

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

for the faithful Luke, can declare that wisdom unto salvation can be got from the ancient writings of his nation, simply "by faith, which is in Christ Jesus."

ROBERT SINKER.

---

ART. II.—DR. DÖLLINGER ON THE INFALLIBILITY  
OF THE POPE.

THE indefatigable Professor Reusch has given to the world another instalment of Dr. Döllinger's writings: *Kleinere Schriften gedruckte und ungedruckte von Joh. Jos. Ign. v. Döllinger*. Stuttgart, 1890. Some of these have been published before, and at least one of them, that on mediæval prophecies, has been translated into English (Rivingtons, 1873). But many even of those speeches and articles which have been previously published in pamphlets and periodicals will be quite new to English readers. Of the pieces which have never been printed before the most important are an "Historical Sketch of the Council of Trent," and a portion of a biography of Pius IX. The latter is a beautiful piece of work, but it carries us no further than 1855. The following translation of an article on the Vatican Decrees was made soon after the original appeared in the *Deutscher Merkur* in 1876, but it was not published because the original article was left unfinished. Dr. Reusch has rightly included this valuable fragment in his collection, and the translation of it may now see the light. The article was written by Dr. Döllinger on the appearance of a German translation of Mr. Gladstone's famous pamphlet on the Vatican Decrees. The English translation of it will be read with interest in connexion with the debate in the House of Commons on Wednesday, February 5th.

Gladstone's pamphlet shows in detail what to everyone acquainted with history and the internal circumstances of the Roman Catholic Church is an incontestable truth, that perfect loyalty of subjects to their Sovereign and to the law of the land is absolutely incompatible with a serious acceptance of the Vatican Decrees of 1870.

The decrees, as is well known, have made it an article of faith that the reigning Pope, and likewise all his 257 predecessors, have always been infallible in the whole sphere of faith and morals, and that all his successors likewise will always be so; and that therefore every Catholic—nay, every baptized Christian—is bound to accept and obey every Papal utterance or decision, if only it falls within the immeasurably wide province of morality, or in any way comes in contact with it, with the same unconditional obedience, the same absolute surrender of his own judgment, with which he would submit to a command directly revealed by God

Himself. This decree, therefore, embraces the whole of the past back to the time of the Apostles, as well as the whole of the future. All that any of the 257 Popes have maintained and taught in matters of faith and morals, if it has been spoken in the character of universal teacher—*i. e., ex cathedrâ*—and is not a casual, unconsidered utterance, is exempt from error, and accordingly binding to this day and for all futurity on every Christian.

But it is only through another article of faith, published along with it on the 18th of July, that this new article of faith receives its full force and significance. In its propositions respecting the nature and extent of the power of the Pope are put forth and ratified as articles of faith, such as hitherto were only to be found in the writings of the flatterers of Rome, partly theologians, partly jurists. The Pope has power and dominion, limitless and immediate, over every baptized human being, from the Sovereign to the beggar, and everyone in the whole extent of religious life, duty and morality is bound to submit unconditionally to what he commands and forbids. This power of his is at the same time an episcopal one; that is to say, the Pope has in every diocese, and over all the Christians in it, all the rights which the Bishop has; and he can, therefore, whenever he pleases, interfere in the Bishop's field of operations, and anticipate or overturn his arrangements. And in the exercise of this plenitude of power (and a greater one cannot be imagined—he has *totam plenitudinem*) he is responsible to no earthly being—not even to the whole Church represented in a council. The whole Church consists of one lord and 180 millions of slaves, whose first duty is blind obedience, and whom a single act of persistent disobedience to a Papal command, or the rejection of a single Papal dogma, consigns to eternal perdition.

Thus that “universal Episcopate,” which the greatest of the Popes twelve hundred years ago rejected with horror as a Satanic extravagance, is made in plain language, and without circumlocution or concealment, into a constitutional principle of the Church, and the ancient fabric is ruined. What Gregory the Great designated a mark of Antichrist, and anathematized as such, is now put before children in their very catechism as a chief article of their religion. And the Bishops who voted for it in Rome, and thereby flung away their ancient dignity like a worn-out garment, returned home as prefects of the Pope.

It is an unlimited despotic power which the Pope has had ascribed to him by the council. For, as is now taught, he is not only not bound by mere human law—that is, by the series of canons laid down, partly by councils, partly by former Popes, all of which he can, on the contrary, abrogate, or alter, or render of no effect in particular cases, just as it pleases him; but not even by Divine law: that is to say, those precepts given by Christ Himself or by His Apostles, which are specified in Holy Scripture, are subject to Papal interpretation and dispensation. The Pope can at his discretion dispense from them in individual cases, or declare that in such cases the Divine law is not binding. At the present time this is accepted in the whole Papal world with all the more security, because the new great doctor of the Church, St. Alfonso di Liguori, has confirmed it with his high authority, and given as a reason for it that, had God not conferred this power on the Pope, He would not have made sufficient provision for the good government of His Church. In the whole extent of the Christian world, therefore, there exist no limits for the Pope but those which he thinks fit to impose upon himself.

I say in the extent of the Christian world, not (as you might expect) merely of the Roman Catholic world; for the Popes have repeatedly declared, and it is the prevailing doctrine taught now in all theological colleges, that all baptized Christians, although from their birth they may

have belonged to other and Protestant communions, yet legally are just as much subject to the Pope as Catholics, and so also remain perpetually bound to observe all the rules of the Church of general obligation, although an ignorance, for which they are in no way responsible, may excuse their transgression of these rules in the eyes of God. The practical consequences deduced from this doctrine are very far-reaching, especially in the subject of marriage.

It is easy, then, to see how these two new articles of faith, of the universal dominion and of the infallibility of the Pope, mutually support and complete one another. As ruler of the whole Church he promulgates universal laws, which, if they concern the faith or touch upon morals, are infallible. For, as in the case of Christ, so also in that of His representative the Pope, law and doctrine are inseparable. When the Pope decides a moral question, he then and there gives a law, and in each of his ethical laws a doctrine is at the same time involved. By the decrees of the 18th of July, 1870, the collections of Papal decretals, which Gregory IX., Boniface VIII. and Clement V. massed together into codes, and solemnly published as such, have now in all the articles belonging to the sphere of faith and morals been invested with indefectible authority. One may safely question whether in the whole Roman Catholic world there are at the present moment half a dozen persons who yet know the full extent of all the principles, doctrines and traditions which have become infallible since 1870. At the present moment the most influential powers and their literary organs are still anxiously careful to avoid discussions on the subject at all risks, and a large number of important articles, which have now become articles of faith, are so far as possible buried in silence and withdrawn from public notice. One must not offer men's intellectual organs of digestion too much at a time any more than their physical ones; and people are also recommended to wait for more receptive times and tones. Moreover, it would be indiscreet to provoke divisions and glaring differences of opinion in one's own camp. It was in itself a most unpleasant circumstance, that the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, which makes all civil power and every Sovereign subject to the Pope even in temporal matters, suddenly received two mutually contradictory interpretations; for, while the German Bishops, under the pressure of their position in reference to the German Government, set aside precisely the most plain and definite part of the Bull, and would allow nothing in the whole document to be binding but one single indefinitely expressed proposition, the Jesuits, in their own Papal organ, the *Civiltà*, and the English Ultramontanes, were honest enough to recognise the plain wording of the Bull, and the fact that this doctrine has now become infallible—that the Pope, as God's Vicegerent on earth, is supreme lord of all kingdoms and peoples, and that they are subject to him in temporal no less than in spiritual things.

Let us consider that for three hundred years a General Council always seemed to be the most improbable of all possible events, that since 1564 not a single Pope has expressed even the wish or the intention of summoning a council, that the mere desire for a council was regarded in Rome as something offensive and as treason against the Pope's majesty; and then the question is forced on us: How, then, is this sudden change in the views of the Curia to be explained? How has it come to pass that what had hitherto at best been regarded as in the highest degree a grave, troublesome and perilous proceeding, now was divested of its terrors and made to seem so desirable?

There was a time when Rome, in spite of her own obligations and her promises in answer to the requests of all Europe, for scores of years refused to summon a council. When she was driven to extremities, and

at length put her hand to the work, the Curia took care that only a miserable caricature of what a council ought to be should be produced. Then, in the year 1868, because no one wanted a council, because not a single voice worth listening to raised this once so mighty cry, because there were no questions requiring a council for their solution, and no one not behind the scenes could conjecture what in the world the assembly was to occupy itself with—then it was arranged by the Pope to hold one.

Meanwhile, everything was already prepared—so well and cleverly prepared that the undertaking, as far as appearances went, was completely successful. Many thousands of hands, episcopal, priestly, and to some extent also lay hands, had helped in the preparation, without knowing what the goal was that was to be reached. But the order of Jesuits did the best service, induced by the hope that the harvest also from this outlay would fall to its share. So long as this order was not strengthened, so long as the education of the younger clergy was not in its hands or in those of its disciples, the accomplishment of the plan was not to be thought of. But with the year 1849 that activity began, and increased in steady progression, which secured the success of the council. The nascent clergy were educated in Ultramontane views, the disciples of the Jesuits thrust themselves more and more into theological colleges, gained influential posts in Chapters and Faculties, in not a few instances became Bishops, and forthwith efforts were also made to drive out the old books of instruction from the theological colleges and schools, and the old catechisms from the national schools, and replace them by new ones composed by the Jesuits or in their spirit, in which none but the names of Perrone, Liguori, Gury and De Harpe might be mentioned. In the course of twenty years this has been done in Italy, France, Ireland, England, Germany and elsewhere, with a success that may well have exceeded the expectations even of those who have brought it about.<sup>1</sup> In this process one finds, on the side of the Bishops and the lower clergy, unconcerned passivity; on the side of the Governments, utter indifference and carelessness. A success so complete justified the boldest hopes with respect to the council; it might reasonably be expected that, by a proper application of the Papal machinery already tried at Trent, the Bishops would be found to be very willing tools, and that the small handful of prelates who still held the old faith would be easily and quickly overwhelmed by the immense majority of those who surrendered unconditionally.

Side by side with the preparations which were conducted more in silence, loud-sounding announcements also, great ecclesiastical demonstrations and spectacles, were meanwhile set on foot, which helped to prepare the way for the council, inasmuch as the Bishops poured themselves out in the humblest assurances of devoted submission, and tied their hands beforehand. The proclamation of the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception was brought to pass, it is true, in the presence of many Bishops who had been summoned to Rome; but good care was taken that this defining of the dogma should have entirely the character of an autocratic act on the part of the Pope deciding by his own authority, and that the Bishops, in spite of their great number, should not even appear as a merely assenting council. On two other occasions, at a great canonization and at a newly invented festival, the so-called *Centenarium Petri*, crowds of Bishops were got together. They appeared in greater

<sup>1</sup> This has been well shown by the Abbé Michaud in his interesting book, "De la Falsification des Catéchismes Français et des Manuels de Théologie" (Sandoz und Fischbacher, 1872).

numbers than ever assembled at Trent. A council might have been formed. There would have been no lack of the richest material for reformatory decisions, of which the pressing need was being felt in all countries. But so tame, so passive and submissive had the Bishops already become, that, with the exception of the Archbishop of Prague and perhaps a couple of French prelates, not one dared even to utter the word "reforms." Accordingly, the Festival of St. Peter closed with the declaration of the Bishops, which was accepted with the greatest applause, and understood as homage paid in advance to the Papal Infallibility: "We all believe and teach as thou believest and teachest." Thus three rehearsals, as of a dramatic performance, preceded the council, and the result was so satisfactory that with perfect confidence it was thought possible to produce the drama itself before the eyes of the world.

The Syllabus with the Encyclica of the year 1864 had already declared war upon the principles on which the life and intercourse of peoples and States rest in modern times; freedom of the press, freedom of opinion, freedom of creed, civil sanction and equalization of other creeds and Churches with the Roman Catholic Church, all this was repudiated, partly by Gregory XVI. previously, partly by Pius IX. in the Syllabus. On the top of this came the solemn condemnation of the fundamental law of the Austrian Empire on the 22nd of July. Pius had declared the new constitution to be an abomination—its conditions respecting the freedom of the press and of faith, respecting the equalization of creeds, to be detestable—and in particular had specified the burial of Protestants in Catholic cemeteries as one of the reasons for his pronouncing this condemnation. At first no one knew how to explain why in the world the constitutional system of the Austrian Empire in particular should be visited with such energetic anathemas, while the like propositions existed in all, or almost all, the constitutions of European States without the Popes saying a word against them, or at most only a gentle diplomatic expression of their dissatisfaction. It was not till two years later that the passing of the Vatican Decrees cleared up this mystery also. It was a prolepsis or preliminary exercise which Pius was making; a programme, from which the world was afterwards to see what extension he meant to give to the new articles of faith promulgated on the 18th of July, 1870, and how he intended to use the self-gotten dignity of supreme ruler and judge over Sovereigns and peoples, constitutions and laws.

One more preparatory act was recognised as likely to be of service. By the proclamation of the Infallibility of the Pope the Bull of Leo X. against Luther, and in it the article which declares that the burning of heretics is a work of the Holy Ghost, became an infallible rule of conduct. In a long chain of Bulls and constitutions, extending over six centuries, the Popes had founded and built up the institution of the Inquisition, had ordained a legal process against persons of other creeds, had created a code of pains and penalties, which, for severity, injustice, and gross violation of the simplest notions of morality and the teaching of the Gospel, is quite without a rival. All this was now to be covered with the shield of the Infallibility; for here it was as legislators, and consequently as teachers of the nations, that the Popes had struck deep into the sphere of morals. The Syllabus had already proclaimed three very comprehensive dogmas, which were also intended to cover the Inquisition:—1. That the Popes have never exceeded the limits of their power. 2. That the Church has the right to use physical compulsion. 3. That freedom of creed is a damnable doctrine. But it seemed advisable to take still more energetic steps with a view to initiating and preparing men's minds in this direction. This was done in the year 1867, by

placing inquisitors,<sup>1</sup> who had been murdered in the work of burning heretics, as, for example, Peter Arbues and the inquisitors of Avignonet, among the saints, and canonizing them. The simultaneous canonization of Archbishop Josaphat Kuncevicz, whom the Greeks that he had persecuted and robbed of their churches had murdered, was intended to serve the same purpose. With a keen eye to the end in view, several smaller councils also were made to precede the grand main act in Rome. Suddenly and unexpectedly commands from Rome had ordered the holding of provincial councils. Such were held at Cologne, Prague, and Colocza in 1860, at Utrecht in 1865, at Baltimore in 1866. Those who took part in them were bound to the strictest secrecy; the results of their deliberations were sent to Rome, came back from thence revised and corrected, and soon it was shown that these were compendious statements of dogma, just such as are found in a hundred school-books; and in many cases the Tridentine decrees and the like had been merely copied. The world wondered that so simple a business, which might well have been left to the nearest Jesuit or the best teacher in the nearest theological college, should be thought to require the immense expenditure of time and costly apparatus necessary for a provincial synod. But the riddle was soon solved when, as the Jesuits forthwith triumphantly made prominent, all with wonderful unanimity taught the dogmatic Infallibility of the Pope.

In the convictions expressed in this article Dr. Döllinger died. About the character of the Vatican Decrees he never wavered. No Old Catholic could be more profoundly convinced than he was that to accept them meant, for Roman clergy, a violation of their ordination vow, and for every well-instructed person, adhesion to what could be proved to be a lie.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

---

### ART. III.—JOHN SINCLAIR, ARCHDEACON OF MIDDLESEX.

THE life of John Sinclair, Archdeacon of Middlesex, coincided with the period when the National Church of England had almost sole control of the elementary education of the country. It covers also that great period of the development of Church life which began with the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," at Oxford. As he was secretary and treasurer of the National Society for upwards of thirty years, and held the Archdeaconry of Middlesex from 1842 to 1875, his work in both respects gave him great influence. Archbishop Tait wrote of him and of the peculiar position which he occupied in the greatest diocese in Christendom, that he was the trusted friend of Bishop Blomfield, and had the same

<sup>1</sup> See the "Report of the Reunion Conference at Bonn," 1875, p. 46, English translation. Pickering. 1876.