith. This notion is never mentioned except when it becomes necessary to refer to it in meeting the objections of opponents, and it is always asserted that it does not belong to the faith. It is not to be admitted that in those circumstances, men of the weightiest character, distinguished with the office of priest or bishop, would have made use of verbal quibbles which it would be hardly possible for their opponents to understand; such a quibble would be that scholastic distinction between a doctrine of the faith and a dogma of the Catholic faith. The bishop of Elphin said, in reply to the archbishop of Cincinnati, that Catholics had not denied the opinion of the infallibility of the pope as a doctrine of faith, but had denied that it was a dogma of the Catholic or defined faith. If this is true, which I by no means believe, the reproach is justly and deservedly to be applied to us, that in a matter of the gravest consequence we have not been ashamed to hide our meaning by making use of scholastic distinctions.

It remains now to speak of the faith of the church of Ireland.

In that very learned speech of his, which remains thus far unanswered, and, as I confidently predict, will continue to be unanswered, the right reverend bishop of St. Augustine in North America (than whom no man in this assembly is more worthy of the respect due, at all times, and from all persons whatsoever, to the Episcopal dignity) remarked that the

Irish Catholics believe their own priests infallible, and therefore (as he asserted) it was no wonder that they should consider the pope of Rome infallible. It seemed to some that he was using an exaggerated expression, rather in joke than in earnest.

And yet it is perfectly true, and so far from being a reproach to Irishmen, it is a very great honor to them, and in the highest degree agreeable to Catholic principles. The Irish think their priests infallible because they receive them as the ministers of the infallible church, and therefore as in accordance with it in their sermons to the people. In just that sense and no other, although with even a greater reverence, on account of his higher rank in the hierarchy of the church, they accept the pope of Rome as infallible. I admit that in many respects they are inferior to other nations; but in this they yield to none—that they are most devoted to the Catholic faith, and most loyal in their obedience to the see of Rome. In both respects that may be said of them which was inscribed by Louis XVI. on the standard of some of them, who had served as mercenaries under the title of the Irish Brigade in his army and in those of his predecessors from Louis XIV.'s time—that they were “*semper et ubique fideles.*” But that they have any intelligent knowledge of the question now under discussion, or are capable of forming an opinion about it, is too ridiculous to need refuting. This is true of the meeting lately held at Cork, of which the bishop of Cashel spoke at the opening of his very neat speech; since it is open to doubt whether the

right reverend bishop of Cork himself, who was said to have presided at the meeting, understood the subject; for there are a good many in this assembly of ours who are in doubt up to this moment what is meant by papal infallibility, whether it is to follow the words of the *schema*, or in preference that mitigated interpretation which the archbishop of Malines, following the example of the bishop of Poitiers, introduced into his explanation. For those cunning men who are the real authors of the *schema*—I do not mean the bishops; whom I do mean will appear before long—well knew that there were many of the fathers who would accept, without being in the least startled, the mitigated explanation (which, nevertheless, had not yet been introduced into the *schema*) and, without thinking, would vote for the definition in the form set forth in the *schema*, at least for substance; whom perhaps a clearer statement of the sense of it would have found in the attitude of dissent from it. But to return to our own people.

The question before us is not about the faith of the people, but about the judgment of prelates and doctors. I do not deny that, at the present time, the episcopate and clergy of Ireland, with the exception of a few distinguished names, is inclined in favor of the notion of papal infallibility; although I have had no means of finding out their opinions, except what this opportunity at Rome has furnished me. But from the beginning it was not so; in evidence of which I cite the well-nigh universal approbation with which the contrary opinion was set forth

in writings from the pens of the most eminent men—who seemed to be pillars, as I might say, of the Irish church—during my youth, and since, being come to manhood, I was advanced to the priesthood. These writings were edited and published repeatedly by a man of consummate learning, of still greater genius, of most fervent piety, and of a zeal for souls truly apostolic, adorned with the episcopal dignity—I mean the Right Reverend James Doyle, bishop of Kildare and Leighlen, and by the Rev. Arthur O’Leary, a priest of the order of St. Francis, and seem to have had the approbation of every one. Besides these, we have the answers of Archbishops Murray and O’Kelly of Dublin and Tuam, and of the aforesaid bishop of Kildare and Leighlen, to the questions put to them by a committee of the British Parliament, in March, 1825.

All these, translated into Latin, with the original text annexed, may be found in the appendix to this speech. They leave no room for doubt what was the opinion of the Irish bishops at that time. The same will be manifest from the resolutions of the bishops of all Ireland presented to the Holy See in 1815, which, although they do not pertain to the present controversy, like the answers before mentioned, do show that the opinion which is said to be now prevalent has not always obtained.* If the matters cited

[* These documents may be found in full, in Latin and English, at the close of Kenrick’s speech as reprinted in the *Doc. ad Illustr. Conc. Vat.* It has not seemed necessary to reproduce them in this edition.]

from the synod of Turles seem to have a different sound, perhaps it happened there, as it did at the second synod of Baltimore, that everything was done according to the nod of the apostolic legate;* especially as no question arose there except questions of discipline, and no occasion was afforded to say or to decree anything on the rights of the bishops, as at the assembly held in 1815, or on the enlargement, in words at least, of the authority of the Holy See.

As to the clergy, I confidently deny that on this point they differed from the bishops. For whence should they have derived a contrary opinion? Surely not from the seminaries in France and Spain, in which, before the founding of Maynooth college in Ireland, about the end of the last century, the majority pursued their theological studies, and from which they would have brought home with them the undoubted sentiments of those famous schools, and not others. But in Maynooth college, the theological lecturers from the beginning were almost all Frenchmen; and their treatises, for a long time after their death, were, by college ordinance, placed in the hands of the students. I was myself present at the beginning of the change in the sentiment of that famous college—if indeed there has been a change, of which I have no knowledge except by conjecture; and along with me was the bishop of Cashel and the bishop of Clonfert, who was but lately here; all of us at that time walked together with one accord in that home

* Appendix A.

consecrated to learning and religion. This was the occasion, to which it will perhaps not be useless to refer.

Almost forty years have passed since I there pursued the study of theology under the learned John O'Hanlon, then lecturer in theology, now professor of higher theological science in the same college. The treatise *De Ecclesiâ* by that man of venerated memory, Delahogue, one of the French *émigrés* in the time of the great Revolution, contained nothing on the infallibility of the pope except a thesis conceived in these or like words: "that the infallibility of the pope is not matter of faith."

In 1831, the aforesaid lecturer on theology; O'Hanlon, of his own accord gave us the thesis. "The pope speaking *ex cathedrâ* is infallible," not in order to convince us of it, but to give us the opportunity of becoming acquainted with this weighty opinion, by the reasons in favor of it, adduced from various quarters. If I remember aright, he did not express his own opinion or press us to accept either side of this disputed question. I confess that I was one of those who took the affirmative. But the new and hitherto unheard-of procedure did not meet the approval of all the professors, one of whom, the lecturer on Holy Scripture, who afterwards came to be president of the college, expressed his displeasure in pretty plain terms to my classmate, now bishop of Clonfert, from whom I learned the fact. We have with us in this Council a most respected man, who used to be a theological instructor in that college for years before I entered it, who is justly and deservedly esteemed the

Nestor of the Irish episcopate, since he has known well nigh three generations of men, and who to eminent learning in theology unites the fame of elegant literary culture; he was well acquainted with the prelates whom I have mentioned, and with other learned men whose names, "*clara et venerabilia*," are written in the hearts and the calendars of the Irish people. With singular moderation this eminent man refrained from uttering himself on this subject; so that the archbishop of Dublin did not hesitate to speak for him and impress him into his party; while those who think with me, and had known him, and who had hoped to see him fighting in our ranks, were grieved to see him, like another Achilles, sitting apart from us. It filled me with quite unexpected delight when I heard him say that in judgments of faith the head should be joined with the body—not as the archbishop of Westminster would have it, that the head should drag the body to itself by communicating to it its own infallibility, but that head and body, by bearing joint testimony to the faith once delivered to the saints, should make unanimous declaration of the same. As he came down from the platform, I congratulated him with the words, "You have vindicated Ireland." If witnesses to the faith of the Irish are to be weighed—which is the fair way—instead of counted, the most reverend archbishop of Tuam may well be offset, as a matter of mere testimony, against the rest of the Irish bishops, not even excepting the archbishop of Dublin.*

[* "The infallibilist speaker who created most sensation was

The bishop of Galway says that the Catholics in Ireland and England were admitted to equal rights with Protestants, not on account of the oath which all, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, were for years obliged to take, but because those in charge of the English government were afraid of civil war unless that concession were made. In this he spoke the truth; but it was nothing to the point; and the true cause of the truth which he uttered seemed to be quite unknown to him.

The papal power has always been excessively odious to the British government. Now if it were a doctrine of faith that the pope is infallible, it could be shown that Protestants had understood the papal power better than English and Irish Catholics themselves. For they knew that the popes of Rome had claimed supreme power in temporal things, and had attempted to dethrone more than one English monarch by dispensing his subjects from their oaths of allegiance.

Cardinal Cullen, archbishop of Dublin. He gained the warm applause of his party by the aggressive tone of his speech, in which he attacked especially Hefele and Kenrick. He appealed to the testimony of Mac Hale [Archbishop of Tuam] to show that the mind of Ireland has always been infallibilist—a glaring falsehood, as is proved by the famous Declaration of the Irish Catholics in 1757, formally repudiating the doctrine. And it made no slight impression when the gray-haired Mac Hale rose to repudiate the pretended belief in infallibility, not merely for himself, but for Ireland.” Quirinus, 557. Wherever this Speech of Kenrick’s throws light upon the severest things said in Quirinus and *Ce qui se passe au Concile*, etc., it confirms them. Witness the very next page of Quirinus: “When Cullen replied to the archbishop of St. Louis, ‘*non est verum*’ [‘it is n’t true!’] the aged prelate requested leave of the legates to defend himself briefly. It was refused.’ Compare above, p. 95.]

Over and over again, the Catholics had denied, under their solemn oath, that this power belonged to the pope of Rome within the realm of England. If they had not done this, they never would have been, and never ought to have been, admitted to the privilege of civil liberty. How it is possible for the faith thus pledged to the British government to be reconciled with the definition of papal infallibility, when it is certain that the popes have often with great solemnity declared that the right belonged to them, and have never renounced it, those of the Irish bishops may look to, who, like myself, have taken the oath in question. It is a knot which I cannot untie. *Davus sum, non Œdipus.* Notwithstanding these things, civil liberty was granted to the Catholics by men who had fought stoutly against it all their lives long. They feared civil war, indeed, but they did not dread it in this sense, that a war of this sort could be damaging to the power of the government in any other way than as a temporary interruption of the public peace. They feared the fact of war—not the issue of it; what that would have been, no man of sense could doubt. Those illustrious men preferred rather to yield, than to triumph by the destruction of a renowned nation, and of a people who even in their errors (as they deemed them) were worthy of a better fate. Would that the moderation of mind showed by those men might be showed by the majority of the bishops who hear me, and that foreseeing the calamities that may come forth among us out of this ill-omened controversy, they might, in

this exigency that calls for the utmost moderation, avert from us who are less in number, but who represent a larger number of Catholics than our opponents—and not from us only, but from the Catholic world—calamities which cannot be anticipated without horror, and which a tardy repentance will be powerless to repair.

IX. I have something to say now on a case of conscience. The case is this, as you know: that the bishops should be reminded that a grave sin would be committed by any bishop who should vote in the affirmative on papal infallibility, without having personally and, as the phrase goes, “on his own hook,” made a thorough examination of the subject; when by that act a new yoke is imposed on the faithful, and the gravest inconveniences are by many thought likely to ensue from it.*

The archbishop of Westminster takes this very hardly, complaining of it as an outrage on the honor and dignity of the bishops; as if he held it impossible for bishops to err, or that they would be clear of all imputation of grave sin, if through carelessness or indolence they should neglect to form a right judgment on this business.

Can they acquiesce in an opinion which perhaps they have never weighed—following the statements of teachers in the seminaries, with the docility which is becoming in pupils towards the learned? The pamphlet by the most reverend archbishop of Edessa, commended to the pope by the eleven erudite

* See Quirinns, 621.

theologians, is perhaps to be taken as setting forth such weighty reasons in proof of the infallibility of the pope, that since no one ought to hesitate to put confidence in it, every one may safely accept its conclusions as so many truths placed beyond every chance of doubt. I am not denying the writer's learning; neither do I wish to call in question his good faith; but I can prove that in this matter he is not free from all error, and that thus far his authority is none too much to be trusted. Besides the example already alleged when I was speaking of the meaning of the text "On this rock," &c., I mention two others: one from the testimonies of the fathers, the other in the method of his argument.

Among the passages which he cites from the fathers is that very common text of St. Ambrose, which I subjoin, taken from pages 31 and 32:

"On Psalm 40, No. 30, he speaks as follows: 'It is Peter himself to whom he says, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church." Therefore where Peter is, there is the church; where the church is, there is no death, but life eternal. And therefore he adds, "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Blessed Peter, against whom the gates of hell have not prevailed, nor the gates of heaven been closed, but who, on the contrary, has destroyed the vestibules of hell, and made clear those of heaven—who has opened heaven and shut up hell! Doubtless if where Peter is, (or where his successors, the popes, are, holding all the prerog-

atives of the primacy,) there the church is, and life eternal without peril of death, then the whole building of the church must necessarily be founded in their faith. Wherefore this must needs be indefectible, and so the gates of hell being vanquished, they themselves, embracing in the true faith all Christ's faithful, open to them the heavenly mansions.'”

This passage was cited by the bishop of Orleans,* in his first letter, as one which might be objected to his position, and he there explained it in a sense consistent with his views, having no doubt that the text of Ambrose was to be received in some other sense than the obvious one, and that, really, it meant that the church was identified with Peter in the case of controverted points of faith, which, so far from denying, the bishop openly admitted. Among others who replied to this letter, was the learned Francesco Nardi, one of the Auditors of the Sacred Rota, and an officer of this Council. Yielding to love of truth rather than of party, he denies that the words of St. Ambrose have the meaning which the bishop of Orleans, among others, believed. I quote his words in the original Italian, so that no one may suspect that the meaning of them has been modified in translation. After giving the explanation of the bishop of Orleans, above referred to, he adds :

“Del resto il valore delle parole di S. Ambrogio (in psalm xl., *Enarr.* n. 30) non credo sia quello che indica lo illustre vescovo, e basta leggerne il contesto. Ivi trattasi della caduta di S. Pietro sanata

* Bishop Dupanloup.

da Cristo, e come Pietro in essa rappresenti il cristiano cadente, poi risorgente, per opera della Chiesa e di Cristo, senza dubbio quelle parole hanno un altro più ampio ed alto significato, ed è che Pietro più che contrasegno, è veramente il rappresentante della vera Chiesa e la sua immagine vivente e operante. Non credo che S. Ambrogio in quel luogo pensasse ad altre *chiese cristiane*, e come da esse si distingue la cattolica per la presenza e governo di Pietro.”*

“Furthermore, I do not think that the meaning of St. Ambrose’ words is that attributed to them by the illustrious bishop. The context settles it. The subject there is Peter’s fall restored by Christ; and since Peter represents therein the backsliding Christian afterwards recovered through the work of Christ and the church, undoubtedly the words have another and a far wider and deeper meaning, to wit, that Peter is more than a symbol—he is an actual representative of the true church, and its living and acting image. I do not think that St. Ambrose in that passage was thinking of *other Christian churches*, and of how the Catholic church is *distinguished* from them by the presence and government of Peter.”†

Monsignor Nardi is right, as I find by consulting the passage in Ambrose. I beg you to observe that

* Sulla ultima lettera di Monsignor Vescovo d’Orleans, osservazioni di Monsignor Francesco Nardi, Uditore di Sacra Rota. Seconda Edizione. Napoli, 1870.

† It is quite in the style of Ambrose thus devoutly and elegantly to identify Peter with the church. See lib. 1, cap. 4, *Lucæ*. Also lib. 5 in *Lucæ* cap. 5. Also the context just preceding the place above cited.

the passage was quoted to prove that Peter is identified with the church—which we all admit, but not in the sense of the *schema*. It is not quoted to prove that by the *rock* Ambrose understands the apostle, for this is not the point in question. Unless, in the place cited, the church is identified with Peter in the sense of the *schema*, it affords no argument in support of the *schema*. The same must be said of all the other quotations, not one of which explicitly gives that view, although the writer attempts, by dint of argument to extract it from them. This one example shows how dangerous it is blindly to follow others in quoting the fathers. A striking proof of this may be found in the appendix to this speech; although it does not relate to the pending question, it gives abundant proof of my assertion, and may serve the purpose I have in view.*

As an example of false inference, I take page 74, where the author tries to prove that the Council of Constance admitted that the pope was above the Council, a question which I will not go into at present. He proves it in this fashion :

[* In the appendix referred to, Abp. Kenrick speaks of having heard, twelve years ago, an Easter sermon in which the preacher said that the Lord after his resurrection appeared *first* to the blessed Virgin Mary—which is contrary to Mark 16 : 9. Inquiring further, he found the same assertion in a work of Pope Benedict XIV., who, while remarking that Estius declares the contrary, nevertheless *thought it better to stick to the pious tradition on this point, notwithstanding it is in open contradiction to the words of the evangelist!*

The remainder of this appendix is not important to the matter in hand; but the passage above quoted is wonderfully characteristic of Roman theology and devotion.]

“In the conciliar epistle, addressed to the German prelates, which Martin, ‘*sacro approbante Concilio,*’ published against the errors of Wiclif and Huss, one of the articles set forth to be believed is this: That the pope is the head of the Catholic church. Therefore the pope bears the same relation to the church universal and to the general Council representing it as the head bears to the body. But from the head the body receives motion and every influence. Therefore, according to the Council of Constance itself, a general council receives all its power of governing the church, not immediately from Christ, but mediately, through the pope, the head of the church. But this cannot be reconciled with what is said in the decree of the fourth and fifth sessions, if the latter is to be received in the sense in which it is taken by the opposition.”

The fallacy of the above reasoning is this: The pope is Christ’s vicegerent in so far as Christ has conferred on him the power of representing Him as the visible head to the faithful. But in the foregoing argument Christ is supposed to have conferred on him the entire fulness of his own power, inasmuch as he is the head of the church, which is His body; a notion which is denied by the advocates of the opposite opinion. He who exercises a delegated power is not to be considered as having the entire power of the one delegating, but only just so much as can be proved, by the documents in the case, to have been conferred upon him. The church, therefore, may receive motion and every influence imme-

diately from Christ himself, the true head of the body, not through the medium of the visible head—that is, the Roman pontiff—unless it appears that Christ, in the government of his church, has reserved nothing to himself; which is supposed, but not proved, by the author of the *Lucubration*.

Speaking of the case of conscience, the archbishop of Baltimore asserted that examination was no less required to vote in the negative than in the affirmative on the question of papal infallibility. I think he was mistaken. He who refuses his consent to impose a new burden on the faithful contracts no obligation; while he who gives his consent (unless, under the force of reasons such as set aside all doubt, he should decide that the affirmative opinion is not only true, but also divinely revealed, and that it is expedient to propound it as such to the faithful to be believed) would be guilty of the most grievous sin. It is not true that by withholding his assent he affirms the four articles of the French Assembly, as the archbishop of Baltimore says—an assertion which seemed to me and to others unworthy of so honorable a man.

And now that that famous Assembly has been mentioned, and now that an acrimonious attack has been made by one of our right reverend orators on a man of eminent learning and character on account of his refutation of a so-called history of that Assembly, suffer me to say a word of both these books, which I have not only read but carefully compared with each other. The *History of the Gallican*

Assembly, which has been so bepraised, is in my judgment a very infamous libel, the author of which has sharpened his pen against the dead, disturbing the ashes of those who had no connection whatever with the Assembly, as well as of those who controlled and directed it.*

That he has made many mutilated quotations, which, by failing to give the whole text, insinuate falsehood even when they do not explicitly utter it, has been proved by the Abbé Loyson.† That learned man has exhibited these facts with the calmness of mind which is characteristic of him, and which, when compared with the temper of the other book, shows him to be a defender of truth and not an insinuator of falsehood. This accounts for the anger which he has stirred up on the part of his antagonists.

X. The archbishop of Westminster holds infallibility to be a spiritual gift, or *charisma*. If that is true, I agree to it in the case of the person making good his claim to the gift; for in the strict sense of the word it is predicable only of a *person*. The usage has prevailed, indeed, of predicating infallibility, of the church, but it would be better to use the word *inerrancy*.

God only is infallible. Of the church, the most that we can assert is, that it does not err in teaching

* Recherches Historiques sur l'Assemblée du Clergé de France de 1682, par M. Gérin.

† L'Assemblée du Clergé de France de 1682, d'après des documents dont un grand nombre inconnues jusqu' à ce jour, par l'Abbé L. Th. Loyson, Docteur et Professeur de Sorbonne. [The Abbé Loyson is a younger brother of the celebrated Father Hyacinthe.]

the doctrines of faith which Christ has committed to its charge; because the gates of hell are not to prevail against it. Therefore infallibility absolute and complete cannot be predicated of it; and perhaps it would be better to refrain from using that word, and use the word *inerrancy* instead. But the church's inerrancy does not seem to be a positive thing, infused into it from heaven—which could not be intelligently said of a “moral person” like the church—although it is always so aided by the grace of the Holy Spirit that it may faithfully keep and set forth the truths which Christ had taught. For this end it has a fit means—but not at all a miraculous means—in the tradition of the particular churches of which it consists. Therefore the inerrancy, or infallibility, of the church is not a *charisma* infused from heaven, as the archbishop of Westminster would have it, by which it may discover and distinguish truths divinely revealed. It is nothing else, in my opinion, than the tradition of the church divinely founded and kept by the divine indwelling, so that it shall not tolerate errors contradicting revealed truths and their immediate and necessary corollaries, nor propound to the faithful, by its supreme authority, anything that is not true.

As I was saying this, not long ago, a Catholic objected that infallibility though not a miraculous, was a supernatural gift; that is, a grace annexed to the office of pope, by means of which, without any miraculous intervention of God he can discern true from false and revealed truth from natural.

Since the Roman pontiff, as bishop, has no other grace of ordination than his brethren who share the same Episcopal office, the supposed grace can only be a personal one. But that kind of grace does not preserve from error those even to whom it is granted in the largest measure, as appears from the saints who in the great schism were found on both sides, although eminent in virtue and splendid with the glory of miracles. If papal infallibility is a personal grace or *charisma*, as the archbishop of Westminster calls it, it demands a miraculous intervention of God, that the pope, when he means to define anything of faith or morals, may be kept free from error.

It may be shown in another way that this novel invention of the *charisma* ought to be rejected, from the consequences which it involves. Granting that infallibility is a *charisma*, in what does it differ from that special private inspiration by which certain persons think themselves led, and which is rejected by theologians on this precise ground, that no means is granted, outside of the person who considers himself to be led by the divine Spirit, by which it may be proved whether the spirit really is divine. Not one word will the archbishop of Westminster listen to, of fixing the conditions for the exercise of the pope's infallibility. He asserts that He who gave the *charisma* will give the means for its due exercise, or will bring it about that such means shall be used.

Verily this is a royal road to the discovery of the truths of faith! And yet it is not without its dangers both for pope and for church. Once imbued with

this conviction, the holier in life, the purer in purpose, the more fervent in piety the pope should be, the more dangerous he would prove both to himself and to the church, which (according to this system) derives its infallibility from him; especially would this be true if he should find even one of his advisers laboring under the same illusion. What need would there be, to a pope who accepted this notion, of the counsel of his brethren, the opinions of theologians, the investigation of the documents of the church? Believing himself to be immediately led by the divine Spirit, and that this Spirit is communicated through him to the church, there would be nothing to hold him back from pressing on in a course on which he had once entered. These consequences of the principle laid down by the archbishop of Westminster prove it to be false. Nevertheless if infallibility is a *charisma*, we must be able to follow out the fact to its conclusions.

XI. Among other things which utterly astounded me, it was said by the archbishop of Westminster that by the addition made at the end of the decree *De Fide*, passed at the third session, we had already admitted the doctrine of papal infallibility, at least by implication, and that we were no longer free to recede from it.*

* The addition was as follows: "Since it is not enough to avoid heretical pravity, unless at the same time those errors are diligently avoided which more or less tend to it, we warn all persons of the duty of observing also the constitutions and decrees in which such erroneous opinions, which themselves are not expressly enumerated, have been proscribed and prohibited by this Holy See."

If I rightly understand the right reverend relator of the committee, who, when this addition had once been moved in the General Congregation, then withdrawn, and finally, while we were wondering what the matter was, suddenly moved a second time, he said, in plain terms, that no doctrine at all was taught by it, but that it was placed at the end of the four chapters of which the decree was composed, in order to round them off handsomely;* and that it was rather disciplinary than doctrinal in its character. Either he was deceived, if what the archbishop of Westminster said was true; or else he intentionally led us into error—which we are hardly at liberty to suppose of so honorable a man. However it may have been, many of the bishops, confiding in his assurance, decided not to refuse their suffrages to the decree on account of that clause; while others, of whom I was one, were afraid that there was a trap set, and yielded reluctantly on this point to the will of others.†

In saying all this, it is not my intention to accuse any of the right reverend fathers of bad faith. I treat them all, as is meet, with due reverence. But it is said that we have among us, outside of the Council, certain “religious” men—who are perhaps pious as well as “religious”—who have a vast influence upon the Council; who, relying rather on trickery than on fair measures, have brought the interests of the church into that extreme peril from which it has risen; who at the beginning of the Council man-

[* “Imponi tanquam eis coronidem convenientem.”]

† Appendix, p. 171. See also above, p. 83.

aged to have no one appointed on the committees of the Council but those who were known or believed to be in favor of their schemes; who, following hard in the footsteps of certain of their predecessors, in the *schemata* that have been proposed to us, and which have come out of their own workshop, seem to have had nothing so much at heart as the depreciation of the authority of the bishops and the exaltation of the authority of the pope; and seem disposed to impose upon the unwary with twists and turns of expression, which may be differently explained by different persons. These are the men who have blown up this conflagration in the church; and they do not cease to fan the flame by spreading among the people their writings, which put on the outward show of piety, but are destitute of its reality.

With more zeal than knowledge, these excellent men would like to cover up the design of the divine Architect with another and, as they may think, a better and stronger one. For He had consulted at once for the unity of the whole, and the liberty of every part; nor had he conferred the entire fulness of his own power on the vicar appointed by himself; knowing what was in man, and not wishing that any one should have lordship over the *clergy*, that is, his "portion," [κλήρος] the church.

Already in vain the petition has been offered that this painful controversy might not be started in the Council. Equally in vain the petition has been urged that there might be no definition until after an examination which should leave no room for

doubt as to the testimony of tradition on this point. In order to such an examination, the request was presented, nearly three months ago, to their eminences the presidents of the general congregation, in a petition from prelates of distinguished sees, that there might be a committee of fathers, taken in equal number from each party, and appointed by the votes of those agreeing with them in opinion. This request was repeated over and over again by others in the General Congregation; and is said to have had the approval of some even of the advocates of papal infallibility. For the question is one which calls for an investigation of the records of the entire church, and should be dealt with in a calm rather than an excited temper. The archbishop of Dublin says, indeed, that such an examination would last too long—that it would reach till the day of judgment. If this be so, it were better to refrain from making any definition at all, than to frame one prematurely. But it is said the honor and authority of the Holy See demand a definition, nor can it be deferred without injury to both. I answer in the words of Jerome, substituting another word for the well-known word *auctoritas*.

MAJOR EST SALUS ORBIS QUAM URBIS *

I have done:

* It is better to save the world than the city.

APPENDIX A.

[SEE PAGE 148.]

SECOND PLENARY COUNCIL OF BALTI-
MORE.

THE remarks in the speech call for a brief statement of the facts which occurred in that Council. It commenced on the 7th of October, and closed on the 21st of the same month, each of these two days being Sunday. Besides the solemn sessions held on these days, there were two others on intermediate days, namely, the 11th and the 18th, only the latter of which was professedly a solemn session, although the other, dedicated to expiation for the souls of departed bishops, was an equal hinderance to the use at least of the whole day for the business of the Council; so that the business was confined to ten or eleven days. Within that brief space of time, there seem to have been passed the decrees which are contained in 274 pages of a volume of large size. All of them, indeed, had been prepared, in advance of the meeting of the Council, by the archbishop of Baltimore, with the coöperation of several theologians, and the aid of sundry bishops, of whom I was one.

The transactions of the first four days seemed to me hardly in accordance with the rules of Councils, and accordingly, on the 12th of October, in the Fifth Private Congregation, I offered the following decree,

in the hope that thereafter, at least, business might go on in a better way :

“It has pleased the fathers that the decrees to be passed in this Council be offered drawn up in the form of synodic decrees, and that the sense of the fathers of each province be called for, in the order of consecration in that province. Furthermore, it has pleased them that mitred abbots be interrogated at the same time with the bishops in whose provinces their monasteries are situated, although their votes are not to be taken. The votes of the fathers, as soon as given, after the statement of their reason (if they wish to sustain that reason by showing the grounds thereof) shall be immediately recorded by the secretaries.”

The reason of the decree thus offered was twofold. I wished that in voting the fathers might distinctly know what the question was—which, I thought, had not always happened in previous congregations.

Since the abbots had only an advisory voice, I wanted the bishops to be interrogated by provinces, and that after the bishops of each province, the abbots should manifest their views; so that those whose votes were still to be given might have the opportunity of knowing what the abbots thought. For what was the use of inviting them to the Council, if they were not to be allowed to express their opinion until after all the bishops had voted, when they could be of no use either to themselves or to anybody else?

The proposed decree was rejected, twelve yeas to

thirty-two nays; either because the matter was not well understood, or because the apostolic legate vehemently objected to it, and they did not like to displease him: or (as I think likely) because they had no hope that it would improve the course of business, and were unwilling to be compelled to remain longer away from their dioceses for no real advantage.

I then offered an exception which I had brought with me in writing, (foreseeing that the decree which I had proposed would not pass,) in the following or like terms:

“The undersigned, archbishop of St. Louis, takes exception against all decrees passed or that may be passed in the present Council, which shall not have been drawn up in conciliar form and distinctly read to the fathers, and approved by a majority vote.

PETER RICHARD KENRICK,

ARCHBISHOP OF ST. LOUIS.

In offering this exception, I said that in order to avoid scandal to the faithful, I would sign the decrees, if that exception was recorded in the Acts of the Council, otherwise not. After some objection, on the part of the apostolic legate, to the wording of the exception in the form in which I first offered it, he consented to my request. But inasmuch as no change was made in the mode of transacting business in the Council, I abstained thenceforth from voting, except once or twice when my opinion was called for.

In the published acts of the Council my excep-

tion is not to be found—whether the apostolic legate had allowed himself this liberty, or whether, peradventure, he had been advised to it from higher quarters. For in the Acts, after it is reported that the decree offered by me was rejected, the record reads thus :

“The metropolitan of St. Louis offered a protest which the most reverend apostolic legate ordered to be reported in the Acts, and which has been transmitted with them to the holy pontiff, p. 72.”

In this way it has been brought about that the exception itself has been omitted, and I am made to appear as taking exception to the rejection of the decree which I had proposed, which would have been too ridiculous; when my exception was against the method of transacting business, which seemed to me not conciliar. My complaint is that the faith pledged to me was not kept. The Acts ought either to have been suppressed, or to have been given entire.

APPENDIX B.

[SEE PAGE 164.]

OUT of the four committees, only that which is called the Committee on the Faith [*Deputatio de Fide*] has thus far done anything in the Council. It is composed of twenty-four bishops, elected by the Council. Some days before the election, printed lithograph tickets, headed with the inscription, "*In Honor of the Blessed Virgin of the Immaculate Conception,*" were distributed among the fathers, the name of His Eminence Cardinal De Angelis being quoted by the persons who ran these tickets, in a sort of recommendation of them. The bishops put in nomination by the pious getters-up of these tickets were almost to a man selected from those who were known not to be opposed to the definition of papal infallibility.

According to the Apostolic Constitution *Multiplies inter*, the duty of the committees was this: In case the *schemata* first presented were either unacceptable to the fathers, or in want of some correction on which the fathers in general congregation could not agree, they were to be recommitted to the committee either for correction or for reconstruction, in view of the remarks of the fathers upon it. In the General Congregation itself, the committee had no duty intrusted to it, although its individual members were at liberty to express their own views, speaking each for himself and not for the committee.

Of the committee's method of doing business in its own meetings, I cannot speak with certainty. But I have heard that when the question was on reconstructing the first schema *De Fide*, the work of preparing the new draft was committed by the others to three bishops, who were undoubtedly aided in their work by the advising theologians of the committee. So that it is not very rash to suppose that the work of reconstruction was, at least mainly, to be referred to those theologians. Doubtless the rest gave their approval; and perhaps they had some share in the work.

As to the committee's way of doing business in the Council itself, I can speak with more confidence. It was on this wise: In every other deliberative assembly, the committee, after reporting the amended bill, has nothing more to do in the assembly, except, as has already been said, that the individuals of the committee are to state their views and give their votes just like other members of the body. Just the contrary has been done. By virtue of the ninth rule of the DECREE, uttered in the month of February—not by the Council, but by the pope—it was permitted to any member of the committee to take the floor in answer to objections against the *schema*, either on the day they were offered, or on the next day. So it has come about that almost every day, at the beginning of the General Congregation, some one of the fathers of the committee, not in his own name, but in that of the committee, is accustomed to make a speech under the pretext of

replying to objections, (though these very rarely are replied to,) but as a matter of fact, in hopes of helping on the *schema* by arguments from every quarter, and so of lessening the force of the objections by making a show of them to the unwary, as if they had been answered. Before reaching the preliminary voting, when the question was to be taken on the several amendments offered by some of the bishops, one of the bishops of the committee, called the *relator*, mounts the platform to inform the fathers what the committee thinks of this and that amendment; adding after each amendment the words: "This amendment the committee accepts," or "rejects," or "thinks that with some verbal changes it may be accepted." After this "relation" has been finished, the reverend monsignor the sub-secretary of the Council puts the amendments to vote separately (giving the number of the amendment, and announcing the first words of it in this fashion: "*This amendment is accepted by the committee,*" or "*is rejected,*" or "*is thus modified.* All those who are in favor of adopting it WILL RISE;" then, "All those who are in favor of rejecting it WILL RISE." It has always happened that the fathers have voted in agreement with the views of the committee. On the first day of the voting, when the question was taken on the third part of the first amendment, *the signal not having yet been used by the sub-secretary as it has constantly been since*, a large number of persons rose, so that those standing had to be counted in order to come at the vote. Then there began to be a great confusion,

and the amendment, although perhaps adopted by the majority, was postponed till the next day. When the next day came, the right reverend relator warned the fathers from the platform that the committee would not accept that amendment. At once, almost all voted by rising to reject it; only a few (as it commonly happens in such circumstances) voting to adopt it, and that rather to show their own mind than with the hope of accomplishing anything.

Thus, in point of fact, the committee is the Council. The Council hangs upon its nod, and follows its dictation in everything. The committee, in turn, is governed by the theologians, in this sense, at least, that it makes their will its own.

In a speech lately made by one of the right reverend relators, Liberal Catholics are numbered among the enemies of the Holy See; although the relator himself—who belongs to a race who for six hundred years have, till now, been impatient of slavery—well knew that there were some among the bishops who go by that name because they believe that there is some middle course to be found between absolutism and utter license.

CHAPTER VIII.

PRETENDED "SPEECH OF A BISHOP IN
THE COUNCIL."

SOON after the close of the Council, a little pamphlet was widely circulated in Italy, under the title, "*The Speech of a Bishop in the Vatican Council.*" It was so bold and fearless in its tone and temper, that its genuineness was doubted by many of those who knew the intolerance of free speech on the part of the majority in the Council, and the arbitrary use of the president's bell. Nevertheless, by many eminent Roman-catholics in Europe, who knew of the extraordinary boldness, both of thought and speech, exhibited in the Council by the Croat bishop, Strossmayer, and the violent clamors which he had resolutely faced, it was believed to be the genuine speech of that great Latin orator; and as such was published in America in an English translation. Subsequently it was disavowed in the name of Strossmayer, and the disavowal was promptly given to the public through the same journals which had circulated the speech.

We print this document here as apocryphal indeed, but as a part of the literature relating to the Council, and an effective argument on the main question before that body; while we reprobate the false pretence under which it was originally published.*

* It is only fair to remember that the writer, as a Roman-catholic, had been trained in a system which justifies such things. See above, pp, 7, 8, 10. Many of what are charged as "Protestant frauds" have a Romish origin; e. g., the Pope Joan story and the "Secret Instructions of the Jesuits."

VENERABLE FATHERS AND BRETHREN : It is not without some tremors, although with a conscience free and tranquil before the living and heart-searching God, that I rise to address this august assembly.

Sitting here among you, I have followed with close attention all the addresses made in this hall, with fervent longings that some ray of light from above might illumine the eyes of my understanding, and qualify me to vote on the canons of this holy Œcumenical Council with a perfect comprehension of the case.

Impressed by the responsibilities resting upon me, and for which God will call me to account, I have devoted myself with the most serious attention to studying the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, demanding of these venerable monuments of the truth to inform me whether the holy pontiff who presides over us is really the successor of St. Peter, the vicar of Jesus Christ, and the infallible teacher of the church.

To solve this grave question, I have had to turn away from the existing state of things, and with the gospel torch in hand to transport myself mentally to the time when neither gallicanism nor ultramontaniam was known ; when the church had for teachers St. Paul and St. Peter, St. James and St. John — teachers whose divine authentication we cannot deny without calling in question what is taught by the HOLY BIBLE, which here lies before me, and which the Council of Trent has proclaimed the “rule of faith and of practice.”

TESTIMONY OF GOD'S WORD.

I open, then, these sacred pages. But what ! shall I dare to tell it ? I find in them nothing to justify, however remotely, the ultramontane view. Nay, more ; to

my utter astonishment, I find nothing said about a pope, successor of St. Peter and vicar of Jesus Christ, any more than about a successor of Mohammed, who was not then in existence.

Yes, Archbishop Manning, you will say that I blaspheme; and you, Bishop Pie, that I am out of my senses. No, no, my lord bishops, I am not blaspheming; I am not beside myself. But now, unless I have failed of reading the New Testament from beginning to end, I declare to you before God, lifting my hand towards yonder great crucifix, that I FIND IN ITS PAGES NO TRACE OF THE PAPACY AS IT NOW EXISTS.

Do not refuse to listen to me, venerable brethren. Do not by your murmurs and interruptions justify those who declare, with Father Hyacinthe, that this Council is not free, but that our votes are imposed upon us in advance. If this were so, this august assembly, towards which the eyes of the whole world are turned, would fall into the most shameful contempt. If we would be great, we must be free.

Reading, then, the Scriptures, with such attention as the Lord has made me capable of, I have not found in them a single chapter, a single verse, in which Jesus Christ commits to St. Peter lordship over the apostles, his fellow-laborers.

If Simon, son of Jonas, had been appointed to be what we understand His Holiness Pius IX. to be in our time, it is astonishing that Christ did not say to the apostles, "When I am ascended up to my Father, ye shall all obey Simon Peter as ye have obeyed me. I appoint him my vicar upon earth."

Not only is Christ silent on this point, but he has so little thought of giving the church a chief, that when he is promising thrones to his apostles, to judge the

twelve tribes of Israel, he promises twelve of them—one apiece—without saying that one is to be higher than the rest, and is to belong to Peter. Matt. 19:28. Surely, if he had wished this to be so, he would have said so. What must we infer from his silence? Logic tells us: Christ did not intend to make Peter chief of the apostolic college.

When Christ sent forth the apostles to the conquest of the world, he gave to all alike the power of binding and loosing; to all, the promise of the Holy Ghost. Let me repeat it: if he had meant to make Peter his vicar, he would have appointed him commander-in-chief of his spiritual army.

Christ, says the Scriptures, forbade Peter and his colleagues to have rule and lordship and power over believers, like the princes of the Gentiles. Luke 22:25. If Peter had been made pope, Jesus would not have spoken thus; for, according to our traditions, the papacy holds in its hands two swords, the symbols of spiritual and of temporal power.

One fact has profoundly impressed me. When I observed it, I said to myself: If Peter had been pope, would his colleagues have suffered themselves to send him with St. John to Samaria to preach the gospel of the Son of God? Acts 8:14.

What would you think, venerable brethren, if at this moment we were to permit ourselves to depute His Holiness Pius IX. and His Eminence Monsignor Plantier to betake themselves to the patriarch of Constantinople, and adjure him to put an end to the Eastern schism?

But here is another fact of greater importance still. An œcumenical council was assembled at Jerusalem to decide on questions on which believers were divided.

Who would have convoked this council if St. Peter had been pope? St. Peter. Who would have presided over it? St. Peter or his legates. Who would have formulated and promulgated its canons? St. Peter. Well, now, nothing of the kind took place. The apostle was present at the council, like all his colleagues. But it was not he who framed its conclusions, but St. James; and when its decrees were promulgated, this was done in the name of "the apostles, the elders, and the brethren." Acts 15. Is this the way we manage things in our church?

The deeper I go, my venerable brethren, in my examination, the more I am convinced that in the Holy Scriptures there is no appearance of the primacy of the son of Jonas.

While we teach that the church is built on St. Peter, St. Paul, whose authority cannot be questioned, tells us in his epistle to the Ephesians (2:20) that it is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." The same apostle is so far from believing in the supremacy of Peter, that he openly rebukes those who say, "I am of Paul and I of Apollos," 1 Cor. 1:12, in the same terms as those who would say, "I am of Peter." If, then, the latter apostle was vicar of Jesus Christ, St. Paul would have taken good care not to censure so violently those who held to his colleague.

The same apostle Paul, enumerating the offices of the church, mentions apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. Is it credible, venerable brethren, that St. Paul, the great teacher of the Gentiles, would have left out the greatest of all the offices—the papacy—if the papacy had been founded by divine institution? It seems to me that this omission would

have been no more possible than a history of this council that should make no mention whatever of His Holiness Pius IX.

The apostle Paul in not one of his letters addressed to the various churches makes any mention of the primacy of Peter. If this primacy had existed ; if, in short, the church had had a supreme head, infallible in teaching, would the great teacher of the Gentiles have omitted all mention of it ? Nay. He would have written a long epistle on this important, this vital subject. When, therefore, he is rearing the edifice of Christian doctrine, is it possible that he leaves out the foundation and the key-stone ? Now, unless the apostolic church is to be reckoned heretical, which we neither wish nor dare to say, we are constrained to acknowledge that the church has never been more fair, more pure, nor more holy, than in the days when it had no pope.

My lord bishop of Laval cannot contradict this ; for if any of you, venerable brethren, should dare to think that the church which at this day has a pope for its head is stronger in the faith, or purer in morals, than the apostolic church, he must say it openly in the face of the world ; for this room is the centre from which our words fly from pole to pole.

I proceed : Not in the writings of St. Paul, nor in those of St. John or St. James, have I found any trace or germ of the papal power. St. Luke, the historian of the missionary labors of the apostles, is silent on this vital point. The silence of these holy men, whose writings are part of the canon of the inspired Scriptures, is as inexplicable, if Peter had been pope, as that of Thiers would have been, if he had omitted the title of Emperor in writing the history of Napoleon Bonaparte.

But the thing which astounds me beyond all expression is the silence of Peter himself. If he had been what we say—the vicar of Christ upon earth—he must have known it. If he knew it, how does it happen that he never once—not one solitary time—acted as pope? He might have done it on the day of Pentecost, when he pronounced his first discourse; but he did not. He might have done it at the Council of Jerusalem; but he did not. He might have done it at Antioch; but he did not. He might have done it in his two epistles to the churches; but he did not. Can you imagine such a pope as this, O my venerable brethren?

If, then, we would maintain that Peter was pope, it necessarily follows that we must maintain that he was not aware of it at the time. I put it to any man with a head to think and a mind to reflect, whether these two suppositions are credible.

To sum up, then: During the lifetime of the apostles, the church never thought of the possibility of a pope. To maintain the contrary, it would be necessary to put the Holy Scriptures into the fire or out of the mind.

But the question is asked, "Was not St. Peter at Rome? Was he not crucified here head downward? The chair from which he taught, the altar at which he said mass, are they not in this Eternal City?"

Venerable brethren, the sojourn of St. Peter at Rome has no other proof than tradition. But even if he was bishop of Rome, what argument can be drawn from his episcopate here to prove his supremacy? A scholar of the highest rank, Scaliger, has not hesitated to say that the episcopate and sojourn of St. Peter at Rome must be classed among ridiculous legends.

CHURCH HISTORY.

But, venerable sirs, we have one dictator before which we all, even His Holiness Pius IX., must needs bow the head in silence. This dictator is *history*.

History is not like the legends, which one can mould at his pleasure as the potter moulds clay; it is the diamond, cutting on the glass words that cannot be cancelled. Thus far I have relied solely on the facts of sacred history; and if I have found no trace of the papacy in the days of the apostles, the fault is not mine but history's. Do you wish to arraign me on a charge of falsehood? You are welcome to do so.

Finding no trace of the papacy in the apostolic records, I said to myself, "I shall find what I am seeking in the annals of the church." Well, I will say it frankly: I have searched for a pope through the first three centuries, and have not found one.

No one of you, I hope, will question the authority of the holy bishop of Hippo, the great and blessed St. Augustine. This pious doctor, the honor and glory of the catholic church, was secretary of the Council of Milevio. In the decrees of that venerable assembly we read these significant words: "Whoever shall wish to appeal to the bishop across the sea, shall not be received to the communion by any one in Africa." The African bishops were so far from recognizing any supremacy of the bishop of Rome, that they judged worthy of excommunication all who had recourse to him by appeal.

These same bishops, in the sixth Council of Carthage, held under Aurelius, bishop of that city, wrote to Celestine, bishop of Rome, giving him notice that he should not receive appeals from bishops, priests, or clergy of Africa; that he should send thither neither

legates nor commissioners; and that he should not bring human pride into the church.

That the patriarch of Rome very early formed the design to gain for himself supreme authority is evident, but it is equally evident that he did not then possess the supremacy which the ultramontanists ascribe to him; for if he had, how would the African bishops, and Augustine, above all, have dared to prohibit appeals from their own decrees to his supreme tribunal?

I readily acknowledge that the patriarchate of Rome held the most prominent position. A law of Justinian says: "We ordain, according to the definitions of the four councils, that the most holy father of ancient Rome be the first among the bishops; and that the most exalted archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, be the second."

You will say to me, "Then bow down to the supremacy of the pope." But, venerable brethren, rush not so hastily to this conclusion; for this law of Justinian bears inscribed at its head, "*Concerning the order of the sees of the patriarchs.*" Now *precedence* is one thing, and *power of jurisdiction* is another. Thus, for example, let us suppose there was an assembly in Florence of all the bishops of this kingdom; the precedence would be given to the primate of Florence, as among the Orientals it is assigned to the patriarch of Constantinople, and in England to the archbishop of Canterbury. But neither the first, the second, nor the third could claim, from the position assigned to him, any jurisdiction over his colleagues.

The precedence of the Roman bishops was derived, not from divine right, but from the importance of the city in which they were established. My lord Darbois of Paris is not superior in dignity to the archbishop of

Avignon ; and yet Paris secures for him a consideration he would not possess if his palace were on the banks of the Rhone instead of the Seine. What is true in the religious order is also true in the civil and political order. The prefect of Florence is no more really a prefect than he of Pisa, but civilly and politically he has greater influence.

I have said that from the first centuries the patriarch of Rome aspired to the universal government of the church. Unhappily he succeeded ere long ; but he had not then attained his object, for, notwithstanding his claims, the emperor Theodosius II. made a law by which he ordained that the patriarch of Constantinople had the same authority as the patriarch of Rome. *Leg. Cod. de Sac. Ecc.*

The fathers of the Council of Chalcedon placed the bishops of the "old" and the "new" Rome in the same order in all things, even in ecclesiastical matters. *Can. 28.*

The sixth Council of Carthage prohibited all bishops from taking the title of "chief of the bishops," or "supreme bishop."

As to the title of "universal bishop," which the popes at a later day assumed, St. Gregory I., believing that his successors would never embellish their names with it, put on record these notable words : " Not one of my predecessors has consented to take this profane title, because, when one patriarch assumes for himself the title of *universal*, the name of patriarch suffers discredit. Far, then, from every Christian be the desire to give himself a title which reflects discredit upon his brethren."

The words of St. Gregory were intended for his colleague at Constantinople, who claimed the primacy

of the church. Pope Pelagius II. calls John, the bishop of Constantinople, who aspired to the supreme pontificate, "impious" and "profane." "Do not regard," says he, "the title of *universal*, which John has unlawfully assumed. Let no one of the patriarchs take this profane title; for what misfortunes must we not expect, if such elements arise among the priests? It would be a fulfilment of what has been predicted: 'He is the king of the sons of pride.'" (Pelagius II., letter 13.)

Do not these authorities (and I have a hundred more just as strong) prove, as clear as the sun at noon-day, that it was not until a very late date that the bishops of Rome came to be regarded as universal bishops and heads of the church? And, on the other hand, who does not know that, from the year 325, in which the first Council of Nice was held, to the year 580, the date of the second Council of Constantinople, out of the 1,109 bishops who attended the first six councils, only 19 were occidental bishops? Who is there but knows that Councils were convoked by the emperors, without consultation with the bishop of Rome, and sometimes in opposition to his wishes? that Hosius, bishop of Cordova, presided in the first Council of Nice, and drew up its canons? The same Hosius presided in the Council of Sardis, to the exclusion of the legates of Julius, bishop of Rome. I will not press this farther, venerable brethren, but pass on to the great argument which is alleged in proof of the primacy of the bishop of Rome.

IS PETER THE ROCK?

By the *rock* on which the holy church was built, you understand *Peter*. If this were true, it would be an

end to the dispute. But the early fathers, who must surely have known something about it, did not think as we do on this point.

St. Cyril, in his fourth book on the Trinity, says: "I believe that by the *rock* we are to understand the immovable faith of the apostle." St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, in his second book on the Trinity, says: "The *rock* is the blessed and sole rock of the *faith*, confessed by the mouth of St. Peter;" and adds, in his sixth book on the Trinity: "It is upon this rock of the *confession* that the church is built." St. Jerome, in his sixth book on St. Matthew, says: "God has founded his church upon this *rock*, and it is upon this *rock* that the apostle Peter received his name." After him, Chrysostom says, in his fifty-third homily on St. Matthew: "'On this rock will I build my church;' that is, on the faith of the confession. And what was the apostle's confession? 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'" Ambrose, the holy archbishop of Milan, on the second chapter to the Ephesians, St. Basil of Seleucia, and the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, teach exactly the same thing.

Of all the doctors of Christian antiquity, St. Augustine is the one who holds perhaps the first place for learning and piety. Hear, then, what he writes in his second treatise on the first epistle of John: "What signify the words, 'On this rock will I build my church'? On that *faith*, on that which is said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'" In his one hundred and twenty-fourth treatise on St. John we find this most significant sentence: "On this rock which thou hast confessed, I will build my church, because Christ was the rock."

So far was this great bishop from believing that the

church was built on St. Peter, that he said to his people in his thirteenth sermon: "Thou art *Peter*, and on this *rock* which thou hast confessed—this rock, which thou hast acknowledged in declaring, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'—I will build my church; on myself, in that I am the Son of the living God, will I build it; on me, AND NOT ME ON THEE."

St. Augustine's opinion on this famous text was the opinion of all Christendom in his day.

To sum up, then, I have proved:

1. That Jesus gave to all the apostles the same power as to Peter.

2. That the apostles never recognized Peter as the vicar of Jesus Christ and the infallible teacher of the church.

3. That Peter never thought of being pope, and never acted as pope.

4. That the councils of the first four centuries, while acknowledging the high dignity of the bishop of Rome, conceded to him only a preëminence of honor; never of power or jurisdiction.

5. That the holy fathers, in the famous passage, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church," never understood that the church was built upon Peter, (*super Petrum*,) but on the rock, (*super petram*,) that is, on the apostle's confession of faith.

I conclude triumphantly with history, with reason, with logic, with common sense, and with Christian conscience, that Jesus Christ conferred no supremacy whatever on St. Peter; and that if the bishops of Rome have come to be sovereigns of the church, it has only been by the process of confiscating, one by one, all the rights of the bishops.

History is neither Catholic, nor Anglican, nor Cal-

vinist, nor Lutheran, nor Armenian, nor Schismatic-Greek, nor Ultramontane. It is what it is; that is, it is something mightier than all the decrees of œcumenical councils.

You may write falsely against it if you dare; but you can no more destroy it than you can throw down the Coliseum by pulling out a brickbat. If I have said anything which history disproves, confront me with history, and without a moment's hesitation I will make the *amende honorable*. But be patient awhile, and you will find that I have not yet said the whole of what I have undertaken to say, and must say. If the stake were waiting for me out on the great square of St. Peter's, I could not be silent; I should be bound to go on.

FORMER POPES NOT INFALLIBLE.

Bishop Dupanloup, in his famous *Observations* on this Vatican Council, has said, and justly, that if we declare Pius IX. infallible, we are bound, as a natural and necessary inference, to hold all his predecessors as infallible. Well, now, my venerable brethren, hear how history lifts up her commanding voice to assure you that some popes have erred. You will have a good time protesting and denying, I promise you, in the face of such facts as these :

Pope Victor, A. D. 192, approved Montanism, and afterwards condemned it.

Marcellinus, A. D. 296-303, was an idolater. He entered the temple of Vesta and offered incense to that goddess. It was an act of weakness, you say; but I reply, a vicar of Jesus Christ on the earth may die, but does not apostatize.

Liberius, A. D. 358, consented to the condemnation

of Anastasius, and professed Arianism, for the sake of being recalled from exile and reinstated in his see.

Honorius, A. D. 625, adhered to monothelitism, as Father Gratry has fully demonstrated.

Gregory I., A. D. 578-590, gives the name *antichrist* to any one who assumes the title *universal bishop*; and, on the other hand, Boniface III., A. D. 607, obtains this title from the parricide emperor Phocas.

Pascal II., A. D. 1088-99, and Eugenius III., A. D. 1145-52, authorized duelling; Julius II., A. D. 1509, and Pius IV., A. D. 1560, forbade it.

Eugenius IV., A. D. 1431-39, approved the Council of Basle and the restoration of the chalice to the Bohemian church; Pius II., A. D. 1458, revoked this concession.

Adrian II., A. D. 867-72, declares civil marriage valid; Pius VII., A. D. 1800-23, condemns it. Sixtus V., A. D. 1585-90, publishes an edition of the Bible, and by a bull recommends its perusal; which Pius VII. condemns.

Clement XIV., A. D. 1769-74, abolishes the order of Jesuits, allowed by Paul III. Pius VII. reestablishes it.

But why resort to proofs so far off? Has not our holy father Pius IX., here present, in his bull prescribing rules for the Council in case he should die during its session, revoked everything in the past that should contravene his decisions, even were it in the decisions of his predecessors? And certainly if Pius IX. has ever spoken *ex cathedrâ*, is it not when from the depths of his tomb he imposes his own will on the princes of the church?

I should never get through, venerable brethren, if I were to lay before your eyes all the contradictions of

the popes in their teachings. If, then, you proclaim the infallibility of the present pope, you will be forced either to prove what is impossible, that the popes have not contradicted themselves, or to declare that it is revealed to you by the Holy Ghost, that papal infallibility dates only from the year 1870. Will you have the hardihood to do this?

The public may perhaps pass by with indifference theological questions, the importance of which they do not apprehend. But however indifferent they may be to principles, they are not at all indifferent to facts. Don't be deluded! If you decree the dogma of papal infallibility, our antagonists the Protestants will leap into the breach with all the more boldness, for the fact that they will have history on their side and against us, while we shall have, to oppose to them, nothing but our negations. What can we say to them, when they begin to parade before the public the line of the bishops of Rome from Linus down to His Holiness Pius IX.?

Oh, if they had all been such as Pius IX. we could beat them all along the line. But, alas, alas! it is very different from this!

Pope Vigilius, A. D. 538, bought the papacy from Belisarius, agent of the emperor Justinian; though to be sure he broke his promise and paid nothing. Is this mode of gaining the tiara canonical? The second Council of Chalcedon formally condemned it, for in one of its canons we read: "The bishop who gains his bishopric by bribes must lose it and be degraded."

Pope Eugenius IV., A. D. 1145, imitated Vigilius. St. Bernard, the bright star of that century, rebuked him thus: "Can you point out to me one man in this great city of Rome, who would have taken you as pope unless he had received either gold or silver?"

Can it be, venerable brethren, that a pope who sets up his money-changers' table at the temple door is inspired by the Holy Ghost? that he has authority to teach the church infallibly?

The history of Formosus you know too well to need that I should deepen its impression on you. Stephen XI. caused his body to be disinterred, clothed with pontifical robes, and cast into the Tiber, after he had cut off from it the fingers with which he had given the benediction—pronouncing him perjured and illegitimate. He was himself afterwards imprisoned by the people, poisoned, and strangled; but behold the due revenges of time: Romanus, the successor of Stephen, and after him John X., reëstablished the memory of Formosus!

You will say, "These are fictions, not history." Fictions, my lords! Go to the Vatican library and read Plotinus, the historian of the papacy, and the annals of Baronius, A. D. 897. They are *facts*, which we would gladly cancel, for the honor of the Holy See; but when the question is on the decreeing of a dogma which may occasion a great schism among us, the love we bear to our venerable mother church—catholic, apostolic, and Roman—forbids us to be silent. I proceed:

The learned cardinal Baronius, speaking of the papal court, says (give attention, venerable brethren, to these words): "What was the aspect of Rome at that time, and how opprobrious, when nobody had power at Rome but all-prevalent courtesans! These were the persons who granted, transferred, took away bishoprics; and, horrible to believe, their lovers, the false popes, came to be placed on the throne of St. Peter." *Baronius, Anno 912.*

You reply, "These were false popes, not true." Very well ; but in that case, venerable brethren, if for fifty years the Roman See was occupied only by anti-popes, where will you find the thread of pontifical succession ? Has the church been able to do without its chief for a century and a half, and go headless ? Look at it ! The greater part of these anti-popes figure in the genealogical tree of the papacy ; and certainly they must have been such men as Baronius describes, for Genebrardus, the great flatterer of the popes, has dared to say in his chronicles, A. D. 901, "This is an unfortunate age, since for about one hundred and fifty years the popes have entirely fallen away from the virtue of their predecessors, and have been more like *apostates* than *apostles*."

I can well understand how the face of the illustrious Baronius must have been covered with blushes at narrating these facts about the Roman bishops. Speaking of John XI., A. D. 931, bastard son of Pope Sergius and Marozia, he wrote these words in his annals : "The holy church, that is, the Roman church, has had to be trodden under foot by such a monster !" And John XII., elected pope at the age of eighteen, by the influence of courtesans, was no whit better than his predecessor.

Venerable brethren, I deplore the necessity of stirring up such a slough. I keep silence respecting Alexander XI., father and lover of Lucretia ; and I pass by John XXII., who denied the immortality of the soul, and was deposed by the holy Œcumenical Council of Constance. Some assert that this council was no more than a provincial council. And this may be so ; but if you deny it all authority, to be logically consistent, you must regard the nomination of Martin V.,

A. D. 1417, as illegitimate. And then, what will become of the papal succession? Will you be able to find its thread?

I make no mention of the schisms which have dishonored the church. In those disgraceful days the Roman See was occupied by two competitors, and sometimes by three. Which of these was the true pope?

To sum up, then: If you declare the infallibility of the present bishop of Rome, you will be held bound to prove the infallibility of all his predecessors, without a single exception. But can you do this, with history lying open and showing as clear as sunshine that the popes have erred in their teaching? Can you do it, and maintain that popes who were guilty of avarice, of incest, of murder, of simony, were nevertheless vicars of Jesus Christ? Oh, venerable brethren, to maintain this monstrous thing would be to betray Christ worse than Judas did. It would be flinging mud in his face!

Believe me, venerable brethren, you cannot make history over again. There it stands, and there it will stand for ever, to protest mightily against the dogma of papal infallibility. You may proclaim it unanimously, but you will have to do without one vote, and that is mine.

The eyes of true believers are upon us; they look to us for the remedy of the numberless evils by which the church is dishonored. Shall we disappoint their hopes? What account could we give to God, if we should let slip this solemn opportunity which he has given us for preserving the integrity of the true faith?

Let us hold it fast, my brethren; let us arm ourselves with a holy courage; let us put forth one mighty

and generous effort ; let us turn to the teachings of the apostles, for aside from these we have nothing but error, darkness, and false tradition.

Let us make use of our reason and understanding by taking the apostles and the prophets as our sole infallible teachers on that greatest of all questions, "What shall I do to be saved?" This being decided, we shall have got the foundation laid for our dogmatic system.

Setting our feet firmly on the solid and changeless rock of the Holy Scriptures inspired of God, we will go boldly forth against the world, and like the apostle Paul, in the presence of the free-thinkers, we will know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified. We will conquer by the preaching of the foolishness of the cross, as Paul conquered the orators of Greece and Rome, and the church of Rome will have its own glorious '89!

You may protest, gentlemen, and cry "Anathema!" but you know perfectly well that you are not protesting against me, but against the holy apostles, under whose protection I would that this Council might place the church. Ah, if bound about with their grave-clothes they were to come forth from their sepulchres, would they speak to you in any different strain from mine?

What answer will you make them, when out of their writings I tell you that the papacy has departed from that gospel of the Son of God which they preached with such courage, and sealed with their generous blood? Will you have the hardihood to say to them: "We prefer to your instructions those of our popes, our Bellarmine, our Ignatius Loyola? No, no! a thousand times no! unless you have closed your ears that you may not hear, and blinded your eyes that you

may not see, and made gross your hearts that you may not understand.

Ah, if He who sitteth in the heavens is disposed to make heavy his hand on us, as once on Pharaoh, he has no need to suffer the troops of Garibaldi to drive us out of the Eternal City; he need only let us go on to make Pius IX. a god, as we have made the blessed Virgin a goddess.

Pause, oh, pause, my venerable brethren, on that hateful and absurd declivity on which you find yourselves. Save the church from the shipwreck that threatens her, by seeking in the Holy Scriptures alone the rule of faith which we must believe and profess.

I have spoken. God be my helper!

CHAPTER IX.

THE ACTS OF THE COUNCIL.

THE Council, not yet formally concluded, but to all intents and purposes defunct, has left as a legacy to the Roman-catholic church, besides a history of scandals, and the hidden seeds of discord and weakness, two documents under the title of "*Dogmatic Constitutions.*"

The first of these, entitled "Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith," is of small consequence in ecclesiastical history, inasmuch as it treats, under four heads, of matters on which there was little difference among those who were likely to be affected by the authority from which it proceeded. The Roman-catholics did not need it, and the atheists, pantheists, and heretics against whom it was levelled were sure to pay no attention to it. It is sufficient to the purpose of this volume, omitting the verbose periods of the "constitution," to give the four chapters of Canons in which the substance of the constitution is briefly summed up negatively in the form of curses against the contrary errors.

CANONS ON THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

I. OF GOD THE CREATOR OF ALL THINGS.

1. If any one shall deny one true God, Creator and Lord of things visible and invisible; let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall not be ashamed to affirm that nothing exists except matter ; let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall say that the substance and essence of God and of all things is one and the same ; let him be anathema.

4. If any one shall say that finite beings, both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the divine substance ; or that the divine essence, by the manifestation and evolution of itself, becomes all things ; or lastly, that God is universal or indefinite being, which by determining itself constitutes the universality of things, distinct according to genera, species, and individuals ; let him be anathema.

5. If any one confess not that the world and all things which are contained in it, both spiritual and material, have been, in their whole substance, produced by God out of nothing ; or shall say that God created, not by his will, free from all necessity, but by a necessity equal to that whereby he loves himself ; or shall deny that the world was made for the glory of God ; let him be anathema.

II. OF REVELATION.

1. If any one shall say that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be certainly known by the natural light of human reason through created things ; let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall say that it is impossible or inexpedient that man should be taught by divine revelation concerning God and the worship to be paid to him ; let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall say that man cannot be raised by divine power to a higher than natural knowledge and perfection, but can and ought, by a continuous

progress, to arrive at length, of himself, to the possession of all that is true and good; let him be anathema.

4. If any one shall not receive as sacred and canonical the books of Holy Scripture, entire with all their parts, as the holy Synod of Trent has enumerated them,* or shall deny that they have been divinely inspired; let him be anathema.

III. OF FAITH.

1. If any one shall say that human reason is so independent that faith cannot be enjoined upon it by God; let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall say that divine faith is not distinguished from natural knowledge of God and of moral truths, and therefore that it is not requisite for divine faith that revealed truth be believed because of the authority of God who reveals it; let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall say that divine revelation cannot be made credible by outward signs, and therefore that men ought to be moved to faith solely by the internal experience of each, or by private inspiration; let him be anathema.

4. If any one shall say that miracles are impossible, and therefore that all the accounts regarding them, even those contained in holy Scripture, are to be dismissed as fabulous or mythical; or that miracles can never be known with certainty, and that the divine origin of Christianity cannot be proved by them; let him be anathema.

5. If any one shall say that the assent of Christian faith is not a free act, but is inevitably produced by the arguments of human reason; or that the grace of God

[* This enumeration includes the Apocrypha.]

is necessary for that living faith only which worketh by charity ; let him be anathema.

6. If any one shall say that the condition of the faithful, and of those who have not yet attained to the only true faith, is on a par, so that Catholics may have just cause for doubting, with suspended assent, the faith which they have already received under the magisterium of the church, until they shall have obtained a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their faith ; let him be anathema.

IV. OF FAITH AND REASON.

1. If any one shall say that in divine revelation there are no mysteries, truly and properly so called, but that all the doctrines of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles, by properly cultivated reason ; let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall say that human sciences are to be so freely treated that their assertions, although opposed to revealed doctrine, are to be held as true, and cannot be condemned by the church ; let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall assert it to be possible that sometimes, according to the progress of science, a sense is to be given to doctrines propounded by the church other than what it has understood and understands ; let him be anathema.

Therefore we,* fulfilling the duty of our supreme pastoral office, entreat by the mercies of Jesus Christ, and by the authority of the same our God and Saviour we command, all the faithful of Christ, and especially those who are set over others, or are charged with the office of instruction, that they earnestly and diligently

* That is, the pope, "with the approval of the holy Council."

apply themselves to ward off and eliminate these errors from the church, and to spread the light of pure faith.

And since it is not sufficient to shun heretical pravity, unless those errors also be diligently avoided which more or less nearly approach it, we admonish all men of the further duty of observing those constitutions and decrees by which such erroneous opinions as are not here specifically enumerated, have been proscribed and condemned by this Holy See.*

The other constitution adopted by the Council bears the title, "*First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ.*"

After a page or two of preamble, begins the first chapter, entitled, "*Of the Institution of the Apostolic Primacy in Blessed Peter,*" which "teaches and declares that according to the testimony of the gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal church of God was immediately and directly promised and given to blessed Peter the apostle, by Christ the Lord." The page of scriptural argument with which this proposition is sustained it is unimportant to produce, inasmuch as the Council claims infallibility only in the dogmas it enunciates, and not at all in the reasons it gives for them. Confessedly, the arguments by which it supports its infallible dogmas may be every one of them fallacious; † and inasmuch as in the present case they have been refuted in advance in the speech of Archbishop Kenrick, ‡ it would be idle to transcribe them.

[* This concluding paragraph is the one insidiously appended to the constitution "just to round it off handsomely," and afterwards treacherously claimed as a concession of infallibility. See above, pp. 83, 163.]

† See Archbishop Kenrick, above, p. 135.

‡ See pp. 105-120. For the full text of these Constitutions,

For the same reason, Chapter II., "*On the Perpetuity of the Primacy of Blessed Peter in the Roman Pontiffs*," may be quoted "by its title only." We come to the real work of the Council only when we reach the last two chapters, which are as follows :

CHAPTER III.

ON THE POWER AND NATURE OF THE PRIMACY OF THE
ROMAN PONTIFF.

Wherefore, resting on plain testimonies of the sacred Scriptures, and adhering to the plain and express decrees both of our predecessors, the Roman pontiffs, and of the General Councils, we renew the definition of the Œcumenical Council of Florence, in virtue of which all the faithful of Christ must believe that the holy apostolical see and the Roman pontiff possesses the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and is true vicar of Christ, and head of the whole church, and father and teacher of all Christians ; and that full power was given to him in blessed Peter to rule, feed, and govern the universal church by Jesus Christ our Lord ; as is also contained in the acts of the General Council and in the sacred Canons.

Hence we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate ; to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, in Latin and English, see Abp. Manning's *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 182-219.

to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the church throughout the world, so that the church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor, through the preservation of unity both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation.

But so far is this power of the supreme pontiff from being any prejudice to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which bishops, who have been set by the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the apostles, feed and govern each his own flock, as true pastors, that this their episcopal authority is really asserted, strengthened, and protected by the supreme and universal pastor; in accordance with the words of St. Gregory the Great: "My honor is the honor of the whole church. My honor is the firm strength of my brethren. I am truly honored when the honor due to each and all is not withheld."*

Further, from this supreme power possessed by the Roman pontiff of governing the universal church, it follows that he has the right of free communication

* Letters of St. Gregory the Great, book 8. 30, vol. 2, p. 919, Benedictine edition, Paris, 1705. [The disclaimer in this paragraph was plainly intended as a salve for the soreness of those bishops who had protested against this statement of the supreme and *immediate* jurisdiction of the pope in all dioceses, as being destructive of the dignity and almost of the function of the bishops. It was much to concede to him the supreme *mediate* jurisdiction, reaching the priests and laity through the medium of the bishop. But to concede to him the right of governing the priests and laity *directly*, over the head of the bishop, through legates and vicars apostolic, was to concede everything; and well deserved to be repaid, at least with a few such civil words.]

with the pastors of the whole church, and with their flocks, that these may be taught and ruled by him in the way of salvation. Wherefore we condemn and reject the opinions of those who hold that the communication between this supreme head and the pastors and their flocks may lawfully be impeded; or who make this communication subject to the secular power, so as to maintain that whatever is done by the apostolic see or by its authority, for the government of the church, cannot have force or value unless it be confirmed by the assent of the secular power. And since, by the divine right of apostolic primacy, the Roman pontiff is placed over the universal church, we further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful,* and that in all cases the decision of which belongs to the church recourse may be had to this tribunal,† and that none may reopen the judgment of the apostolic see, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgment.‡ Wherefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman pontiffs to an Œcumenical Council as to an authority higher than that of the Roman pontiff.

* Brief of Pius VI., *Super soliditate*, of November 28, 1786.

† Acts of the Fourteenth General Council, (Second of Lyons,) A. D. 1274.

‡ Letter VIII. of Pope Nicholas I., A. D. 858, to the Emperor Michael. [It is under this principle that the Roman-catholic church, which now ostentatiously disclaims the right which it formerly as distinctly claimed, of attempting the overthrow of a secular government by releasing its subjects from their oath of allegiance, may, when the occasion arises, reach the same end by *deciding* that the oath is no longer binding and allegiance no longer due. The next paragraph, which declares the pope's sovereignty to extend not only to faith, but to *morals*, does (as this word is constantly used by Roman-catholic writers) expressly assert that the decision of such *political* questions belongs to the pope.]

If then any shall say that the Roman pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government of the church spread throughout the world ; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part and not all the fullness of this supreme power ; or that this power is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the churches, and over each and all the pastors and the faithful ; let him be anathema.

CHAPTER IV.

CONCERNING THE INFALLIBLE TEACHING OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

Moreover, that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the apostolic primacy which the Roman pontiff, as the successor of Peter, prince of the apostles, possesses over the whole church, this holy see has always held, the perpetual practice of the church confirms, and Œcumenical Councils also have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession : The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith.* And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said, “Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build

[* This passage illustrates how closely the whole fabric of the Romish system is connected with that primary perversion which Archbishop Kenrick so well exposes in his Speech, pp. 99-101 ; the perversion of the word “faith” from its evangelical meaning of *trust*, to signify the acceptance of dogmas.]

my church," Matt. 16:18, these things which have been said are approved by events, because in the apostolic see the Catholic religion and her holy and well-known doctrine have always been kept undefiled. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that see, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion which the apostolic see preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion.* And, with the approval of the Second Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed that the Holy Roman Church enjoys supreme and full primacy and preëminence over the whole Catholic church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the plenitude of power from our Lord himself in the person of blessed Peter, prince or head of the apostles, whose successor the Roman pontiff is; and as the apostolic see is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so also if any questions regarding faith shall arise they must be defined by its judgment. Finally, the Council of Florence defined: That the Roman pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole church and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole church.

To satisfy this pastoral duty our predecessors ever made unwearied efforts that the salutary doctrine of Christ might be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care watched that it might be preserved genuine and pure where it had been received. Therefore the bishops of the whole world,

* Formula of St. Hormisdas, subscribed by the fathers of the Eighth General Council, (Fourth of Constantinople,) A. D. 869.

now singly, now assembled in synod, following the long established custom of churches and the form of the ancient rule, sent word to this apostolic see of those dangers especially which sprang up in matters of faith, that there the losses of faith might be most effectually repaired where the faith cannot fail.* And the Roman pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling Œcumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular synods, sometimes using other helps which divine Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognized as conformable with the sacred Scriptures and apostolic traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that by His revelation they might make known new doctrines, but that by his assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the apostles. And indeed all the venerable fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have venerated and followed their apostolic doctrine; knowing most fully that this see of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the prince of his disciples: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren."

This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by heaven upon Peter and his successors in this chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doc-

* Letter of St. Bernard to Pope Innocent II.

trine ; that the occasion of schism being removed, the whole church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell.

But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the apostolic office is most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority, we judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouchsafed to join with the supreme pastoral office.

Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed : that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedrâ*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal church,* by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his church should be endowed for defining doctrine, faith, or morals ; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the church.

[* These various limitations are equivalent (as Bishop Dupanloup has suggested in his Farewell Letter—Appendix to Father Hyacinthe's Discourses, vol. 2) to a definition of the *fallibility* of the pope on all other occasions than those of *ex cathedrâ* utterance. For instance, while the decree certifies that the insolent bull *Unam Sanctam*, which claims for the pope secular supremacy over all civil governments, (see above, p. 125,) is infallible and irreformable, it virtually warns us that the Allocution addressed to certain eccle-

But if any one—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition ; let him be anathema.

The work of examining and comparing the enormous series of papal documents, forged and genuine, to see which of them come within the terms of infallibility, is a work yet to be executed by scholars. These terms have been fixed with caution, in order to exclude the notoriously heretical teachings of certain of the earlier popes, as Honorius and Liberius. According to

siastics by Pius IX. in July or August, 1871, in which he distinctly repudiates the doctrine of the *Unam Sanctam*, is spoken by him as a mere man, and is not in the least to be trusted. Speaking in this Allocution “as a private doctor,” and therefore fallibly, he claims that the overthrow of governments by popes was never attempted under the pretence of a *divine* right, but only by virtue of the public law and usage of those times, and that the contrary statement is an ugly calumny, designed to embarrass the relations of the Holy See with civil governments.

The claim is a timid tergiversation, extorted by the threatening posture of events, and quite unworthy the author of the Syllabus. Another private doctor, whose authority far outweighs that of Dr. Mastai-Ferretti, to wit, Dr. Orestes A. Brownson, declares that “the power she [the church] exercised over sovereigns in the middle ages was not a usurpation, was not derived from the concessions of princes or the consent of the people, but it was *and is hers by divine right*; and whoso resists it rebels against the King of kings.” “All history fails to show an instance in which the pope, in deposing a temporal sovereign, professes to do it by the authority vested in him by the pious belief of the faithful, generally-received maxims, the opinion of the age, the concessions of sovereigns, or the civil constitution and public laws of Catholic states. On the contrary, he always claims to do it by the authority committed to him as the successor of the prince of the apostles by the authority of Almighty God.” “Either the popes usurped the authority they exercised over sovereigns in the middle ages, or they possessed it by virtue of their title as vicars of Jesus Christ on earth.” Brownson’s Quarterly Review, April, 1854. See the quotation more in full at p. 583 of a convenient book of reference, “Romanism as it Is,” by Rev. S. W. Barnum, Hartford, 1871.]

some Catholic scholars, no document of all the first twelve centuries of church history bears this character.* But according to others, of equal authority, there are instances of *ex cathedrâ* teaching as far back as the age of Cyprian and Pope St. Stephen.† The best that can be said is that it is still left by the Council a doubtful question, and probably one that can never be fully settled without a special papal revelation, what documents are to be reckoned as belonging to the new Bible of the Roman-catholic church.

Four, however, of those which are most distinctly certified to the public, under the terms of the Vatican dogma, as infallible and “irreformable,” demand attention.

I. The first is the bull *Unam Sanctam* addressed to the whole Christian world in the year 1302, by Boniface VIII., which teaches “that there are in the church and in its power two swords, the spiritual and the temporal : that it belongs to the spiritual power to establish the temporal and to judge it when it is in the wrong ; so that if the secular power goes astray it is to be judged by the spiritual power ; if the inferior spiritual power errs, it is to be judged by the higher ; but if the supreme spiritual power errs, it can be judged by God only, and not by man ; and that this supreme authority, not human, but divine, is vested in Peter and

* Quirinus, p. 131.

† See the long Latin tractate by Bishop Ketteler of Mayence, entitled “*Quæstio*,” in *Documenta ad Illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*. Speaking of the pope’s letter to Cyprian on the rebaptism of those baptized by heretics, the bishop (now a fierce adherent of infallibility) remarks : “If there is any such thing as a definition *ex cathedrâ*, this was one,” and then proceeds to show that instead of being deferred to as infallible or even authoritative, it was opposed with all his might by that apostle of the authority of the Roman see, St. Cyprian himself. Pp. 39, 40.

his successors ; and that every human creature is subject to the pope by reason of sin.”*

II. Paul IV. issued with peculiar solemnity, and directly *ex cathedrâ*, his bull *Cum ex Apostolatus officio*.† He had consulted his cardinals, and obtained their signatures to it, and then defined, “out of the plenitude of his apostolic power,” the following propositions :

(1.) The pope, who as “Pontifex Maximus” is God’s representative on earth, has full authority and power over nations and kingdoms ; he judges all, and can in this world be judged by none.

(2.) All princes and monarchs, as well as bishops, as soon as they fall into heresy or schism, without the need of any legal formality, are irrevocably deposed, deprived for ever of all rights of government, and incur sentence of death.

(3.) None may venture to give any aid to an heretical or schismatical prince, not even the mere services of common humanity ; any monarch who does so forfeits his dominions and property, which lapse to princes obedient to the pope, on their gaining possession of them. . . .

Such is this most solemn declaration, issued as late as 1558, subscribed by the cardinals, and afterwards expressly confirmed and renewed by Pius V., that the pope, by virtue of his absolute authority, can depose every monarch, hand over every country to foreign invasion, deprive every one of his property, and that without any legal formality, and not only on account

* See above, in Abp. Kenrick’s Speech, p. 125 ; and in “*Pouvoir du Pape au Moyen Age*,” p. 571. Paris, 1845.

† The account of this bull is abridged from *Janus*—Pope and Council—pp. 311, 312, Am. ed.

of dissent from the doctrines approved at Rome, or of separation from the church, but for merely offering an asylum for such dissidents, so that no rights of dynasty or nation are respected, but nations are to be given up to all the horrors of a war of conquest.

III. Far graver and more permanent consequences resulted from the other document,* the bull *In Cœnâ Domini*, which the popes had labored at for centuries, and which was finally brought out in the pontificate of Urban VIII., in 1627. It had appeared first in its broader outlines under Gregory XI., in 1372. Gregory XII., in 1411, renewed it, and under Pius V., in 1568, it preserved its substantial identity, with certain additions. According to his decision it was to remain as an eternal law in Christendom, and above all to be imposed on bishops, penitentiaries, and confessors, as a rule they were to impress in the confessional on the consciences of the faithful. If ever any document bore the stamp of an *ex cathedrâ* decision, it is this, which has been over and over again confirmed by so many popes.

This bull excommunicates and curses all heretics and schismatics, as well as all who favor or defend them—all princes and magistrates, therefore, who allow the residence of heterodox persons in their country. It excommunicates and curses all who keep or print the books of heretics without papal permission, all—whether private individuals or universities, or other corporations—who appeal from a papal decree to a future General Council. It encroaches on the independence and sovereign rights of states, in the imposition of taxes, the exercise of judicial authority, and the punishment of the crimes of clerics, by threatening with excommu-

* See Janus, Pope and Council, 313.

nication and anathema those who perform such acts without special papal permission ; and these penalties fall not only on the supreme authorities of the state, but on the whole body of civil functionaries, down to scribes, jailers, and executioners. The pope alone can absolve from these censures, except *in articulo mortis*. . . . This bull was annually published in Rome on Maundy-Thursday for two hundred years, . . . and if it has ceased to be read out on that day, as before, since Clement XIV.'s time, still it is always treated, as Crétinean-Joly states, in the Roman tribunals and congregations, as having legal force.*

IV. A fourth document on which authority equal to that of divine inspiration is now declared to be conferred is the notorious encyclical *Quanta Cura*, with its appended *Syllabus*. This, the chief of the recent utterances of the chair of Peter, has already been transcribed in full upon the pages of this volume.† But in one, especially, of its censures, the infallibility of this document is pledged to the vindication of all the monstrous and hideous usurpations and tyrannies of which the popes in all past ages have been guilty. The twenty-

* The bull *In Cœnâ Domini* is quoted by Archbishop Manning as being in full force at this day, in *Petri Privilegium*, 3. 19, *note*. But as if to repudiate in the most unmistakable terms the excuses offered by those Roman-catholic apologists in free countries, who pretend that this "irreformable" and infallible bull has become obsolete, and that the Romish church has ceased to be a tyrannical and persecuting institution, one of the first acts of the reigning pope after the assembling of the Council was to fulminate a new bull, *Apostolicæ Sedis*, "virtually intended as a renewal or confirmation of the bull *In Cœnâ Domini*." "Certain excommunications nobody paid any attention to are dropped out, as, for instance, of sovereigns and governments who levy taxes without permission of the pope. But new censures of wider application have come into their place." *Quirinus*, 100, 105.

† See above, pp. 22-48.

third article of the *Syllabus* stigmatizes as one of "the principal errors of our time" the statement that "the Roman pontiffs have exceeded the limits of their power or usurped the rights of princes."* What atrocities against the rights of man and the liberty of nations are hereby justified and claimed as within the just power of the popes for all future time, all history declares.

According to the new dogma, the pope may by divine right give whole nations into slavery on account of some measure of their sovereign.

He has the right to make slaves of a foreign nation merely because they are not Catholics.

He has the right to rob innocent populations, cities, regions, or countries *en masse*, with the sole exception of infants and the dying, of all those services which he declares essential to salvation, merely because the sovereign or government has violated a papal command or some right of the church.†

He has the right to make a present of whole countries inhabited by non-Christian peoples, and hand over

* See above, p. 39. In the Letter Apostolic *Multiplices inter*, here referred to in the *Syllabus*, this statement is cited as the very climax of the horrors contained in the book under censure. "Finally, not to speak of a multitude of other errors, to such a pitch of audacity and impiety does he proceed, as to pretend, with nefarious insolence, that popes of Rome and Œcumenical Councils have exceeded the limits of their power, and usurped the rights of princes, and also erred in definitions of faith and morals." *Recueil des Allocutions consistoriales, Encycliques, etc., citées dans l'Encyclique et le Syllabus du 8 Décembre, 1864.* Paris, 1865. In this edition, published by the "printers to the pope," the French translation is untrustworthy, two significant clauses being suppressed from the single sentence above quoted.

† Pope Clement IV., in 1265, "did not exceed his powers" when he applied this process to Charles of Anjou, sheerly to enforce the prompt collection of a debt. Janus, 12.

all rights of sovereignty and property in them to any Christian prince he may please.

He has the right to incite princes, by promises of forgiveness of sins and heaven, to make war on the enemies of his secular authority.

He has the right to provide for the Inquisition by direct and personal legislation of his own, depriving those accused before the holy office of any advocate to defend them, authorizing the application of the torture, obliging the magistrate to carry out the capital sentences of the Inquisition, prohibiting them to spare the life of any lapsed heretic, even on his conversion.

He "does not exceed his powers" in forcibly depriving heretics of their children in order that they may be brought up Catholics.

He "does not exceed his powers" in releasing at his pleasure from oaths of allegiance taken by a people to their government.

He "does not exceed his powers" in absolving a sovereign from the treaties he has sworn to observe, or from his oath to the constitution of his country, or in giving full power to his confessor to absolve him from any oath he finds it inconvenient to keep.

He "does not exceed his powers" when he assumes to dissolve the bond of marriage by declaring one of the parties to be excommunicated.

The act of Pope Adrian IV., in delivering Ireland over to that subjection to the English crown from which it has never escaped, was within the power of the pope.

And the act of St. Pius V., and of his successor Sixtus V., which excommunicated Queen Elizabeth of England and invited her assassination, is justified by

the Council as an act which it would be right to do again, under like circumstances.*

* See Quirinus, pp. 634-653. Janus, p. 12. Bishop Dupanloup, Appendix to Hyacinthe, vol. 2; with the references cited by each. All these, at the time of writing, were acknowledged Catholic writers.

CHAPTER X.

THE SEQUEL OF THE COUNCIL.

THE outburst of war which followed immediately upon the promulgation of the new dogma, and drove the terrified pope and court of Rome to an immediate prorogation of the Council, was not altogether an untoward event to the Romish church. It swept away indeed, within nine weeks, the temporal sovereignty of the pope, which might otherwise have lasted a few months or years longer. But it served to distract the minds of men from reflecting upon the monstrous act that had just been performed, and so to delay a little, and perhaps to mitigate, the inevitable revulsion of thoughtful minds in the Roman-catholic church from the "sacrifice of the intellect" which was now demanded of them in the much-abused name of Christian faith. Weeks and months passed by, and the agitations of an unprecedented political crisis continued to absorb the intellectual activity of the world. No very alarming sounds of protest seemed to be heard from any quarter, and the abettors of the plan for the definition of infallibility, if perchance they had had at first some misgivings at the results of the work of their own hands, plucked up courage again, and made themselves merry over the forebodings of those who had prophesied damage and loss to the church in consequence of the definition.

All this time, however, the court of Rome was not idle.

When, in a political nominating convention, the more numerous of two factions has carried its point against the other by the use of expedients appropriate to that arena—the “previous question,” the “suspension of the two-thirds rule,” etc.—and so has accomplished by mere majority what, after all, it needs the “moral unanimity” of the party to make of any avail; it becomes necessary, after the adjournment, to institute measures for conciliating or whipping in the disaffected.

The situation of the successful party in the Council was very like this. If the threats made in the speeches and protests of the minority, and still more vehemently in their private conversation,* to denounce the Council as “void of truth and liberty,” and to refuse assent to its decrees on this ground,† and on the ground that no conciliar definition could make that to be true which is not true‡—should be carried out by any considerable number, all the cost and pains that had been spent in assembling the Council and in forcing through it the great *schema*, would prove to have been worse than in vain.

The appliances at hand for bringing refractory ec-

* In pursuance of the plan of this book, to make no statement except on the authority of credible documents, we have refrained from the allegation of many facts which tend to discredit, even to a Roman-catholic mind, the authority of the Council, but which are demonstrated only by private testimony. It is notorious, and the fact is proved by the concurrent testimony of many independent witnesses, that the bishops of the minority were profuse in denunciation of moral and physical constraint, intimidation, bribery, and corruption, which they declared to have been practised or attempted by the court of Rome in carrying through of its scheme. The statement in the text is justified by reference to Quirinus, and *Ce qui se passe au Concile, passim*.

† See above, pp. 70, 81, 82.

‡ See above, pp. 85, 133.

clesiastics to terms of submission were not few. Sometimes they were to be directly summoned to surrender, under threat of deposition and excommunication. Sometimes the religious awe with which the authority of pope and council is regarded by sincere Roman-catholics might be trusted to work against the sense of oppression and outrage with which the dissentients had taken their leave of Rome before the Council closed. Sometimes, doubtless, the consciousness that all hope of professional promotion was dependent on the good-will of that court of Rome which now demanded the great act of submission might be counted on to turn the balance of some hesitating mind. But another process for enforcing absolute subservience to the central will had long ago been prepared against just such emergencies, by which the court, without seeming to do anything at all, might in fact do everything short of actual bodily compulsion.

Among the enormous encroachments of the Roman see which in latter ages have swallowed up the last vestiges of the freedom of the bishops is that which is suggested by the phrase "quinquennial faculties." At the accession of each bishop to his office, papers are issued to him licensing him for five years from that date, and no longer, (unless the license be renewed for a like period,) to perform certain acts, without which it would be, in effect, impossible for him to continue the administration of his diocese. It is publicly and responsibly charged, in Rome itself, before the very face of the pope's court, that the adhesion of the bishops of the minority was extorted from them under the pressure of the refusal otherwise to renew their "faculties."*

* Letter to Mgr. Nardi, published in *La Libertà*, Rome, April 14, 1871. "You think that the question of infallibility is closed

By one influence or another it was brought about that many, in fact, nearly all, of the bishops who had protested most stoutly against the dogma as incredible by the adhesion of many of the opposition bishops. You are mistaken. The Council not having been concluded with the *definiens subscripsi* of all the bishops, the opposition may at any time be renewed. And well it may be, considering that the adhesions have been obtained in a manner of which you are not ignorant, that is, by means of *moral violence*. I will mention one case, by way of example. As the last Lent approached, the opposition bishops applied, like the others, for the renewal of their 'faculties'—for the popes now hold all episcopal powers concentrated in their own hands. Well, what was the answer? That if they wished the faculties, they should humble themselves at the feet of the holy father, that is, give in their adhesion to his infallibility and exclusive jurisdiction. Thus many adhered, in order to escape the vexation of the Curia, and to make it possible to carry on the spiritual government of their dioceses." The letter, though anonymous, is known to have been written by an eminent priest of one of the religious orders in Rome. In his speech before the Old Catholic Congress at Munich, September, 1871, Father Hyacinthe describes with great power and pathos the various forms of "moral violence" brought to bear on the will and even on the conscience of those who in their hearts disbelieved the infallibility dogma, to induce an outward act of submission.

Among the "faculties" or licenses issued regularly by the pope to bishops, on their application, empowering them to exercise functions pertaining to their office, the most important are those which are always conferred for the term of *five years*, and are therefore called "the quinquennial faculties." When the person intrusted with them dies or is promoted during the term, the faculties do not descend to his successor, but must be applied for anew. They are enumerated in twenty particulars; but the most important may be summed up under these six heads:

(1.) The power of absolving in cases usually reserved to the pope; also from heresy, apostasy, schism, and even (in Protestant countries) from relapse.

(2.) Permission to have and read (in order to confute them) heretical and other writings designated in the Index of Prohibited Books; and to allow the reading of them, with the same purpose, (under a prohibition to circulate them,) to other learned and discreet men.

and against the Council as being without liberty and therefore without authority, were induced, like the archbishop of St. Louis, to retract their words; or else, like the bishop of Cleveland, quietly to retire from the administration of their dioceses. The first voice to break the silence was the same voice, as of one crying in the wilderness, which had wakened the attention of the whole world by a Protest uttered from the silence of his Carmelite cell, one short year before.

The following is

FATHER HYACINTHES'S APPEAL TO THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS.

ROME, absent in body, present in spirit,
Christmas, 1870.

When war broke out, like that thunderbolt which burst over the Vatican at the promulgation of the impious dogma, I hastened to write a brief protest. This duty fulfilled, I kept silence. I watched the sweeping off, as of the chaff which the wind driveth away, of those two absolutisms which, sometimes in mutual

(3.) Permission to grant dispensations in case of certain impediments to marriage.

(4.) Power to absolve in case of secret crime, with the exception of murder; and to commute, or release from vows, duties of fasting, etc.

(5.) Release from the obligation of certain of the more cumbersome formalities in conducting divine service.

(6.) The power of transferring these faculties to priests within the diocese.

It is obvious that even those bishops who are not "removable at the nod" of the pope, must nevertheless become quite helpless in their subserviency to him, as soon as their "five-years' faculties" expire.

For a fuller account of the matter, see that standard Roman-catholic work, Wetzer und Welte's *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s. v. *Facultäten*.

league, sometimes in hostility, had so grievously oppressed both the church and the world—the empire of the Napoleons and the temporal power of the popes. The abettors of the infallibility movement have not understood this religious silence to which so many souls have restrained themselves, and which they above all others ought to have maintained ; pursuing that audacious policy which with one stroke has accomplished both their triumph and their ruin, they busy themselves with noisy calculations upon the more or less prudent reserve of some, the more or less constrained adherence of others. Such a misunderstanding cannot longer be kept up ; it would be wrong not to oppose what would otherwise result in establishing falsehood by prescriptive right.

The political catastrophe which, especially for Frenchmen, might seem at first a reason for silence, becomes, if truly apprehended, an urgent motive for speaking and acting. I do not hesitate to say it, the question which at this very moment takes precedence of all others in France is the religious question. France cannot do without Christianity ; and yet she cannot accept Christianity under the forms of oppression and corruption with which it has been disguised. Therefore it is that she, even more than the Latin races in general, has been forced to live without religion, and consequently without moral power, between ultramontanism and infidelity, two foes of which she has taken but too slight account, and against whom she had need to fight not less, certainly, than against those who have invaded nothing but her soil.

Suffer me, then, in the presence of the woes of my country and the woes of the church, to address the Catholic bishops of the whole world, and especially

those of them who look upon the situation as I do myself, and who, to my own knowledge, are not few. Who am I that I should speak to them so boldly? But the illustrious Gerson has not hesitated to declare that in times of crisis the humblest woman has the right to convoke the Œcumenical Council and save the church universal. I assume this right; I perform this duty; I conjure the bishops to put an end to that latent schism which is separating us by chasms, the depth of which is the more fearful as it is more unperceived.

Above all, we need to be told by them whether the decrees of the late Council are binding on our faith or no. In an assembly the primary conditions of which are absolute liberty of discussion and moral unanimity of suffrage, bishops, respectable by reason of their number and by their eminence in learning and in character, openly and repeatedly complained of all manner of restrictions put upon their liberty, and finally refused to take part in the vote. Is it possible that, returning to their dioceses, and waking as it were from a long dream, they have acquired the retrospective certainty of having really enjoyed, while at Rome, that moral independence of which they were not conscious at the time? The supposition is an insult. We are not dealing here with one of those mysteries that are above man's reason, but simply with a fact of consciousness. To change one's mind in a matter of this sort would not be to submit one's reason to authority; it would be to sacrifice one's conscience.

Now, if this be so, we are still free, after, as before the Council, to reject the infallibility of the pope, as a doctrine unknown to ecclesiastical antiquity and having its foundations only in apocryphal documents upon which criticism has pronounced beyond all appeal.

We are still free to say, openly, loyally, that we do not accept the late Encyclicals and the *Syllabus*, which their most intelligent defenders are constrained to interpret in opposition to their natural meaning, and to the known intent of their author, and the result of which, if they were to be taken in earnest, would be to establish a radical incompatibility between the duties of a faithful Catholic and those of an impartial scholar and a free citizen.

Such are the most salient points at which the schism has been effected. It is the right of every Catholic who cares for the integrity and the dignity of his faith, of every priest who has at heart the loyalty of his ministry, to interrogate the bishops on these points; and it is their duty to answer without reservation and without subterfuge. Reservation and subterfuge—these have been our ruin. *It is high time to restore in our church the ancient sincerity in religion which has so decayed among us.

But, mark it well, the facts and doctrines which I have pointed out are connected with a great system, and, to reach the details, the remedy must penetrate the whole. The question is aggravated by the very excesses of the ultramontanes, and from this time forth the issue is to be this: whether or not the nineteenth century is to have its Catholic Reformation, as the sixteenth had its Protestant Reformation.

Look, O bishops, upon the bride of Jesus Christ, whom you also have espoused, the holy Church, pierced, like Him, with five wounds!

The first, the wound in the right hand—the hand which holds the light, is the hiding of the word of God. That sacred volume, opened over the world to enlighten and to fructify, why has it been shut up again in the

darkness of dead languages, and under the seal of the severest prohibitions? The bread of instruction and life which God had prepared as well for the poor as for the wise and learned, how has it been taken from them? It is vain to allege, for a pretext, the abuses of heresy and unbelief. Put the Bible in its true relation with science, by an intelligent exegesis, and they will have nothing to fear from each other. Put it in its true relation with the people, by a religious education worthy of itself and of them, and the Bible will become the safest guide of the people's life—the healthiest inspiration of their worship.

The wound in the other hand is the oppression of intellect and conscience by the abuse of hierarchical power. Of a truth, Jesus Christ said to his apostles: "Go, teach all nations;" but he said also to them: "The princes of the nations exercise dominion over them, but it shall not be so among you!" Successors of the apostles, make haste to unbind from our shoulders that burden which neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear, and restore that light and easy yoke to which we are invited by the love of the Redeemer!

And what shall I say of the spear-wound in the heart? I must call it by its name, for they who most suffer from it are those who most shrink from speaking of it—it is the celibacy of the priests. I speak not of voluntary celibacy, the more pleasing to God as it is free and joyous, like the love that inspires it—the portion of a few souls, called to it and sustained in it by an exceptional grace. But when it is extended indiscriminately over natures the most unlike and the most unfit—when it is imposed as an irrevocable oath upon their inexperience and enthusiasm, celibacy becomes an institution without mercy, and too often without mo-

rality. The nations who look upon it as the exclusive ideal of perfection, throw contempt on the sanctity of wedded life ; and, debasing the family in comparison with the cloister, they reduce the family to a mere refuge for vulgar, or, at best, for earthly souls. The domestic hearth ceases to be an altar !

But the last wounds of the church, that cripple her feet when she would rest upon the earth, are these: worldly policy and superstitious piety. A policy the church must have, for she stands in necessary relations with the powers of this world ; but that policy is most completely expressed in the words of the Master : “I, if I be lifted up above the earth, will draw all men unto me.” Is this that policy of the temporal power and the secular arm which makes the possession of certain provinces in Italy and certain privileges in Europe the essential condition of the empire of souls, the pivot of the whole spiritual structure? A policy as fatal to the church and the world as that Revolution which it subserves even while it is contesting it! A policy the impotent, blind persistency in which it is now desired to exalt to the dignity of a dogma! And yet there is no lack of spiritual force in modern Catholicism. It counts its devout souls by thousands ; it sees the noblest works and virtues flourishing within its pale. Why is this piety, so touching and so genuine, too often handed over to the seductions of a mysticism without depth, and an asceticism without austerity—so different from those that shed grandeur on the early Christian centuries? External practices of devotion—material practices, I had almost said—are multiplied without limit ; the adoration of the saints, especially of the holy Virgin, are developed in proportions and under a character which are alien to genuine Catholic feeling ;

and that worship of the Father in spirit and in truth, which Jesus made the soul of his religion, is sensibly diminishing among us.

Such is the body of Christ, in the state to which our sins have brought it on the earth—sins of the priests, as much and more than those of the people. O bishops, will you have no pity on us? Will you not apply some efficacious remedy? “Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there?”

I pause. My heart is so burdened that I cannot go on. I know not what shall become of my poor word amid the shock of empires and the voice of blood going up from the field of carnage. But I know this: that, if it be not strong enough to speed the accomplishment of God’s designs, it is faithful to declare them.

And this, too, I know: that I do not separate myself from the holy Catholic faith, nor from the church of my baptism and priesthood. If her venerated chiefs shall heed my humble appeal, I shall resume at once, in obedience and in honor and loyalty, a ministry which has been the one passion of my youth, the one ambition of my life, and which nothing but my conscience could have forced me painfully to relinquish. If, on the contrary, they answer me only by their reprobation or their silence, I shall not suffer this to disturb me in my love for a church that is greater than those who govern it, stronger than those who defend it. Holding fast by the heritage left me by my fathers, and not to be rent from me by unjust and therefore invalid excommunications, I shall devote to the preparation of the kingdom of God upon earth that free personal labor which is the common duty of all true Christians.

HYACINTHE.

From France, tossing in the agony of her terrible calamity, this touching appeal called forth no answering voice. It may have seemed to the party of absolutism a mere cry of fruitless despair, the wail of a dying cause. For their heart seemed more fully set in them than ever to carry through their victory with a high hand. They proceeded to take rigorous measures against the most illustrious of those scholars who, speaking in the name of theological science, had pronounced the doctrine of infallibility to be in contradiction to the facts of history, and the citations made in defence of it to be forgeries, interpolations, mutilations, and perversions. The venerable Döllinger was summoned by his archbishop to repudiate that which he solemnly believed to be the truth, and to enunciate that which he knew to be falsehood, under penalty of deposition and excommunication. The summons was answered on the 28th of March, 1871, by a memorial respectful in tone, but in its spirit a challenge to the hierarchs of the church to meet its scholars and doctors and disprove the indictment of fraud, falsehood, and oppression which he there put on record against them.

He declared himself ready to prove—

First, that the texts of holy Scripture cited in defence of the decrees of the Council could not be so cited except in violation of the solemn oath, sworn by every priest, not to receive nor interpret the holy Scripture except in accordance with the unanimous consent of the fathers.*

Secondly, that the assertion that the substance of the new decrees has been believed and taught in the church always and everywhere, or almost everywhere,

* See above, p. 106.

rests on an entire misapprehension of tradition, and a perversion of history, and is in direct opposition to the clearest facts and testimonies.

Thirdly, that the bishops of the Latin countries, who constituted the immense majority of the Council, had been misled on the subject of the papal authority by the text-books used in their theological training; the passages quoted in these books as proofs being false, forged, or garbled.

Fourthly, that the new decrees are in direct contradiction to decrees of former Œcumenical Councils confirmed by popes.

Fifthly, that the new decrees are incompatible with the constitutions of the states of Europe, and especially with that of Bavaria.

This brave letter concluded with the following words:

“As a Christian, as a theologian, as an historian, and as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine.

“Not as a Christian; for it is irreconcilable with the spirit of the gospel, and with the clear declarations of Christ and the apostles. It seeks precisely to erect a ‘kingdom of this world’ such as Christ repudiated—a ‘lordship over the church’ such as Peter forbade to himself and to all.

“Not as a theologian; for it stands in irreconcilable contradiction to all the authentic tradition of the church.

“Not as an historian; for as such I know that the constant effort to realize this theory of universal empire has cost Europe rivers of blood, has devastated and degraded whole countries, has ruined the noble fabric of the constitution of the ancient church, and has engendered, aggrandized, and perpetuated in the church the most deplorable abuses.

“Finally, as a citizen, I must reject this doctrine ; because, by its pretension to bring states and monarchs and the whole political order into subjection to the papal power, and by the exemptions from law which it claims for the clergy, it prepares the way for discords infinitely mischievous between state and church, between clergy and laity. For I cannot hide from myself that this doctrine, in consequence of which the ancient German empire was brought to ruin, if it should once become dominant in the Catholic part of the German nation, would implant also in the newly constituted empire the germs of an incurable disorder.”*

* I. von Döllinger's Erklärung an den Erzbischof von München-Freising. München, 1871. Dr. Döllinger appends to this conclusion of his Declaration the following from the pope's official organ, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, of March 18, 1871: “The pope is the supreme judge of the law of the land. In him, the two powers, the spiritual and the secular, meet as in their apex ; for he is the vicegerent of Christ, who is not only a Priest for ever, but also King of kings and Lord of lords. . . . The pope, by virtue of his high dignity, is at the summit of both powers.” This interpretation of the Vatican decrees will of course be repudiated by the Romish clergy in America. But is it not authoritative? Archbishop Manning, who claims to know the mind of the pope, although he may perhaps not equally apprehend the expediency of disguising it, presents a like statement. See above, in Abp. Kenrick's Speech, p. 129 and *note*. We have since found Archbishop Manning's utterance at Kensington, there quoted, given more at length, and the statement is so condensed, explicit, and authoritative, that it is worth repeating. He is speaking as in the name and person of the pontiff :

“You say I have no authority over the Christian world, that I am not the vicar of the Good Shepherd, that I am not the supreme interpreter of the Christian faith. I am all these. You ask me to abdicate—to renounce my supreme authority. You tell me that I ought to submit to the civil power, that I am the subject of the king of Italy, and from him I am to receive instructions as to the way I should exercise the civil power. I say I am liberated from

The exposure of the enormous insolence and the greedy grasp of these papal pretensions began to tell, not only upon the minds of scholars and of intelligent private Roman-catholics, but upon practical statesmen. It had been in vain that before and during the sitting of the Council, efforts had been made to combine the administrators of European governments in an effort to discourage the enactment of a dogma fraught with such political mischiefs. They were averse to any

all civil subjection, that my Lord made me the subject of no one on earth, king or otherwise; that in His right I am sovereign. I acknowledge no civil superior, I am the subject of no prince, and I claim more than this—I claim to be the Supreme Judge and director of the consciences of men; of the peasant that tills the field and the prince that sits on the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms—I am the sole last Supreme Judge of what is right and wrong.”

The practical political bearing of this theory, now become the law of the church, may be illustrated by two facts occurring in a single American diocese.

In February, 1856, the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Toronto declared in a pastoral letter: “Catholic electors in this country who do not use their *electoral power* in behalf of separate schools are guilty of mortal sin. Likewise parents not making the sacrifices necessary to secure such schools, or sending their children to mixed schools.

“Moreover, the confessor who should give absolution to such parents, *electors*, or *legislators* as *support mixed schools* to the prejudice of separate schools would be guilty of a mortal sin.”

Accordingly, on the 6th of July, 1856, this bishop excommunicated Messrs. Couchon, Cartier, Lemieux, and Drummond, members of the Canadian Parliament, for not voting straight in respect to education and legacies to priests. [Romanism as it Is, pp. 520, 521, 586.]

The influence of the hierarchy and the confessional on nominations, elections, and legislation is generally a secret, even from many of the faithful, who stoutly and honestly declare that it does not exist. Ordinarily it is revealed to outsiders only by its effects, which are sometimes startling enough, as the history of New York city shows.

interference with the mere enunciation of abstract propositions at a distance. But it could no longer be disguised that the question whether Cæsar was to have the things that are Cæsar's, was coming to a practical issue. The hierarchy of Germany, led by the archbishop of Munich, hastened to oppose the letter of Dr. Döllinger with two pastorals under their joint signatures, addressed, one to the clergy and the other to the laity, asserting the binding authority of the Vatican decrees, denouncing theological science in Germany as unfaithful to the church, and nervously denying that the Roman dogmas could be dangerous to civil governments—the charge was “a calumny.” But one thing was evident, alike from the attack and from the defence and disclaimer, to wit, that once more the hierarchy had waked up against itself an old antagonist within the church, which more than once before had encountered its fiercest terrors without flinching, and put a barrier to its exorbitant pretensions. This antagonist was *The Catholic Universities*.

The summary proceedings against the venerable Döllinger had the effect to draw forth some indications of sympathy and coöperation from the insulted governments, and to rally about him thoughtful, scholarlike, and courageous men, willing to share the persecution which might be inflicted on him for the declaration of facts which were as well known to themselves as to him. The answer to the bishops' pastorals, published in June, 1871, stood in the name, not of Dr. Döllinger alone, but of more than thirty persons, eminent in church or state, or in literature and science. It was as follows :

DECLARATION OF PROF. DÖLLINGER
AND HIS ASSOCIATES.

In view of the administrative measures and the manifestoes of the German bishops in support of the decrees of the Vatican, the undersigned deem it necessary to set forth in the following declaration the principles on which they act, and so far as in them lies, to offer some relief for the burden which is lying on men's consciences.

I. Faithful to the inviolable duty, incumbent on every Catholic Christian, of holding fast the ancient faith, and repelling every novelty, were it announced even by an angel from heaven—a duty not denied by the pope or the bishops—we persist in rejecting the dogmas of the Vatican. Never heretofore has it been a part of the doctrine of the church or of the Catholic faith, that every Christian should recognize in the pope an absolute master and sovereign to whom he is directly and immediately subject, and to whose envoys and legates he owes unconditional obedience in everything touching religious faith and practical morality. It is likewise notorious that down to the present day, it has never been the teaching of the church that the gift of infallibility has been granted to a man—that is, the pope for the time being—in the definitions which he addresses to the whole church on points of faith and on human rights and duties. On the contrary, these propositions, although in great favor at Rome and encouraged by all the means at the disposal of a dominant power, have hitherto been nothing but scholastic opinions, which the most renowned theologians have been at liberty to attack and repudiate without exposing themselves to the slightest censure. It is notorious

(and if the German bishops do not know this, they ought to know it) that these doctrines owe their origin to falsehood, and their diffusion to violence. These doctrines, in the form in which they have been proclaimed by the pope in the Vatican decrees, strip the community of believers of its essential rights, deprive its testimony of all value, destroy the authority of ecclesiastical tradition and the fundamental principles of the Catholic faith, according to which Christians are bound to believe nothing but what has been taught and believed always, everywhere, and by all : *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*. Notwithstanding the late pastoral of the German bishops affirms that Peter has spoken by the mouth of the pope, proclaiming himself infallible, we are bound to repel such a pretension as a blasphemy. Peter speaks to us, clearly and intelligibly to every one, in his acts and his speeches related by the holy Scriptures, and in his epistles, which are addressed to us as well as to the first believers. These acts, speeches and epistles are animated by a totally different spirit, and contain a very different doctrine from that which it is now sought to impose upon us. The attempt has been made, it is true, to mitigate these new doctrines, which in their crudity and their incalculable sweep wound all the Christian feelings ; and it has been sought to persuade the people that they have always been believed, and that they cover no ensnaring consequences. Just as before, in other circumstances, so in the late pastoral, great pains have been taken to present the infallibility spoken of in the new decrees as a prerogative pertaining to the whole *magisterium* of the church, composed of pope and bishops. But this interpretation is in contradiction to the clear and literal sense of these decrees, according

to which the pope exclusively, and by himself alone, is infallible ; he it is to whom the assistance of the Holy Ghost is given, and who in his decisions remains completely independent of the judgment of the bishops, so that their assent to every papal decision whatsoever is henceforth obligatory, and cannot be refused. However the German bishops may argue that the *plenitude of power* with which he is invested by the Vatican decrees cannot be considered as a power unlimited and extending to everything, because the exercise of it is restrained by revealed doctrine and the divine constitution of the church, they might as well argue that unlimited and despotic power does not exist anywhere in the world, even among the Mohammedans, because the sultan and the shah of Persia themselves acknowledge that their power is limited by the law of God and the dogmas of the Koran. By the new decrees the pope is not only invested with dominion over the whole field of morality, but he determines—still by himself alone, and with the authority of an infallible master—what does and what does not belong to this domain, what principles are of divine obligation, and also what interpretation and application it is best to give to them in particular cases. In the exercise of this authority, the pope is not bound to receive any approval outside of himself ; he is accountable to no one on earth, and no one may oppose him. Every one, prince or peasant, bishop or layman, is obliged to submit without condition, and obey without contradiction his every command. If such a power cannot be called unlimited and despotic, there never has been unlimited and despotic power in the world, and there never will be.

II. We persist in our profound conviction that the Vatican decrees constitute a serious peril to the state

and to society ; that they are incompatible with the laws and institutions of modern states, and that in accepting them we should be entering into an irreconcilable conflict with our political duties and oaths. In vain do the bishops labor, whether by affecting to be ignorant of them, or by attempting to interpret them in their own fashion, to destroy the incontestable fact of the existence of bulls and pontifical decisions which subject all powers to the will of the apostolic see, and which condemn in the most absolute way the laws most indispensable to the existence of modern society. The bishops are perfectly well aware that, by virtue of the Vatican decrees, they have no right to restrict pontifical decisions, whether old or recent, by artificial interpretations, and that the contradictory explanation of one solitary Jesuit will outweigh that of a hundred bishops. In this very matter, the interpretations of the German bishops are in opposition to those of other prelates, particularly those of the archbishop of Westminster, Manning, who gives to the papal infallibility the widest imaginable extent.* And consequently, notwithstanding the reproaches addressed to us by the bishops, we consider ourselves fully warranted in saying that an infallibility such as it is wished to ascribe to the pope, and to him alone, without the intervention of any other party, should be styled a *personal* infallibility. This expression is perfectly exact, and in accordance with the usage of speech, in which we commonly call that power *personal* which is possessed and exercised by a monarch independently of the other authorities of the state. Thus, too, an official prerogative is called *personal* when it is so strictly and inseparably attached to a person that he can neither divest

* See above, p. 229.

himself of it nor delegate it to others. When we compare (which the German bishops have neglected to do) the condemnations pronounced in the *Syllabus*, (which has now become a decree invested with the papal infallibility,) the solemn condemnation by the pope of the Austrian constitution, the simultaneous publications of the Jesuits of Laach, Vienna, and Rome, who are much better informed than the German bishops on the intentions of the Roman Curia—when we compare all these with the Vatican decrees, we must be blind not to see an ably-concerted plan for the universal monarchy of the popes. Our governments, our laws, and our political constitutions, everything pertaining to morality, the actions of each individual—everything, must henceforth be submitted to the Roman Curia, its organs, and its legates, whether fixed or itinerant, whether bishops or Jesuits. Sole legislator in matters of faith, discipline, and morals, supreme judge, sovereign, and irresponsible executioner of his own sentences, the pope, by virtue of the new doctrine, possesses such a plenitude of power, that the most ardent imagination can conceive of none greater. The German bishops might well lay to heart the golden words pronounced at Munich by the Franciscan Occam in a situation analogous to our own: “If the bishop of Rome possessed a plenitude of power such as the popes falsely lay claim to, and such as many, through mistake, or in the spirit of adulation concede to them, all men would be slaves; and this is plainly contrary to the liberty of the gospel law.”

III. We appeal to the testimony involuntarily borne by the German bishops themselves to the justice of our cause. If we openly and directly reject the new doctrine which makes the pope universal bishop and abso-

lute master of every Christian in the whole domain of morals—that is to say, of everything that one may or may not do—the bishops, for their part, prove, by the different and contradictory interpretations given in their pastoral letters, that they apprehend clearly enough the novel character of this doctrine, and the repugnance it excites, and they make it plain that, at the last analysis, they are ashamed of it themselves. Not a man of them has had the courage to follow the example of Manning and the Jesuits, and give the Vatican decrees their simple and natural sense.* But they forget that if they were to apply to the other decrees on matters of faith efforts like those they employ in their pastorals in order to extenuate the meaning of those now in question, they would soon shake the solidity and unity of doctrine, and produce a general sense of insecurity and uncertainty throughout the whole domain of faith. In fact, what would be left of certainty and assurance in the decisions of the church, old or new, if they were all to be treated in the method employed by the late pastorals for the interpretation of the bull of Boniface VIII.,† and if people were to fall into as flat a contradiction as they have in the present case, with the literal sense of the decisions and their manifest intention? We deplore such a use of the teaching power of the bishops. Still more profoundly do we deplore that these bishops have not been ashamed, in a pastoral addressed to the Catholic laity, to respond to the outcry of the consciences of their people by insults to reason and learning. Truly, when we look

[* So far as we are aware, this disposition to mince the matter is as prevalent among the American bishops as among the German.]

[† The bull *Unam Sanctam*. See Abp. Kenrick, p. 125, above.]

back from these men who seem to know no higher duty than that of blind obedience, towards their venerable predecessors in the episcopate—like Cyprian, Athanasius, and Augustine—we feel that we have better excuse than ever St. Bernard had for letting slip that sorrowful exclamation : *Quis nobis dabit videre Ecclesiam sicut erat in diebus antiquis?**

IV. We repel the threats of the bishops as being out of accordance with law, and their despotic measures as not being valid nor binding. In other times, throughout the whole church, the maxim was held in great respect, that whenever it was possible to show the time of the first appearance of any doctrine, it was a sure proof that the doctrine was false. Now this is precisely the fact in the case of the new doctrine of papal infallibility. We can fix exactly the date of its appearance, the persons who conceived it, and the interests which it was made to subserve. In former times, when popes and bishops cut off from the communion of the church the authors and abettors of an anti-Catholic doctrine, they vindicated themselves mainly by the novelty of the doctrine, and its opposition to the old traditional faith ; and by this fact, so obvious and easy to be proved, that their opinion had not been theretofore received as part of the divine revelation, the excommunicates might be convinced of the justice of the sentence pronounced against them by the church. Now, on the contrary, for the first time (no other example of it can be found in the course of eighteen centuries) excommunication is fulminated against men, not for maintaining and propagating a new doctrine, but because they would preserve the ancient faith as they

[* “Who will show us the church as it used to be in old times?”]

have received it from their parents and their teachers in the school and in the church, and are not willing to accept a different doctrine, nor change their faith as they do their garments. It is the general teaching of the fathers of the church, that an unjust excommunication does not harm him who suffers it, but only him who pronounces it; and that, on the contrary, God turns into a source of grace the sufferings of those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake. We know that such condemnations are as invalid and destitute of binding force as they are unjust, and that consequently they cannot deprive believers of their right to the means of grace instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, nor take from priests the faculty of dispensing them. We are resolved, therefore, that we will not suffer ourselves to be robbed of our rights by censures inflicted in the interest of false doctrines.

V. We live in the hope that the conflict which has broken out shall be, under the direction of Providence, a means of realizing the reformation so long desired, and now become inevitable, in ecclesiastical affairs, both in the constitution and in the life of the church. As we look towards the future we are cheered and comforted amid the bitter trials of the present confusion. If at present we meet, in all parts of the church, abuses without measure, which, fortified and put beyond the reach of cure by the triumph of the Vatican dogmas, might grow in time to such dimensions as to choke all Christian life—if we perceive with grief the tendency towards a centralization which paralyzes the mind, and towards a mechanical uniformity—if we consider the ever-growing incapacity of the hierarchy, which knows nothing else to do but to oppose the immense intellectual movement of the present age with

conventional phrases and impotent imprecations—on the other hand our courage revives at the remembrance of better times, and we put our trust in the divine Ruler of the church. Looking to the past as well as to the future, we see before us the vision of the regenerated church restored to its true ideal—to that condition in which every civilized people of the Catholic communion, without prejudice to its union with the universal church, but liberated from the yoke of arbitrary domination, shall order and perfect its own ecclesiastical constitution in accordance with its own character, and in harmony with its peculiar mission of civilization, through the agreement and mutual coöperation of clergy and laity; and in which all Catholic Christendom shall be placed under the direction of a primacy and an episcopacy which, through their learning and the active part which they shall take in the public life of the people, shall gain the knowledge and capacity needful to reconquer for the church and permanently to secure for her the only place worthy of her—the place she ought to hold at the head of universal civilization. By this course, and not by the decrees of the Vatican, shall we make progress towards the supreme end assigned to Christian development, that is, the reunion of the other Christian communions now separated from us—a union desired and promised by the Founder of the church, and longed-for and demanded with an ever-increasing ardor by numberless Christian believers, both in Germany and elsewhere. May God grant it to us!*

* Not having the original of this document at hand, we have translated from the authorized French version published in connection with the manifesto of Father Hyacinthe, "*Ma foi et ma conscience*," by Dentu, Paris.

The combat entered upon in such sober earnest could not but grow more and more active, and by its relation to material and secular interests compel the attention of the civil government, and of that part of the public to whom its merely religious aspect had no interest. One of the earliest documents of the controversy was the work of Professor Von Schulte of Prague, one of the first scholars in Europe in Canon Law—a work which deals specially with the relations of the irreparably divided Catholic church of Germany to the state and to the church property, claiming that the *Old Catholics*, as the anti-infallibilist party began to be called, were the true representatives of that institution which the state had recognized as its established church, and the successors to its “good will” and effects.*

In presence of a revolt so resolute and serious, Rome could not but anathematize and excommunicate. Her imprecations fell like hail upon the ranks of the Old Catholic party. Priests were suspended or deposed, schoolmasters were removed from office, profes-

* A brief notice is given in *The Nation* of November 2, 1871, of an article in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, probably from the distinguished pen of the editor, Von Sybel, which “discusses the Vatican Council from the point of view in general of Döllinger and the anti-infallibilists. After a sketch of the history of the Council and of the dogma of infallibility—in which the striking point is made that this was the first Council in which only ecclesiastics sat, and, since the *theologians* were excluded, only the higher clergy—the writer proceeds to speak of the future. He shows that the treaty which has heretofore existed between church and state assumes the Confession of Trent as its basis. If the church discards this traditional character, and its relation to the state and to other confessions is essentially altered, the contract is virtually broken, and the other party is freed from all its obligations. It is for Germany to say, then, whether the primacy of Rome is any longer to be acknowledged.”

sors were stigmatized as heretical, and students warned against their teachings. Every combination of influences was brought to bear to make sympathy with the obnoxious party costly and dangerous. "For the priest, it is poverty, dishonor under the ban of interdict and the thunderbolt of anathema, the loss of this ministry of the altar and of souls to which in youth he so joyously offered himself a sacrifice. For the layman it is injury in the good name and estate which are not merely his, but which he holds jointly with his wife and as a trust for his children. If he is an officeholder, he compromises his promotion under an ultramontane administration. If he is a representative, he hazards his election; a physician or lawyer, his practice; a merchant, his business connection; a citizen in any relation, his consideration with a great number of his fellow-citizens. Must I mention, in conclusion, one thing more painful still?—he hazards the peace of his fireside and the sanctity of his shroud and bier!"*

In the great Roman-catholic state of Bavaria, and elsewhere in Germany, the governments refused to sustain the sentences of the hierarchy. Deposed ecclesiastics, like Friedrich and Döllinger, continued to be recognized as holding their former offices, or, as a more emphatic rebuke to the bishops, were advanced in dignity. And while schoolmasters, thrust from their employment for refusing submission to the new dogma, were restored and protected by the state, those bishops who had hastened to promulgate the Vatican decrees without the consent of the government, were sharply admonished that they had rendered themselves liable to pains and penalties for violation of public law. Thus

* Speech of Father Hyacinthe at the Old Catholic Conference, Munich, September 23, 1871.

Peter once more found that he who takes the secular sword may perish by the sword.

But a far more important matter than the attitude of the governments was the attitude of the peoples. And this was not slow in being manifested. Addresses of sympathy flowed in from every quarter to the men who were recognized as the leaders of the movement. To one of these were attached no less than twelve thousand signatures. And it was a notable thing to what a great extent these signatures represented, not in all cases the nobility or the wealth of the continent, but its thoughtfulness and learning. The new growth had struck deep root in the universities. As if to emphasize the distinctive character of the struggle as an antagonism between ignorant devotion and enlightened faith, the bishops attempted to offset the moral effect of the multitudes of the Old Catholic addresses and popular assemblies, by gathering mass-meetings, which were made up in large proportion of that ignorant peasantry on whom the grasp of a priesthood is always found to be strongest.

The growing movement necessitated a general conference for consultation; and the assembling of such a body at Munich in September, 1871, marks the close of the brief but momentous first chapter of the yet unwritten and unenacted history of the Old Catholic church after its disruption from the Vatican or Neo-Catholic church.

Of this meeting, it is sufficient that we record the document which, after long and serious debate, was finally adopted as a

PROGRAMME OF THE ANTI-INFALLIBILITY LEAGUE.

1. A proper sense of our religious duties compels us to cling to the Old Catholic faith as laid down in Holy Writ and tradition, and to the Old Catholic forms of divine service. We therefore regard ourselves as legitimate members of the Catholic church, and will not be expelled from that church, nor do we renounce any of the civil or ecclesiastical rights belonging to it. As to the ecclesiastical penalties to which we have been subjected for adhering to the old faith, we declare them arbitrary and absurd; and shall not thereby be prevented from acknowledging ourselves and acting as true and conscientious sons of the church. Taking our stand upon the creed contained in the Symbol of Trent, we reject the dogmas proclaimed under the pontificate of Pio Nono as contrary to the doctrine of the church and to the principles which have prevailed since the first Council was assembled by the apostles; we more especially reject the dogma of infallibility and of the supreme, immediate, and ever-enduring jurisdiction of the pope.

2. We adhere to the old constitution of the church. We repudiate every attempt to restrict the right of the individual bishops to direct the religious concerns of their respective dioceses. We repudiate the doctrine contained in the Vatican decrees, that the pope is the only divinely-appointed exponent of ecclesiastical authority, such doctrine being at variance with the Canon of Trent, which teaches that the hierarchy consists of bishops, priests, and deacons, and that this hierarchy is instituted by God. We acknowledge the primacy of the Roman bishops as it has been acknowledged in

accordance with the testimony of Holy Writ, and by the testimony of the fathers and councils of the old undivided Christian church. We furthermore declare :

(a.) That more is required to define dogmas than the dictum of some temporary pope, backed by the consent, tacit or expressed, of the bishops, who have taken the oath of inviolable obedience to their primate. A dogma to be valid must be in accordance with Holy Writ and the old traditions of the church, such as they have been conveyed to us in the writings of the recognized fathers and decrees of the councils. Even an œcumenical council, though it were really œcumenical and possessed the formal qualifications which the late Vatican Council lacked, would not be entitled to enact decrees in opposition to the fundamental truths and the past history of the church ; nor would such illegal decrees be binding upon the members of the church, even though they had been passed unanimously. And we declare :

(b.) That the dogmatic decisions of a council must be in conformity with the religious belief of the Catholic people ; that they must agree with Catholic science and the original and traditional faith of the church. We reserve to the Catholic clergy and laity, as well as to theological scholars, the right to pronounce an opinion upon and protest against new dogmas.

3. Availing ourselves of the assistance of theological and canonical science, we aim at a reform of the church, which, in the spirit of the ancient church, is to do away with the abuses and short-comings now prevailing, and satisfy the legitimate wishes of the Catholic people for a regular and constitutional share in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs.

We maintain that the reproach of Jansenism is

unjustly cast upon the church of Utrecht, and that, accordingly, there is no difference of dogma between ourselves and that church.

We hope for reunion with the Greek, Oriental, and Russian churches, the separation of which from the Catholic church arose without any cogent reason, and is prolonged without there being any incompatibilities in dogma between us and them.

If these reforms are carried out, and the road of science and progressive Christian culture is steadily pursued, we expect that the time will come when an understanding will be effected with the various Protestant churches, as well as with the Episcopal churches of England and America.

4. In educating the Catholic clergy, we deem it indispensable that they should be introduced to the study of theological science. Considering that the clergy exercise a great influence upon the intellectual condition of the people, and that we all are alike interested in possessing a pious, moral, intelligent, and patriotic clergy, we deem it dangerous that candidates for clerical honors should be brought up in a state of artificial seclusion from the culture of the age, as is now the case in the seminaries and other similar institutions directed by the bishops. We demand a dignified position and protection from hierarchical tyranny for the members of the lower clergy. We deprecate the practice recently adopted by the bishops, in imitation of the French law, of arbitrarily removing clergymen from one parish to another; (*amovibilitas ad nutum.*)

5. We are faithful to the political constitutions of our various states, because they guarantee civil liberty and the advance of the humanizing culture of mankind. We therefore reject, from motives alike con-

nected with the politics of the day and the history of civilization, the treasonable doctrine of papal supremacy, and promise to stand by our respective governments in their struggle against ultramontane principles as reduced to dogma in the Syllabus.

6. As the present disastrous division in the Catholic church has been notoriously brought about by the so-called Society of Jesus ; as this order is, moreover, abusing its power, infecting the hierarchy, the clergy, and the people with tendencies hostile to culture, orderly government, and national progress ; and as this order teaches and inculcates a false and corrupt system of morals ; we express our conviction that peace and prosperity, concord in the church, and the establishment of proper relations between church and society will be possible only after the injurious action of this order has been arrested.

7. As members of that Catholic church which cannot be altered by the late decrees of the Vatican, and which has had its existence guaranteed and protected by the various states, we maintain a right to the secular property of the church.

8. Bearing in mind that in the programme drawn up at Munich last Whitsuntide* we have already reserved our right, in the anomalous condition in which we are placed, to have the ceremonies of the church performed by priests under ecclesiastical censure ; that in the same programme some of those priests have declared their willingness to perform those functions ; that we are justified, by necessity, in thus going back to the apostolical times, when there were no distinct parishes ; that the having recourse to such priestly action is dependent on local circumstances and indi-

* See above, pp. 232-240.

vidual wants ; that until such changes in the law can be effected as will satisfy these wants, Catholics adhering to the old faith of their church cannot be left without the legal benefit of certain ecclesiastical acts, the Catholic Congress resolves :

(*a.*) That in all places where the want is felt, regular parish priests shall be appointed, the question whether there is a want being left to the decision of the local committees.

(*b.*) We claim to have our priests recognized by the secular authorities as entitled to perform those religious functions on which civil rights are based, in accordance with the existing legislation of many states.

(*c.*) The various governments are to be petitioned to accord us these rights.

(*d.*) Having been placed in the condition in which we find ourselves, every Old Catholic is entitled to ask foreign bishops to perform the said functions for him ; and when the right moment has come, we shall be justified in procuring a regular episcopal jurisdiction.

The paragraph of the foregoing paper most significant of immediate results, is the last, or eighth. It formed no part of the original draft brought before the conference by a committee of five great Catholic scholars, led by Döllinger. The thought of the decisive and almost irrevocable organic separation from that vast corporation which they had all their lives been wont to identify with the kingdom of God on earth, was utterly distressing to them ; and when the addition was moved, they opposed it with all their might. Argument and persuasion might have failed to change their determination. But what these could not have done was wrought by the malice of their enemies, blind-

ly working out the plans of God's providence. Eighty parishes, which very early in the history of the controversy had declared their adhesion to the party of liberty, were lying under interdict; the dead were refused Christian burial, and there were none to solemnize the rites of baptism and marriage. There was no alternative.

From the beginning, this work had marched on to this point under the guidance of no human forethought, its most active promoters seeming bound by a power that carried them whither they would not. Its chief human promoters have been, in fact, its enemies, "howbeit they thought not so." The history of its brief past helps us indistinctly to forecast its future, and to prophesy that the main interest of the Programme, which proposes to limit this new growth of religious thought by the Canons of Trent, will be mainly interesting to the future historian as an historic landmark from which to measure its advancement.

Thus, briefly, in a single one of its aspects, have we traced the history of two of the most momentous years in ecclesiastical history. And if our hearts and sympathies have constantly been with those who in the great pending struggle have been the champions of personal and national and ecclesiastical liberty, and of scriptural and historical truth, we would not do injustice to those on the other side who may have been fighting for conscience' sake. It is possible for us to recognize the fact which they behold so clearly, but which, with happy inconsistency, the "Liberal Catholic" is unable to perceive—that despotism, spiritual and secular, and falsehood to science and to history, are the logical result of the premises with which they

start. We cannot refuse our respect to a certain moral dignity in the course of those whose steady advocacy of the fatal dogmas was not actuated by the spirit of faction nor by the solicitation and corruption of the Roman court, but by a steadfast fidelity to those wretched principles which find their logical fulfilment only in just such conclusions. There is something to admire in the unmoved resolution with which, under such convictions, they went forward, in the face of signs of coming disaster that even a child could read, to enunciate and promulgate the blasphemous dogma which they were warned would revolt the intellect and conscience of even Roman-catholic Christendom.

The only parties in the business towards whom it is impossible even for charity to find some feeling of respect, are the corrupt abettors of the dogma; and those of its opposers who, having known and declared it to be a falsehood, nevertheless proclaim their submission to it, and under the threat of Rome consent to lend their active aid to enforce upon other men this "strong delusion, that they should believe a lie."