

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1927

### The Vactican Council of 1870

George Dolak

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_dolakg@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Dolak, George, "The Vactican Council of 1870" (1927). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 681.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/681>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

**THE VATICAN COUNCIL OF 1870.**

**A Thesis**

**presented to the Faculty of**

**Concordia Seminary,**

**St. Louis, Mo.,**

**by**

**George Dolak,**

**in partial fulfillment**

**of the requirements for**

**the degree**

**of**

**Bachelor of Divinity.**

**1927**

## THE VATICAN COUNCIL OF 1870.

The nineteenth century has been a century in which the Roman Church made very marked progress in its endeavor to restore that supremacy to the Roman Curia which it enjoyed during the Middle Ages. The blow which Luther dealt to the papacy was one from which the papacy recovered but slowly. The Romanists instituted the counter-Reformation to counteract the damaging effects which the reformation by the Friar of Wittenberg had produced within the ranks of the Catholic church. Especially during the 19th century do we see the papal see making rapid strides in the restoration of its pristine power and glory. The progress which was made during this century towards a return to the old Roman ecclesiastical monarchy was due very largely to the efforts of an order which was established for that very purpose, viz., the <sup>Jesuits</sup> Jesuits. This order, founded in 1540, with Ignatius Loyola as its general, had as its avowed purpose the spreading of the cause of the Roman chair in foreign countries. In 1773 the Society of Jesus was dissolved by Pope Clement XIV. Fisher says in his "History of Christian Doctrine", that <sup>the</sup> the cause of the order's breakdown and dissolution was its interference in <sup>in</sup> politics, its worldliness, and its thirst for power. (p. 537). After the expiration of 41 years, the order was again restored by Pope Pius VII <sup>VII</sup> in 1814. The last characteristic which Fisher mentions as having <sup>caused</sup> caused the order's breakdown in 1773, is the same one which manifests itself during the 19th century. Dr. Gräbner remarks that the Jesuits were always a restorative of the papacy. (Theolog. Quart., V, 105-116). As the forged Isadorian Decretals, the falsifications of Gratian, the system of Gregory VII, and the establishment of the Mendicant Orders all <sup>helped</sup> helped immeasurably in the promotion of the papal power and in the spreading of this conviction during the Middle Ages that the Roman bishop is the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth and God's vice-gerent among men,

so did the Jesuits of the 19th century render invaluable service in the cause of the pope, so that the papacy again reached the zenith of spiritual power and glory.

Rome ever looks for a complete restoration of its might and <sup>power</sup> power. Although the 19th century marked the dissolution of the papal states (1870), and thus put an end to the pope's hopes and aspirations for a complete restoration of temporal power, still we see an increase in the spiritual power which makes up for the diminution in temporal authority. As Dr. Graebner remarks in the above-quoted article, the principles and aims of the popes of the 19th century did not differ from the aims of the medieval popes, but agreed in all respects, since all popes tried to secure a firm hold on the consciences of the people subject to their jurisdiction. Our subject draws our attention <sup>especially</sup> especially to one pope in the 19th century under whom two of the most daring doctrines of the Catholic Church were promulgated. We refer to Pius IX <sup>TX</sup> who used the Jesuitic order to the greatest advantage, in the <sup>interests</sup> interests of the Roman See. During the entire incumbency of Pope Pius IX, we see the Jesuitic order used as the means of obtaining recognition of <sup>papal</sup> papal indefectibility. In 1854 Pope Pius IX elevated the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, which was a favorite doctrine of the <sup>Jesuits</sup> Jesuits, but which had been held until then merely as a theological <sup>opinion</sup> opinion, to the position of an official dogma of the Catholic Church, and that without the aid of an ecumenical council. In 1870, with the aid of his Jesuit workers, Pope Pius was able to have the doctrine of the <sup>papal</sup> papal infallibility made a dogma of the church and placed on a level with other doctrines revealed to us by God in His Book.

This tendency to elevate the Roman Curia to such heights that an ecumenical council would be entirely unnecessary for the <sup>definition</sup> definition of a doctrine, is designated as Ultramontanism. Ultramontanism is the belief that the Roman Curia is superior to the ecumenical council, in other words, it is the stand that the pope is superior to the entire

to the collective episcopate. It is absolutism in the church. The Ultramontanists placed the concept of church above that of religion; they spoke, thought, and wrote of the pope and the church as of interchangeable terms. They claimed that the power of the keys included also temporal power and jurisdiction. (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia). This latter view includes also this that conscience should be disobeyed on the claim of a foreign authority, as well as the admission that religious convictions can be forced upon a person by material power. This, of course, is but a reiteration of the claims of such an early pope as Symmachus, who claimed that the pope, who is judge over all, can himself be judged by no one, and the reiteration of the claims of Boniface VIII to spiritual and temporal power as embraced in his famous bulls, In Coena Domini, Ausculta Fili, and Unam Sanctam, for Boniface VIII believed that the pope received all rights and that he cherishes them in the shrine of his breast.

The last ecumenical council which had been held was the Council of Trent which was held during the years 1545-1563. Three full <sup>centuries</sup> had already passed without the convocation of an ecumenical council, and, consequently, the pope thought that his plan of convoking a council would meet with general approval. Of course, every previous ecumenical council had been called for the purpose of condemning some form of <sup>pre-</sup>valent heresy and for publishing the true doctrine, and as we shall see, <sup>and</sup> the pope claimed that such a need for a positive statement and <sup>re-</sup>declaration of doctrinal truth was present. Such a meeting of church <sup>dignitaries</sup> from all parts of the globe would also enable the Roman Curia to obtain first-hand information regarding the attitude of Roman Catholics in various parts of the world towards Rome itself.

That the pope had long been thinking of convoking an ecumenical council is evident from the fact that the first intimation of such a move was given already on Dec. 6, 1864. The pope on this occasion <sup>asked</sup> asked the views of his Roman <sup>\* cardinals</sup> cardinals on the idea of

them declared the idea was acceptable, with the exception of Cardinal Pentini, who said that there was no occasion for a council. And that the question of the dogmatization of papal infallibility must have been the subject matter of the consultations is evident from the <sup>state-</sup>ment of Cardinal Ugolini that the proclamation of papal infallibility as an official doctrine of the Church, revealed by God and necessary for salvation, would make unnecessary the calling of ecumenical <sup>councils</sup> in the future for the purpose of deciding such questions, which the pope, by virtue of his new power, would be able to decide himself. <sup>Two</sup> days later, Dec. 8, 1864, on the anniversary of the dogmatization of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, the pope issued an encyclical to which he attached his Syllabus, in which he condemned 80 errors and in which he condemned the possibility and desirability of reconciliation of <sup>the</sup> the papacy with modern civilization. Since the pope's suggestion found such general approval among the Roman cardinals, the pope immediately asked the Roman cardinals to make suggestions on the council and on matters which might come up for the council's consideration. It is <sup>in-</sup>teresting to note here that the pope late <sup>r</sup> disclaimed all intention <sup>and</sup> and personal interest in the promulgation of papal infallibility, and said that the only purpose of the council was to confirm the doctrines <sup>which</sup> which he had set forth in his Syllabus, i. e., to receive the Church's stamp <sup>of</sup> of approval and thus to have these doctrines elevated to a position of official recognition by the Church. At first the pope asked only the Roman cardinals for suggestions as to the purpose of the proposed <sup>coun-</sup>council, but later on he consulted also other bishops, at the same time <sup>exerc-</sup>exercising extreme caution to consult only those whom he knew to be favorably inclined to the claims of Ultramontanism. The bishops offered quite a variety of subjects which they thought might occupy the <sup>atten-</sup>attention of the proposed council. In spite of the pope's denial that the council was to elevate the papal infallibility to a dogma of the <sup>Church</sup> Church, the Civiltà Cattolica, a review by the Jesuits, came out plainly with the

statement that the council was to be convened for the purpose of:  
 1. confirming the Syllabus, 2. of promulgating the infallibility, and  
 3. of dogmatizing the doctrine of the bodily Assumption of Mary. The  
 pope now felt quite sure of his ground and so he continued with the  
 preliminary plans of the council, and appointed a Central Committee,<sup>to</sup> to  
 which were subject other committees on dogmatics, church discipline,  
 religious orders, Oriental churches and missions, and on ecclesiastical  
 polity and ceremonies.

The reception of the proposed council in the various European  
 countries was undoubtedly influenced not a little by the frank and <sup>open</sup> statement  
 of the Civiltà that infallibility would certainly be one of  
 the matters to be treated by the assembled episcopate. The liberal  
 Catholics immediately voiced their opposition to a council with such  
 a purpose in view. The main opposition was in Germany, where the cler-  
 gy was too well acquainted with the field of Church History to be led  
 blindly into the dogmatization of infallibility, and in France, where  
 the University of Paris had been, since the Middle Ages, one of the <sup>firm</sup> firm-  
 est opponents of the Roman claims to supreme secular and spiritual au-  
 thority, and one of the staunchest advocates of the superiority of the  
 entire episcopate. The leader of the liberal Catholics in Germany was  
 Döllinger, who, with his party, said that the church was done with the  
 theocratic civil forms of the Middle Ages, (the Augsburg Allgemeine  
 Zeitung, 1869 A.D.). The German episcopate issued a pastoral trying to  
 quiet current demonstrations of dissatisfaction, assuring the people  
 that the council would not try to formulate a doctrine which was not  
 already a part of the Roman Catholic deposit of faith, but at the same  
 time it gave expression to its own fears and apprehensions over the  
 council and the proposed proclamation of infallibility in a private  
 letter to the pope. In Austria, the announcement of the council was  
 received indifferently, while in Italy a weak and short-lived opposi-  
 tion manifested itself in the formation of the ecumenical council of

free-thinkers, which, however, was of little consequence and was soon disbanded. In general, it may be said that the civil governments of Europe did not place any obstacles in the path of the council, for the governments were loath to interfere, although Prince Hohenlohe of Bavaria advised the German government to try to bring pressure to bear upon Rome. But, mostly for political reasons, there was no action taken upon his suggestion.

The bull *Aeterni Patris* of June 29, 1868 had announced that the council would be convened on Dec. 8, 1869, which was the anniversary of the dogmatization of Mary's immaculate conception. The pope himself was to determine the order of business, this being made possible by the committees to which the pope had only such men appointed who were known to be favorably inclined towards the claims of the papacy. The pope thought that an ecumenical council would be an opportune time to address all other Christians outside of the Roman Catholic Church and so he issued another bull, *Iam Vos Omnes*, in which he admonished and exhorted all Christians outside of the Catholic Church to return to the fold of the mother church on this occasion. It is needless to say that his invitation was ignored by non-Catholics who resented the <sup>pope's</sup> implication and Rome's claim that all of the baptized are in reality members of the Roman Catholic Church and, therefore, subject to the pope.

On Dec. 2, 1869 a pre-synodical assembly was held in which Pius addressed the council and in which the presidents of the council were appointed by the pope. All of these were staunch adherents of the <sup>pope's</sup> and this insured the pope's control over the council's proceedings. The pope was to decide whether any proposal would go before the council. The sessions of the council were to be of two kinds: general congregations and public sessions. The congregations were private; they were presided over by the presidents elected, or rather, appointed, from among the cardinals, and their decisions were only provisional. The public sessions were presided over by the pope himself. In the public



sessions there was no debate permitted. The definitive voting took place during these sessions of which there were only four during the entire session of the council. If a doctrine were accepted by the public session it was to be promulgated immediately by the pope as a dogma of the church, "sacro approbante concilio". At this preliminary meeting held Dec. 2, it was decided to refer matters on which there was no unanimity to 4 committees, viz., 1. on things pertaining to the faith, 2. on discipline, 3. on the regular orders, and 4. on Oriental <sup>rites</sup> rites. Each one of these committees was composed of 24 members.

The formal opening of the council took place on Dec. 8, 1869, the right transept of St. Peter's being used for the sessions of the council. On this occasion the cardinals were permitted to kiss the pope's hand; the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops were permitted to kiss his right knee, while the abbots and heads of orders, being proportionately lower in the scale of ecclesiastical system, were permitted to show due respect to His Holiness by performing the same act upon the pope's pedal extremity. In the appointment of the committees <sup>which</sup> which followed on this day, the pope again committed a tactical error by <sup>having</sup> having only Italians appointed to such committees and thus insuring absolute control on his part. The council now proceeded to the work at hand and things proceeded quite tranquilly until the 28th of December, when the first real debate took place on the Schema de Fide, when <sup>Bishop</sup> Bishop Strossmayer of Diakova raised his voice in objection, demanding that a reform be instituted among the cardinals themselves. In this he was supported by other members of the council who demanded, among other things, that the papacy be made accessible to others besides Italians, that decentralization take place, that a new rule be made on the celibacy of priests, and that the breviary should be revised, etc. It was also at this stage of the proceedings that a petition, signed by 480 bishops, was presented to the council, demanding that papal <sup>infallibility</sup> infallibility be elevated to the position of a dogma of the church.

Since any attempt to describe the proceedings of the Vatican Council would simply be inconceivable without a section devoted to a consideration of the doctrine of infallibility, we shall first give the proceedings of the council in outline and shall then turn our attention to a separate consideration of the most important result of the council's efforts, the doctrine of papal infallibility.

It was evident already during the first public session that the proclamation of papal infallibility by acclamation would be an impossibility, although Manning denies that it was the intention of the friends of the Curia to try to have the doctrine accepted by acclamation, for he says that acclamation is not definition. (Manning, The Vatican Council, page 44.). The second public session was appointed for Jan. 6, 1870. On Feb. 22, 1870, a papal bull was made public, 'Multiplices Inter', which changed the order of business, restricting the bishops' liberty considerably by making long debates impossible. This rule was also introduced that a mere majority was all that was required for dogmatization, thus discarding the time-honored rule which obtained also at the Council of Trent, that moral unanimity is absolutely necessary in defining doctrines. Beside the usual form of voting by either 'placet' or 'non placet', a conditional form of voting, the 'placet iuxta modum' was now permitted in the congregations general, but not in the public sessions. The papists claimed that these changes were made only for the sake of expediting the council's business, but it was undoubtedly done also to facilitate the passing of the doctrine of papal infallibility after the papal party saw how great the opposition to the doctrine really was. All protests of the minority against these changes were simply overruled as the chairman now had the right of depriving a speaker of his right to address the assembly upon presentation of a petition signed by a minimum of ten bishops. This shows that the pope was now adopting a more aggressive attitude. Although the pope himself never attended the 'congregationes generales', he kept in close

touch with the council and was able to direct everything to his own satisfaction. On Jan. 21, the Schema Constitutionis Dogmaticae de Ecclesia Christi set forth the supremacy of the ~~of the~~ Church over the State and the supremacy of the Roman bishop over the entire Church. On March 6 an appendix was added to Chapter IV of De Ecclesia which contained these startling words: "Romanum pontificem in rebus fidei <sup>et</sup> et morum definiendis errare non posse". Here the Curia manifestly gave up all attempts at dissimulation and came out plainly with its position by attaching this appendix which was added, "cum plurimi episcopi petierint".

In the third public session held on April 24, 1870, the scheme 'De Doctrina Catholica' occasioned much debate which finally <sup>culminated</sup> culminated in a tempestuous uproar and tumult produced by Bishop Strossmayer's fearless and straightforward speech. The constitution was, however, adopted unanimously by 667 ecclesiastics.

The papal party had now come out clearly with its position <sup>for</sup> for the doctrine of infallibility and there now ensued a period which <sup>was</sup> was marked by intense activity by both the majority and minority. The pope himself, although himself not taking active part in this papal <sup>prop-</sup> propaganda, nevertheless showed that he considered the stand which a member of the council took on the infallibility question a personal <sup>matter</sup> matter. He considered opposition to the doctrine as personal antipathy and <sup>en-</sup> enmity and was not slow in showing his feelings on the matter to those concerned. There was especially a great deal of literary activity in both camps. Among the most important writings were Cardinal Rauscher's 'Observationes quaedam de infallibilitatis ecclesiae subjecto', Bishop Hefelé's 'Causa Honorii papae' and Bishop Ketteler's 'Quaestio'. On May 9, the schedule 'Constitutio Dogmatica prima de ecclesia Christi' was referred to the synodical delegates. The constitution treated <sup>the</sup> the primacy of the Church and considered it in the phases of 1. its institution in Peter, 2. its succession, 3. its force and reason, and 4. the Roman

bishop's infallibility. It must be remembered that whenever a schema was introduced, it was never introduced in its entirety so that the delegates would be enabled to get a general survey of the doctrine, but it was introduced piece-meal, with hardly enough time intervening between successive presentations to permit the delegates to give <sup>serious</sup> serious consideration to the matter under discussion. Each section of a <sup>schema</sup> schema was voted upon separately, after which the entire schema was adopted as a complete whole. On May 13, the debate on this constitution began. In all there were 64 speeches delivered on the floor on this subject, while a great many waived this right later on when they saw the <sup>futility</sup> futility of protesting against the council's actions. The majority claimed that the doctrine had always been a part of the church's deposit of faith and that it had merely lacked recognition as a formal doctrine of the whole Church, and that the present time was the most opportune time to make the promulgation of the doctrine, since its truth had <sup>been</sup> been called into question by many within the Catholic Church. The <sup>minority</sup> minority, on the other hand, opposed the dogmatization of papal infallibility mainly on the grounds of expediency, saying that it would cause much disturbance in foreign countries and would practically render impossible a defense and justification of the doctrine in the eyes of those belonging to Protestant denominations. (Purcell of Cincinnati). There were approximately 200 bishops in the minority. Their main weakness lay in the fact that they were really one at heart with the majority in regard to their personal opinions on the doctrine of <sup>infallibility</sup> infallibility, but opposed its elevation to an official doctrine of the Church <sup>merely</sup> merely on the grounds of expediency and opportuneness. This, of course, <sup>deprived</sup> deprived them of any real strength and precluded the possibility of presenting a solid front against the majority in the efforts to prevent the elevation of infallibility to an official teaching of the Church. Archbishop Manning goes so far as to say that he cannot think of five men who opposed the doctrine itself, although this of course is a gross

exaggeration on the part of a Roman Catholic convert. (Manning, The Vatican Council, p.33.). It must be remembered that his statement is made on the basis of the post-conciliar submission of the members of the minority to the pope. Simpson in his book "Roman Catholic Opposition to the Infallibility" quotes Hasenlever to the effect that this submission, which Catholics were pleased to call 'sacrifice of reason', was really a sacrifice of everything that a man values in his individual make-up, for it "paralyzes the innermost depths of personal existence", (p.315). On June 3, the general debate on the constitution was closed with the opening of a special debate announced for June 6. Chapter III (De Ecclesia) was adopted on June 11, only after a sharp debate had taken place which compelled certain revisions and restrictions to be made. The debate on the fourth chapter, (De Infallibilitate), began on June 15. During the course of the debate on this matter, Cardinal Guidi expressed himself on the subject in a manner highly objectionable and displeasing to his papal highness, and for which Guidi was summoned into the presence of the pope to give an account. During the course of the conversation, Guidi remarked that tradition would not permit such a doctrine to be entered into the canons of the Church as an official doctrine of the Church. To this Pope Pius IX made the well known and sharp remark, "I am tradition", thus arrogating unto himself the same power and privileges which Louis XIV had, when he exclaimed, "I am the state!" However, in spite of all of the opposition on the part of the minority, the fourth chapter was passed on July 13. Of the 601 delegates present, 451 voted placet, 88 voted non placet, and 62 voted placet iuxta modum. Besides this, there were 80 delegates present in the city of Rome, who simply did not vote on the question. So we see that the total of the opposing minority amounted to approximately 200 delegates, which is, indeed, an imposing enough minority to be taken into consideration when a doctrine is made a part of the Church's deposit of faith. The minority now realized to what a pass

things had come and so determined upon one more, final, desperate stand. Accordingly a number of the minority bishops appeared before Pius to see whether he could not be influenced to change the resolution. It must be remarked, however, that their petitions fell far short of their original demands. In fact, as we can readily see from the fact that Ketteler fell upon his knees before Pius and addressed him as 'most holy Father', their entire behavior and attitude was altogether out of keeping with their previous actions. It seemed as though the pope might finally be inclined to concede just a little bit, although he postponed any definite answer until the following day. His answer indeed, came like a thunderbolt out of the sky and simply left the minority disconcerted, for instead of the expected concession, the pope had had this significant phrase appended to the section pertaining to the personal infallibility of the pope: "and, therefore, the like definitions by the Roman pontiff ARE ABSOLUTE OR UNALTERABLE IN THEMSELVES, AS OF INTRINSIC FORCE, AND NOT BY CONCESSION OF THE CHURCH". ( ex sese irreformabiles esse, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae ). This shows how irrevocably the pope was committed to the doctrine of infallibility. On July 16, in the 86th general congregation, the entire constitution was accepted and on the 18th of July, the entire constitution was accepted in the <sup>4th</sup> public session. Up to this time the delegates had been forbidden to leave the Holy City without special permission from the pope. But now 55 of the minority bishops, who thought it <sup>would</sup> be futile to oppose the dogmatization of infallibility, wrote to the pope on the evening preceding the 18th of July, and petitioned him for special permission to leave the city, for they added, they were also irrevocably pledged to oppose the doctrine of infallibility, but at the same time, did not wish to offend his papal holiness by a public demonstration of their disagreement with the new doctrine. It is needless to say that the pope, who probably feared just such a public demonstration, gave them this permission cheerfully. As a result of the

departure of so many delegates, we find only 535 present at the 4th public session, over which the pope himself presided. When the definitive voting took place, only two members of the council dared to vote non placet, Bishops Riccio of Cajazzo and Fitzgerald of Little Rock, Arkansas. It is interesting to note here the description which the Catholic Encyclopaedia gives of the final pronulgation of the <sup>doctrine</sup> doctrine: "During the proceedings a thunderstorm broke over the Vatican, and amid thunder and lightning the pope promulgated the new dogma like a Moses promulgating the law on Mt. Sinai"!, (Cath. Enc. XV, 309.), although, of course, we can think of another reason besides divine <sup>pleasure</sup> pleasure, which would account just as plausibly for this demonstration of the elements. The two bishops who had voted non placet, immediately <sup>announced</sup> announced their submission to the 'Holy father'. The Catholic Encyclopaedia sets forth the submission of Bishop Fitzgerald in a dramatic manner, describing the bishop's action thus: "the bishop of Little Rock said simply and with true greatness, 'Holy Father, now I believe'". XV, 307. We shall touch upon the subject of the submission of the other <sup>bishops</sup> bishops in a little greater detail later on. The attendance upon the <sup>council</sup> council had dwindled down from the greatest number ever present, 767 fathers, to a mere 104 soon after the 18th of July. The bishops were greatly fatigued, since the heat in Rome was practically unbearable for those accustomed to a milder clime, and besides, entire Europe was now in a state of turmoil over the impending break between France and Germany. Nor was the pope's position an enviable one, for soon after the 18th of July the Italian army entered the city of Rome, the papal states were dissolved by the withdrawal of the French army from Italian soil, and the city of Rome was now proclaimed as the capital city of a unified Italy. The most important of councils since the Tridentine was never officially adjourned, for the pope's bull, Postquam Dei munere, of Oct. 20, 1870, merely prorogued the council indefinitely, the pope's main reason for its prorogation being that conditions had arisen in

Europe which made it imperative for the bishops to be present in their <sup>the</sup> respective dioceses. He might have added also, this, that he had incurred a great expense by having 300 delegates staying with him. He might, moreover, have said that the main purpose of the council had been achieved on the 13th of July with the elevation of infallibility to the position of an official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

Before we pass over to a consideration of the doctrine itself, we might mention briefly the accomplishments of the council. Simpson remarks concerning the council and its results, that no comparison between its results and those of the past councils can be made. In <sup>fact</sup> fact, we have but to recall that the entire first three months were spent without any appreciable progress having been made and without the council having been able to point to one decree which would have justified such an expenditure of time. Of course, from the view-point of a <sup>faith-</sup> faithful Ultramontanist, the time had been redeemed well and hardly could have been spent to better advantage, for was not the infallibility of the Roman See now declared to the world to be a doctrine revealed by God to his faithful ones, a doctrine, which, if a man did not acknowledge <sup>-false</sup> it, would make it impossible for him to be a member of God's communion of saints on earth? There was a conspicuous lack of the reforms which had been warmly advocated by many of the bishops. In fact, the entire results of the council may very well be summed up as having been:

1. the establishment of the universal episcopacy of the pope, <sup>and</sup> and
  2. the definition of the pope's infallibility,
- which are chapters 3 and 4 of the constitution De Ecclesia.

The exact wording of the important infallibility clause in the 4th chapter, on the authority of the church is as follows: "The sacred council thus approving, we teach and so define as a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra, i. e., when in the discharge of his office as pastor and teacher of all <sup>Christians</sup> Christians, and in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority he defines a doctrine



on faith or morals to be observed by the entire ecumenical church; thereby using the divine assistance to him vouchsafed by promise to blessed Peter; he then brings to bear that potential infallibility wherewith the divine Redeemer desired and willed that his Church be instructed in such definition of doctrine on faith or morals, and, therefore, the like definitions by the Roman pontiff are absolute or unalterable in themselves as by intrinsic force and not by concession of the Church. Now, therefore, if any were to presume (which may God avert) to contradict our definition; let him be anathema."

It was this doctrine which the members of the majority, headed by Archbishop Manning and Bishops Senéstrey and Deschamps principally, claimed had reposed in the Church's deposit of faith ever since the first centuries. Some delegates, who not only opposed the expediency of the doctrine's elevation, but who opposed the doctrine itself most bitterly were: Rauscher, Strossmayer, Hefele, Ketteler, Kenrick, and Dupanloup. It is generally conceded that the ablest theologians and the keenest intellects of the period were arrayed on the side of the opposition to the doctrine of infallibility. Among the most learned opponents of the infallibility doctrine must be mentioned Döllinger, professor of Church History at the University of Munich, who, although not invited to the council, nevertheless wrote against it, showing that the doctrine was simply untenable on historical grounds. While the majority attempted to show, that of necessity, the popes of the past centuries had never <sup>erred</sup> when speaking on matters of faith or morals, the minority, on the other hand, adduced records, whose authority and authenticity and reliability could not be questioned, to prove that the popes in past times had committed many errors and that the <sup>Roman</sup> bishops of the first five centuries had not attempted to arrogate such privileges unto themselves, as Pope Pius IX was trying to secure for himself. Simpson points out in his book that the popes of the first eleven <sup>cent</sup> centuries, on the occasion of their accession to the papal chair, confirmed

the verdict of condemnation passed against Pope Honorius by the Sixth Ecumenical Council, and later again by the seventh and eighth <sup>ecumenical</sup> ecumenical councils. It was necessary for the minority to appeal to history, for the definition of papal infallibility implied that all of the past <sup>popes</sup> had possessed this gift of infallibility, which papists claim was given by Christ to Peter, the first pope, and transmitted to each succeeding pope in an unbroken line of succession.

The papists offer a series of Scripture passages in support of their claims that the doctrine of infallibility is contained in the revealed Word of God. The most important of these passages are:

1. Mat. 16, 18 ("Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my <sup>church</sup> church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"), 2. Luke 22, 32 ("But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail thee not; and when thou <sup>thou</sup> art converted, strengthen thy brethren"), and 3. John 21, 15 ("He saith unto him: Feed my lambs"). On the basis of these passages Romanists claim that a special power and jurisdiction was given to Peter over the entire Church and that at the same time his supremacy over the other apostles was established. We need not go into detail with regard to the passages adduced to prove Peter's supremacy over the <sup>Church</sup> Church, and through that, the Roman bishop's supremacy, for we know that our S<sup>a</sup>vior gave the same power to all of his disciples which in Mat. 16, 18 is addressed to Peter (soi), as we can read in Mat. 28, 19 and John 20, 22, 23 ("and when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto the <sup>m</sup> Receive YE the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins YE remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins YE retain, they are retained".) With regard to the second verse we simply ask, Is it less probable that Christ prayed for Peter for the simple reason that he knew very well that Peter, because of his tempestuous nature, was the one who needed it more than any one of the others? This explanation takes on additional force when we notice that in the very next verses

following this statement of our Lord, (viz., John 21, 34), Christ informs Peter that he will deny his Lord three times before the crowing of the cock. In the light of this explanation the last passage becomes very evidently but a reconfirmation of Peter in his apostolic office. The three-fold question which Christ puts to Peter undoubtedly is to impress Peter and us with the fact that Peter was fully restored to his former position as Christ's apostle by this triple confession <sup>which</sup> corresponded to the triple denial of Christ in the courtyard of the high priest.

The infallibilists, furthermore, say that history corroborates their claim that the early church acknowledged and recognized a supremacy on the part of the Roman bishops and that this supremacy was actually exercised by the bishop of Rome. Whereas, it is an incontrovertible historical fact that during the first three centuries there was not the slightest sign of an acknowledgment of the Roman bishop's supremacy on the part of the other metropolitans. It is just as true an historical fact that the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem protested vigorously whenever the Roman bishop <sup>did</sup> attempt to appropriate some right or power which was not properly his. This we can see from the Sixth Canon of the Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.) <sup>D.)</sup> which placed the Roman bishop on a level with the bishops of Alexandria <sup>and Antioch</sup> and Antioch. As Janus points out, (Der Pabst u. das Konzil, p. 73ff), the following facts concerning the first centuries simply cannot be changed without a complete falsification of history,

1. that the emperors called the synods which were held,
2. that the Roman bishop did not always preside, as e.g. at Nicaea, 325, and at Ephesus, 439; and moreover that the Roman bishop was not even represented at the Second Ecumenical Council held at Constantinople, 381 A.D.,
3. that the decrees published needed no papal confirmation, and
4. that the Roman bishop had no power of excommunication. As the author

of Janus very clearly shows (p. 96ff), ~~that~~ history nowhere records the case of a sect having been condemned, at any time during the first six centuries, for not having acknowledged the pope. The only concession made by the bishops of the first centuries in regard to the position of the Roman bishop was that they were willing to concede him to be a 'primus inter pares', this being brought about purely by considerations of such a nature as the location of the city of Rome, its size and importance in the commercial world, the size of the congregation and its glorious past in having been associated, in life and in death, with the greatest apostles.

The advocates of papal infallibility claim that this doctrine is clearly taught by the church fathers, who, they say, ascribe a higher <sup>or</sup> dignity and honor to the Roman bishop. But we fail to find any proof of this in the church fathers. When the first real attempt was made by a Roman bishop to force his position upon the rest of the Church, in the case of the Easter Controversy with Pope Victor, the attitude of the entire church, including the church fathers Irenaeus and Tertullian, was that apostolic tradition was preserved in all of the apostolic sees. Ayer has shown that Cyprian's tract on the "Unity of the Church", was shamefully interpolated by friends of the Roman See, (Ayer, Source-book for Ancient Church History, p. 241), in their attempt to establish Roman supremacy on the basis of the authority of the church fathers. And so it is with Augustine, for what can be clearer than the following words of Augustine, quoted by Bishop Strossmayer at the Vatican Council, "What do these words mean, 'and upon this rock I will build my church?' Upon this rock, namely, on the faith which said: 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God'." (Lehre u. Wehre, XXXV, 151-164). So we see that the church fathers were far from ascribing a position of superiority to any particular church, for they guarded the powers given by Christ to the Church very zealously, and maintained that the supreme teaching authority resided in the entire episcopate.

Since the church fathers were one in their denial that any single episcopate or individual was possessed of supreme teaching authority, we can readily see that the argument from the church fathers does not hold. The council of Trent said that the Scriptures must be explained according to the church fathers. The author of Janus points out, with his characteristic keenness, the dilemma into which Romanists fall when trying to prove Roman supremacy from the church fathers, for, says he, there were no church fathers, in the strict sense of the term, after 604 A.D., and since the church fathers of the first six centuries <sup>cannot</sup> cannot be shown to have upheld a supremacy of the Roman bishop, the argument not only immediately becomes of no value, but reacts like a boomerang upon those who try to use this particular point to uphold such a supremacy. (Der Pabst u. das Konzil, p. 99ff). Pope Agatho was the first one to apply the words of Luke 22, 32-37, to the Roman see. (circa 680 A.D.) From this period we see the Roman bishop making great strides towards the goal of secular and spiritual supremacy. The first systematic endeavor to prove Rome's superiority were the Pseudo-Isadorian <sup>Decretals</sup> Decretals which appeared about 850 A.D., although dating back to about 500 A.D., whose purpose was to elevate the papacy above the temporal power, and to establish the supremacy of the Roman See within the Church. The first pope to use these decretals to full advantage was Nicholas I. It is incredible that he was unaware of their spurious character, for he was in possession of the Roman archives and was well acquainted with the tradition of the Church. The next great pope was Gregory VII, 1073. Janus says that he also forged papal letters to prove his superiority, (p. 99ff). Regardless of the manner in which he did it, it is undeniable that he raised the papacy to an undreamed-of height by successfully introducing his idea of an all-encompassing theocracy, of a universal vassal-union. Gregory insisted that the pope was the representative of God on earth and that all spiritual and temporal power were dependent upon him. He was also the first one to be able

to depose monarchs.

In addition to the two systems mentioned as aiding papal power, we must also mention the Gratian Decretals of 1050 A.D., whose conclusion was: "that it is a duty to let also the unbearable be pleasing, if it be imposed by Rome". (Janus, p.156). Besides these falsifications, there were other systems which rendered invaluable aid in increasing papal prestige and power. We refer to the Crusades, which gave the pope control over kings, and to the founding of the Mendicant Orders, through whose efforts the ordinary clergy lost most of its power, and by whose efforts the pope became recognized as the universal pastor, for his emissaries were given access to any local congregation, thus interfering with the control of local clergy over their respective flocks. Pope Gregory VII claimed that he was "really the lord and possessor of the whole world". In the Unam Sanctam, 1302, Boniface VIII claimed that the temporal power depends on the spiritual, that the pope has both of these swords, and can, therefore, be judged by no man. Innocent III used the picture of Peter walking upon the sea to prove that Peter's successors also have the right to walk upon the sea, <sup>which</sup> which, he says, represents the masses. The height of papal power was really reached under Innocent III, and we have but to think of the Fourth Lateran Council, held in 1215, to see that he had succeeded in bringing the papacy to that point where the council's only function was to listen to and to endorse, for the sake of form, the decrees of the pope. In other words, Innocent III had reached the peak of papal power, infallibility.

Thus we see that the infallibility-doctrine was actually exercised and put into force long before it was declared to be an official doctrine of the Church. But since, this was dependent in the greatest measure upon the personal aggressiveness of the pope, we find that very few of his successors were able to uphold the papal honor against the European monarchs as well as he was able to. There also appeared new

forces within the Church itself which had to be reckoned with. Men arose who denied that the pope is possessed of the supreme teaching power, men like Marsiglio of Padua, Gerson, Occam, and institutions like the University of Paris. Then there came a time in which the papacy sank to the very nadir of dishonor, wickedness, licentiousness, and <sup>world-</sup>worldliness, times like the reign of pornocracy and the era of nepotism, <sup>times</sup>times when the very existence of the Church was endangered by a serious <sup>break</sup>break in the Church. We refer to the Great Schism, 1378 A.D., during which the power of the papacy gradually decreased and became practically <sup>nil</sup>nil. There came a time when the wishes of the 'Holy Father' were entirely disregarded, when councils were called without consulting the pope. <sup>The</sup>The Roman Church cannot change the fact that the most important councils of Basel and Constance had as their goal and result decrees which aimed at reforming the Roman See, establishing the superiority of the entire episcopate i.e., the superiority of a council over the 'single voice' in Rome. And as we have mentioned in the introduction, there <sup>came</sup>came the Reformation at the hands of Martin Luther, who showed, on the basis of Scripture, that it is the duty of the ecclesiastical powers to <sup>preach</sup>preach the Gospel, while the temporal powers are to protect the lives and property of their subjects.

We have traced the development of papal infallibility. What had gradually developed within the early Christian Church because of outward circumstances, viz., the growing up of the Christian Church simultaneously with the Roman Empire, and what had been brought to a definite use during the many centuries, by strong-willed popes, was now declared to be an official dogma of the Roman Catholic Church by the Vatican Council of 1870.

There are, of course, many difficulties connected with the <sup>infalli-</sup>infallibility dogma, one of them being that all decrees of all past popes are thereby made irreversible. And here the proponents of infallibility must exercise every bit of their ingenuity in their attempts to overcome

arguments advanced by such men as: Strossmayer, Döllinger, Kenrick, Friedrich, Acton, and other men thoroughly acquainted with papal history. The case which gives the papists the greatest amount of trouble and worry, and which they have not succeeded in explaining even with a show of satisfaction to real students of history up to the present time, is, as Manning calls it, "the monotonous controversy about Pope Honorius". (Manning, The V. t. Council, p. 16ff). Pope Honorius I wished to bring about a reconciliation between the eastern and western churches and in his eagerness to do so, he made a concession in favor of Monothelism, which "virtually denies the reality of the incarnation". (Simpson, R.C. Opp. to the Doct. of Inf., p. 32). It was the question as to whether <sup>whether</sup> there were one or two wills in our Lord Jesus Christ. Honorius plainly says, "we confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ". (Simpson, p. 33). The Sixth Ecumenical Council, 681 A.D., put an end to the Monothelite Controversy and condemned Honorius as a heretic, its action being later confirmed by Pope Leo III. Honorius was subsequently anathematized by the Seventh and Eighth Ecumenical Councils. Even in the face of clear and incontestible evidence, Manning dares to make the statement that the 'Honorius case also proves infallibility', (Vat. Council, <sup>124</sup> p. 124), but forgets this detail, to show in what manner it does so. Manning also speaks as though this were the only historical difficulty to be solved, whereas we shall show that their number is legion. Various <sup>attempts</sup> attempts have been made to prove that Honorius is not to be accused of teaching a heresy, among which are:

1. the argument that great discrepancies prevail among historians on the case of Honorius (Vat. Council, p. 128)
2. that Honorius was defining no doctrine whatever, and that he was not speaking as pastor of the universal church,
3. that as soon as a pope might be even slightly inclined towards error, he immediately ceases to be pope, for God deposes him.

Manning devotes an entire chapter to the 'case of Honorius' and says



that the cumulus of evidence for the infallibility of the Roman <sup>pope</sup> pontiff outweighs all such doubts, for he says, that Honorius forbade the making of any new definition, that his two epistles are entirely orthodox, and that his only fault was "in the omission of apostolic authority, for which he was justly censured". Manning claims that it is an "injustice to censure his language used before that condemnation, just as it might be just to censure it after the condemnation had been made". (Vat. Council, p. 244ff). In short, the arguments of Manning amount to this: that the council which condemned Honorius condemned him mistakenly, for it was in error on the facts of the case, or, that Honorius was condemned for imprudence, or, Manning makes even this admission, that Honorius was condemned as a private theologian. As to these <sup>arguments</sup> arguments we would simply ask, what could be clearer than Honorius' statement adduced above that there is only one will in our Lord Jesus Christ. Surely, nothing could be plainer. The argument that it was merely an imprudence on the part of Honorius to use such terminology is just as specious, for Janus' argument as to the ex cathedra character of Honorius' utterance is just as forceful when applied to this argument of the papists. Janus says, "When then, is a decision given ex cathedra unless when the successor of St. Peter, being consulted by the entire east, should suppress a deadly error and strengthen his brethren?" (Der Papst u. das Konzil, p. 39). Regardless of the innumerable loopholes which Catholic theologians have invented to escape the charge of fallibility in the case of Honorius, history nevertheless, but gives back its faithful record that Honorius was condemned as a heretic by three ecumenical councils. History also reminds of the fact that every Roman pope up to the eleventh century, for the Romanists must have lost sight of the condemnatory clause on Pope Honorius in the papal oath, likewise condemned Pope Honorius as a heretic and branded him with an infallible anathema. As Engert says so ironically in his 'Die Sünde der Päpste', "It is and remains a fact, that infallible councils

and infallible popes have condemned the infallible Honorius as a heretic." (P.48)

One of the arguments which Manning advanced at the time of the Vatican Council for a quick dogmatization of the infallibility doctrine was that in these modern times, when the calling of an ecumenical council was such a cumbersome task, the Church would be enabled to pass judgments and to meet exigencies with greater efficiency. It is remarkable that after such an argument was used that no pope has <sup>attempted</sup> attempted to issue an infallible statement since 1870. The restrictions imposed by the cunning Roman theologians have protected the church against the possibility of another such unfortunate incident as the 'Honorius Case', for immediately after the prorogation of the council, the conciliar secretary, Fessler, issued conditions necessary for a doctrine to be infallible. His conditions were contained in the infallibility clause itself, viz., that the pope must express himself on a doctrine pertaining to faith or morals, and that the doctrine must be of such a nature that the entire Church must regard it as necessary for salvation. Since that time Roman Catholic theologians have gone on 'ad infinitum' in their application of what Newmann calls 'the principle of minimizing', which, he adds, is so 'necessary for a wise and cautious theology'. Manning adds this phrase that it is not necessary to have a series of texts to prove a doctrine's infallible character, "since it is manifest that the extent of Holy Revelation is greater than that of Holy Scripture." (Vat. Coun. p.241) Among the more recent conditions given as favoring the infallibility of a doctrinal expression are those given by Simpson, in addition to the two mentioned above, viz.,

1. with respect to its form, the expression must be a dogmatic utterance
2. it must be intended for every member of the Universal Church because it defines something essential to be believed.

It is evident that all of these conditions are simply various ways of rendering the original conditions as given in the infallibility

clause itself. It is needless to say that no pope ,or any Roman Catholic theologian ,has ever undertaken the stupendous task of determining just how many ex cathedra utterances are contained in the Roman archives. There is no list of infallible decrees issued for a great deal of caution must be exercised in declaring that all of the necessary conditions have been fulfilled by the dogmatization of a particular doctrine. Among those decrees which have been said to have fulfilled all of the required conditions are:the Dogmatic Constitutions of Constance against Wyclif and Hus;Leo the Tenth's constitution Exsurge,against Luther;one sentence in the Unam Sanctam; the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and the Doctrine of Infallibility. From the rareness of infallible decrees we see that a multitude of conditions must be fulfilled before a doctrine will be <sup>marked</sup> with the official infallibility stamp.

Manning says that by 'faith and morals',"the whole revelation of faith",or,"the whole supernatural order,with all that is essential to the sanctification and salvation of man through Jesus Christ",is to be understood.

With regard to the condition that the entire Church must be <sup>ad-</sup> addressed if an utterance is to be considered infallible,Janus asks,"Why should the pope be less infallible when addressing only a <sup>portion</sup> of the church than when addressing the whole church?"(p.430).

By the adoption of the doctrine of papal infallibility,the Church committed itself irrevocably to the position of an ecclesiastical monarchy,for it is interesting and significant to note "that the three theories which assign infallibility to the church,to the episcopate,and to the pope are respectively democratic,aristocratic,and monarchical".(Simpson,R.C. Opposition to the Doct. of Inf.,p.350)

Before we pass over to the submission to the doctrine of infallibility by the members of the minority,we shall,instead of <sup>ing</sup>entering upon individual cases in which other popes erred and dwelling upon

them in detail, simply quote a masterly section from Bishop Dupanloup's speech delivered at the Vatican Council, in which the bishop shows that popes were no more than human beings, subject to like <sup>frail</sup> frailties as we are, and that some of them were incredibly worse than many a man of this world: "Pope Victor first approved of Montanism, and then <sup>then</sup> condemned it. Marcellinus was an idolater; Liberius consented to <sup>the</sup> the condemnation of Athanasius and made a profession of Arianism that he might be recalled from exile and restored to his see. Honorius adhered to Monotheletism. Gregory I calls any one antichrist <sup>who</sup> who takes the name of universal bishop and, contrariwise, Boniface III made the parricide emperor Phocas confer that title on him. Virgilius purchased the papacy from Belisarius, Paschal II and Eugenius III authorized duelling; Julius II and Pius IV forbade it. Eugenius IV approved the council of Basel and the restitution of the cup to the church of Bohemia; Pius II revoked the concession. Hadrian II declared civil marriages to be valid; Pius VII condemned them. Sixtus V published an edition of the Bible and commended it to be read; Pius VII condemned the reading of it. Clement VIII abolished the <sup>or</sup> order of the Jesuits permitted by Paul III; Pius VII reestablished it. If, then, you proclaim the infallibility of the actual pope, you must prove that which is impossible----that the popes never contradicted each other.

"Baronius must have blushed when he narrated the acts of the Roman bishops. Speaking of John XI, natural son of Pope Sergius and Marozia, he said the Holy Church, i. e., the Roman, had been vilely trampled on by such a monster. John XI, elected pope at the age of 18, was not one whit better than his predecessor. I am silent of Alexander, the father and lover of Lucretia. I turn away from John <sup>XXIII</sup> XXIII, who denied the immortality of the soul and was deposed by the council of Constance. This century is unfortunate, as for nearly 150 years,

the popes had fallen from all virtues of their predecessors and have become apostates rather than apostles." (Theolog. Quart., XLIII, 84-85.)

It was to such a doctrine, which disregarded absolutely the testimony of centuries of history, that the delegates and the whole church were asked to submit. The surprising thing for us is that in spite of all of the opposition which was manifested at Rome <sup>against</sup> against the doctrine of infallibility, all of the minority delegates finally submitted to the decree and declared themselves to be obedient sons of the Church. Some declared their submission to the doctrine <sup>immedi-</sup> immediately upon its promulgation, while Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, <sup>Mo.,</sup> Mo., for instance, did not send in his notice of submission until the <sup>early</sup> early part of 1872. Slowly but gradually the rebellious sons of the <sup>church</sup> church saw that it would be useless to continue in their refusal to submit and so they finally yielded to the pope's incessant demands and declared their willingness to submit. When we think back to the stormy sessions which took place at the council, and when we think of the pope's attitude of personal antipathy towards all who opposed infallibility, and when we think of the ardor, zeal, and sincerity with which some of the delegates fought against its dogmatization, it <sup>seems</sup> seems impossible to us that such men, contrary to the dictates of their conscience and to what they knew to be right, would in the end calmly submit to the doctrine because they considered it to be their duty as obedient sons of the Church. Lord Acton, who did more than any other man, except the bishop of Orleans, in exciting public feeling, especially in Germany and England, against the Vatican Council, drew up a severe and scathing denunciation of the weakness on the minority members and speaks of the action of the minority in this tenor: "They approved what they were called on to reform and solemnly <sup>blesse</sup> blessed with their lips what their heart knew to be accursed". (Simpson, R.C. Opposition to the Dec. of Inf. p. 33). He further says that "the

cowardly weakness on the one side and unscrupulous coercion on the other" (ibid. p. 331), secured the passing of the decree. That this plan of coercion was really the only plan open to the infallibilists is conceded by Acton when he says, "to admit that a minority could <sup>pre-</sup>vent or nullify a dogmatic action of the papacy, was to renounce infallibility" (ibid. p. 320). As we have mentioned already, the delegate who was the last one to announce his submission was Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, Mo. When Kenrick did finally announce his submission to the dogma, he was brought to task for his action by Lord Acton, to whom he then replied that his submission "was one of pure obedience and was not grounded on the removal of my motives of opposition to the decrees as referred to in my speech and set forth in my pamphlets." (ibid. 302). On the question of the retraction of his pamphlets, for he had written some very telling arguments against infallibility and had prepared a speech, which, however, he was not <sup>able</sup> to deliver before the council, he says emphatically, "This I shall not do, no matter what the consequences may be." (ibid. p. 302).

All of the delegates, then, finally announced their submission to the new doctrine. But there were some men in the ranks of the Catholic Church who did not fear to brave the consequences of a consistent refusal to submit, based upon their persuasion by reliable historical facts, which simply refused to be removed by the simple process of a papal decree. Among those who were finally excommunicated for their refusal to submit were Professors Langen <sup>Rusch,</sup> and Reusch, and Dr. Hasenlever. The latter illustrated the impossibility of a reconciliation of the new dogma with the principles of episcopal teaching-authority, by adducing the algebraic formula: if  $a + b$  equals  $a$ , then  $b$  equals  $0$ , thus showing that the new doctrine reduces episcopal authority to a non-existent quantity. But there was still <sup>still</sup> one man whom the verdict of excommunication affected more than it <sup>did</sup> di-

the others, and that was Dr. Döllinger, who had been one of the leaders of the opposition to the doctrine. His friends tried to persuade him to modify his position, but not succeeding in this, they tried to bring their influence to bear upon the pope to deal kindly with the old gentleman who had been in the fold of the Church for such a long time. Döllinger remained as firm as adamant in his determination to adhere to the only position which he was convinced, on the basis of his historical studies, was the right one. He answered his friends, "As a Christian, as a theologian, as a historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine", and again, "Rest assured that I shall not dishonor my old age with a lie before God and man". (Simpson, p. 320). Döllinger accepted his excommunication and refused to join the Old Catholic Party which was formed by those who flatly refused to submit to the doctrine of infallibility.

The argument that submission to the infallibility decree was a "sacrifice of intellect" shows what a firm hold the Roman Church has upon its members. As Montalambert says, this sacrifice of reason is also a sacrifice of justice, truth, and history. (Simpson, p. 184). But it is, of course, very consistent Roman teaching, for the <sup>Catholic</sup> Roman Catholic Church believes that only the church has the right <sup>to</sup> interpret Scripture, and that, in turn, "when we speak of the Church, we mean the pope" (Jesuit Gretser, Janus, p. 40). The pope then plays the part of a court of final appeal. The Catholics adduced this very argument to show the necessity of the doctrine of infallibility, for, they said, is it not the natural order of things, even in civil affairs, that <sup>there</sup> there must be a final authority whose word decides the matter? On this argument Simpson has a very fine answer when he speaks of "the huge abyss which separates infallibility as the Church understands it <sup>from</sup> from civil sovereignty and final judicial appeal. The former not only demands submission, but assent, belief. The second only imposes respect

and exterior obedience without involving any interior conviction or belief; without preventing discussion, contradiction and reversal by subsequent legislation". (p. 152). It is evident that on the basis of Scripture the very first premise of the Catholics in fallacious and this of course, makes every other premise and conclusion which they may draw, a false one. Sacrifice of reason is to be made not to the decrees of any human being, but only to the inerrant Word of God, which itself tells us that we are to bring "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ". (2 Cor. 10,5).

By forsaking the ancient rule of St. Vincent of Lerins who exhorted, "Let us follow universality, antiquity, consent", (Simpson, p.26) the Catholic Church ushered upon itself a new era, in which it officially admits this statement made by the Jesuit professor Ebermann, <sup>that</sup> "that the pope can impart light although blind, and even a wholly ignorant pope can quite well be infallible, as God, we know, in old times led men on the right way by means of a mere ass". (Theol. Quart. Xlll, 65ff). The Roman Church entered upon an era of ecclesiastical monarchism <sup>and</sup> and has thereby taken away the rights of the individual bishops, although "the Vatican decree indeed maintains the paradox that exclusive papal authority enhances that of the bishops". (Simpson, p.353). The Roman Church has officially discourage, Scripture-study, for now a papal decree establishes a new doctrine beyond any possibility or even necessity of an appeal to the Scriptures. The pope can set up a new doctrine at will. Pius IX said in his Syllabus that it is a grievous error to say, "that divine Revelation is imperfect and that, therefore, subject to a continuous and indefinite progress." (Theol. Quart. <sup>XIII</sup> Xlll, 65-69). And yet we find that very pope declaring, without the aid of a council, that the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception is a God-revealed doctrine. We find him doing all in his power to have the decree of infallibility passed. By the dogmatization of infallibility,



the Roman Church has officially shown itself to be in favor of the tactics of suppression which were used by the majority members under the direction of the pope, and opposed to liberty. For, although the Catholics deny this charge most emphatically, it is evident to any serious student of the council that repressive measures were adopted and that the council was far from being a free one. We translate <sup>di-</sup>rectly from *La Liberté du Concile et L'Infaillibilité*, "or has a coun- <sup>coun-</sup>cil, which does not discuss, and is not permitted to discuss, the necessary liberty?" (*Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium, Vaticanum*--Friedrich, p.139). Nippold says, "but in the application of the means which Pius personally used for the intimidation of opponents, nothing was left unattempted, from friendly persuasion to angry threat and brutal force". (*Papacy in the 19th Century*, p.153). And here we might refer to such a recognized authority as Ranke, who, although conceding that there is no authentic proof that the pope called the council for the purpose of declaring the infallibility doctrine, nevertheless says, "but that it was his intention, is beyond doubt". (*Die Römischen Päpste*, III, 193.) And then he adds this significant statement, "there was no room left for free speech". (*Ibid.*).

In conclusion we must remark that with the passing of the Vati- <sup>Vati-</sup>can Council, the Roman Catholic Church passed safely through one of the greatest crises with which it had been confronted since the days of the Augustinian monk. Not only did the Ultramontanist Party <sup>reach</sup> reach its goal, the official recognition of the papal supremacy in the Church, <sup>church,</sup> but it had done so without losing one of the delegates who had <sup>attended</sup> attended the council. It is true that the Old Catholic Church was formed by those who were absolutely dissatisfied with the conciliar results, but <sup>but</sup> this was but a negligible number in comparison to the strong minority. The fact was that the Roman Church had finally come through victorious in spite of the danger which had threatened to cause a schism in the

ranks of the Church. From this period on there is very little danger of a similar breach ever threatening the Roman Church, for the doctrine of infallibility makes absolutely superfluous the calling of an ecumenical council at any time in the future, and we have also seen what a hold the Catholic Church has upon the consciences and intellects, not only of its laity, but also of the clergy, by its claim that reason must be sacrificed in the interests of the Church. Instead of the decentralization which the delegates had demanded, the Roman Curia simply enhanced the papal power by complete centralization in Rome. Truly, this is "Romanism gone mad" (Dupanloup). Roman Catholic theologians undoubtedly realized the great danger to which they had exposed the Church, for upon sober consideration, this new power must seem logically untenable also to them.

Briefly, the<sup>n</sup> results of the Vatican Council were:

1. The establishment of the universal episcopacy of the Roman bishop, by means of which the pope can interfere in the affairs of any particular congregation, diocese, or bishopric under the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church. This is Chapter III of the Constitutio Dogmatica prima de Ecclesia Christi.
2. The dogmatization of the doctrine of papal infallibility, by which the decrees of all popes are declared to be irreversible, by virtue of a personal, separate (separate from the Church), independent, and absolute infallibility, which makes it impossible for the pope to err when he speaks as universal pastor to the entire church on matters of doctrine or morals, by which is understood the entire field of divine Revelation, for God immediately deposes a pope who might venture to speak ex cathedra (even though all necessary conditions are fulfilled), and hence the erring pope is, in reality, pope no longer. This is Chapter IV of the Constitutio Dogmatica prima de Ecclesia Christi.

FINIS.

oooo0000oooo

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia.

Encyclopedia Britannica.

Schaff, Realencyklopädie.

The Catholic Encyclopedia.

Lehre und Wehre.

Theological Quarterly.

Fisher, History of Christian Doctrine.

Hippold, The Papacy in the 19th Century.

De Cesare, The Last Days of Papal Rome.

Ranke, Die Römischen Päpste.

Engert, Die Sünde der Päpste.

Fairbairn, Catholicism, Anglican and Reformed.

Friedrich, Documenta ad illustrandum Vaticanum Concilium.

Simpson, Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility.

Janus, Der Pabst und das Konzil.

Manning, The Vatican Council.