

authority for his bold, rash, and unkind assertion. An honest man should affirm nothing for which he cannot give solid and reliable evidence. The truth is this:—Many newspapers complained of the exclusion of laymen, and especially of the envoys of princes. Count Daru wrote two letters to that effect. Many distinguished ladies are also supposed to have given warnings to the bishops when they went to Rome. Several Liberal papers, in France, Germany, and other countries, set all kinds of rumours afloat. The Pope was threatened with abolition of the Concordat in France, and the withdrawal of the French army from Rome, and the prohibition of Peter's Pence. It was added that should the dogma be defined, there should be many apostasies in Eastern countries. At Constantinople no effort was spared to poison the minds of the Armenians. The German Press went so far as to demand that the decision should rest with the bishops of the Opposition, which were an insignificant minority, because they were considered more learned and intelligent and represented larger sees. The pretended superior learning of the few bishops of the Opposition was a myth; the fact is that on the side of the minority there were very few men of an imposing character; many of them made frightful theological blunders, and their arguments, on the whole, were extremely weak. As the Rev. J. Dickson might doubt my statements and imagine that they are the effect of prejudice and ignorance, let him take the trouble to read "Hergenrother" Catholic Church and Christian State, London, 1876. The Vatican Council, where he will find the authentic proofs of all I have just advanced. They are to be found in the 1st volume, part 2 "Charges against the Vatican Council," p. 137-167. We admit that some prelates considered the definition *inopportune* and were freely permitted to express their views; but this cannot be brought as an argument against the Council; on the contrary, it shows that all the prelates had the greatest liberty of speech, which is indispensable to come to the clear knowledge of truth. I doubt very much that any of the inopportunists went so far as to say that if the dogma were defined "the Church they loved would become a laughing stock among the nations"? Where has my rev. friend taken this piece of news? I should like very much to know, in order to examine what it is worth. If it be a gratuitous assertion of his, it is unwarrantable.

THE NEGATIVE VOTES.

"When the first vote was taken," says the Rev. J. Dickson, "150 bishops had the courage to say 'no,' and 80 did not vote, and may be set down as opposed. This is an answer to the statement of our friend that the Infallibility of the Pope was always the doctrine of the Roman Church."

REPLY.

The Rev. J. Dickson is again perverting truth. When the first vote was taken, 62 bishops voted "Yes" conditionally *Placet juxta modum*. They wanted the words, "of himself, and not through the previous agreement of the Church, *Ex sese, non autem ex Consensu Ecclesie*" to be added. This shows the unanimity of the bishops about the dogma of infallibility. The votes passed on July 13 were not decisive. It was only a preparatory meeting, many of the strongest advocates of the definition being absent. The 50 who withdrew were no longer members of the Council. They cannot, as my friend pretends, be set down as opposed, since they almost all believed firmly in the infallibility of the Pope, and simply objected to the opportuneness of the definition, which is quite different. Why does the Rev. J. Dickson falsify authentic documents, and misrepresent facts and persons? See Hergenrother: "Catholic Church and Christian State. Charges against the Council" 1, 10, p. 152-153—1876, London, Burns and Oates.

(d) THE FINAL VOTE.

"At the final vote there were still two nays. Time and pressure, however, bore down all opposition, and one day, amid thunder, and lightening and rain, a day similar to that on which the Council met, as if the heavens were denouncing the proceeding, the Pope by the light of a candle read the famous decree that was to secure for ever the preservation of the Roman Church, but the very next day saw the German battalions at work, which demolished at Sedan the Napoleonic Empire, and with it the temporal throne of the Pope."

REPLY.

This burlesque description of the grand and majestic ceremony of the closing of the Vatican Council was drawn by the Rev. J. Dickson with a view to turn it into ridicule. Should one who pretends to have no other aim but the "glory of God and His Son Jesus Christ" have recourse to such means, in order to throw discredit on the most august assembly of Christendom? There never was in the Church a greater harmony than that which was displayed on that solemn occasion. Hear how Cardinal Manning, who was an eye witness, speaks of it "Setting aside this one question of opportuneness there was not in the Council of the Vatican a difference of any gravity, and certainly no difference whatsoever on any doctrine of faith. I have never been able to hear of five bishops who denied the doctrine of Papal Infallibility." (Vatican Council by Cardinal Manning p. 33). Two bishops only voted "non placet." Where, in the history of the Christian Church, was there a greater unanimity, especially if we bear in mind that the two Bishops who had given a negative vote submitted after-

wards? The Rev. Dickson tells us "eighty did not vote, and may be set down as opposed." The number "eighty" is inaccurate, "fifty," not "eighty" absented themselves. Admitting their's might be reckoned as a negative vote, what is fifty negative to 553 affirmative votes? No council in the Church had, in proportion, a more overwhelming majority. It is a vile calumny on the part of my rev. friend to say that any pressure was exercised on the Fathers assembled. Every one was perfectly free to vote according to his conscience; had they not all been in favour of the proclamation, they could all have voted "non placet" as the two who recorded a negative vote. The fact that the Pope and bishops paid no attention to the threats of German, French and Eastern diplomatists shows that the Catholic Church is not a time-serving Church; that being the Pillar of Truth, she is not afraid to affirm it, no matter what temporal consequences may follow. God may permit her to be afflicted and persecuted for a while, but ultimately she will triumph over all her enemies. The definition of the infallibility of the Pope has strengthened the unity of the Church and thrown a brighter light on a truth which was generally believed from the beginning, as we have shown but not explicitly defined. The great need of our age is respect for authority. The dogma of infallibility gives to the spiritual authority in the Church a new strength and a new splendour. It is the most imposing protestation against revolution.

OBJECTION VII.—The Great Schism of the West.

"The great schism of the West over rival popes in the XIV century lasted fifty years. Clement VII. supported by the bishops of France, Spain and Savoy opposed Urban VI, supported by the bishops of Italy, Germany and the north of Europe, and these two Popes vilified and excommunicated one another. At their death the number of rival Popes was increased to three. In 1046 A.D. there were four, while at times in the 13th and 14th centuries rival Popes swarmed like bees, and every one had his sting, and the wonder is that any body lived to tell the tale. Will our friend not agree with this?"

REPLY.

In order to understand the great schism of the West a retrospective view of the preceding ages is necessary. The northern barbarians who invaded Europe from the 5th century had spread desolation everywhere and destroyed the civilisation of previous ages. The Catholic Church Christianised them, and changed those ravenous wolves into meek lambs. Germany owes to the missionaries sent to her by the Popes the greatness which it attained in Europe. Pope Leo III, crowned Charlemagne Emperor in 800 and thus laid the foundation of the Western Empire. Ever since the influence of the Pope in Germany was very great. He alone could crown the Emperor. His advice was asked in all matters of importance. The empire of Carcagne comprised the present territory of France and Europe besides Germany. It was divided after his death. Germany still retained a certain influence over Italy, but France had the influence over the greater portion of the rest of Europe. Soon contests arose between the Popes and the German Emperors. When these went too far in their oppression of the Italian people, the Popes courageously opposed them. Alexander III. resisted Frederick Barbarossa and maintained the independence of Italy. However, the Germans had their confederates in Italy, the Ghibellines, who defended the claims of the German emperors. The Pope was supported by the Guelphs, who were the advocates of Italian independence. Protected by the German Emperors, the Ghibellines grew very powerful. The Popes were sometimes driven from the eternal city of Rome by the Imperialists. On account of the continual wars between the Ghibellines and the Guelphs the sojourn of the Pope in Rome became unbearable; this is why he had to leave Italy and take refuge in France at Avignon. The cause of the quarrel with the German emperors was that they wanted to have the nominations to bishoprics and abbies, and thus enslave the Church. The Popes could not consent to this, and they declared the claims of the German emperors and also of some French monarchs to be a criminal usurpation. If the civil authorities could appoint church dignitaries, the Church would soon degenerate and would have to accommodate herself to the whims and caprices, even of scandalous princes. The people of Europe were very much attached to the Catholic Church and held their clergy and the monks in great esteem and veneration, as is evident from the splendid cathedrals, colleges, monasteries, convents, hospitals, etc., they built all over Europe for them and richly endowed. The Church also defended the poor from the oppression and tyranny of cruel princes and landlords. Through this she was often unjustly persecuted by them. She offered asylum to the sick and afflicted, and also to travellers and artists. By the truce of God, she mitigated, as far as it was in her power, the horrors of war, for four days in the week. The Lords wanted the bishops and monks to espouse their quarrels, and, for that object, they desired to have none appointed to bishoprics or abbies except those who were devoted to them and upon whom they could rely in case of emergency. Unfortunately those whom they proposed were often most unworthy, and the Church, happen what may, had to reject them. You may easily understand this by the state of France at the present time. Had the Jesuits and other religious Orders been willing to submit to the