

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY  
AND  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES, No. 8.—OCTOBER, 1873.

---

ART. I.—THE MODERN ENGLISH PULPIT.

By Rev. W. H. LORD, D.D., Montpelier, Vt.

IN order to prepare the reader to appreciate our estimate of the Modern English Pulpit, we shall first give some illustrations of the natural correspondence between the physical and intellectual character of a people and their religious faith and teaching. Each national mood of mind or tribal idiosyncrasy brings its own special mode of want and supply. John Knox would have been impossible in Athens, and Jeremy Taylor could not have lived in Paris. The ultimate seat of human faith lies deep below all national or tribal propensities, but the modes in which religious faith manifests and interprets itself are widely various. Ere faith comes to the surface and crystallizes itself in concrete shape, its type and color will be affected by the strata of thought and feeling through which it emerges into light. The ideas and forms of national life will therefore more or less affect the interpretation and disclosure of the same faith. The national character determines the character of its preachers. It is very rare, and then only in some grand exceptions, like Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles, that a preacher, celebrated in one nation, is equally celebrated in another. An exotic preacher, unless he is very tough and hardy, rarely flourishes out of his native soil. Lebanon is the place for cedars and Elim for palm trees, while the sombre olive thrives best along the slopes of the Mediterranean hills.

And to a great extent the order and constitution of churches are determined by the traditions and peculiarities of national life. The Romish Church, inheriting the apparel and household

## ART. IV.—THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

*Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni 1870.* Gesammelt und herausgegeben von Dr. JOHANN FRIEDRICH, Professor der Theologie in München. Nördlingen, 1871. 2 Parts, pp. 316 and 437.

*Sammlung der Actenstücke zum ersten Vaticanischen Concil mit einem Grundrisse der Geschichte desselben* von EMIL FRIEDBERG, ordentl. Professor der Rechte an der Universität Leipzig. Tübingen, 1872. pp. 954.

*Geschichte und Kritik des Vaticanischen Concils von 1869 und 1870*, von Lic. Theol. THEODOR FROMMANN, Privatdocent an der Universität Berlin. Gotha, 1873. pp. 529.

THE stenographic reports of the proceedings of the Vatican Council are locked up in the archives of the Vatican, and are not likely to see the light of day for some time to come. But in spite of the strict secrecy imposed upon the fathers of the Council, the main facts and speeches were made known by the enterprise or indiscretion of members and their friends of both parties. During the Council full reports were published by the editors of the *Civiltà cattolica* at Rome, and the *Paris Univers* of Veuillot, on the part of the Infallibilists, and in the *Letters of Quirinus*, on the part of the anti-Infallibilists or Old Catholics. After the Council, Professor Friedrich, a colleague of Dr. Döllinger, issued his *Diary*, and a collection of *Documents*, which furnish an inside view of this important event. And now we have two complete and impartial histories of the Vatican Council by Protestant scholars. Friedberg, Professor of ecclesiastical law at Leipzig, gives us a collection of all the important documents, with a sketch of the history of the Council from the beginning to its close. Frommann, Private Lecturer on Theology in the University of Berlin, has written a critical history of the Council on the basis of the official documents and private reports.

More than three hundred years after the close of the Council of Trent, Pius IX., who had proclaimed the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception, who in the presence of five hundred Bishops had celebrated the eighteenth centennial of the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and who was permitted to survive not only the golden wedding of his priesthood, but even

—alone among his more than two hundred and fifty predecessors—the silver wedding of his popedom (thus falsifying the tradition “*non videbit annos Petri*”) resolved to convoke a new oecumenical council, which was to proclaim his own infallibility in all matters of faith and discipline, and thus to put the top-stone to the pyramid of the Roman hierarchy.

He first intimated his intention, June 26, 1867, in an Allocution to five hundred Bishops who were assembled at the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter in Rome. The Bishops in a most humble and obsequious response, July 1, 1867, approved of his heroic courage, to employ, in his old age, an extreme measure for an extreme danger, and predicted a new splendor of the Church, and a new triumph of the kingdom of God. Whereupon the Pope announced to them that he would convene the Council under the special auspices of the Immaculate Virgin, who had crushed the serpent’s head and was mighty to destroy alone all the heresies of the world.

The call was issued by an encyclical commencing “*Æterni Patris Unigenitus Filius*,” in the 23rd year of his Pontificate, on the Feast of St. Peter and Paul, June 29, 1868. It created at once a universal commotion in the Christian world, and called forth a multitude of books and pamphlets even before the Council convened. The highest expectations were suspended by the Pope and his sympathizers on the coming event. What the Council of Trent had effected against the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, the Council of the Vatican was to accomplish against the more radical and dangerous foe of modern liberalism and rationalism, which threatened to undermine Romanism itself in its own strongholds. It was to crush the power of infidelity, and to settle all that belongs to the doctrine, worship and discipline of the Church, and the eternal salvation of souls. It was even hoped that the Council might become a feast of general reconciliation to divided Christendom; and hence the Greek schismatics and the Protestant heretics and other non-Catholics were invited by two special letters of the Pope (Sept. 8 and Sept. 13, 1868) to return, on this auspicious occasion, to “the only sheep-fold of Christ,” for the salvation of their souls.

But the Eastern Patriarchs spurned the invitation as an insult to their time-honored rights and traditions, from which they

could not depart. The Protestant communions either ignored or respectfully declined it.

Thus the Vatican Council, like that of Trent, turned out to be simply a general Roman Council, and apparently put the prospect of a reunion of Christendom further off than ever before.

While these sanguine expectations of Pius IX. were doomed to disappointment, the chief object of the Council was attained in spite of the strong opposition of the minority of liberal Catholics. This object, which for reasons of propriety is omitted in the bull of convocation and other preliminary acts, but clearly stated by the organs of the ultramontane or Jesuitical party, was nothing less than the proclamation of the personal *Infallibility of the Pope*, as a binding article of the Roman Catholic faith for all time to come. Herein lies the whole importance of the Council; all the rest dwindles into insignificance and could never have justified its convocation.

After extensive and careful preparations, the first (and perhaps the last) Vatican Council was solemnly opened amid the sound of innumerable bells and the cannon of St. Angelo, but under frowning skies and a pouring rain, on the festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Dec. 8, 1869, in the Basilica of the Vatican. It reached its height at the fourth public session, July 18, 1870, when the decree of Papal Infallibility was proclaimed. After this it dragged on a sickly existence till October 20, 1870, when it was adjourned till November 11, 1870, but afterward indefinitely postponed on account of the change in the political situation of Europe. For on the second of September the French Empire, which had been the main support of the temporal power of the Pope, collapsed with the surrender of Napoleon III. at the old Huguenot stronghold of Sedan to the Protestant King William of Prussia, and on the twentieth of September the Italian troops, in the name of King Victor Emanuel, took possession of Rome, as the future capital of united Italy. Whether the Council will ever be convened again to complete its vast labors, like the twice interrupted Council of Trent, remains to be seen. But in proclaiming the personal infallibility of the Pope, it made all future œcumenical Councils unnecessary for the definition of dogmas and the regulation of discipline, so that hereafter they will be

empty ritualistic shows. The acts of the Vatican Council as far as they go are irrevocable.

The attendance was larger than that of any of its eighteen predecessors, and presented an imposing array of hierarchical dignity and power. The whole number of prelates of the Roman Catholic Church who are entitled to a seat in an œcumenical Council, is 1037. Of these there were present at the opening of the council 719, *viz.* 49 Cardinals, 9 Patriarchs, 4 Primates, 121 Archbishops, 479 Bishops, 57 Abbots and Generals of Monastic Orders. This number afterward increased to 764, *viz.*, 49 Cardinals, 10 Patriarchs, 4 Primates, 105 diocesan Archbishops, 22 Archbishops *in partibus infidelium*, 424 diocesan Bishops, 98 Bishops *in partibus*, and 52 Abbots and Generals of Orders, etc. Distributed according to continents, 541 of these belonged to Europe, 83 to Asia, 14 to Africa, 113 to America, 13 to Oceanica. At the proclamation of the decree of Papal Infallibility, July 18, 1870, the number was reduced to 535, and afterward it dwindled down to 200 or 180. Among the many nations represented the Italians had a vast plurality of 276, of whom 143 belonged to the former Papal States alone. France, with a much larger Roman Catholic population, had only 84, Austria 141, Hungary 48, Spain 41, Great Britain 35, Germany 19, the United States 48, Mexico 10, Switzerland 8, Belgium 6, Holland 4, Portugal 2, Russia 1. The disproportion between the representatives of the different nations and the number of their constituents was overwhelmingly in favor of the Papal influence. More than one-half of the fathers were entertained during the Council at the expense of the Pope.

The Romans themselves were remarkably indifferent to the Council, though keenly alive to the financial gain, which the dogma of the Infallibility of their sovereign would bring to the the Eternal City and the impoverished Papal treasury. It is well known how soon after the Council they voted almost in a body against the temporal power of the Pope, and for their new master.

The strictest secrecy was enjoined upon the members of the Council. The world was only to know the final results as proclaimed in the public sessions, until it should please the Roman court to issue an official history. But the freedom of the press

in the nineteenth century, and the elements of discord in the Council itself, frustrated the precaution.

The subject matter for deliberation was divided into four parts: on Faith, Discipline, Religious Orders and on Rites, including Missions. Each part was assigned to a special commission (*Congregatio* or *Deputatio*) consisting of 24 Prelates elected by ballot for the whole period of the Council, with a presiding Cardinal appointed by the Pope. These commissions prepared the decrees on the basis of *schemata* previously drawn up by learned divines and canonists, and confidentially submitted to the Bishops in print. The decrees were then discussed, revised and adopted in secret sessions by the general congregation (*congregationes generales*) including all the forty-five fathers, with five presiding Cardinals appointed by the Pope. The general congregation held 89 sessions in all. Finally the decrees thus matured were voted upon and solemnly promulgated in public sessions in the presence and by the authority of the Pope.

There were only four such public sessions held during the ten months of the Council, viz. the opening session, Dec. 8, 1869, which was a mere formality, but of a ritualistic splendor and magnificence such as can be gotten up nowhere on earth but in St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome; the second session, Jan. 6, 1870, where the fathers simply professed each one before the Pope the Nicene Creed and the Profession of the Tridentine Faith; the third session, April 24, 1870, when the dogmatic constitution on the Catholic faith was unanimously adopted; and the fourth session, July 18, 1870, when the dogmatic constitution on the Church of Christ and the Infallibility of the Pope was adopted with two dissenting votes.

The management of the Council was entirely in the hands of the Pope and his dependent Cardinals and Jesuitical advisers. He originated the topics which were to be acted on; he selected the preparatory committees of theologians (mostly of the ultramontane school) who, during the winter of 1868-69, drew up the *schemata*; he appointed the presiding officers of the four Deputations, and of the General Congregation; and he proclaimed the decrees in his own name with the approval of the Council. He even personally interfered, during the proceedings, in favor of his new dogma, by praising Infallibilists and by ignoring or rebuking anti-Infallibilists. The discussion could be virtually arrested

by the presiding Cardinals at the request of only ten members; we say virtually, for although it required a vote of the Council, a majority was always sure. The revised order of business, issued Feb. 22, 1870, departed even from the old rule requiring moral unanimity in definitions of faith, (according to the celebrated canon, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est,*) and substituted for it a mere numerical majority, which was necessary to secure the triumph of the Infallibility decree in view of a powerful minority. Nothing could be printed in Rome against Infallibility; while the organs of Infallibility had full freedom to print and publish what they pleased. Such prominence of the Pope is characteristic of a Council convoked for the very purpose of proclaiming his personal infallibility, but is without precedent in history (except in some mediæval Councils); even the Council of Trent maintained its own dignity and comparative independence.

This want of freedom of the Council—not to speak of the strict police surveillance over the members—was severely censured by liberal Catholics. More than one hundred Prelates of all nations signed a strong protest (dated Rome, March 1, 1870) against the order of business, especially against the majority vote, and expressed the fear that in the end the authority of this Council might be impaired as wanting in truth and liberty—a calamity so direful in these uneasy times, that a greater could not be imagined. But this protest, like all the acts of the minority, was ignored.

The proceedings were of course in the official language of the Roman Church, which all Prelates could understand and speak, but very few with sufficient ease to do justice to themselves and their subjects. The difference of pronounciation proved a great inconvenience, and the Continentals complained that they could not understand the English Latin.

The Council, upon the whole, compares favorably as to intellectual ability, moral character, and far-reaching effect, with preceding Roman Councils, and must be regarded as the greatest event in the history of the Papacy since the Council of Trent. It embraced much learning and eloquence, especially on the part of the French and German episcopate.

On the other hand, it had its full share of ignorance, superstition, bigotry and passion, which considerably detract from its

moral dignity and weight. The following characteristic episode is authenticated by the concurrent testimonies of Lord Acton, the pseudonymous Quirinus, Professor Friedrich, and the author of the French work, *Ce qui se passe au Concile*. When Bishop Strossmayer, the boldest member of the opposition, and an eloquent Latinist, in a session of the General Congregation (March 22), spoke favorably of the great Leibnitz, and paid Protestants the poor compliment of honesty (quoting from St. Augustine; "*Errant sed bona fide errant*"), he was interrupted by the bell of the President (De Angelis) and his rebuke, "This is no place for praising Protestants" ("*hicce non est locus laudandi Protestantess*")! Very true, for the Council-hall was only a hundred paces from the Palace of the Inquisition. When, resuming, the speaker ventured to attack the principle of deciding questions of faith by mere majorities, he was more loudly interrupted from all sides by confused exclamations: "Shame! Shame! down with the heretic!" ("*Descendat ab ambone! Descendat! Hæreticus! Hæreticus! Damnamus eum! Damnamus!*") "Several Bishops sprang from their seats, rushed to the tribune, and shook their fists in the speaker's face" (Quirinus, p. 387). When one Bishop (Place, of Marseilles) interposed, "*Ego non damno!*" the cry was raised with increased fury: "*Omnes, omnes illum damnamus! damnamus!*" Strossmayer was forced by the uproar and the continued ringing of the bell to quit the tribune, but did so with a triple "*Protestor.*" The noise was so great that it could be heard in the interior of St. Peter's. Some thought the Garibaldians had broken in; others that Infallibility had been proclaimed, and shouted, according to their opposite views, either "Long live the Infallible Pope!" or "Long live the Pope, but not the infallible one" (comp. Quirinus and *Ce qui se passe*, p. 69). Quirinus says that the scene, "for dramatic force and theological significance exceeded almost anything in the past history of Councils" (p. 386), and that a Bishop of the United States said afterwards, "not without a sense of patriotic pride, that he knew now of one assembly still rougher than the Congress of his own country" (p. 388). Similar scenes of violence occurred in the œcumenical Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, but Christian civilization ought to have made some progress since the fifth century.



The chief importance of the Council of the Vatican lies in its decree on Papal supremacy and infallibility. It settled the internal dissensions between Ultramontanism and Gallicanism, which struck at the root of the fundamental principle of authority ; it destroyed the independence of the episcopate, and made it a tool of the primacy ; it crushed liberal Catholicism ; it completed the system of Papal absolutism ; it raised the hitherto disputed opinion of Papal Infallibility to the dignity of a binding article of faith, which no Catholic can deny without loss of salvation. The Pope may now say : *L'église c'est moi !*

But this very triumph of absolutism marks also a new departure. It gave rise to a secession headed by the ablest divines of the Roman Church. It put the Papacy into direct antagonism to the liberal tendencies of the age. It excited the hostility of civil government in all those countries where Church and State are united on the basis of a concordat with the Roman See. No State with any degree of self-respect can treat with a sovereign who claims infallibility and therefore unconditional submission in matters of moral duty as well as of faith. In reaching the summit of its power, the Papacy has hastened its downfall.

For Greeks and Protestants the Vatican Council is no more œcumenical than that of Trent, and has only intensified the antagonism. Its œcumenicity is even denied by such eminent Roman Catholic scholars as Döllinger, Von Schulte and Reinkens, because it lacked the two fundamental conditions of liberty of discussion and moral unanimity of suffrage. But the subsequent submission of all the Bishops who had voted against Papal Infallibility, supplied the defect as far as the Roman Church is concerned. There was nothing left to them but either to submit or to be expelled. They chose the former and thus destroyed the legal and moral force of their protest, although not the power of truth and the nature of the facts on which it was based. Henceforward Romanism must stand or fall with the Vatican Council. But (as we have before intimated) Romanism is not to be confounded with Catholicism any more than the Jewish hierarchy which crucified our Saviour is identical with the people of Israel from which sprang the apostles and early converts of Christianity. The destruction of the infallible and irreformable Papacy may

be the emancipation of Catholicism and lead it from its prison house to the light of a new reformation.

Three schemes on matters of faith were prepared for the Vatican Council, one against Rationalism, one on the Church of Christ, and one on Christian Matrimony. The first two were revised and adopted. The third was indefinitely postponed. There was also much discussion on the preparation of a small popular catechism adapted to the present doctrinal status of the Roman Church, and intended to supersede the numerous popular catechisms now in use ; but the draft, which assigned the whole teaching power of the Church to the Pope, to the exclusion of the Episcopate, encountered such opposition (57 *Non Placet*, 24 conditional *Placet*) in the provisional vote of May 4, that it was laid on the table and never called up again.

I. THE DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CATHOLIC FAITH (*constitutio dogmatica de fide catholica*).

It was unanimously adopted in the third public session, April 24 (*Dominica in albis*), 1870.

The original draft laid before the Council embraced eighteen chapters, on Pantheism, Rationalism, Scripture and tradition, revelation, faith and reason, the trinity, the two natures of Christ, the primitive state, original sin, the Christian redemption, the supernatural order of grace ; but it was laid aside. Archbishop Conolly, of Halifax, recommended that it should be decently buried.

In its present form the constitution on the Catholic faith is reduced to four chapters, with a proëmium and a conclusion. Ch. I. treats of God as the Creator ; ch. II. of Revelation ; ch. III. of Faith ; ch. IV. of Faith and Reason. Then follows eighteen canons in which the errors of Pantheism, Naturalism, and Rationalism are condemned in a manner substantially the same, though more clearly and fully than had been done in the first sections of the Syllabus.

The decree asserts, in the old scholastic terminology, the well-known principles of supernaturalism as held by orthodox Christians in all ages, but without the remotest idea of the freedom of science and its progress since the Council of Trent. Hence a liberal member of the Council, in the course of discussion, declared the *schema de fide* a work of supererogation. "What boots it," he said, "to condemn errors which have been

long condemned and tempt no Catholic. The false beliefs of mankind are beyond the reach of your decrees. The best defence of Catholicism is religious science. Encourage sound learning, and prove by deeds as well as words that it is the mission of the Church to promote among the nations liberty, light and true prosperity." On the other hand, the "*Univers*" called the scheme "a master-piece of clearness and force;" the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" sees in it "a reflex of the wisdom of God;" and Archbishop Manning thinks that its importance "cannot be over-estimated;" that it is "the broadest and boldest affirmation of the supernatural and spiritual order ever yet made in the face of the world; which is, now more than ever, sunk in sense and heavy with materialism." Whatever be the value of the positive principles of the schema, its popish head and tail reduce it to a *brutum fulmen* outside of the Romish Church, and even the most orthodox Protestants must apply to it the warning, *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*.

The preamble, even in its present modified form, derives modern rationalism and infidelity, as a legitimate fruit, from the heresies condemned by the Council of Trent, that is, from the Protestant Reformation; in the face of the fact patent to every scholar, that Protestant theology has been in the thickest of the fight with unbelief, and, notwithstanding all its excesses, has produced a far richer exegetical and apologetic literature than Romanism during the last three hundred years. The boldest testimony heard in this Council was directed against the preamble by Bishop Strossmayer, from the Turkish frontier, (March 22, 1870). He characterized the charge against Protestantism as neither just nor charitable. Protestants, he said, abhorred the errors condemned in the schema as much as Catholics. The germ of rationalism existed in the Catholic Church before the Reformation, especially in the humanism which was nourished in the very sanctuary by the highest dignitaries, and bore its worst fruits in the midst of a Catholic nation at the time of Voltaire and the the Encyclopedists. Catholics had produced no better refutation of the errors enumerated in the schema than such men as Leibnitz and Guizot. There were multitudes of Protestants in Germany, England and North America who loved our Lord Jesus Christ and had inherited from the shipwreck of faith positive truths and monuments of divine grace. Although this

speech was greeted with execrations, it had at least the effect that the objectionable preamble was somewhat modified.

The supplement of the decree binds all Catholics to observe also those constitutions and decrees by which such erroneous opinions as are not here specifically enumerated, have been proscribed and condemned by this Holy See. This might be so construed as to include all the eighty errors of the Syllabus. The minority, who in the General Congregation had voted only a conditional *Placet*, were quieted by the official assurance, that the addition involved no new dogma, and had a disciplinary rather than a didactic character. Some gave their votes with a heavy heart, conscious of the snare. Strossmayer stayed away. Thus a unanimous vote of 667 or 668 fathers was secured in the public session, and the Infallibility decree was virtually anticipated. The Pope, after proclaiming the dogma, gave the Bishops his benediction of peace, and gently intimated what he next expected from them.

## II. THE FIRST DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. (*Constitutio dogmatica prima de ecclesia Christi.*)

This was passed with two dissenting votes in the fourth public session, July 18, 1870. It treats, in four chapters, (1) of the institution of the Apostolic Primacy in the blessed Peter; (2) of the perpetuity of St. Peter's Primacy in the Roman Pontiffs; (3) of the power and nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff; (4) of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

The new features are contained in the last two chapters, which teach *Papal Absolutism*, and *Papal Infallibility*. The third chapter vindicates to the Roman Pontiff a superiority of *ordinary* episcopal (not simply an extraordinary primatial) power over all other churches, and an immediate jurisdiction, to which all Catholics, both pastors and people, are bound to submit in matters not only of faith and morals, but even of discipline and government. He is therefore the Bishop of Bishops over every single Bishop and over all Bishops put together; he is in the fullest sense the Vicar of Christ, and all Bishops are simply Vicars of the Pope. The fourth chapter teaches and defines, as a divinely revealed dogma, that the Roman Pontiff, when speaking from his chair, (*ex cathedra*) *i. e.* in his official capacity, to the Christian world on subjects relating to faith or morals, is infallible, and that such definitions are irreformable (*i. e.* final and irreversible) in and of

themselves, and not in consequence of the consent of the Church."\*

To appreciate the value and bearing of this decree, we must give a brief history of it.

The Infallibility question was suspended over the Council from the very beginning, as the question of questions, for good or for evil. The original plan of the infallibilists, to decide it by acclamation, had to be abandoned in view of a formidable opposition, which was developed inside and outside of the Council. The majority of the Bishops circulated early in January a monster petition, signed by 410 names, in favor of Infallibility. The Italians and the Spaniards circulated similar petitions separately. Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore, formerly an anti-infallibilist, prepared an address offering some compromise; to the effect that an appeal from the Pope to an œcumenical council should be reprovèd. But five counter-petitions signed by very weighty names, in all 137, representing various degrees of opposition, but agreed as to the *inopportunit*y of the definition, were sent in during the same month (Jan. 12th to 18th) by German and Austrian, Hungarian, French, American, Oriental, and Italian Bishops. The Pope received none of these addresses, but referred them to the Deputation on faith. While in this he showed his impartiality, he did not conceal, in a private way, his real opinion, and gave it the weight of his personal character and influence.

"Faith in his personal infallibility," says a well-informed Catholic, "and belief in a constant and special communication with the Holy Ghost, forms the basis of the character of Pius IX." In the Council itself, Archbishop Manning, the Anglican convert, was the most zealous, devout, and enthusiastic infalli-

\* "Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christianæ exordio perceptæ fideliter inhærendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis Catholicæ exaltationem et Christianorum populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse declaramus: *Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definenda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; utique ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ irreformabiles esse.*

'Si quis autem huic hostiæ definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat, præsumserit; anathema sit.'

bilist ; he is " more Catholic than Catholics " to the manor born, as the English settlers in Ireland were more Irish than the Irishmen, and altogether worthy to be the successor of Pius IX. in the chair of St. Peter. Both these eminent and remarkable persons show how sincere faith in a dogma which borders on blasphemy, may by a strange hallucination be combined with rare purity and amiability of character.

Besides the all-powerful aid of the Pope, whom no Bishop can disobey without fatal consequences, the infallibilists had the great advantage of perfect unity of sentiment and aim ; while the anti-infallibilists were divided among themselves, many of them being simply *inopportunist*s ; they professing to agree with the majority in principle or practice, and to differ from them only on the subordinate question of definability and opportunity. This qualified opposition had no weight whatever with the Pope, who was as fully convinced of the opportunity of the definition as he was of the dogma itself. And even the most advanced anti-infallibilists, as Kenrick, Hefele, and Strossmayer, were too much hampered by Romish traditionalism to plant their foot firmly on the Scriptures, which, after all, must decide all questions of faith.

In the meantime a literary war on Infallibility was carried on in the Catholic Church in Germany, France and England, and added to the commotion in Rome. A large number of pamphlets, written or inspired by prominent members of the Council, appeared for and against Infallibility. Distinguished outsiders, as Dollinger, Gratry, Hyacinthe, Montalembert and Newman, mixed in the fight, and strengthened the minority. The utterance of Dr. John Henry Newman, the intellectual leader of the Anglo-Catholic apostasy, and by far the ablest scholar among English Romanists, reveals a most curious state of mind, oscillating between absolute infallibilism and hopeless skepticism. In striking contrast with his admiring pupil, Manning, Dr. Newman thus unburdened his troubled heart to Bishop Ullathorne, of Birmingham (see his letter published ' by permission ' in the *Standard* of April 7, 1870) :

"Rome ought to be a name to lighten the heart at all times, and a Council's proper office is, when some great heresy or other evil impends, to inspire hope and confidence in the faithful ; but now we have the greatest meeting which ever has been, and that at Rome, infusing into us by the accredited

organs of Rome and of its partisans, such as the *Civiltà* (the *Armonia*) the *Univers*, and the *Tablet*, little else than fear and dismay. When we are all at rest, and have no doubts, and—at least practically, not to say doctrinally—hold the Holy Father to be infallible, suddenly there is thunder in the clearest sky, and we are told to prepare for something, we know not what, to try our faith, we know not how. No impending danger is to be averted, but a great difficulty is to be created. Is this the proper work for an œcumenical Council? As to myself personally, please God, I do not expect any trial at all; but I can not help suffering with the many souls who are suffering, and I look with anxiety at the prospect of having to defend decisions which may not be difficult to my own private judgment, but may be most difficult to maintain logically in the face of historical facts. What have we done to be treated as the faithful never were treated before? When has a definition *de fide* been a luxury of devotion, and not a stern, painful necessity? Why should an aggressive, insolent faction be allowed to ‘make the heart of the just sad, whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful?’ Why can not we be let alone when we have pursued peace and thought no evil? I assure you, my Lord, some of the truest minds are driven one way and another, and do not know where to rest their feet—one day determining ‘to give up all theology as a bad job,’ and recklessly to believe henceforth almost that the Pope is impeccable, at another tempted to ‘believe all the worst which a book like *Janus* says’; others doubting about ‘the capacity possessed by Bishops drawn from all corners of the earth to judge what is fitting for European society,’ and then, again, angry with the Holy See for listening to ‘the flattery of a clique of Jesuits, Redemptorists, and converts.’ Then, again, think of the store of Pontifical scandals in the history of eighteen centuries, which have partly been poured forth, and partly are still to come. What Murphy (a Protestant travelling preacher) inflicted upon us in one way, Mr. Veillot is indirectly bringing on us in another. And then, again, the blight which is falling upon the multitude of Anglican Ritualists, etc., who themselves, perhaps—at least their leaders—may never become Catholics, but are leavening the various English denominations and parties (far beyond their own range) with principles and sentiments tending towards their ultimate absorption into the Catholic Church. With these thoughts ever before me, I am continually asking myself whether I ought not to make my feelings public; but all I do is to pray those early doctors of the Church, whose intercession would decide the matter (Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Basil), to avert this great calamity. If it is God’s will that the Pope’s infallibility be defined, then is it God’s will to throw back ‘the times and moments’ of that triumph which he has destined for his kingdom, and I shall feel I have but to bow my head to his adorable, inscrutable Providence. You have not touched upon the subject yourself, but I think you will allow me to express to you feelings which, for the most part, I keep to myself. . . .”

After preliminary skirmishes the formal discussion began in earnest in the 50th session of the General Congregation, May

13, 1870, and lasted to the 86th General Congregation, July 16. About eighty Latin speeches were delivered in the general discussion on the schema *De Romano Pontifice*, nearly one-half of them on the part of the opposition, which embraced about one-fifth or sixth of the Council. When the arguments and the patience of the assembly were pretty well exhausted, the President, at the petition of a hundred and fifty bishops, closed the general discussion on the third day of June. About forty more bishops who had entered their names were thus prevented from speaking; but one of them, Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, published his strong argument against Infallibility in Naples. Then, it seems, five special discussions commenced on the Proœmium and the four chapters. For the fifth or last discussion a hundred and twenty bishops inscribed their names to speak; fifty of them were heard, until on both sides the burden became too heavy to bear; and, by mutual consent, a useless and endless discussion, from mere exhaustion, ceased.

When the vote was taken on the whole four chapters of the Constitution of the Church, July 13, 1870, in the 85th secret session of the General Congregation, (601 members being present) 451 voted *Placet*, 88 *non-Placet*, 62 *Placet juxta modum*, over 80 (perhaps 91), though present in Rome or in the neighborhood, abstained for various reasons from voting. Among the negative votes were the Prelates most distinguished for learning and position, as RAUSCHER, Cardinal Prince-Archbishop of Vienna, SCHWARZENBERG, Cardinal Prince-Archbishop of Pragne, DARBOY, Archbishop of Paris, MATTHIEU, Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon, GINOULHIAC, Archbishop of Lyons, DUPANLOUP, Bishop of Orleans, MARET, Bishop of Sura (*i. p.*), SIMOR, Archbishop and Primate of Hungary, HAYNALD, Archbishop of Kalossa, FOERSTER, Archbishop of Breslau, SCHERR, Archbishop of Munich, KETTELER, Bishop of Mayence, HEFELE, Bishop of Rottenburg, STROSSMAYER, Bishop of Bosnia and Syrmia, MAC HALE, Archbishop of Tuam, CONOLLY, Archbishop of Halifax, KENRICK, Archbishop of St. Louis.

On the evening of the 15th of July the minority sent a deputation consisting of Simor, Ginoulhiac, Scherr, Darboy, Ketteler and Rivet to the Pope. After waiting an hour they were admitted at 9 o'clock in the evening. They asked simply for a withdrawal of the addition to the third chapter which assigns to



the Pope the exclusive possession of all ecclesiastical powers, and for the insertion, in the fourth chapter, of a clause limiting his infallibility to those decisions which he pronounces *innixus testimonio Ecclesiarum*. Pius returned the almost incredible answer: "I shall do what I can, my dear sons, but I have not yet read the scheme; I do not know what it contains." He requested Darboy, the spokesman of the deputation, to hand him the petition in writing. Darboy promised to do so, and added, not without irony, that he would send with it the Schema which the Deputation on Faith and the Legates had with such culpable levity omitted to lay before his Holiness, exposing him to the risk of proclaiming in two days a decree he was ignorant of. Pius surprised the deputation by the astounding assurance that the whole Church had always taught the unconditional infallibility of the Pope. Then Bishop Ketteler, of Mayence, implored the Holy Father on his knees to make some concession for the peace and unity of the Church.

The well-informed Quirinus, *Letter lxxix*, p. 801, gave, a few days afterwards, the following fresh and graphic description of this interesting scene:

"Bishop Ketteler then came forward, flung himself on his knees before the Pope, and entreated for several minutes that the Father of the Catholic world would make some concession to restore peace and her lost unity to the Church and the episcopate. It was a peculiar spectacle to witness these two men, of kindred and yet widely diverse nature, in such an attitude, the one prostrate on the ground before the other. Pius is '*totus teres atque rotundus*,' firm and immovable, smooth and hard as marble, infinitely self-satisfied intellectually, mindless and ignorant, without any understanding of the mental conditions and needs of mankind, without any notion of the character of foreign nations, but as credulous as a nun, and above all penetrated through and through with reverence for his own person as the organ of the Holy Ghost, and therefore an absolutist from head to heel, and filled with the thought, "I and none beside me." He knows and believes that the Holy Virgin, with whom he is on the most intimate terms, will indemnify him for the loss of land and subjects by means of the infallibility doctrine and the restoration of the papal dominion over states and peoples as well as over Churches. He also believes firmly in the miraculous emanations from the sepulchre of St. Peter. At the feet of this man the German Bishop flung himself, *ipse Pápa papalior*, a zealot for the ideal greatness and unapproachable dignity of the Papacy, and at the same time inspired by the aristocratic feeling of a Westphalian nobleman and the hierarchical self-consciousness of a Bishop and successor of the ancient chancellor of the Empire, while yet he is surrounded by the intellectual atmos-

phere of Germany, and with all his firmness of belief is sickly with the pallor of thought, and inwardly struggling with the terrible misgiving that after all historical facts are right, and that the ship of the *Curia*, though for the moment it proudly rides the waves with its sails swelled by a favorable wind, will be wrecked on that rock at last."

This prostration of the proudest and ablest of the German Prelates made some impression. Pius dismissed the deputation in a hopeful temper. But immediately afterward Manning and Senestrey (Bishop of Regensburg) strengthened his faith and frightened him by the warning that if he made any concession he would be disgraced in history as a second Honorius.

In the session on the 16th July, on motion of some Spanish Bishops, an addition was inserted, "*non autem ex consensu ecclesiæ,*" which makes the decree still more obnoxious. On the same day Cardinal Rauscher, in a private audience, made another attempt to induce the Pope to yield, but was told: "It is too late."

On the 17th of July, fifty-six Bishops sent a written protest to the Pope, declaring that nothing had occurred to change their conviction as expressed in their negative vote; on the contrary they were confirmed in it; yet filial piety and reverence for the holy Father would not permit them to vote *Non placet* openly and in his face, in a matter which so intimately concerned his person, and that, therefore, they had resolved to return forthwith to their flocks, which had already too long been deprived of their presence, and were now filled with apprehensions of war. Schwarzenberg, Matthieu, Simor and Darboy head the list of the signers.\* On the evening of the same day not only the 56 signers, but 60 additional members of the opposition departed from Rome, promising to each other to make their future conduct dependent on mutual understanding. This was the turning point. The opposition broke down by its own act of cowardice. They ought to have stood like men on the post of duty, and repeated their negative vote according to their honest convictions. They could thus have prevented the passage of this momentous decree, or at all events shorn it of its œcumenical weight, and kept it open for future revision and possible reversal. But they left Rome at the very moment when their

---

\* See the protest in Friedberg, p. 622. Comp. Frommann, p. 207.

presence was most needed, and threw the easy victory into the lap of the majority.

When, therefore, the fourth public session was held on the memorable 18th of July, (Monday) there were but 533 fathers present, and of these all voted *Placet*, with the exception of two, viz., Bishop Riccio of Cajazzo in Sicily, and Bishop Fitz-Gerald of Little Rock, Arkansas, who had the courage to vote *Non placet*, but immediately before the close of the session submitted to the voice of the Council. So in this way a moral unanimity was secured as great as in the first Council of Nicæa, where likewise two refused to subscribe the Nicene Creed; "What a wise direction of Providence," exclaimed the *Civiltà Cattolica*, "533 yeas against 2 nays. Only 2 nays, therefore almost total unanimity; and yet 2 nays, therefore full liberty of the Council. How vain are all attacks against the œcumenical character of this most beautiful of all councils."

After the vote the Pope confirmed the decrees and canons on the Constitution of the Church of Christ, and added from his own inspiration the assurance, that the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff did not suppress but aid, not destroy but build up, and formed the best protection of the rights and interests of the Episcopate.

The days of the two most important public sessions of the Vatican Council, namely, the first and the last, were the darkest and stormiest which Rome saw from Dec. 8, 1869, to 18th of July, 1870. The proclamation of the new dogma was accompanied by claps of thunder and flashes of lightning from the skies, and so great was the darkness which spread over the Church of St. Peter, that the Pope could not read the decree of his own infallibility without the light of a candle (Quirinus, Letter lxi., p. 809).

A Protestant eye witness, Prof. Ripley, thus described the scene in a letter from Rome, published in the *New York Tribune* (of which he is one of the editors) for Aug. 11, 1870 :

"ROME, July 19.—Before leaving Rome I send you a report of the last scene of that absurd comedy called the Œcumenical Vatican Council. . . . It is. . . a remarkable coincidence that the opening and closing sessions of the Council were inaugurated with fearful storms, and that the vigil of the promulgation of the dogma was celebrated with thunder and lightning throughout the whole of the night. On the 8th of last December, I was

nearly drowned by the floods of rain which came down in buckets ; yesterday morning I went down in rain, and under a frowning sky which menaced terrible storms later in the day. . . *Kyrie eleison* we heard as soon as the mass was said, and the whole multitude joined in singing the plaintive measure of the Litany of the Saints, and then with equal fervor was sung *Veni Creator*, which was followed by the voice of a secretary reading in a high key the dogma. At its conclusion the names of the Fathers were called over, and *Placet* after *Placet* succeeded. *ad nauseam*—but what a storm burst over the Church at this moment ! the lightning flashed and the thunder pealed as we have not heard it this season before. Every *Placet* seemed to be announced by a flash and terminated by a clap of thunder. Through the cupolas the lightning entered, licking, as it were, the very columns of the Baldachino over the tomb of St. Peter, and lighting up large spaces on the pavement. Sure, God was there—but whether approving or disapproving what was going on, no mortal man can say. Enough that it was a remarkable coincidence, and so it struck the minds of all who were present—and thus the roll was called for one hour and a half, with this solemn accompaniment, and then the result of the voting was taken to the Pope. The moment had arrived when he was to declare himself invested with the attributes of God—nay, a God upon earth. Looking from a distance into the hall, which was obscured by the tempest, nothing was visible but the golden miter of the Pope, and so thick was the darkness that a servitor was compelled to bring a lighted candle and hold it by his side to enable him to read the formula by which he deified himself. And then—what is that indescribable noise ? Is it the raging of the storm above ? The pattering of hailstones ? It approaches nearer, and for a minute I most seriously say that I could not understand what that swelling sound was, until I saw a cloud of white handkerchiefs waving in the air. The Fathers had begun with clapping—they were the fuglemen to the crowd who took up the notes and signs of rejoicing until the Church of God was converted into a theater for the exhibition of human passions. “*Viva Pio Nono*,” “*Viva il Papa Infallibile*,” “*Viva il trionfo dei Cattolici*,” were shouted by this priestly assembly ; and again another round they had ; and yet another was attempted as soon as the *Te Deum* had been sung and the benediction had been given.”

This voice of nature was variously interpreted either as a condemnation of Gallicanism and liberal Catholicism, or as a divine attestation of the dogma, like that which accompanied the promulgation of the law from Mount Sinai, or as an evil omen of impending calamities to the Papacy. And behold, the day after the proclamation, Napoleon III., the political ally and supporter of Pius IX., unchained the furies of war, which in a few weeks swept away the Empire of France and the temporal throne of the infallible Pope. His own subjects forsook him and almost unanimously voted for a new sovereign,

whom he had excommunicated as the worst enemy of the Church. A German empire arose from victorious battle-fields, and Protestantism sprung to the political and military leadership of Europe. History records no more striking example of swift retribution on criminal ambition. About half a dozen Protestant churches have since been organized in Rome, where none was tolerated before, except in the house and under the protection of some foreign ambassador; a branch of the Bible Society was established, which the Pope, in his Syllabus, denounces as a pest, and a public debate was held in which even the presence of Peter at Rome was called in question.

Once before the Papacy was shaken to its base at the very moment when it felt itself most secure. Leo X. had hardly concluded the fifth and last Lateran Council, in March, 1517, with a celebration of victory, when an humble monk in the north of Europe sounded the key-note of the great Reformation.

What did the Bishops of the minority do? They all submitted, even those who had been most vigorous in opposing not only the opportunity of the definition, but the dogma itself. Some hesitated long, but yielded at last to the heavy pressure. Cardinal Rauscher, of Vienna, published the decree as early as August, and afterward withdrew his powerful "Observations on the infallibility of the Church" from the market, regarding this as an act of glorious self-denial for the welfare of the Church. Cardinal Schwarzenberg, of Prague, waited with the publication till Jan. 11, 1871, and shifted the responsibility upon his theological advisers. Hefele, of Rottenburg, who has forgotten more about the history of Councils than the Pope and his cardinals and episcopal tools ever knew, after delaying till April 10, 1871, submitted, not because he had changed his conviction, but, as he says, "because the peace and unity of the Church is so great a good that great and heavy personal sacrifices may be made for it;" *i. e.* truth must be sacrificed to peace. Bishop Maret, who wrote two learned volumes against Papal Infallibility, which were not refuted, declares in his retraction, that he "wholly rejects everything in his work which is opposed to the dogma of the Council," and "withdraws it from sale." Archbishop Kenrick yielded, but has not refuted his *concio habenda at non habita*, which remains an irrefragable argument against the new dogma. Even Strossmayer, the boldest of the bold in the minority, lost his courage

and keeps his peace. Darboy died a martyr in the revolt of communists of Paris in March 1871. Of those opponents who, though not members of the Council, carried as great weight as any Prelate, Montalembert died during the Council, Newman kept silence, Père Gratry, who had declared and proven that the question of Honorius "is totally gangrened by fraud," wrote from his dying couch at Montreux, in Switzerland, (Feb. 1872) to the Archbishop of Paris that he submitted to the Vatican Council, and effaced "everything to the contrary he may have written."

It is said that the adhesion of the minority Bishops was extorted by the threat of the Pope not to renew their "quinquennial faculties" (*facultates quinquennales*), that is the papal licenses renewed every five years permitting them to exercise extraordinary episcopal functions which ordinarily belong to the Pope, as the power of absolving from heresy, schism, apostasy, secret crime (except murder) from vows, duties of fasting, the power of permitting the reading of prohibited books (for the purpose of refutation) marrying within prohibited degrees, etc. But aside from this pressure the following considerations sufficiently explain the fact of submission:

1. Many of the dissenting Bishops were professedly anti-Infallibilists, not from principle, but from subordinate considerations of expediency, because they apprehended from the definition great injury to Catholic interests, especially in Protestant countries. Events have since proved that their apprehension was well founded.

2. All Roman Bishops are under an oath of allegiance to the Pope, which binds them to preserve, defend, *increase* and *advance* the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the Pope and his successors.

3. The minority Bishops defended Episcopal infallibility against Papal infallibility. They claimed for themselves what they denied to the Pope. Admitting the infallibility of the Council and forfeiting by their voluntary absence on the day of voting the right of their protest, they must either on their own theory accept the decision of the Council or give up their theory, cease to be Roman Catholics, and run the risk of a new schism.

At the same time this submission is an instructive lesson of the fearful spiritual despotism of the Papacy, which overrules the stubborn facts of history and the sacred claims of individual

conscience. For the facts so clearly and forcibly brought out before and during the Council by such men as Kenrick, Hefele, Rauscher, Maret, Schwarzenberg, Dupanloup, have not changed, and can never be undone. On the one hand we find the results of a life-long conscientious and thorough study of the most learned divines of the Roman Church, on the other ignorance, prejudice, perversion and defiance of scripture and tradition; on the one hand we have history shaping theology, on the other theology ignoring or changing history; on the one hand the just exercise of reason, on the other blind submission which destroys reason and conscience. Truth must and will prevail at last.

---

#### ART. V.—THE NECESSITY OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN COLLEGES.

By the late FRANCIS LIEBER, LL.D., New York.\*

THE present professor of the theological branches in the South Carolina College has resigned his chair, and, it is understood, the question has been raised whether this chair ought not to be abolished. Under these circumstances it will not be considered presumptuous in one who must be supposed to be thoroughly acquainted with the whole operation of the college within, and its relation to the State at large, and who yields to no one in the deep interest he feels in the institution, if he states his opinion on a subject which appears to him of vital importance.

The writer of these lines is convinced that South Carolina College, as indeed every college in the Union, would be essentially defective without a chair for the evidences of Christianity, and biblical knowledge in general, and without an officer whose

---

[\*We are permitted to publish the following article, found among the papers of the late Dr. Lieber. It was probably written about 1850, when the author was a Professor in South Carolina College. His life-long devotion to education, as well as his distinguished learning and ability, give great weight to the opinions he here advocates, on a question more urgent and important now than it was when this paper was written.—Eds.]