

THE
NEW REFORMATION

A NARRATIVE OF THE
OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT

FROM 1870 TO THE PRESENT TIME

WITH A HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

BY

THEODORUS

(JAMES BASS MULLINGER 1834-1917)

“UNITAS IN NECESSARIIS”

“The struggle of the Old Catholics is in itself the same struggle which has been maintained in the Church of England by those who, from the time of Lord Falkland down to the present day, have endeavored to set forth more reasonable views of religion, in distinction from the hierarchical or Puritan views which have alternately been upheld by the fashion of the day or the domination of party” — DEAN STANLEY, Preface to *Father Hyacinthe’s Catholic Reform*

“The Old Catholic body seems to hold out to the English Church an opportunity which has been denied to it for three hundred years.”—CANON LIDDON, *Preface to Report of the Bonn Conference*



COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

COPPERWOOD PRESS

2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	1
A List of the Ecumenical or General Councils of the Church	3
Introduction.....	5
Chapter I.	
The Vatican Council.....	51
Chapter II.	
The Year 1871 and the Congress of Munich.....	83
Chapter III.	
The Year 1872 and the Congress of Cologne.....	117
Chapter IV.	
The Year 1873 and the Congress of Constance.....	145
Chapter V.	
The Year 1874:	
The Synod of Bonn—The Congress of Freiburg—	
The Conference at Bonn.....	173
Conclusion.....	225
Index.....	241

CHAPTER I.

THE VATICAN COUNCIL

The outline given in the preceding pages will have sufficed to indicate the main points in the history of the long struggle between the two theories of conciliar and papal infallibility. That infallibility, in a more or less definite form, has always been assumed as present in the Church, can scarcely be questioned, though the belief has doubtless often been maintained in a manner repugnant to Scriptural teaching. But when it has once been admitted that the guidance of the Holy Spirit has been promised as a perpetual legacy to the faithful, it is obvious, unless we are prepared to interpret this theory in some purely figurative sense which would deprive it of all practical significance, that the Divine voice must needs avail itself of human instruments in order to render its utterances authoritative among men. From the first assembling of the Apostles “with one accord in one place,” on the day of Pentecost, down to the Council of the Vatican—whether the synod has been one of bishops, or presbyters, or deacons—it has ever been the practice of such assemblies to seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit in prayer, to assume that that prayer has been answered, and finally to enunciate their decisions as the ultimate verdict of their “Church.” For all practical purposes, therefore, the theory of infallibility, in one form or another, is that of every Christian communion; the supernatural element is, in each case, distinctly assumed.¹ And the question really at issue in the Church of Rome has throughout been—not whether infallibility is, or is not, given to the Church—but whether this infallibility is to be held to reside in one man, or in some hundreds of men distributed over Christendom? And the answer to this question must evidently be sought, in a reasonable interpretation of Scripture and in a careful consideration of the doctrine of the primitive Church.

∞
Infallibility always a theory with respect to Church tradition.

∞
The real question at issue.

☞
First
announcement of an
Ecumenical
Council.

☞
Objects for
which it
was to
assemble.

☞
Papal Infallibility not
mentioned.

It was early in the year 1868 that Apostolical Letters² were issued from Rome, convening an Ecumenical Council to be held in that city—the first sitting to take place on the day of the Immaculate Conception, 1869. The Catholic journals unanimously greeted the announcement as a matter for unqualified congratulation. The scope and purpose of the Council were clearly indicated. The doctrines of the “Syllabus” were to be emphatically recognized and enforced. Two great and pressing evils, it was alleged, were menacing the Church: first, the existence of a large number of politicians and public men bitterly hostile to her interests; while, secondly, as the result of the activity of this body, a great social calamity was impending over Europe—the severance of civil society from the Church’s control and influence. “Indifferentism,” as denounced in the “Syllabus” was declared to be the special cause of these evils, and was consequently to form the special subject of the Council’s deliberations. “As previous Councils,” said a writer in the *Dublin Review* “have been summoned against Arianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Lutheranism, so this has been summoned against Indifferentism and the evils thence flowing forth.”³ A number of minor subjects were somewhat vaguely described, as likely to be brought under the Council’s consideration, but not a word occurred bearing upon the dogma of Papal Infallibility; and the same journal, referring to rumors to the effect that this question would be brought forward, observed, “We cannot find, in the Bull of Convocation, any reference, however distant, to such a subject.” In the spring of 1869 it began, however, to be very currently reported, that the dogma would form at least one of the questions which the Council would be called upon to discuss, if, indeed, its promulgation were not really the main object that the assembly was designed to accomplish; and while by the Ultramontane press the prospect was hailed with expressions of rapturous delight, not a few of the organs of the Liberal party indicated with considerable boldness the theoretical conclusions involved in such a dogma, and the practical results to which it might lead.⁴

It well deserves, indeed, to be placed on record, and is a fact that renders the supineness of the principal European Powers all the more remarkable, that energetic protests, as regarded both the political and ecclesiastical significance of the projected Council, were not wanting, long before the opportunity for energetic counter-action had passed away. The "Allgemeine Zeitung," in a series of able articles published in the month of March, entitled "The Council and the Civilta," first exhibited in the light of historical research the true bearing of the questions which it was believed would be brought forward for the Council's decision.⁵ On the 9th of the same month, eight months before the Council assembled, Prince Hohenlohe, the Premier of Bavaria, called the attention of the Cabinets of Europe to the grave political import of the approaching event. He stated that it had been ascertained, beyond all reasonable doubt, that the object of the Ultramontane party was the dogmatization of the "Syllabus" and of the theory of papal infallibility, and pointed out the effects that such a proclamation must necessarily have upon the relations of Church and State throughout Europe. His individual opinion was reinforced by that of the faculties of theology and law in the University of Munich, who, in reply to five questions which the prince had formally submitted for their consideration, set forth, in terms which afterwards became only too painfully intelligible, the evils that would ensue if the aims of the Ultramontanists were successful.⁶ Unfortunately, the representations of the Bavarian Premier failed to convince the statesmen whom he addressed, and the opportunity for interference was allowed to pass by. We shall afterwards see how, when it was too late, the action which he recommended was attempted, and attempted in vain.

It will be interesting here to note the previous career and position at the time of some of those who were now to represent, either by their presence or their writings, the Liberal element in Roman Catholicism, and, at a later period, the party driven by the action of the Ultramontanists into openly-avowed dissent.

☞
Protest of
the press
against its
reported
object.

☞
Protest of
Prince
Hohenlohe.


 Leaders of
 the Liberal
 party in
 Germany.
 Dr.
 Döllinger.

Dr. Johann Joseph Ignatius von Döllinger was born at Bamberg, in February 1799, and is consequently now in his 77th year. He was educated at Wurzburg, and after having been for some time professor at the ecclesiastical seminary at Aschaffenberg, was appointed in 1826 one of the faculty of theology in the university of Munich, then just founded. At that time there were few ecclesiastical scholars of note in Catholic Germany, and, in default of a really authoritative guide, his active intellect and scholarly tastes led him to prosecute an independent course of research into the *origines* of Church history. The first published result of his labors—"The Doctrine of the Eucharist in the First Three Centuries"—appeared in 1826, and was subsequently incorporated in the two volumes of his "Church History" (1833-5), a work of which, up to the present time, no more volumes have been issued, though his "Compendium of the History of the Church down to the Reformation" (1836-43) bore witness to the ability and thoroughness of his researches upon a later period. His "History of Islamism" (1838), and his work on German Lutheranism, "The Reformation, its Internal Development, and its Effects," were regarded as works of a high order. His lectures in the university also produced a considerable impression, though he for some years ceded his chair to Möhler, of whom he was an attached admirer and friend, and whose minor works he subsequently edited. About this time he assumed the editorship of the "Historisch-politische Blätter"; and from 1845 to 1847 he represented the university in the Bavarian Chamber, where he was generally regarded as a leader of the Ultramontane party; but in 1848, under the predominating influence of a faction in the Cabinet, who feared alike his abilities and his high character, he was deprived of both his professorship and his seat in the Chamber. He was thereupon nominated and elected by the Liberal party to a deputyship to the National Parliament, and, while filling this post, he both wrote and spoke with great effect in defense of religious liberty, and as the champion of ecclesiastical freedom represented in Germany views nearly identical

with those espoused by Montalembert in France. In the spring of 1849 he returned to Munich, and was restored to his professorship and also to his seat in the Chamber. His "Hippolytus and Callistus; or, the Roman Church in the Third Century" (1853), his "Paganism and Judaism" (1857), and his "Christianity and the Church at the Period of their Foundation" (1860), now successively appeared, and raised his reputation, both as a scholar and a writer, to the highest eminence—the last-named production being generally regarded as his masterpiece. In 1861 he published his "Church and the Churches," a work undertaken partly from a perception of the dangers that were then threatening the temporal power of the Pope, and having for its object to show "the universal importance of the papacy as a world-power," and to indicate the doctrinal basis of a possible reunion of the Churches, although with respect to such a scheme he frankly admitted in his preface, that there was not "the smallest probability" that it could immediately be carried into effect. In fact, for a long time, Dr. Döllinger was regarded as a pillar of Ultramontanism; and a recent writer in the "Contemporary Review" has even ventured to declare him to be "mainly responsible for the mental slavery, the narrow views, and servile and superstitious submission to the Pope observable in the Catholic clergy of Bavaria."⁷ In the year 1863 he showed, however, sympathies of a very different character, in the controversy in which he became involved while supporting Professor Frohschammer in his defense of the liberties of science against the archbishop of Munich and the Pope. He invited some of the most distinguished *savants* of Germany to a conference, professedly summoned for the purpose of considering and formally declaring the rights of science. The results were singularly disappointing. The energetic and overbearing opposition of those who represented the Jesuit party so far prevailed with the assembly as completely to change its purpose, and Dr. Döllinger, who presided, eventually found himself charged with the duty of transmitting to the Pope a telegraphic message, to the effect that the question had been decided "in the sense

His Church
and the
Churches.

Dr.
Döllinger
and Froh-
schammer.

of the subjection of science to authority.” The doctrines advocated by Frohschammer were thus placed under a ban; his supporters were silenced and humiliated; and the professor himself was left completely isolated. Döllinger submitted unhesitatingly; and the proceedings probably served really to hasten on the promulgation of the “Syllabus” of 1864.

Such were the antecedents and attitude of the future leader of the movement with the history of which these pages are especially concerned. Dr. Döllinger was not himself present at the Council; but there were not a few of the same party—if such a name may be applied to the various elements that composed, for a few short months, the anti-Ultramontanist section at the assembly—but little his inferiors in ability or in the capacity to estimate in all its bearings the significance of the occasion that had called them together.⁸ Dr. Friedrich, professor of theology at Munich—a profound ecclesiastical scholar, to whom the history of Councils, and especially that of Trent, had for years been the subject of especial study—attended Cardinal Hohenlohe in the capacity of theological adviser; and his journal of the Council, during the greater part of its proceedings, appeared in the following year, and forms a highly valuable record. Equally eminent, though known chiefly as an ecclesiastical jurist, was Von Schulte, professor of the Canon Law at Prague. At the commencement, indeed, his reputation was that of a decided Ultramontanist; but he proved courageous enough to avow the convictions which gradually forced themselves upon him with the progress of events. Haneberg, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St. Boniface at Munich, represented an influence unsurpassed by that of any ecclesiastic, in a city conspicuous for its strong Catholic sympathies. Strossmayer, bishop of the Croatian diocese of Diakovar, and an ardent Panslavist, was soon to give evidence of that signal ability as an orator which marked him out for the leadership of the minority in debate. Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague; Ketteler, bishop of Mayence;

☞
Dr. Friedrich.

☞
Professor
Von
Schulte.

☞
Haneberg.

☞
Strossmayer.

and cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna, apart from their high position, were also distinguished either by their active participation in the proceedings of the Council or by their written contributions to the controversy.

Among the French bishops, the learned and eloquent Darboy, archbishop of Paris, whose tragical fate, a few months later, attracted the attention of all Europe, was well known to be strongly opposed to the proposed dogma; and the vote of Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans, was probably regarded by the papal party as already decided. A native of Savoy, who had risen almost solely by personal merit, he was distinguished by his labors in the cause of religious education. His liberal advocacy of classical studies, as an important element in such an education, had exposed him to the attacks of the "Univ-ers," while his courageous maintenance of Gallican liberties against Ultramontane pretensions had drawn upon him the hostility of the Jesuits. On the other hand, he was a strenuous opposer of secular education, and his influence had proved fatal to the claims of M. Littré at the candidature of that eminent scholar for the vacant chair in the Academy in the year 1854. Ginoulhiac, bishop of Grenoble, sustained the reputation of his Order for learning, a quality for which the French episcopate is but moderately distinguished. England sent archbishop Manning, whose known determination from the first, to support the dogma unflinchingly, stood in strong contrast to the moderation of bishop Clifford and the candor of the aged MacHale. The most conspicuous of the American episcopate was bishop Kenrick of St. Louis, whose pamphlet, towards the close of the Council, so ably vindicated the position assumed by himself and his brother bishops.

During the week preceding the opening of the Council, the "Methodus" and "Ordo" for the regulation of its manner of procedure were in circulation among the assembling members, and at once attracted a large amount of criticism.⁹ It was found that, in singular

↳
Leaders of
the Liberal
party in
France.
Darboy.

↳
Dupanloup.

↳
Ginoulhiac.

↳
English
bishops.

↳
Criticism
evoked by
the publi-
cation of
the Meth-
odus and
Ordo.

contrast to the order which had obtained at the earlier General Councils and even at that of Trent,¹⁰ the Pope assumed to himself the sole right to initiate topics for discussion and the exclusive nomination of the officers of the Council. The bishops, it is true, were invited to bring forward proposals of their own;¹¹ but it was necessary that they should first of all submit them to a commission appointed by the Pope, half of whom were to be Italians. If any proposal were passed by this commission, the Pope still reserved to himself the power of excluding it from discussion. Four election commissions, consisting each of twenty-four members, and presided over by a cardinal nominated by the Pope, 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, by which body it was again to be discussed with the assistance of other theologians. When it came back from the commission it was to be put to the vote as it then stood, with the corrections and comments, and to be passed or rejected without further debate. 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. In the right conceded to them of electing these commissions the bishops certainly acquired some influence over the Council's decrees but their position was in every way inferior to that of the theologians nominated by the Pope, for while the latter might be summoned to defend or alter their work in council, the bishops who had spoken, or proposed amendments, were excluded from such further action. "The Pope," said Quirinus, "appears as the author of the decrees, the one authoritative legislator, who out of courtesy allows the bishops to express their opinions, but finally decides himself, in the plenitude of his sovereign power, as seems good to him." It can scarcely be regarded as surprising that cardinal Schwarzenberg declared to professor Friedrich that he found the proposed "Ordo" "very entangling" (*sehr verfanglich*).

It was on the eighth of December, a day of pouring rain, amid the thunder of cannon and the pealing of bells, that the Council assembled for the first time. The business was chiefly of a formal character—a sermon, an allocution from the Holy Father, and an official decree announcing the Council opened, and appointing Epiphany for its next session. In the meantime the Liberal party began to take more accurate estimate of its strength, and to find that its numerical inferiority was only too apparent. Out of 921 prelates who had received summons to attend the Council 767 were present, and of these 276 were from Italian dioceses. On December 22nd the bishops of Germany and Hungary accordingly convened a meeting, at which it was decided to endeavor to obtain, as at the Council of Coustance,¹² some remedy against the numerical preponderance of Italy. Representing as they did, though only sixty-seven in number, a population of forty-six millions of Catholics, they considered it unjust that they should be liable to be constantly outvoted by nearly five times their number, when this large majority of votes represented only some twenty-seven millions, the population of Italy. It was therefore resolved, in conjunction with the more moderate prelates of every nationality represented at the Council, to address the Pope on the subject, and to petition that the grievance might be adjusted by the division of the whole number of representatives into eight¹³ national sections—each section to have freedom of discussion among its members, and to be entitled to suggest proposals to the four commissions. This petition was curtly rejected;¹⁴ and the *Civiltà Cattolica* denounced it as an unheard-of thing to seek to introduce “the modern theory of numbers” into the Church. The bishop of Formione, it insisted, with his diocese of 70,000 souls, was entitled to as much weight as the archbishop of Cologne, who directed the spiritual interests of nearly two millions.

On December 28th the articles proposed for the Council’s adoption were published under the title of *Schema constitutionis dogmaticae de doctrina Catholica contra multi-*

✎
First assembling of the Council.

✎
Its composition.

✎
Inequalities of the representation of different countries.

✎
Schema de Doctrina.

plices errores ex rationalismo derivatos. It presented a kind of compendium of doctrine, divided into eighteen chapters, embodying a sort of amplification of the earlier part of the "Syllabus." Its great length and "wholly unconciliar form" were freely commented on by Quirinus. It was already known to be entirely the work of the Jesuit party, and it now transpired that its authors were two German members of that body, of but slight theological eminence. On December 28th and 29th the first debate took place, and the *Schema* encountered vigorous resistance. On the first day cardinal Rauscher opposed it in a brilliant speech, and was followed by five others. On the following day Strossmayer and Ginoulhiac distinguished themselves by the boldness of their censures—the former selecting for especial attack the autocratic mode of expression employed by the Pope in its promulgation. The freedom of these criticisms alarmed the Ultramontanists; and when the Council reassembled, as appointed on Epiphany (January 6th), the *Schema* was withdrawn, and it was sought to disguise the unsatisfactory progress of affairs by occupying the Council with an individual subscription to a confession of the Catholic faith.

✎
Vigorous
opposition.

✎
The *Schema*
withdrawn
for amend-
ment.

✎
Schema de
Disciplina.

From this time, up to nearly the close of January, the Council was occupied with the *Schema de disciplina*, which dealt with the duties of the episcopal order, their modes of life, their visitation of the clergy and people, and the obligations under which they lay to visit Rome frequently and to give in regular reports on the state of their dioceses. Friedrich noted down in his "Diary" that he found it yet worse than the *Schema de fide*, and censures the manner in which it passed over the gravest scandal of the time—the immoral life of many of the clergy¹⁵—without attempting any effectual remedy. Archbishop Darboy significantly observed that it rendered necessary the discussion, not only of the duties assigned to the bishops by Rome, but also of the rights of the Order. "The design is everywhere apparent," observed Quirinus, "of increasing their dependence on the *Curia*, and centralizing all

Church government in Rome still more than before." It was in the debate to which this measure gave rise, that Strossmayer assumed that leading position which he continued to occupy so long as it seemed possible that reason and argument might not altogether be thrown away on the majority of his auditors in the Council. His tact, eloquence, and mastery of each subject at once marked him out for the leadership of the Opposition, and his superiority was finally conceded even by Dupanloup, on whom it had at first seemed probable that the office might devolve. The effect produced by his magnificent speech on this occasion, as he passed under review every main defect in the Romish ecclesiastical system, may be inferred from the fact that, on the following day, the president deemed it advisable specially to enjoin the discontinuance of audible applause.

Ability with which it was opposed by Strossmayer.

In the meantime the majority, alarmed by the resolution with which the French and German opposition bishops maintained their resistance to both portions of the *Schema*, resolved on a more expeditious and less differential course of action. Under the inspiration of bishop Martin of Paderborn and Senestrey of Regensburg, a petition was proposed, urging that the public good of Christianity seemed to demand, "that the Holy Council of the Vatican, professing and again and again explaining more fully the Florentine decree, should define clearly and in words that admitted of no doubt, that the authority of the Roman pontiff is supreme, and therefore exempt from error, when in matters of faith and morality he decrees and ordains what is to be believed and held by all the faithful of Christ and what is to be rejected and condemned by them."

Petition of the majority for an enunciation of the dogma of papal infallibility.

The petition was not ready for presentation until the end of January, and as soon as the opposition party were apprised of the design they prepared a counter-petition, which was signed by a majority of the French and by nearly all the German and Hungarian bishops—in all 137 names. A third petition was drawn up by a party of

Counter-petition of the minority.

✎
Petition of a
third party.

compromise, consisting chiefly of Spanish representatives, and recommending the adoption of a less positive formula in the dogma. The Pope rejected the opposition address; and the acceptance of the infallibilist petition being thereby rendered difficult, it was hastily withdrawn at the last moment.

✎
Rumors of
the designs
of the
majority.

It was now that rumors of a yet more unscrupulous course of action on the part of the majority began to give rise to considerable excitement. It was said that, on the *Schema de doctrina* (which had been referred to the commission for revision) being again brought before the Council, it would be proposed to adopt it without further discussion, and that the precedent thus established would be made use of in carrying through measures of yet greater importance. On the other hand, rumors of a dissolution began also to be heard. The minority could learn nothing satisfactory except that the French Government had conveyed to cardinal Antonelli, through the Marquis de Bouneville, the resident ambassador, the feeling of the Cabinet as adverse to any declaration of papal infallibility whatever. This indicated that the Pope could no longer count on the support of France; but it also soon became known that the ambassador had received for reply a denial of the right of his Government to interfere, and a general assertion of the rights of the Council.

✎
Intima-
tion of the
French Gov-
ernment.

✎
Published
expressions
of opinion
by
Döllinger,
Gratry,
Pusey,
Newman,
and Montal-
embert.


The convictions of the minority at this juncture were, however, not a little strengthened by the moral support which they received from some of the most eminent leaders of religious thought in Europe. An able criticism of the infallibilist address, from the pen of Dr. Döllinger, elicited general attention, and his statement that his views were shared by the greater number of the German bishops was angrily but vainly challenged by the Roman party. At nearly the same time Father Gratry's "First Letter,"¹⁶ a sad and solemn appeal, found its way to Rome. Dr. Pusey's volume¹⁷ had arrived shortly before, in which he pointed out that the consequences resulting from the promulgation of the dogma could not but be fatal to the prospects

of reunion with the Eastern or the English Church. Dr. Newman,¹⁸ while declining to give a definite expression of opinion, pointed out the difficulty of maintaining such a doctrine in the face of historical evidence. But the protest of Montalembert excited by far the deepest interest. That eminent man, than whom no Frenchman living had given stronger proofs of unselfish devotion to the Church, was now on his death-bed. In a letter dated February 22nd he declared that as an Ultramontane of the old school he felt himself completely severed from those of the new, whom he described as “spiritual absolutists transferring to the ecclesiastical world those traditions of individual and exclusive rule which belong to secular despotisms. That which was Ultramontanism in 1847 was called Gallicanism in 1870!”¹⁹

The belief in a dissolution soon died away as the intentions of the papal party began further to develop themselves. On February 22nd the oppositionists were thrown into a state approaching consternation by the announcement of a new *Regolamento*, professedly introduced for the sake of facilitating the despatch of business. By this the president was to have the power of imposing silence on any speaker, and, in the event of a majority of votes being on his side, to bring any debate to a peremptory close. It was also announced that all decrees would in future be regarded as carried if a majority of votes were in their favor. This latter decision necessarily called forth the strongest protests from the Opposition, who, of course, maintained the traditional principle that the decrees of a General Council require the unanimous, or all but unanimous, assent of its members, to give them the necessary validity.

The only prudent course of action for the minority at this juncture would obviously have been, to decline all further participation in the Council's proceedings until the *Regolamento* had been withdrawn. They shrunk, however, from so decided a policy, and their antagonists turned their hesitation to rapid advantage by now bring-


 The new
Regolamento.


 Reluctance
 of the
 Opposition
 to adopt a
 decided
 course.

ing forward the dogma concerning papal infallibility in its most arrogant and uncompromising form. On March 6th copies of the decree were forwarded to the residences of the different members of the Council. "This," said Quirinus, "was the answer to the protesting movement. . . .The *Curia* has known how to give so emphatic an expression to its contempt for opposition, that even the sharpest and bitterest words would show less scorn and insolence. By choosing the precise moment, when the minority declare that their conscience is troubled and in doubt about the legitimacy and result of the Council altogether, for bringing forward the very decree which has all along been the main cause of that doubt and trouble of conscience, they proclaim plainly and emphatically that they know the Opposition regards its own words as nothing but words, and that there is no earnest manly decision or religious conviction behind them."

☞
Opposition
to the *Regolamento*.

On March 22nd the inevitable collision came on. The *Regolamento* still stopped the way; and a few determined spirits were resolved that it should not become the law of the assembly without at least a protest, however ineffectual, on their part. It soon became evident that their opponents were equally resolute. Schwarzenberg alluded very slightly to the subject in his speech, but was at once called to order. Bishop Kenrick, who followed next, spoke with significant emphasis of the necessity of defending the rights and privileges of his Order. It was on Strossmayer, however, that the brunt of the battle devolved. Passing over the question of the *Regolamento* he proceeded to criticize a passage in the *Schema de doctrina*. The *Schema* had come back from the commission with alterations of sufficient importance to indicate a wish to conciliate the feelings of the minority, but it still contained an assertion which was felt by all liberal Catholics to be untrue, in stigmatizing the Protestant Churches as the parents of modern infidelity, "of monstrous systems known under the names of Mythism, Rationalism, and Indifferentism." Strossmayer protested against the injustice of these

☞
Strossmayer's
speech.

☞
He vindicates
Protestantism
from the charge
of infidelity.

charges, and declared that the "indifference" of Catholics before the Reformation, and their rationalistic doctrines before the Revolution, had been the real causes of those evils. There were many able champions of Christian doctrine among the Protestants, of whom it might be said with St. Augustine, "errant, sed bona fide errant." Long ago Protestants had ably refuted the very errors condemned in the *Schema*, and it was but simple justice to assert that Leibnitz and Guizot had earned the gratitude of all Christian men.

"Each one of these statements," says Quirinus, "and the two last names, were received with loud murmurs, which at last broke out into a storm of indignation. The president, De Angelis, cried out, 'Hicce non est locus laudandi Protestantas.' And he was right, for the Palace of the Inquisition is hardly a hundred paces from the spot where he was speaking. Strossmayer, then reverting to the *Regolamento*, exclaimed, in the midst of a great uproar, 'That alone can be imposed on the faithful as a dogma which has a moral unanimity of the Church in its favor.' At these words a frightful tumult arose. Several bishops rushed from their seats to the tribune, and shook their fists in the speaker's face. Place, bishop of Marseilles, one of the boldest of the minority, and the first to give in his public adhesion to Dupanloup's Pastoral, cried out, "Ego illum non damno." Thereupon a shout resounded from all sides, "Omnes, omnes illum damnamus." The President called Strossmayer to order, but the latter did not leave the tribune before he had solemnly protested against the violence to which he had been subjected. There was hardly less excitement in the church outside than in the council-hall. Some thought the Garibaldians had broken in; others, with more presence of mind, thought infallibility had been proclaimed, and these last began shouting 'Long live the infallible Pope!' 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.'"



Scene in the assembly.

This stormy scene was succeeded, on the following day, by a lull, and the majority even appeared ashamed of their previous violence. They manifested, however, no signs of yielding, though some of the most eminent members of the minority made urgent representations to the president. At last, on the morning of the 26th, the influence of an English bishop (said to be bishop Clifford) prevailed, and the preamble which had been so strongly denounced was withdrawn. It came back, duly amended, on the 28th, and was then accepted unanimously.

✎
The preamble withdrawn and amended.

The feelings thus temporarily allayed were soon again aroused by the appearance of a supplemental paragraph, appended to the fourth canon of the fourth chapter of the *Schema de fide et ratione*,²⁰ the import of which pointed plainly at exalting the judicial authority of the Roman Congregations—the tribunals through which the Pope immediately asserts his autocratic powers. The opposition to this paragraph was considerable, but less unanimous than that previously exhibited, and was dexterously met by the papal party. The paragraph embodied, it was urged, a form dear to the traditions of the *Curia*; the preamble had been withdrawn; the decree itself had been materially modified; and any further concession would be tantamount to an acknowledgment of defeat. By persuasion of this kind the scruples of the Opposition were overcome. The paragraph was allowed to take its place along with the first four chapters of the *Schema*, with which it was now submitted for the Council's acceptance. These chapters had already received considerable modification; and in the opinion of many the chief danger now lurked in the supplementary paragraph. But the concession once made could not be revoked, and on April 24th the Council passed the *Constitutio dogmatica de fide Catholica*²¹ (now no longer a *Schema*) almost without a dissentient voice.

✎
Opposition to the clause enhancing the authority of the Roman congregations.

✎
The clause ultimately allowed to stand.

✎
Results hitherto attained by the majority.

The party of the *Curia* had thus virtually ensured its triumph. It had procured the definition and promulgation of the Church's decrees by the Pope as supreme legislator, the Council simply confirming and approving

them; a new method of procedure in the assembly had been implicitly accepted; while, in the fatal paragraph, the Council had been induced to assent to a declaration which invested with supreme authority the former dogmatic utterances of the Vatican.²² It needed but one step more and their triumph would be complete. It was accordingly now resolved to bring on at once the doctrine of Papal Infallibility for formal acceptance.

As the supreme crisis drew near, the interest felt by all Europe in the question became unmistakably evident. The Powers who had disregarded Prince Hohenlohe's warnings stirred themselves to energetic action. Both France and Austria, while disclaiming any intention of controlling the policy of the Council, announced that they repudiated all responsibility for acts which might exhibit the teachings of the Church in direct antagonism to the principles recognized by all European governments and nations. Prussia, Portugal, and Bavaria followed with similar protests. "All," said Quirinus, "give warning that they shall regard the threatened decrees on the power and infallibility of the Pope as a declaration of war against the order and authority of the State." In England, in the House of Lords, the bishop of Ely (Dr. Harold Browne)²³ protested against any decision at which the Council might arrive on account of the Council "not being general, not being free, and not anything like that General Council to which our forefathers professed themselves ready to submit." On the other hand, the great majority in the Council, together with the Jesuits and the English converts without, urged on the final measure. An address, signed by 300 Catholics, residents or visitors in Rome, was drawn up for the purpose of encouraging the Pope by the expression of their profound devotion to the Church and to its head. There were also other reasons for despatch than those derived from past success, and these were to be found in the risks attendant upon postponement. It was now May; the hot season was approaching; and it was feared that if the whole *Schema* consisting of no less than seventy articles,



Renewed protests of European powers.



Reasons for hastening on the acceptance of the dogma.

were taken in regular order, the Council would have to be prorogued before the chapter relating to the all-important dogma could be discussed.

The chapter²⁴ concerning the infallibility of the Pope which it was proposed to annex to the *Decretum de Romani Pontificis primatu*, had been distributed among the members of the Council as early as March 8th; and on May 1st there appeared, for like distribution, the observations and suggestions of no less than forty-seven bishops (among whom were Rauscher, Ketteler, Furstenberg, Hefele, and Schwarzenberg), which the Commission had analyzed for the purpose.²⁵ The *Constitutio dogmatica prima de ecclesia Christi*,²⁶ in the form in which it was now brought before the Council and eventually carried, was divided into four chapters: (1) Concerning the institution of the Apostolic primacy in St. Peter. (2) Concerning the perpetuity of the primacy of St. Peter in the Roman pontiffs. (3) Concerning the scope and significance of the primacy of the Roman pontiff. (4) Concerning the infallible supremacy of the Roman pontiff.

✎
Constitutio de
Ecclesia
Christi.

Of these chapters the first two attracted comparatively little attention, for they embodied nothing that might not fairly be regarded as the prevalent belief of Catholics; but the interpretation given to the theory of the primacy in the third chapter was at once seen to be a considerable advance even upon the definition of the Council of Florence, for by the insertion of four additional new clauses the jurisdiction of the Pope was extended as "ordinary and immediate" over the whole Church.²⁷ A blow was thus aimed at all those episcopal rights for which the archbishop of Paris had recently so successfully contended, and which, if abolished, would leave the whole Order in a state of abject submission to the Pope. "Bishops," observes Qmrinus, "remain only as papal commissaries, possessed of so much power as the Pope finds good to leave them, and exercising only such authority as he does not directly exercise himself; *there is no longer any episcopate*, and thus one grade of the hierarchy is abolished."²⁸ In addition to

✎
Extension
given to
papal juris-
diction.

this, in order to preclude the possibility of any appeal, the decision of the Council of Constance, establishing the supreme authority of General Councils, was distinctly set aside, by a declaration that “it was a departure from truth to assert that it was lawful to appeal from the decisions of the Roman pontiffs to an Ecumenic Council, as though to an authority superior to the Roman pontiff.”²⁹

Of the fourth chapter the following is a literal translation:

“That the supreme power of the *magisterium* is also contained in the Apostolic primacy, which the Roman pontiff, as successor of Peter the Prince of Apostles, possesses over the Universal Church, has always been held by this Holy See, is proved by the perpetual use of the Church, and has been declared by Ecumenical Councils themselves, and by those especially in which the East agreed with the West in the union of faith and charity. So the fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following the footsteps of their predecessors, put forth the solemn profession: “The first condition of safety is to keep the rule of right faith, and because it is impossible that the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ should be set aside, who said: ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,’ these words are verified by facts, for in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved immaculate, and holy doctrine has always been proclaimed. Desiring therefore never to be separated from its faith and doctrine, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion which the Apostolic See proclaims, in which is the whole and true solidity of the Christian religion.”³⁰ Also the Greeks professed, with the approbation of the Second Council of Lyons, that the Holy Roman Church possesses the supreme and full primacy and sovereignty over the Universal Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges itself to have received with plenitude of power from our Lord himself in Blessed Peter, the Prince or Chief of the Apostles, of whom the Roman pontiff is the successor; and as he, beyond all others, is bound to defend the truth of the faith, so also, if any questions concerning the faith shall arise, they ought to be defined by his judgment. Lastly, the Council of Flor-



The dogma concerning papal infallibility.



Historical precedents pleaded in justification.

ence 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 given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, rule, and govern the Universal Church.

❧
Definition
of doctrine
by preced-
ing Popes.

“To fulfill this pastoral duty, our predecessors have labored unweariedly that the salutary teaching of Christ should be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and have watched with like care that when it had been received it should be preserved pure and uncorrupted. Wherefore the bishops of the whole world, now singly and now assembled in Synod, following an ancient custom of the Church (St. Cyril of Alexandria to Pope St. Celestine), and the form of the ancient rule (St. Innocent I to the Council of Carthage), have reported to the Apostolic See such dangers as emerged especially in matters of faith, that the injuries done to the faith might be repaired in that quarter where the faith can experience no failure. And the Roman pontiffs, as time and circumstance required, either by convening Ecumenical Councils, or by consulting the Church spread over the world, or by local synods, or by other helps supplied by Divine providence, have defined that those things should be held which they knew; by the help of God, to be in accordance with Holy Writ and Apostolic tradition. For the Holy Spirit did not promise the successors of St. Peter to reveal to them new doctrine for them to publish, but to assist them to keep holily and expound faithfully the revelation handed down through the Apostles, *i.e.* the Deposit of Faith. Their Apostolic doctrine has been embraced by all the venerable fathers, and has been revered and followed by all the holy orthodox doctors, knowing well that this See of St. Peter remains always exempt from all error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Saviour to the chief of his disciples: ‘I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy Brethren.’

❧
Infallibility
bestowed
on the suc-
cessors of
St. Peter.

“This gift of unfailling truth and faith was divinely bestowed on Peter and on his successors in this Chair, that they might discharge the duties of their exalted office for the salvation of all; that the universal flock of Christ, turned by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished by heavenly teaching,

that the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be preserved in unity, and supported by its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell.

“But since in this our age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is more than ever required, not a few are found who oppose its authority, we judge it to be necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only begotten Son of God deigned to join to the supreme pastoral office.

“Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition derived from the commencement of the Christian faith, to the glory of God our Saviour, to the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and to the salvation of Christian nations, *sacro approbante Concilio*, we teach and define that it is a divinely revealed dogma: that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of his office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, he defines, in virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, is endowed with the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, with that infallibility with which our divine Redeemer willed that the Church should be furnished in defining doctrine of faith or morals ; and, therefore, that such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not in virtue of the consent of the Church.

“That if any (which may God avert) shall presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.”³¹

The debate began on May 15th and during the first week a succession of ecclesiastical dignitaries of the first rank, among whom were the archbishops of Vienna, Prague, Gran, Paris, Antioch, and Tuam, protested against the fourth article. Archbishop Manning, on the other hand, maintained that any denial of the doctrine of infallibility was a heresy, and deserving of the penalty of excommunication. Bishop Hefele and cardinal Schwarzenberg were among the first principal speakers; the former bringing to bear upon the subject an amount of historical knowledge which shone superior to that of every other orator. On the 19th cardinal Cullen, “the

∞
The dogma defined.

∞
Debate on the dogma.

∞
Speeches of Hefele, Schwarzenberg, Cullen, Simor, MacHale, Darbois, Stross-

protagonist of Romanism in the British Isles," as Quirinus styles him, vainly endeavoured to show that the bishop of Rottenberg had contradicted the assertions contained in his own writings. Simor, primate of Hungary, to the manifest discomfiture of the majority, arrayed his unrivalled powers as a Latin orator on the side of their antagonists. MacHale, archbishop of Tuam, now a feeble old man, opposed both the statements and the arguments of cardinal Cullen. In the prime of life he had occupied a foremost place among the Irish bishops; and he did not affect to forget that, at the time of the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill he had emphatically repudiated the dogma now presented for his acceptance.³² His prolix and somewhat involved speech was succeeded by the eloquent and scholarly harangue of the archbishop of Paris, who not only predicted that the dogma, if carried, would be fatal both to the Church and to the temporal power, but declared that a decree concerning doctrine not accepted by the whole episcopal body could have no binding force. He concluded by urging that if the question could not be allowed to drop, it might at least be deferred to a future discussion.³³

The next great speeches were those of Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, and Strossmayer. The last effort of the bishop of Diakovar was not unworthy the reputation he had gained. He fell back on the strong position afforded in the third century by the doctrinal teaching of St. Cyprian and the controversy maintained by that father with Stephen of Rome. He spoke with energy in defense of the Gallican Church; and declared that the dogma of papal infallibility, once proclaimed, would be "the death-knell of General Councils." At the close of his speech he pleaded forcibly for the principle of moral unanimity, arguing that all patristic authority pointed to three essential conditions for propounding an article of faith—"antiquity, universality, and agreement." Of all the speeches delivered during the Council this attracted, perhaps, the largest amount of attention. "It became," says Quirinus, "the topic of conversation in all circles in Rome."

The debate held its course thus far with little interruption. There were still forty-nine bishops to speak, when, on June 3rd, bishop Maret addressed the assembly. His speech was distinguished rather by candor than tact; and after some trenchant remarks, he was proceeding to argue that for a Council "to confer" infallibility on the Pope involved a kind of palpable contradiction and absurdity, when he was rudely interrupted by the president. A petition, signed by 150 members, for the closing of the debate was suddenly produced; the question was put, and carried by a large majority, and the proceedings were abruptly terminated.³⁴

☞
The speech
of bishop
Maret inter-
rupted.

It was now clearly seen that the minority had nothing to hope for from the consideration of their opponents, and that their protest might as effectually be given by a silent voice. It even became a question, whether complete silence would not be the most dignified mode of testifying their sense that the Council was no longer free. Hitherto it had been hoped that by prolonging the debates a prorogation might be rendered inevitable; but this justifiable strategy, it was now apparent, would not be practicable. At one time it was resolved to petition that the Council might be prorogued; but the increasing acerbity of temper exhibited by the pontiff, and the fierceness of his tone at several of his public audiences, convinced the minority of the hopelessness of such an appeal. It was evident too that before long, if not prorogued, the Council would dissolve of itself. The summer heat was beginning to tell perceptibly on the health of those representatives who came from Northern climes. Rome, said Quirinus, at the end of June, was like an episcopal lazaret-house. The Opposition members were, of course, the chief sufferers; the Spanish and Italian bishops, who were either natives of Italy or a similar climate, being comparatively but slightly affected. As the police had orders to prevent the departure of any of the members unprovided with a passport, and applications for passports were in most cases refused, the unhappy invalids found themselves in a position not unlike that of the inhabitants

☞
Forebodings
of the
minority.

☞
Illness of
many of the
bishops.

of a besieged city. The numerical strength of the Ultramontane party, again, enabled it quickly to repair any losses sustained through sickness, while the Opposition had already mustered all its available strength; and finally, while the former were encouraged by the prospect of a speedy triumph, and of substantial rewards in the shape of cardinals' hats and offices of honor and emolument, the latter were dejected by the consciousness of failure and by forebodings of the consequences which would probably follow upon a faithful adherence to their convictions. Already, indeed, a certain degree of vacillation began to be observable on the part of not a few; and it was in vain that the more heroic spirits endeavored to inspire them with bolder sentiments. Even the unlooked-for secession of cardinal Guidi to the side of the minority failed to produce more than a passing elation. A scheme was now proposed, whereby at the first voting (the *secret* voting, as it was termed) each member of the Opposition should give his vote *juxta modum*, signifying thereby only a conditional assent to the new dogma; the condition being, that certain modifications (which he was subsequently to propose in writing) should be adopted before the dogma was brought before the Council to receive their public and final assent. It was proposed by bishop Ketteler, bishop Melchers, and archbishop Landriot of Rheims that the minority should for the present content themselves with voting in this manner; and should at the same time unite in a declaration to the effect that, unless their written demands were complied with, their final vote must be a *Non placet*. This proposal was fortunately rejected, under the influence of more courageous advisers, and the sequel fully justified the hopeful estimate which the latter had formed of the resolution of their party.

☞
Signs of yielding on the part of some members of the Opposition.

☞
The final voting.

At length, on July 13th, the Council assembled to vote upon the famous fourth clause. Every effort had been made by the papal party to intimidate their antagonists by prophecies of a complete success. The Pope himself was said to have predicted that not above ten would vote *Non placet*. As it was, there were eighty-eight; 400 voted *Placet*,

and sixty-one *Placet juxta modum*; ninety-one abstained from recording their votes. The elements of which the phalanx of the *Non placets* was composed are deserving of special notice. It included, almost without exception, the bishops of the East—a sinister omen for the prospects of a united Christendom. The whole Hungarian episcopate were there. Nearly all whose dioceses represented important and stirring cities, the bishops of North America, of Ireland, and of England, were found in these ranks; and not a few whose dioceses lay in Northern Italy completed the list. The names, again, comprised beyond all question three-fourths of the most eminent members of the Council,—Schwarzenberg, Mathieu, Darboy, Rauscher, Simor, Ginoulhiac, MacHale, Dupanloup, Ketteler, Strossmayer, Clifford, Kenrick, Maret, and Hefele. In the list of those who voted *Placet juxta modum* scarcely a name of note appears.

After the voting had taken place, it was proposed by the archbishop of Paris, at a meeting of the Opposition, that the dissentients should leave Rome in a body, so as not to be present on the 18th, when the dogma was to be promulgated in its entirety. In the meantime the general feeling of the minority at the manner in which the Council had been overruled, the precedents of former Ecumenical Councils disregarded, and real freedom of action suppressed, had found expression in two notable pamphlets,—*Ce qui se passe au Concile* and *La Dernière Heure du Concile*. The former, published at Paris, and believed to be from the pen of M. Guillard, was a sarcastic *exposé* from official documents of the whole course of procedure, and concluded with a significant intimation that the political interests of France were largely involved in the conclusions of the Council. The second, the work of Darboy himself, was an eloquent and convincing piece of argumentation, pointing out how effectually the intervention of the pontiff had extinguished the freedom of the Council, and consequently deprived its decisions of all just claim to be regarded as authoritative utterances of the Church.

☞
Strength of
the minor-
ity.

☞
Pamphlets
by Darboy
and Guil-
lard.

✎
The minority determine to leave Rome.

The suggestion with reference to the joint action of the minority made by the archbishop of Paris was almost unanimously acted upon; but before leaving Rome he and his brother dissentients addressed a memorial to the Pope, wherein having recorded their adherence to their already avowed sentiments, they expressed their unwillingness to give them public expression on the approaching final occasion. "They shrank," says Michaud, "from uttering their *Non placets* in the presence of the Pope, and from opposing him to his face upon a question to which he, personally, attached so great an importance."³⁵ To this declaration they subjoined a unanimous protestation of their unchanged loyalty to his Holiness in all other matters. Having delivered the document at the Vatican, they then hastened to quit Rome.

✎
Declaration of the dogma.

It was thus that on the appointed day, only two prelates—bishop Riccio of Cajazzo and bishop Fitzgerald of Little Rock—uttered their *Non placets*, as the question was finally put to the assembly in the dark and gloomy Council Hall. It was a day clouded with ominous forebodings. The great war was on the point of breaking out, and but few visitors remained in Rome to be spectators of the concluding act of the drama. As the Pope read aloud the decree of his own infallibility a storm which had long been gathering broke over St. Peter's, and the decree was read by the aid of a taper, and to the accompaniment of thunder and lightning. To most these circumstances seemed an inauspicious omen; but the supporters of the decree professed to accept them as an expression of the divine sanction, like that which attended the promulgation of the law on Mount Sinai.

"Future historians," said Quirinus, "will begin a new period of Church history with July 18, 1870, as with October 31, 1517."

✎
Outbreak of the war.

On the very same day that the dogma was proclaimed at Rome the declaration of war by France was made known in the capital of Prussia. To those who have carefully watched the progress of events during the last ten

years it will be difficult to believe that this was a mere coincidence. It is now very generally admitted that, under the empress's influence, the state policy of France had for some years before been more and more subservient to the aims of the Jesuits; that the emperor was thus led to conceive and set in motion the ill-fated expedition to Mexico, designing, by the aid of those who there favored the same views, to found, side by side with the Great Republic of the North, a Catholic Empire.³⁶ Devotion to the interests of Ultramontaniam, it was notorious, had long been the best stepping-stone to advancement in the civil administration of France, and was almost essential to like promotion in the army; and up to the very day when the French lines were rolled back in irretrievable disaster at Worth and Gravelotte, the priest and the soldier exalted in the confident assurance of the simultaneous victory of Catholic France and Jesuit Rome.³⁷

☞
Connections
between the
two events.

However much the proclamation of the dogma might be regarded as a triumph, the political results by which it was immediately attended could have given but little satisfaction to its supporters. In England it evoked a display of anti-Catholic feeling such as had not been witnessed since the creation of the Catholic bishoprics. It perceptibly augmented the dislike to dogmatic teaching in Germany. It provoked the abolition of the Concordat in Austria. In both Italy and Spain the old absolutist traditions seemed to have passed away, and religious influences to be banished from the political sphere.

☞
Political
results of
the declara-
tion of the
dogma.

In the following October, though the circumstance attracted but little notice during the concentration of European interest on the progress of the war, Victor Emmanuel issued a decree for annexing Rome to the Italian kingdom; and in the language of the present Prime Minister, "that immemorial and sacred throne, which emperors and kings for centuries failed to control, vanished like a dream."³⁸ "It is remarkable," observed a writer in the *Saturday Review*, "how little attention has been excited by this sudden and to all appearance final collapse."

☞
Fall of the
temporal
power.