

compromise to the effect that an appeal from the Pope to an œcumenical Council should be removed. But five counter-petitions, signed by very weighty names, in all 187, representing various degrees of opposition, but agreed as to the *inopportunit*y of the definition, were sent in during the same month (Jan. 12 to 18) by German and Austrian, Hungarian, French, American, Oriental, and Italian Bishops.

The Pope received none of these addresses, but referred them to the Deputation on Faith. While in this he showed his impartiality, he did not conceal, in a private way, his real opinion, and gave it the weight of his personal character and influence. "Faith in his personal infallibility," says a well-informed Catholic, "and belief in a constant and special communication with the Holy Ghost, form the basis of the character of Pius IX." In the Council itself, Archbishop Manning, the Anglican convert, was the most zealous, devout, and enthusiastic Infallibilist; he urged the definition as the surest means of gaining hesitating Anglo-Catholics and Ritualists longing for *absolute* authority; while his former teacher and friend, Dr. Pusey, feared that the new dogma would make the breach between Oxford and Rome wider than ever. Manning is "more Catholic than Catholics" to the manner born, as the English settlers in Ireland were more Irish than Irishmen, and is altogether worthy to be the successor of Pius IX. in the chair of St. Peter. Both these eminent and remarkable persons show how a sincere faith in a dogma, which borders on blasphemy, may, by a strange delusion or hallucination, be combined with rare purity and amiability of character.

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

In the meantime a literary war on Infallibility was carried on in the Catholic Church in Germany, France, and England, and added to the commotion in Rome. A large number of pamphlets, written or inspired by prominent members of the Council, appeared for and against Infallibility. Distinguished outsiders, as Dollinger, Gratry, Hyacinthe, Montalembert, and Newman, mixed in the fight, and strengthened the minority. The utterance of Dr. John Henry Newman, the intellectual leader of the Anglo-Catholic apostasy, and by far the ablest scholar and dialectician among English Romanists, reveals a most curious state of mind, oscillating between absolute infallibilism and hopeless skepticism, and taking refuge at last in prayer—not to Christ, nor to the Holy Ghost, nor to the Apostles, but—to St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine, that they might enlighten the Council at this critical juncture, and decide the matter by their intercession.

After preliminary skirmishes, the formal discussion began in earnest in the 50th session of the General Congregation, May 18, 1870, and lasted to the 86th General Congregation, July 16. About eighty Latin speeches were delivered in the general discussion on the schema *de Romano Pontifice*, nearly one-half of them on the part of the opposition, which embraced less than one-fifth of the Council. When the arguments and the patience of the assembly were pretty well exhausted, the President, at the petition of a hundred and