may be addressed to all doubters: How does it happen that all orthodox writers, differing as they may differ upon a hundred minor points, invariably utter the same sound, and speak in perfect unison, when they refer to the person and work of Jesus Christ Jehovah, as the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely ?

ARTICLE VIII.

HISTORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

[by Thomas Witherow]

Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti et Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani, Die 8 *Decembris,* 1869, *a SS. D. N. Pio P. IX. inchoati.* Friburgi Brisgovise: 1871.

Documenta ad lllustrandum Concilium Vaticanum anni 1870. *Gesammelt und herausgegeben* von Dr. JOHANN FRIBDRICH. Nordlingen: 1871.

Letters from Rome on the Council. By QUIRINUS. Reprinted from the *Allgemeine Zeitung.* Authorised Translation. London : 1870.

For three hundred years after the Council of Trent had closed its sittings in 1564 no ecclesiastical assembly professing to be in any sense œcumenical, met in Christendom. The experience gathered by successive Popes at Constance, at Basle, and even at Trent, did not favor any repetition of the experiment. These great councils had shewn signs of a desire to assert their independence. The members of them had manifested an amount of insubordination, which made it difficult to persuade them to do the exact thing which the papal court expected them to do. Besides, there was some danger of a council putting itself into antagonism to the governments of Europe, and of thus precipitating a conflict, from which the Church was not likely to escape without damage, and which, for that reason, it would be the part of wisdom to postpone and to avoid. For such reasons, it was

generally believed that the world would never see another General Council.

Under these circumstances, Christendom was taken somewhat by surprise when, on the 26th of June, 1867, Pope Pius IX. announced that it was his design to summon, at an early day, a General Council at Rome, to deliberate on grave and important matters affecting the interests of the Church. Though the bishops, to whom this intimation was made, professed to receive it with pleasure, some of them, we can well believe, were alarmed at the prospect ; and all the more so, that there was nothing, at that time, in the condition of the Church to make it necessary to incur the risk of such a dangerous experiment. But Pius knew well what he was about. He had a grand project before his mind, and to him and his advisers it seemed that the times were ripe for its accomplishment.

Pio Nono, though inferior to many of his predecessors in culture, has never had a superior among them in purity of morals, in suavity of manners, in rigid tenacity of purpose, and in the desire to leave behind him a great and historic name. From the first, he cherished the ambition of doing something which should make his pontificate worthy of being remembered in after ages. The fall of the temporal power—an event the consummation of which was then imminent-—was likely enough to give him the celebrity that he desired ; but a man in his position may well be pardoned for wishing to associate his name with something great, but not so calamitous in its nature. His early association with the Liberal party in Italy, from the ruinous consequences of which French intervention alone had saved him; the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith in 1854 and the celebrated Encyclical of December 8, 1864, with its Syllabus of eighty errors placed by him under ecclesiastical ban, might have been sufficient to signalise the pontificate of a man who had sat in the chair of Peter for a longer period of years than any of the two hundred and fifty-six men who preceded him in office. But even these were not enough. Two ideas, which had weakened the power of many of his predecessors, and which, if let alone, might be productive of evil at a future day, had yet to

be rooted out of the Church. One of these was the notion that a General Council has it in its power to limit the authority, or even reverse the decisions, of a Pope; the other, that bishops have some authority of their own, derived from Christ through the apostleship, and independent of the chair of Peter. It would, he thought, consolidate the papal power and smooth the way of all his successors till the end of time, if these two ideas were formally condemned. It might then be affirmed as a Christtian dogma; that church power comes down from Christ through the Pope only, and that no bishop has any right or privileges further than he is pleased to permit; and also, that while councils may and ought to join the successor of Peter in testifying to the truth, it is he alone who is able to testify as to what is the truth without possibility of error. If a General Council could be induced to affirm these two propositions—*that*, of course, was not understood at Rome to be necessary to the truth of the doctrine contained in them, but it would silence objectors. Never again could any man have the face to appeal from the Pope to a General Council, if a General Council itself had abnegated its rights, and had acknowledged the Pope to be the only source of power in the visible Church. Were it to do so, Gallicanism would receive its deathblow and trouble Christendom no more. Ever after, the personal declaration of the vicar of Christ would end all controversy. In presence of the condemnation of the ONE INFALLIBLE MAN, Rationalism would not venture to speak, Communism would not lift its head, and Protestantism itself would wither and die. Results so beneficial seemed deserving of a vigorous effort in order to attain them, and could not fail to make illustrious the pontificate in which they were secured.

Moreover, Pio had good reason for believing that the means by which he hoped to reach these results were not impracticable, or even difficult. No previous pontiff, as he well knew, was more popular with the clergy. As misfortunes, arising from his relations with the Italian government, and from the loss of most of his territorial dominions, descended upon him in a series of successive strokes, the Catholic bishops made his sufferings their own, and gathered around the throne of their chief with the

greater love and veneration. Besides, the eternal city, under protection of French troops, was still subject to his rule; but it was uncertain how long, in the casualties of political action, the little strip of territory which he governed might enjoy immunity from invasion. Above all, the Jesuits were in favor of the movement. However ambitious of power that aspiring order might be, it could not object to see the Pope absolute ruler of the Church, so long as it remained, what it has been for some time. absolute ruler of the Pope. Nor was it likely that the Catholic governments of Europe would throw any serious difficulty in the, way ; most of them had stood aside, and looked quietly on, to see the vicar of Christ despoiled of most of his possessions, and all of them were shy in cultivating the friendly alliance which had existed between them and Rome in former ages. They could scarcely complain now if the Church took them at their word, and pursued its own way, without asking either their cooperation or advice. Ancient Rome, when the sceptre of dominion over the nations dropped from her hands, seized the sceptre of dominion over human souls, and long held undisputed sway alike over their faith and their life. Now that the vicar of Christ was being despoiled of his territories by sacrilegious force, and that enemies were rejoicing over the approaching overthrow of his temporal jurisdiction, would it not be a grand and masterly stroke to take up a new position, which should enable him to claim the sovereignty, not of one poor little province in central Italy, but of all Christian governments, and, with the concurrence of all Catholic bishops, to have himself acknowledged the one infallible monarch upon earth ?

There is now little doubt that thoughts like these were in the mind of the pontiff when, on the 29th of June, 1868, he issued a bull convoking a General Council to meet at Rome on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception in the following year, the 8th of December, 1869, for the purpose of providing a remedy for the existing evils by which society was afflicted. In this bull, however, he gave no hint of the one grand remedy which there is reason to think had already been resolved upon at the Vatican. That was to appear in due time.

In the interval, nothing was left undone to impress the whole Christian world with the importance of the event which was about to take place. Invitations were addressed to the prelates of the Greek Church, and of the Nestorian and Monophysite Churches of the East not in communion with the Apostolic See, urging them on this occasion to unite with their Latin brethren, and to renew the bonds of ancient brotherhood. The Anglican bishops being judged heretical, were of course ignored; but on the 13th September, 1868, an appeal from Rome was addressed to Protestants and to other non-Catholics, reminding them of the marks of the one true Church, calling their attention to the injuries inflicted on society by their sects and divisions, and urging them to take the opportunity afforded by the Council to be reconciled to the Church from which their ancestors had departed. This was followed up by an apostolic letter, dated 11th of April, 1869, promising full remission of sins to all who, between the 1st of June following and the day fixed for the meeting of the Council, should visit their parish churches on two separate occasions, and there pray devoutly for the conversion of the erring, for the spread of the holy faith, and for the triumph and peace of the Catholic Church. The faithful over Christendom rushed to the altar and took advantage of the very easy terms on which pardon was offered. The Protestants almost everywhere responded to the appeal made to them to reenter the Church, with significant silence. But the Oriental prelates, representing a numerical aggregate of some seventy or eighty millions of professing Christians not in communion with Rome, were more emphatic in their refusal to accept the papal invitation.

The Patriarch of Constantinople receives the spiritual homage of some eighty archbishops and one hundred and seventy bishops. Upon this great ecclesiastic the Pope's legate, having previously given notice of his intention, waited at the time appointed, for the purpose of presenting him with a splendidly bound copy of the Pope's Encyclical. The Patriarch did not take the document into his hand, but by a peculiar movement signified his wish that it should be laid upon the divan. The legate then made a short statement explanatory of the object of the Council. The reply

of the Patriarch in substance was: " It is useless I should go to a council in which a discussion so often fruitlessly undertaken before, can only divide men's minds still further **:** the Oriental Church will never abandon the doctrine that it has received from the apostles, and which has been handed down by the holy fathers and general councils." At the close of this speech, the successor of Chrysostom and Photius beckoned with his hand, whereupon his secretary took up the Encyclical, which all this time the Patriarch did not deign to read or even to touch, and replaced it in the hands of the legate, remarking to him as he did so, that "the Greek Church would never recognise the Pope's infallibility, nor the domination that he assumed over General Councils, nor the monarchy that he exercised over the Church." The answer of the other great Oriental prelates was to the same effect. In a word, the one hundred and fifty millions of Greek and Protestant Christians refused to participate in any way whatever; so that instead of being Œcumenical, in the true sense of the word, the Council came to be what, from the first, Pius knew well it would be, representative of the Latin Church alone.

Meanwhile preparations were going forward at Rome, with the view that, when the prelates should assemble, they would have little to do except to ratify the proposals submitted to them. The subject of infallibility had not been mooted in the original bull of convocation; and as if to turn the minds of the bishops in another direction, so early as the 6th of June, 1867, a circular was sent them, embodying seventeen questions on points of discipline, and requesting an answer. Six special commissions, consisting mostly of Roman canonists, each presided over by a cardinal, and each with a distinct class of subjects intrusted to it, were appointed to sit and arrange material for the meeting. The Pope himself decreed that the Council should hold its solemn sessions in the basilica of St. Peter's; that all the deliberations should be conducted in Latin, the official language of the Church; and that all the members should sit in the order of their rank. All the officials, the presidents and secretaries, were to be named by the Pope. It was arranged that four "congregations" or commissions—one on doctrine, one on discipline, one on oriental

rites, and one on monastic matters—should be appointed by ballot in the Council; that they should sit permanently ; and that these congregations—each consisting of twenty-four members, presided over by a cardinal—on the basis of the rough drafts drawn up by the commissions appointed by the Pope, should prepare the decrees. These proposed decrees, having been printed, were to be distributed to the members of Council, and then on an appointed day they were to come up before the " general congregation;" that is, before the whole council, in secret session, for consideration and discussion. Members wishing to address the general congregation were to send in their names a day previously, in order that each might have an opportunity to speak in the order of his rank, but before the close of the sittings it was found necessary to modify this arrangement. In case there was no difference of opinion in the general congregation, the vote was to be taken at once ; but in case of a serious difference, the proposed decrees were to be sent back for revision, and brought again before the general congregation at a future meeting. When a public, or, as it was called, a *solemn* session of the Council was held, it was held simply for the public adoption of the decrees already adopted in private session; no speeches were then allowed ; and no man then had the power of saying more than *Placet,* or *Non-placet,* to the proposal. The public vote having been taken, the Pope, who at the solemn session was to preside in person, would announce the result and decree accordingly. No member was at his own option to submit a proposal even to the general congregation. It had first to be submitted to a congregation of cardinals, and afterwards to the Pope, that they might decide whether the subject was suitable for consideration. It was in the special congregations that the real business of the Council was transacted, as it was in the general congregation that the discussions were to be held; but in both everything was to be done in secret, and the outside world was to see and know nothing except what transpired at the solemn sessions. Upon trial, however, it was found that seven hundred men could not keep a secret, and each day's proceedings in the general congregation made their way out of doors, and in substance were reported in

Thomas Witherow, Southern Presbyterian Review 26.2 (April 1875): 339-375.

the papers at Rome, Paris, and Berlin. No member of the Council was to depart from the city without permission—an order which, as Pius was still sovereign ruler of Rome, it was easy for him to enforce; .and lest his sudden demise should tempt the prelates to do something not set down in the programme, a special bull was issued, enacting, that in case the Pope should die while the Council was in session, it must immediately dissolve. Every precaution was thus taken that the Council should do exactly what the Pope wished, and that, in case of refusing so to do, it should do nothing.

As the time appointed for the meeting drew near, the more intelligent Greek and Protestant Christians regarded the affair with some curiosity, as a modern reproduction of those great ecclesiastical gatherings, which in ancient and mediaeval times had exercised a marked influence on the current theology—a link in the chain of great events, whose rapid unrolling is one of the characteristics of our age. But the more intelligent Catholics viewed the matter with more than a historical interest: in them it awoke anxiety and alarm. Though none outside the papal court knew of a certainty why the Council was called, they, by a kind of instinct, subsequently justified by facts, suspected that its object was to coin a new dogma, and add it to the current list of Catholic doctrines. In the more enlightened circles of France and Germany, it was believed that the real design of the meeting of the Council was to affirm the personal infallibility of the Pope, and all who were sufficiently informed to know the consequences involved in such an article of faith, trembled at the prospect which it opened in the distance. In their anxiety to allay this alarm, the German bishops assembled at Fulda three months before the meeting of the Council, and issued a pastoral in which they stated that a General Council can establish no new dogmas, nor indeed any others than those already written on Catholic hearts ; that the only dogma it could affirm is one contained already in Holy Scripture or apostolic tradition, and that its purpose was to set the original truth in clearer light. The design of this manifesto was to remove the popular, fears in regard to the infallibility ; and yet the studied vagueness with which the pre-

lates express themselves, betrayed a feeling on their part—a possibility that the popular fears might, after all, be realised, and seemed to provide for themselves a line of retreat, of which they could take advantage in case of necessity. Well meant as this manifesto was, it was viewed with dissatisfaction at Rome ; and when they followed up their action by forwarding to the Court a joint letter in which all except three remonstrated against the definition of the dogma as inopportune, it is said that the Holy Father was astonished at the presumption of these German bishops in no common degree.

The Council, when it assembled, proved to be a General Council of the Roman Catholic Church, in the very narrowest sense. It contained no representative of the hundred and fifty millions of Christians comprised in the Oriental and Protestant Churches; it did not include an envoy from any of the Catholic governments of Europe. Even France, the eldest son of the Church, which so long had lent its soldiers to guard the Pope in his chair, was not permitted to send an ambassador to the meeting. "Were the privilege granted to France," said Antonelli, "it could not be refused to the other powers." France, therefore, had to be shut out, lest, if the door was opened, Austria, Bavaria, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, might venture to step in. This one fact shews clearly the altered position of affairs since the Council of Trent met in 1545, and how much the attitude about to be assumed by the Church was at variance with the principles of modern society.

It is also worthy of remark, that the prelates who sat in council did not represent the laity of the Church in proportion to their numbers and importance. Had all entitled to sit in a General Council of the Romish Church been present, it would have consisted of 1,049 members; but age, illness, and other reasons, made this impossible ; as it was, there met in Council 51 cardinals, 10 patriarchs, 9 primates, 115 archbishops, 480 bishops, 22 abbots, and 25 generals and vicar-generals of monastic orders—in all 712. Of these 10 belonged to Australia, 7 to Africa, 76 to America, 84 to Asia, and 535 to Europe. Of the 535 European members, Italy alone supplied 276, all the other countries of

Europe united only 259. Twelve millions of German Catholics were represented in the Council by 14 votes; the States of the Church, with a population less than one million, were represented by no fewer than 62. There were 120 archbishops and bishops *in partibus*, that, is, titular bishops who had no dioceses; while Paris, with its two millions of Catholics, and Cologne, with a million and a half, were represented each by one archbishop. Notwithstanding these anomalies, perhaps the Church was never so widely represented in any previous Council. Every country in the world where Catholicism has found a home, sent somebody to speak in its name. From Pagan lands there were present missionary bishops, Malay, Chinese, Negro, and Hottentot. From the distant cities of the East, there had come bishops of small communities which professed allegiance to the Roman See. America for the first time appeared by its representative. in one of the great Christian Councils. The leading capitals of Europe were represented each by one of its most dignified ecclesiastics. Under the dome of St. Peter's there assembled the representative pastors of one hundred and eighty millions of human souls. No other man on earth than Pio Nono could have assembled at his call such a grand array out of so many and so distant nations.

December 8, 1869, proved to be a dark and dismal day; but the downpour of rain did not damp the spirit of the prelates, and the Council met amid the ringing of bells and the thunder of cannon, which, from their iron throats, gave the strangers a noisy welcome. The Pope in person took the chair, and after the usual religious formalities, delivered an address, in which he spoke of dangers surrounding the Church, said that he had called them together to aid him by their advice, and closed by imploring on their behalf the guidance and protection of the Holy Spirit, the Queen of Heaven, of the angels and archangels, of Peter and Paul.

The Council had no sooner met than it was discovered that the arrangements made for conducting business were anything but favorable to free and serious deliberation. The basilica of St. Peter's was constructed for grand ceremonials exhibited to the

eye, not for intellectual appeals addressed through the ear to the understanding; voices lost themselves in the vast void which intervened between the floor and the roof; it required an effort to hear anything; and it was not till near the final close of the sittings that the difficulties so long complained of were to some extent diminished by means of a mechanical contrivance which served as a sounding-board. The effect of requiring all the speeches to be in Latin was, that many from want of practice in Latin composition, were precluded from addressing the Council; those who spoke, usually read speeches that were previously prepared ; and the few who were able to make themselves heard, were not very well understood, whether from peculiarities of national pronunciation, or from the rapid utterance of a language which they were not accustomed to use as an instrument of thought. Reply and rejoinder, strictly speaking, there was none; for if a man or his published sentiments were directly assailed in the general congregation, he could not respond till his turn came to speak, which might not be for some weeks after, when the whole matter was but dimly remembered ; or if he had already spoken, he must allow the attack to pass in silence, inasmuch as it was not permitted to the same man to speak twice in the same debate. Should a speaker occasionally drop a remark displeasing to the curia, that is, to the cardinals and immediate advisers of his Holiness, or object to the concentration of unlimited power in the hands of one man, he was significantly reminded that he had sworn at his consecration not only to maintain but to increase the rights of the popedom. Reporters from the public press were strictly excluded, and although stenographic writers were employed to take down what was said, members were not permitted afterwards to examine even their own speeches, or to correct any inaccuracy which might have crept into the report, Prelates, not serving on any of the special congregations, were not allowed to hold any external meeting for deliberation in common, nor to print anything till it had passed the censorship, nor to originate any action whatever; the only privilege afforded them was the right of speaking in the general congregation, and of saying *Placet* or *Non-placet* in the solemn session. Even

in the general congregation, the right of speech was not beyond interference ; an unpalatable address was usually shortened by the vigorous ringing of the bell of the presiding legate, or interrupted by the prelates scraping their feet along the floor. The ballot for the special congregations, which shaped the decrees and in fact transacted all the real business, was so adroitly managed that no bishop, known to be opposed to infallibility, was by any chance elected to serve upon any of them; and it is not difficult in those circumstances to imagine how suggestions, handed in by the minority to commissions composed exclusively of opponents, would be received. Anything written by the minority, with the view of explaining or defending their opinions, had to be printed at Naples or Florence ; but those in favor of the infallibility, were quite free to have printed at Rome anything which they required. It was evident that the Council had assembled, not so much to deliberate and to do what on the whole seemed best for the good of the Church, as to receive the commands of the Holy Father, and to give expression to his mind rather than its own.

Though the great object of the Council was kept a strict secret in official circles, every man came to Rome with the presentiment upon his mind that it was convened to decree the infallibility, and the members were classed with the majority or the minority according as they favored or opposed the dogma. The majority, supposed to number five hundred at least, consisted mostly of Italians, and of titular prelates without sees and without people, the latter of whom were lodged and boarded in Rome at the Pope's expense, and, as a matter of course, were hot for infallibility. The minority, supposed to be unfriendly to the dogma, were mostly Hungarian, German, French, and American prelates—men whose theological culture had been derived from something more liberalising than the study of the canon law. But the influence of the minority was weakened by a division in their own ranks—some of them opposing the dogma on the ground that it was in direct contradiction to historical fact, others on the lower ground that it was inopportune to proclaim it in present circumstances. The manifest policy of the curia was

first to feel its way and test the actual strength of the minority, and then; after this was ascertained, to use every possible means to break the opposition down, so as to produce virtual unanimity at last. In this the court was only too successful.

So soon as the special congregations were appointed, they set to work, and drew up *schemata*, that is, rough drafts of decrees, which it was hoped the general congregation would, with slight change, adopt, and the Council, in solemn session, affirm. These *schemata* were each a little treatise on a particular subject, divided into chapters and sections, as if the design had been that the Council at its close should issue a complete code of theology and discipline. Each *schema* was intended to be a complete official deliverance upon its own subject. Fifty-one of these *schemata*, it was understood, were to be submitted to the Council, namely, three on the subject of faith ; twenty-eight on discipline ; eighteen on religious orders ; and two on oriental church affairs. But the progress of business was so much slower than had been anticipated, that on the 8th of March, three months after the Council met, not one of the *schemata* had been finally adopted; only five of them had been discussed in the general congregation; twelve were then in the hands of members; and thirty-nine had not as yet emerged from the special commission to be distributed among the bishops for consideration. At this rate of progress, years must have elapsed before the Council could get through the work which its conductors had carved out for it. It was not destined to sit so long; and yet it did not separate till it had performed the main duty for which it was convened.

The first SCHEMA laid before the general congregation was that ON FAITH, which came up so early as the 28th of December. Originally it had consisted of eighteen chapters, but when it had passed the ordeal of discussion in the general congregation, it was reduced to very modest dimensions indeed. The first solemn session of the Council was fixed for the 6th of January, in the hope that before that time it would be ready for being publicly affirmed; but the opposition to it was so much greater than had been expected, that when the day arrived there was no de-

cree ready for public ratification, and the fathers, rather than separate without doing anything, repeated publicly the oath which each of them had already taken at the time of his ordination.

The opposition to this *schema* was strong in the general congregation. On the day it was introduced, seven prelates spoke against it, and on the 30th of December five others, all of whom objected to it mainly on the ground that it was unsafe for the Church to pledge itself to any narrow definition. It was sent back for revision. On the 16th of March it was again distributed in an amended form, with the view of considering it in the general congregation on the 18th; but so many sent in their names as wishing to speak on the subject, that the design of holding another solemn session on the 25th of March, for its public ratification, had also to be abandoned.

It was in course of a debate on the amended draft, on the 22d of March, that a memorable scene occurred. A Hungarian prelate, Strossmayer, bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium, spoke that day in his turn. Referring to a passage of the *schema,* where the unbelief and rationalism of the present age are said to have had their origin in the Reformation, and in the rejection by Protestants of the decrees of the Council of Trent, he called attention to the well-known historical fact, that in the centuries before the Reformation religious indifference and heresy were common, and that the unbelief, which attained its climax in the French Revolution, had manifested itself, not in a Protestant, but in a Catholic nation: he reminded them of the distinguished services which Protestants, by their able answers to infidel arguments, had rendered to the cause of Christianity in general, and added that all Christians were under obligation to such writers as Leibnitz and Guizot. Each of these statements was received with murmurs, but the murmurs at last rose to a very torrent of indignation. The president, Cardinal De Angelis, cried out most appropriately, considering that the Palace of Inquisition stood at no great distance from the spot where the Council was assembled, " This is no place for praising Protestants." Amid the uproar, Strossmayer exclaimed, "That alone can be imposed

upon the faithful as a dogma, which has the moral unanimity of the bishops in its favor." The obvious bearing of this general principle upon the doctrine, which, though not yet under discussion, was nevertheless present to every mind, stirred the feelings of the Council. Several prelates sprung to their feet, rushed to the tribune, and in wild excitement shook their fists in the speaker's face, exclaiming, "Shame! shame! down with the heretic!" The tumult was awful. The Bishop of Marseilles had the courage to shout amid the din, "I do not condemn him," but his voice was borne down by the response of the majority, "We all, all of us, condemn him." One bishop did not think it beneath his dignity to call the speaker a "damnable heretic." The presilent, who kept ringing his bell throughout the commotion, succeeded at last in quelling the noise, and informed Strossmayer that he was out of order; whereupon the speaker descended from the tribune, after having first solemnly protested against the unbecoming treatment that he had received. It was estimated that from two hundred to four hundred bishops took part in this discreditable scene. An American prelate afterwards remarked that he "now knew at least one assembly rougher in its deliberations than the Congress of his own country."

The general debate on the *schema* being concluded, the general congregation proceeded to examine the various chapters in detail. On the 29th of March the first voting took place, when the preamble was adopted in a modified form; and afterwards daily sessions were held on other parts of the draft. On the third chapter no fewer than one hundred and twelve amendments were proposed, but the discussion on these was conducted in a much more quiet way than that of the 2'2d of March. The result of the protracted debate was, that the *schema* as adopted was reduced from eighteen to four chapters, introduced by a preamble, and having appended to them eighteen canons anathematising all contrary opinions. The third solemn session of the Council was held on the 24th of April, and at this meeting, some five months after the Council opened, the first decrees were passed. Strossmayer and some other bishops stayed away, so that a unanimous vote of the six hundred and sixty-seven members present on that

Thomas Witherow, Southern Presbyterian Review 26.2 (April 1875): 339-375.

day was obtained in favor of the " Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith." The form of promulgation ran thus: "Pius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, with the approval of the sacred Council, for perpetual remembrance, declares," and so on. Some took exception to his Holiness assuming to promulgate the decrees in his own name; but it was made a point of honor with the curia that they should be published, not in the name of the Council, but in the name of the Pope, with the Council's approbation. It was so done accordingly; and after the decree was pronounced in due form, the Pope gave to the assembled fathers the benediction of peace.

The Dogmatic Constitution, thus unanimously adopted as the public expression of the mind of the Roman Catholic Church, traces up the errors of Atheism, Pantheism, Materialism, and Rationalism, at present existing in the world, to the fact that so many rejected the divine authority of the Church as expressed in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and claimed the right of private judgment—that is, to Protestantism; for though it is not expressly named, *that* is what is meant in reality. It entirely overlooks that Protestantism, as a religious system, has never sanctioned these errors, that few Protestants, comparatively, have adopted them, and that their ablest antagonists have been always found in the Protestant Churches. The first chapter, treating of the nature of the Divine Being, is unexceptionable; but the second chapter reaffirms the old Romish doctrine that supernatural revelation is contained both in written books and unwritten traditions ; that the true sense of Scripture is that which has been held, and is held, by holy Mother Church ; and that no one is permitted to interpret Scripture contrary to this sense and to the unanimous consent of the fathers. The third chapter, on Faith appeals to the Church as herself a witness for her divine mission and an evidence for Christianity, by reason of her "admirable propagation, her eminent holiness, her inexhaustible fecundity; her catholic unity, and her invincible stability;" thus setting forth once more the old and often-refuted sophism, that everything true of the universal body of God's saints in the world, is of the Romish Church alone. The fourth chapter, on Faith

and Reason, defines " that every assertion contrary to the truth of enlightened faith, is utterly false ;" forbids Christians to defend, as legitimate conclusions of science, such opinions as are known to be contrary to the teaching of the faith, especially if they have been reprobated by the Church ; and affirms that the meaning of the sacred dogmas, which the Church has once set forth, is to be perpetually retained, and is not to be departed from under the appearance and pretence of more profound intelligence. The canons appended to the Constitution on Faith, pronounce an anathema on all who hold atheistic, materialistic, and pantheistic opinions, or who deny the divine inspiration of the Scriptures and the possibility of miracles, or who assert that the progress of science demands that a sense different from that which the Church has understood shall be given to dogmas taught by the Church ; and they end by calling on all to labor in warding off and banishing these errors from Holy Church.

The second SCHEMA presented to the Council was ON DISCIPLINE, dealing more particularly with the duties of bishops. Its general tendency seemed to be to centralize all church power in Rome, by curtailing any independent jurisdiction which still remains to the episcopate, and making it helplessly dependent on the popedom. One of its provisions, for example, forbade a prelate to reside temporarily outside the bounds of his diocese, without having first obtained the papal consent, and required the archbishop to report to Rome any bishop who did not comply with this regulation. Another conferred upon the Pope the right of bestowing, during the temporary vacancy in a see, any benefices in the bishop's gift; the obvious effect of which would have been to draw place-hunters in crowds to Rome, and, of course, to bring large sums into the papal coffers.

The draft containing these and other proposals, gave rise to a brilliant debate in the general congregation, during the course of which the curia was obliged to listen to some plain home-truths, which it was not very fond of hearing. It commenced on the 14th of January, and was continued at intervals for several weeks after. In the discussion, Darboy, archbishop of Paris, who afterwards fell a victim to the tyranny of the Commune.

remarked that, in considering the subject, they must speak of the rights, no less than of the duties, of bishops ; and Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague, did not hesitate to say that the college of cardinals needed reform no less than the episcopal order.

The great speech, however, was that of Strossmayer, on the 25th of January. The substance of his address was, that reform should not commence with the bishops; it should begin with the highest, and end only with the lowest members of the hierarchy. The popedom itself should be no longer a purely Italian institution ; for Catholics in every country of the world should be eligible to office. The Roman congregations should no longer be composed exclusively of Italians, and should be open to ecclesiastics from all parts of the Church, so that religious questions, in future, may be viewed in a less narrow and jealous spirit. The college of cardinals should contain a representation of all Catholic countries in proportion to their population and importance. General Councils ought to be held more frequently—say once in every ten years, as recommended by the Council of Constance. In this way the nations would have presented to them, at frequently recurring intervals, an example of the forbearance, patience, and charity, with which the Church deals with great questions. Provincial Synods, also, should have a definite and acknowledged influence over the appointment of bishops; He went on to speak of the centralisation of power at Rome, as stifling the very life of the Church, and asserted that true unity is not reached by a flat uniformity, but by every national section of the Church retaining its own peculiar institutions. He called the canon law, as it now exists, a "Babylonish confusion," made up in the main of unpractical, or corrupt, or spurious canons and said that the world was looking to the Council for a codification of canon law, drawn up, not by Roman canonists, but by learned and practical men from all parts of the Church, and which should be adapted alike to present times and circumstances. In answer to a previous speaker, who had said that the reformation of the college of cardinals might be safely intrusted to their father the Pope, Strossmayer now said that they had

also a mother, the Church, whose office was to give them wholesome advice and instruction, to which they ought to attend. His speech lasted for an hour and a half; and many who heard it said afterwards that no such eloquence in the Latin tongue had been heard for centuries.

Melchers, archbishop of Cologne, also took part in the discussion. He complained of the concentration of ecclesiastical power at Rome; of the system of dispensations always purchasable there; and of its meddling and troublesome domination. Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans, also spoke of "those courtiers who had never learned to tell the truth to the Pope"—a description which, of course, the curia would understand. But one of the most amusing things was said by a Hungarian bishop, when illustrating the evils arising from the necessity of having to apply to Rome for dispensations. He told of a poor woman who came weeping to her bishop, begging him to save her marriage, and her very existence, by a dispensation. But the bishop could not help her in the way she wished; a dispensation could be granted by the Pope only ; and from the Pope there was not the slightest chance of obtaining it; for, said the speaker, significantly, "Mulier non habet pecunias"—*a 'woman has no money*. The court prelates took all this very much amiss and afterwards said of the poor Hungarian bishop, that "he had made himself very disagreeable with his *mulier non habet pecunias."*

The Council was prorogued before this *schema* on discipline had come forth from the ordeal of discussion and was ripe for passing into a decree. It therefore ranks among the lapsed proposals; though, should the Council ever reassemble, it is possible that it may be revived. Meanwhile the discussion upon it is of interest to us, as affording a glimpse of the internal condition and administration of the Romish Church, and as proving that many of its own ablest and most accomplished prelates are anything but satisfied with the existing state of affairs.

There is reason to believe that the original design of the papal court was, that the Council should vote the dogma of Infallibility by acclamation. But circumstances did not favor this design. It was discovered at an early part of the proceedings, that there

was a small but influential minority opposed to it. From the first, the opposition bishops showed a disposition to speak their; minds freely and at length ; so that there was every probability that the sittings would be very protracted. In the unsettled state of Europe, who could tell what disarrangement might occur to prevent the grand consummation? Some political storms might rise suddenly to disperse the Council before it had time to do the main work for which it had been called together. Considerations of this kind led to the SCHEMA ON THE CHURCH being brought forward at an earlier period than was originally proposed. It was printed and put into the hands of members about the 21st of January.

In its original form it was a lengthy document of 213 pages, and was drawn up so skilfully that the doctrine of the infallibility, which was not stated but implied throughout, could, by a slight addition, be inserted with ease as the natural conclusion to which the whole led up. Three main ideas ran through it all: *first* that the Pope has an absolute dominion over the whole Church; second, that his temporal power as a sovereign prince is one of the doctrines of Christianity; and *third*, that Church and State are inseparable, but only on this condition, that when the two powers come into collision, the Church is always to prevail, the draft as originally presented, twenty-one canons were attached. On the 6th March, as the court party then more than before were feeling the necessity of coming to the point without delay, the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the Pope was added by way of supplement and conclusion. Up till the 25th of that month, criticisms might be sent in and suggestions offered; and, even after that date, the congregation having the *schema* in charge made various alterations, the object being to preserve the dogma, and, consistently with that, to secure for its definition as much unanimity as possible.

For months the Infallibility was the grand subject to which were directed the thoughts of the leading ecclesiastics of Europe. In the Council, prelates opposed to it soon became known; and some of them were plied with arguments and temptations almost irresistible to side with the majority ; while others of them, not

open to conviction, found to their surprise that no difficulty was thrown in the way of their leaving the city and returning home as soon as they pleased. Out of doors, before and after the Council opened, distinguished theologians, such as Newman, Montalembert, Hyacinthe, Gratry, and Dollinger, expressed their mind freely on the matter ; most of them against the definition. When the *schema* was actually tabled in the Council, the Catholic governments of Europe remonstrated against the dogma, more particularly against the application of its principles embodied in the canons attached ; but even by them Pius was not to be turned from his purpose; and Cardinal Antonelli assured their representatatives, with all due suavity, that his master and himself were concerned only about the theory, and that there was no intention on the Pope's part to put the new principles in force.

The debate commenced in the general congregation on the 13th of May. Though all the chapters of the *schema* were before the house, yet the discussion constantly gravitated toward the infallibility, which every one felt to be its heart and soul. It was ominous of a struggle, that upwards of a hundred members sent in their names, as desirous to speak on the subject. Though these were not all heard, yet the great dignitaries of the Council at one time or other had full opportunity of giving expression to sir sentiments ; of whom only a few of the more important can be noted here.

Dr. Manning, archbishop of Westminster, asserted that infallibility was already a doctrine of the Church, which could not be denied without proximate heresy; and that the Council was then engaged not (as some alleged) in making a new doctrine, but simply proclaiming a doctrine already in existence. Many would be been prepared to admit that the Pope, speaking in conjunction with the bishops, is infallible; but the great Anglican convert, more Roman than the Romans themselves, was the first to take high ground, and to say out boldly in the Council, that the Pope is infallible, even independently of the episcopate.

Cardinal Cullen, on the 19th of May, made rather a sharp attack on Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg, author of the celebrated work on the Councils, and the highest living authority in that

department of ecclesiastical knowledge. But the speech did not attempt to refute any of Hefele's positions; it was a mere *argumentum ad hominem*, intended to shew that in speaking of Honoring, the historian had contradicted himself.

Simor, primate of Hungary, and now (1874) a cardinal, father surprised his friends by opposing the dogma. He was succeeded at the tribune by the archbishop of Tuam, Dr. Machale a man of celebrity thirty years before, when O'Connell rather profanely designated him the "lion of the tribe of Judah," but who appeared before the Council as a feeble old man. His speech was not very effective, but it served to shew at least that all Ireland was not in favor of the dogma. Archbishop Darboy followed, repeatedly declaring that a decree not accepted by the whole episcopate could have no binding force.

The discussion was continued for many successive days, the ablest speakers on both sides taking part in it, and the monotony of debate being occasionally relieved by a little of the grotesque and absurd. Pie, bishop of Poictiers, maintained that the Pope is infallible, *because*, St. Peter was crucified with his head downwards Original as this argument is, it was eclipsed by that of a Sicilian bishop, who said that when St. Peter was preaching in Sicily, he told the people about his infallibility ; that the inhabitants, having some doubt about it, determined to send a deputation to the Virgin Mary to make inquiries, and that her answer was that she was present when her Son conferred this prerogative on Peter. He added, that the Sicilians ever since have been warm infallibilists, for the answer of the Virgin quite removed all their doubts. If this be true, the Sicilians are certainly very advanced theologians.

Valerga, titular bishop of Jerusalem, was less absurd, but not more convincing. He drew a parallel between the Fallibilists and the Monothelites, and maintained, that, as in the person of Christ a divine will coexisted with a human will subject to sin, so in the Pope personal and official infallibility might coexist with moral sinfulness. It is not supposed, however, that many felt there was much weight to be attached to this rather far-fetched analogy.

An American prelate, Dr. Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, spoke strongly on the other side. He maintained that the voice of Christian antiquity, prior to the forged decretals, is unanimously against the notion that the Pope alone, without the bishops, is infallible. He admitted that no Pope could wilfully become heretical, but that did not prove him to be infallible; and, against Manning, he asserted that no man is justified in calling a "proximate heresy" an opinion which the Church has not already condemned; "for." said he, " it is the duty of each individual to follow, not to anticipate, the Church's sentence." He made matters right, however, with the curia, by saying in conclusion, that he would accept the definition if the Council should proclaim it, for he was convinced that God was among them.

Strossmayer made the most remarkable speech of all. He declared that the Papal infallibility was opposed alike to the constitution of the Church, to the rights of the bishops and Counsils, and to the immutable rule of faith. In governing the Church, the Pope and the bishops possessed authority and rights in common, as is shewn by the history of the Councils, which in ancient times pronounced on questions of faith and morals. That such Councils met so often, proves that the Pope was not then held to be infallible; for had he been so considered then, there was no necessity to call a Council—the shortest way would have been to inquire at the oracle which never errs. Were the dogma now to be affirmed, the rights of bishops would be gone; all left them would be a shadow—the mere right of giving their assent. For the making of a dogma, something more than a numerical majority is needed—moral unanimity in the Church is essential. Let the personal infallibility of the Pope be affirmed, and then it will be no longer necessary to have what in ancient times was deemed essential to an article of faith—antiquity, universality, and consent. If some were anxious to have the doctrine proclaimed, the greatest enemies of the Church were certainly of the number, and desired nothing better; and the decree, as he anticipated, would work great evil, by preventing some from entering the Church, and by driving out others who had already entered. He concluded by expressing the hope that

Thomas Witherow, Southern Presbyterian Review 26.2 (April 1875): 339-375.

the holy father would imitate Christ and St. Peter, by shewing an example of humility, and that he would have the proposal withdrawn.

The speech was moderate in its tone, and the speaker throughout was listened to with great attention. The bishop of Pittsburg was not so fortunate. With the freedom characteristic of his country and of his race, he said that the adherents of the Church in the nation from which he came, knew nothing of the doctrine; and yet they were Catholics in life and practice, not like the Italians, who are Catholics only in name. The bell of the president immediately reminded the honest American that he was touching on rather dangerous ground.

Senestrey, bishop of Ratisbon, assured the Council that Germany was in favor of infallibility, and that it was simply an invention to say that in that country there were evil-minded persons to call it in question; but he was followed by Dinkel, bishop of Augsburg, who contradicted the statement, and warned the assembly not to be misled by such tricks.

Maret, dean of the Theological Faculty of Paris, and a bishop *in partibus*, was the next speaker. He distinguished between infallibility based on the consent of the bishops, and personal infallibility. He warned the Council of the dilemma that lay before it: either the Council was about to give the Pope an infallibility which he did not possess before, in which case the donor was greater than the receiver, by divine and inalienable right; or else the Pope was about to give himself an infallibility which he did not possess before, in which case he exercised the right of changing the constitution of the Church by his own personal power; and if the latter were allowable, he did not see any necessity for summoning the Council at all. At this point Cardinal Bilio interrupted the speaker by exclaiming, "You are ignorant of the very rudiments of the faith; it does not to the Council to judge and to decide, but simply to acknowledge the truth and give its vote, and then to leave the Pope to define what he chooses by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Notwithstanding this interruption, Maret was allowed to finish his speech, but at its conclusion it was announced that the debate in

the general congregation upon the collective *schema* was now closed, in consequence of a written request to that effect, signed by one hundred and fifty members, having been received by the presidents.

This was on the 3d of June. The minority made a sort of feeble protest at the unexpected close of the discussion, inasmuch as forty members who wished to speak were thereby deprived of the opportunity; but as nearly eighty speeches had been already delivered for and against the dogma, the prolongation of the debate would have been more likely to waste time than to cast additional light upon the subject. Besides, if anything important yet remained unsaid, it could be produced when the separate chapters of the *schema* came up for discussion *seriatim.* These chapters, after passing through the fire of discussion in the general congregation, were now reduced to four, with a preamble, the doctrine of the infallibility being inserted in the last chapter. But as this great dogma was the natural completion of the whole *schema*, the debate on the three previous chapters constantly reverted to the infallibility, even before the fourth chapter came to be discussed in its order.

About one hundred and twenty prelates sent in their names as desirous to speak on the chapters in detail, of whom about fifty enjoyed that privilege. One of the first to revert to the grand subject was the Dominican monk, Guidi, cardinal archbishop of Bologna. He commenced by saying that the personal infallibility of the Pope was a doctrine unknown to the Church down till the fourteenth century. Scripture and tradition furnish no proof of it. Was there an instance where the Pope, apart from the Church, had ever defined a single dogma? An act might be infallible, but a person never. But every infallible act, he argued, proceeds from the Church herself only: the Pope has to examine whether all the churches agree with the Romish Church on the point in question, and then, having ascertained the fact, is to decree accordingly. He shewed from the works of the Jesuits Bellarmine and Perrone, that in defining doctrines the Popes never act alone, nor have they acted alone even in condemning heresy. As the speaker proceeded, a prelate, unable to restrain

himself when he heard his own opinions called in question, called him a "scoundrel," another called him "a brigand." Guidi conducted himself with great coolness in the face of these salutations, and concluded by proposing that infallibility should be affirmed of the Pope, only when he spoke after making full inquiry into the traditions of the Church on the subject, and after obtaining the consent of the bishops to his decree. It is said that the Pope afterwards sent for the bold Dominican, and rebuked him sharply for his heresy and ingratitude. It did not escape remark throughout the proceedings of the Council, that Pius seemed to regard every man who spoke against his absolute infallibility as a personal opponent of his own.

Dr. Leahy, archbishop of Cashel, in Ireland, spoke on the 13th of June. His argument was, that society now needs a deliverer to protect it from the encroachments of Rationalism, the anti-church policy of civil governments, the poisonous influence of journalism, and the political sects of revolution; that this deliverer, to be of any use, must be omnipotent and infallible, and that the Pope is the very man. The bishop of Badajoz, in Spain, with the capacious faith characteristic of his country, asserted (hat the Pope is virtually Christ in the Church—the continuation of the incarnation of the Son of God, and that therefore to the holy father belongs the same power, in extent at least, as belonged to Christ when he was visible on earth.

These sentiments were introduced incidentally in speeches made avowedly on those chapters which preceded the fourth of the *schema,* but at last the fourth chapter, containing the great dogma, came forward for special discussion.

The first speaker upon it was Matthieu, cardinal archbishop of Besancon. His address was mainly a panegyric on his own nation, without whose army, at Cavita Vichada, neither Pope nor Council, he alleged, could remain at Rome a single day. This line of remark from him was provoked by Valerga, who in a previous speech had reproached the French for their Gallican errors.

Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna, then spoke. He shewed that the personal infallibility of the Pope was inconsistent

alike with the facts of history and the traditions of the Church, and that its affirmation at present was likely to damage the Church seriously in future; and he recommended, that, if now proclaimed, every occasion of its exercise should be made conditional on the consent of the episcopate being previously obtained.

On the 20th of June the subject was resumed. The bishop of Teano, in Italy, charged Guidi, although said Guidi was an Italian and a Dominican and a cardinal, with exceeding the French in his desire to canonise Gallicanism, and maintained that it should be left to the Pope to determine in each case how far the Church was to be consulted and the Holy Ghost invoked. Guidi had asserted that the admonition of Christ to Peter to "strengthen his brethren," implied their possession of something which was to be strengthened, and had interpreted it to mean that the Pope was to confirm the doctrine which the bishops already held. To this the bishop of Teano now replied, by saying that Guidi's notion was utterly uncatholic; that the initiation of doctrine must come from above, not from below; that it must originate, not with the bishops, but with the Pope, who has it in his power to avail himself of the help of the Holy Ghost.

On the same day Dr. Machale again spoke against the infallibility with great severity, and Dr. Errington, an English archbishop, who had once acted as coadjutor to Cardinal Wiseman, proposed to express the dogma in an abstract form, but the proposal was not accepted by either side.

Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, then delivered a great and powerful speech. Three times, he said, he had asked for proof from Scripture, from tradition, and from Councils, to shew that the bishops of the Church were excluded from the definition of dogma; but hitherto he had asked in vain. Now again he abjured them, like the blind man on the way to Jericho, to give him sight that he might believe. The credibility of Catholic doctrine, as founded on the general consent of the episcopate, had been used by him and others as an argument to draw into the Church those who stood without; but now a magnet, which had so often proved its attractive power, was to be taken from

them, and they were told to believe, without proof, that it had always been the creed of the Church that the Pope is everything and the bishops nothing. But "we bishops," he continued. "have no right to renounce for ourselves and for our successors the hereditary and original rights of the episcopate, and to give up the promise of Christ, ' I am with you to the end of the world.' But now they want to reduce us to nullities, to tear the noblest jewel from OUT pontifical breastplate, to deprive us of the highest prerogatives of our office, and to transform the whole Church, and the bishops with it, into a rabble of blind men among whom is one alone who sees, so- that they mast shut their eyes and believe what he tells them."

The bold American was followed by a Spanish prelate, the archbishop of Granada. His tone was basely servile to the curia. In the superabundance of his homage he declared that to define infallibility was not enough far him; he wished the Council to decree another Christian dogma—the divine and inviolable nature of the Pope's temporal power.

From the specimens of individual opinion thus presented, the sources of the weakness of the minority are evident. Hampered by the Romish principle of the authority of the Church, none of them could build on the great broad fact, that infallibility is devoid of all basis in the Holy Scriptures. Some of them did maintain that it was in direct opposition to historical fact; others, that it was contrary to the traditions of the Church. Some were in favor of a modified infallibility; others did not object to the doctrine, but pled only for delay. The minority was thus divided in its opposition. But the court party, now aware that the majority was on their side, were united and resolute, and pushed forward the matter to the end; and the Pope, notwithstanding the increasing heat of the summer, and the fever and disease which it usually brings with it to strangers in the, city, announced his intention not to prorogue the Council until the *schema on* the Church was disposed of conclusively. As the debate progressed, every means short of force was employed to detach. individuals from the minority, and thus to secure, if possible, moral unanimity. But as the summer heat increased, and fever

became more virulent, and intrigues multiplied, a sense of weariness crept over the Council, and all began to feel the necessity of coining very soon to an end.

On the 23d of June, Landriot, archbishop of Rh eims, proposed that the whole subject should be remitted to a commission appointed by the Council, with instructions to examine the traditions on the subject, and to report—a proposal which seemed so fair that it was difficult to resist it; yet as *that* had to be done at all hazards, it was displeasing to the curia. But the placid termination of the speech removed all dissatisfaction, for he stated that if it pleased the Pope to affirm the dogma, he submitted already by anticipation.

On the 25th of the same month, Ketteler, bishop of Mayence, alleged that it had not been shewn as yet that any evidence for the personal infallibility of the Pope was contained either in Scripture, or in tradition, or in the consciousness of the Church; all, in fact, that could be said for it was, that it is the opinion of a certain school. He admitted the right of the Pope to condemn doctrines which contradict dogmas already decided by the Church, but could not admit his right to formulate new dogmas, which is an entirely different matter. The deposit of the faith is not intrusted to the Pope alone; in every decree Scripture and tradition are to be taken into account, and the bishops are essential to the Pope as representatives and witnesses of tradition.

The answer to this, given by an Irish ecclesiastic, Dr. Keane, the bishop of Cloyne, was somewhat amusing. He said that the popes were not dependent on the bishops for tradition, because St. Peter brought the whole body of tradition with him to Rome-the Pope had charge of the deposit, and could have recourse to it when necessary. To some in the Council it seemed rather an original idea that St. Peter's portmanteau was stored up somewhere in the Vatican, and that each successive occupant of the chair had only to slip in his hand when there was occasion, and stake out what he wanted.

At the sitting on the 28th of June, Ginoulhiac, bishop of Grenoble, reputed to be, after Maret, the most learned of the French bishops, opposed the dogma, not on the ground that it

was false, but that the proclamation of it would be productive of evil, stirring up hostility to the Church in quarters where it did not now exist, and intensifying it where it existed already.

Martin, bishop of Paderborn, created something like a stir in the Council, by delivering, in an elevated tone, bordering on a scream, a speech, in which he asserted that the personal infallibility is inseparable from the primacy; that the Pope is the supreme legislator, and it is necessary, therefore, that he should be beyond the danger of falling into an error. And so important did he hold this doctrine to be, that he thought priests, and others having care of souls, "should be admonished to impress this doctrine often upon the people from the pulpit.

Verot, bishop of Savannah, in the United States, when answering the common statement which seems to pass for an axiom at Rome, namely, that historical facts must yield to the certainty of doctrine, threw his judgment into a very emphatic form—"With me, an ounce of historical fact is worth a thousand pounds of your theories."

Little new light was now coming in from either side. On the 4th of July, all who had not yet spoken waived their right, and by mutual consent this remarkable debate ended ; remarkable for the length to which it extended, the importance of the subject discussed, the rank and ability of the speakers, and the results certain to arise from the decision pronounced.

The 13th of July was fixed for taking the vote in the general congregation. On that day there were 91 members of the Council, known to be in Rome at the time, who did not answer to their names. There were, however, 601 members actually present. Of these, 451 voted *Placet;* 62 voted *Placet juxta modum*—that is, they voted for the dogma conditionally; and 88 voted *Non-placet.* The numerical weight of the minority was thus greater than had been anticipated, when the influences at work to diminish their numbers were considered. Among the 88 who had the courage to appear and oppose the Papal Infallibility by their vote, were included Cardinal Rauscher, archbishop of Vienna; Cardinal Schwarzenberg, archbishop of Prague; Cardinal Matthieu, archbishop of Besancon ; Simor, primate of

Hungary ; Darboy, archbishop of Paris ; Genoulhiac, archbishop of Grenoble; Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans ; Maret, bishop of Sura and dean of the Sorbonne ; Haynald, archbishop of Kalossa ; Ketteler, bishop of Mayence; Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg; Strossmayer, bishop of Bosnia and Sirmium ; Conolly, archbishop of Halifax, in Nova Scotia; Kenrick, archbishop of St. Louis; and Machale, archbishop of Tuam—men second to none for learning and position in the Roman Catholic Church. The bulk of the majority consisted of Italians and Spaniards, men whose names, if mentioned, could add nothing to the weight of their votes.

Notwithstanding all that had occurred, some hopeful spirits, it would seem, still thought that a private representation to his Holiness might even yet save the ship of the Church from striking on the rocks. No harm could result from making the experiment. An influential deputation from the minority, consisting, among others, of Darboy, Simor, and Ketteler, waited on the Pope on the evening of the 15th of July. They earnestly entreated that, for the sake of peace, he would withdraw that portion of the 3d chapter, which, at the expense of the bishops, concentrates all ecclesiastical power in himself, and insert a clause in the 4th chapter, limiting his infallibility to such decisions on faith and morals as were arrived at after full inquiry into the traditions of the churches. The deputation were a little taken aback when his Holiness assured them that he had not yet read the *schema,* and did not know what it contained. Had he not positively said so, they could not have believed this possible; but, with admirable presence of mind, the archbishop of Paris said that the legates were certainly much to blame, who up to this time had kept him uninformed as to the terms of a decree which, as was announced, he was, in three days after, to affirm as true before the Church and the world. But their surprise was still greater when he responded by saying that "the *whole* Church had *always* taught the unconditional infallibility of the Pope." After that astounding statement, further reasoning, of course, was useless. Unwilling to leave without another efforts still, Bishop Ketteler fell upon his knees and implored him to

Thomas Witherow, Southern Presbyterian Review 26.2 (April 1875): 339-375.

make some concession for the good of the Church; but, while smooth and polished as marble, Pius was as cold and hard, and the distinguished German asked in vain. For a moment, indeed, the deputies thought that they had made an impression, but an hour after the interview, Manning and Senestrey called, and Pius soon relapsed into that "*non possumus"* mood which is associated with his name, and which will probably characterise his pontificate to other generations.

Public opposition and private remonstrance had both failed to avert the danger; and now the solemn session was at hand. To the minority it seemed that to record a public vote against the infallibility could not prevent the definition, while it would exhibit their divisions to the world, and aggravate the evils of the Church. Accordingly, on the 17th, fifty-six prelates sent in a written protest, in which they informed his ' Holiness that they were still of the same mind, but that, out of respect to himself, they would not vote against a matter in which he took so deep an interest, and that therefore they should return to their homes. The same evening, nearly sixty others left the city. By their absence from the next day's ceremonial, they refused to grace the triumph of their opponents, and avoided the mortification of a. public discomfiture. But this was the move which in reality lost the battle. By their voluntary withdrawal from the field, they acknowledged that the victory was with the opposition ; they renounced all claims to a drawn battle, and actually produced the moral unanimity, which, they had always said, was essential to a valid decree, and which, if they had remained at their post, could not have been obtained for the Papal Infallibility.

The 18th of July was the day fixed for the proclamation of the dogma, which, according to the curia, was to consummate the victory of the Church. On that day the fourth and last solemn session of the Council was held. It proved to be a day of darkness and storm, the rain pouring down in torrents, flashes of lightning alternating with peals of thunder, and repeatedly lighting up the dim aisles of St. Peter's with their lurid glare. The Pope was present in full state, together with the prelates and cardinals of the majority, to the number of five hundred and

thirty-three. The religious service being concluded, the secretary read the dogma, and then the names or the members were called over in succession. Amid the darkness and thunder of that dismal day, all present, to the number of five hundred and thirty-one, voted *Placet;* two only voting *Non-placet*—namely, Riccio of Cajazzo, in Sicily, and Fitzgerald of Little Rock, in Arkansas, United States ; but their opposition must have been the result of no very deep conviction, for before the session was closed, they also had submitted to the decree. After the voting, the result was made known to the Pope. Pius then stood up with his golden mitre upon his head, but so thick was the darkness, that an attendant had to bring a lighted candle in order to enable him to read the formula. By its assistance, he was enabled to announce to the Church and to the world, that henceforth a man was clothed with the infallibility of God. The decree thus being ratified, the Ultramontane triumph was secure. Higher than the thunder out of doors was the loud and long-continued roar of applause which rose from the assembled prelates : hundreds of white handkerchiefs were waved over their heads, and shouts of " Viva Pio Nono," "Viva il Papa infallibile," were again and again repeated. The *Te Beum* and the benediction brought this extraordinary scene to a close.

The *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church of Christ,* as this decree is called, consists of a preamble and four chapters, each of which closes with an anathema on those who deny the doctrine therein affirmed. The preamble asserts that Christ placed Peter over the other apostles, "that by means of a closely united priesthood the whole multitude of the faithful might be preserved in the unity of the faith and communion." The first chapter affirms that Christ conferred on St. Peter "the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God," appointing him "the prince of all the apostles, and the visible head of the whole Church militant." The second chapter affirms that St. Peter has a perpetual line of successors in this primacy over the universal Church, and that whoever succeeds Peter in the Roman See, "by the institution of Christ obtains the primacy of Peter over the whole Church." The third chapter affirms, that by the

appointment of Christ the Roman Church has supreme jurisdiction over all other churches; that the jurisdiction of the pontiff is immediate; that to it all, both pastors and the faithful, are bound to submit, not only in matters of faith and morals, but in matters of discipline and government: that, in the exercise of his office, he has the right of freely communicating with all pastors of the Church, and with their flocks, irrespective alike of the will or confirmation of the secular power; that he is the supreme judge of the faithful; and that it is unlawful to appeal from his decisions to an œcumenical council. The fourth chapter declares that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the primacy which the Pope enjoys over the whole Church: that he is the father and teacher of all Christians ; that the See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error; and that this gift of truth and never-failing faith was conferred upon Peter and his successors to enable them to perform their high office for the salvation of all. Then follows the decree of Infallibility, in the following words:

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

The events which followed the decision were so sudden and stupendous, that they excited the astonishment of Europe. Two days after the proclamation of the dogma, the Emperor Napoleon III., who had for some time felt jealous of the growing influence of North Germany, declared war against Prussia, and entered on that disastrous campaign which in a few weeks resulted in the loss of his crown and in the humiliation of France. 'On the 2d of September, Napoleon surrendered at Sedan; the fall of the

Imperial Government in France was followed by the proclamation of a republic; the King of Prussia, after his triumph and the capture of Paris, assumed the title Emperor of Germany; and Protestantism, in his person, was elevated to the political and military leadership of Europe. Meanwhile the removal of the French troops, which for years at Civita Vecchia had protected the last remnant of the Pope's civil authority, and their return to their own country, left the way open for the important event which occurred in Italy. So soon as it was known that the tide of war was going against France, King "Victor Immanuel, who had long been on the watch for an opportunity to occupy the capital of his own kingdom, stepped in without encountering any resistance, and on the 24th of September, amid the welcome and plaudits of the populace, took possession of Rome. With him the Bible entered, and, at the same time, civil liberty and religious toleration, so that now Christian worship is as free in the city of the Cæssars and of the Pope as in any city of the world. Since that time Victor Immanuel occupies the Quirinal, and Pio Nono the Vatican; the temporal power, which had been wielded by his predecessors for eleven hundred years, having dropped from the hands of the infallible Pope as quietly as a sere leaf from the autumn tree.

The changes which had thus taken place in a few weeks, and the free institutions by which Pius IX. now found himself surrounded, were not favorable to the continuance of the Vatican Council. But the declaration of infallibility, the real work for which it had been convened, was accomplished. Notwithstanding, it existed formally till the 20th of October; then it was adjourned till the 20th of November; and then it was prorogued *sine die.* Should it ever assemble again, it will be under very different conditions from those which surrounded it on the 8th of December, 1869. But why should it meet? An infallible Pope has all within himself; he can never need a council any more.

What has been the action of the minority since the Council was closed? The answer which we have to give to this question is the most humiliating fact of all. Their conduct has been

apparently that of men who either had no deep convictions of truth, or no strength to make the sacrifices which deep convictions demand. All the opposing bishops have, we believe, submitted to the decree, and have accepted as true what they declared to be opposed to Scripture, to tradition* and to history. Rauscher of Vienna published the decree in August, 1870; Schwarzenberg of Prague hesitated till January 11, 1871; and Hefele waited till the 10th of April, saying, as he yielded, "The peace and unity of the Church is so great a good, that great and heavy sacrifices may be made for it." Maret, the dean of the Sorbonne, has withdrawn from sale his writings against infallibility, adding that he " wholly rejects everything in his work which is opposed to the dogma of the Council." Even the gifted and learned Strossmayer is dumb, and has, we fear, followed the example of his brethren. After fighting in the Council the battle of truth with such ability and persistence, their defection is disappointing, and demonstrates but too forcibly how immeasurably in faith and courage, these men fall short of the men of the Reformation ago. No effort of imagination enables us to think that the same silence and submission found in Rauscher, and Hefele, and Maret, when the interests of truth and conscience were at stake, could by any possibility have been shewn, under similar conditions, by Martin Luther or Philip Melancthon, by John Calvin or John Knox.

The full effects of the Vatican Council it will require centuries to work out. Meanwhile this much is evident, that it has given the last and finishing blow to Gallicanism, for now a General Council has condemned that old theory, has actually signed away its own rights and privileges, and has affirmed that henceforth no appeal lies to any Council whatever after the decision of the Pope has been pronounced. It has destroyed the independence of the Catholic bishops; they can no longer claim to derive their authority directly from Christ and the apostles; they derive it from the Pope, and henceforth they can originate no action and exercise no jurisdiction except by his permission and authority. It has made the Pope the absolute ruler of the Church, no longer bound to consult farther than he chooses the voice of the bishops

or the tradition of the churches. Everywhere over the world it has made such a thing as liberal Catholicism impossible; he who henceforth attempts to reconcile the Romish Church and modern civilisation, by the very act publicly fixes the stigma of heresy on himself. It has created a new Article of Faith, unknown to the Scriptures or the primitive ages, and which no Roman Catholic was bound to believe up till the 18th of July, 1870. He who refuses to believe it now, incurs the sin and penalty of heresy.

From a papal point of view, these results may be counted advantages rather than disasters; but even Roman Catholics can scarcely see the benefit of the new secession from the Church which has taken place on the continent, of the loss to their body of such men as Dollinger, Friedrich, Hyacinthe, and Reinkens, or of the collision with the civil power which the decree has precipitated in Germany and Switzerland. This is the beginning; who can tell the end? Even at present it is easy to see that a new and perennial element of strife has been wantonly east into the political and ecclesiastical relations of Europe; and it is certain that historians, in coming time, will regard the Vatican Council of 1869 as an era from which Latin Christianity entered on a novel and most interesting part of its career, and commenced to develop tendencies, the results of which will be fresh starting-points in the story of man.