

and secularism, and return to the Lord, and submit to his vicar, there is hope for them; if not, there is none. They must go the way of the nations that turned away from God, and would not have him to reign over them.

THE DOELLINGERITES, NATIONALISTS, AND THE PAPACY.

[From Brownson's Quarterly Review for January, 1873.]

OUR Lord built his church on Peter; and the supremacy in governing, and infallibility in teaching the universal church of Peter in his successors, the Roman pontiffs, have always been held and acted on by the church in all ages and nations as the fundamental principle of her constitution, and the law given her by her divine Founder. The Council of the Vatican has imposed no new faith; it has only defined what has been the faith from the beginning. It matters nothing that the faith on these points had not been explicitly defined from the beginning, for the church defines no point of faith till it is litigated, and in her capacity of *ecclesia judicans*; and even then ordinarily only in condemning and anathematizing the error or errors opposed to it, and she is her own judge of the time and manner of doing it.

The history of the church would be utterly inexplicable without the recognition of the pope as supreme governor and infallible teacher of the whole body of the faithful, or without recognizing at least that such is and always has been the faith of the church. How, otherwise, explain the fact that no assembly of bishops, however numerous, was ever held to be an œcumenical council unless convoked by the authority of the Roman pontiff, presided over by himself in person or by his legates, and its acts approved by him? The schismatic Greeks confess even to-day their inability to hold an œcumenical council, because no council can be œcumenical until it is presided over, and its acts approved, as they say, by the archbishop of old Rome. We know that as early as the second century, if my memory is not in fault, the heathen urged against the church the very objection

urged in our own days in Germany, England, and our own country: that she is dangerous to the empire, because Christians, being united under one supreme ruler, make that ruler a formidable rival to Cæsar. Whence came such an objection, if it was not well known that the church everywhere recognized the Roman pontiff as her supreme ruler or governor under Christ, her invisible head?

The heretics urged, at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third century, the same charges against the bishops of Rome, and accused them of the arrogance and usurpations, that do the Anglicans and Episcopalians of our times. Dr. Döllinger himself shows in his "*Hippolytus und Kallistus*," that the *Philosophoumena* was written by a heretic who was the contemporary of St. Zephyrinus and his immediate successor, St. Callistus, and who flourished between 180 and 231. From the *Philosophoumena*, he proves that the papacy was as fully constituted at that epoch as it has been at any time since, and that the Roman pontiffs claimed and exercised all the authority in governing and teaching the universal church, claimed for them by either the Council of Florence in 1439, or by the Council of the Vatican in 1870. The same has been shown still more conclusively from the same heretical work, by the late Abbé Crux. Even Tertullian, after his fall, implies the same in his sneer at the Roman pontiff for claiming to be "the bishop of bishops." The testimony here, as in the case of the heathen, is unimpeachable, for it is the testimony of an enemy to the papacy, who wished to depreciate, not exalt, the papal authority. If the papal power was claimed and exercised at so early a period, within less than a lifetime after the death of the last of the apostles, it evidently must have been founded in the original apostolic constitution of the church. It appears fully recognized and in full operation at too early a day, to have been a corruption, a usurpation, or a development. If the constitution of the church was papal at the end of the second century, it must have been so at the end of the first century when St. John died, and then so from the beginning.

We disposed of the theory of development in a former series of the *Review*, and our view was confirmed by the action of the bishops,—with the acquiescence, to say the least, of the Holy Father,—assembled at Rome on the occasion of the definition by the supreme pontiff of the immaculate conception of the ever blessed virgin mother of God. The

bull preceding the definition, originally presented for the consideration of the bishops assembled, recognized the theory of development; but after their criticism it was withdrawn by the Holy Father, and another, the one published, was drawn up and presented, which excludes that theory. Dr. Ward of the *Dublin Review*, we must therefore believe, is mistaken in asserting that it is now accepted by the church as Catholic doctrine. The reverse is the fact. The attempt of certain theologians to foist it upon the church, has signally failed. The papacy cannot be a corruption, for there is no imaginable element of the constitution of the church, if it is denied, of which it could be a corruption any more than a development. The papal authority, whether as ruler or teacher, either was or was not founded in the apostolic church, and therefore could only be simply affirmed or denied. There was and could be no chance either for development or corruption in the case.

The most generally approved theory among the heterodox is, that the power claimed and exercised by the popes in mediæval and modern times is a usurpation which they have been enabled to effect by the aid of the civil power. But they certainly could derive no aid from the civil power prior to Constantine; for, prior to him, that power was hostile to the popes, doomed them to death, sought to suppress the church, and to extirpate Christianity from the empire. After the conversion of Constantine and the peace of the church, and even for some time before, the seat of the civil power was transferred to the East; and under Constantine, from Rome to Byzantium, which became Constantinople, or the new Rome, and sought to exalt the bishop of that city, not of Rome, which ceased to be the permanent residence of the imperial court or the imperial capital. The interest of the civil authority of the empire was henceforth to enlarge the power of the bishop of new Rome, not of old Rome; and the imperial influence, after a long struggle, did succeed in raising the bishop of Byzantium,—originally a simple suffragan see of Heraclea,—to be patriarch of Constantinople, taking precedence of Antioch and Alexandria, ranking immediately after the bishop of the see of Rome. Here was an obvious case of usurpation, effected in violation of the apostolic canons and the traditions of the fathers, by the aid of the civil power, but not a usurpation in favor of the pope.

Now, if there was no tradition or law that the primacy

belonged to the successor of Peter in the chair of Rome why did the usurpation stop at the *second place* for the courtly and ambitious prelates of Constantinople, instead of grasping the first? Yet neither the emperor nor the bishop of Constantinople, backed by all the power of the empire, ever dared aspire so high, or take precedence in jurisdiction, or in order, of the unarmed and—humanly speaking—defenceless bishop of Rome? The fact is inexplicable, except on the ground that the East as well as the West recognized, as the law of Christ, the supremacy of the successor of Peter in the Roman see. Nothing else could have checked the usurpation, for the civil power was not wielded by the Roman pontiff, but was wielded by the patriarch of Constantinople.

There is another objection to this favorite theory of usurpation. The papal supremacy means supremacy over patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, as well as over the lower orders of the clergy and the laity of the universal church. It is fair to assume that each bishop would have as strong an inclination to resist the papal usurpation, as the pope could have to usurp power. How, then, was the bishop of Rome, starting on a footing of equality in rank and power with his episcopal brethren, with no pre-eminence by divine appointment or the apostolic constitution of the church over them, able to force them to submit to his supreme authority, and acknowledge that they receive their mission from God through him, and that it is only through and in union with him that they are judges of the faith.

There have been times when there were eighteen hundred bishops, several of them holding far wealthier and more populous sees than the see of Rome: how was a single bishop able to bring all of them into submission—subjection. I should say—to himself? By the aid of the civil power?—Not at all. It is doubtful if any civil aid could have forced the bishops against the constitution of the church, which, on the supposition, they must have known as well as the bishop of Rome, and have had, each of them, equal authority to interpret,—against their own convictions and natural love of both power and independence, to acknowledge and submit to the papal supremacy. The acknowledgment and submission were yielded, as we have seen, before the bishop of Rome had, or could count on, any civil aid; and after the civil power became Christian, it as a rule sus-

tained, not the pope, but the refractory bishops in their resistance to his authority, and not seldom persecuted them if they obeyed it. Even the *False Decretals* were compiled in the interests of the episcopacy, not of the papacy. The theory, therefore, of papal usurpation is untenable, is unhistorical, unphilosophical, impossible, and can explain none of the facts in the case. The only adequate explanation of the fact is in the conviction of the faithful, of the church herself, that our Lord did build his church on Peter, and that Peter lives, teaches, and governs in his successors in the see of Rome. Hence the fathers of Chalcedon, when the tome of Pope St. Leo was read, exclaimed: "Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo."

But along-side of these facts there is another series of facts in some sense opposed to them:—Not all bishops, nor all the laity, especially sovereign princes, have at all times yielded due and prompt obedience to the apostolic authority of the Roman pontiff; and such as resist have invented theories to excuse or justify their disobedience. They have alleged that the primacy of Peter and his successors, in the see of Rome, was only a primacy of order, not of jurisdiction; that it was conferred by the church, by the emperor, or the consent of the people; that the supremacy claimed and exercised by the Roman pontiff, is incompatible with the independence and authority of temporal princes, with the rights and independence of nations; that the civil power has in each nation the supreme authority in ecclesiastical administration and the temporalities of the church, indeed has no superior in any order, &c. Yet it is to be remarked that none of this series of facts are, properly speaking, facts within the church, or even endorsed by her authority. They are historical facts, indeed, but facts lying outside of the church; facts, so to speak, of the sovereigns or secular authority, and of refractory and disobedient churchmen, courtier bishops and prelates, imperial legists, who prefer the temporal to the spiritual, and Cæsar to Peter. Theories invented to justify or excuse them, have never been accepted or approved by the church, but always resisted by her, as well as the deeds they seek to justify.

Now it is on this series of facts that is based the antipapal theory of the Gallicans, and of the so-called Old Catholics with Döllinger at their head, and Bismarck as their patron. When I first became a Catholic in 1844, the method generally adopted and approved among English-speaking Catho-

lies, of repelling the charge that the papal supremacy is incompatible with the rights and independence of states, and that the spread of the Catholic Church, in this country especially, would prove dangerous to our republican institutions, was to cite examples from history, especially from English history, of Catholics adhering to the temporal sovereign, and arming in his defence in defiance of the pope. Priests, and even bishops, were accustomed to declare from the pulpit, that if the pope should dare to interfere with our civil institutions, they should be the first to buckle on a knapsack, shoulder a musket, and march to resist him. That is, if any thing was meant, Catholics would in case of a conflict between the two powers, support the national authority against the supreme authority of their church. They have often done so, but never as good Catholics. Always, since the formation of Christendom, especially since the development and growth of the nations of modern Europe, have there been plenty of nominal Catholics with bishops and archbishops at their head, to support Cæsar against Peter, and the secular power against the spiritual. But this fact only proves that erring secularists and nationalists are capable of resisting the pope, as all sinners resist God. Yet it proves not that the pope has not, or has not always had, supreme spiritual authority in the government of men and nations, or that the Council of the Vatican has introduced any new law or new faith. The question always comes up: Was this theory of the sovereigns, and of their courtiers and lawyers, and of the prelates who supported the national authority against that of the Roman pontiff, ever accepted by the church as Catholic doctrine? Or was it always opposed by her as repugnant to the rights of God, or the spiritual order?

We all know that when it was set up by the Greeks, and made their excuse for their disobedience to the supreme pontiff, they were condemned and excommunicated as schismatics. The sessions of the Council of Constance that impugned the papal supremacy, and the acts of the *concilium* of Basil, that placed the council above the pope, were never approved by the supreme pontiff, remained always without legal force, and were responded to by the Council of Florence in 1439, where both East and West were united in the decree, that the bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, the true vicar of Christ, the teacher of all Christians, has *plenary authority* to feed,—that is, to

teach,—direct, and govern the universal church. When thirty-five French bishops, with Bossuet at their head, in 1682, at the command of the court drew up the notorious four articles, the pope instantly condemned them as null and void, and the king promised to revoke his edict commanding them to be subscribed and taught by all theological professors in his dominions. Certain it is that Gallicanism and Döllingerism were the doctrine of the courts, never the doctrine of the Catholic Church. Yet we do not recollect that our Lord ever commissioned temporal sovereigns, Cæsar or his courtiers, to teach the nations his word, or gave them power to judge in spiritual matters. It is not true that Catholics are free to hold, and can hold without heresy, any opinions not explicitly and formally condemned, as the Gallicans assumed.

The *Alt-Katholiken* simply oppose to what has always been the teaching and the practice of the church, the unauthoritative theories and pretences of the temporal sovereigns, and their laic and cleric courtiers and adherents, who could not brook the papal supremacy or the independence of the church, and sought to bring her in her spiritual government, if not in her dogmas, into subjection to the imperial, royal, or national authority,—the essential principle of gentilism, as the very name *gentile* itself implies. So far from being old Catholics, they are only old heretics. Their heresy is as old as the great gentile apostasy from the patriarchal religion, or the dispersion of mankind after the building of the tower of Babel. Old they are, indeed, but not old Catholics. They are not Catholics at all; they are gentiles, that is, nationals, and labor to make the church in each independent country a national church, holding from the nation, and subject to the national authority. Dr. Döllinger objects to the decrees of the Council of the Vatican, because, in his judgment, they encroach on the rights of sovereigns, which, of course, he must hold to be paramount to the rights of God, or else his objection has and can have no force or pertinency. But no national church, subject to the national authority in her doctrine, discipline, temporalities, the education of her clergy, or the election and dismissal of her pastors, is the Catholic Church or any part of it. Such a church is simply a gentile church, not a Christian church, nor the kingdom of God on earth. *National* stands opposed to *catholic*, as the *particular* to the *universal*. The so-called Old Catholics lose the church by absorb-

ing it in the state or nation, and therefore are, like Anglicans, justly termed gentiles; but, however many fragments of Catholic truth they may retain, or how many Catholic practices they may continue, they are in no sense Catholics, though undeniably anti-Catholics. The very assumption of the epithet "old" proves it.

Nationalism, in one form or another, has always been an unrelenting enemy of the church. The Jews opposed nationalism to our Lord, and said: "If this man be suffered to go on, the Romans will come and take away our name and nation." The Romans never admitted any but national religious or national gods in their Pantheon. Conquered, tributary, or protected nations might retain their national religion, and worship their national gods, but were not permitted to abandon them for any other. The barbarians who conquered the empire and seated themselves on its ruins, no sooner began to be consolidated into distinct nations, than they made war on Catholicity and sought to make the church national, subject to the national taste and authority. Protestantism was born of nationalism; England separated from the pope through national prejudice against foreigners, especially Italians and Spaniards, and because she wanted a snug little English religion of her own, holding exclusively from herself. Gallicanism was born of the pride of *la grande nation* under *le grand monarque*, that revolted at the bare thought of recognizing the centre of religious authority elsewhere than in Paris. Even in this country, where the church has hardly gained a foothold, we hear men arguing that none but native-born Americans should be bishops or simple priests, just as if it could matter where a bishop or a priest is born, or of what nationality he is, if he knows his duty and is a fit man for his place.

The only conservative power in the church—and I might say in society—is the papacy. Reject the papacy, the supremacy of Peter in his successors, make the church simply episcopal, presbyterian, or congregational, and she inevitably becomes national, and splits up into a thousand and one conflicting sects. A church really catholic is inconceivable without the papacy, as always believed by the church and defined by the Council of the Vatican. Without the pope as the source and centre of authority, the church as the kingdom of God on earth has and can have no unity, and without unity it can have no catholicity. Catholicity cannot be produced by aggregation, any more than infinity can

be obtained by the addition of numbers. Only that which is essentially ONE can be catholic.

The papacy is therefore essential to the very conception of the church as catholic. It is as essential to the church organism as the central cell, or organite, as physiologists say, to every living organism, in which all in the organism takes its rise, and from which it proceeds, or by which it is produced. The organite, or central cell, in all organisms generates or produces the whole organism. It must therefore be living and energetic, and of course does not and cannot derive its life or energy from the organism, which cannot exist without it; it must derive both life and the *vis generatrix aliunde*. Hence the spontaneous generation, asserted by some scientists, or sciologists rather, is impossible and absurd.

The church is defined by the blessed apostle to be the body of Christ, and must therefore be an organism, like every living body, not a simple organization or association of individuals. The pope, as its central cell, organite, or germ, cannot, then, derive his life, his *vis generatrix*, from the church organism, for without him that can no more exist than can the generated without the generator, or the creature without the creator. The pope derives his papal life, or generative energy, through the Holy Ghost from Christ, the Word incarnate. He lives by the life of Christ, and by him teaches and governs the universal church; he is, as pope, vitally connected through the Holy Ghost with Christ himself and is his representative or vicar, through whom the life of Christ flows to all who are in communion with him, and brings them into living union with Christ the Son, who is one in the unity of the Holy Ghost with God the Father.

It is thus, it seems to us, that we must understand the position and office of the papacy, if we assert a Catholic Church at all. The opinion emitted by the learned Benedictine, Tosti, in the prologue to his *Storia del Concilio di Costanza*, that the papacy, if lost, may be recovered by the bishops, and, failing the bishops, by the Christian people, seems to us to be untenable, since, without the papacy, there are neither bishops nor Christian people to reconstruct it. The individual pope may die, but the papacy is immortal. Among the three claimants in the great schism of the West, in the fourteenth century, there was a legitimate pope to whom the succession of Peter belonged; and that undoubtedly was Gregory XII. The Council of Constance was no

council till he convoked it, and the cardinals had after his resignation, elected a new pope, Martin V., who continued it. There was great confusion, no doubt, in many minds, much increased by the universal desire to heal the schism without deciding which of the claimants was the true pope, or censuring any one of the three obediences. But as there are no susceptibilities to manage at present, we need not hesitate to treat the Avignon and Pisan popes as no popes at all, and the successors of Urban VI. as the legitimate Roman pontiffs. The whole difficulty grew out of the conflict of nationalities; and if the church had not been supernaturally sustained, she would have perished in the struggle. And after all, it was that very schism that planted in Christendom the seeds of the Protestant defection, and the hardly less dangerous heresy of Gallicanism, which erected resistance to the papacy into a system, and obscured the minds, enfeebled the faith, and abased the Catholic character of the principal Catholic nations of Europe, and which has brought about the deplorable state of modern nations, hardly more Christian, except in name, than were pagan Greece and Rome.

But to return to the papacy as essential to the unity and catholicity of the church, the visible origin and source of all church life and authority, doctrine and discipline. The doctrine we have set forth, and which we expressly maintained in January, 1856,* can be successfully controverted only by denying that our Lord has founded a visible catholic church, or a visible kingdom of God on earth. The generality of Protestants acknowledge a catholic church in words at least; but very few of them hold her *visible* unity and catholicity, and most of them take refuge in the assertion of the *invisible* catholic church. They in fact recognize no church organism at all, and the visible churches they do recognize are simply aggregations or associations of individuals more or less numerous. They recognize no church in communion with Christ, and deriving its life from him and imparting it to its members. In their view the church, as such, is severed from Christ and has no vital relation to him, except through its members. It derives its life from the individuals associated, who must obtain their Christian life, if they have any, and give evidence of living it, before they can be aggregated to the society. Hence

*See *The Constitution of the Church*, Vol. VIII., p. 527.

their churches serve no purpose, count for nothing in the economy of grace, or of Christian life and salvation; and, accordingly, we find Protestants gradually, as they recede further and further from the church of Rome, coming to the conclusion that union with the church is not essential, and that one can live the Christian life and be saved outside of all church organizations, as well as inside of any of them, a conclusion strictly logical from Protestant principles.

To deny the visibility of the Catholic Church is to deny that our Lord has founded any church, or set up his kingdom on earth for the spiritual instruction, discipline, and government of men and nations. Catholic theologians distinguish, indeed, between the body of the church and the soul of the church, and maintain that only those who belong to the soul of the church can be saved; but they do not maintain, so far as I am aware, that one can belong to the soul without belonging, *vel re, vel voto*, to the body of the church. The soul of the church is Christ himself, and Christ cannot be distinct from Christ. The invisible church is not a church that Christ founds or creates, but is Christ himself without a visible body, organs, or representative; that is, no church distinguishable from the incarnate Word himself. This can be accepted only by those sophists who make no distinction between the Creator and his works. Among Catholics the church means always the visible body of Christ, mystically, or, as we have said, vitally, united to him through the Holy Ghost in the sacraments and communion with his vicar, the spiritual father of all the faithful. The "Old Catholics" cannot fall back on the invisible church of Protestants without giving up all pretence of being Catholics at all, in any recognized sense of the term.

The "Old Catholics" know perfectly well that the Catholic Church has always been papal, and that to deny the papacy has always been held to be a heresy fatal to the unity and catholicity of the church; which it must be, since our Lord said: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam*. If the Lord founded his church on Peter,—that is, the papacy,—it follows necessarily that, if you take away the papacy, you take from the church her foundation, and consequently leave her to fall through. Do the "Old Catholics" deny that they reject the papacy, or the papal supremacy, and assert that they only reject the papal infallibility? Be it so; the pope is supreme, if at all, *jure di-*

vino, and he is supreme in teaching the universal church—if we may credit the Council of Florence, which the “Old Catholics” must accept—no less than in governing. Never has it been lawful in the church either to dispute a papal constitution, or to appeal from the decision of the pope to a general council. The bishop, even prior to the recent definition, who should refuse to accept a papal definition of faith and protest against it, would have been *ipso facto* excommunicated and deprived of his jurisdiction. The authority of the pope from God to teach, implies the correlative duty of the church to believe what the pope teaches. If God authorizes the pope to teach, he commands us to believe his teaching. If the pope then could err in teaching, it would follow that God could be the accomplice of a false teacher, and command us to believe error; which is inconvenient and not supposable, for God is truth, and it is impossible for him to lie, to authorize a lie, or an untruth. If the papacy is admitted at all, the supremacy and official infallibility of the pope, as defined by the fathers of the Vatican, must be admitted, to say the least, as a necessary logical consequence. I could not assert that it was strictly *de fide*, but I believed the pope officially infallible by divine assistance when teaching *ex cathedra*, or deciding a controversy respecting faith for the universal church, as undoubtedly before the publication of the recent definitions of the Holy Father, the sacred synod approving, as I believe it now; and Gallicanism has always seemed to me to be inchoate Manicheism, and as such this *Review* has uniformly opposed it.

I have listened, with what patience I could, to the facts and arguments adduced to prove that the pope has erred in matters of faith; but even the great Bossuet was obliged to confess that he could not prove that any pope had ever erred when speaking *ex cathedra* and defining a point of faith, or condemning an error opposed to it. The strongest case is that of Pope Honorius, in relation to the two wills and the two operations in our Lord. That the pope was negligent, and failed to do his duty by crushing out the insurgent error at once with the authority of St. Peter, nobody disputes; but that he did not fall into heresy or err in his own doctrine, the learned Bishop Hefele fully concedes. This erudite historian of the councils, who had no unwillingness to find that the pope had erred,—for he was an opponent, not an advocate, of papal infallibility,—winds up his long

discussion of the question of Pope Honorius, by asserting that the pope was orthodox: a conclusion I had come to years ago, from the pope's own letters to Sergius. Nobody pretends that the pope is impeccable; but a moral fault is not necessarily a doctrinal error, and it is only for a moral fault that Pope Leo II. confirms the censure of his predecessor.

The pretence, that the definitions of the Council of the Vatican infringe the rights of sovereigns and impair the obligations of existing concordats, is hardly worthy of serious consideration. They change nothing in the previously existing relations of church and state, or in the obligations of the concordats conceded by the church to the state. The pope acquires by them, in relation to the church or the state, no new power, and no power he has not in all ages and nations claimed and exercised, or which has not been conceded by every sovereign state that has negotiated with him a concordat. The very fact of negotiating with him a concordat, recognizes him as sovereign pontiff or supreme governor of the universal or Catholic Church; and this is all that the council has defined as to the papal supremacy. Whether the church holds the pope to be infallible or not in teaching the universal church, is no concern of the state as such; for the state, in consideration of certain concessions to it by the pope in the concordat, guaranties her full liberty of doctrine and worship, and the state can take no cognizance of what she teaches her own children. Infallible or not, a papal constitution of doctrine has always been binding by every concordat on the state in its relations with Catholics or the Catholic Church; and in all cases where Catholic rights or duties were involved, is and always has been the supreme law for the civil courts. A papal constitution could not be lawfully resisted before the definition, any more than it can be now. Dr. Döllinger knows this as well as we do, and he cannot have made his objection in good faith.

The papal infallibility assures nations, governments, and individuals, that the pope can declare nothing to be the word of God which is not his word, or to be the law of God which is not his law; and no one has or ever had the right to disbelieve the word of God, or to disobey the law of God, as declared by the pope. The definition, therefore, imposes upon men or nations no new obligation of faith or obedience, and the papal infallibility offers the very guaranty that all men

and nations want: that nothing but the infallible word of God shall be proposed to the faith of either, and that nothing shall be exacted of either in morals or practice not enjoined by the divine law infallibly applied. Nothing is or can be more absurd than to object to the papal infallibility, if the pope be, by the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost, really infallible. Infallibility in teaching, defining, and applying faith and morals, is what all men need; what gives them perfect certainty and security. And Almighty God could confer no greater boon on the human race than in the institution of a living and visible organ of such infallibility, accessible to all the world. The infallible pope is in the spiritual firmament what the sun is to the material, and gives light, life, warmth, and health to all on whom he sheds his radiance. The great difficulty men have in believing it, is that it seems too good to be true. But is there any thing too good for Him to give us, who freely gave up his only begotten Son to die for us; or is there any good that the Son, who freely humbled himself, took on him the form of a servant, and for his love of us submitted to the death of the cross, and to whom is given by his Father all power in heaven and on earth, will withhold from us? Do we forget that the Gospel is the gospel of infinite goodness, love, and mercy?

Infallibility in teaching is a necessity, if men would know or believe the truth. Without infallibility somewhere and practically available in believing, there can be no true belief or faith human or divine; for a belief that is not certain is simply opinion, and without infallibility there is no certainty. Hence all men, who hold that certainty in any thing is attainable, assert infallibility. The rationalist asserts the infallibility of reason; the Protestant asserts the infallibility of the written word; Dr. Döllinger and his followers assert the infallibility of historical science, or the erudition of German university professors; Gallicans assert the infallibility of bishops either congregated in council or dispersed, each one teaching in his own diocese. Catholics assert the infallibility of reason in things which fall within its province, and the infallibility of the pope, by divine appointment and the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost, in matters which transcend reason, or the natural order:—all equally assert infallibility. The rationalist asserts it only in the natural order, and excludes the supernatural order in which the natural has its root, and without which it does not and

cannot exist. The Protestant asserts the infallible Bible, but he has only a fallible authority, for he has no infallible authority for declaring its sense, in which only it is infallible. The Gallican, who denies the infallibility of the pope, is no better off; for he is obliged to admit that all the bishops in the world without the pope cannot make an infallible definition of faith, and that only those who are in communion with the pope and receive their mission from him, are to be recognized as bishops of the Catholic Church, or as having Catholic jurisdiction. So the Gallican has no infallibility without the pope. Without him there is no council, and the *ecclesia dispersa* is infallible only by virtue of communion with the pope, and it is only through him that we can know infallibly what bishops are in communion with him, or what the bishops, spread over the whole world, teach each in his own diocese.

The Döllinger rule, which assumes that the church is to be controlled in her definitions of faith by the investigations and conclusions of learned professors of German or any other universities, is at best only a reproduction of rationalism, and makes no account of the assistance of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth promised her, and without which infallibility is not attainable in the supernatural order. The definitions of the church, whether made by the pope in council or by the pope alone, are infallible, not by virtue of human learning, science, wisdom, or sagacity, but by the supernatural assistance of the Holy Ghost; and I do not find that Christ has anywhere promised this assistance to the learned professors of the German universities. Besides, of all the sciences, that of history is the least certain, as no man can doubt who has read the historical works even of Döllinger himself, especially his *Papsts Fabeln*. Historical science is so far from controlling the church in her decisions, that it is the church that must control the conclusions of the historian. The church is the controlling fact of the universe, and in her alone is to be found the key to all history and to all science. Hence no one who rejects the papacy, the central principles of the church, or proceeds to explain history or science from the outside of the church, or independently of her, can ever write true history or give us genuine science. He loses himself in a wilderness of facts, the sense or order of which baffles all his intelligence; for the universe is created and governed *ad Christum*, and therefore *ad ecclesiam*, which is his body, his glory, and in which are

concentrated and fulfilled all the purposes of the Creator. All history and all science must be studied from the point of view of the Word, as Frederic Schlegel, after St. Augustine, justly maintains; and therefore from the central point of the papacy, that represents him in the visible order.

The mistake of many of our German professors arises from their not considering that the natural exists in order to the supernatural, and that, taken without reference to its end in the supernatural, we have and can have no clue to its meaning or significance. Bishop Hefele, who has at length, we are happy to learn, accepted the decrees of the Vatican, professes in his history of the councils to relate the historical facts as he finds them, without reference to their bearing on Catholic dogma, and this method of writing history has met much and high commendation. It would be a true and just method were it not that the real fact is not intelligible, has no significance except in relation to dogma, and must be understood by the dogma, if understood at all. The truth of the dogma is the key to the true fact, and controls its sense, and therefore must control the judgment of the historian. History written with this superb indifference to dogma, that is, to the highest order of truth, is no history at all, unless by an inconsequence. The church is not an accident or an incident in God's universe; it is not a mere adjunct to the natural, and separable from it; but is integral in the Creator's works, as the end for which they all exist and to which they all tend. The church is their crowning fact, for which they are made and sustained. The church, then, is not a theorem, nor a hypothesis, which may be entertained, discarded, or ignored, as of no account. She is a universal fact, as much so as creation itself, and as the fact of creation, she accredits herself. She is not only the great central fact of the universe, but contains in her dogmas the principles and explication of all other facts. It is idle, then, to pretend that history can be written from a point of view outside of the church, or that it is indifferent to her dogma. All Catholics may not be capable of writing history, but none but a Catholic can write history worthy the name; nor can any one but a Catholic, who has in his church the key to all facts of every order, give us real science, or a scientific explanation of any class or order of facts. We say, then, dogma controls history, not history dogma, and dogma is determined by the church through the supernatural and infallible assistance of the

Holy Ghost, who leads her into all truth. These so-called Old Catholics (as if Catholicity could be either old or new) hardly deserve the serious refutation of their principle of infallibility, which we have given it. They are neither philosophers nor theologians; they have no breadth or depth of mind, and are as narrow and as superficial as our contemporary Protestants and rationalists.

We need not comment here on infallibility as asserted by Catholics. The Catholic assumes the validity, and indeed the infallibility of reason, in questions of pure reason, but the papal infallibility, by divine assistance, in all questions that transcend reason, so far as the truth in regard to them has been revealed by our Lord himself and the Holy Ghost through the prophets and apostles. Yet as the rational is for the super-rational and the natural is for the supernatural, in which it has its principle, medium and end, reason has not her complement in herself, and is completed only in revelation. The questions of either order do not come up separately from those of the other; they come up in a mixed form, run into each other, are, so to speak, interlaced one with another, so that both rules are brought into play at the same time, and are alike necessary in the solution of the problems raised. A broad and distinct line of demarcation between questions of reason and questions of supernatural authority can be drawn only for a short distance, and in general the two authorities do and must operate together, each performing its proper function. Philosophy is the rational element of theology, but philosophy and theology are not and cannot be two separate and independent sciences; each is necessary to the other, and the two elements together form only one complete and dialectic whole. Thus the Catholic never asserts reason at the expense of the papal infallibility, nor papal infallibility at the expense of reason; but accepts and harmonizes both in the dialectic constitution of the Creator's works, as revealed in the Word—works of nature and works of grace, both of which are equally his works, and forming ontologically one whole.

But Döllinger and his associates do not err solely through ignorance. At the bottom of their rejection of papal infallibility is a concession to cesarism or nationalism, which is necessarily antagonistic to Catholicity, and to the papal authority which sustains it. They may call themselves Catholics to take away their reproach, to seduce the simple and unwary, or to obtain their salaries from the state; but

their real motive is hostility to the Catholic Church herself. A plan had been concocted prior to the Council of the Vatican, indeed an association was formed—if we may credit the statement made to us personally by an Anglo-Catholic, as he called himself, and of which he professed to be a member, and which he assured us had assumed formidable proportions—to effect a grand union of all episcopal churches, including the church of Rome, in the world. The plan, as detailed to us, contemplated a union, or, rather, a confederation of the Greek church, the Armenian church, the Russian church, the Anglican church, the Gallican church, the Spanish church, the Scandinavian churches, and the Roman church, on a national and liberal basis. Each national church was to be independent of the others in its internal arrangements and worship, was to have its own liturgy, and administer its own ecclesiastical affairs. The pope was to have the primacy of honor and order of the whole, but no jurisdiction except in his own national church. Anglicans, whose orders were considered doubtful, should submit to have their orders rehabilitated by bishops whose orders could not be questioned.

The obscurity in which the question of the papal prerogatives was supposed to be involved, it was thought, would afford an opportunity of bringing the great body of the Catholic people into the plan, and through their pressure and the influence of public opinion, force the pope to accede to the union or confederation. Our informant insinuated, rather than asserted, that Döllinger and his Munich friends were the originators of the plan; but he claimed to have recently visited him, and distinctly asserted that the learned professor belonged to the association, and was a prominent leader in the movement.

The convocation of the Council of the Vatican by the pope, was a terrible blow to the conspirators, and the two decrees, the one defining the papal supremacy, and the other the papal infallibility, was a severer blow still. They had left no stone unturned to prevent the adoption of these decrees, which so effectually dissipated the pretended obscurity which enveloped the prerogatives of the successor of Peter, and defeated all hopes of drawing the Roman church into their plan of national churches. This was fatal. Without the Roman church their confederation of national churches was sure to miscarry; for as long as Rome stood out, they could get nobody to acknowledge their confeder-

ation of national churches as the Catholic Church. The convocation of the council was in the nick of time, and nothing could have been more opportune than the definition of the papal supremacy and infallibility, so strenuously resisted even by a number of eminent prelates as inopportune. These eminent prelates, we must believe, little knew into whose hands they were playing, or what influences had been brought to bear on them; and the convoking of the council and its decrees are to us a new proof that the church operates under divine direction, and that our Lord watches over the interests, and protects by his love and power the honor of his immaculate spouse. He has again brought to naught the councils of the ungodly against her. Blessed be his name now and for ever.

The plan, of course, was favored by the secular powers, and Döllinger and his associates were only the tools of Cæsar. Cæsar is instinctively opposed to Catholicity, and it is only under the influence of extraordinary grace that he tolerates any but national churches. He wants the church or religion to discipline his subjects and enforce on them, in the name of God, submission to his authority; but wants not a church able to subject him to her discipline if he does not reign justly and oppresses his subjects. In this he is the dupe of Satan. One of the great causes of the frightful alienation in modern times of the people, who are naturally conservative and never given to innovation, from the state no less than from the church and religion, is the fact that Cæsar has used the church to preach submission to the people, but prohibited her from using her authority to rebuke his own tyranny and oppression. To the people religion has come to appear as the accomplice of the despot, and they regard it as their worst enemy, and have in large numbers come to hate it, and to loathe its very name, although the Catholic Church is their best and often only friend, and, where free, is their most efficient protector. For the prevalent hatred of religion among the people, kings and their courtiers, worldly prelates, and *liberal* Catholics are responsible, and kings are no longer secure on their thrones. It is the inevitable effect of *decatholicizing* and nationalizing the church.