



CATHOLICISM IN BAVARIA.

by A Bavarian Catholic

IT is well known that Bavaria, next after Austria, has been, since the Reformation, the stronghold of Catholicism in Germany. So great has been the influence of the Jesuits, and through them of the Pope, that it has been called the "German State of the Church." Even lately, after a hard battle with the Liberals, the Ultramontane Roman or Jesuit party, obtained a majority in the Chamber of Deputies. Yet at the present time there goes out directly from Munich, the chief town of Bavaria, the most determined opposition to the Jesuits and the claims of the Papacy. This opposition proceeds not merely from the diplomatic action of the government; but also from two members of the University. Döllinger and Frohschammer represent, indeed, two different kinds of opposition. The one is concerned chiefly with the dogma of Papal infallibility and what is connected with it, Roman absolutism and the domination of the Jesuits. The other goes further, and is striving for the emancipation of the spiritual life from Papal authority, the constraint of dogmas, and the excesses of superstitious worship. It seeks also, by this means, to effect the reconciliation of religion with science and civilization. Before speaking more fully of these two oppositions, it will be desirable to take a brief glance at the previous ecclesiastical history of Bavaria.

Before the Reformation the Bavarian princes and people were not

in any way specially inclined to Romanism or Papalism. On the contrary, particularly under the Emperor Ludwig, Bavaria entered into a determined warfare with the Popes. The people, notwithstanding the Papal excommunication, clung faithfully to their prince, and Bavaria was then the refuge of the most decided opponents of the authority and immense claims of the Pope. It was here, for instance, that the celebrated William of Occam, with his followers, the Minorites, found protection under Ludwig, and by his writings inflicted severe wounds on the Papacy itself. When the Reformation broke out, it spread in a short time over old Bavaria and Oberpfalz: the latter of which now constitutes the darkest province in the kingdom of Bavaria. But a decided reaction followed. Duke William IV. was a zealous Catholic. He saw with anxiety and sorrow the progress of the Lutheran doctrine among his people, and resolved to check it. Judging that the recently established Order of the Society of Jesus was the best adapted to perform this object, he sent his Chancellor to Rome, to ask from Pope Paul III. the learned theologians for his University of Ingoldstadt. This request he of course obtained. Soon after this followed the proper settlement of the Jesuits in Bavaria. This was in 1556, by the arrival of eighteen members of that Order. Then Bavaria, both prince and people, began to be disposed towards Papalism and Jesuitism. With this began the so-called "Ausländerei," or reign of foreigners. Among these Jesuits there was scarcely one native Bavarian. They were Italians, Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Germans from the western provinces. Ample means for accomplishing their object were placed at their disposal, and they soon ruled the University, the learned schools, the nobility, the women, and, above all, the princes. Non-Catholics were again made Catholic, either by preaching or by force. If any one refused to be converted, he was executed or banished. And thus the Bavarian people again became Catholic, and from this time intellectual life in Bavaria almost entirely ceased. The Pope became the ruler in the most important matters by means of his agents, the Jesuits. The people were allowed more of the sensuous pleasures of life. Because of the great number of festival days and pilgrimages they could pass much time in idleness. They were entertained with gorgeous ritual in the churches. They were lulled to sleep by rosaries and litanies. They were gratified and impoverished by frequent indulgences. But they were not allowed to think or to inquire for themselves. Their intellectual employment consisted in believing the Jesuits and obeying the Pope. And dear did this rule of the priests cost Bavaria. It is well known to what fearful sufferings the people were exposed in the Thirty Years' War through the policy of the Elector Maximilian I., led on by the Pope and the

Jesuits. But Adlzreiter, the Jesuit historian of Maximilian, says : "For all their many and great sacrifices and sufferings, God, after a wonderful manner, seemed to provide safety and deliverance for poor Bavaria when He restored the holy bodies of the physicians, Cosmas and Damian." The Elector had learned that their bodies lay in Bremen, altogether despised by the heretics, and he did not rest till, at great expense, he had them brought to Munich. This was what at that time was meant by care for the commonweal !

The dominion of the Jesuits in Bavaria kept itself firm, and for the most part immovable, until the middle of the eighteenth century. Then came the time of the "Aufklärung;" and in the measure that knowledge and education increased, dissatisfaction also increased against the Jesuits, who had not merely become ambitious of power, but greedy of wealth. They were first banished on this account from the southern kingdoms, and this could not be without its influence on the northern. That their power in Bavaria was not now what it had been is manifestly evident from this, that they could not prevent the establishment of the Academy of Sciences at Munich in 1759, nor hinder its prosperity, even though they were patronised by the Elector Maximilian III. and his consort. That a new era was expected, and that the wealth and dominion of the Church were in danger, is sufficiently manifest from the sayings and poems of that era.* The suppression of the Order in 1773 by Pope Clement XIV. put an end also to their existence in Bavaria. But their activity and influence did not end with their suppression. Under the Elector Karl Theodore, whose reign began in 1777, there came a good time for those whom we may call ex-Jesuits.

The mental oppression brought on by Jesuit domination had too

* In Landshut a Jesuit caused a drama, written by himself, to be performed by his scholars. It was called *Bavaria Vetus et Nova*. In this drama a "Pseudopoliticus" sang the following air :—

" Ad quid in templis aurum stat ?
Cur non per orbem ambulat
In bonum reipublicæ ?
Cur Christum facis divitem
Qui vitam amat pauperem
Et opes docet spernere ?
De aureo Apostolo
Vel martyre argenteo
Num legimus prodigia ?" &c.

Another air of this drama contains the following strophe :—

" Libertas sentiendi
Lex prima est siendi
Si jura dat religio
Captiva gemit ratio
Qui vinculis Romanis
Ligatur instar canis
Nunquam mentem erigit,"
Nunquam, se nil scire, scit, &c.

Of course this had to be sung by the vile person in the drama. The author attributed such bad principles to "New Bavaria," that he was not again tolerated in Bavaria.

long weighed on the Bavarian people to be without pernicious consequences. Powers and capacities which had not been used were lamed and crippled. Strivings which the people had been taught to suspect must at last have appeared hurtful, if not hateful. This also happened, that the people were entirely deprived of independent thinking, and were thus kept in mental nonage. The sense for mental effort, and the value of mental cultivation were lost by degrees, and even now cannot generally be awakened. There were not wanting, however, some agreeable exceptions. From the midst of the Bavarian people soon appeared some eminent men, who showed what the national intellect really was, and that the Jesuit way of thinking was a foreign importation, and not indigenous to Bavaria. We mention only three of these men—a theologian, an historian, and a philosopher. The first is Sailer, a theological author and professor, who died Bishop of Regensburg. As professor of theology he had already forsaken the usual scholastic and Jesuit track, and shown a more liberal tendency, both in his teaching and as an author. But the power of the Jesuits was still so great, that they were able to effect his removal from the professor's chair, and to keep him from it for ten long years. In the beginning of this century Sailer was nominated by the king Bishop of Augsburg, but the confirmation of the appointment was refused at Rome. When advanced in years, he succeeded in obtaining from the Pope his confirmation as Bishop of Regensburg. Sailer was a man of liberal sentiments, entirely opposed to hierarchical domination and ecclesiastical formalism, tolerant, humane, not without a measure of the mystical element, yet as clear in intellect as he was generous in heart. He died in great esteem, leaving behind him many friends and disciples. He was the good bishop. The old Bavarian clergy still hold his memory in the deepest reverence; but the younger clergy, for the most part, are of an entirely different way of thinking.

The second of the three men to be mentioned as representing the old Bavarian spirit is Westenrieder, to whom is dedicated one of the many statues which adorn the town of Munich. He also was a clergyman, but he occupied himself chiefly with history. He was of a liberal spirit, a great enemy to the doings of the Jesuits, and animated by a spirit of toleration and humanity. But on that very account he had to endure incessant hostility and persecution from the Jesuits. For the third representative of the Bavarian intellect and the free scientific spirit we may mention Baader, the philosopher. The active part of his life also falls into the end of the last or the beginning of this century. He sought everywhere to give a new life and impulse to philosophy and theology, already benumbed by narrow-heartedness and formalism. He had not indeed much

success, which was due to his unscientific method and his indulging in speculations which sometimes were lost in a fantastic theosophy. Towards the end of his life, he so far rebelled against the Roman yoke that he discussed the propriety of the separation of Germany from Rome. He manifested at last a predilection for the Greek Church.

In the beginning of this century Bavaria was erected into a kingdom, and greatly enlarged. Some provinces, the chief population of which were Protestant, were united under one government, and Munich became the chief town of a kingdom which had various confessions of faith. The former intolerant exclusiveness, by which Bavaria was shut up within itself, and all non-Catholics excluded from municipal and civil offices, was no longer reckoned just. In Munich itself Protestants obtained the rights of citizens; and civil offices, as well as professorships in the University, were held by Protestants. Men of moderate liberal tendencies, such as Thiersch the philologer, Schelling the philosopher, and Schubert the psychologist, all Protestants, received appointments in the University. This, indeed, was not done without much wrath, lamentation, and strife on the part of the strong Roman Catholics, with which was mingled also the jealousy of natives against foreigners. But neither these men, nor those who, somewhat later, were invited from other countries, were able to obtain much influence over the mental life of the Bavarian people. This was partly because the spirit of the people had been long oppressed through the Jesuit discipline, and was not merely indifferent to mental activity, but even suspicious of it. Doubtless, it was also partly due to the circumstance that foreigners rarely obtain so great an influence over a people as those born among them. To the latter they open their minds trustfully; but, as a rule, they shut them obstinately against foreigners. The result was the ordinary one of isolated appointments. When the foreign Jesuits arrived in Bavaria, they found themselves in favourable circumstances. They all worked after a plan, and by the same method. They laid hold of men by means of their religious wants; they were trusted because of their religious creed. They came in contact with all classes of society. They worked upon all the faculties of the soul. To favour their object, they could bring to bear on men supernatural as well as natural motives. It is then no marvel that they obtained a lasting influence, the consequences of which even now form both an active and a passive opposition to the liberal efforts of the government and the universities.

But the free "Aufklärung"-favouring disposition of the government did not continue long. After the death of Maximilian I. in 1825, Ludwig I. came to the throne, and under him followed a powerful

Catholic ecclesiastical reaction. At first, indeed, the king appeared to be animated by a liberal spirit. He promised at the solemn opening of the University of Munich that he would take science and free inquiry under his own special; royal protection. But his mind soon seems to have changed. To this the political commotions of the first thirty years of his reign may have largely contributed. For science he had but little taste: his whole soul was devoted to art. This taste for art must have made him particularly susceptible of the influences of the external ritual of Catholicism, and led him to promote as far as possible its restoration. Appointments of foreigners were now also made in the universities, but of an entirely different kind from those of which we have already spoken. Soon a great number of ecclesiastical Ultramontanes were collected, and with them were united like-minded native Bavarians, both men and women. With Görres from Coblenz as their leader, well known as an infatuated Jacobin in his youth, they united themselves to the ministry of Abel; and for a long time, particularly from 1837 to 1847, they in every respect ruled Bavaria. The legally guaranteed rights of Protestants were in danger. It was found that in some points the Concordat concluded in 1818 was in contradiction with the so-called edict of religion, which determines the religious relations of Protestants. The approaching revolution put an end to the rule of these Ultramontanes. This, in connection with the universal anger caused by the influence which a Spanish dancer had obtained over the king, at last caused him to abdicate the government in favour of Maximilian II. The happy time in which Ultramontanism had the government of the kingdom in its hands departed, and has not yet returned. But the genuine Ultramontanes were not entirely satisfied even with the government under the ministry of Abel. They found that the Catholicism which the king had promoted was too much "a royal Bavarian Catholicism." Indeed, this king, notwithstanding all his support of the Catholic reaction, maintained zealously a certain independence even in Church matters, and did not allow any direct authority to be exercised by the Roman Curia. And so Ultramontanism, in the proper sense of a Roman government within the State, such as the authorities at Rome wished and aimed at, was never able to establish itself. On some occasions King Ludwig resolutely opposed the Roman Curia. It was proposed at Rome to put into the Index the fantastical work of the celebrated Görres—"Christliche Mystik." When the king heard of it he remonstrated with the Congregation of the Index, and forbade such a useless and hurtful proceeding against a man so highly esteemed by himself, and so much revered in the Church. Genuine Ultramontanism was much better able to establish itself in Bavaria under Ludwig's

successor, the noble and liberal-minded King Maximilian II., against his will certainly, and without his knowledge.

Maximilian was more devoted to science than to art. As Ludwig tried to bring glory and renown to his kingdom, which was not politically influential, by the creation and collection of works of art, so Maximilian II. tried to effect the same object by furthering the interests of science. The appointments made, particularly in the University of Munich, were of a kind entirely opposed to the Ultramontanism of the former reign, the phalanx of which was broken in 1847. Men of liberal minds, and possessing the true scientific spirit, mostly Protestants from the North, were made professors. Among these, chief of all, is to be mentioned Liebig. An important remnant of the disarmed Ultramontane phalanx still existed in the University. With these were banded some native professors, not otherwise of any importance, but dissatisfied with the preference given to foreigners. This gave occasion to much dissension and party spirit in the University, now happily diminished, if not altogether extinct. Maximilian provided ample means for the study of the natural sciences. His main object of elevating the people mentally, and giving them a more liberal education, had but little success in the strong Catholic provinces. Indeed, as we have already said, Ultramontanism was able to make greater progress under this liberal government than under the former reign. The reasons of this peculiar fact are worth noticing. In the year of the revolution, 1848, the people everywhere demanded from governments greater rights than they had hitherto possessed. The bishops did not hesitate to seize this opportunity to demand a higher measure of ecclesiastical, that is to say, hierarchical, freedom. And, in truth, no one had greater gains out of these revolutionary movements than the Roman Catholics and the hierarchy. From that time the Jesuits were again able to obtain a firm footing in Germany, especially in Prussia, where their influence is now great. The Bavarian bishops met in the old episcopal town of Freising, to consider and to formulate their increased claims on the government. These claims, which in some things went beyond the existing Concordat, were not all granted; but in 1852 a part of them were admitted, and these of such importance, that in their consequences they must be dangerous to the government itself. The first was that the so-called inferior clergy were given up even more completely than before to the power and will of the bishops, without being able to expect or to claim any protection or help from the civil government. The bishops thereby obtained unlimited authority over the whole clergy, and were able in consequence successfully to lay the foundation of an absolute Ultramontanism of the Roman hierarchical state within the State. The

clergy had to submit. Not one of them, without endangering his whole existence, can take the side of the government, or show any spirit of patriotism. In accordance with this, the education of the clergy was entirely given up to the bishops and Rome without any control from the State. Roman ecclesiastical principles were inculcated on the clergy. They learned scholasticism, but of modern science they knew but little, and that only in the one-sided way of controversy. The institutions in which the clergy were educated, entirely in Roman principles, under the supervision of the bishops, are the episcopal seminaries and Lyceums. To these boys are brought at a very early age, and trained after the monastic fashion. As a rule they learn nothing of the world till, as young priests, they enter on the cure of souls with their narrow monastic view of human life. Their character is formed, by having learned to yield a blind obedience to those above them. A like obedience they demand from others. They are successful with women, but men feel themselves repelled from religion. The so-called Lyceums, in which the clergy, as a rule, receive their higher education, are institutions in which only theology and philosophy are taught. They have become entirely institutions of the bishops and nurseries of the Roman spirit. The teachers, indeed, are appointed and paid by the government, but the choice of them rests with the bishops, so only those obtain appointments who are of the bishops' way of thinking. This circumstance shows what great means the Bavarian government places at the disposal of the bishops successfully to carry on a war against itself, and to establish the power of the Roman hierarchy. Maximilian II. made it a principle to promote energetically in the University science and free inquiry, in spite of the outcry of the Ultramontanes. But, on the other hand, he gave up the Lyceums, as well as the theological faculties in the University, to the bishops. Such is the union of Church and State in Bavaria—no happy principle, surely, by which the Roman educated clergy exercise the greatest influence over the people, and can entirely frustrate all the efforts of the Universities to promote a free and liberal education. The bishops, as soon as they found the Lyceums given up to them, began to keep candidates in theology away from the Universities and their liberal training. They were confined to the Lyceums, where they might be educated entirely as the bishops directed. All this evil resulted from the circumstance that this noble-minded king made mistakes in his choice of bishops, not indeed from any fault of his own, but owing to unfortunate relations which he could not change. The king has the nomination of the bishops, but the appointment must be ratified by the Pope before it is valid. No one, therefore, can be made a bishop if the Papal confirmation is denied. The consequence is that it is

difficult to find anywhere a bishop who is an independent thinking man. In consequence of compromises, those who are made bishops are either men that are entirely insignificant, from whom nothing is to be feared, or they are of the Roman party. And so it has happened in Bavaria that almost all the sees are occupied by mental nonentities, under the control and guidance of the Papal nuncio. The exceptions are where they are filled by the disciples of the Jesuits, expressly educated for the office, who can put on the appearance of Liberalism when they have an object to obtain.

Into such hands were the theological faculties and Lyceums given up. It is then no wonder that the greater number of the theological professorships, especially in the Lyceums, with other important offices, are held by the so-called Roman doctors, that is, priests educated in German colleges in Rome.

It has thus happened that under the government of the liberal Maximilian, who was much opposed to the Jesuits, Ultramontanism proper has been able to establish itself. The blame of this, doubtless, was due to the Bavarian minister of worship, who either entirely lacked the necessary insight to perceive whither these relations tended, or the disposition to oppose the gradually increasing Ultramontanism, and to give the king that information concerning it which was his bounden duty. The Ultramontane plantation grew and spread forth its branches without experiencing any check from the representatives of government. By uniting with itself the political revolution and the long-nourished hatred of Prussia, the Ultramontane party was able, in 1869, to obtain a majority in the Chamber of Deputies. In the Upper House it had hitherto almost always the victory. So Bavaria now seems entirely to be undertaking afresh the part of the "German State of the Church."

And yet from Bavaria, and especially from Munich, there goes forth the most determined opposition to the newest Roman claims, and the misuse to be made of the Vatican Council for their ratification. We need not speak of the diplomatic action of the government through Prince Hohenlohe, that is well known. We shall consider more closely the two oppositions which we mentioned in the beginning.

The one, as we have said, proceeds from Döllinger, and at the present stands directly in the foreground. It is concerned chiefly with the personal infallibility of the Pope. Döllinger has been for forty-five years Professor of Theology in the University of Munich. He is also Provost of the "Hofkirche" of St. Cajetan, and only lately was nominated a member of the Bavarian Council. Formerly he was a very zealous Churchman, and during the administration of Abel was rightly accounted one of the pillars of

the "Royal Bavarian Catholicism," as the genuine Ultramontanes would say, of that time. He distinguished himself by a sharp, often bitter, polemic against Protestantism, whereby, as well as by his great learning, he obtained an immense reputation among Catholics and also at Rome. Since 1848 his early and very intolerant views seem to have become somewhat milder. In 1857 he undertook a journey to Rome and returned under great mental depression, owing to what he had seen of the Roman Church administration. But it was only in 1861 that, by a public act, he brought upon himself the greatest displeasure of the Roman-Jesuit Ultramontane party. At Easter in that year he delivered some lectures on the States of the Church and the temporal power of the Pope. He wished to prepare the Catholic public for what then appeared to be near at hand, the loss of the Pope's temporal dominion. He showed that this in no way belonged to the essence of the Catholic Church, that its loss would not bring any danger to the faith; yea, that the temporal dominion of the Pope was in many ways a hindrance to the fulfilment of his spiritual functions, and that its administration led to many evils. This only raised the highest displeasure among the Ultramontane zealots. The Papal Nuncio who was present at the lecture by Döllinger's special invitation, rose up in the midst of it, with great ostentation, and left the lecture-room. The Ultramontane papers wrote violent articles against the man who formerly had been regarded as an Ultramontane light of the Church. This displeasure had in some measure subsided when, in the autumn of the same year, at the General Assembly of the Catholic Unions at Munich, Döllinger read an explanation, which seemed very like a retraction of his lectures. But the satisfaction which this gave soon disappeared when the obnoxious lectures appeared in print, though in a somewhat milder form, and as the beginning of a greater work, with the title "The Church and the Churches, the Papacy and the States of the Church." The first part of this work contains a keen criticism of the different Protestant tendencies and parties. The second is occupied with the Roman Church, and reveals many evils and corruptions in the ecclesiastico-political government of the States of the Church. The first part naturally gave great satisfaction to the Ultramontane party, and the second in the same measure dissatisfaction. Yet the book was spared Roman censure, and escaped being put in the Index.

In the autumn of 1863 Döllinger, in union with two or three other professors of theology, called a Conference of learned Catholics at Munich. This was done in consequence of the excitement which had been caused by the collision into which Professor Frohschammer had been brought with Rome and the Archbishop of Munich, through

his demand of freedom for science. It was contemplated, according to the programme, to plead, though in a very temperate form, for the right of freedom in science, and to oppose the domination of scholasticism and the terrorism of the Jesuits. In this sense Döllinger expressed himself particularly in the opening address. But the protest and the firm opposition of a small number of Ultramontane zealots was sufficient to cause the original design, which was to plead for the right of science, to be abandoned. This telegraph was finally sent to Rome: "The important question concerning the relation of science to Church authority has been determined by the Conference in the sense of the subjection of the former to the latter." Nevertheless, notwithstanding this departure from the original programme, and though the Conference was summoned by the express permission of the Archbishop of Munich and by the written agreements of other bishops, and though it was expressly arranged that Frohschammer should not receive an invitation, yet there was great anxiety at Rome concerning this Conference. Fears were entertained as to the consequences of the independent step which these learned men had taken, and the somewhat freer tone which had been produced. But Döllinger's words caused most anxiety. He advocated a greater freedom for science, with reservations and some cautious limitations, and so far agreed to Frohschammer's demand. Moreover, he said, with emphasis, that, "as human things now are, error has its meaning in free inquiry as a stage in the journey to truth." Then he said that public opinion must be allowed to have some weight in Church matters. At last he added some remarks not very appreciative concerning the old scholasticism. On this the Roman and Jesuit fury broke forth, in a Papal brief to the Archbishop of Munich, December 21, 1863 (*Tuas libenter, &c.*), which was also published by the bishops. In this brief the Pope grievously laments that a few private doctors should take upon themselves to treat of scientific and ecclesiastical matters which belonged only to the legitimate authority which was over them. Of the freedom of science he wishes to know so little that he condemns the position that expressly defined dogmas only are to be regarded as the limits and boundaries of science. He tells them sharply that the Papal Constitutions, the Decrees of the Index, &c., are also to be esteemed the limits and boundaries of science. And so in this brief, in almost every respect, the very opposite of what Döllinger had asked was commanded and prescribed. He was silent. The desire to call a second Conference of learned Catholic men had departed from him. The authorities at Rome remained distrustful of Döllinger; and although he, with other professors of theology, took care, by a public explanation, to disown the full and decided scientific position

of Frohschammer, yet in Rome, and particularly by the Pope himself, he was regarded as scarcely better than Frohschammer. On the other hand, there were not wanting circumstances which tended to increase his irritation against the Roman Curia, particularly some chicanery against such as were reckoned his disciples.

Then came the time of the Vatican Council. The bull containing the summons appeared, and it became clearer than ever that the whole design of the Council was nothing else but to sanction the collected Syllabus Errorum of the Encyclica of 1864, and to make some new dogmas, especially that of the personal infallibility of the Pope. The Jesuits have laboured for this unceasingly. They announced in the beginning of last year, in their *Civiltà Catholica*, that all "good Catholics" desire the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope. On this provocation there appeared, in March of last year, in the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, five articles under the title "Das Concil und die Civiltà." In these articles the scheme, betrayed by the Jesuits themselves, is criticized with great penetration. The inadmissibility, as well as the religious and political mischief, of passing the dogma of Papal infallibility, are particularly pointed out. The articles excited great attention, and soon it was known that Döllinger, though not their author, was yet their intellectual originator. They appeared later much enlarged, and with references to the sources of evidence, under the title of "The Pope and Council. By Janus." This work was chiefly directed against Papal absolutism and the infallibility of the Pope. It was very clearly shown how the Popedom had entered, and by degrees had established itself in the Church, by means of many fictions and forgeries. It was also shown what enormous evils and corruptions had been caused by its rule. Many errors were pointed out into which different Popes had fallen in the course of centuries. Soon after this work there appeared a little pamphlet, "Considerations for the Bishops of the Council concerning the question of Papal Infallibility," which, in a shorter and milder form, contains the substance of the work of "Janus." Of this pamphlet Döllinger expressly proclaims himself the author. There appeared also in the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* two articles with Döllinger's name, "Some Words concerning the Address on Infallibility," to the majority of the bishops of the Council. The other is, "The New Programme of the Council, and its Theological Importance." These are written in the same spirit, and controvert in the same way the infallibility of the Pope, declaring it a historical untruth, and an unrighteous novelty in the Catholic Church. It is, then, chiefly this contemplated new dogma against which Döllinger brings to bear all his vast learning, and which he seeks to prevent, because he regards it as destructive of the Catholic Church itself. But

it does not appear that his labours, or those of his way of thinking, will have any success. Everything, rather, seems to show that his cause is wrecked, and that, in a short time, the dogma of Papal infallibility will be proclaimed by the Vatican Council.

The next question is, Will Döllinger admit the decision of the Council, or will he remain in opposition, refuse to acknowledge the authorized dogma, and deny obedience to the Pope? It appears that the last is contemplated—that he will declare the decision of the Council invalid, and endeavour to prevent its acceptance on the ground that the Council has not been free, that the programme has been imposed on the Council by the Curia, and because the dogma is a new one, in contradiction with the old principle of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, that that only is to be held for a dogma in the Catholic Church “which has been believed always everywhere and by all.” But this proceeding can only have success, indeed, can only be ventured on, if the bishops of the opposition in Rome refuse to submit to the decision of the majority and the Pope. In this case a schism will arise. But the prospect of success is not great, since in Germany and Austria there is an important number of bishops for the infallibility of the Pope. In Bavaria, for instance, about the one half. So that by an inner division the schism will lose its force. Again, on the side of the Pope and the majority of the Council, this will not pass merely for a schism. It will be designated a heresy, because it will be in contradiction to a defined article of the faith. When the Pope himself has become a living personal dogma, whoever opposes the Pope must be regarded and treated as a heretic; not as formerly, a mere schismatic. The settling of this question must come before long.

Much different, and reaching further, is Frohschammer's opposition to the Roman Church administration. He is much younger than Döllinger, and began his public life as a teacher in the University in the beginning of 1850. He was then in the theological faculty, but in 1855 he passed over to the philosophical, being appointed professor of philosophy. Besides the philosophical subjects, he has read lectures on logic, psychology, metaphysics, the history of philosophy, pedagogy, and especially the philosophy of religion, and the natural sciences. These two last subjects, which demand on the one side a knowledge of the entire history of religion, and on the other, of the newest natural sciences, specially determined his line of thought, and the character of his writings. He soon came in conflict with the Roman Curia. His treatise “*On the Origin of the Human Soul*,” which appeared in 1857, justifying the theory of the generation of souls, was put in the Index of forbidden books. It is for the most part theological, but containing some sharp remarks on the excessive authority which was yielded to the Schoolmen. The theory

vindicated was condemned by the scholastics of the Middle Ages, and by their successors of the present time. The author refused to submit to the decree of the Congregation of the Index, notwithstanding all entreaties. In 1858, appeared his "Introduction to Philosophy." Here, again, he criticized the scholastics, claimed independence for philosophy, and particularly controverted the principle furbished up again by the Jesuits and their retainers, that "philosophia est theologicæ ancilla." Soon after appeared the treatise on "the Freedom of Science."

A year later Frohschammer established his philosophical periodical, the *Athenæum*. In all these writings he continued to express his views with increasing decision, till suddenly, in 1862, he was threatened by the Archbishop of Munich with excommunication unless he submitted within ten days. But this did not come. The archbishop did not dare to fulfil his threat, but had recourse to Rome, and left it to take the necessary steps. All the writings already mentioned had been put in the Index, and the Pope sent to the archbishop a brief concerning Frohschammer (Dec. 11, 1862, *Gravissimus inter*), in which he was charged with ascribing too much right and power to human reason, with striving to explore the Christian mysteries, and with claiming freedom for science, which was described as a "lawless license." It was also said that he had made statements which were not true concerning the commendable proceedings of the Congregation of the Index. Finally, it was enjoined on the archbishop to bring back the erring one to the right path. Frohschammer gave an explanation, but refused submission. On this measures were taken against him: all students of the University that intended to be priests were forbidden by the archbishop and all other bishops to attend his lectures. In consequence of this there arose among the students of the University an important movement. It was decided that an address should be presented to Frohschammer, which was subscribed by more than a hundred students, expressing their attachment to him, and proclaiming their appreciation of his efforts. On the other hand, the professors of theology, of whom many had assured him of their agreement, by degrees began to stand aloof from him, and at last openly disowned him.

Frohschammer, however, carried on his *Athenæum* for some time, in spite of all opposition, until the publisher, who feared the injury which was threatened to his business, did not venture to continue its publication. When the Papal Encyclica, with the *Syllabus Errorum* of Dec. 8, 1864, appeared, Frohschammer devoted to it an anonymous pamphlet, of which a second edition was published with his name. In 1868 appeared his chief work, "Christianity and Modern Science," which was noticed briefly in this Review in July the

same year as a remarkable work, and again in the June number of this year. In 1869 he published "The Right of Private Judgment," which is chiefly occupied with determining the relations between Church and State, but which also discusses the question of the infallibility of the Pope, and establishes, from facts of history as well as from principles of reason, that infallibility must be denied to the Church, as well as to the Pope; that is, the Church as simply episcopal.

When the work of "Janus" appeared, in which the infallibility of the Church is assumed, while that of the Pope is controverted, Frohschammer ventured to give the work a thorough criticism in the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*. This criticism was republished as a pamphlet, with the title—"An Estimate of the Infallibility of the Pope and the Church." The great merit of the work of "Janus" is admitted, but Frohschammer says emphatically, that its author goes but half way, and that he has not shown the necessary consequences of the facts which he has brought forward. If a Church in which all that "Janus" produces is possible—all these fictions, forgeries, and assumptions made to establish the claims of the Pope to an absolute dominion over the whole Church—then it is impossible that the Church itself can be infallible. Since the Popes for centuries really regarded themselves and acted as the Church, then it must be that infallibility was long ago taken away by this very fact that these fallible Popes acted as the infallible Church. The battle, then, against Papal absolutism cannot be isolated or localized. It touches necessarily the Church itself. As many historical facts can be adduced against the infallibility of the Church as against the infallibility of the Pope. In a second pamphlet, called "The Political Significance of the Infallibility of the Pope and the Church," he maintains that not much will be gained by preventing the infallibility of the Pope from passing into a dogma, since the Pope has hitherto governed the Church as an absolute ruler without the dogma. If the opposition, then, accomplishes no more than is proposed by the simple opponents of Papal Infallibility, it will have succeeded in doing but very little for the reforming of the Church, and satisfying the religious necessities of the present age.

What Frohschammer has in view and at present desires for the safety, as well as the renovation, of religion in its relation to science, is what has been called since Lessing "the Christianity of Christ," in contradistinction to the Christianity of Church decrees and dogmas. He considers that to be the true essence of Christianity which Christ Himself taught and practised. The original principles are the most important, not those which arose later. The

clear and simple doctrines themselves must be regarded as the necessary and certain, not the dark and doubtful, which have arisen from controversy, and which have made out of Christianity a religion of strife, hatred, and persecution, instead of a religion of love, peace, and reconciliation.

Frohschammer has been reproached with the charge of Rationalism. He does not admit that the reproach is just. Certainly he says science, so far as it goes, must be the rational work of the Ratio; but he does not resolve religion into knowledge, nor put science in the place of religion. Each has a peculiar region of its own. He distinguishes in religious faith itself between the historical and the mystical ingredients. Besides the truths that are traditional or grounded on authority, he acknowledges a peculiar immediate relation of the human soul to the Divine, by which the historically received faith becomes living. He wishes that the dogmatic formulas, which arose in the course of long controversies and by dialectical processes, be again dissolved by science, gradually as the necessity emerges. His views are received chiefly by educated laymen; while Döllinger's disciples are chiefly among the liberal-minded clergy. Great immediate results are not expected from these endeavours unless some unforeseen circumstances should arise; but they help to prepare the mind, to unloose beforehand the bands with which men's intellects are bound, and, above all, to awaken an interest for these high questions. The indifferentism of the educated, Frohschammer says, is, in fact, the stronghold of the Roman dominion over the souls of men.

Much will, of course, depend for the future position of Catholicism in Bavaria on the support of the young king. It has been believed hitherto that he had quite lost himself in Romantic enthusiasm; but he has lately shown some indications that he regards with a lively interest the intellectual conflicts of the present time, and is opposed to the Roman claims. There is a well-grounded hope that he will continue in this direction. Much will also depend on the future queen. A Russian princess has already been spoken of. Protestants and liberal Catholics are looking to England. It is expected that the Jesuits, as well as the king, will find a match, whether the future queen of Bavaria be a Russian or an English princess.

A. BAVARIAN CATHOLIC.