

001281
CSP-2

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA ÉCOLE DES GRADUÉS

THE FRENCH LIBERAL CATHOLICS AND
LOUIS VEUILLOT FROM THE SYLLABUS
OF ERRORS TO THE VATICAN COUNCIL 1864-1869

Marian Joseph Kowalski

Thesis presented to the Department of
History of the University of Ottawa in
partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Toronto, Ontario, 1966

*Degree granted
May 21, 1968
J. Beauchamp
Secretary*



UMI Number: EC55421

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC55421
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Marian J. Kowalski was born on 1 April 1940, in Oshawa, Ontario. He received a Certificate d'études française from the Université de Bordeaux in 1962, an Honours degree in Modern History from the University of Toronto in 1964, and a M. A. in French Literature from the University of Western Ontario in 1965. The title of his Master's essay was The Vinteuil Sonata in Marcel Proust's 'Un Amour de Swann', A Study in the Profanation of Art.

PREFACE

The intellectual history of the 19th century turns on the debate between liberal and conservative, between freedom and authority. Burke and Fox in England, Pebedeneostsev and Radischev in Russia, Hamilton and Jefferson in America, have all been concerned with the greater or lesser degree of liberty to which the body politic ought to be accommodated. But nowhere has this dialogue been conducted with greater interest than in the land of de Maistre, Collard, Blanc and Barrès. Since 1789, Frenchmen have not ceased to debate the principles enshrined in the Revolutionary document known as the Declaration of the Rights of Man. With the revolutions of 1830 and 1848, and the coup d'état of 1852, the tenets of '89' became something of a national obsession. Each change in government, of which there were many, awakened an interest in the abstract principles of political theory which form the basis of statehood.

This thesis is concerned with some religious aspects of this debate. Many Catholics in the France of 1860 were anxious that the Church should embrace some of the principles won by the revolutionaries of 1789. They were the Liberal Catholics who had founded their own organization in 1855. Against this group was aligned the conservatives or Ultramontanes under the leadership of Louis Veuillot,

probably the greatest opponent that 19th century liberalism has known. This work undertakes to study the attitude of these groups in the period 1864-1869 and attempts to ascertain the role played by Louis Veillot in the polemics between the movements. To this end it borrows a procédé from the French Catholic novelist François Mauriac. The author of Thérèse Desquereux^D is in the habit of introducing his characters at a time when the plot has reached the proportions of a crisis. This thesis employs a similar methodology. It begins with the Syllabus of Errors, a document that spelled despair for the Catholic liberals and triumph for their Ultramontane adversaries. It ends with the Vatican Council of 1870, when for a brief moment the positions were reversed. With Mauriac we believe that movements, like people, are more amenable to analysis during moments of great stress.

I am grateful to the following people for advice and assistance in the preparation of this thesis: Dr. R. Lebrun under whose guidance the work was begun; Dr. R. Keyserlingk under whose direction it was finished; the library staff of Saint Paul's University, Saint Michael's College, Saint Basil's Seminary, the University of Ottawa, the University of Toronto, and the University of Western Ontario.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION -----	i
FIRST PART	
I. THE END OF THE CATHOLIC PARTY 1845-1860	1
The Catholic Party and the coup d'état-----	6
The liberals break away-----	13
Polemics between the groups-----	15
II. LOUIS VEUILLOT -----	21
Early Years -----	21
The Conversion-----	21
The <u>Univers</u> -----	23
Journalist, novelist, pamphleteer-----	24
"Le célèbre M. Veillot" -----	27
"L'école de l' <u>Univers</u> "-----	36
III. LOUIS VEUILLOT AND THE ULTRAMONTANE MOVEMENT -----	39
The New Ultramontanes-----	39
Pio Nono-----	40
Philosophy, theology, education-----	41
'Popery' -----	44
Miracles and Mariology-----	47
Pius IX and Louis Veillot -----	50
SECOND PART	
IV. THE LIBERAL CATHOLICS. THE CONGRESS OF MALINES -----	57
The "groupe de Correspondant" -----	57
Their ideas-----	61
The strength of the movement-----	61
The Liberal Catholic manifesto. The Congress of Malines-----	64
Reaction to the speech-----	67
Louis Veillot and the Malines Congress-----	71

V.	THE SYLLABUS OF ERRORS-----	73
	Reaction to the Syllabus-----	76
	Bishop Dupanloup saves the Liberal Catholic movement-----	79
	Louis Veillot's intrigue-----	84
VI.	THE "LIBERAL ILLUSION" -----	90
	The silence of the Liberal Catholics-----	97
THIRD PART		
VII.	THE VATICAN COUNCIL-----	101
	The confidence of the Liberal Catholics-----	101
	Louis Veillot and the news of the Council-----	104
	Louis Veillot and the Bull of Indiction-----	107
	The despair of the Liberal Catholics-----	113
VIII.	THE <u>CIVILTA</u> ARTICLE AND PETITIONS IN THE <u>UNIVERS</u> -----	118
	The <u>Civiltà</u> article-----	118
	Petitions in the <u>Univers</u> -----	126
IX.	LOUIS VEUILLOT AND THE HYACINTHE AFFAIR	131
	The Liberal Catholic's man-----	131
	Louis Veillot and Father Hyacinthe-----	132
	The Apostasy-----	133
	Veillot's triumph-----	140
X.	RUMOURS CONCERNING THE COUNCIL-----	146
	Preparations for the Council-----	146
XI.	THE LIBERAL CATHOLIC MANIFESTO ON THE COUNCIL-----	154
	Louis Veillot's defense of Ultramontanism-----	158
	The history of infallibility according to Veillot--	161

XII.	LOUIS VEUILLOT VS. BISHOP DUPANLOUP	
	THE LAST BATTLE-----	166
	Bishop Dupanloup's 'Observations'-----	167
	Louis Veillot's refutation of the 'Observations'--	174
XIII.	THE MEASURE OF VEUILLOT'S SUCCESS-----	180
	CONCLUSION-----	186
	APPENDIX-----	197
	BIBLIOGRAPHY-----	199
	ABSTRACT OF <u>Louis Veillot and the French</u>	
	<u>Liberal Catholics from the Syllabus of Errors to</u>	
	<u>the Vatican Council (1864-1869)</u> -----	210

INTRODUCTION

The problems to which this thesis addresses itself are two-fold. It attempts first of all to delineate the attitudes of two conflicting schools of political thought in the 19th century French Church. Secondly, it proposes to ascertain the role of Louis Veuillot, editor of the Univers, in the polemics between these two groups. The study begins with the encyclical Quanta cura and ends with the opening of the First Vatican Council. The thesis thus covers a period of about five years - from December 8, 1864 to December 8, 1869 - although something is said in the first four chapters of earlier developments in French religious and intellectual history by way of background to the period under consideration.

The terminal points of this work, the Syllabus of Errors and the Vatican Council, have been chosen with a definite purpose in mind. It is the nature of intellectual history that its development is quite often slow, even imperceptible. Sometimes it is not possible to detect where one idea ends and yet another begins. (Is naturalism the work of Comte, Bernard or Zola?) Also, intellectual notions such as Christian liberalism and Ultramontanism are often vacuous; they remain attitudes of mind incapable of analysis until applied to concrete

questions. The problem of delineating intellectual systems often involves a foreshortening of our perspective, it necessitates our locating a movement at a particular moment in its development. The period from December 8, 1864 to December 8, 1869 provides such a foreshortening which is neither artificial nor arbitrary. It allows us to observe the Liberal Catholics and Ultramontanes during a crisis point in their development. The news of the Syllabus caused jubilation in the camps of the conservative Ultramontanes; the same news drove the liberals to desperation. When it was announced that a Council of the Church would be held in 1869, the positions were for a moment reversed. The five years between these important dates witnessed an incredible activity on the part of both groups. From their correspondence and personal memoirs it is possible to detect the real fears and hopes of the Liberal Catholics. The Ultramontanes party during the same period was more overt in its activities. (The personal writings and newspaper articles of Louis Veuillot say pretty much the same thing.) But the excitement caused by the Syllabus of Errors - the Ultramontanes saw it as the final vindication of their cause - led the conservative Roman Catholics to formulate their policies in the most extreme form.

The last twenty years (ever since the end of the Fascist experiment) have seen an incredible interest in the ultra-conservative

philosophies of the past. Historians of the European tradition have turned from the popular liberal figures i. e. the great reformers and revolutionaries and have begun to publish monographs on their conservative opposites. In French historiography there has been a considerable interest in the right wing figures of the Third Republic, in Barrès, Maurras, Déroulède, Boulanger, and in the movements they led, the Action Française, and the Ligue de la Patrie Française.

Historians are even beginning to look to the early 19th century, to the Restoration, and have discovered the spiritual ancestors of the French right in Chateaubriand, de Maistre, de Bonald and Lamennais. Between these two epochs there exists today a serious gulf in historical scholarship. Students in search of the exponents of Catholic traditionalist philosophy seem to have ignored the forty-five years that separate the end of the Restoration from the beginning of the Third Republic.

Yet this 'middle' period saw the triumph in France of Catholic conservative thought in the form of the New Ultramontanism. The movement was led by Louis Veillot possibly the most influential journalist of his day. This man provided the Church with the most unrelenting apologetic that 19th century Roman Catholicism has known. He almost single handedly destroyed the nascent Liberal Catholic party.

Nothing has been written about Veillot since his brother (himself an active Ultramontane publicist) published a four volume study in 1913. Eugène Veillot's biography is comprehensive but it suffers from the perspective of its author and from the fact that it was

written in the heat of polemic. It is as much an attack on the Liberal Catholics as it is a biography of the editor of the Univers. There have been other contributions in the form of laudatory pamphlets issued by Catholic publishing houses and brochures that have come off the press of the Action française, but they come nowhere near resembling dispassionate scholarship. Since 1913 numerous documents have appeared that Eugene Veillot had not been able to consult for his own study. These are mostly the memoirs and letters of the Liberal Catholics, Veillot's adversaries, but they do allow the student to better appreciate the nature of Veillot's apologetic and to assess his influence more precisely. Recent works dealing with French religious history allow one to locate Veillot in his age in a manner that had not been possible before. Of special interest are Christian Marcilhacy's doctoral dissertation on the diocese of Orléans in 1850, and Canon Aubert's study on the pontificate of Pius IX.

The Liberal Catholics, on the other hand, have not suffered from the lack of scholarly attention. Canon Aubert of Malines, the best authority on French religious developments during the Second Empire, has published a good number of brilliant articles on different aspects of the Liberal Catholic movement in this period. There has been no attempt, however, to draw a composite picture of the movement as a whole. J. R. Palanque of Aix University has come close to such a presentation with his Catholiques Libéraux et Gallican En France

face au Concile du Vatican 1867-1870. This work bears a 1962 copy-right date but it was actually written in 1919 as a thesis for the Diplôme d'études supérieures. Palanque remarks that he has used all the known sources up to 1962 and his bibliography is up to date. But the work suffers in the way of analysis and interpretation and one suspects that much more could have been done with primary sources, especially with Augustin Cochin's correspondence and the memoirs of the duc de Broglie. General histories of the French Church treat of the Liberal Catholic movement as a whole, but with the possible exception of Aubert's study on the pontificate of Pius IX these works are no more than brief surveys. It does not seem necessary then to apologize for dealing with Catholic liberalism in this thesis. Even though the problem has received the attention of historians, nothing representing an overall assessment of the movement in the 1860's has yet appeared.

A study of the French Liberal Catholic movement in this period is also justified because it provides a useful contrast to the Ultramontane school and especially to its leader Louis Veillot. Next to the free thinkers and anti-clericals, the group most disliked by the editor of the Univers was the liberal wing of the Roman Catholic Church. Christian liberalism was anathema to the man who preached a return to the practices of the medieval Church. His religious attitude may be properly ascertained and his influence correctly assessed only if one considers his relationship to those Catholics who were charting an alto-

gether different course for the Church. Veillot felt that the attitude of the Liberal Catholics was basically mistaken, and nowhere does he espouse his own authoritarian and conservative convictions with greater force than in the polemics with his liberal adversaries.

FIRST PART

CHAPTER ONE

THE END OF THE CATHOLIC PARTY 1845-1860

In 1844 Lacordaire wrote:

Avez-vous remarqué que c'est la première fois depuis la Ligue que l'Eglise de France n'est pas divisé par des querelles et des schismes? Il n'y a pas quinze années encore, il y avait des ultramontains et des gallicans, des cartésians et des mennaisiens, des jésuites et des gens qui ne l'étaient pas, des royalistes et des libéraux, des côteries, des nuances, des rivalités, des misères sans fond ni rêve; aujourd'hui tout le monde s'embarasse...¹

By 1864, however, Bishop Dupanloup would write:

Il est plus doux de combattre les ennemis de la religion que de voir aujourd'hui partout la division dans l'Eglise, et les catholiques a'acharner les uns contre les autres...²

The twenty years that separated these letters saw the disintegration of what had once been a united Catholic party. Under the July Monarchy a group of Roman Catholics had united behind the Count de Montal-embert in an effort to win freedom of education and the right to establish Roman Catholic schools. This right had been guaranteed in the

1. Falloux, le comte de, (editor), Correspondance du R.P. Lacordaire et du Madame Swetchine, Auguste Vaton, Paris, 1864, p. 393.

2. Lagrange, F. (ed.), Lettres Choisies de Mgr. Dupanloup, Jules Gervais, Paris, 1888, v.1, p. 123.

Restoration charter but had never been implemented by the government. The nucleus of the group was drawn from both lay and ecclesiastical society. Besides the abbé de Salinis, Gerbet, Dom Gueranger, and d'Alzon were to be found, laymen such as Montalembert, the count de Falloux, Eugène Veillot and his brother Louis. In 1845 the Comité pour la défense de la liberté religieuse was founded under the presidency of Montalembert. The Catholic party was now official. It drew its support from the episcopate which was sympathetic to its aspirations, from the lower clergy and from Catholic laymen, especially the legitimists and anti-Orleanists. During the election of 1846 the Catholic party supported all candidates who would oppose the Université's monopoly of French education and who would fight for the liberty of instruction guaranteed by the charte. To this end the party succeeded in electing 140 members to the chamber.

With this support it seemed as if the end of the Université's monopoly was at hand. But the party's united front was broken by an internal division over its aims and methods. In 1845 Father Dupanloup, one of its members, published De la pacification religieuse, a brochure which granted certain rights to the government in the field of education. He allowed that even if the Catholics should be given the right to operate their own schools, the state should retain the prerogative of supervising them. Louis Veillot criticized this conciliatory suggestion and held it to be dangerous.³ Nothing less than the abolition

3. Weill, G., Histoire du Catholicisme Libéral en France, 1828-1908, Felix Alcan, Paris, 1909, p. 81.

of the Université would satisfy him. The two came to loggerheads again in the following year when Dupanloup in his Etat actuel de la question repeated his earlier concessions. Veillot's newspaper, the Univers, again attacked both Dupanloup and his pamphlet.

The February revolution of 1848 which brought down the House of Orleans prevented this latent division from erupting. The June uprising of the same year seemed even to heal the rift within the movement. Against the spectre of socialism manifested during the 'June days' the Catholic party became that of established order, and internal disputes were subordinated in the face of the proletarian uprising. But with the election of Louis-Napoleon and the subsequent return of order, the party was again able to concentrate on its educational program. In return for Roman Catholic support in the elections, Louis-Napoleon had intrusted the Ministry of Public Education and Religious Cults to the comte de Falloux, a member of the Catholic party.

In 1850 the emperor established a legislative commission to examine the education question and to draft a new education law. Two members of the Catholic party, Dupanloup and Montalembert, sat on the commission and played an important role in steering the new law through the chamber of deputies. Along with the comte de Falloux they represented the liberal wing of the Catholic party and were willing to make concessions to the state. Not only did they not press for the abolition of the secular Université, but also they contended that a

connection with lay society was a positive good for Catholic education.⁴ In this respect they were in complete opposition to the conservative wing led by Veillot who was supported by the majority of the episcopate. This last group wanted the Church to have full control of French education. When it realized that this was impossible, the conservatives demanded their own Church schools with absolutely no interference from the state.⁵

Between these two attitudes there was little chance of compromise. Even if the Liberal Catholics had wanted to subordinate the Université to Church control, they saw that it would be impossible to pass such an extreme measure through the Chamber of Deputies. They felt that a compromise was essential and that the state must be given certain rights even with regard to the education of Catholics. And since only the liberal wing of the party was represented in the legislative commission, the law was drafted in their image and they bore the responsibility. By the Falloux Law of 15 March 1850, the Church received the right to establish its own schools but these schools were subject to state regulation with regard to courses, grades and the qualification of professors.

The Falloux Law precipitated a bitter debate within the Catholic party. As early as June 29, 1849 when it was in the process of formula-

4. Falloux, A., de, Discours et Mélanges Politiques, Plon et Cie, Paris, 1882, v. 11, p. 79.

5. Huckaly, J. H., "Roman Catholic Reaction to the Falloux Law", French Historical Studies, 4 (1965), p. 207.

tion, the law was bitterly attacked by Veuillot in his Univers. His attacks were answered by Dupanloup in the Ami de la religion, another Catholic newspaper. What was at issue in these arguments was more than just an educational law; rather it was the attitude the Church should take to modern French society. This point is illustrated in a pamphlet published in 1856 by the comte de Falloux in which he outlined his opinion of why Veuillot's Univers had attempted to sabotage the law.⁷

Il [Veuillot] se mit à établir que l'enseignement religieux de la jeunesse pouvait et devait être l'unique souci de la société. Selon lui, la religion était désintéressé de tout le reste. Qu'importait aux catholiques les principes qu'après elle contribuent le plus efficacement à la paix, à l'ordre, à la prospérité des peuples? qu'importait une juste ou fausse direction de la politique nationale?⁸

Falloux implied that Veuillot, through insisting that Catholics be educated exclusively in religious schools, was causing the Church to turn its back on the problems of modern society. It is only through contact with secular life, he argued, that Roman Catholics could come to grips with the issues of contemporary civilisation.

This attitude is characteristic of Liberal Catholicism and is one that is studied later in this thesis. But the fact that the stand of Christian Liberalism should have been debated within the Roman Catholic Party in connexion with the Falloux Law has usually escaped

7. Falloux, A. de, op. cit., p. 56.

8. Ibid., p. 79.

the attention of historians, who have felt that the law was formulated only because the liberal wing of the Catholic party felt that nothing more could be gotten from the chamber of deputies.⁹ It is clear that the liberals saw something positive in the connexion between secular and religious education.

2.

When Louis-Napoleon attempted to enlist the support of Roman Catholics in the cause of despotism after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, the Church was confronted with a problem that had not existed for over twenty years. With the fall of the Bourbon dynasty in 1830 the connexion that had united the Church with the government of France had been broken. By the charter of 1830 Roman Catholicism was no longer the religion d'état - but only the religion "professed by the majority of citizens". The House of Orleans moreover, although nominally Roman Catholic, was far less willing to champion the cause of the Church than had been its Bourbon predecessor. So little was the Church identified with the state during the eighteen years of the July Monarchy, that when the Orleans dynasty fell in 1848 the Church was not considered to be organ of the government as it had been during the Restoration, and was spared the attacks of the revolutionaries.

That the July Monarchy had shown Catholics that government

9. Huckaly, J. H., op. cit., p. 206.

support was not essential to the proper functioning of their faith was one thing, Louis-Napoleon's promise to encourage their cult in exchange for Church support for himself was another. Some Catholics were aware that a coup d'état favourable to the Church was in preparation.¹⁰ On the night before the event, Napoleon III's agents had visited the editorial offices of the Univers and informed Louis Veillot that the new regime would positively encourage the faith.¹¹ Veillot was amenable to the idea, as was the liberal wing of the party with the possible exception of Dupanloup.¹² Roman Catholics were obsessed with the memory of the proletarian uprising of June 1848, and saw in Louis-Napoleon the symbol of ordre sociale. Since the constitution did not permit the re-election of the President and since Louis-Napoleon's term was about to finish, they felt that the only alternative to a coup was political and social anarchy, a return to the turbulent politics of the Second Republic.¹³

Following the coup, Roman Catholic support for the new regime was almost unanimous. "Il n'y a ni à choisir, ni à récriminer, ni à délibérer," wrote Louis Veillot, "il faut soutenir le gouvernement. Sa cause est celle de l'ordre social."¹⁴ In vain did Bishop

10. Weill, G., op. cit., p. 109.

11. Veillot, E., Louis Veillot, Lethielleux, Paris, 1913, V. 11, p. 433.

12. Weill, G., op. cit., p. 111.

13. Veillot, L., Oeuvres Complètes, (hereafter O.C.) Lethielleux, Paris, Troisième, série, 1929-1937, V. 31, p. 1.

14. Ibid., p. 1.

Dupanloup in his pastoral instructions of December 3, recommend that Catholics be cautious and reserved in their attitude to the new government.¹⁵ The episcopate almost to a man came out in support of the Emperor, while the lower clergy seemed intent on regarding the coup as something providential.¹⁶ That Louis-Napoleon's seizure of power was an unconstitutional act did not at first trouble his Catholic supporters, for the political anarchy during the Second Republic had disparaged parliamentary government in their minds. When on January 8 Louis Veuillot equated democracy with anarchy - "Le principe de la libre discussion," he wrote, "c'est-a-dire le dogme parlementaire, le dogme générateur de l'anarchie-" he expressed a sentiment that was shared by many of his contemporaries.¹⁷

But Roman Catholic support for the government of Napoleon III, almost unanimous at first, was not to last for a long time. It occurred to some Catholics that Church support for an unconstitutional and anti-parliamentary government was close to scandal. When the Emperor confiscated the properties of the fallen dynasty, the liberal leader of the parti catholique, ~~de~~ Montalembert,[†] whom Napoleon III had given a ministerial position, resigned his seat. He did more. In October 1852 Montalembert published a pamphlet entitled Des intérêts catholiques au XIX siècle in which he undertook to show that

15. Weill, G., op. cit., p. 111.

16. Ibid., p. 111.

17. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 31, p. 271.

Roman Catholic support of Louis-Napoleon had been misplaced. The publication of this work was a momentous event in the history of the French Church. Montalembert was a prestigious figure. His rupture with the government of Napoleon III and his call to other Catholics to follow him, broke the Catholic movement in two and replaced the parti catholique with a liberal progressive group led by Montalembert and a conservative, Ultramontane one led by Louis Veuillot.

Montalembert argued in his brochure that of all the forms of government, absolutism was the most inimical to the Church.¹⁸

"Or partout où elle [the Church] a été ruinée, c'a été sous la pression du pouvoir absolu."¹⁹ He submitted that only under a system of political liberty would the French Church be able to minister to the needs

of modern society.²⁰ The cause of political absolutism "si imprudemment adopté par certains catholiques,"²¹ was a "cause perdue."²²

"Malheur à ceux qui voudraient enchaîner à cette idôle décrépite les destinées immortelles de la religion."²³ He pointed out that the very Catholics who during the July Monarchy had demanded political liberties on behalf of the right of Roman Catholics to operate their

18. Montalembert, R.F. de, Des Intérêts Catholiques au XIX siècle, H. Geomaire, Bruxelles, 1852, p. 75.

19. Ibid., p. 76.

20. Ibid., p. 79.

21. Ibid., p. 77.

22. Ibid., p. 148.

23. Ibid., p. 148.

own schools according to the charter of 1830, were now supporting a government for whom the motion of political freedom was an alien one. "Vous avez deux poids et deux mesures; vous avez des enseignes de réchange: hier, la liberté comme en Belgique; aujourd'hui le pouvoir comme en Russie."²⁴ He then went on to warn his coreligionaries of the dangers inherent in state support. He admonished them not to press the government to champion Roman Catholicism to the legal exclusion of other religions in the country. "La liberté de conscience...la où il existe, où il a été une fois inscrit dans les lois, gardons nous de l'en effacer, -car il y devient le sauvegarde de la foi et le boulevard de l'Eglise."²⁵ Freedom was the keynote of Montalembert's pamphlet. It was a eulogy of political liberty.

Au milieu des misères de notre société, si vacillante, si mobile, se discréditée à ses propres yeux, est-il pour l'Eglise un rôle plus digne et plus sur que de rester fidèle à l'alliée qu'elle invoquait naguère, et qui lui a rendu de si bons services. [i. e. political liberty].²⁶

Montalembert's pamphlet is a model of 19th century liberal thought. The distrust of absolute authority, the eulogy of parliamentary freedom, the championing of religious toleration - all of them are characteristics of French Liberal Catholicism.

Just as Montalembert's pamphlet anticipated the tenets of the Liberal Catholic party, so did Veuillot's reply prefigure the atti-

24. Ibid., p. 87.

25. Ibid., p. 86.

26. Ibid., p. 152.

tude of the conservatives and Ultramontanes.²⁷ "Si l'Eglise est libre", asked Veuillot, "Quelle hostilité M. de Montalembert pourrait-il raisonnablement garder contre le pouvoir qui maintiendra cette liberté, source de toutes les autres...".²⁸ Veuillot did not feel that the Church had anything to fear from the support of an absolute government: he felt that it was a positive good! "L'alliance naturelle de l'Eglise et le Pouvoir," he wrote, "nous paraît plus désirable et plus nécessaire que jamais."²⁹ The 18th century, the century of anti-clericalism and atheistic philosophy resulted, according to Veuillot from too much liberty and too little authority.³⁰ The ancien régime clergy had embraced freedom and liberty "dans la situation politique où M. de Montalembert veut le voir" only to be tortured and massacred by the revolutionaries.³¹ "Notre point hostile au pouvoir établi tant que ce pouvoir ne persécute point l'Eglise, et lorsqu'il la protège, n'être point ingrats, voilà notre politique."³² Although Veuillot did not specify the nature of this "pouvoir établi", his antipathy to parliamentary government leads one to believe that he favoured absolute government. For him, the parliamentary system represented "un grand nombre d'idées fausses...contraires aux principes, par conséquent aux intérêts catholiques."³³ Of parliamentary assemblies

27. His article: "Des Intérêts Catholiques au XIX siècle par M. le comte de Montalembert" appeared on 6 Nov. in Paris.

28. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 31, p. 265.

29. Ibid., p. 342.

30. Ibid., p. 351.

31. Ibid., p. 286.

32. Ibid., p. 279. 33. Ibid., p. 271.

he wrote: "Plus ou moins deguisées, l'ambition, la corruption, la peur en sont les ressorts ordinaires."³⁴ He acknowledged that power often leads to despotism but, "la liberté a aussi sa pente vers son despotisme, qui est l'anarchie."³⁵ Where Montalembert exhorted Roman Catholics to support a regime characterized by political liberty. Veillot argued that "entre la liberté politique... et la liberté de l'Eglise, les faits révèlent un antagonisme constant."³⁶ Where Montalembert signaled the contradiction in the Catholic attitude before and after the coup d'état, Veillot saw none: "Nous disions que l'Eglise avait droit aux mêmes libertés que l'~~Etat~~ ^{Etat}..."³⁷

Veillot's refutation of Montalembert's brochure reveals an attitude that may be characterized as 'absolutist'. The liberal precepts espoused by civil society-freedom, parliamentary government, religious toleration - did not according to him, constitute suitable reference by which to judge religious society. The Church, he argued, was above the pale of the secular state. He was explicit in this matter when he argued that the Church was entitled to the liberties vouchsafed by civil society, but denied that the latter was entitled to the privileges enjoyed by the Church.³⁸ He saw no contradiction

34. Ibid., p. 294.

35. Ibid., p. 293.

36. Ibid., p. 338.

37. Ibid., p. 276.

38. Ibid., p. 276.

here. Where Montalembert argued that the Church should share in the political liberties of a liberal society, thus putting both lay and ecclesiastical offices on the same plane, Veuillot implied that the Church has priority over the state. For him the juristic concepts of equity, equality, and partnership were out of place when applied to religious matters.

3.

This dispute involving the most important principles led Montalembert to dissociate himself from the Catholic party he had once led, and to criticize those of its members who continued to support Louis-Napoleon. Three years after the coup he set about organizing another Roman Catholic party, one which reflected his own liberal and progressive attitudes to problems of government and Church State relations. To this end he enlisted the support of a handful of very distinguished Roman Catholics: the comte de Falloux, Albert de Broglie, Augustin Cochin, Theophile Foisset, Charles de Lenormont and Felix Dupanloup, now bishop of Orleans. He undertook to popularize the ideas of this group in the Correspondant, a monthly literary review. It was hoped that in this journal the liberal wing could both propagate their own ideas and combat those of the absolutist school now represented by Veuillot's Univers. It was to serve as a "ralliement pour tous ceux d'entre nous que l'Univers n'a pas entraînés dans son orbite," and to protest "contre les doctrines

de servilité et d'intolérance qui prévalent ailleurs."³⁹

Il [Montalembert] m'offrit d'entrer dans un comité de rédaction déjà composé, avec le but de réfuter la thèse intolérante de l'Univers [wrote the duc de Broglie] et de maintenir la défense de l'Eglise sur le terrain et sous la protection de la liberté.⁴⁰

In 1855, the group acquired the controlling interest in the Correspondant. The editorial staff consisted of Montalembert, Falloux, de Broglie, and Augustin Cochin. At this point it may be said that the Catholic movement was irrevocably split. At one pole were the ultra conservatives represented by Louis Veuillot and the Univers; at the other the liberals led by Montalembert and represented by the Correspondant. Where the conservatives were basically integralist in attitude holding to an extreme and authoritarian position in religious and political matters, the liberals were more conciliatory and were intent upon showing Frenchmen the progressive face of Roman Catholicism. For, in addition to espousing political liberalism, the Liberal Catholics wanted to make clear that the Church was abreast of the latest developments in literature, science, and philosophy and that it was not antagonistic to modern civilization. "Il [the Correspondant], wrote Foisset in 1855, "consolera une foule d'intelligences qui voudraient bien être de leur temps sans abjurer la foi catholique."⁴¹ Their journal was to be a "recueil voué à la con-

39. Pange, J. de, "Theophile Foisset et le prince de Broglie avec des lettres inédites," Le Correspondant, (1929), p. 117.

40. Ibid., p. 114.

41. Ibid., p. 133.

ciliation du catholicisme avec les nécessités modernes."⁴² It was to the educated and sophisticated strata of society that the men of the Correspondant addressed themselves.

4.

On 25 January 1856, the Correspondant published an article by the duc de Broglie entitled "Des caractères de la polemique religieuse actuelle." The Church, he argued, had nothing to fear from modern civilization. "L'Eglise doit être pour la société moderne ce qu'est la foi pour la raison, non l'ennemi qui le combat, mais l'autorité qui la règle."⁴³ De Broglie felt that the Church, in allying itself with an autocratic power, was turning its back on the needs and the aspirations of the modern age. "Les principes constitutifs de la société moderne doivent trouver dans les vérités de la religion, non la contradiction qui les condamne, mais le compliment qui les achève..."⁴⁴ On 14 February, Louis Veillot answered de Broglie in an article in the Univers entitled "L'Esprit moderne." The "modern spirit" was the source of all heresies. "Dans le Christianisme, c'est le commencement de toutes les hérésies."⁴⁵ "La première fois que l'Esprit moderne a parlé, il s'appelait Lucifer, et il a dit: Non servium." According to Veillot modern civilization, "cet mélange d'aveuglements et de fragilités," could offer Catholics absolutely

42. Ibid., p. 133.

43. Pange, J. de, op. cit., p. 119.

44. Ibid., p. 119.

45. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 32, p. 440.

nothing.⁴⁷ For the Church to accommodate itself to the spirit of the times would lead to weakness, apostasy and heresy.⁴⁸ Salvation could be found only if one withdrew deeper within the faith and away from the world.⁴⁹ For Veillot the Church was sufficient onto itself and needed no lessons from contemporary society. "Il y a une autorité dans l'Eglise de Jésus-Christ, sans laquelle on ne peut rien conclure; c'est le Pape, ou plutôt c'est Jésus-Christ lui-même."^{49a}

In a pamphlet of the same year, de Falloux undertook to explain "la permanence de deux camps en conflit sous le même drapeau."⁵⁰ He put the blame for this conflict squarely on Veillot's shoulders. "L'ancien parti catholique," he said, "avait contracté l'alliance avec la liberté. L'Univers lui a brusquement substitué le culte de despotisme."⁵¹ Louis Veillot, he declared, was very definitely a danger to the Church. "Nous pensons donc et nous disons à nos adversaires: La timidité du plus humble des catholiques serait moins nuisible à la religion que votre zèle et votre apologie."⁵²

Veillot undertook to refute de Falloux's allegations in six long articles that appeared in the Univers in the summer of 1856, and which were later published in a pamphlet. To the charge that he,

47. Ibid., p. 447.

48. Ibid., p. 445.

49. Ibid., p. 442.

50. Falloux, A de, op. cit., V. 11, p. 7.

51. Ibid., p. 95.

52. Ibid., p. 81.

Veillot, had made a volte face from liberty to despotism, he replied that he had never been a liberal.⁵³ As to the nature of his stand which de Falloux had criticized as being more harmful than beneficial to the Church. Veillot answered simply that "un journal, disions-nous est essentiellement une machine à guerre."⁵⁴ Having settled these points with his adversary, Veillot attempted his own analysis of the history of the Catholic party. He agreed with de Falloux that the movement broke over the education law and the coup d'état of 2 December.⁵⁵ He then went on to give a third, and what he considered the most important reason for the split. It was the "esprit académique," he argued, that had contributed more than any other factor to the difficulties between Roman Catholics. By the "esprit académique" Veillot meant the spirit of conciliation with liberal principles that the progressive wing of the party had manifested after the coup d'état. "Quand on s'est mis dans nos rangs à glorifier la plupart des dogmes et des inventions révolutionnaires, il est devenu impossible de s'entendre."⁵⁶ That Veillot in his analysis attached so much importance to the spirit of compromise between the Liberal Catholics and the state is a revealing point. It shows how deeply aware he was of the principles that separated his attitude from theirs. The academic spirit, he wrote, "a fait naître le goût des alliances et des

53. Veillot, L., O.C., p. 422.

54. Ibid., p. 465.

55. Ibid., p. 468.

56. Ibid., p. 468.

accommodements ou les principes sont engagés."⁵⁷ Veillot was very much aware of the fact that the Liberal Catholics were attempting to alter both the image and the role of the French Church in its relationship to contemporary society.

Veillot continued the attack in December of the following year with four articles devoted to Montalembert. In the interval, the Liberal Catholics continued to publish numerous articles on literature, science, history and philosophy in the Correspondant that were contrived to show Catholics that recent developments in these disciplines were not necessarily inimical to the faith. These articles must have troubled Veillot and seem to have been very much on his mind when he wrote on Montalembert:

On l'entend [Montalembert] glorifier l'esprit moderne, l'humanité, le progrès, ces niaiseries qui servent de belier pour battre la vérité catholique, dont le libéralisme veut faire l'irréconciliable ennemie de la civilisation et l'obstacle à tout adoucissement des misères humaines.⁵⁸

In the same year Veillot proposed to Catholics that a conciliatory attitude to the times was impossible. "Deux puissances", he apocalyptically remarked, "vivent et sont en lutte dans le monde moderne: le Christianisme et la Révolution. Ces deux puissances se nient réciproquement; voilà le fond des choses."⁵⁹ One could be either a Christian or a Liberal-Catholic but one could not be both.

57. Ibid., p. 468.

58. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 33, p. 288.

59. Ibid., p. 279.

The year 1858 witnessed an equally bitter polemic between the two schools. In that year Albert de Broglie published a historical monograph entitled L'Eglise et L'Empire romaine au IV siècle. The Roman conquest, he argued, had paved the way for the rapid expansion of Christianity. But once the Church had become established it did not extirpate pagan civilization but rather assimilated the best elements of that culture. Could it not behave in the same way toward modern society "qui ne vient pas, après tout, d'une origine si coupable, et qui n'est pas souillée de si grands crimes?"⁶⁰ Veillot did not attempt to refute de Broglie's thesis himself. Instead he opened the columns of his newspaper to Dom Gueranger, the Benedictine abbot of the monastery of St. Pierre de Solesmes. The latter wrote thirty articles for the Univers in which de Broglie was accused of historical naturalism, of ignoring the divine nature of the Church. More important, de Broglie was accused of attempting an impossible union between modern society and Roman Catholicism, of attempting to construct a "trait d'union entre l'error et la vérité."⁶²

This bitter polemic prevented any understanding between the two schools. The principles that separated the camps were in themselves irreconcilable, but a more conciliatory attitude on the part of

60. Brugerette, J., Le Prêtre Français et la société contemporaine, Lethielleux, Paris, 1952, V. 1, p. 210.

61. Pange, J. de, op. cit., p. 123.

62. Brugerette, J., op. cit., p. 211.

the protagonists might have created an atmosphere in which even principles could have been adjusted. But the manner in which the debate was conducted seemed to prevent the possibility of a fruitful dialogue. The conservatives viewed the Liberal Catholics with suspicion, fearing they would bring heresy into the Church. The liberals were horrified at what they considered the retrograde attitude of Louis Veuillot and his supporters and worried over what this attitude would do to the image of the French Church. Thus in August 1861, Montalembert wrote that the Church could never minister to its times until it overcame the complete "abaissement" into which it had been plunged by "Veuillotisme".^{62a} And on October 11, 1862, the Liberal Catholic celebrity, Madam de Forbin, wrote Augustin Cochin's wife that "j'avoue que pour mon compte je ne saurais croire au'il y ait avec cette école [the Univers school] aucune alliance possible."⁶³

62a. Cornudet, L., (editor), Correspondance de Montalembert et de Leon Cornudet 1831-1870, Honore Champion, Paris, 1905, p. 344.

63. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin et le premier concile du Vatican, (Documents inédits)", Revue d'histoire de l'Eglise de France, 47-48 (1961-62), p. 58.

CHAPTER TWO

LOUIS VEUILLOT

1.

Louis Veillot was born in 1813 into a poor lower class family. His father was a barrel maker. His formal education ended at the age of thirteen when he became a clerk in a lawyer's office. Here he demonstrated a pronounced literary taste and a precocious ability to write copy. At eighteen he became a journalist with the Echo de la Seine Inférieure. A year later he was chief editor of the very obscure Memorial de la Dordogne. In the 1830s he worked for three Orleanist journals - la Charte, la Paix, le Moniteur Parisien - where his mordant satire and piquant style made him into something of a minor celebrity. Book and drama reviews were his speciality. He was urbane, witty, and enthusiastic about the arts. His lack of formal education was compensated by an intensive study of the classics. He became the very type of litterati for which Paris is justifiably famous.

2.

A trip to Rome in 1838 changed everything. Veillot had been baptised when he was a child and was nominally a Roman Catholic. But he never attached much importance to his religion until he visited

the city of Peter in March, 1838. "Je me suis converti à Rome", he enthusiastically informed a friend, "j'ai pris la bonne résolution de pratiquer...les devoirs de ma religion."¹ The sincerity of these words cannot be challenged. For the remaining forty-five years of his life Veillot practiced his faith with the kind of intrepidity that only comes with conversion.

Because of his religious experience he decided to forsake journalism. The following years were spent in the writing books of a purely religious nature. In 1838 he published les Pelérinages de Suisse in which he wrote that:

Mieux vaudrait souffrir au sein d'une nation
des empoisonneurs et des meurtriers, mieux vau-
drait y introduire la guerre, y acclimater la peste,
y entretenir la famine, que d'y laisser pénétrer
l'hérésie.²

It was this extreme philosophy, the direct result of his conversion, that henceforth characterized Veillot's apologetic and made it into the most inflexible defense of the Church that 19th century Catholicism knew. In 1840 appeared Pierre Saintive, "un roman chrétien...et qui put être lu sans danger par une honnête femme."³ In the same year he published Le Saint Rosaire médité, a short book of religious devotion and prayer, and in 1841 Agnès de Louvens, "roman pour des jeunes filles."⁴ None of these works achieved a brilliant success and the

1. Veillot, F., Louis Veillot, Maison de la bonne presse, Paris, 1913, p. 28.

2. Ibid., p. 29.

3. Ibid., p. 31.

4. Ibid., p. 36.

sales were at best mediocre; but they popularized Veuillot's name in Roman Catholic circles and made it possible for him to enter the Catholic newspaper l'Univers in 1841.

3.

The Univers was founded by the abbe Migne in 1833 and had not until then been a very great success. When Veuillot came to work for the paper he found it on the verge of financial ruin, but things began to improve shortly after his arrival. The 1840s were good years for Catholic journalism; with the campaign against the Université's monopoly on education and the formation of a Catholic party, there were lively issues with which to stir the hearts of the faithful. Veuillot made journalistic capital out of these issues and the cause of the Univers was joined to that of the parti catholique with the result that the popularity of the newspaper was considerably increased. As the prestige of the Univers rose, so too did that of its most talented writer Louis Veuillot. Although legal and administrative control of the paper remained in the hands of a certain M. du Lac, Louis Veuillot was acknowledged to be the most important force behind the journal by 1850.

4.

The next two decades were the heroic years for both Veuillot and the Univers. With the conviction of a convert, a very

real literary talent, and a journal at his disposal, Veuillot set out to defend the Church against the evils inherent in modern times. To this end he made himself hated by thousands, many of his coreligionaries included, and a reputation for being the greatest journalist of his day.

Veuillot's articles in the Univers in the period 1850-1870, cover an extraordinary range of topics. Political questions, Church history, Christian art, the Roman question, literary criticism, foreign policy, military history, the papacy, the theatre-every conceivable subject that might in one way or another effect the fortunes of the French Catholic Church are treated. Each article betrays the same hand witty, mordant, self-confident, aggressive, sometimes even savage when a freethinker or anti-clerical forms the subject matter. Of Victor Hugo's Contemplations Veuillot wrote: "C'est lui même uniquement qu'il contemple."⁵ Of Saint-Beuve: "C'est un piéton très laborieux, tout couvert des poussières d'une incroyable quantité de chemins."⁶ When Edgar Quinet rather unchivalourously suggested that Garibaldi had defeated the papal troops at Mentana with four thousand badly armed boys, Veuillot riposted that:

Il faut avoir vu le représentant du peuple
Edgar, colonel Quinet, à la tête de sa légion
en 1848, c'est-à-dire à la tête de son cheval,
qu'il n'enfourcha jamais. Car ce fougeux
prophète et ce belliqueux tribun n'a jamais
pu monter ni cheval ni tribune.⁷

5. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 32, p. 497.

6. Ibid., p. 160.

7. Ibid., p. 280.

"On traite avec emotion l'aventure de M. Saint-Beuve, parlant devant le Senat, ou plutot derrière puisque le Senat tournait le dos,"⁸ reported Veuillot when Saint-Beuve addressed the Senate. "Garibaldi", wrote Veuillot, "a son style, particulièrement empreint du cachet d'insanité qui marque toutes les productions de l'école humanitaire dont il est le mahomet."⁹

He sometimes outdid himself and his polemic became markedly unjust. When Renan, after the severest self-examination, published his study on the apostles and Jesus, Veuillot attributed the historian's scholarship to vain glory:

M. Renan appartient à la race qui hait Jesus-Christ et il ne manque pas d'amour pour la gloire. Il s'est aperçu qu'il devait perdre sa peine à outrager les Apôtres, l'Eglise et l'idée de Dieu, mais que l'outrage direct à Jésus-Christ faisait plus d'effet. Il y revient.¹⁰

This kind of apologetics was a constant source of embarrassment to the Liberal Catholics who were anxious to meet scholarship with scholarship and to prove that the Church was every bit as progressive as its detractors. "Dieu nous a envoyé un public à qui nous pouvons faire tant de bien en le préservant des excès de l'Univers," wrote Foisset in 1856.¹¹ But Veuillot adamantly refused to see anything in French society that could possibly command the respect of the Church. Society was sick. "La civilisation n'ignore pas qu'elle est malade, elle ne sait

8. Ibid., p. 425.

9. Ibid., p. 100.

10. Ibid., p. 200.

11. Pange, J. de, op. cit., p. 114.

point qua cette maladie va a la mort... ", he sepulchrally proclaimed.¹²

The Liberal Catholics were exasperated by this kind of talk but they were in the minority. The greater part of French Catholics were solidly behind Veillot. "Une grande institution catholique" is what the Bishop of Arras called the Univers in 1856.¹³ Who else in the religious press could ridicule the great Victor Hugo in one sentence or repay Edgar Quinet in his own coin? Even Saint-Beuve who was unmercifully villipended by Veillot and who disliked him immensely, had to admit that he was "un journaliste du plus grand talent",¹⁴ an "excellent prosateur",¹⁵ "un grand satirique et railleur",¹⁶ "un défenseur à feu et à sang."¹⁷

In addition to his prolific contribution to the columns of the Univers, Veillot still found time to write a number of books and pamphlets on religious matters. In 1848, he published the Libres

12. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 34, p. 571.

13. Maurain, J., La Politique Ecclesiastique du Second Empire, Felix Alcan, Paris, 1930, p. 173.

14. Saint-Beuve, Les Grands Ecrivains francais, Garnier, Paris, 1930, p. 120.

15. Ibid., p. 105.

16. Ibid., p. 105.

17. Ibid., p. 121. In Against Nature (published in 1884) Huysmans says of Veillot: "This religious blackguard had none the less compelled recognition by sheer force of talent, goading the Press on till he had the whole pack at his heels, pummelling them till he drew blood in his Odeurs de Paris, standing up to every attack, kicking himself free of the vile pen-pushers that came snapping and snarling after him." Huysmans, J-K., Against Nature, translated by Robert Baldick, Penguin Books, London, 1966, p. 155.

Penseurs, a bitter attack on contemporary novelists, journalists, free thinkers and anti-clericals. In 1854, he wrote the Droit de Seigneur, a 400 page study of a medieval practice that had become something of an embarrassment to the Church. Veuillot, after no little research into the problem, proposed that the custom had never really been sanctioned by the Church. In 1861 appeared Le Pape et la diplomatie, a brochure that championed the Italian policy of Pius IX. In the same year he wrote Le Parfum de Rome, a painfully adulatory description of the Rome of the relics, saints and popes. "En lisant cette livre", wrote Scherer a Swiss clergyman, "on assiste à un carnaval sacrilege; le char descend couvert de marques avinés." "C'est la piété à l'état de démence, c'est la devotion tournant à l'obscenité."¹⁸ In 1864, the Vie de Notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ, Veuillot's refutation of Renan's work on the life of Jesus. The editor of the Univers did not join issue with the great Hebraist in the field of biblical exegesis - he was hardly Renan's match in scholarship -, but wisely staked his argument on a literal interpretation of biblical texts. Finally, the Odeurs de Paris in 1866. This was a systematic attack on contemporary art, literature, theatre, science, philosophy, education, manners and mores.

5.

Veuillot loved controversy and it was in the heat of debate that he made his reputation as one of the great journalists of his cen-

18. Veuillot, F., op. cit., p. 108.

ture. He was an aggressive individual and he believed that the Church should play an aggressive role in society. In December 1858 he wrote that "c'est aux catholiques de lever la tête; eux seuls sont vivants sur la terre, eux seuls ont le remède aux maux du genre humain."¹⁹

His religious attitude was a simple one; only the Church possessed the truth and the nature of this truth was such that any attempt to adapt it to the needs of modern society would be fatal. He had no respect for the Liberal Catholics whose conciliatory attitude to modern problems he interpreted as cowardice. "Des que l'empêché paraît menaçante", he wrote in 1858, "il n'en faut pas davantage à certains esprits: tout de suite ils affichent un catholicisme plus accommodant."²⁰

There was no mistaking who these "certains esprits" were. Society, he felt, should come to the Church not vice versa. He saw things simply, this was his strength and perhaps his weakness too. He had no love for his times and saw nothing worthwhile in French civilization. "Elle [civilization] est pourrie, inguérissable", he remarked in 1865.²¹

"Quant aux choses de ce monde, elles me paraissent absolument sans espoir. La civilization périra sans remède, c'est le moins que l'on puisse attendre", he exclaimed two years later.²²

19. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 34, p. 574.

20. Ibid., V. 32, p. 367.

21. Ibid., V. 15, p. 232.

22. Ibid., V. 27, p. 169.

It was the unequivocal nature of his defense of the Church's interest that accounted for Veuillot's popularity in Roman Catholic circles. In an age when discoveries in biology, geology and history were casting serious doubt on the divine nature of the Church, it must have been a source of great consolation to many Catholics to read in the Univers that the new science was no more than the parting shot of a rotten civilization about to disintegrate. What after all were "le progrès", "l'humanité" and the "esprit moderne" but simple "niaiseries qui servent de belier pour battre la verité catholique...".²³ Because he had this ability to give simple solutions to complicated problems, Veuillot became extraordinarily popular in the Catholic world. When in 1852 the archbishop of Paris attempted to suppress the Univers because of what he considered the violent nature of its apologetic, the Archbishop of Reims came to Veuillot's assistance and openly declared that the Univers was "à la fois plus fort que la plupart des autres journaux religieux et plus zélé pour les doctrines romaines."²⁴ When Veuillot's "zeal" got him into difficulty again in 1856, Bishop Paris published a letter in the Ami de la religion, a competitor of the Univers, in which he contended that "la suppression de l'Univers serait pour la religion un malheur public."²⁵ "Ce n'est pas un journal que je défends; c'est une grande institution catholique."²⁶ Even the

23. Ibid., V. 33, p. 288.

24. Veuillot, F., op. cit., p. 74.

25. Ibid., p. 82.

26. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 173.

Liberal Catholics painfully acknowledge Veillot's inordinate popularity. In a letter of 25 March 1856, the duc de Broglie complained of "la malheureuse solidarité de l'Eglise avec ce journal [l'Univers]." ²⁷

That the Church was solidly behind Veillot is no surprise. During the debates on the education law and the coup d'état, he more than anyone had flattered her pretensions to absolute power in education and had allied her cause to that of political despotism. There was something that smacked of the ancien régime in his attitude and which accounted for much of the support he received in Roman Catholic circles. In a revealing letter of 1855, Theophile Foisset wrote the duc de Broglie that:

Depuis le schisme de 1790 les catholiques de France ont été généralement nourris dans l'aversion du mouvement de 1789 et de l'esprit moderne; à cet égard l'Univers flatte leurs préjugés et leur convient beaucoup mieux que nous. ²⁸

If the majority of Roman Catholics appreciated Louis Veillot, the majority of the lower clergy were positively rapturous about him. "I have no influence with my clergy", Cardinal Mathieu is reported to have said. "The Univers is all powerful with them." ²⁹

There were 48,391 regular clergy in the France of 1851. By 1860 their number had grown to 52,303. ³⁰ Until very recently, almost

27. Pange, J., de, op. cit., p. 121.

28. Ibid., p. 119.

29. Ward, W., William George Ward and the Catholic Revival, Macmillan, London, 1893, p. 234.

30. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 59.

nothing was known about the mentality and religious attitude of these men. Christian Marchilhacy has recently written a doctoral thesis on the diocese of Orleans in 1850 which has contributed immensely to the study of the 19th century French cure. From her study the following salient features emerge. The clergy was 99% of peasant origin.³¹ Their religious attitude was markedly Jansenist; "elle... est tout pénétrée de jansénisme, négative, morose, tient pour rien la vie présente et tourne le dos au monde considéré comme foncièrement mauvais."³² The clergy was conservative and reactionary in nature, and was unable to comprehend the problems of the modern age.³³ "Le pasteur considère comme son premier devoir de mettre ses brebis à l'abri, de les préserver de toute condamnation extérieure; le ghetto chrétien, voilà à quoi il tient."³⁴ The clergy fostered a myth concerning the ancien régime when religion was an official function of the government and felt a nostalgia for the "sages lois", "bonnes lois", that had regulated religious belief.³⁵ It was distressed by the absence of government support which in better days had forced religious practices on the unwilling.³⁶

The intellectual background of the clergy was very modest; it was apprehensive of learning and scholarship and even sometimes considered books to be pernicious.³⁷ "La majorité des cures", writes

31. Marchilhacy, C., Le Diocèse d'Orléans au milieu du XIX siècle. Les hommes et leurs mentalités, Sirey, Paris, 1964, p. 219.

32. Ibid., p. 227. 34. Ibid., p. 228. 36. Ibid., p. 259.

33. Ibid., p. 228. 35. Ibid., p. 259. 37. Ibid., p. 253.

Marcilhacy, "préchant une religion de crainte. Le jugement de Dieu, l'enfer, le sacrilège, le péché hantent leur pensée... voilà l'essentiel de la vie chrétienne."³⁸

With this outlook it is not difficult to understand the affinity these men must have had for Louis Veillot. For no one inveighed against modern society with a hatred and intensity that characterized the almost daily declamations issuing from the editorial rooms of the Univers. The clergy "ne lit que l'Univers "lamented Montalembert, "et... s'est fait pace tua dixerim une religion sans honneur et sans probité."³⁹ Prefectural reports in the 1860s describe the cure as intolerant, arrogant and stupid; these qualities are attributed to the influence of the Univers.⁴⁰ In a letter to Leon Cornudet in August 1861, Montalembert speaks of the "abaissement" of the Church which has resulted, according to him, from "Veillotisme".⁴¹ In November 1868, the Bishop of Grenoble complained of the "influence malsain", that Louis Veillot exercises "sur une partie du clergé...".⁴² In December 1869 Madame Forbin, a Liberal Catholic, reported that in the diocese of Marseille, "l'Univers est l'oracle des curés qui ne

38. Ibid., p. 250.

39. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 173.

40. Ibid., p. 321.

41. Cornudet, L., op. cit., p. 344.

42. Bazin, G., Vie de Mgr Maret Eveque de Sura, archeveque de Lepante, son temps et ses oeuvres. Berche et Tralin, Paris, 1891, V. 111, p. 91.

lisent pas d'autre journal."⁴³

It was the clergy who bought the Univers and who constituted the largest proportion of its readers.⁴⁴ This is an important point because one copy of that newspaper in a religious community was usually perused by more than one reader. Thus in 1859 a government official reported that: "Cette feuille [the Univers] a dans l'Ardèche 80 abonnés représentant 800 lectures environ."⁴⁵ Even the episcopate was deeply influenced by Veillot's paper. As early as 1852, Leon Cornudet complained to Montalembert of the "doctrines funestes de l'Univers, hélas pratiquées plutôt justifiées par une partie de l'episcopat."⁴⁶ In 1869, Bishop Maret received a letter from Rome which spoke of the "excellents Prélats qui font leur éducation ecclésiastique et politique dans les colonnes de son [Veillot's] journal."⁴⁷

By 1855 the Univers had a circulation of 3,519, of which 3,077 copies were sold in the provinces.⁴⁸ The circulation increased with time, but does not seem to have exceeded 5,000 copies by 1860. In that year, Louis Veillot achieved journalistic martyrdom when his paper was suppressed for publishing a papal document highly critical of the Emperor's Italian policy. "Voici l'arrêt de mort, le journal ne vivra plus demain", he remarked as he prepared the ency-

43. Palanque, J., op. cit., p. 75.

44. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 158.

45. Ibid., p. 158.

46. Cornudet, L., op. cit., p. 309.

47. Bazin, G., op. cit., V. 111, p. 56.

48. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 161.

clical Nullis certe for publication.⁴⁹ He seems almost to have welcomed the opportunity to prove his devotion to the Holy Seer. "Nous éprouvions plutôt un sentiment de joie", related Francois Veuillot "de trouver une si belle occasion de périr."⁵⁰ The imperial decree which outlawed the paper testifies to the important role it had acquired in Roman Catholic circles. "Le journal l'Univers", it charged, "s'est faite dans la presse périodique l'organe d'un parti religieux..."⁵¹ The courage he showed in publishing the papal document made Veuillot into a great celebrity. De Viel-Castle wrote in his diary that because "le célèbre Veuillot... ce rude pamphletaire", had been silenced by the government, the priests at the Tuilleries were refusing to celebrate the Mass!⁵²

For the next seven years, le Monde replaced the Univers as the leading Roman Catholic conservative newspaper, and Veuillot turned to writing books and pamphlets. His success seems to have been even greater than that which he enjoyed as a journalist. The first edition of his Parfum de Rome, (5,550 copies), published in 1861, was sold out in a matter of days.⁵³ His brochure Le pape et la diplo-

49. Veuillot, F., op. cit., p. 103.

50. Ibid., p. 103.

51. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 34, p. 449.

52. Viel-Castle, H., de, Petite Histoire du Second Empire, La Presse de l'Opera, (n.p., n.d.), p. 275.

53. Veuillot, F., op. cit., p. 108.

matie sold 35,000 copies!⁵⁴ But the greatest triumph in these years was the Vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ. The sales of this work was of course heavily favoured by the succès de scandale of Renan's Vie de Jesus, but the fact that it went through three editions in one year must also testify to the prestige of its author. By 1874 it had gone through eight printings.⁵⁵ In 1866, Veuillot's popularity was such that the 30,000 copies of the Odeurs de Paris sold in eight days!⁵⁶ Veuillot caustically informed a friend in January 1867 that "il [the publisher] avait sagement tiré 3,500 exemplaires de ce livre, dont plus de 35,000 sont partis en six semaines."⁵⁷

In spite of this success, Louis Veuillot longed to return to journalism, to have at his disposal a Catholic newspaper. The liberalization of the French press laws in the year 1867 gave him an opportunity to satisfy this desire. He petitioned the government for the right to re-enter journalism and his request was granted. The Univers reappeared on 16 April 1867. It is some indication of Veuillot's popularity that it was with the encouragement and co-operation of twenty French bishops that the newspaper was re-established.

54. Ibid., p. 108.

55. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 1, p. 61.

56. Ibid., V. 27, p. 164.

57. Maynard, U., Monseigneur Dupanloup et M. Lagrange son Historien, Société de librairies catholique, Paris, 1884, pp. 366, 212.

It is a further measure of his influence that he found no difficulty in raising the necessary funds for the operation. "Savez-vous que j'ai trouvé 300,000 francs en un mois?" he asked a friend. "Apprenez à m'estimer un peu."⁵⁸ By October 1867 the Univers with two weekly editions was publishing at the rate of 8,250 copies each.⁵⁹ Its chief competitor in the Catholic press, Le Monde was publishing 6,400. A year later the Monde was down to 4,500 and Veuillot's newspaper was verging on 11,000.⁶⁰

The new Univers differed very little from the old. Six years away from journalism had taught Veuillot that if anything, more passion was required for the defense of the Church.⁶¹ One of his first articles in the restored Univers treated of a meeting held in Paris by the Société des amis de la paix, that had been founded in London in 1847. The society held annual meetings in which individuals were invited to discuss means of preserving the peace of Europe. The organization was not religiously oriented but opened its doors to all men of good will. The conference of 1867 had been attended by Father Gratry, a Roman Catholic priest. Veuillot was scandalised. "On

58. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 27, p. 233.

59. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 807.

60. Ibid., p. 807.

61. On 31 May 1866, he wrote M. Auguste Roussel that: "il est certain que l'espoir de tirer quelque chose de l'esprit moderne nous la fait traiter avec trop de mollesse et que nous entrons dans la voie des accommodements qui devient bien vite la voie des concessions. J'y ai marché avec eux [Liberal Catholics] jamais sans un certain scrupule. Les événements postérieurs nous ont tirés de là." Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 16, p. 30.

s'impatiente lorsqu'un prêtre catholique se fourvoie parmi ces naifs murmurants", he reported.⁶² His own solution for Europe's problems was the same simple advice that had never ceased to characterize his authoritarian attitude. "Hors l'Eglise, point de père, point de frères, point de paix."⁶³ When the society met again in June of the following year, Veillot once more rose to the occasion. This time a Carmelite monk by the name of Father Hyacinthe had actually participated in the conference together with a Protestant clergyman and a Jewish rabbi. This exercise in eucumenicism earned him this tribute from Veillot: "Ainsi le Carmel et la religion catholique ont triomphé hier, entre midi et cinq heures, à Paris, dans un lieu que sainte Thérèse et saint Pierre n'auraient pas voulu hanter."⁶⁴ His absence from the daily press had obviously done nothing to soften Veillot's apologetic.

6.

Louis Veillot was not the only force behind the Univers, but was himself supported by a coterie of like-minded individuals. His brother Francois, less talented perhaps but every bit as extreme as Louis, provided many articles for the journal. Pie, bishop of Poitiers, perhaps the most reactionary churchman of his time, was

62. Ibid., V. 35, p. 134.

63. Ibid., p. 134.

64. Ibid., V. 36, p. 187.

the Univers' most enthusiastic supporter from among the episcopate. This man dreamed of the day when the comte de Chambord would once again restore the French Church to its former stature.⁶⁵ His synodal and pastoral letters "sur les erreurs du temps present," were often reproduced on the pages of the Univers. Dom Gueranger, abbé at the Benedictine monastery of St. Pierre de Solesmes and leading representative of traditionalist theology contributed articles on religious questions. From the episcopate encouragement also came from Bishops Grousset, Parisis, and Salinis.⁶⁶ Lesser churchmen like the abbés Combalot and Gaume also wrote on matters of the faith.

Collectively this group let loose a powerful stream of conservative propoganda. The collected writings of Louis Veuillot alone run to an oceanic-40 volumes in the Lethelleux edition! Supported by the clergy and by the Roman Catholic masses who were conservative in sentiment,⁶⁷ these people became the spokesmen for a particular kind of Roman Catholicism. As early as 1862, Madame de Forbin mentioned the "école de l'Univers", in a letter to Augustin Cochin's wife.⁶⁸ When the Liberal Catholic bishop of Orleans asked one of his priests his religious allegiance, the answer was to the point: "Nulle-

65. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX (1846-1878), Bloud et Gay, Paris, 1952, p. 233.

66. Dansette, A., Religious History of Modern France, trans. John Digne, Herder and Herder, N.Y., 1961, V. 1, p. 300.

67. Aubert, R., op. cit., p. 306.

68. Palanque, J., op. cit., p. 58.

ment Dupanloup tout Veuillot."⁶⁹ (Félix Dupanloup was bishop of Orleans). Where in 1844, according to Lacordaire, there were no divisions among Roman Catholics, by the end of the 1860s it seemed as though one had to be either a Liberal Catholic or a Veuillotiste. The Liberal Catholic celebrity madame de Frobin belonged to the former category but her sister-in-law was a "Veuillotine".⁷⁰

69. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 27, p. 264.

70. Palanque, J., op. cit., p. 75.

CHAPTER THREE

LOUIS VEUILLOT AND THE ULTRAMONTANE MOVEMENT

1.

That a man should not be studied apart from his times is the oldest caveat in the historical profession. Some practitioners, Carlyle notably, have been openly disdainful of this advice. They have seen history as something like the collective biography of great men in past time. Perhaps they have not been totally mistaken. Personality may, in some cases, provide a sufficient explanation for the popularity and influence of a historical personage. But in the case of Louis Veillot, such an approach would simply be impossible. If ever a man was borne into prominence on the crest of a wave, that man was Louis Veillot.

No one looks at Rome et Lorette today; the Odeurs de Paris makes interesting reading as a period piece but nothing more. La Vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ is manifestly unscientific even to the theologically untrained. Respectable works of literary criticism ignore the author of the Second Empire's best sellers. A very real journalistic talent this man certainly had; but it required a great deal more than brilliant copy to win the respect of more than half the episcopate, the lower clergy, the Roman Catholic masses - and the Pope!

Veillot had something to say to his times.

2.

In France the Ultramontane movement began during the Bourbon restoration when Lamennais, de Maistre and de Bonald thrilled Roman Catholics and ultra royalists with dreams of a medieval theocracy founded on the word of God and presided over by the Pope. With the memories of 1789 still in the minds of many, the movement became very popular. "L'Eglise tremblante s'attache au pape comme à la seule chance de salut", remarked Stendhal in 1830.¹ During the July Monarchy when the connexion between the Church and the French state was no longer a very close one, the Ultramontane movement lost its momentum. Lamennais, its chief exponent, had repudiated the school he once led, and Joseph de Maistre was now dead, and eighteen years of de facto separation had taught the Church that a return to medieval practices was not essential to its success.

But by the mid 1850s, Ultramontanism was again a powerful force in French Catholic circles. Pius IX's difficulties with the Italian revolutionaries created a considerable wave of sympathy for the "prisoner in the Vatican". The possibilities that many Roman Catholics saw in Louis-Napoleon's coup d'état awakened the memories of better days when king and bishop were equal partners in the govern-

1. Beyle, H., Le Rouge et le Noir, Chronique du XIXe siècle, Garniers Freres, Paris, 1960, p. 177.

ment of men. "Dans notre constitution monarchique," repined Louis Veuillot, "le clergé était le premier ordre de L'Etat, riche, puissant, indépendant...".² Finally, the movement offered recourse to Roman Catholics frightened by the almost daily attacks of Renan, Taine, Litre, Vacherot, and the host of priest haters spawned by the anti-clerical press. The knowledge that the man in the Vatican was the repository of 1800 years of tradition must have been a great source of consolation for these people; especially if one considers that in this man there latently resided the power of infallibility.

3.

"Le triomphe de l'ultramontanisme", writes Professor Aubert, "fut autant le triomphe d'un homme que celui d'une doctrine."³ When Pio Nono ascended to the chair of Peter as Pius IX in 1846, he was considered by his contemporaries to be a liberal in his attitude to the Church and its relations with modern society. During his pontificate of thirty two years, he made himself a reputation for being one of the most reactionary pontiffs in Church history. It seems that his experience with the Italian nationalists, who even forced him to flee Rome at one time, led him to believe that the optimism of earlier years had been misplaced. He was convinced that any modification of his own prerogative in the way of concessions to the Italian revolutionaries would only increase the incidents of anti-clericalism

2. Veuillot, L., *O.C.*, V. 31, p. 282.

3. Aubert, R., *Vatican I*, Editions de l'Orante, Paris, 1964, p. 34.

in the Papal States. What was needed was more, not less power for the Holy See. When he saw in the 1850's that the Ultramontane movement, especially in France, was intent upon a new assertion of the privilegium Petri, he did everything in his power to encourage the movement. "He could see what the Church wanted from him," writes E. Y. Hales, "and he was neither too recluse nor too cautious to give it."⁴ From about 1850 on, the Roman Curia openly encouraged all Roman Catholics who extended or even exaggerated the prerogatives of the Holy See. It undertook to model religious practices and customs after the Roman fashion; one had to think, pray, even dress in the Roman manner.

The greatest support for 'romanization' came from the lower clergy. The French curé had a long history of suffering at the hands of local bishops. Canon law was not highly developed in 19th century France and cases where bishops and other dignitaries abused their powers seem to have been considerable.⁵ Pio Nono encouraged the priests to go over the heads of local bishops and to appeal their cases to Rome. In a brief of January 21, 1856, every priest suffering the attack of a bishop ex information conscientio had the right of

4. Hales, E. Y., Pio Nono. A Study in European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1956, p. 280.

5. Palanque, J. R., Catholiques Libéraux, et Gallicans en France face au Concile du Vatican 1867-1870, Annales de la Faculté des Lettres Aix-En-Provence, 1962, p. 16.

appealing the Pope.⁶ Pius IX was prepared to back up this legislation. He defended his right to hear the appeal of a certain priest who found himself in difficulty with the Archbishop of Paris in October 1865.⁷ When the abbé Thomas published two works which pointed out certain abuses of episcopal power, in France, the Congregation of the Inquisition ordered the French bishops involved to put an end to the malpractices.⁸

The results of these measures on the lower clergy was tremendous. The correspondance generale of Bishop Maret contains an undated letter from a priest of an episcopal city which contains this remark. "Je n'ai pas étudié et moins approfondi la question et cependant je suis tout dévoué à l'ultramontanisme...les évêques sont si...difficiles à supporter."⁹ When it became known that any priest could appeal to the Pope and when he was encouraged to go to Rome for even minor points,¹⁰ the cure's estimation for Pius IX became considerable. In 1858, the abbé Gerbet wrote that "no French Bishop dare venture without instantly being annihilated by the public opinion of the clergy to defend himself...Rome can do anything now."¹¹ The

6. Ollivier, E., L'Eglise et L'Etat au Concile du Vatican, Garnier Freres, Paris, n.d., V. 1, p. 245.

7. Ibid., p. 297.

8. Ibid., p. 298.

9. Bazin, G., op. cit., V. 111, p. 7.

10. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 277.

11. Ward, W., op. cit., p. 234.

difficult position of the French episcopate was illustrated in 1863 when the Archbishop of Paris was led to denounce "ces étranges catholiques dont la piété consiste principalement à saluer le pape de loin pour insulter les évêques de près."¹²

By 1865, the lower clergy were unanimously ultramontane in sentiment. The influence of the cure was such that many bishops who would otherwise have held a more independent view in religious matters joined the movement. It would have been embarrassing for them to appear less devoted to the Holy See than the priests in their dioceses. Thus in 1865, the administrator of religious cults Baroche reported that the pressure of the Ultramontane religious congregations had had "la plus fâcheuse influence sur l'attitude des évêques."¹³

4.

Pius IX's intellectual background like that of most Italian ecclesiastics was a very modest one. "Il avait du se contenter d'études assez sommaires et n'avait guère idée des méthodes scientifiques modernes, en matière historique notamment..."¹⁴ When he undertook then to standardize Roman Catholic theology and philosophy after the pattern taught at the Holy See, what he had in mind was a teaching of a distinctively traditionalist and authoritarian nature. This was perhaps unfortunate especially in the Latin world where theological studies had not yet developed anything of the higher criticism which

12. Dansette, A., *op. cit.*, V. 1, p. 48.

13. Maurain, J., *op. cit.*, p. 806.

14. Aubert, R., *Vatican I*, p. 35.

characterized the German theological schools at Munich and Tubingen.¹⁵

In France the Pope's attitude had a considerable impact on political thought because at this time some French Catholics were attempting to come to terms with the liberal principles of 1789. The influence of the Holy See weighed heavily against this movement. In 1856, the liberal abbe Goddard published a work entitled Les Principes de 1789 et la doctrine catholique. Each article of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, was confronted with the opinions of three Catholic theologians: Saint-Thomas, Bellarmin, and Suarez. There was no opposition, argued Goddard, between the revolutionary document and Roman Catholic dogma.¹⁶ The Liberal-Catholics were enthusiastic over this brochure and Augustin Cochin openly praised it. But the pamphlet was put on the index.

The influence of the Holy See in the field of French education was equally far-reaching. Encouraged by the Roman Curia the French Ultramontanes denounced the explanation which drew a connection between the moon and the month as being unscientific. Then an Ultramontane, a certain M. Gaume, accounted for the seven

15. Lord Acton began an essay in 1864 with the following remark: "Among the causes which have brought dishonour on the Church in recent years, none have had a more fatal operation than those conflicts with science and literature which have led men to dispute the competence, or the justice or the wisdom of her authorities." Dalberg-Acton, J.E., Essays on Freedom and Power, G. Himmelforb editor, Beacon, Boston, 1949, p. 269.

16. Weill, G., op. cit., p. 163.

days of the week by arguing that each one represented one of the seven deadly sins.¹⁷ The works of Bossuet and the Maurrists were replaced by Ultramontane books of little scientific value.¹⁸ The Acta sincera Martyrum by Reinart, "one of the standard authorities on the subject" was replaced by "the thoroughly uncritical and inexact Actes des Martyrs of Veuillot's friend and collaborator Dom Guéranger.¹⁹ Church history was represented by the unsound works of the abbe Darras and what the Bollandist Pere de Smedt has called "the historical errors and lies of M. Ch. Barthelemy."²⁰

In general, it may be said that French Catholic thought in the period 1850-1870 was characterized by the adulation of authority and by the disparagement of the human intellect. (See Appendix A, p. 107). In the most recently published work on this problem Professor Foucher concludes that: "ce mouvement [Catholic theology] ...portait naturellement à rechercher une autorité non seulement en religion mais en philosophie, et à limiter strictement les droits de la raison individuelle."²¹

17. Ward, W., op. cit., p. 102.

18. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 300.

19. Ward, W., op. cit., p. 120.

20. Ibid., p. 119. In 1850, Father Chastel remarked that: "Si l'Eglise n'y prend garde, il s'établira dans le monde, comme une chose jugée, que l'Eglise est l'ennemi de la science et la raison." Weill, G., op. cit., p. 195.

21. Foucher, L., La philosophie Catholique en France au XIXe siècle avant la renaissance Thomiste et dans son rapport avec elle (1800-1880). Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, Paris, 1955, p. 265.

5.

The interior position of the human intellect in the Catholic thought of this period is demonstrated by the popularity of miracles and by the almost fanatical adulation of Pius IX. That the lower clergy had very good reason to feel close to Pio Nono has been shown. Pius IX contrived to win this kind of support from every one. To secure this end he was not afraid of asserting his prerogative to an unprecedented degree. On December 8 1854, he alone proclaimed that the Immaculate Conception was dogma. The bull Ineffabilis Deus made no mention of the adhesion of the episcopacy - it simply remarked that the bishops had made their opinions known. The dogmatic value of the document reposes solely on the pontifical pronouncement.²² It is true that twenty bishops had taken part in the ceremony but they were informed by Cardinal Brunelli that they were not to discuss or debate the principles involved in the documents.²³

The importance of this event is that Pius IX, as if by right, had created a new dogma for the Church. This exercise of the prerogative was unparalleled. "Le plus important n'est pas le nouveau dogme en lui-même", opined Bishop Talbot, "mais la manière dont il est proclamé."²⁴ A religious journal in the city of Nantes wrote that: "Louis XIV avait prononcé ce mot célèbre: L'Etat, c'est moi

22. Palanque, J.R., Catholiques Libéraux et Gallicans, p. 18.

23. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 279.

24. Ibid., p. 279.

Pie IX a fait plus, il a dit en action, avec plus de raison que lui: L'Eglise, c'est moi."²⁵ But objections like these were not common. Emile Ollivier, who lived through these times, recollected that French Catholics were enthusiastic about the dogma.²⁶ Those few who, like the writer in the Journal des Debats, feared a "revolution" in Rome were violently rebutted by Louis Veuillot who stoutly defended the dogma.²⁷

The enthusiasm for the new dogma was an indication of a religious phenomena that would one day lead to Pio Nono's apotheosis. Already the semi-official Vatican newspaper, the Civiltà Cattolica was proclaiming that when the Pope meditates God is thinking in him.²⁸

Pius IX did nothing to discourage this tendency. When 500 bishops met in Rome in 1862, they addressed him in the following terms: "Quand vous parlez, c'est Pierre que nous entendons; quand vous décrétez, c'est à J. C. que nous obeissons."²⁹ "The successor of St. Peter had become the object of a real cult. Pious Catholics seemed to regard him as a saint simply because he was a Pope," writes A. Dansette. "Some even seemed to deify him."³⁰

25. Ibid., p. 301.

26. Ollivier, E., op. cit., V. 1, p. 312.

27. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 32, p. 117.

28. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 302.

29. Palanque, J.R., Catholiques Libéraux et Gallicans, p. 20.

30. Dansette, A., op. cit., V. 1, p. 303.

There is no exaggeration here. In 1864, Louis Veuillot wrote a friend that:

Pie IX est un saint. On dit je le crois
et j'en ai des exemples qu'il fait des
miracles. Pie IX est le même homme que
saint Pierre, et saint Pierre est le représentant
de Notre-Seigneur. Il est par sa fonction,
Jesus lui-même continue. [!]³¹

Pius IX made use of this phenomenal popularity in order to continue the process of 'Romanization' begun in the early 1850s. In France the Holy See condemned theological treatises published by the Sulpicians and thus forced them to abandon the customs and traditions of the Gallican Church.³² The Holy See also refused to recognize the diplomas granted by the state theological faculties and replaced them by a Roman college for higher studies "from which French priests returned with the ideas, customs and even the garb of Italian priests."³³ Rome undertook to standardize religious practices in all countries after the pattern in use at the Holy See. This caused a particularly bitter conflict in France, a country which in 1850 had twenty different liturgies. The clergy of Lyon attached considerable importance to theirs contending that it had an Asiatic origin.³⁴ They felt moreover that the question of the liturgy was a matter for local bishops to decide.³⁵ But Dom Geuranger with the

31. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 7, p. 194.

32. Dansette, A., op. cit., V. 1, p. 301.

33. Ibid., p. 310.

34. Ollivier, E., op. cit., V. 1, p. 311.

35. Ibid., p. 311.

support of Louis Veuillot undertook a campaign to make French religious practices identical with the Roman ones. The movement was encouraged by the Pope in a brief of March 1864. By 1870, not more than three or four dioceses had their own liturgy. "Je suis frappé", wrote the French ambassador to the Vatican, "de travail d'assimilation qui se poursuit ici des églises de la catholicité toute entière au rite, à la liturgie, aux costumes, à l'habillement sacerdotale de Rome."³⁶

6.

"Il nous semble que l'époque qui suit le siècle de Voltaire pourra s'appeler le siècle de Marie", wrote Louis Veuillot in March 1855.³⁷ Thanks to apparitions at Lourdes and La Salette, there arose in mid-century France a veritable cult of the Blessed Virgin. "Mary imperceptibly supplants Christ and becomes the deity of France as she already was of Italy and Spain."³⁸ In a book by the Abbey Guilan, Le Mois de Marie, Mary is represented as a "kind of chief divinity to whom it consequently is safest of all to pray."³⁹ The adoration of the Blessed Virgin was accompanied by a mystical belief in the saints, relics and apparitions. In June 1865, the bishop

36. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 695. Sartiges continues: "Ces formes ont pris une telle importance dans l'Eglise de Saint-Père que Sa Sainteté en est arrivé à faire des représentations aux membres du clergé qui se présentent devant lui avec le rabat porté dans le costume ecclésiastique français."

37. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 32, p. 166.

38. Brandes, G., Revolution and Reaction in Nineteenth Century French Literature, Russell and Russell, N.Y., n.d., p. 281.

39. Ibid., p. 280.

of Poitiers, remarked that Jesus had announced through his prophet that in the last days of the world visions and apparitions would abound. "Ces temps", reflected Pie, "étaient venus."⁴⁰ Such was the propensity for the miraculous that provincial France was even found to contain a relic preserved from the Circumcision.

For some Roman Catholics, the situation was embarrassing. In 1855, Bordas-Demoalin, a leading Christian philosopher attacked the "mariolatrie" of his contemporaries; but his attitude does not seem to have been shared by the majority of his coreligionaries. Their spokesman was Louis Veuillot whose articles La Grotte de Lourdes of August 1858, was the first in the French press to treat of this particular apparition.⁴¹ (Veuillot went on to defend the miracle against the attacks of the anti-clerical press.⁴²)

The liberal Catholics feared that an uncritical acceptance of the supernatural would lead the Church away from modern society. In May 1856 the comte de Falloux published a brochure in which he accused Louis Veuillot of encouraging the abuse of mysticism.⁴³ But the Liberal Catholics were in the minority and the intellectual level of the episcopate and the clergy was such that new religious

40. Baunard, Mgr., Histoire du cardinal Pie, Poitiers, 1893, V. 2, p. 231.

41. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 33, p. 535.

42. Ibid., p. 546.

43. On 1 March 1855, Veuillot had written that the growth of female religious orders represented "une sorte d'incarnation de la Mère de Dieu et un avènement personnel de Marie sur la terre." Veuillot, L. O.C., V. 32, p. 171.

phenomena went largely unchallenged. Besides, the new devotion had the approbation of Rome. Had not Pius IX, without even consulting the universal episcopate, himself declared the dogma of the Immaculate Conception?

7.

"These modern Jesuits, or so-called Ultramontane party and their tools, form a powerful body in the Catholic Church...", wrote Odo Russel in 1865.⁴⁴ And so they did. Although the movement was represented in all European countries, it took a particular guise in France. Since 1789, the principles of the Revolution had not ceased to be debated in that country. The liberal wing of the Catholic party was amenable to many of the tenets of '79'; they believed in political liberties, religious toleration and the secular state. At the very moment they attempted to impose their attitudes on the French Church, events in Rome mitigated against them. The Pope was engaged in a death struggle with the Italian nationalists who also espoused the principles of the French Revolution. Political liberalism was confused with religious liberalism in the minds of

44. Blakiston, Noel, The Roman Question, Extracts from the Despatches of Odo Russel from Rome 1858-1870, Chapman and Hall, London, 1962, p. 304. On 3 November 1868, Russel, with that Whig bias that characterizes his writings, reported that: "By placing himself at the head of the legitimist and Clerical Parties and calling upon them to crush indiscriminately Liberty, Progress or Revolution, the (so-called) common enemies of the Church, the Pope has created a Political Catholic Party all over the world, a legion of men and women disciplined and comanded by the clergy." Ibid., p. 353.

many Roman Catholics. The Liberal Catholics, according to some, were saying the same things as Cavour and Garibaldi.

Because of the events in Rome, it is not surprising that Pius IX would forsake his earlier liberalism in favour of an authoritarian and paternalistic attitude. He encouraged Roman Catholics to think in the same way. The Ultramontane movement became as a result, conservative and authoritarian in both its political and theological aspects. "The Ultramontane school", wrote the archbishop of Paris in 1855, "was once a school of liberty; it has been turned into a school of slavery with two main objects; the idolatry of the temporal power and the idolatry of spiritual power."⁴⁵

No one benefited more from the Pope's encouragement than did Louis Veillot. When the Archbishop of Paris, who was a Gallican, condemned the Univiers in 1853, Veillot appealed to Rome. The result of his appeal was the encyclical Inter Multiplices which ordered the French bishops to be

generous in their encouragements, and to show their goodwill and their love towards those men who . . . devote the watches of the night to writing books and papers so that Catholic doctrine may be propogated and defended. . .⁴⁶.

The encyclical was a blow to the Liberal Catholics who saw the document as papal approbation for Louis Veillot.⁴⁷ The Pope came to

45. Spencer, P., Politics of Belief in Nineteenth-Century France, Faber and Faber, London, 1954, p. 145.

46. Hales, E.Y., op. cit., p. 282.

47. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 159.

Veillot's assistance again in 1860 when the Univers was suppressed by the government. He published a public letter of gratitude for the services Veillot had rendered the Church; a letter which explicitly acknowledge his support for Veillot's policies.⁴⁸ Again in 1863, when Veillot published his Vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ in refutation of Renan's Vie de Jésus he received a complimentary brief from Pius IX,⁴⁹ in which the Pope showered him with an unprecedented degree of public affection. Even Montalembert's Liberal Catholic biographer was forced to admit that "nulle autre personne au monde n'avait reçu de Pie IX pareil témoignage de tendresse, d'admiration et de reconnaissance."^{49a} The Liberal Catholics had sometimes received complimentary briefs from the Pope, but never before had any layment whether liberal or conservative, been treated with such affection by Pius IX.

48. "C'est pour Nous un devoir de louer, tout particulièrement l'ardeur avec laquelle vous vous êtes efforcés, sans peur aucune, de réfuter les journaux imprudents, de défendre les lois de l'Eglise, de combattre pour les droits de ce Saint-Siège." "La petite devotre coeur, votre respect, et ce zèle même que vous montrez pour la défense de la vérité, Nous sont des témoignages très agréables." Veillot, L., O.C., V. 34, p. 446.

49. "Elle [the book] respire cette faim, cette soif de la justice, cet élan et cette fermeté d'esprit que vous avez montrés jadis en soutenant le combat auquel vous étiez engagé." "Nous demandons instamment à Dieu pour vous un accroissement toujours plus abondant de la grâce et Nous vous donnons avec amour à vous et aux vôtres, la bénédiction apostolique, augure de ce don céleste et gage de Notre bienveillance particulière et de notre affection." Charbonnel, J., Pensées de M. Louis Veillot, Poussielgue Freres, Paris, 1868, p. vii.

49a Lecanuet, R.P., Montalembert, Ch. Poussielgue, Paris, 1905, v.111, p. 380.

The incredible prestige that Veillot had in the eyes of Pius IX was partly owing to the fact that he wrote what the Pope wanted to hear. Sending a copy of his Parfum de Rome to the Nuncio in Paris. Veillot remarked that "vous verrez aisément Monseigneur, que mon dessein a été comme toujours de glorifier la Papauté et le Pape." J'espère qu'ils [his books] augmenteront les attaches si puissants qui lient la France au Saint-Siège et que ceux qui travaillent à les rompre n'en viendront pas a bout."⁵⁰ The man who honestly believed that the Pope was a saint and that he performed miracles was not one to measure his words when it came to describing Pius IX.

Le voilà, le vrai Pretre et le vrai Roi,
prophétiquement signalé par David; le
voilà revêtu de justice et d'innocence...⁵¹

The Pope rewarded Veillot's dedication by granting him numerous audiences. During one of these, in 1858, Pius IX is reported to have told him: "Vous avez toujours été dans la bonne voie; vous n'en sortirez pas."⁵² Before republishing the Univers in 1867, Veillot sought the blessing of Pius IX. "Je ne veux rien entreprendre sans avoir reçu la bénédiction du Saint-Père...". "Je mettrai à ses pieds tout ma pensée et toute ma volonté."⁵³ After their meeting Veillot could write his brother that: "Je quitte le Saint-Père.

50. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 7, p. 383.

51. Ibid., V. 36, p. 211.

52. Veillot, F., op. cit., p. 97.

53. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 27, p. 181.

Je suis ravi, embarrassé, beni avec bonté et je pourrais dire avec une tendresse... Il m'a rebeni, il m'appelai caro Veillot!"⁵⁴

In 1869, the Bishop of Orleans in a fit of pique addressed an official public Avertissement against Louis Veillot. He accused him of being the self-appointed spokesman of the French Church.

"J'accuse vos usurpations sur l'Épiscopat, et votre intrusion perpétuelle dans ses plus graves et plus délicates affaires."⁵⁵ Bishop

Dupanloup was of course correct. Veillot who was only a Catholic layman, and not even a trained theologian at that, undertook to enlighten the French episcopate on even the most complicated theological matters. But that the editor of the Univers felt himself the equal of any French bishop should have surprised no one considering the kind of support this man was getting from Rome.⁵⁶

54. Ibid., p. 189.

55. Cecconi, E., Histoire du Concile du Vatican, d'après les documents originaux, traduit par Jules Bonhomme et D. Duvillard, Librairie Victor Lecoffre, Paris, 1887, Doc. cclxxxii, p. 1317

56. "The Pope was not inclined to censure Veillot's opinions." writes E. Y. Hales. "He liked Veillot's interpretation of his pronouncements better than he liked the Bishop of Orleans interpretations." Hales, E. Y., op. cit., p. 282. Such was Veillot's prestige in Rome that on 31 December 1864, Father Debeauvais could write Bishop Dupanloup that: "M. Veillot a vraiment ici une position étrange. Une importance curieuse s'est attachée à son nom; les cardinaux le reçoivent avec distinction; les prélats le reçoivent, l'entourent, le consultent... la première place est pour lui partout...". Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup et le Syllabus", Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique, 51 (1956), p. 846.

SECOND PART

CHAPTER FOUR

THE LIBERAL CATHOLICS. THE CONGRESS OF MALINES.

1.

The handful of men who founded the Correspondant in 1854 in opposition to Veuillot's Univers had grown in strength, and by the 1860's they could count among their numbers some of the most influential Roman Catholics of the Second Empire. Their leader was Rene Forbes, comte de Montalembert a distinguished historian, statesman and crusader - he had been a collaborator of Lamennais in the early days of the Avenir. Behind him were alligned the Prince de Broglie, grand-son of Madame de Stael, the conte de Falloux, a fervent royalist, Louis de Carne, a deputy during the July Monarchy and a historian of the 18th century, Alexander de Metz-Noblat "d'une vieille famille lorraine,"¹ Augustin Cochin, "d'une très ancienne famille de bourgeoisie,"² Francois Rio, art historian, and Theophile Foisset. "La plupart sont de veille noblesse, d'autres sont de bourgeoisie honorable: Tous appartiennent à cette classe fortunée qui constituait alors 'l'aristocratie de la société française!'"³ The group was socially well considered and even had its Liberal Catholic

1. Palanque, J.R., Catholiques Liberaux et Gallicans, p. 42.

2. Ibid., p. 43.

3. Ibid., p. 43.

salons - those of la duchesse de Galliera, la comtesse de Haute-Feuille and la marquise de la Ferte-Mauny.⁴ In the episcopate they could count on the support and collaboration of Bishop Dupanloup, the most urbane prelate of the Second Empire.

The liberals looked upon themselves as intellectuals and perhaps, with some reservation, the epithet is deserving. They were well represented in the Academie Francaise - it became their "centre d'operations."⁵ Montalembert was elected one of the forty in 1851, de Falloux in 1856, de Broglie in 1862, and Carne in 1863. They saw to it that their colleagues Dupanloup, Laprade, Champagnay, were in due turn similarly honoured. "A la fin de l'Empire, writes Palanque, elle [the Academy] est devenue une sorte de salon catholique-libéral où règne un certain esprit de coterie."⁶ But if these men were not intellectuals in the strict sense - few of them were interested in higher criticism - they made a considerable pretense to being 'with their times'. They were in close relations with Dr. Dollinger, the distinguished German Church historian at the theological school of Munich. They endeavoured to understand political and religious problems in other countries besides France. All of them were well travelled. Montalembert, for example, had been born in England and had visited Hungary, Sweden, Germany and

4. Ibid., p. 47.

5. Ibid., p. 43.

6. Ibid., p. 43.

Italy. They were very much aware of the religious problems in these places. They were also in communication with Protestants and Roman Catholics in foreign countries. Montalembert was engaged in an extensive correspondance with the Polish Liberal Catholic Adam Mieckiewicz. This cosmopolitan characteristic of the Liberal Catholics is important and explains the understanding these men had of the religious conditions in other countries - an understanding not shared by their Ultramontane opponents.

2.

The Correspondant was born out of the resentment the liberal wing of the Catholic party felt for Louis Veuillot and his ideas. They wanted to put an end to "la malheureuse solidarité de l'Eglise avec ce journal [the Univers] ...".⁷ What the Liberal Catholics most disliked about Veuillot's apologetic was its condemnation en bloc of the principles of 1789. These men felt that many of the liberal principles that derived from the French Revolution could be accommodated by the Church. They regretted "que le clergé français n'appréciat pas plus généralement certains bienfaits qu'on ne devrait ni méconnaître ni refuser d'admirer dans la société

7. Pange, J. de, op. cit., p. 132.

moderne."⁸ In his acceptance speech at the French Academy, Bishop Dupanloup remarked that the Church should assimilate those things in modern society which are good,⁹ "le Christianisme ne réjette rien de ce qui fut bon dans la pensée et la parole humaine,"¹⁰ The greatest obstacle to any reconciliation between the Church and contemporary society, he felt, was the Ultramontanes movement - "Ces laïques qui déshonorent le zèle par l'amertume et la violence."¹¹

The Liberal Catholics felt that time was on their side, that Ultramontanism was a passing phenomena, and that one day their principles would triumph. "Le temps travaille visiblement pour nous," wrote Leopold de Gaillard on 29 July 1862.

Ne brusquons rien, [he continued] mais ne reculons pas. Condamnés ou non, les principes de 89 seront avant 25 ans l'espoir et la loi de tous les peuples civilisés. Cet avenir assuré nous conseille à la fois la prudence et la fermeté.¹²

8. Falloux, le comte de, Memoires d'un Royaliste, Perrin et Cie, Paris, 1888, V. 2, p. 417. In Against Nature Huysman makes his protagonist Des Esseintes reflect that "the Correspondant... did its best to cover the imperious doctrines of the Church with a varnish of tolerance. Veillot, a more honest, outspoken man, spurred these subterfuges, unhesitatingly admitted the tyranny of ultramontane dictates, openly acknowledged and invoked the merciless discipline of ecclesiastical dogma." Huysmans, J., - K., Against Nature, translated by Robert Baldick, Penguin Books, London, 1966, p. 154.

9. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 232.

10. Cited by Louis Veillot in an article in the Univers, O.C., V. 32, p. 205.

11. Lagrange, F., Lettres Choisies de Mgr. Dupanloup, Jules Gervais, Paris, 1888, V. 1, p. 151.

12. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin..." (documents inédits)¹²

In order to facilitate the coming of this day, the Liberal Catholics set out to modernize the image of the Church. In their literary review, the Correspondant, they undertook to familiarize Roman Catholics with theological and political principles of all schools. These were cultivated men and they wrote in measured words of recent developments in philosophy, science, and theology. They hoped to show Catholics that modern changes in these disciplines were not necessarily antagonistic to the faith.¹³ In their political posture, they adopted the basic tenets of 19th century liberalism - the ones Montalembert had formulated in his article: "Les intérêts Catholiques au dixneuvième siècle." They believed in religious toleration, separation of Church and state, and parliamentary government. Democrats they definitely were not.^{13a}

3.

The Liberal Catholics, although well received by the opinion eclairee and supported by the Orleanist aristocracy, were nowhere as powerful as the Ultramontanes. They could count on half the episcopate at the most, but had no support from the lower clergy and little sympathy from the mass of Roman Catholics. Their episcopal support seems to have been due to the resentment

13. In 1864, de Broglie wrote Theophile Foisset that: "L'un des malheurs de notre temps, ... c'est le néant des études théologiques. De là le caractère de l'ultramontanisme au XIXe siècle; il est tout de sentiment et le sentiment raisonne peu." Pange, J. de., op. cit., p. 130.

13a. See p. 63 below.

that many bishops felt after the centralizing tendency of the Roman Curia and its habit of interfering in local church affairs. (It is significant that during the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception, the Liberal Catholic Dupanloup insisted that the bull mention the presence and consent of the episcopate).¹⁴ Other bishops moreover had an adverse reaction to the Ultramontane movement itself and especially to Louis Veuillot, its chief protagonist. On 18 December 1866, the Minister of Education informed Napoleon III of the attacks of five bishops against the Ultramontane newspaper le Monde. The conservative propoganda of that journal had rendered their dioceses "ingouvernables".¹⁵ With the Italian war of 1860 and the emperor's subsequent loss of Ultramontane support there was even more sympathy in the episcopate for liberal ideas. Baroche, the Minister of Religious Cults, appointed bishops who were least disposed to support the Ultramontane movement. There were eighteen such nominations in the latter part of the Second Empire.¹⁶ But some of the new bishops were Gallicans who openly championed the government. The Liberal Catholics who opposed Louis-Napoleon right from the coup d'état could not ally themselves with this group.

14. Maynard, U., Monseigneur Dupanloup et M. Lagrange son historien, Société générale de librairie catholique, Paris, 1884, p. 130.

15. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 306.

16. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 306.

It is rather difficult then to speak precisely in the matter of Liberal Catholic support among French prelates. Maurain estimates that in 1865 there were fifteen conservatives "ultramontains intran-sigéants", thirty Gallicans, and about twenty five or thirty bishops who sympathized with the liberal cause.¹⁷ As the Second Empire came to a close the Gallicans and Liberal Catholics would on occasion overcome their differences and demonstrate a united front on some issues; but this was not until 1869.

It is even more difficult to be precise about the support the Liberal Catholics received in the secular world. Bury tells us that they "were well regarded by intellectuals", but this says little.¹⁸ Maurain points out that they were supported only by Paris society and by the Institute de France.¹⁹ Their bi-monthly literary review, le Correspondant, had a circulation of 4,800 in 1866.²⁰ The number appears respectable, but Veuillot's Univers was selling 10,000 copies in 1868 and that at twice a week! One doubts also that issues of the Correspondant were passed from hand to hand as frequently as Veuillot's newspaper was.

17. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 808.

18. Bury, J. B., History of the Papacy in the 19th Century, Schocken, N. Y., 1964, p. 151.

19. Maurain, J., op. cit., p. 172.

20. Ibid., p. 749.

In July 1868, the Liberal Catholics founded their own newspaper le Français, but it was not a very popular journal.²¹ This evidence would suggest that Liberal Catholicism during the Second Empire was more a coterie than it was a widespread movement. The leaders of the party were among the most respected Catholics of their day; this would account for their support in the Orleanist aristocracy, among French intellectuals and the episcopate. But the movement does not seem to have been supported by either the lower clergy or by the Roman Catholic masses.

4.

In the summer of 1863, the conte de Montalembert was asked to address a Roman Catholic congress at Malines, Belgium. He accepted the offer as it gave him an opportunity to attack what he felt were the theological and political exaggerations of the Ultramontane school.²² The sponsors of the congress, aware of the papal support and the strength of the conservative movement, informed Montalembert that to use the congress as a platform for attacking the "école absolutiste" would be both tactless and dangerous.²³

-
21. On 11 September 1869, F. Beslay, the editor of the Français related that the journal was on the verge of financial ruin. C. f. Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup au début du concile du Vatican", Miscellanea Hist. eccles., Stockholm 1960, (1961), p. 110.
 22. Aubert, R., "L'Intervention de Montalembert au Congrès de Malines en 1863", Collectanea Mechliniensia, 35 (1950), p. 526.
 23. Ibid., p. 526.

He agreed therefore to limit his discourse to a defense of Liberal Catholic principles. The speech was delivered on 20 and 21 August and published in the Correspondant under the title L'Eglise libre dans l'etat libre on 25 August and 25 September.

Montalembert's speech at Malines is the most successful attempt at summarizing the position of the French Liberal Catholics that had yet been undertaken during the Second Empire. It is a document of the first importance. "Les Catholiques", he said, "n'ont pas encore pris leur parti de la grande révolution qui a enfanté la société nouvelle, la vie moderne des peuples."²⁵ This was the theme of his discourse - to show Roman Catholics that their attitude to European society had been retrograde and that it needed to be corrected. Democracy, he proclaimed, is an inalterable fact of modern life.²⁶ By democracy he meant "la démocratie libérale, par opposition avec la démocratie purement égalitaire."²⁷ The future of society, he argued, demanded that the Church reconcile itself with the democratic fact.²⁸ "Surtout il faut renoncer au vain espoir de voir renaître un régime de privilège ou une monarchie absolue favorable au catholicisme."²⁹ Liberty, he contended, was a positive good for the Church, but the Church could only be free "au sein de la

25. Montalembert, R.F. de., Discours de M. le comte de Montalembert, Victor Lecoffre, Paris, 1892, V. III, p. 401.

26. Ibid., p. 401.

27. Ibid., p. 404.

28. Ibid., p. 405.

29. Ibid., p. 405.

liberté generalé." ³⁰ It could therefore ask for no special privilege from the government. "Tout privilège, si ancien, si inoffensif, si légitime qu'il soit, répugne à nos générations éprises d'égalité ...". ³¹ This was a direct attack on those Roman Catholics, notably the Ultramontanes, who supported the autocratic government of Napoleon III.

Montalembert contended that there was nothing in the ideas or in the institutions of modern democracy that was irreconcilable with Roman Catholic teaching, "ne soit acceptable ou meme profitable aux catholiques." ³² This led him into a discussion of religious toleration, by far the most dangerous aspect of his speech. He attempted a distinction between "l'intolérance dogmatique", and "tolérance civile"; "l'un nécessaire à la vérité éternelle et l'autre nécessaire à la société modern". He told his audience that of all the liberties, "la liberté de conscience est la plus précieuse, la plus sacrée, la plus légitime, la plus nécessaire". ³³ He admonished Roman Catholics who wanted freedom of conscience only for themselves and refused to grant this right to other religious minorities. ³⁴ He cautioned his coreligionaries against accepting the support of an absolute government. "L'Italie, l'Espagne et la Portu-

30. Ibid., p. 407.

31. Ibid., p. 408.

32. Ibid., p. 433.

33. Ibid., p. 446.

34. Ibid., p. 447. "Peut-on aujourd'hui demander la liberté pour la vérité", he asked, "c'est-à-dire pour soi (car chacun, s'il est de bonne foi, se croit dans le vrai), et la refuser à l'erreur, c'est-à-dire à ceux qui ne pensent comme nous. Je réponds nettement: Non!" Ibid., p.467.

gal sont la pour nous prouver l'impuissance radicale du système compressif, de l'antique alliance de l'autel et du trône pour la défense du catholicisme."³⁵ "La foi catholique n'a rien dû, ou presque rien, à l'emploi de la force..."³⁶ Again he was attacking those Catholics who openly supported the absolutism of Louis Napoleon in exchange for favours granted to the Church. More particularly, he was attacking Louis Veillot in spite of his promise not to criticize the "école absolutiste". He made this clear when he quoted an article that Veillot had written on 24 August 1856 in which he had said that: "L'Eglise seule doit être libre."³⁷

5.

With the assistance of some twenty years hindsight the duc de Broglie, who had accompanied Montalembert to Malines, called the speech a great mistake: "Une huile bouillante jetée sur un feu qui allait s'éteindre."³⁸ "Il [Montalembert] eut l'idée assez malheureuse d'aborder en quelque sort dogmatique les points les plus délicats de la thèse que nous soutenions."³⁹ "Il avait évidemment plus songé à contredire ses adversaires de Paris qu'à contenter ses auditeurs de Malines."⁴⁰ But de Broglie was writing long after the

35. Ibid., p. 452.

36. Ibid., p. 451.

37. Ibid., p. 469.

38. Broglie, A. De., "Mémoires-IX. Autour du Syllabus", Revue des Deux Mondes, November (1925), p. 126.

39. Ibid., p. 124.

40. Ibid., p. 125.

Liberal Catholic principles had been condemned by the Syllabus; no such regret was found in liberal circles in August 1863. Augustin Cochin had read the proofs of the speech in July and he seemed to approve of it. "Tres heureusement formulé", he wrote. "La manière de faire accepter la liberté aux catholiques."⁴¹ After the speech Cochin was equally enthusiastic: "notre petit drapeau est devenu l'étendard de tous."⁴² Montalembert, himself, was satisfied with the effects of his speech. "Le catholicisme libéral y a remporté une victoire plus éclatante et plus populaire que toutes celles du passé", he wrote.⁴⁴

This optimism was not to last for more than a few days. By September Cochin's letters were filled with fear and apprehension.⁴⁵ He suspected that some conservative bishops, namely Pie and Wisemen, would denounce Montalembert's speech in Rome.⁴⁶ In fact Bishop Pie, the conservative leader in the French episcopate, had written the Pope and asked for a condemnation of the Malines discourse. He had even sent his Vicaire General abbé de Briey to Rome

41. Cochin, H., Augustin Cochin 1823-1872, ses lettres et sa vie, Bloud et Gay, Paris, 1926, V. 1, p. 339.

42. Ibid., p. 317.

43. Ibid., p. 351.

44. Aubert, R., "L'intervention de Montalembert...", p. 537.

45. Cochin, H., op. cit., p. 349.

46. Ibid., pp. 349, 365.

in order to support his demand.⁴⁷ The Liberal Catholics in turn commissioned Bishop Dupanloup to support Montalembert in Rome against the Ultramontanes.⁴⁸

The Curia upheld the conservatives in this dispute. The decision is not surprising. What Montalembert had said at Malines was highly inopportune. The Piedmontese government which had caused so much difficulty for the Holy See, had itself expressed its religious and political attitude in terms that closely resembled those Montalembert had used at Malines.⁴⁹ It too had demanded religious toleration and civil liberty in the name of self determination. In fact, count Cavour, who more than any man constituted Anti-christ for conservative Roman Catholics, had even used Montalembert's formula "L'Eglise libre dans l'état Libre", although in a different context.⁵⁰ It seems logical therefore that the Pope, who had been forced at one time to flee the Holy City in the face of Italian nationalists, would not be amenable to the liberal principles announced at Malines Belgium.

By February 1864, Montalembert had been assured by his brother-in-law Monseigneur de Merode that "on ferait quelque chose contre les catholiques libéraux...".⁵¹ In March of that year the

47. Lecanuet, R.P., Montalembert, Ch. Poussiégué, Paris, 1905, V. 11, p. 363.

48. Cochin, H., op. cit., p. 349.

49. Broglie, A. de, op. cit., p. 123.

50. Ibid., p. 123.

51. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin... (Documents inédits)", p. 60.

Pope asked Antonelli, the cardinal Secretary of State, to write Montalembert a confidential letter denouncing the doctrines expounded at Malines.⁵² The leader of the French Liberal Catholics was informed in March 1864 that the ideas he had espoused were "reprehensible par le conflit dans lequel ils se trouvent avec les enseignements de l'Eglise catholique, avec les actes émanés de divers Souverains Pontifes."⁵³ This was not all. The Liberal Catholics were informed that their doctrines were highly suspect at Rome and that very soon Pius IX would make a public pronouncement against Catholic liberalism.⁵⁴ "La menace restait ainsi suspendue sur nos têtes", recollected de Broglie in his memoirs.⁵⁵ And on 28 December 1865 another Liberal Catholic, Victor de Laprade, lamented that: "On nous fait redouter encore pour cette année un manifeste de Rome contre les catholiques libéraux et les idées du Correspondant."⁵⁶ Laprade's forebodings found justification on December 8, 1865, in the encyclical Quanta Cura, to which was appended the Syllabus of Errors.

52. Aubert, R., *Le Pontificat de Pie IX*, p. 253. It required the remonstrances of the Parisian Jesuits and Bishops Guibert, Lavigerie and Dupanloup so that the blame would be private not public.

53. Aubert, R., "L'intervention de Montalembert...", p. 549.

54. Broglie, A. de, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

56. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin... (Documents Inédits)", p. 63.

6.

Louis Veuillot had been invited to the Congress of Malines but did not attend. When he read the first instalment of Montalembert's speech in the *Correspondant* his reaction was, of course, an unfavourable one. "Quand tout sera publié, je verrai s'il convient que je parle", he wrote his sister on 28 August.⁵⁷ It is likely that Veuillot would have replied especially since he had been personally attacked by Montalembert. But two factors prevented an immediate rebuttal on his part. First his newspaper had been suppressed by the government in 1860 and he was thus deprived of a readily available organ. More important was the fact that his mother died on 17 September; his letters of this period show him almost totally preoccupied with his loss and with family affairs. But it may very well have been that Veuillot was indirectly instrumental in an attack on Montalembert.

A Belgian conservative count Val de Beaulieu had written Veuillot an unfavourable report on the Malines Congress.⁵⁸ In his reply to de Beaulieu's letter Veuillot intimated that a refutation of Montalembert's speech would be in order. "Quand on aura un document officiel, il sera bon, je crois, de répondre. Le parti libéral veut manifestement s'emparer de la chose et en faire un coup de parti."⁵⁹ Now whether the Belgian attacked Montalembert on Veuillot's advice or on his own initiative cannot be determined. One

57. Veuillot, L., *O.C.*, V. 7, p. 403.

58. *Ibid.*, V. 8, p. 16.

59. *Ibid.*, V. 8, p. 16.

can suppose that the encouragement of France's leading Ultramontane counted for something in de Beaulieu's resolve to attack the discourse of Malines. In March 1864, the Belgian count published a brochure entitled: L'Erreur libre dans l'état libre, a direct parody of the title Montalembert had given his address. In this pamphlet of some ninety three pages Montalembert was vigorously attacked on at least seventy five occasions.⁶⁰ What is more important, the brochure received a public brief of commendation from Monseigneur Mercurelli of the Roman Curia.⁶¹ The letter was widely perused in Roman Catholic circles and the liberals, of course, were disconcerted by what Madame de Forbin called the "déplorable épître de Mgnor Mercurelli."⁶² But the letter was "peu de chose" when compared to another papal document that was still in the process of formulation - the Syllabus of Errors.

60. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin... (Documents inédits)", p. 39.

61. Lecanuet, R.P., op. cit., V. 11, p. 380.

62. Palanque, J., (Documents inédits), p. 62.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE SYLLABUS OF ERRORS

1.

Perhaps no papal document has caused as great a furor in the Catholic world as did the encyclical Quanta Cura to which was appended the Syllabus of Errors. "The most unbounded pretensions to absolute control over the souls and bodies of mankind are proclaimed and re-asserted by the Pope in these documents", wrote Odo Russell to his government.¹ It is true that Russell viewed the events of Rome with the bias of an English Whig, but his reaction to that document was shared by many Roman Catholics.

A condemnation of modern errors had been brewing for some time. In 1860, Gerbet, bishop of Perpignan, published his Instruction pastorale sur diverses erreurs du temps présent which censured 85 errors of "modern times" including Liberal Catholicism.² Gerbet sent the pastoral to Rome and the Pope asked a commission to choose from among the 85 condemned propositions and to formulate a document based on their choice.³ When the bishops of the Church met in Rome in 1862, the Pope presented them with a list of 61 modern errors taken from Gerbet's letter. Dupanloup, the Liberal Catholic bishop of Orleans, predicted that the publication of

1. Blakiston, N., *op. cit.*, p. 299.

2. Besse, R.P., Le Syllabus, l'Eglise et les libertés, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, Paris, 1913, pp. 256, 85.

3. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 245.

this document would cause an "orage" in the modern world.⁴ It was decided then not to publish the encyclical. Pius IX, according to Professor Hales, had also considered a draft by Louis Veillot, which later formed the basis of the latter's Illusion libérale, but was dissuaded by the bishop of Orleans from using it as the basis for his encyclical.⁵ (There is then a sufficient amount of justification for the feeling in Liberal Catholic circles that a document denouncing their cause was in the making.)

The work that appeared on December 8, 1864, as the Syllabus of Errors was based on previous papal encyclicals, allocutions and pastoral letters. From these documents were culled 80 propositions "embracing the principal errors of our time."⁶ They were simply listed and no attempt was made in the document to explain the context in which they were originally formulated. The Syllabus was prefaced by the encyclical Quanta cura which undertook to explain the necessity of proscribing the "depraved opinions" of the modern age.⁷ Of the errors of "modern times" contained in this document many constituted the basis of the Liberal Catholic movement.

4. Lagrange, F., Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup évêque d'Orléans, Poussielgue, Paris, 1883, V. 2, p. 455.

5. Hales, E.Y., op. cit., p. 257. Eugene Veillot relates that Louis had been asked to collaborate in the preparation of the Syllabus in 1861. He had compiled some notes on the errors afflicting modern society - Eugene does not say whether they were sent to Rome - and these notes became the basis for the Illusion libérale, a pamphlet published in 1866. Veillot, E., op. cit., V. 3, p. 500.

6. Vaughan, H., The Year of Preparation for the Vatican Council. Including the Original and English of the Encyclical and Syllabus and of the Papal Documents Connected with its Convocation. London, Burns

Oates, 1869, p. 151. OF OTTAWA SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

7. Ibid., p. xiii.

It is then useful to compare some of the propositions of the Syllabus with the tenets of Liberal Catholicism which Montalembert had developed in his Malines address. One cannot but suspect, in fact, that this speech was much in the mind of the Roman Curia when it formulated the Syllabus.⁸ Thus error XV reads: "Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, led by the light of reason, he may have thought true."⁹ Proposition XXIV refutes Montalembert's ideas on religious coercion: "The Church has no power of employing force..."¹⁰ But most serious of all were those propositions dealing with modern liberalism:

LXXVII In this age it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be treated as the only religion of the State, all others worship whatsoever being excluded.

LXXVIII Hence it has been laudably provided by law in some countries, that men thither immigrating should be permitted the public exercise of their several worships.

LXXIX For truly it is false that the civil liberty of all worships, and the full power granted to all of openly and publicly declaring any opinions or thoughts whatever, conduces to more easily corrupting the morals and minds of people and propagating the plague of indifferentism.

8. Pio Nono denied that the Syllabus was aimed at Montalembert's speech. "Here it [the speech] is", he remarked, to Mr. Mansell, "it cannot have been condemned if I have not read it." Ward, W., op. cit., p. 243. But if he had not read it then why did he instruct Antonelli to censure it privately?

9. Vaughan, H., op. cit., p. xxiv.

10. Ibid., p. xxvi.

Especially hostile to Liberal Catholicism was the final "error":

LXXX The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile and harmonize himself with progress, with liberalism, and with modern civilization.¹¹

Everything Montalembert had said at Malines was censured in this document. The whole concept of a free Church in a free State was explicitly denounced in sections LXXVII and LXXVIII, as were the notions of religious toleration and freedom of conscience. The very spirit of Liberal Catholicism - that of reconciling the Church to its times was attacked in the last proposition. The Syllabus of Errors was a tragedy for the Liberal Catholic movement and a triumph for the conservative Ultramontanes. For the next decade the liberals were to live in the fear that one day the eighty negative propositions of the Syllabus would become positive dogma for the Christian world. The movement was almost broken.

2.

The Ultramontanes were enthusiastic about the document. "L'Encyclique nous réjouit fort", wrote Louis Veuillot on 27 December.¹² "On est content de l'effet de l'Encyclique". "Les catholiques prennent bien la leçon, voilà l'essentiel."¹³ He knew what the encyclical meant for the Liberal Catholics - "la couleuvre que doivent avaler quelques - uns de ceux que regarde l'Encyclique" - and he was well

11. Ibid., p. xxxvii.

12. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 7, p. 193.

13. Ibid., p. 197.

contented with this triumph.¹⁴ For those who could not appreciate it. Bishop Pie made clear the position of Liberal Catholicism in a pastoral letter of 1865.

L'acte du huit décembre... est dirigé contre les adversaires, contre ceux de dehors; c'est vrai; mais il s'adresse encore plus, s'il est possible à ceux de la maison [i. e. the Liberal Catholics].¹⁵

The Syllabus was aimed at the "soi-disant catholiques sincères" who had given themselves the task of harmonizing the Church with "les idées modernes".¹⁶ The encyclical provided the Ultramontane movement with a great fillip. On 13 January 1865 the conservative newspaper Le Monde remarked that:

Notre foi unique est de stigmatiser comme anti-catholique le libéralisme, le progrès et la civilisation moderne. Nous condamnons comme anti-catholique ces avortons de l'enfer.¹⁷

The Liberal Catholics despaired. The Syllabus of Errors not only censured their cause, but at the same time officially gave the Church a decidedly reactionary character. A Piedmontese newspaper declared that the Pope, now an implacable enemy of modern civilization, would outlaw the steam engine, the telegraph and gas lighting in

14. Ibid., p. 199.

15. Oeuvres Episcopales du Cardinal Pie Evêque de Poitiers, Librairie Religieuse H. Oudin, Paris, n. d., V. 5, p. 436.

16. Ibid., p. 435.

17. Aubert, R., "Les Reactions suscitées par la publication du Syllabus", Collectanea Mechliniensia, 34(1949), p. 312.

the Papal states.¹⁸ The great Parisian dailies - le Constitutionnel, la Patrie, le Journal des Débats, le Siècle - found in that document proof for their contention that the Church was the enemy of human reason.¹⁹ On January 1865, the French government decreed that no bishop could publish a document containing "des propositions contraires aux principes sur lesquels reposent la constitution de l'Empire."²⁰ From Rome, Odo Russell wrote his government that: "The struggle is now no longer between the Pope and Italy alone, but between that Papacy and modern civilization...".²¹

Of all the embarrassment caused by the publication of the Syllabus the consternation of the Liberal Catholics was by far the greatest. They alone had undertaken to modernize the Church and they must now feel the effects of this condemnation en bloc of their program. "Le rocher est retombé sur nous comme sur l'ancien Sisyphe..." wrote Augustin Cochin on 11 January.²² "Albert Broglie" he continued, "est très décidé à se retirer [from the Correspondant] j'ai le plus grand desir de le suivre." "L'Encyclique [a des] conséquences désastreuses surtout pour mes amis et pour moi", wrote Montalembert.²³ "Je trouve qu'il faut tout simplement nous retirer

18. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 255.

19. Besse, R.P., op. cit., p. 88. And Odo Russell reported that: The efforts of the ablest and most eloquent defenders of the Papacy in Europe are paralyzed because they can no longer speak in her defense without being convicted of heresy. Silence and blind obedience must henceforth be their only rule of life." Blakiston, N., op. cit., p. 302.

20. Besse, R.P., op. cit., p. 89.

21. Blakiston, N., op. cit., p. 302.

22. Cochin, H., op. cit., V. 1, p. 58.

de la rédaction du Correspondant. .."²⁴ The duc de Broglie recollected in his memoires that: "Si le Correspondant avait du paraître le lendemain de la publication d l'Encyclique, je ne sais en vérité comment nous en serions tirés."²⁵ "On aurait dit que l'Eglise commandait aux fidèles de sortir du siècle comme d'un abime de corruption."²⁶ And Foisset in turn was led to remark that: "L'Encyclique une fois acceptée, le Correspondant n'a plus de raison d'être."²⁷ The Syllabus had even presented a considerable challenge to his faith. "J'ai à sauver ma foi. Elle a été en péril et je me suis demandé comment la Providence a pu permettre cet acte."²⁸ Bishop Dupanloup was similarly troubled. "La tempête éclate", he wrote in his diary on hearing of the Syllabus.²⁹

3.

The Correspondant could say absolutely nothing about reconciling the Church with modern times just as long as these principles were condemned by Rome. Everything the Liberal Catholics had stood for since the formation of the party in 1854 had been censured

24. Lecanuet, R.P., Montalembert, V. 2, p. 384.

25. Broglie, A. de, Memoires, p. 131.

26. Ibid., p. 130.

27. Pange, J. de, op. cit., p. 132.

28. Ibid., p. 132.

29. Branchereau, L., editor, Journal Intime de Monseigneur Dupanloup, Pierre Tequi, Paris, 1928, p. 259.

in the Syllabus of Errors. If Catholic liberalism was to be kept alive in France something would have to be done about that document. The bishop of Orleans undertook to write a commentary on the encyclical in such a way that would dispose of the antagonism between the Syllabus and the principles of Liberal Catholicism. The resultant brochure - La convention du 15 septembre et l'encyclique du 8 décembre - came close to being the greatest coup in French ecclesiastical history.

Dupanloup's interpretation of the Syllabus was joined to an attack on Louis Napoleon's Italian policy. (By the Convention of September 15 the emperor had agreed to the eventual evacuation of French troops from Rome.) This was a "clever tactical device", as Bury has quite rightly remarked "to unite the Roman question in which he took the offensive with the Syllabus on which he maintained the defensive."³⁰ Dupanloup's commentary on the Syllabus reposed on the distinction he drew between thèse and hypothèse. The Church, he argued, had certain absolute rights (thèse) which in actual practice required modification (hypothèse). "Ce qui pourrait être admissible en hypothèse sera souvent faux en thèse."³¹ Thus in theory the Church was intolerant of other religions but in practice it tolerated them - Jews and Protestants were allowed to celebrate their confessions even in Rome. Dupanloup went on to argue that the condemnation

30. Bury, J.B., *op. cit.*, p. 41.

31. Dupanloup, F., La Convention du 15 septembre et l'Encyclique du 8 décembre, Charles Douniol, Paris, 1865, p. 105.

of an erroneous proposition does not necessarily imply the affirmation of its converse.³³ (This was a very crucial point. The Syllabus had merely condemned negative propositions and it might have seemed logical to expect that the Church approved of the converse of these propositions when they were put in the affirmative sense.) With this interpretation Dupanloup concluded that "loin d'être un acte d'agression", the Syllabus was "un grand acte de defense."³⁴

His argument was logically sound given the frame of reference he had adopted. Where the Syllabus had stated as erroneous the proposition: "The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile and harmonize himself with progress, with liberalism, with modern civilization"; Dupanloup answered that "dans ce nom si vaguement complexe de civilisation moderne, il ya du bon, de l'indifferente, et il y a aussi du mauvais."³⁵ The Church, he maintained could accept what was good in society and continue to oppose what was indifferent or evil.³⁶

The publication of Dupanloup's brochure was a momentous event in the Roman Catholic world; the popularity of his commentary testifies to the very real consternation the Syllabus had caused. The first edition of the pamphlet was gone in two hours.

33. Ibid., p. 101.

34. Ibid., p. 104.

35. Ibid., p. 104.

36. Ibid., p. 104.

By February 1865, 85,000 copies were sold,³⁷ 100,000 two weeks later.³⁸ "Je n'ai de ma vie vu effet pareil", recollected de Broglie. "La société qui ne respirait plus ^{eut} un soulagement comme un homme sur le point d'étouffer à qui on aurait coupé le corde qui lui serait la gorge."³⁹ From Rome, Odo Russell reported that Dupanloup's pamphlet "is thought a masterly production by the Catholic Embassies ...".⁴⁰ "On respire et le vent a tourné...", remarked Augustin Cochin.⁴¹ Werner de Merode, the Pope's Minister of Arms, wrote that: "Chacun s'aborde en se réjouissant de pouvoir concilier ainsi l'obéissance au Saint-Père et la faculté de vivre en paix avec les lois et les coutumes françaises."⁴² Three hundred and thirty eight bishops from the Roman Catholic world complimented Dupanloup for his brochure. Even prelates noted for their anti-liberalism - Mgr. Sergent, Mgr. de Boullerie and Mgr. de Montpellier "le très anti-libéral évêque de Liège" -- applauded the pamphlet.⁴³ Orleans had shown the Church's detractors that the Pope was not inalterably opposed to progress and civilization.

37. Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup et le syllabus", p. 472.

38. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 257.

39. Broglie, A. de., Mémoires, p. 136.

40. Blakiston, N., op. cit., p. 306.

41. Cochin, H., op. cit., V. 2, p. 63.

42. Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup et le Syllabus", p. 476.

43. Ibid., p. 868.

Although the Liberal Catholics were pleased with the commentary, their fears were far from being allayed. Albert de Broglie might very well argue that Dupanloup's interpretation made the encyclical into "le document le plus inoffensif" but his optimism was not shared by his colleagues.⁴⁴ Even while he was writing his commentary Bishop Dupanloup confided to his diary that the Syllabus could not be explained away - "bien difficile, peut-être impossible".⁴⁵ Cochin, who assisted him in the composition of the brochure, wrote as late as February 1865, that "tout ce que je lis, y compris ce que j'écris ne me paraît qu'une série de subtilités."⁴⁶ And Montalembert who was most directly concerned with the Syllabus, could derive no consolation from Orlean's commentary. "Je n'y puis voir qu'un subterfuge très éloquent."⁴⁷ "Je suis blessé jusqu'au fond de l'âme", he wrote, "par une doctrine au'aucune subterfuge, quelque éloquent qu'il soit, ne peut rendre acceptable pour ma conscience."⁴⁸ Orlean's apologetic might have appeared successful in the Catholic world in general, but among the Liberal Catholics his success was a qualified one. What was needed was a complimentary brief from

44. Broglie, A. de., Memoires, p. 133.

45. Branchereau, L., op. cit., p. 259. On 8 January Dupanloup wrote in his diary that: "Je veux tout faire, tout enlever, en un clin d'oeil. Impossible. J'en perds la paix, la vie intérieure, la lumière, l'inspiration... Ce n'est plus du tout la volonté de Dieu, ni l'oeuvre de Dieu". Branchereau, L., op. cit., p. 259.

46. Cochin, H., op. cit., V. 2, p. 61.

47. Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup et le Syllabus", p. 477.

48. Ibid., p. 478.

Pius IX; a letter that, as Cochin later put it, would prove that the Pope was not against them - "que le Saint Père a pu et voulu triompher de tous les ressentiments qui l'avaient jusqu'ici presque emporté sur la justice."⁴⁹

4.

At the same time he sent his pamphlet to Rome, Bishop Dupanloup instructed his friends there to attempt to obtain a complimentary papal brief for the brochure.⁵⁰ A French bishop, Mgr. Place, acted on Orlean's behalf in this matter. He seems to have been successful and Mgr. Mercurelli of the Curia composed a favourable draft for the Pope's consideration.⁵¹ Pius IX, it appears, was prepared to accept Mercurelli's version when Louis Veuillot intervened in the process.⁵²

Louis Veuillot, the arch-enemy of Liberal Catholicism, happened to be in Rome at this very time. He had received a copy of Dupanloup's pamphlet from Mgr. de Merode⁵³ and found it to be "ridicule et même bête et même odieux."⁵⁴ The man who had regarded the Syllabus as something of a personal triumph could not abide the thought that Orleans would be congratulated for having rendered it inoffensive.⁵⁵ He saw through the subterfuge of Bishop Dupanloup and

49. Ibid., p. 856.

50. Ibid., p. 499.

51. Ibid., p. 853.

52. Ibid., p. 853.

53. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 8, p. 211.

54. Ibid., p. 211. 55. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 8, p. 211.

made it a point to illustrate the weakness in the document to members of the Curia. "J'ai vu clair tout de suite, et j'ai hautement dit partout et très haut toute ma pensée."⁵⁶ Veillot let it be known in Rome that Orleans "réleverait le drapeau du catholicisme libéral; qu'on y verrait un désaveu de la parole du Saint-Père."⁵⁷ By February Veillot could write: "Je livre une guerre acharnée à Félix [Felix Dupanloup]. Je me trémousse, je cours, je vois celui-ci, celui-là, cet autre."⁵⁸ He composed some notes that illustrated the weakness of Orlean's commentary. On the 1st of February, through the intermediary of Mgr. Bernardi, they were in the hands of the Pope.⁵⁹ And the Pope asked Mercurelli to prepare a different letter of approbation for Bishop Dupanloup.

Before the new letter was drafted, Louis Veillot attempted to insure that Dupanloup would receive no approbation whatever from Rome. On 7 February he sent Mgr. Bernardi an article from the newspaper la France. The France had been enthusiastic about Orlean's pamphlet, but la France was a Gallican newspaper! Veillot remarked that: "Je crois qu'on y trouve la vraie signification et la vraie but de la fameuse brochure."⁶¹ He was implying that any

56. Ibid., p. 213.

57. Ibid., p. 213.

58. Ibid., p. 214.

59. Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup et le Syllabus", op. cit., p. 853. "J'ai fait une note où tous les points sont marqués et que les mains les plus sûres ont porté sous les yeux les plus clairvoyants", wrote Veillot. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 8, p. 214.

60. Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup et le Syllabus", p. 88.

61. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 8, p. 217.

interpretation of the Syllabus in Dupanloup's sense would weaken the Church's defense against the inroads of Gallicanism. But he must have known that at this particular moment the Liberal Catholics and the Gallicans hated each other. He then went on to remind Mgr. Bernardi that the brochure bore the mark of the Correspondant, "la tendance du Correspondant", and that it attempted to cover up "les erreurs sur l'Eglise qui sont le péché propre du catholicisme libéral."

62

Veillot representations were highly successful.^{62a}

On 21 March Bishop Place informed Dupanloup that:

Le P. de Villefort...m'a fait la communication suivante. "La première impression produite sur le Saint-Père par la lecture de votre écrit était excellent et la satisfaction sans aucune restriction, c'est là du reste ce que j'ai recueilli de tout part. M. Veillot est alors intervenu éconduit sévèrement par le cardinal Antonelli, il s'est alors retourné vers Mgr. Bernardi, et vers Mgr. Mercurelli; le premier a épousé ses idées; le second a pu en être impressionné mais nullement dominé."⁶³

Bernardi's influence seems to have been enough to convince Pius IX that the original complimentary brief drafted by Mgr. Mercurelli should be modified.⁶⁴ Orleans would be complimented, but there

62. Ibid., p. 217.

62.a It was at this time that Father Debeavoir wrote Dupanloup that: "M. Veillot a vraiment ici une position étrange. Une importance curieuse s'est attaché à son nom. Les cardinaux le reçoivent avec distinction; les prélats le reçoivent, l'entourent, le consultent... Le Pape l'aime et tout ce qui entoure le Pape, et c'est la misère! Si j'osais de dirais la honte." Aubert, R. "Monseigneur Dupanloup...", p. 896.

63. Ibid., p. 295.

64. Ibid., p. 895.

would be some reservations in the brief. Veillot was informed by Mgr. Bernardi that Dupanloup could not display the complimentary brief because it would contain a left-handed compliment.⁶⁵

On ajoute [Veillot wrote his sister on 20 February] et voilà le chicotin que l'on sait très bien que lorsqu'il jugera bon d'expliquer l'Encyclique à son troupeau, il s'appliquera à le faire avec plus de soins comme il convient lorsqu'il s'agit de parole du Saint-Père.⁶⁶

Veillot was correct. The Pope terminated his compliments to Orleans with what appears to be an admonition. He expressed his hope that the bishop of Orleans in any further explanation of the Syllabus would speak more doctrinely than he had previously, "d'autant plus dans le sens vrai de cet acte qu'il en a réfuté avec plus d'énergie les interprétations erronées."⁶⁷ Moreover it was that part of Dupanloup's brochure that dealt with the Convention of 15 September that received the Pope's warmest enthusiasm.

65. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 8, p. 226.

66. Ibid., p. 226. On 25 March, Bishop Place wrote Dupanloup that: "J'acquis aujourd'hui la certitude que les mots studiosius atque accuratius avaient été proposés et très ardemment patronnés par Mgr. Bernardi agissant d'accord avec Veillot ou sous sa influence." Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup...", op. cit., p. 898. A photograph of the original document is contained in appendix P. to volume I., of Fernessol's Pie IX. The last sentence of the brief reads: Pro certo habentes te, pro zelo quo religionis et veritatis causam teuri soles, ea studiosius atque accuratius traditurum esse populo tuo germanum Nostrarum litterarum sententiam, auo vehementius calumniosas intertationes lis affictas explososti...". Fernessole, P., Pie IX, P. Lethellieux, Paris, 1960, V. 1, p. 272.

67. Lagrange, F., op. cit., V. 2, p. 475.

Veillot was satisfied with what he had accomplished at Rome. "Il est positif que j'ai opprimé Félix [Dupanloup] et je m'en réjouis."⁶⁸ He realized that the document Dupanloup would receive was more of a liability than an asset to the liberal cause and that Orleans would be in no hurry to show it to others.⁶⁹ Veillot did this for him. On 14 April he dispatched a copy of the letter to his sister Elise in Paris and asked her to publicize it. "J'espère que...vous ne négligerez pas de faire courir votre traduction du bref."⁷⁰ He wanted to insure that the proviso he had added would not be glossed over by those who did not understand latin.⁷¹

68. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 8, p. 230. Veillot was correct; he had severely damaged Dupanloup in this conflict. It is illuminating to compare the Pope's reaction to Dupanloup's pamphlet before and after the intervention of Louis Veillot. Professor Aubert in his pièces annexes has included this "lettre d'un secrétaire de Dupanloup contenant la copie de divers temoignanges en provenance de Rome." This document describes the Pope's reaction before 1 February, that is before Veillots intervention. "Mgr. Mercurelli m'a dit que dans sa dernière audience, il avait trouvé le Pape ayant la brochure de l'évêque d'Orleans à la main; et la première parole du Pape a été pour lui exprimer son admiration sans réserve aucune en même temps son regret d'avoir été empêché de la terminer par suite des accablements, mais le Saint-Père a fait soigneusement une corne à la page où il en était pour reprendre après le départ de Mgr. Mercurelli. Le concert d'approbations complète, absolue qui part du Saint-Père et se continue avec le cardinal Antonelli et tout ce que je connais de cardinaux, de prélats de l'étranger n'est combattues que par M. Veillot et quelques uns de ses amis. Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup..." p. 901. Compare this account with Odo Russell's description of his audience with Pius IX on 13 February, after the intervention of Louis Veillot. "I told the Pope," writes Russell, "that I had carefully studied that document [the Syllabus] and had also read Mgr. Dupanloup's pamphlet on the subject, but that I honestly confessed I could not reconcile the original text with the Bishop of Orleans commentary and I therefore humbly begged his Holiness to tell me whether I might consider the Bishop's interpretation of the original text as correct. He replied that no one had a right to interpret the Pope's words, the plain

In all fairness it must be remarked that he saw nothing malicious in this. He believed that the Liberal Catholics were heretics - "ces Athanases du temps"⁷² - and that in weakening the Syllabus they were denying themselves the truth. "Les catholiques", he wrote, "qui donnent de l'Encyclique une explication equivalent a un refus refusent la grande grâce de la lumière."⁷³

Still there is something uncharitable in what he did to Dupanloup at Rome. The Liberal Catholics were on their knees after the Syllabus; a complimentary brief might have made the movement respectable again. One can understand Veillot's apprehensions in this matter, and appreciate why he did everything in his power to see that such a document would not be forthcoming. But that he would advise his sister to publicize a letter that he more than anyone had rendered insulting must only attest to the hatred he felt for the Liberal Catholics.

meaning of which could be seen in the original texts of the documents, pastorals and encyclicals to which the Syllabus referred." Blakiston, N., *op. cit.*, p. 397.

69. Veillot, L., *O.C.*, V. 8, p. 240.

70. *Ibid.*, p. 243.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 243.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 273.

73. *Ibid.*, p. 260.

CHAPTER SIX

THE "LIBERAL ILLUSION"

1.

Political liberalism implies a high degree of optimism, a confidence in the ability of men to govern themselves with a minimum of direction. It was derived from the 18th century Enlightenment and represented an aspect of the idea of progress, a belief that men were not inherently evil. Christian liberalism, although it embraces the concept of original sin, does accept the notion of political liberty, religious toleration and freedom of conscience-concepts that also repose on an optimistic view of mankind. These ideas formed the credo of the French Liberal Catholics and they were enshrined in two documents - Montalembert's Interêts catholiques au dix-neuvième siècle (1852) and also in his manifesto of Malines: L'Eglise libre dans l'état libre (1863). They were also implied in Bishop Dupanloup's commentary on the Syllabus which argued that since men and society were not by definition evil, the Church, without danger to itself, could be reconciled to the modern age.

Louis Veillot was greatly troubled by these ideas, and in 1866 he undertook to destroy the foundations of Christian Liberalism, in a pamphlet entitled l'Illusion libérale. The French Ultramontane celebrity had been asked in 1861, to collaborate in the formulation of

what eventually became the Syllabus of Errors. He had, according to Mr. Hales, submitted a draft of modern errors to Pius IX. Veillot kept these notes and he used them in 1866 for the Illusion liberale.¹ "J'avais le coeur gros sur ce chapitre [i. e. the Syllabus], je me suis degonflé...", he wrote on 11 March 1866.² This pamphlet then is both a commentary on the Syllabus as well as an attack on the Liberal Catholics. It is Veillot's own profession de foi and it is also the most complete description of the Ultramontane views he represented.

Veillot began his attack by challenging the belief that men are capable of determining their own destiny. "Affaiblie par le pêché", he wrote, "l'humanite pench naturellement à l'erreur...".³ Liberalism, which respected the ability of men to make their own judgements, was an error of the rich.⁴ Those who lived among the people could see that men were incapable of arriving at any truth by themselves.⁵ The confidence the Liberal Catholics had placed in modern democratic institutions, he argued, was misplaced. The Church, he allowed, might very well be a weak institution but to accommodate it to modern conditions would make it even weaker.⁶ He compared the role of the French Liberal Catholics to that of Satin who

-
1. Veillot, F., Louis Veillot, V. 3, p. 500. See p. 72, note 5.
 2. Veillot, L., O.C. V. 9, p. 9.
 3. Ibid., V. 10, p. 318.
 4. Ibid., p. 357.
 5. Ibid., p. 357.
 6. Ibid., p. 330.

from the top of a mountain tempted the Lord with new kingdoms.

"Le libéralisme renouvelle cette scene; l'Eglise est pauvre, elle a faim, que l'Eglise soit libérale, elle sera riche...".⁷

Using a favourite expression Veillot argued that two forces, Revolution and Revelation, were struggling for the souls of men.

"Ces deux puissances se nient reciproquement, voilà le fond des choses."⁸ A third force existed between these two extremes. "Il pretend tenir des deux autres et se croit de force à les concilier."⁹

The Liberal Catholics were this force and their position, according to Veillot, was a hopeless one. "Par cela même que le Tiers-Parti adopte la Révolution, il nie le Christianisme, dont la Revolution est la contradiction absolue et la négation formelle."¹⁰ Outside of heresy

Veillot saw no way in which the Church could accommodate the liberal principles of the French Revolution. Men could either be "libéraux pénitents" or "catholiques impénitents", but not both.¹¹ He accused the liberals of attempting to reconcile good and evil,¹² and reduced their religious toleration to religious indifference. Their so-called justice was simply a means of holding Luther, Mahomet, Joe Smith, God in equilibrium.¹³ "Jésus ne veut point d'un pareil équilibre: 'Qui n'est pas pour moi est contre moi.'"¹⁴ Given this attitude

7. Ibid., p. 330.

8. Ibid., p. 339.

9. Ibid., p. 339.

10. Ibid., p. 339.

11. Ibid., p. 335.

13. Ibid., p. 332.

12. Ibid., p. 335.

14. Ibid., p. 332.

Veillot could only conclude that the Liberal Catholics were heretics. "Il [the Liberal Catholic] porte un caractère plus connu, et tous ses traits font également reconnaître un personnage trop fréquent dans l'histoire de l'Eglise, SECTAIRE, voilà son vrai nom."¹⁵

Where Catholic liberalism was characterized by a flexible and conciliatory attitude in Church-State relations, Veillot opposed the idea of authority and force. Deists, atheists, and agnostics could not, he proposed, be destroyed by a religion "commode" and "tolérante"; a "contradiction absolue" was necessary.¹⁶ "Si l'esprit d'obéissance ne nous garde pas, nous sommes pris."¹⁷ This obéissance was owed by all Catholics to the Church - the sole repository of truth.

"Si cette obéissance est la théocratie, ceux qui en ont peur sincèrement n'ont pas assez peur d'autre chose."¹⁸ Veillot did not shrink from mentioning theocracy - a return to the privileged Church of the Middle Ages. He positively favoured such a development. "Il faudra reconstruire l'édifice sociale suivant les règles éternelles..."¹⁹ He envisaged a government benevolent to the Church, one that would

15. Ibid., p. 320.

16. Ibid., p. 321.

17. Ibid., p. 321.

18. Ibid., p. 327.

19. Ibid., p. 347.

impose religious observation on all citizens.²⁰ "Ceux que cette loi pourrait gêner seront gênés."²¹ A measure of toleration could be extended to Jews and free thinkers who would be allowed to celebrate their confessions incognito on Saturdays and Mondays.²²

He then went on to defend the use of force as an instrument for insuring religious practice on the unwilling. "La force aux mains de l'Eglise est la force du droit, et nous ne voulons pas que le droit demeure sans force."²³ In this society the Church would receive privileges by right and not under the laws of the constitution as the Liberal Catholics demanded. This led him to attack Montalembert's concept of a free church in a free state. "Chercher dans les libertés politiques la base de celles de la religion? Ce serait assésoir l'immuable sur le mouvant."²⁴ The Church, he contended, was superior to society. "L'Eglise a une constitution divine, elle vit de son droit propre... et non de privilège."²⁵ The Church had not to ask to the State for guarantees; the opposite was true. "Elle [the Church] ne reçoit pas de privilèges celle en accorde."²⁶ Where the Liberal Catholics accepted the separation between Church and State, Veillot proposed a monistic society under the direction of the former

20. Ibid., p. 347.

21. Ibid., p. 347.

22. Ibid., p. 347.

23. Ibid., p. 334.

24. Ibid., p. 342.

25. Ibid., p. 340.

26. Ibid., p. 341.

27. Ibid., p. 348. "En effet l'Eglise a une constitution divine, elle vit de son droit propre, et non de privilège. Qui donc lui aurait accordé

The most important role in this society was reserved for the Pope. "Il faut se serrer autour du Souverain Pontiffe, suivre inébranlablement ses directions inspirées...".²⁸ He spared no praise in his encomium of Pius IX and theological exaggerations abound in his thinking. "Jésus Christ est le roi de monde, il parle au monde par son Prêtre, et les décrets de ce Prêtre, étant l'expression des droits royaux de Jésus-Christ sont éternnels."²⁹ "Saisis du trouble affreux de ce temps nous ne savons tres certainement qu'une chose: c'est que nul homme ne sait rien, excepte l'homme avec qui Dieu est pour toujours, l'homme qui porte la pensée de Dieu."³⁰ "Si l'hérésie déborde, il n'y a qu'un refuge: c'est la Pierre. Tu es Petrus...".³¹

Four years before the Vatican Council Veuillot proclaimed that the judgements of Pius IX were infallible,³² and as such commanded the obedience of all Roman Catholics.³³

This consideration of the papacy gave him an opportunity to treat of those Catholics who interpreted papal documents. There seems no doubt that what he had in mind was Dupanloup's commentary

un privilège qui ne lui appartient pas de nature? l'Etat? Mais alors la société civile est donc supérieure à la société religieuse et peut légitimement lui reprendre ce qu'elle lui a bénévolement octroyé...". "L'Eglise n'a pas été faite, par l'Etat; c'est elle au contraire qui a fait l'Etat et la société...".

28. Ibid., p. 358.

29. Ibid., p. 324.

30. Ibid., p. 358.

31. Ibid., p. 323.

32. Ibid., p. 360, 325.

33. Ibid., p. 358.

on the Syllabus of Errors. "Quand le Souverain Pontife a proclamé une décision pastorale nul n'a le droit d'y ajouter ou d'en retrancher la moindre voyelle, non addere, non minuere. Ce qu'il affirme, c'est le vrai pour toujours."³⁴ The Liberal Catholics, according to Veillot, had commented on and interpreted the encyclical in a manner that reduced it to peu de choses."³⁵ But, he concluded, these subterfuges had not won any support for their cause because everyone could see through their specious arguments. "Jusqu'ici la chapelle libérale manque d'entrée et semble n'être qu'une porte de sortie de la grande église."³⁶

The Illusion libérale recapitulates all of the characteristics of the French Ultramontane movement: the appeal to order and authority, the exaggerated role of the papacy in the government of men, the justification of force as an instrument of the Church, the superior role of the Church in its relations with the State, the notion that the Church owes its privileges to right and not to concessions, the distrust of political freedom, the suspicion that men, through the use of their own intellect, are unable to arrive at any truths, the almost Jansenist pessimism born out of a heightened awareness of original sin. Everything is here. The pamphlet appeared in April, 1866,

34. Ibid., p. 358.

35. Ibid., p. 328.

36. Ibid., p. 350.

and by May Veillot could write that 6,000 copies had been sold.³⁷

It seems to have been very well received both in France and in Rome. Pius IX in the course of an audience accorded to P. Picirillo is reported to have said: "Je suis très content de cet écrit. Louis Veillot a exprimé toutes mes idées, car ce sont absolument mes idées... il les a exprimées parfaitement...".³⁸

2.

Veillot expected that the Liberal Catholics would refute his attack; he contrived that they would. "Je m'arrangerais d'être attaqué parce que je crois que j'aurais à répondre et que je pourrais les serrer de plus près," he wrote Cardinal Pitra.⁴⁰ Any attempt on the part of the liberals to defend their principles would provide him with a pretext to attack the movement again, and perhaps destroy it.

He was most perturbed when no reply was forthcoming. "Les

38. *Ibid.*, V. 10, p. xi.

40. *Ibid.*, V. 9, p. 13. But count d'Esgriny wrote Veillot that: "Je tiens de l'abbé Sauvé que deux évêques ont délicatement coupé dans l'illusion libérale deux ou trois propositions inexactes (à leur avis) et les ont envoyées à la congrégation de l'index sans dire d'ou elles étaient tirées et en demandaient la condamnation." Veillot, E., *Louis Veillot, op. cit.*, V. 3, p. 502. This is likely what Veillot meant by "dogmatiser" in the letter cited above. The propositions condemned may have been those dealing with the papal prerogative - they were later condemned by Dupanloup in an *Avertissement à M. Louis Veillot*. On 25 June, Veillot wrote that: "Quant aux docteurs de théologie qui disent que l'écrit ne porte pas [likely a reference to the two bishops], cela dépend des docteurs et de la théologie: à Rome on a trouvé que la chose portait". Veillot, L., *O.C.*, V. 9, p. 53. This reaction seems to be substantiated by the fact that Pius IX had already read these arguments before and was prepared to use them for the basis of what became the Syllabus. See p. 71 above.

libéraux veulent bien dogmatiser mais non pas discuter," he complained on May 31.⁴¹ By the end of June there was still no answer. "Il [the Correspondant] a gardé le silence," complained Veillot, "Je crois qu'il eût réclamé si'il l'avait pu faire sans se retracter ou sans se compromettre."⁴²

On this count Veillot was correct; the Correspondant would have answered if it could have done so without compromising itself. That it did not attempt a defense against a pamphlet that had blatantly equated Catholic liberalism with heresy testifies to the lack of confidence on the part of the Liberal Catholics. The movement had been broken by the Syllabus of Errors; it was never to recover. Its principles had been condemned by Rome and any hope of papal sanction for its cause was non existant. It is true that the commentary of the Bishop of Orleans had saved the movement from outright extinction, but it has been seen that the leaders of the party considered the brochure, brilliant as it was, as nothing more than subterfuge. A complimentary letter from Pius IX might, by officially sanctioning the Liberal Catholic interpretation of the Syllabus, have restored confidence in the movement. But Louis Veillot had seen to it that the liberals did not get that kind of document. It is not surprising then that the Correspondant feared to criticize a brochure which, in spite of its violence, seemed to be sanctioned by Rome. Where else could Veillot find justification for his eulogy of religious intolerance, coercion, force,

41. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 9, p. 23.

42. Ibid., p. 53.

and theocracy but in propositions 77-80 of the Syllabus of Errors?

The Liberal Catholic movement was almost destroyed in 1865 and it is necessary to make this clear. The historians of the school, Lecanuet and Lagrange notably, do not sufficiently acknowledge this. In the post 1865 polemics they compare the violence of Louis Veuillot with the diplomacy and tact of the liberals. But the fact that the Correspondant would not publicly engage in religious polemics does not testify to a greater civility on the part of the men who wrote in that journal as these historians suggest. The Liberal Catholics appeared tolerant and tactful because they were very definitely on the defensive.⁴³ They had no other choice but to be meek. Veuillot could be aggressive because he felt with justification that he had carte blanche from Rome to write what he liked.

In his Mémoires the duc de Broglie recollected that:

Il était clair que la ligne de conduite que nous suivions, sans être précisément censurée, n'avait pas l'approbation du chef de l'Eglise. Nous ne pouvions avoir la prétention de prendre à sa place, et contrairement à ses désirs ouvertement exprimés, la tête du mouvement catholique.^{43a}

It was his opinion that the Correspondant should abstain from "toute

43. The Correspondant was now suspect to many Roman Catholics. Bishops Pie and Doney even threatened to outlaw its distribution in their diocese. Brugerette, J., op. cit., V. 2, p. 219.

43a. Broglie, A. de, Mémoires, p. 125.

polemique sur les points controversés", and remain simply "une revue morale, littéraire et politique."⁴⁴ He threatened to resign from the journal if this advice was not followed.⁴⁵ "Il était évident", he continues, "que vous aviez affaire à Rome à un entourage du Pape pris parmi nos adversaires les plus acharnés, qui ne songeait qu'à nous prendre en faute...".⁴⁷ The advice of Alfred de Broglie was followed. The heroic age of the Correspondant was now over. "L'âge héroïque était passé, le Correspondant cessait d'être une oeuvre" suivant le mot de M. Foisset, pour devenir une grande revue."⁴⁸ Only Montalembert opposed this new attitude; Dupanloup,⁴⁹ Cochin,⁵⁰ and de Falloux⁵¹ were for a more cautious policy.

It is clear from de Broglie's memoirs that after the publication of the Syllabus the French Liberal Catholic party was without self confidence. Veillot's Illusion libérale went unchallenged. This was the first sign of the cautious policy that would henceforth characterize the movement. Not until 1868 did the two schools join issue in a question of religious polemic, and even then the Correspondant would enter the arena in an act of desperation. In the interval Louis Veillot himself seems to have ignored the Liberal Catholics, perhaps because he sensed that after the Syllabus they were no longer a danger. Both

44. Ibid., p. 135.

45. Ibid., p. 134.

46. Broglie, A. de., Mémoires, p. 134.

47. Ibid., p. 138.

48. Pange, J. de., op. cit., p. 135.

49. Lagrange, F., op. cit., V. 2, p. 124.

50. Broglie, A. de., Mémoires, p. 134.

51. Lecanuet, R.P., op. cit., V. 3, p. 438.

schools diverted their energies to an eloquent defense of the temporal power in its struggle with the Italian nationalists. Veillot even attempted a reconciliation with Montalembert, the liberal leader, and threw his support behind him and de Falloux in the election of 1867.⁵² But the principles that separated the two schools would not, in Veillot's mind, admit of compromise. These differences were unfortunate for French Catholics because it led them to take divergent views in the most important religious event of the century. In June 1867 Pius IX announced that for the first time in over 300 years the bishops of the Catholic world would meet in solemn conclave in Rome.

52. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 27, p. 335. Veillot's sincerity in this matter cannot be questioned; his personal correspondance gives ample proof of the fact that he sincerely wanted a reconciliation. On 8 April 1867 he asked a certain M. de Jansande to review Montalembert's Moines d'Occident for the Univers. "Je tiens surtout à l'éloge de l'ouvrier. Si vous voulez faire quelques réserves, il suffit qu'elle soient indiquées par un voile." O.C., V. 27, p. 240. But he found it difficult to reconcile himself with the principles of Liberal Catholicism. On 16 December, 1866, he wrote Mgr Mermillod: "Oui, c'est toujours le moment de se réunir... Mais où se réunir Monseigneur, et qui marquera le terrain: S'il n'y avait pas que des difficultés de personnes... Mais la question de doctrine, qu'avons nous à faire et que pouvons-nous faire là-dessus." V. 27, p. 131. Veillot was acutely aware of principles. In December 1867, he wrote Mgr. Chigi, the Nuncio Apostolique, that "la ligne de l'Univers contraire leur politique de conciliation entre le vrai et la faux." O.C., V. 27, p. 335.

THIRD PART

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE VATICAN COUNCIL

1.

In June 1867 Pius IX announced to 500 bishops who had gathered in Rome for the 18th centenary of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul that a council of the Church would be held in the near future. On June 5, 1867, Bishop Dupanloup, who had been in Rome, wrote Montalembert of this "nouvelle, mais bonne et grande."¹ "Il faut bénir Dieu" he said, "car c'est ici une inspiration tout à fait inattendue, et d'une portée incalculable."² Informed of the forthcoming Council Montalembert wrote Leon Cornudet this very revealing letter:

J'ai en ces temps - ci par l'évêque d'Orléans...des nouvelles bien consolantes...sur ce coup d'état providentiel que...a substitué aux extravagances que nous redoutions il y a quelques mois, la convocation d'un Concile, c'est-à-dire l'événement le plus propre à confondre les exagérations fanatiques et courtoisanesques dont l'ultramontanisme contemporain a été si prodigue. Les catholiques libéraux et parlementaires...ne peuvent que se réjouir d'une issue si heureuse et si imprévue.³

Montalembert would regret this optimism one day, but for the time being he like Dupanloup was of the opinion that the Council would be favourable to the cause of Liberal Catholicism. This view seems to have been shared by his colleagues. The comte de Falloux wrote in

1. Lagrange, F., Lettres Choisies de Mgr. Dupanloup, V.2, p. 197.

2. Ibid., p. 197.

3. Cornudet, L., ed., Correspondence de Montalembert et de Leon

his memoirs that at the first news of the Council, "le Correspondant" stimulé par l'évêque d'Orléans se montra plein de confiance et de joie."^{3a}

In view of what subsequently took place at Rome this optimism appears almost inconceivable. If, as de Broglie wrote in his memoirs, the Liberal Catholics were suspicious and fearful of the Pope ever since the Syllabus, why did they rejoice in the news of a Council over which he would preside?^{3b} A diary entry by Montalembert indicates that the reason for this confidence is to be found in the hope that the Council, because of its universal character, would take the affairs of the Church out of the hands of the conservative Roman Curia.

Il y'aura discussion, il y'aura opposition; des voix éloquentes se feront entendre pour exposer les besoins des sociétés modernes, pour défendre et revendiquer les libertés nécessaires.⁴

He was of the opinion that the proceedings of the Council would be conducted in a free and open manner with bishops from all parts of the world given the opportunity to reform the Church. This opinion was also expressed by the bishop of Orleans. A diary entry by Bishop Dupanloup of August 1867, reads: "Le Concile. Grande invitation à un renouvellement de l'esprit sacerdotal, du zèle du dévouement-Souffle

Cornudet, Librairie Honore Champion, Paris, 1905, p. 355.

3a. Falloux, A. de, Mémoires d'un Royalist, Perrin et Cie, Paris, 1888, V. 2, p. 418.

3b. See p. 98 above.

4. Lecanuet, R. P., Montalembert, V. 3, p. 431.

nouveau.⁵ (*Italics added*). In September of the same year de Falloux told the Malines Congress that the Council would see "la discussion la plus vaste, la plus libre, sur les intérêts primordiaux de l'humanité tout entière."⁶ The Liberal Catholic devotee Madame de Forbin remarked in a letter that "cette réunion d'un concile.. pourra faire tant de bien...".⁷ The Gallican Bishop Maret, although separated from the liberals because of his support for the Empire, shared many of their views concerning the need of the Church to be reconciled with modern society. In July 1867 he wrote Louis Napoleon that: "Cette convocation pouvait seule nous donner la liberté d'aborder les grandes questions qui naissent de la situation des esprits et des choses, et de proposer des doctrines et les réformes...".⁸ A year later he told the Emperor that the Council would be able to conciliate the Church with modern civilization "par l'acceptation de tout ce qu'il y a de légitime et de nécessaire dans les institutions sociales des temps modernes."⁹

The Liberal Catholics then were hopeful that the forthcoming Council would vindicate their cause to the detriment of the Ultramontanes. They seem to have felt that the damage done by the Syllabus of Errors would be redressed once the bishops met at Rome. So as not to gainsay these expectations they agreed to remain silent until the

5. Branchereau, L., *op. cit.*, p. 291.

6. Falloux, A. de, *op. cit.*, V. 2, p. 413.

7. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin...(Documents inédits)", p. 64.

8. Bazin, G., *Vie de Mgr Maret*, V. 3, p. 28.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

opening of the conclave.¹⁰ A new condemnation of their principles at this particular moment could destroy the movement. Montalembert violently opposed this policy and tried to persuade the Bishop of Orleans to write a brochure showing how the Council would answer the needs of contemporary society.¹¹ Dupanloup, supported by the editorial staff of the Correspondant, refused this request. He argued that an open stand on the part of the Liberal Catholics would jeopardize their cause even before the Council began.¹² The comte de Falloux was even more explicit. He told Montalembert that if the liberals remained silent their patience would soon be rewarded - "sera bientôt récompensé par un des coups de lumière et de grâce qui illuminent tout l'histoire de l'Eglise."¹³ Their strategy is clear. Any Liberal Catholic proclamation now would be answered by Rome; but once the bishops of the Catholic world were united, the voice of Rome would be stifled by a liberal majority.

2.

In formulating their strategy the Liberal Catholics had apparently not counted on Louis Veillot. As early as November 1865, he was aware of the "terrible écroulement qui se prépare à Rome pour le chatiment du monde...".¹⁴ Veillot had been in Rome in June 1867 and like Dupanloup he was informed of the forthcoming Council. The news of that event put him "aux anges de la joie."¹⁵ He felt that the

10. Lagrange, F., Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup, V. 3, p. 124.

11. Lecanuet, R.P., op. cit., V. 3, p. 435. On 2 March 1867 Montalembert had written Dupanloup: "Je ne vous demande plus une oeuvre de

Council would spell the death of Liberal Catholicism. "L'Encyclique et le Syllabus seront glorifiées", he informed his brother.¹⁶ He seemed aware also of the hopes the Correspondant had in the Council. "Il [Dupanloup] dit que le concile ne fera rien. Ne crois jamais cela. L'Eglise ne fait pas un concile au bout de trois siècles, pour qu'il n'en sorte qu'une brochure Dupanloup."¹⁷ But unlike the liberals Veillot had a free hand to say whatever he liked about the convocation. In five articles which he dispatched to the Univers from Rome he gave his own interpretation of the calling of the Council - an interpretation that terrified the Liberal Catholics.

Where the liberals anticipated an event characterized by love and understanding - "un grand oeuvre de pacification et de lumière", Veillot saw something altogether different.^{17b} "La contre-révolution commence". The Council would be held "pour rasseoir la raison abandonnée du genre humaine."¹⁸ "Rome... prend officiellement en mains les

doctrine, de discussion, de longue haleine: vous n'en auriez ni la force ni la loisir. Je ne vous demande qu'un grand cri clamorum validum, comme dit Saint-Paul en parlant du dernier cri de Jésus-Christ sur le Calvaire."

12. Lagrange, F., op. cit., V. 3, p. 124.

13. Lecanuet, R.P., op. cit., V. 3, p. 438.

14. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 27, p. 105.

15. Ibid., p. 254.

16. Ibid., p. 251.

17. Ibid., p. 255. 17b. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cxxxiv, p. 203.

18. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 12, p. 12.

reines du monde."¹⁹ "Pie IX oeuvre sa bouche sacrée, et la grande parole, le Fiat lux va sortir de ses lèvres."²⁰ He ominously proclaimed that the Council "verra ... poser la pierre inébranlable de la reconstruction... C'est dans ce moment la que les entrailles engourdies de la terre s'emeuvent à la voix de Pontife, pour enfanter de nouveau la civilisation de la Croix."²¹

Veillot remarked that the Council would increase the Pope's prerogative - it would declare him infallible.²² He was here mentioning a subject that was taboo for the Liberal Catholics who if anything wanted a decrease in papal strength and a larger voice for the episcopate in Church affairs. Pius IX was, after all, the perpetrator of the Syllabus of Errors. Was he speaking infallibly here? For Louis Veillot, on the other hand, there were no words to describe the attributes of Pio Nono. "Pie IX agit comme ce saint à qui Dieu commande de passer la mer...".²³ "Jesus et Pierre sont vivants...".²⁴ "Je m'agenouillerais, je baiserais les pieds du Saint-Père...".²⁵ For the liberals the worst was yet to come. In the following year Veillot gave his own interpretation of the bull Aeterni patris that officially announced the Council.

19. Ibid., p. 7.

20. Ibid., p. 14.

21. Ibid., p. 14.

22. "On propose aux Catholiques", wrote Veillot, "de soutenir jusqu'à l'effusion de leur sang inclusive, la croyance à l'infailibilité de Pierre; il y a longtemps que j'ai fait ce vœu, et je le regarde comme un des vœux du baptême. On peut ne point le renouveler explicitement, mais je ne vois nul moyen d'être catholique sans l'accomplir".

3.

It had been a matter of great concern to the Liberal Catholics that the papal document that announced the Council should be worded very carefully. In the past Church councils had been called to deal with specific problems - the Council of Trent, for example, was called to deal with Protestantism - and the bull that announced the Council explicitly stated the errors that were to be condemned. If the Bull of Indication for the forthcoming Council should mention liberalism, modern civilization, or progress as one of the errors to which the bishops would address themselves then Catholic Liberalism would be seriously compromised. They could expect nothing from a Council that was called to condemn their principles even if the majority of bishops there were sympathetic to their cause. Bishop Dupanloup, accordingly, made it a point to write Mgr. Franchi of the Curia and asked that the bull be written in the most diplomatic and conciliatory language - "de manière à ne heurter personne."^{24a}

The bull Aeterni patris appeared in June 1868 and stated that a council of the Church would be held in Rome beginning on December 8, 1869.^{25a} Apart from making this specific point the document said almost nothing concerning the reasons for the convocation. It spoke

Ibid., p. 16.

23. Ibid., p. 13.

24. Ibid., p. 23.

25. Ibid., p. 17.

24.a Lagrange, F., Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup, V. 3, p. 110.

25.a Professor Bury saw something sinister in this date. "The 8th of

of the "evils with which civil society is afflicted", ^{26a} and of the "corrupt morals of the people", ^{27a} and remarked that the Church was shaken by a "fearful tempest", ^{28a} but beyond this it did not go. No particular error was singled out for condemnation nor was their a specific purpose set for the Council. "Never before in the annals of the Church", writes Bury, "had a Council been summoned for such indefinite reasons". ²⁹ Nothing in the document could be construed as an attack on the Liberal Catholics or their principles. "Elle le [Dupanloup] combla de joie". ³⁰

The "joy" of Bishop Dupanloup was abruptly ended when Louis Veillot undertook to read between the lines of this document and to interpret for his readers the Pope's real intentions. "En lisant la Bulle", he wrote his sister on 6 July, "j'ai vu tant de choses à dire...

Je voudrais vider le sac de mes amertumes et de mes indignations sur cette civilisation de la belle Hélène et faire fumer tout mon encens devant ce Pape, ce dernier roi, ce dernier père, ce dernier homme, qui porte si bravement la croix. ³¹

Veillot was incredibly moved by the official publication of the bull *Aeterni patris* and his letters in this period show how momentous that event was for him. "Nous entrons dans des temps véritablement nouveaux... Ce qui va se passer, quelqu'un l'a déjà vu: c'est Noé." ³²

December, 1869, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, was the date of the issue of the Syllabus. These deliberately designed chronological coincidences are an outward symbol of the close inner connexion of the three great acts of the pontificate of Pius IX". Bury, J.B., *op. cit.*, p. 57.

26a. Vaughan, H., *op. cit.*, p. 37.

27a. *Ibid.*, p. 36.

These sepulchral remarks are not confided to his private correspondence ~~and~~ but appeared in his article on the Bull of Indication as well.

L'Horizon du Genre Humaine was the foreboding title Veillot gave to this article. He contended that the Roman Catholic Church was standing in the dawn of a new era. For the first time in history the leaders of state had not been invited to attend a Church council. For Veillot this fact signalled the end of an epoch. "L'ordre sur lequel la

28a. Ibid., p. 37.

29. Bury, J. B., op. cit., p. 56.

30. Lagrange, F., Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup, V. 2, p. 112.

31. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 11.

32. Ibid., p. 9. On 26 June, 1868, he wrote: "Ainsi la bulle affichée le 29 Juin 1868 proclamera en effet que ce jour - là le moyen age a fini-Grosse, grosse date". O.C., V. 27, p. 401. He seems seriously to have believed that the Council would pass extreme measures in order to solve the problems of the day. On 26 July 1868 he wrote: "Tout ce que l'esprit de compromis suggere est embarrassant, et accablant... Comptez que hors la vérité integrale qui ne peut périr nous n'avons rien à sauver et nous ne sauverons rien. C'est ce que le prochain Concile nous appréhendra. L'esprit Saint dira aux hommes ce qu'il leur dit toujours, et particulièrement ceci: Qui n'amasse pas avec moi dissipe. L'écroulement de la société en sera la preuve, d'ailleurs déjà visible". O.C., V. 10, p. 18.

33. The bull ignored the custom of inviting the leaders of state to the Council. The reason being that Europe and the rest of the world were no longer constituted of Catholic states as in other epochs. It is not that the "sovereigns of Europe were more eager to go and applaud Hortense Schneider in Offenbach's Grand-duchesse of Gerolstein, than to visit Rome in order to venerate the head of the Christian world, and to receive lessons and counsel from the example of the Apostles and the Saints", as Professor Hayward has preposterously suggested. They simply were not invited to come. Hayward, F., The Vatican Council. A Short History, translated by the Earl of Wicklow, Clonmore and Reynolds, Dublin, 1951, p. 29.

société a vécu durant plus de dix siècles a cessé d'exister. Ce que l'on appelle le 'moyan age' est terminé.... Un autre ère commence."³⁴

Church and State were no longer one. The bull because it did not ask the representatives of the State to attend the Council, now admitted this fact. "L'âme et le corps ne sont plus unis."³⁵ Veillot knew that the Liberal Catholics championed such a separation and he disparagingly referred to them. "L'Eglise est présentment une âme sans corps."³⁶ "Même dans l'Eglise plusieurs en éprouvent une joie qu n'est pas selon la saggesse."³⁷ There was no longer any place for Catholics in a state not officially sanctioned by the Church. "Nous [Catholics] n'avons plus guère de place dans l'état. Que sommes-nous en France, nous autres catholiques? Peuples conquis purs et simples contribuables, rien autre chose."³⁸ The whole social order upon which the Church in France had reposed, had now crumbled away. "Voici que la matière sociale est rédevenue ce qu'elle était à l'aurore de Charlemagne."³⁹ L'ancien édifice a croulé."⁴⁰ "C'est l'entrée au désert où durant quarante années le peuple de Dieu doit errer...". As justification of this apocalyptic vision Veillot cited the severest passage to be found in Aeterni patris.^{41a}

But if civilization was crumbling away men had not to fear because a new society would soon replace the old. "Le ~~font~~ lux a retenti

34. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 12, p. 34.

35. Ibid., p. 34.

37. Ibid., p. 34.

39. Ibid., p. 34.

36. Ibid., p. 34.

38. Ibid., p. 40.

40. Ibid., p. 37.

une création va lentement sortir de cette mort...".⁴² "Pie IX élève la voix. Il entre dans sa dictature, il commande."⁴³ A new Christian society was about to be founded under the guidance of the Pope. The council would signal the first step in this reconstruction. "Les idées érrantes seront sévèrement rappelées au giron."⁴⁴

On entrevoit l'organisation chrétienne et catholique de la démocratie. Sur les débris des empires infidèles on voit renaître plus nombreuses la multitude des nations, égales entre elles, libres, formant une confédération universelle dans l'unité de la foi, sous la présidence du pontife romain également protégé et protecteur de tout le monde; un peuple saint comme il y eut un saint Empire. Et cette démocratie baptisée...abolira partout les idoles elle fera régner universellement le Christ et fiet unum ovile et unus pastor.⁴⁵

This article with its reference to the Pope's dictatorship, the antagonism between Church and State, the universal Catholic confederation, and its picture of a sinful society being replaced by something resembling the Holy Roman Empire, where idols would be extirpated and Jesus Christ would reign universally, was just the kind of thing the Liberal Catholics feared most of all. Aeterni patris, as they saw

41. Ibid., p. 39.

41a. Veillot cited the following passage from the bull: "Every effort must be made that by God's good help, all evils may be removed from the Church and from civil society; that unhappy wanderers may be brought back into the straight path of truth, justice and salvation, that vices and errors being taken away...". It is an indication of Veillot's intentions here that the part of the bull he chose to quote was immediately followed by this passage which he did not choose to mention: "For no man can deny that the power of the Catholic Church, and of her doctrine not only regards men's eternal salvation but also benefits the temporal welfare of the people; and that it promotes their true prosperity, order and tranquillity, and also the progress and solidity of human sciences." Vaughan, H., op. cit., p. 39.

it, meant none of these things. For them it was a document that could be reconciled to the needs of the modern age. But Veillot did not see it that way. He was now more intrepid than ever before. His letters in this period betray a tendency to view the events of the world in extremes.⁴⁶ He had little regard for what he honestly felt was an evil and unredeeming world. It would be unfair then to expect of him the same respect for what the liberals reverently called "la société moderne." The society Veillot was interested in was the one Pius IX would inaugurate in Rome in December 1869.

Then too Veillot could say what he liked while the Liberal Catholics could not. After his article on the bull, he was informed that the Pope had told Cardinal Nardi that it was a beautiful piece of work.⁴⁷ "Le pape a dit: E bello, bello, assai; e ne ha promesso degli altri." "Cela veut dire: 'Va de l'avant! Et je ne serai pas sourd."⁴⁸

42. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 12, p. 38.

43. Ibid., p. 38.

44. Ibid., p. 40.

45. Ibid., p. 41. In another article on 19 July Veillot wrote that the Council would take "des résolutions fortes et mures, telles que les réclame le péril de la société." Ibid., p. 43.

46. On 21 July 1868 he exhorted Madame Testas to love the Church. "Quant aux choses de ce monde, elles me paraissent absolument sans espoir. La civilisation périra sans remède, c'est le moins que l'on puisse attendre." O.C., V. 10, p. 17. On 3 January 1867 he told the abbé Delas that the world was "canaille et crapule au dernier point..." Ibid., p. 178.

47. Ibid., p. 19. In August 1868, Veillot wrote M. Prosper-Dagas that: "Le pape a été content de mon article sur le concile. Je le sais positivement." Ibid., p. 48.

48. Ibid., p. 21.

4.

Veillot's interpretation of Aeterni patris disconcerted the Liberal Catholics. The notion of a new universal confederation presided over by the Pope was especially repugnant to them. Bishop Dupanloup thought that it was a dangerous idea and that it justified those anti-clericals who argued that the Council would be a return to the middle ages.⁴⁹ Montalembert was similarly distressed. "Vous le voyez", he wrote Dupanloup citing this particular passage, "c'est toujours la même méthode sacrifier le possible à l'impossible."⁵⁰ And Theophile Foisset remarked that "ils [the Ultramontanes] ont dans la tête un Charlemagne chimerique, qui n'a jamais existé, jamais."⁵¹ The talk of the antagonism between Church and State and the catastrophes for the world that Veillot had envisaged were also badly taken.⁵²

Veillot's interpretation of the papal document put the liberals in a very delicate position. They had agreed to remain silent on religious questions until the Council opened. They knew that their views were suspect at Rome ever since the Syllabus of Errors and the last thing they wanted at this particular moment was yet another condemnation. But if they remained silent it would mean the triumph of

49. Lagrange, F., Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup, V. 3, p. 115.

50. Ibid., p. 115.

51. Ibid., p. 115.

52. Ibid., p. 114.

the conservative interpretation that Veuillot had given to the Bull of Indication. Somehow the liberals must challenge that view, and at the same time not compromise their cause. The situation demanded great tact and diplomacy.

At first the Liberal Catholics did nothing. Montalembert was angered; he mistook their reticence for cowardice - "je vous trouve tous d'une sagesse d'une prudence et pour tout dire, d'une froideur qui me déconcerte", he remarked on October 27,⁵³ He could not agree to the strategy of silence adopted by his colleagues, but decided to make his own move against the Ultramontanes. In vain did Cochin beg him to "ne pas eclater avant le Concile".⁵⁴ Montalembert was intent on hoisting the banner of Liberal Catholicism as he had done at Malines. He proposed to use the recent revolution in Spain in order to demonstrate that the alliance of Church and State was fatal to the former. He would thus be rebutting Veuillot who openly favoured such an alliance in his commentary on Aeterni patris. By November 1868 he had completed the first draft of an article which concluded that "la décadence de l'Espagne a commencé le jour où l'Eglise est devenue sous Charles-Quint et Philippe II l'instrument et le complice du despotism."⁵⁵ He wanted this article to be published in

53. Lecanuet, R.P., Montalembert, op. cit., V. 3, p. 437.

54. Cochin, H., op. cit., V. 2, p. 201. Cochin expressed his fears to Montalembert in a letter of 26 September 1868. "Il est vrai, il y a aussi une renaissance libérale sérieuse, exempte de socialisme et de servilisme... Mais hélas! n'est-ce pas cela même que l'on voudrait voir frapper de foudres solennelles!"

the forthcoming edition of the Correspondant. His colleagues were terrified and their reactions testify to the precariousness of the French Liberal Catholics on the eve of the Vatican Council. "Considérez froidement où en est la guerre, ce que sont les circonstances", pleaded Cochin.⁵⁶ "Notre impatience à l'approche du Concile serait déraisonnable...".⁵⁷ "On nous guette...".⁵⁸ "Les moines de la Civiltà... forgent les fers qu'ils comptent mettre a nos idées; fers que le Concile brisera".⁵⁹ (*italics added*). When these arguments did not convince Montalembert of the need for patience, his colleagues simply refused to print the article in the Correspondant. He in turn withdrew from the editorial staff of that journal.

But if the Liberal Catholics were too frightened to express their aspirations in specific terms, they wanted at least to show that the forthcoming Council would not be the "chatiment de la terre" that Veuillot had envisaged. Augustin Cochin asked Bishop Dupanloup to write an article on the Council that would express a more optimistic viewpoint.⁶⁰ Orleans agreed and his Lettre sur le futur concile oecuménique appeared on 1 November 1868. (Both Cochin⁶¹

55. Ibid., p. 201. Augustin Cochin's correspondence relates in detail the history of Montalembert's ill fated article.

56. Ibid., p. 202.

57. Ibid., p. 202.

58. Ibid., p. 203.

59. Ibid., p. 203. On 18 November Cochin write Montalembert that to say anything before the Council opened would be very dangerous. "Quelle est de même la besogne utile d'ici au Concile? De ne pas donner lieu par aucune excitation aux foudres de là-bas et aux frayeurs, d'ici". Ibid., p. 203.

and de Falloux⁶² assisted in the composition of this pamphlet.) In a very carefully worded argument Bishop Dupanloup attempted to show that society has nothing to fear from the Council: it would not result in any chastisement but in a positive good. "Il y'aura donc la deux grands objets: le bien de l'Eglise et le bien de la société humaine. Il y a ce la et il n'y a que cela."⁶³ Without mentioning Veuillot by name Dupanloup refuted his interpretation of Aeterni partis. "Grande est l'erreur de ceux qui dénoncent le futur Concile comme une menace, comme une oeuvre de guerre."⁶⁴ Orleans then went on to show that severe measures would not be taken at Rome because they would jeopardize any chance of reunion with the Eastern Church and with the Protestant sects.⁶⁵ A spirit of conciliation was necessary, he wrote, and this was implied in the Bull of Indiction. "Le Saint-Père ne parle que de charité et de paix...".⁶⁶ The Council would end all misunderstanding among Christians. It would be a "oeuvre de pacification et de lumière."⁶⁷

60. Ibid., p. 184.

61. Ibid., p. 185.

62. Palanque, J., "Catholiques Libéraux et Gallicans," p. 74.

63. Ibid., p. 74. Cecconi has only included a portion of this important document and it has been necessary to refer to a secondary source.

64. Ibid., p. 75.

65. Ibid., p. 75.

66. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cxxxiv, p. 180.

67. Ibid., p. 195.

68. Ibid., p. 203. Back in 1867 the High Anglican Pussey had written Dupanloup that "there are 8,000 of us in England who pray daily for the unity of the Church". Bury, J.B., op. cit., p. 59. But the idea to mention the difficulty of a reunion with the Protestants came from Augustin Cochin who seems to have seen the argument as more of a

"Une oeuvre de pacification et de lumière" - this is what the Liberal Catholics wanted. But ever since Veillot's commentary on Aeterni patris they feared that the Council would be something else. Veillot was the chief spokesman of French Ultramontanism and the liberals knew that Pius IX sympathised with his cause. To offset this influence they let it be known that the Council would not take any reactionary measures; but they could not be sure of this. Because of their delicate position in the Church they were unable to express openly their desire that the Council would accommodate the Church to democracy, progress, science, civilization and liberalism. They were forced to resume their strategy of complete silence, and at the same time hope that Louis Veillot would not be given to further prognostication.⁶⁹

tactical device than anything else. Cochin, H., *op. cit.*, p. 195. The Liberal Catholics were less concerned with a reunion with the Protestants and with the Eastern Church than they were with the problems of modern society, progress, science, humanity, democracy, and liberalism. But after the Syllabus of Errors it would be tactless on their part to mention these aspirations. The historian of the movement, Professor Palanque, has quite correctly pointed out that Dupanloup's letter on the future Council betrays this fear. "Cette lettre est bien signigative de l'état de l'esprit des libéraux en 1868: ils redoutent en secret les definitions qui vont, dit on être portées, mais afin de ne pas fortifier les chances de définition, ils disent tout haut que le Concile leur sera favorable pour le faire croire aux autres". Palanque, J., Catholiques Libéraux et Gallicans . . . , p. 75.

69. Montalembert was dead set against this tactic of silence. On 24 May, 1868, he wrote de Falloux that: "Mieux aurait voulu mille fois tomber dans l'idiotisme que de retrouver toutes mes facultés pour végéter dans un lâche silence ou une inaction calculée." Lecanuet, R.P., Montalembert, V. 3, p. 438.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE CIVILTA ARTICLE AND PETITIONS IN THE UNIVERS

1.

On February 13, 1869, the Univers printed an article that had appeared in the Roman newspaper the Civilta Cattolica a week before. It was entitled Note sur le futur concile oecumenique. It was given the fullest approbation of the Univers,¹ and was called by that newspaper a document of "exceptional importance."² It was a bombshell. The article was nothing more than a vindication of the extreme Ultramontane position, a eulogy of the conservative thinkers, Veillot notably, and a blatant attack on the French Liberal Catholics. What is more it proposed for the forthcoming Council the very measures the Liberals dreaded most.

The article undertook to delineate the attitude and the aspirations of French Catholics with regard to the Council.³ Catholic France, it argued, was divided into two schools. "Les uns simplement catholiques; les autres qui se disent catholiques libéraux."⁴

1. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cxlviii, p. 270.

2. Ibid., p. 240.

3. Cecconi has included a document entitled Responses aux divers questions qui ont été proposées par son excellence Monseigneur le Nonce Apostolique en France touchant le Concile (cxxxviii, p. 210) - that explains the genesis of the Civilta article. It should be noted that the Papal Nuncio, Chigi, was in epistolary relations with Louis Veillot (see for example, O.C., V. 27, p. 335) but there is no

The Liberal Catholics, according to the author, feared that the Council would decree the dogma of papal infallibility and that it would reassert the Syllabus of Errors. The liberals, he continued, hope that the Council will interpret the Syllabus "en un sens favourable à leurs idées."⁶ They, say that if the Council proclaims the doctrine of papal infallibility it will be necessary to say "Credo in papum"⁷ instead of "Credo in Ecclesium".

But the "catholiques proprements dits", that is to say "la grande majorité" of French Catholics are of an opposite opinion. Like proverbial lambs "ils sont soumis de coeur et d'âme aux décisions qui seront proclamées."⁸ They believe that the future Council will be very short. This opinion stems from the belief that the bishops of the Christian world are in basic agreement with regard to the questions to be considered "de sorte que la minorité, si éloquent qu'elle puisse être ne pourra fournir une longue opposition."¹⁰ The author was here attacking the notion of opposition and discussion on which the liberals based their aspirations. From the point of view of religious dogma the French Catholics, according to the writer, wanted the Council to affirm as articles of faith the negative propositions of the

evidence to suggest that Veillot had anything to do with writing this article.

4. Cecdonie, E., op. cit., doc. cxxxix, p. 208.

5. Ibid., p. 208.

6. Loc. cit.

7. Loc. cit.

8. Ibid., p. 209.

9. Ibid., p. 209.

Syllabus.¹¹ Moreover they would welcome, "avec bonheur", the proclamation of papal infallibility by the Council.¹²

Then came the *trouvaille*. The author of the article allowed that out of a sentiment of "auguste réserve" the Sovereign Pontiff might be reluctant to take the initiative in proclaiming himself infallible. But what was there to prevent an "explosion unanime de l'Esprit-Saint par la bouche des Pères du futur Concile", from proclaiming the dogma by acclamation?¹³ That is to say without discussion or debate!

The article ended with a consideration of the disposition of the French press. The latter was divided into four categories: "la presse révolutionnaire, la presse parlementaire, la presse religieuse libérale, et la presse religieuse romaine."¹⁴ The liberal press, and under this rubric the author listed the France, the Gazette de France, the Français, and the Villes et Compagnes, was favourable to the Council; "seulement elle affecte une certaine prédilection pour les doctrines de l'ancien clergé de France, fait ressortir volontiers les droits des Evêques et ne serait pas très éloignée d'accepter un certain contrôle des actes pontificaux de la part des clergés nationaux, sinon de l'Etat."¹⁵

10. Loc. cit.

11. Ibid., p. 211. "Il se pourrait que le Concile, en établissant par des formules affirmatives, et avec les développements nécessaires, les propositions présentées par le Syllabus sous la forme négative, fit complètement disparaître le malentendu qui existe non seulement dans les sphères du pouvoir, mais dans un grand nombre d'esprits d'ailleurs cultivés, mais étrangers au style théologique."

This was a singularly unfortunate error on the part of the author. The Français was the only Liberal Catholic journal in this list; the others were either Gallican or government supported, hence their affinity for French ecclesiastical traditions and their support for the Empire - a sentiment not shared by the Français. The author nevertheless condemned the liberal journal through association. The "presse religieuse romaine", on the other hand, had the "meilleurs intentions". These newspapers were of course represented by the Monde and the Univers.¹⁷

This article had a tremendous impact in France. The hope the liberals entertained concerning open discussion and debate at the Council seemed threatened by the talk of proclaiming the Syllabus as dogma and papal infallibility by acclamation. It is necessary to point out that the Civiltà cattolica was the semi-official organ of the Vatican. What appeared in its columns seemed to have the Popes imprimator.¹⁸ Dom Cuthbert Butler hinted in 1930 that the article might have been a "ballon d'essai" on the part of the Curia to see how such opinions would be received.¹⁹ The Ultramontane historians, Grandérath and Cecconi, on the other hand, argue that the article was simply an attempt to get information about the attitude of Roman

12. Ibid., p. 212.

13. Loc. cit.

14. Ibid., p. 197.

15. Loc. cit.

16. Loc. cit.

17. Loc. cit. "Beaucoup de personnes se plaignent même que ces

Catholics on the eve of the Vatican Council.²⁰ Ceconi even included some documents that would seem to corroborate this thesis.²¹ And Antonelli, the Cardinal Secretary of State, argued that the Popes true intentions were not be found in this article.²²

But it is known today that the publication of the Civiltà article was approved by Pius IX himself.²³ Certainly the extreme ideas that appeared in the account would not have passed his scrutiny unless they had his approbation. What is more it is clear that the article was written by an Ultramontane friend of Louis Veuillot²⁴ by the abbé Darras.²⁵ So that even if the purpose of the article was to gather

18. feuilles, particulièrement la dernière, s'en occupent trop et dépassent la mesure qui convient à des écrivains purements laïques; on reproche à cette presse, notamment à ces journaux d'être acerbes, intolérants pour les opinions libres, violents envers les personnages qui ne partagent pas leurs opinions et outres souvent dans leurs thèses."

18. Bury pointed out that in 1866 the Pope issued a brief elevating the Civiltà into "something of a congregation". "By this arrangement the Magister Palatini reads the proofs and underlines passages which are then erased by the Secretaria di Stato. Thus the Paper authentically expresses the Papal ideas". Bury, J. B., op. cit., p. 54.

19. Butler, Cuthbert. The Vatican Council, The Story Told From Inside In Bishop Ullathorne's Letters, Longmans, London, 1930, V. 1 p. 109.

20. Granderath, P. T., Histoire du Concile du Vatican. Kirch, P., ed., et traduit par des religieux de la meme compagnie, Albert Duvil, Bruxelles, 1907, V. 1, p. 217.

21. See Ceconi, E., op. cit., doc. cxxxv, p. 804.

22. Ollivier, E., op. cit., V. 1, p. 436.

23. Aubert, R., Vatican I, Editions de l'Orante, Paris, 1964, p. 74.

24. Ibid., p. 74.

25. Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX, p. 216. On 29 June 1869 Veuillot had dinner with the abbe Darras and other Ultramontane celebrities where they talked "Haute Politique". O.C., V. 10, pp. 152-153.

information about the attitude of Catholics, it was a particular kind of information these men were after. Hence their eulogy of Veuillot and their disparagement of the Liberal Catholics.

By publishing this article Veuillot had again stopped the liberals in their tracks. There is no evidence in the correspondence to indicate that Veuillot had encouraged the abbé Darras to write the article; but the assessment could not have been more à propos had Veuillot written it himself. By simply printing the document on the first page of his newspaper, with an enthusiastic introduction and the most wholehearted approbation - in block letters - he had furthered his own interpretation of the Council. Bishop Dupanloup, even though he appreciated full well the importance of this document, accused Veuillot of exaggerating its importance "pour nous réduire au silence."²⁶

The Liberal Catholics had at once to defend themselves without at the same time exposing their movement to a condemnation from Rome. Dupanloup took up their cause in two articles that appeared
27
in the Français on 18 and 19 March. He pointed out that the Civiltà cattolica "n'est après tout qu'un recueil périodique... sans autorité hiérarchique dans l'Eglise."²⁸ He more than anyone knew

26. Cecconi, E., doc. cxlviii, p. 285.

27. In Cecconi these documents are signed Francois Beslay but they are really the work of Bishop Dupanloup. Lagrange, F., Vie de Mgr Dupanloup, V. 3, p. 125.

28. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cxlviii, p. 249.

that the Jesuits who ran the Civilta had long flattered the Pope's prerogative and even in France were regarded as an organ of the Vatican; but he wanted somehow to show that the measures that the Civilta article anticipated were without foundation. Orleans then went on to argue, as in his Lettre sur le futur concile, that the forthcoming Council would not enact the measures proposed by the Civilta because this would destroy any hope of reunion with the separated Christian sects. "Il répugne absolument à la prudence et à la charité du Pape et des évêques de grandir encore un obstacle déjà si grand et d'élargir l'abîme qu'on veut combler."²⁹ He argued that for theological reasons it was almost impossible to define ex cathedra infallibility - "Les théologians les plus ultramontains disputent."³⁰ To the Civilta's contention that the Council would be short without discussion or debate, Dupanloup pointed to the Council of Trent where the bishops debated "longuement et profondément."³¹ He was especially sensitive to the argument that the minority bishops at the Council would not constitute any worthwhile opposition. It was this very opposition that the liberals counted on for modernizing the Church. "On parle d'opposition", wrote Dupanloup, "Et depuis quand appelle-

29. Ibid., p. 250.

30. Loc. cit.

31. Ibid., p. 248.

t-on 'opposants' les Eveques qui discutent et exposent librement leur opinion dans un Concile."³²

The tone of this article again betrays the precarious situation of the Liberal Catholics. So much did Orleans wish to avoid controversy that he did not even mention the Syllabus of Errors, which the author of the Civilta article wished to be transformed into an article of faith at the forthcoming Council. He knew that to do so would invoke the censure of the Pope who if anything wanted a strict and not a loose interpretation a la Dupanloup of that document.³³ Dupanloup hid his real fears behind appeals to church unity. Nowhere in this document does he refer to the needs of modern civilization viz a viz the Council; it would be tactless to say such things in the Catholic world since the Syllabus of Errors was promulgated.

Orlean's true aspirations are to be found only in his private correspondence. On July 4 he wrote a friend:

Mais le concile que je demands, c'est un grand concile jetant de vives lumières, sur les graves questions contemporaines qui interessent la société et l'Eglise; il me sembele qu'il y aurait une magnifique exposition de doctrine à faire et non pas simplement sous la forme négative ni uniquement par voie de condamnation.³⁴

It is a measure of the weakness of Catholic liberalism that Dupanloup, in his refutation of the Civilta article, could not allude to these

32. Loc. cit.

33. See note 68 on p. 88.

34. Lagrange, F., Lettres Choisies, V. 1, p. 245.

"graves questions contemporaines".

2.

Louis Veuillot was under no such obligation. When the Bull of Indication was promulgated in June 1868 and it became certain that a Council would be held in the following year, he decided to open a subscription in his newspaper in order to help defray the cost of that event. Veuillot did not only print the names of those who contributed to the fund, he also printed whatever the subscribers had to say about the Council. This was very serious as far as the Liberal Catholics were concerned. The Univers' Ultramontane readers, and especially the lower clergy, felt free to interpret the Council and its work in a manner that had no theological justification whatever, and Veuillot saw no reason why these views should not be carried in his newspaper. Thus two Catholics from Besancon hoped that the Council "nous délivrera des catholiques libéraux."³⁵ But the most distressing remarks as far as the liberals were concerned were those that exaggerated the prerogative of Pius IX. One Roman Catholic applied to the Pope words that were usually reserved for the holiness of Jesus Christ: "Talis enim decebat et nobis esset Pontifex, sanctus, innocens, impollutus, segere gatus a peccatoribus et excelsior coelis factus."³⁶ Another replaced the word Deus by the

35. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cclxxxi, p. 1341. These citations have not been included in the O.C. but were cited by Bishop Dupanloup in the Avertissement.

word Pius in the Roman hymn Rerum Deus tenax vigor:

Rerum PIUS tenax vigor
Immotus in te permanens
Da verbe vitae quae regant
Agnos, oves et saeculem.³⁷

Another wrote:

Pater pauperum
Dator munerum
Lumen cordium
EMITTE coelitus
Lucis tuae radium.³⁸

And yet another subscriber remarked: "A Pie IX qui représente mon Dieu sur la terre: Iste Deus Meus et glorificabo eum; Deus patris mei, et exaltabo eum."³⁹ A parish priest hoped that the Council would justify "nos chères croyances à l'infaillibilité du Pape et à l'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge."⁴⁰

In November, 1869, came: "Liberalisme catholique, protestantisme catholique", and "les princes de la maison de Broglie appartiennent comme les autres à l'Eglise enseignée."⁴¹ From the diocese of Orleans came a citation from a priest who confused the temporal and the spiritual powers.⁴² Veillot saw nothing improper in these remarks. "D'un bout à l'autre on y entend chanter le large coeur catholique", he remarked in April 1869 as he cited the following: "Au Père! Au Roi! Au Docteur Infaillible! A l'Homme de Christ! Au Vicaire de Christ! A Pie IX bienfait du Christ!"⁴³

37. Loc. cit.

38. Ibid., p. 1345.

39. Loc. cit.

40. Loc. cit.

41. Ibid., p. 1339.

42. Ibid., p. 1346.

43. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 210.

To appreciate the gravity of these remarks it is necessary to understand that the question as to whether or not the Pope was infallible was still theologically open. Even less decided was the question as to whether Pio Nono was the living embodiment of Jesus Christ. Many bishops were distressed by these ideas. This was especially true in a diocese where the prelate who was either a Liberal Catholic or a Gallican was forced to see his clergy advance ideas contrary to his own in the columns of the Univers. This was the case of the liberal Bishop Place. Some of his clergy cited a passage from a catechism that Place had authorized twenty years previously that argued for papal infallibility, with the comment that they felt they were obliging their bishop in so doing.⁴⁴ "Il est impossible qu'il [Place] ne soit pas affligé de voir dans les ridicules souscriptions de l'Univers le nom d'un grand nombre de ses prêtres ...", wrote Madame Forbin to Augustin Cochin's wife.⁴⁵ The height of insult was registered on November 8, 1869 when one of Bishop Dupanloup's curés wrote Veuillot's newspaper, calling himself a "lecteur impenitent de l'Univers", a letter in favour of papal infallibility.⁴⁵

The apotheosis of Pius IX that took place in almost every issue of the Univers was a source of great shame to the Liberal Catholics.

44. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin... (Documents inédits), p. 75.

45. Ibid., p. 75.

In a letter to the great German theologian, Dr. Dollinger in November 1869, Montalembert lamented "l'âbime d'idôlatrie où est tombé le clergé français."⁴⁷ Of all the miracles that have taken place in the history of the Church, he continued, none can surpass or even equal "cette transformation si prompte et si complète de la France catholique en une basse-cour de l'anti-camera du Vatican."⁴⁸ It was not simply, as Dupanloup openly contended, that the Liberal Catholics were opposed to papal infallibility for purely theological reasons. One suspects that they would easily have acknowledge this prerogative to a Pope who was not as hostile to liberalism as was Pius IX in 1869.⁴⁹ What they feared were reactionary judgements on political and social questions that would have the stamp of infallibility and would henceforth be irrevocable. If the Syllabus had been delivered by an infallible Pope speaking ex cathedra would it have admitted of a loose interpretation like the one Bishop Dupanloup gave it?

It is not surprising then that the liberals were horrified at the statements their opponents were making in the Univers. On 15 November 1869 Augustin Cochin wrote the comte de Carne the following letter which testifies to his very real concern.

46. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cclxxxii, p. 1346.

47. Palanque, J., Catholiques Libéraux et Gallicans, p. 160.

48. Ibid., p. 160.

49. In July 1869 Montalembert wrote: "Ce qui me répugne à moi, ... ce n'est pas l'Infaillibilité du pape en matière de foi, ce serait son omnipotence sur les questions politiques, omnipotence que des esprits exagérés chercheraient à eriger en dogme, comme une conséquence de l'infailibilité doctrinale du Saint-Siège." Ibid., p. 122.

Nous aurons beau faire, alléguer nos paroles, nos intentions, nos services, notre bonne volonté, notre complète obéissance; c'est comme si nous ne disons rien, nous voilà convaincus de fomenter la révolte et de propager l'erreur, et pour deux francs, une bonne âme, en souscrivant au Concile peut se passer le pieux plaisir de nous lancer une injure.⁵⁰

Cochin here seems to be admitting that the tactic of diplomatic silence the Correspondant had adopted on the eve of the Council had not been successful. His frustration is understandable. The Liberal Catholics, for all their studied civility, could not prevent Veillot and his Ultramontane readers from openly expressing their dire prognostications concerning the most important event in Church history. But there is no good reason to expect, as Cochin implicitly did, that Veillot should himself assume a posture of formal reticence like the one the liberals had adopted. He hated Christian liberalism - it was a great heresy in his estimation - and in this view he had the encouragement of Rome, the lower clergy and the Roman Catholic masses. What is more, Veillot's suspicions concerning his adversaries found their justification when Father Hyacinthe Loyson, a Liberal Catholic celebrity, openly broke with the Roman Catholic Church.

50. Cochin, A., op. cit., V. 2, p. 252.

CHAPTER NINE

LOUIS VEUILLOT AND THE HYACINTHE AFFAIR

1.

Father Hyacinthe Loyson of the Barefooted Carmelites was the pride and the joy of the Liberal Catholic party: "une des célébrités du groupe catholique - libéral."¹ Like the great Lacordaire - who had died in 1861 - he was a predicateur and seemed like the former to have had considerable oratorical charm.² From the pulpit of Notre Dame cathedral he thrilled Catholics, especially Liberal Catholics, with his sermons dealing with the needs of the Church in the modern world. Eucumenicism was one of his favourite topics and his conciliatory attitude to this problem won him the respect even of some free-thinkers and anti-clericals. Henri Brisson of the Temps called his meetings at Notre Dame "l'un des novements les plus graves de l'histoire intellectuelle du siècle."⁴ The Liberal Catholics were enthusiastic about their man. Montalembert even gave Hyacinthe a rosary that had once belonged to the great Lacordaire! The leader of the Liberal Catholics called the Carmelite a "vrai libéral, vrai démocrate, vrai prêtre et vrai chrétien."⁵

1. Palanque, J.R., Catholiques Libéraux et Gallicans, p. 93.

2. Professor Palanque says of Hyacinthe that: "En 1868, il paraissait en France le plus grand orateur sacré: on faisait appel à lui en toutes occasions." Ibid., p. 94.

3. Houtin, A., Le Pere Hyacinthe dans l'église romaine 1827-1869.

2.

During an audience accorded him in 1869, Father Hyacinthe informed the Pope that his greatest enemies were the Ultramontanes and especially Louis Veuillot: "J'air pour ennemis, Tres Saint Père, les amis de M. Veuillot."⁶ It is natural to expect that Veuillot, with his integral attitude to matters concerning the faith, would view Hyacinthe's ventures into ecumenicism with considerable alarm. When the Carmelite addressed the Société des amis de la paix in June 1867, Veuillot regretted in the Univers that a Catholic priest would "fourvoie parmi ces naifs murmurateurs."⁷ (The society was open to all men regardless of religious conviction).

In October 1868, Father Hyacinthe published in the Rivista Universale a speech he had given in connection with the recent revolution in Spain. That event, according to him, had sounded the death knell for the connection between Church and State.

Cette nouvelle et formidable leçon que nous donne l'Espagne. La vieille organisation politique du catholicisme s'écroule de toute part en Europe dans le sang, et ce qui est pire, dans la boue; or c'est à ces débris impuissants et honteux que l'on voudrait lier l'avenir de l'Eglise.⁸

Some critics had seen this as an attack on the Pope's temporal power.

Emile Nourry, Paris, 1920, p. 151.

4. Ibid., p. 151. In a speech in 1865 Hyacinthe said: "Je ne tournerai vers les nations qui ne sont pas la mienne, je regarderai au sin du deisme sincere, et je leur dirai: "Vous etes mes auxillaires!" Ibid., p. 147.

5. Ibid., p. 151.

6. Ibid., p. 290.

7. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 9, p. 134. 8. Houtin, A., op. cit., p. 252.

The Carmelite explained that this was not so and asked Louis Veuillot to publish a commentary of his to this effect. Veuillot published the letter to which he appended his own commentary. He accused Hyacinthe of having "le goût de la popularité."⁹ According to Veuillot Hyacinthe was a victim of "la fausse opinion commune à toutes les écoles dites libérales."¹⁰ In June 1869, the Carmelite was called to Rome in order to defend himself before the Pope. Veuillot published a fictional account of this interview for the Univers in which he pictured the Pope telling Hyacinthe to cease his aberrations: "Allez et ne pécher plus."¹¹ The result of these altercations was that by June 1869, the relationship of the Ultramontane journalist and the Liberal Catholic predicateur had become acrimonious to say the least.

3.

In a letter of November 8, 1868 to the comte de Montalembert, Augustin Cochin made the following prognostication: "Nous l' [Hyacinthe] excitons sans le vouloir, et le jour pourrait venir où sa robe le brûlerait."¹² Unfortunately for the cause of Catholic liberalism Cochin's forebodings were realized. It was a double misfortune

9. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 100.

10. Ibid., p. 100. Veuillot prophetically wrote that "on est tourmenté de la pensée qu'il y a dans tout cela autre chose, qui ne peut être dit clairement." Ibid., p. 101. An ominous remark in view of subsequent events.

11. Ibid., p. 239. Hyacinthe informed Veuillot the next day that he had not had to retract any of his ideas before the Pope. Veuillot in turn printed an article that was widely attributed to the Pope concerning Hyacinthe's previous letter. According to the author of this article what Hyacinthe had told Veuillot about not having to retract his

that Hyacinthe would chose to leave the Church four months before the Vatican Council opened. Although his apostasy was not directly concerned with the Council, his defection caused the liberals to be pessimistic about their chances of getting the kind of convocation they wanted. (Cecconi then quite rightly included the documents concerning this scandal in the collection dealing with the preliminaries to the Council.)

Father Hyacinthe was unhappy with the situation of the Roman Catholic Church and with the role that Pius IX aspired to in its hierarchy. In October 1868 he confided to his journal that: "Le Pape n'est pas le Maître de l'Eglise et des âmes, mais leur serviteur."¹³ In February 1869, he wrote a colleague that he was resolved to oppose any "arbitrary" or "tyrannical" measure in the Church "vinsent-elles de pape lui-même."¹⁴ In May of the same year just after his first audience with the Pope he wrote in his journal that Pius IX was the "opresseur de la conscience de 200,000,000 de chrétiens...".¹⁵ Finally he was determined "de ne point passer un seul jour jusqu'au prochain concile sans faire quelque chose, par la plume, par la parole ou par la prière, contre le Romanisme."¹⁶ With such thoughts

ideas was not "conforme a la verite". Houtin, A., op. cit., p. 296.

12. Cochin, H., op. cit., V. 1, p. 303.

13. Houtin, A., op. cit., p. 270.

14. Ibid., p. 287. After leaving Rome Hyacinthe visited the famous German theologian Ignatius Doellinger who reinforced his apprehensions concerning the Pope. A diary entry of 30 May 1869 reads: "Voici à peu près ce qui m'a dit Doellinger. 'La Papeauté par suite des fausses décrétales, sous l'influence de Gregoire VII, a pris la forme d'un absolutism que ma conscience chrétienne, et je dirai ma conscience historique, ne me permettent d'admettre.'" Ibid., p. 292.

15. Ibid., p. 287.

16. Ibid., p. 315.

it is natural that Father Hyacinthe would run into considerable difficulty with his Ultramontane opponents and especially with Louis Veuillot.

The controversy between Hyacinthe and Veuillot came to a head over a speech the former gave at the Congres de la Paix in June 1869.¹⁷ The speakers at this gathering represented a wide spectrum of French religious and intellectual thought. Saint-Simoniens (Michel Chevalier), rationalists (Jules Simon), Protestants (Martin Paschaud), Jews (Rabbi Isisore), Roman Catholics (P. Gratry, Charles Pernaud, Father Hyacinthe) were together seated on the speakers dias.¹⁸ "On eût dire que les fossés qui séparent les peuples allaient se combler."¹⁹ The great event of this meeting was an allocution delivered by Father Hyacinthe. The Carmelite told his audience that the key to world peace was to be found in the Gospel.

Il faut lire et expliquer au monde, qui ne les connaît pas encore, ces deux grands livres de la morale privée et de la morale publique. Le livre de la Synagogue érit par Moise et l'Evangile de Jésus Christ!

.....

Car c'est un fait certain qu'il n'y a de place au soleil du monde civilisé que pour ces trois sociétés religieuses: le Catholicisme, le Protestantisme et le Judaïsme.²⁰

17. Hyacinthe's biographer remarks that Veuillot's harsh treatment on this occasion led to his decision to leave the Church, Ibid., p. 295.

18. Ibid., p. 297.

19. Ibid., p. 298.

20. Ibid., p. 301.

These words were taken to heart by the audience. Martin Paschaud, the representative of French Protestantism, took the chair and addressed Hyacinthe this tribute: "Je ne sais pas si je suis catholique, je ne sais pas si vous êtes protestants mais ce que je sais, c'est que nous sommes de la même religion. (Applaudissements)." ²¹ Paschaud had unwittingly given Hyacinthe the kiss of death: Louis Veillot wrote that the approbation of the Protestants and free thinkers was proof of Father Hyacinthe's heresy.

Louis Veillot had attended the Congrès de la Paix and had witnessed this triumph of the ecumenical spirit. His article on this meeting appeared on June 16 and was written with a vengeance, ²² "C'était très beau", he reported in a spirit of undisguised irony, "la salle pleine, beaucoup de dames, le bureau chargé de fleurs de rhétorique au moment de s'ouvrir! Ils ont presque pleuré."²³ Then came a reference to Father Hyacinthe. "A sa petite place de sous-diacre, le P. Hyacinthe était cependant le lion de cette pompe passyfique."²⁴ "Ainsi", he continued, "le Carmel et la religion catholique ont triomphé hier, entre midi et cinq heures à Paris dans un lieu que sainte Thérèse et saint Pierre n'aurait pas voulu hanter."²⁵ Veillot then went on to employ a procédé he often used

21. Ibid., p. 303.

22. In an undated letter to Mlle. de Gramont Veillot wrote: "La sottise! la sottise! Demain je fais celle d'aller entendre le P. Hyacinthe et l'on me garde une place. Si c'est le desir de m'edifier qui me pousse là, je l'ignore." Veillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 99. The letter may or may not relate to the conference under discussion; but it shows that Veillot was not favourably inclined to hear what Hyacin-

when attacking the Liberal Catholics. He cited the favourable reports that Hyacinthe's speech had received in the Protestant and anti-clerical press. That he was condemning the Carmelite by association was clear to everyone.

Voici le Temps, organe du protestantisme politique et orléaniste... , le Journal des Débats l'a vu et entendu avec plaisir -- Écoutons maintenant M. Sauvestre. C'est celui-là qui s'est rendu immortel en appelant vermine les Petites Soeurs des Pauvres. "26

In conclusion Veillot hoped that Hyacinthe, once returned to his cell, would realize that his present triumph was only a "triste et périlleux enfantillage. "27

The Superior General of Hyacinthe's order received a copy of the discourse that had been delivered to the Congrès de la Paix. He informed Hyacinthe that the speech contained "des propositions vagues qui se prêtent... à des interprétations fâcheuses."28 The Carmelite was informed that his presence at the conference had caused "un grand scandale dans toute l'Europe."29 He was ordered to cease from publishing his letters and speeches and to refrain from appearing in public.30 He was requested to contemplate in solitude "les grandes vérités de la religion... pour le profit de votre âme."31 But the man who had committed to his diary his resolve to never again suffer arbi-

the had to say.

23. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 36, p. 286.

24. Ibid., p. 287.

25. Ibid., p. 287.

26. Ibid., p. 289.

27. Ibid., p. 290.

28. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. ccxxv, p. 875.

trary measure, was not to be silenced. He may indeed have followed the Superior General's injunction to study in solitude the truths of his religion, but the conclusions derived from his meditations only strengthened his conviction that his cause was the right one. In September he published an apologia in the form of a letter addressed to his superiors. It was printed in le Temps on the evening of the same day, and reproduced in the Journal des Débats on the 21st.³⁴ It was a bombshell. It scandalized the Roman Catholic world and jeopardized the cause of Christian Liberalism on the eve of the Council. It was, as Montalembert put it, an "explosion terrifiante."³⁵

Father Hyacinthe notified his superiors that he was leaving his order because it had become "une prison de l'âme."³⁶ He remarked that he was in no wise prepared to keep silent. "Les saints ne sont jamais tus... je suis de leur race."³⁷ He informed his Superior General that the Church was at a crucial moment in its history, on the eve of an ecumenical council, and that he, Hyacinthe, must speak his peace.

29. Ibid., p. 290.

30. Ibid., p. 877.

31. Ibid., p. 877. This letter was published in Veillot's newspaper on 4 October.

34. Houtin, A., op. cit., p. 319.

35. Houtin, A., Le Père Hyacinthe, réformateur catholique 1869-1893, Emile Nourry, Paris, 1922, p. 1.

36. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. ccxxiii, p. 868.

37. Ibid., p. 868.

Je élève donc, devant le Saint-Père et devant le Concile, ma protestation de chrétien et de prêtre contre ces doctrines et ces pratiques qui se nomment, remaines [Ultramontane], mais ne sont pas chrétiens, et qui, dans leurs envahissements, toujours plus audacieux et plus funestes, tendent à changer la constitution de l'Eglise le fond comme la forme, de son enseignement et jusqu'à l'esprit de sa piété. Je proteste contre la divorce impie autant qu'insensé qu'on s'efforce d'accomplir entre l'Eglise, qui est notre Mère selon l'éternité et la société du dix-neuvième siècle, dont nous sommes les fils selon le temps, et envers qui nous avons aussi des devoirs et des tendresses.³⁸

He then went on to express his fears concerning the Vatican council.

Like his Liberal Catholic colleagues he wanted the bishops, once gathered in Rome, to debate openly the problems facing the Church in the 19th Century. When the article of the Civilta which had been reprinted in the Univers, openly challenged this right, and when the petitions in Veillot's journal made it appear that the question of papal infallibility was a closed one from a theological point of view, Hyacinthe seems to have been driven to desperation. He was extremely outspoken on this matter.

Si des craintes que je ne veux pas partager, venaient à se réaliser, si l'auguste assemblée n'avait plus de liberté dans ses délibérations qu'elle n'en a déjà dans sa préparation, si en un mot, elle était privée des caractères essentiels à un Concile oecuménique, je crierais vers Dieu et vers les hommes pour en réclamer un autre véritablement réuni dans le Saint-Esprit....³⁹

38. Ibid., p. 869. "Ma conviction la plus profonde", he continued, "est que si la France en particulier, et les races latines en général, sont livrées à l'anarchie sociale, morale et religieuse, la cause principale en est non pas sans doute dans le catholicisme lui-même, mais dans la manière dont le catholicisme est depuis longtemps compris et pratiqué."

Hyacinthe had let the cat out of the bag. Never before had the Liberal Catholics publicly expressed their apprehensions concerning the Council. They had feigned optimism in the face of the forthcoming convocation calling it an "oeuvre d'illumination et de paix", and hoped that they could convince the Roman Catholic world that this is what it should be. Now their real fears had been made public by a monk on the verge of leaving the Church.

The Superior General of the Carmelite order replied to Hyacinthe's letter on September 26.⁴⁰ Hyacinthe was ordered to return to his monastery or face excommunication. But even before he received this letter Father Hyacinthe had acquitted himself of his monastic garb and was never again to see the inside of a cloister.

4.

Emile Ollivier, recollecting the apostasy of Father Hyacinthe, remarked how the Ultramontane party made religious capital of that event: "Voilà, disent les pontificaux, où conduisent les idées libérales, à l'apostasie et à la révolte; mieux vaut l'obéissance que nous prêchons."⁴¹ It is not difficult to see how this could have been so. Hyacinthe had been one of the celebrities of the Liberal Catholic group and had openly espoused their ideas in his conferences at Notre Dame

39. Ibid., p. 39.

40. This letter was published in the Univers on 4 October.

41. Ollivier, E., op. cit., V. 1, p. 442.

He was, moreover, a declared enemy of the Ultramontane movement and of its leader Louis Veuillot. It is not unnatural that the conservatives should argue that the apostasy of Father Hyacinthe was proof of the latent heresy with which Christian liberalism was stained.

Louis Veuillot had anticipated Hyacinthe's break with the Church.⁴³ "Je m'y attendais à ce coup...", he wrote after the event.⁴⁴ More important was the fact that Veuillot appreciated the strategic value of Hyacinthe's apostasy. He was aware of the "embarras où il [Hyacinthe] allait mettre ses amis et ses patrons du libéralisme",⁴⁵ and he made use of this event in his campaign against Christian liberalism. In an article of September 21, 1869, Veuillot went out of his way to establish the connection between Hyacinthe and the Liberal catholics, and to make the Carmelite's heresy the necessary result of this connection. "Il y a plus longtemps que le médiocre fruit est détaché. L'événement ne surprendra personne. Le discours au congrès de la paix et assez d'autres indices l'annoncent formellement."⁴⁶ According to Veuillot, Hyacinthe had followed a "voie logique": "son point de départ devait le mener où le voilà."⁴⁷ Veuillot pointed out that Hyacinthe had friends in different places, "les uns dans l'Eglise et dans le monde religieux", "les uns et les autres s'attendaient à le voir sortir de son couvent."⁴⁸

43. On 3 August 1869 Veuillot wrote his sister that: "Il y a longtemps que nous doutons que ce carme a envie de manger du gigot et des pois au lard." Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 189.

44. Ibid., p. 206.

45. Loc. cit.

A week later he made the connection explicitly: "Il ne restera plus aux catholiques libéraux... et aux révolutionnaires que le P. Hyacinthe."⁴⁹ It is clear from these citations that Veuillot was attempting to demonstrate that Catholic liberalism was theologically incompatible with Roman Catholic dogma. Hyacinthe, because of his liberalism, must need leave the Church - he had followed a voie logique. The implication here was that all Liberal Catholics were similarly on the verge of heresy; only a matter of degree separated them from their fallen companion.

For the Liberal Catholics, whose doctrines were already suspect at Rome, this was the last impression they wanted to create on the eve of the Vatican Council. Bishop Dupanloup advised his erstwhile companion to throw himself at the feet of the Pope in a transport of penance.⁵⁰ And Montalembert, in a letter of October 6, cen-

46. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 36, p. 371.

47. Ibid., p. 371.

48. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 36, p. 372.

49. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cclxxxii, p. 1324. This passage was not included in the collected works of Veuillot but is cited from Bishop Dupanloup's Avertissement. Orleans remarked on the lapse of charity on Veuillot's part in exploiting the Hyacinthe scandal against the Liberal Catholics. There may have been something in this charge - apart from Liberal Catholic strategy - as the article was not reprinted by Veuillot or by his nephew in the Mélanges.

50. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. ccxxvi, p. 879.

sured Hyacinthe's behaviour.⁵¹ But what really troubled the Liberal Catholics was the way Veuillot had used the scandal to his own advantage. Madame de Forbin complained of the "soi-disant chretiens"

[qui] font bien voir à l'excès de leur satisfaction qu'ils esperent bien envelopper tous les chrétiens libéraux dans ce qu'ils se hatent d'appeler la chute du P.H. [i.e. Father Hyacinthe].⁵²

Madame Cochin remarked, in turn, that the apostasy had given "des motifs de triomphe à l'Univers...".⁵³ "Tous les catholiques ont gemi de sa chute", wrote Dupanloup, "vous Monsieur [Veuillot] vous avez triomphé...".⁵⁴

These were harsh words but were they justified? Veuillot had used the Hyacinthe affair in order to delineate the errors of Catholic liberalism. Was there anything reprehensible in this? Had he not, after all, pointed to a fact that in the bottom of their hearts the liberals must themselves acknowledge; the fact that in the Roman Catholic Church of 1869 there was no room for their ideas. The Liberal Catholics themselves admitted this in private. Their corres-

51. *Ibid.*, doc. ccxxxv, p. 1033. In a letter of 28 September not included in Cecconi's documents Montalembert wrote Hyacinthe that: "Mais le plus grand des reproches que j'ai à vous adresser, c'est d'avoir trahi vos amis, vos frères d'armes en procurant le triomphe le plus éclatant aux délations et aux previsions insultantes de nos adversaires". Houtin, A., *op. cit.*, p. 345. More than anyone Montalembert realized the difficulties occasioned by Hyacinthe's apostasy. Augustin Cochin, on the other hand, was reluctant to criticize: "Je ne serai pas de ceux qui pietineront sur lui comme le fait déjà l'Univers". Cochin, D., *op. cit.*, V. 2, p. 145.

52. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin...", p. 67.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 68.

54. Cecconi, E., *op. cit.*, doc. cclxxxii, p. 1325.

pondence abounds with the blackest forebodings concerning the intentions of the Pope, and the Roman Curia, but they were loathe to express these ideas in public.^{54a} Only one of their number, Father Hyacinthe, felt it necessary to speak his piece and this he did in the letter to his Superior General. An examination of this document shows that it embodies as completely as possible all the fears the Liberal Catholics felt for the Ultramontane movement. "Je proteste" wrote Hyacinthe, "contre le divorce impie... entre l'Eglise... et la société du dix neuvième siècle."⁵⁵

The author of this letter, seeing how his ideas were censured by the hierarchy, found it necessary to leave the Church. Were not his friends in a similar position? In actual fact their orthodoxy in those days owed more to their silence than it did to any belief that the Church was amenable to their ideas.^{55a} What Veillot had done was simply to show how Hyacinthe was a spokesman for a group and that the fate of this group must necessarily be the same as his. Only a matter of degree separated the apostate from the group to which he belonged. Even the Liberal Catholic Augustin Cochin realized this

54a. A good example of this is to be found in a letter that the Liberal Catholic Leopold de Gaillard wrote to Madame de Forbin on 19 October, 1869. "Si elle [the Church] profite de l'emotion universelle pour renforcer son Syllabus et pour condamner l'interpretation liberale de l'évêque d'Orléans, pour nous ce sera le silence ou la révolte." Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin...", p. 62.

55. Cecconi, E., *op. cit.*, doc. ccxxiii, p. 869.

55a. On 26 September 1869, Augustin Cochin wrote Mantalembert that: "Il y a aussi une renaissance libérale sérieuse, exempte de socialisme et de servilisme. J'en ai vu partout des symptomes heureux:

when he wrote: "Nous l' [Hyacinthe] éxcitons sans le vouloir, et le jour pourrait venir ou sa robe le brûlerait."⁵⁶

elle est notre espoir. Mais hélas! n'est-ce pas cela meme que l'on voudrait voir frapper de foudres solonnelles!" Cochin, D., op. cit., V. 2, p. 192.

56. Cochin, D., op. cit., V. 1, p. 303. See p. 134 above.

CHAPTER TEN

RUMOURS CONCERNING THE COUNCIL

1.

Hyacinthe's defection in September 1869 had severely jeopardized the cause of French Liberal Catholicism on the eve of the Vatican Council. It has been seen how the Ultramontane party used that incident in order to delineate the heresy with which Catholic liberalism was allegedly afflicted. The Hyacinthe scandal was not an isolated event, but closely followed the other Liberal Catholic reversals. Veillot's commentary on the Bull of Indiction, his dire prognostications concerning the Council, his approbation for the Civiltà article, and the petitions he promoted concerning the Council, made it appear as though Catholic France expected the convocation to promulgate the very measures the liberals abhorred i. e. papal infallibility and the Syllabus of Errors. The Liberal Catholics, moreover, could not openly challenge these views because their opinions were suspect at Rome; and rumours from Rome concerning the Council made it appear as though everything Veillot had prophesied was justified in fact.

2.

The preparations for the Council were made in the strictest secrecy. The episcopate as a whole was not invited to co-operate. There were 87 consulateurs drawn from their number, it is true,

but all these men were characterized by their Ultramontane sentiment "pour la plupart ils étaient connus pour leurs tendances curialistes et leurs hostilité au libéralisme catholique."¹ In April 1865, thirty six prelates from the Catholic world had been consulted under the seal concerning the program for the forthcoming Council but again these bishops were Ultramontanes.² (It was on this occasion that Veillot's colleague, Cardinal Pie, suggested that the Council enact the Syllabus of Errors.)³ Left in the hands of the Roman Curia the Councillar preparations had a decidedly conservative nature. Thus the presidency of the preparatory commission on Politico-Eclesiastical Affairs - a crucial commission as far as the liberals were concerned - was given to Cardinal Reisach, a notorious anti-liberal.⁴

With the Ultramontanes in charge of the preliminaries to the Council it seemed to the Liberal Catholics that a new extension of the Privilegium Petri was in the making. An extension of the papal prerogative was one of the things the liberals most dreaded. It would mean that Pio Nono's pronouncements on matters of faith would henceforth bear the stamp of irrevocability. They had seen an attempt in this direction in June 1867 when the bishops had gathered in Rome in order to celebrate the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of St.

1. Aubert, R., Vatican I., p. 55.

2. Ibid., p. 41.

3. Collectio Conciliorum Reventiorum Ecclesiae Universae, Arnheim, 1923, V. 49, p. 114.

4. Aubert, R., Vatican I., p. 65.

Peter. An attempt to extending the prerogative of Pius IX became obvious to everyone when the word "infallible" was included in the text of an address to be delivered by the bishops to the Pope. Orleans saw to it that the word was omitted, against the protestation of the Ultramontane Bishop Manning,⁵ but the incident had been enough to frighten the Liberal Catholics who, if anything, wanted a larger voice for the universal episcopate in the affairs of the Church.⁶ From that day the Liberal Catholics began to suspect, slightly at first, that the Council might do two things dangerous to the cause of the Church: proclaim the ex cathedra infallibility of the Pope and give dogmatic formulation to the Syllabus of Errors.⁷

The year 1869 abounded with rumours concerning the Draconian measures to be taken at Rome. In January, Montalembert wrote Bishop Dupanloup that: "Il faut s'attendre, m'assure-t-on, à un décret sur ou contre la liberté de conscience."⁸ A few weeks earlier,

5. Ibid., p. 71.

6. In August 1867, Montalembert wrote that: "L'archevêque Manning compte sur le prochain concile pour nous donner le coup de grâce." Ibid., p. 71.

7. In November, 1868, Madame de Forbin remarked how "Mgr. Place a bien des inquiétudes que je crois malheureusement trop fondées..." Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin...", op. cit., p. 65. Place was a Liberal Catholic bishop thought to be aware of matters in Rome. But this apprehension was not limited to the French Liberal Catholics. On 16 December 1868, Odo Russell informed his government that: "No one seems yet to realize the Pope merely intends the Council to be a grand Ceremony in St. Peters for his own glorification and the formal confirmation of the Syllabus doctrines, his temporal Dominions and his Ex-Cathedra infallibility. De part et d'autre il y aura des surprises. Whatever may be said to the contrary on high Authority, I do not myself believe that any single Bishop or any number

the Gallican Bishop Maret received this news from Rome: "L'infal-
 libilité papale reste à l'ordre du jour...". "On est toujours en plein
 Moyen Age."⁹ After the article of the Civiltà cattolica - these fears
 appeared to find their justification. "Vous avez certainement remar-
 qué la publication d'un article de la Civiltà par l'Univers", wrote a
 member of the episcopacy to Bishop Maret. "Le programme de ques-
 tions à traiter dans le Concile... sera bientôt dressé non par Rome,
 mais par des journalistes. Grâce à eux nous connaissons nos devoirs."¹⁰

When Odo Russell asked Antonelli, the cardinal Secretary of State,
 whether the infallibility of the Pope would be proposed for the approval
 of the bishops at the Council, the cardinal's reply shows to what degree
 the apprehensions of the Liberal Catholics were grounded in fact.

"The excathedra infallibility of the Pope", said Antonelli, "has ever
 been an article of faith with every true Catholic and therefore admits
 of no discussion."¹¹

of conspiring Bishops can sustain an individual or independant opinion
 under the paternal wings of the Vatican if the Pope commands obed-
 ience...". Blakiston, N., op. cit., p. 354.

8. Aubert, R., Vatican I, p. 73.

9. Bazin, G., op. cit., V. 3, p. 80.

10. Ibid., p. 82, On 9 April 1869, Bishop Maret received the follow-
 ing information from the German theologian Ignatius Doellinger:

"Tout est déjà arrangé par le parti dominant, pour la proclamation
 du nouveau dogme de l'infalibilité. Mgr. Manning s'est chargé de
 prendre l'initiative". Ibid., p. 86. In yet another dispatch of Jan.
 1869, Odo Russell wrote that: "It [the Council] will be so organized
 and managed as to render the expression of any individual and inde-
 pendent opinion on the part of foreign bishops quite impossible, and
 they will be disagreeably surprised to find themselves compelled to
 sanction what they intended to condemn." Blakiston, N., op. cit.,
 p. 356

The Liberal Catholics saw in papal infallibility the culmination of what they felt were the reactionary policies of the Ultramontane school. The notion of an infallible Pope was for them a medieval one. Montalembert, who hated the Gallicans for their support of the autocratic Empire, had at least to acknowledge his respect for the guarantees the Gallican Church had formulated against papal encroachments. Faced with a Church whose government, according to him, "se transforma de plus en plus en monarchie absolue", he came to appreciate "les réserves salutaires" of Gallican theology.¹² "Toute puissance exercée par des hommes est exposée aux abus", he wrote in May 1869.¹³ What troubled Montalembert was not papal infallibility in purely theological questions, but the Pope's omnipotence in political problems - "omnipotence que des esprits exagérés cherchent à ériger en dogme, comme une conséquence de l'infaillibilité doctrinale du Saint-Siège."¹⁴ He feared that if the forthcoming Council proclaimed the doctrine of Papal infallibility it would mean the triumph in the Church of the Ultramontane point of view. In France it would mean the victory of Louis Veillot's conservative, authoritarian and paternalistic political philosophy.

11. Blakiston, E., *op. cit.*, p. 363. Russell continues: "From this conversation I infer that the dogma of the Pope's personal infallibility will never be submitted to a debate but will be presented in such form to the Council as to enable the bishops to confirm it." Russell was convinced that the Council would not be conducted in a free and open manner. On 16 June 1869 he wrote: "As matters now stand I really do not believe that Bishops can hold independent opinions in Rome, and whatever their private feelings may be in their respective Sees, not one of them in Rome will venture to vote against the Infallibility and

Far more than theological questions were at stake here, and it is necessary to make this point clear. The Liberal Catholics pointed to the theological difficulties of infallibility or remarked that the doctrine was inopportune. But they never openly admitted that it was inopportune because it represented a whole attitude that was contrary to their own i. e. Ultramontanism. Their real fears are to be found only in their personal correspondance and memoires. Thus in October, 1869, Montalembert wrote Adolphe Deschamps that if the Council enacted the reactionary policies that the Ultramontane publicists were calling for then the Church would lose the respect of all educated men.

L'Eglise gardera partout beaucoup de femmes et d'enfants; dans les populations rurales, une minorité de plus en plus décroissante; dans les classes dirigeantes une rare élite d'armes ferventes, capables d'aller au delà du martyr pour rester fidèles à l'enseignement de l'Eglise. Mais perdra nécessairement et en masse ces classes dirigeantes.¹⁵

Assumption of the Virgin Dogmas or the confirmation of the Syllabus. I hope I may be mistaken." Ibid., p. 367. Russell was mistaken but his fears must have been shared by many religious and political liberals.

12. Lecanuet, R.P., Montalembert, V. 3, p. 430.

13. Ibid., p. 430.

14. Palanque, J., Catholiques Libéraux et Gallicans..., p. 122. Montalembert informed Foisset that: "Vous faites fausse route en vous préoccupant trop de l'infailibilité; ~~ce n'est ni son origine.~~

15. Lecanuet, R.P., op. cit., V. 3, p. 433.

The Liberal Catholics by October 1869, had their backs against the wall. Their tactic of self-imposed silence had been based on the hope that one day the Council would reward their patience and vindicate their cause. Their propaganda organ the Correspondant, did not directly engage in any discussion on the forthcoming Council for fear of being condemned outright even before the convocation began.¹⁶ But as the days went by and rumours from Rome seemed to justify Veillot's contention that the bishops would take reactionary measures at the Council, it became obvious that an open stand must be taken. Something must be said to offset the impression that the Univers was giving concerning the Council.

Louis Veillot's apocalyptic interpretation of Aeterna Patris, his collection for the Council where for two francs any man-Jack, as Cochin put it, could attack the Liberal Catholics, the importance he attached to the Civilta article which called for a new Syllabus of Errors, and his treatment of the Hyacinthe affair where Christian liberalism was made synonymous with heresy, could no longer pass unchallenged. What is more Veillot continued until the convocation of the Council to extoll the virtues of Pius IX in a manner that distressed the liberals. "Il a été le Pape de la Propagation de la Foi, le Pape de l'Immaculée Conception, le Pape du Syllabus, le Pape du

16. Some Liberal Catholic ideas concerning the Council were indirectly expressed in the way of book reviews and acknowledgements for books received. A work by Professor Hefélé, which maintained that the Pope was neither inferior nor superior to a General Council, was cited as was another work that spoke favourably of the old Gallican tradition.

But beyond this nothing was said.

Concile."¹⁷ For Veuillot there were no limits to the papal prerogative. "Le voilà, le vrai Prêtre et le vrai Roi, prophétiquement signalé par David."¹⁸ "Tout le respect, tout l'amour qu'éprouve encore le genre humaine s'est concentré sur lui."¹⁹ "Pie IX, de la bouche duquel n'est sortie aucune parole trompeuse."²⁰

"Nous commençames alors a nous éffrayer", recollected de Falloux, "Après mure délibération, le Correspondant resolut de parler une fois, une seule fois."²¹

17. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 36, p. 212. Veuillot explicitly made the connection here between the Pope, the Council and the Syllabus!

18. Ibid., p. 211.

19. Ibid., p. 211.

20. Ibid., p. 213.

21. Falloux, H. de, Memoires d'un Royaliste, V. 2, p. 418. This resolution on the part of the liberals to speak their mind may have been influenced by an event in Germany in May 1869. Thirty Catholic professors and layment of Coblenz had sent the bishop of Treves a manifesto that explicitly denounced the projects that the Civilta Cattolica had proposed for the Council in its issue of 9 February.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE LIBERAL CATHOLIC MANIFESTO ON THE COUNCIL

1.

The article that appeared in the Correspondant on 10 October 1869 under the title Le Concile was signed "La Rédaction". The duc de Broglie wrote the article with the collaboration of de Falloux, Dupanloup, and Cochin.¹ (Montalembert, angry at his colleagues for what he considered their cowardly behaviour, refused his assistance).² The work was divided into two parts. The first was concerned with the question of papal infallibility, and listed the possible difficulties concerning this doctrine. If promulgated it would put the Church "dans un état de dépendance exagérée sous la main d'un chef unique."³ It would follow that infallibility if proclaimed in 1870 would necessarily have a retroactive power. All the acts of all the popes in the history of the Church would then be of an irrevocable nature.⁴

They were against papal infallibility and the Syllabus of Errors. They spoke very liberally of the problems facing the Church. "L'Eglise, croyons-nous, devra abandonner la pensée de rétablir les gouvernements théocratiques du moyen âge." Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. clvii, p. 330. Montalembert saw this letter in a German periodical in July 1869. He wanted the Liberal Catholics to publish it in the Français but they refused. Lecanuet, R., op. cit., V. 3, p. 437. He then on his own publicly expressed his gratitude to the German laymen for their courage in opposing the Ultramontanes. "J'ai cru voir un éclair perçant les ténèbres; j'ai enfin entendu une parole virile et chrétienne au milieu des déclamations et des flatteries dont on nous assourdit." Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. clxix, p. 339. It is possible that the Liberal Catholics were encouraged by this event to publish

This would cause difficulties for Roman Catholics especially when it came to assessing the acts of Gregory VII, Innocent II, and Boniface VIII.⁵ With an increased prerogative the Pope might extend his new power into non-theological spheres. "Des lors les prétentions à la monarchie universelle deviennent une annexe au Credo...".⁶

The Pope would then be obliged to treat Napoleon III in the same way Pope Boniface treated Philippe le Bel.⁷ This being so, all Roman Catholics would become the instruments of theocratic absolutism.⁸ This in turn would cause persecution of Catholics in countries such as England and Russia where they were in a minority.⁹ "Telle serait la conséquence d'une formule vague de l'infaillibilité pontificale...".¹⁰

The article went on to attack those Roman Catholic journalists who extolled papal absolutism. There is no doubt that Louis Veuillot was the person they had in mind, when they decried "ces docteurs improvisés de la presse", who confound, "toute ce que Rome distingue, mettant sur le même pied les actes les plus divers et les plus inégaux de l'autorité pontificale pour les imposer avec le même poids"¹¹...

their own manifesto on the Council albeit in far more measured terms than the German layment had used. Eugene Veuillot, argued that this is what in fact took place. Veuillot, E., Louis Veuillot, op. cit., V. 4, p. 25.

1. Pange, J. de, op. cit., p. 135.

2. Cochin, H., op. cit., V. 2, p. 248. See p. 118 above.

3. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. clxviii, p. 418.

4. Ibid., p. 424.

5. Ibid., p. 425.

6. Loc. cit.

9. Loc. cit.

7. Loc. cit.

10. Ibid., p. 426.

8. Loc. cit.

11. Ibid., p. 429.

pour faire prendre à la soumission des chrétiens vers le Saint-Père l'aspect de la servilité et faire parler à leur amour filial le langage d'une superstition idolâtre."¹²

The second part of the article attempted to refute publicists who contended that the Council would castigate modern civilization for its sinful ways. Again there seems little doubt that Louis Veuillot was the person the liberals had in mind. "Les sociétés modernes", they wrote, "ne sont... travaillées par aucun mal, ni menacées d'aucun péril nouveau ou particulier."¹³ The bishops at the forthcoming Council, they continued, would not take any reactionary measures against civil liberties; these bishops were altogether different from the prelates that attended earlier councils: "ces enfants de Paris ou de New York, élevées à l'école de la souveraineté populaire et de l'égalité démocratique."¹⁴ There will be prelates from France, Belgium, England and America, "dans tous les pays de libertés publiques."¹⁵ The Liberal Catholics seem to be intimating that the conservative bishops from Italy, Spain and France will face a powerful opposition from their opposites who come from more democratic countries.

The optimism of the liberals concerning the Council was based on the expectation that it would see an open debate on the problems facing the Church and the authors of the Correspondant manifesto

12. Loc. cit.

13. Ibid., p. 433.

14. Ibid., p. 414.

15. Ibid., p. 439.

16. Ibid., p. 442.

wanted to make it clear that the possibility of such a debate was very real. "Les Evêques des Etats Unis arriveront à Rome n'ayant jamais connu d'autre état sociale que la liberté sous la loi."¹⁶ These men, according to the authors, are of the opinion that the greatest need for the Church in modern times is freedom, religious and political.¹⁷ "En d'autres termes, tous devront déclarer que le règne du privilège a péri pour l'Eglise et que le droit commun est la seule defence qu'elle puisse désormais invoquer."¹⁸

The article concluded that the days of special privilege were over so far as the Roman Catholic Church was concerned. They had been swept away in the Revolution with all other special rights and privileges, "et nous ne connaissons personne, absolument personne aujourd'hui, qui nourisse l'absurde esperance de le lui restituer."¹⁹ Having disposed of the possibility of reactionary measures being taken at the Council, the article expressed the hope that the bishops would set about establishing a "bonne intelligence entre les sociétés modernes et l'Eglise."²⁰

Never before had the Liberal Catholics come so close to publicly expressing their hopes and apprehensions concerning the Vatican Council. But even this manifesto contained a good measure of reticence; the Syllabus of Errors was not even mentioned and this is

17. Ibid., p. 439.

18. Ibid., p. 439.

19. Ibid., p. 445.

20. Ibid., p. 434.

what the liberals feared most of all. The subject was obviously too delicate to be treated in public. Yet in spite of these reservations, some liberals were very pleased with the article: they saw it as a refutation of Veillot's forebodings concerning the Council. "Eh bien! il a parlé ce vieux muet de Correspondant", wrote Leopold de Gaillard. "Il s'est montré, le vieux trembleur! Il a dit non aux séctaires de la Civiltà et de l'Univers...".²¹ Gaillard, with obvious relish, was delighted with the way the Correspondant had refuted the Univers. The Liberal Catholics had finally taken their stand on the Council and had rebuked Louis Veillot. But on this score the article may very well have been a tactical mistake on the part of the liberals.²² It gave Louis Veillot an opportunity to answer their attack, and he answered with a vengeance.

2.

Ever since the Illusion liberale in 1867, Louis Veillot had been waiting for a pretext which would allow him to attack the Liberal Catholic movement. It will be recalled that when he wrote that brochure he had contrived that the liberals would answer it. But the

21. Palanque, H., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin...", p. 71.

22. Augustin Cochin himself remarked that the article was too little and too late. When he sent Montalembert the proofs on 9 October he remarked: "C'est un flot de plus dans cette marée montante qui commence à se dessiner de plus en plus sur cette plage plate et triste où notre bateau est sur le flanc depuis quelques années. Aurait-il fallu gonfler ses ondes plus tôt et avec plus de fracas? Cela se peut et je ne pretends pas que nous ayons agi pour de mieux mais enfin nous agissons." Cochin, D., op. cit., V. 2, p. 299. One cannot but detect a note of desperation in this letter. The article, as Cochin intimates, did not go far enough but unfortunately for the Liberal

heroic age of the Correspondant had ended with the Syllabus of Errors; it had become a literary review and ceased to treat of religious questions that might lead to a dispute with its enemies. But the article of October 10 had changed everything. The Liberal Catholics had once again engaged in polemics with their Ultramontane opponents and Louis Veuillot, who saw the article as a personal insult,²³ was provided with the excuse he needed to attack their ideas. The title he gave to his rebuttal was: "Entrée des 'Failliblistes' Français, Leur Soumission à l'Esprit Moderne. 89 appliqué à l'Eglise-Politique de Tout Ce Qui A Péri Et De Tout Ce Qui Va Périr",²⁴ and shows to what extent he was determined to discredit the Liberal Catholics on the eve of the Council.

Of the Correspondant article he wrote: "Les formes du langage sont pieuses, le fond de la pensée est involontairement sceptique."²⁵ This was the crucial point. The liberals had in public, at least, to demonstrate as much attachment to the Pope as did their Ultramontane opponents - given the disposition of the Church, the Pope, and the Curia. Their reservations in this matter were never openly expressed. But Veuillot read between the lines of their article and showed his readers that the love the Liberal Catholics feigned for

Catholics it had aroused the wrath of Louis Veuillot.

23. Veuillot, E., Louis Veuillot, V. 4, p. 25.

24. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 12, p. 58.

25. Ibid., p. 58.

26. Ibid., p. 58.

the Holy See and the Church was something less than complete.

"En attestant sa foi, l'auteur anonyme ne laisse voir que ses doutes, et il prend si grand soin de justifier ses doutes qu'ils semblent former le capital de sa foi."²⁶ In this respect he was not being unjust. The liberals, although they distrusted Pius IX and the Italian bishops, had clothed their suspicions in the most devotional language.²⁷ They pretended that papal infallibility could not be formulated for theological reasons. They knew that some bishops opposed this idea and they had cited Pallavicini's History of the Council of Trent which argued that no dogma could be formulated without the unanimous consent of all bishops.²⁸ "Il suffit donc qu'une croyance soit contestée par une partie notable et pieuse de l'Eglise... pour qu'un Concile hésite à la faire passer à l'état dogmatique."²⁹ But the Liberal Catholics cared little about theological difficulties; what troubled them were the politico-religious consequences of according infallibility to the man who had decreed the Syllabus. They could not express these reservations in public but Veillot did it for them. "Il [the Correspondant] s'élève contre l'infailibilité du Pape, il presse l'Eglise de se reconcilier avec l'esprit moderne."³⁰

27. In the most recent study of French Liberal Catholicism the historian of that movement who is generally sympathetic to the liberal cause says of the Correspondant article of 10 October: "Opposition déguisée à l'infailibilité pour des raisons politiques; confiance simulée dans le Concile par un tactique un peu analogue à celle de l'Avenir Catholique sur le terrain doctrinale; voilà à quoi se résume ce long manifeste ou, avec la réserve que comportaient les problèmes, les catholiques libéraux ont dit leur pensée tout entière." Palanque, J., Catholiques Libéraux et Gallicans..., p. 100.

"Il fait de la politique et de la politique de 89."³¹ Veillot was here drawing a connection that could only disturb the Liberal Catholics, but one which was valid just the same: the connection between political and religious liberalism.^{31a}

3.

A second commentary on the Correspondant article appeared in the Univers in November 1869: the Histoire de l'infaillibilité. In This piece Louis Veillot attempted to show that the notion of papal infallibility had an irrefutable historical justification. Veillot was a publicist and not a theologian and the claims he made in this article on behalf of the papacy betrays a desire to exaggerate the prerogative of the Pope beyond anything that the evidence could possibly suggest. That the leading French Ultramontane felt perfectly free to make such claims in public testifies to the general theological level of not only his readership but also of the French episcopate. Only one man, Bishop Dupanloup, would openly challenge these views!

He began his article with an argument that was common to Ultramontane apologetic. Man, he said, was a fallen creature, lost in the night of his unrestrained liberty. Hence it was necessary to

28. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. clxviii, p. 421.

29. Ibid., p. 420.

30. Veillot, L., O.C., V. 12, p. 59.

31. Ibid., p. 61.

31a. Veillot went on to say of the Correspondant article: "C'est la thèse. Rendons-la plus claire. Le Pape désormais souverain constitutionnel dans les leçons spirituels comme dans les choses temporelles, acceptera l'infaillibilité du Concile, et le Concile à son tour, par une autre assimilation inévitable acceptera

have an infallible leader. "Pour ne pas perir, il nous faut un re-
 parateur, un chef et un phare."³² (The argument was common to
 Ultramontane writers during the Restoration, especially Lamennais
 and de Maistre). Then with a kind of circular argument he proposed
 that since infallibility was necessary it was certain. "Dieu y a pourvu,
 autrement nous n'aurions pas de Dieu...".³³ Then followed a historical
 survey in which inspiration, revelation and infallibility were blatantly
 confused. Adam, according to Veuillot, was the first repository of
 infallibility. However, he was perverted by the "esprit moderne", and
 the result was the Flood.³⁴ God then spoke to Noah and the latter
 became infallible.³⁵ Noah shared his infallibility with no one and took
 no man's counsel. (A necessary point with Veuillot who wanted to delin-
 eate the inferior position of the bishops in their relations with the infal-
 lible head of the Church). In fact the first deliberating assembly in human
 history denounced God and built the tower of Babel.³⁶ Moses was the next

l'infailibilité du genre humaine moderne, c'est à dire du peuple sou-
 veraine." Ibid., p. 60. The Liberal Catholics has said no such thing
 but Veuillot was attempting to argue that they were undertaking to demo-
 cratize the Church. "La 'Réaction du Correspondant'", he continued,
 "invite le Concile à mettre l'Eglise sur la voie d'une transformation
 qui aboutirait à la démocratie pure." Ibid., p. 60. (My italics). He
 accused the Liberal Catholics of heresy, "Le Correspondant, préoccupé
 de ses conceptions et des ses terreurs libérales, n'écoute que les bruits
 du monde et les susurrements des sectaires." Ibid., p. 61.

32. Ibid., p. 65.

33. Loc. cit.

34. Ibid., p. 65.

35. Loc. cit.

36. Ibid., p. 66.

to be invested with infallibility. "Moise est pleinement investi de l'infaillibilité." "On ne voit autour de lui aucun conseil."³⁷ But Moses, as Veuillot saw it, had been deranged ("ébranlé") by the voice of the "esprit moderne", and infallibility fell into better hands.³⁸ It was created by Jesus and established in a permanent institution where it was existed from that day to this; in the Church of St. Peter. But humanity, concluded Veuillot, was in the same state in which it existed before the Flood, "quelle que soit l'estime du Correspondant pour l'esprit humaine moderne."³⁹ Hence: "Il [mankind] a toujours besoin de Moise, toujours besoin de Noe, il lui faut toujours un guide, définitiveur infaillible de la vérité."⁴⁰

From this it would appear that Veuillot was less intent on propounding theological justification for infallibility than he was in showing how that doctrine was congenial to his authoritarian and paternalistic notions of government. Since mankind, according to him, required an infallible leader, infallibility existed. "L'infaillibilité est nécessaire: donc elle est visible et elle est certaine."⁴¹ Lamennais had said much the same thing in his essay on religious indifference as did de Maistre in Du Pape; but the difference was that these men were not undertaking,

37. Ibid., p. 66.

38. Ibid., p. 67.

39. Ibid., p. 68.

40. Loc. cit. Veuillot's assessment of contemporary civilization was at this time more pessimistic than ever before. On 26 Dec. 1868 he wrote Mgr. Mishin: "Quelle malheureuse chance de vivre parmi ces écroulements du monde." O.C., V. 10, p. 95. In January 1869 he wrote the abbe Guerber that: "Il faut aller au fond; ~~et cette civilisation,~~

as Veuillot ostensibly was, to set forth proofs of the Pope's infallibility. They simply wanted to show that after the dislocation of the French Revolution mankind required unchallenged leadership. Veuillot used the same arguments in order to prove that Pius IX was ipso facto infallible. His reference to the "esprit moderne", which seems inappropriate when applied to Adam and Moses, also indicates that he was far from writing a dispassionate account of Church history as the title of his article and the gravity of the subject matter would lead one to expect. The Liberal Catholics, for all their subterfuge, had at least taken pains to be accurate when treating of the Church and its history; that Veuillot felt himself to be under no such obligation shows to what extent Ultramontanism had succeeded in exaggerating the Priviligium Petri.

His survey of the history of papal infallibility was congenial to most Roman Catholic thought of this period. It was the liberals, not the conservatives, who were proposing a questionable and disturbing thesis to the Church and Louis Veuillot was very much aware that their position in the Catholic world, especially since the Syllabus of Errors, was a precarious one. His own arguments, because they reposed on an uncompromising interpretation of the Gospel and because they extolled the prerogative of Pius IX, could pass unchallenged. Veuillot knew that

41. Ibid., p. 65.

he spoke for most of Catholic France when he labelled the Liberal Catholics heretics. Bearing this fact in mind it is possible to see that in any contest between the Correspondant and the Univers, the latter would win. The Liberal Catholic had ended their tactic of diplomatic silence and had made public their fears concerning the Council, but they had incurred the rebuke of Louis Veuillot who had used this opportunity in order to brand his opponents as schismatics. One can appreciate now that the cause of Catholic liberalism would have been better served had the Correspondant continued to remain silent until the Council opened.

CHAPTER TWELVE

LOUIS VEUILLOT VS. BISHOP DUPANLOUP. THE LAST BATTLE

1.

The tactic of the Correspondant backfired. Rather than clear the air of Ultramontane "excesses", the article had given Veuillot an opportunity to set forth the conservative claims on the Council even further. This outcome should have been not difficult to foresee. Veuillot admired the Pope more than did the liberals who could come no where near matching his adulation for Pio Nono. Because of their reservations they had perforce to speak in measured words, although clothed in devotion, when addressing Pius IX. Veuillot on the other hand, wrote what the Pope, half the episcopate, the lower clergy, and the majority of French Catholics wanted to hear; the Liberal Catholics did not. Veuillot could never be non plussed, there were no limits to his affection for the Holy See. But the Liberal Catholics, because they harboured certain reservations concerning the prerogative of the Papacy, could be branded as lesser Catholics or, as Veuillot sometimes called them, non-Catholics.

The Liberal Catholics must have been aware of the fact that in any combat with Veuillot they would be at a great disadvantage.¹ But once the Council opened they could count on the liberal bishops in the

episcopacy, led by the influential bishop of Orleans, to get from that convocation the kind of reforms they desired or at least to block the measures they feared.² That the liberal group should break their self-imposed silence on the eve of the Council was, as Cochin's letter indicates, an unfortunate act of desperation.³ It was followed in November of that year by yet another one.

2.

Bishop Dupanloup, the leading Liberal Catholic ecclesiastic, had been singularly absent from the pre-Councilar debates. The reason for this was that his colleagues wanted him to say absolutely nothing until the convocation began, and then to use his prestige with his fellow bishops once the Council opened.⁴ They correctly reckoned that for him to engage in an unequal battle with his Ultramontane adversaries would seriously compromise the cause of Catholic liberalism: better wait for the Council when the balance would be more equal. Once in the guarded halls of St. Peter's, the Bishop could speak his mind without worrying about his conservative opponents, Veuillot notably.

1. In fact even the volatile Montalembert, (Montalembert of all people), realized this. On 10 December 1868 when Hyacinthe was engaged in a bitter polemic with Louis Veuillot, he gave the Carmelite the following advice: "Si vous voulez bien suivre mes avis, où plutôt profiter de ma longue et dure expérience, vous ne vous engagerez jamais dans une lutte de rectifications et d'explications avec nos antagonistes de la presse fanatique en France, en Italie ou ailleurs... aux dénonciations et aux accusations des familiers de l'inquisition contemporaine, il ne faut répondre que par le silence envers eux. Quant à toucher ou à éclairer qui que ce soit à Rome tant que durera la situation actuelle, vous devez savoir comme moi que c'est impossible." Hautin, A., Le Père Hyacinthe dans l'Eglise Romaine, p. 259.

But Orleans, against the advice of his colleagues, decided to act. "Il a pris son parti seul, contre tous et malgré tous", wrote Augustin Cochin.⁵ De Falloux, in his Memoires, attributes this action to the "violences de la polemique prétendu ultramontaine...".⁶ This assessment is not inaccurate. Orleans did seem troubled by the claims that the Univers and the Civilta cattolica were making on behalf of the papacy. So much was he distressed that he wrote a brochure entitled: Observations sur la controverse soulevée relativement à la définition de l'infailibilité au prochain concile which attacked certain Ultramontane journalists, namely Louis Veuillot and the editors of the Civilta. The pamphlet was published in the Français of 17 November, and also issued to every member of the episcopacy.

Although Bishop Dupanloup did not mention Louis Veuillot by name, it was obvious that he had him in mind when he castigated certain "journalistes intemperants", who had forced the doors of the Council

2. In his memoirs de Falloux wrote that the liberals put all their confidence in the Counciliar activity of Bishop Dupanloup. Falloux, H. de, Memoires d'un Royaliste, V. 2, p. 422.

3. See note 22 on p. 158.

4. Falloux, H. de, op. cit., p. 422.

5. Cochin, H., op. cit., V. 2, p. 254.

6. Falloux, H. de, op. cit., V. 2, p. 422. Many other factors could have contributed to Dupanloup's resolution to say something at this particular time. He seemed to be worried over what Ultramontane propoganda was doing to the chances of reunification with the Protestant Church. On 4 September 1869, he wrote in his diary: "Ils [the Protestants] nous éstiment. Pourquoi les repousser par des injures au lieu de les attirer par des vertus et de les éclairer par des raisons?"

with "les débats sur un des sujets théologiques les plus délicats."⁷

"Deux journaux surtout, la Civiltà cattolica et l'Univers ont pris ici la plus étonnante des initiatives."⁸ These papers, he argued, had made it appear that papal infallibility would be proclaimed as a matter of course by the bishops, without even prior discussion or debate.

What is worse, these journals had denounced as "schismatics" and "heretics" those Catholics who had taken a different attitude on this question.⁹ Dupanloup was obviously concerned with the bad press that Louis Veuillot had given the Liberal Catholics. By his own admission that inveterate journalist had been more than successful in equating Catholic liberalism with heresy.

Orleans attempted by one stroke to undo this damage; but this task was impossible because he had only a fraction of the support that Veuillot enjoyed. He set out nonetheless to prove that opposition to papal infallibility was theologically respectable. To this end he quoted a passage from an article by the English conservative Bishop Manning which had appeared in the Univers. The English prelate argued that "judgements ex cathedra are in their essence judgements of the Pontiff

Branchereau, L., op. cit., p. 306. Other problems: On 9 July the Archbishop of Chambéry wrote Dupanloup: "Je crains les indiscretions de quelques zelateurs exagérés. Ils conseillent de définir l'infailibilité. Qu' arrivera-t-il? On blessera l'Empereur et il retirera ses troupes de Rome, et les Italiens y entreront de suite et n'en sortiront pas de sito ". Brugerette, J., op. cit., V. 1, p. 226. Finally, Ferdinand Mourret found in Dupanloup's papers a transcription of a meeting the bishop had with Emile Ollivier, Napoleon's first Minister. The latter threatened to break off relations with the Holy See if infallibility was proclaimed at the Council. Mourret, Fernand, Le Concile du Vatican, Bloud et Gay, Paris, 1919, p. 51.

apart from the episcopal body whether congregated or dispersed."¹⁰

Dupanloup cited this passage on at least five occasions but with this difference: The words "apart from" had been translated in Veuillot's newspaper by the French séparément de which can mean "in opposition to". This was the interpretation Orleans chose to give that word and it formed the basis of his argument against infallibility.¹¹ Thus he wrote that:

Il s'agissait donc d'obliger désormais tous les catholiques à croire, sous peine d'anathème, que le Pape est infaillible, même, je me sers des propres expressions de Mgr. L'Archeveque de Westminster, quand il prononce seul 'EN DEHORS DU CORPS EPISCOPAL REUNI OU DISPERSÉ'; et qu'il peut définir les dogmes seul, 'SEPARÉMENT, INDEPENDAMMENT DE L'EPISCOPAT'.¹²

Dupanloup argued that it would be impossible for the bishops at the Council to pass such an extreme measure. For a doctrine formulated in this manner would provide an insurmountable obstacle to the prospects of reunion with the Protestant and Eastern Churches. He reminded his readers that there were 75 million Christians of the Eastern rite and 90 million Protestants who remained outside of the Roman Catholic fold. "Eh bien, qu'est-ce qui sépare de nous les Orientaux? La suprématie du Pape. Ils ne veulent pas la reconnaître comme de

7. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cclxiii, p. 432.

8. Ibid., p. 433.

9. Ibid., p. 435.

10. Loc. cit.

11. Bishop Manning protested that he meant no such thing. According to his biographer, the abbe Hemmer, the translation had been done by Louis Veuillot. Hemmer, H., Vie du Cardinal Manning, Lethielleux,

droit divin."¹³ Again he cited Manning's passage on infallibility.¹⁴

What was the issue that separated Roman Catholics from their Protestant brethren? "Ne parlez donc plus de leur imposer préalablement pour condition de retour, l'infaillibilité personnelle et séparée du Pape! Car ce serait l'oubli de toute prudence comme de toute charité."¹⁵

Having set forth these religious difficulties Dupanloup went on to discuss the political consequences that a proclamation of infallibility would have. Of the five great European powers, he wrote, Russia, Prussia and England were not Roman Catholic. "Qui ne sait quels embrages tous ces gouvernements nourrissent encore contre l'Eglise ... croit-on qu'une définition de l'infaillibilité personnelle du Pape soit de nature à dissiper ces embrages?"¹⁶ What could prevent an infallible Pope from proclaiming as dogma certain principles that his predecessors had espoused: that the vicar of Christ had direct power of temporal princes, that he could institute and depose sovereigns, and that the civil law of the land was subordinate to his law?¹⁷ Should a pope because of his newly acquired power, attempt any such thing it

Paris, 1898, p. 206. Did Louis Veillot intentionally exaggerate the inferior position of the bishops of the Church in their relationship with the Papacy as he had done in the article on the history of infallibility? Dupanloup's biographer thinks he did. Lagrange, F., V, 3, p. 136. But his Ultramontane critic, the abbe Maynard, argues that the French was not at all faulty and that only those who seemed predisposed to interpret "séparé de" as "in opposition to" would do so. "Cette expression (apart from, separement) nepouvait donner une impression pénible qu'à ceux qui étaient d'avance disposés à la prendre en un mauvais sens, ou plutôt

would have terrible consequences for the Church. Yet these were the very things the Ultramontane publicists were calling for. "Sans cesse les journaux, qui se donnent parmi nous comme les purs représentants des principes romains, étalent des théories dans leurs colonnes..."¹⁸

The rest of the pamphlet was devoted to the specific theological difficulties attendant upon the Pope's infallibility. What exactly is an ex cathedra pronouncement asked Dupanloup. "Est-ce un simple bref? Oui disent les uns; non disent les autres. Est-ce une bulle, une allocution consistoriale, une encyclique?"¹⁹ What would be the position of the bishops and the Roman Catholic faithful if the dogma should be proclaimed. "A quoi bon desormais les Conciles oecumeniques? Puisqu' UN SEUL, le Pape [again he quoted the same passage from Manning] pourra tout décider infailliblement."²⁰ The bishops would then no

en un sens absurde et anti-catholique." Maynard, U., op. cit., p. 179. Now Veuillot knew very little English and abbe Hemmer to the contrary it is not likely that he would attempt such a translation himself. Even if he had there is no justification for Lagrange's contention that he did so maliciously. The most natural English equivalent to "apart from" is in fact "séparément de".

12. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cclxiii, p. 434.

13. Ibid., p. 442.

14. Ibid., p. 443.

15. Ibid., p. 445.

16. Ibid., p. 448.

17. Ibid., p. 452.

18. Ibid., p. 455.

19. Ibid., p. 456.

20. Ibid., p. 471.

longer be voices in the Church but "de simples echos".²¹

Orleans pamphlet surprised everyone, especially his Liberal Catholic colleagues. This was the first time that a bishop of the Roman Catholic world had openly expressed his opposition to papal infallibility. Dupanloup moreover had not minced words: he had set forth in concise terms the genuine apprehensions of the liberals concerning the prerogative of Pius IX.^{21a} It was a risky manoeuvre on his part. Dupanloup was the Liberal Catholic trump. His influence was supposedly reserved for the big stakes at Rome; but he had played his hand even before the Council opened.²² "Va-t-il faire une trouée dans les rangs ennemis ou se creuser sa fosse à lui-meme?" asked Augustin Cochin.²³ His apprehension can be appreciated. If this brochure should be condemned by Rome, it would not only be Orleans

21. Ibid., p. 474.

21a. Even so Dupanloup could not fully speak his mind and express his resentment of the centralizing tendency of the Curia. We have on record a letter written by his vicaire general and closest friend, the abbe Lagrange, which more succinctly expresses the Liberal Catholic fear of papal infallibility. "A mon sens", writes Lagrange, "la est le vrai p̄ril: moins dans le triomphe d'une doctrine théologique [i. e. infallibility] que dans ses résultats immédiats, soit sur tous les non-catholiques, point de vue dont on ne sent pas assez a Rome la gravité, soit dans la pratique habituelle du gouvernement de L'Eglise et cet exorbitant italianisme, qui a fait et peut faire encore tant de mal à l'eglise, soit enfin sur ces tendances si opposées à la conciliation que nous cherchons, parce qu'elle est la vérité, non moins que la nécessité, entre le catholicisme et les sociétés modernes, tendances que la proclamation du dogme en question exagerait, j'en suis convaincu." Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup au debut du Concile du Vatican", p. 105.

22. It is true that Orleans had written two articles attacking the Civiltà cattolica in March, 1869, but he had used a pseudonym on that occasion and it was not generally known that he was the author.

"fosse" that had been dug but that of his colleagues as well. Fortunately, for the Liberal Catholics this did not happen. A refutation of the brochure came not from Rome but from Louis Veuillot.

3.

If Louis Veuillot disliked the Liberal Catholics, he positively hated Felix Dupanloup whom he privately called an "abominable et scelerate vieille bête."²⁵ Veuillot often lampooned both the bishop's person and his pastoral activities in his private correspondance.²⁶ Their quarrel was of long standing and went back to the 1850's when Orleans had unsuccessfully attempted to condemn the Univers. "Il [Orleans] m'a beaucoup persécuté", Veuillot told the Pape Nuncio in 1867.²⁷ The leader of the French Ultramontanes who also considered himself "la garde du Concile"²⁸ was not then disposed to let Dupanloup's observation of the forthcoming convocation go unanswered. But there was a difficulty: Dupanloup was a bishop and Veuillot was not. The former, because of his capacity, had a right to make public his appreciation of the greatest event in Church history, even if, as everyone knew, this appreciation was contrary to what the Pope and the Curia desired. But Veuillot, even if he was a celebrated laymen, was in no position to openly question this view.

He overcame this difficulty by a not very subtle combination of criticism and deference. While recognizing that he had no right to criticize the pamphlet "par prudence et par déference", ^{28a} he managed,

nevertheless, to attack both the brochure and its author.

Nous tenons [he wrote] que les actes épiscopaux doivent être soustraits à la contestation publique des laïques. Elargissant ce devoir, nous nous abstenons même de plaider.

En ceci du moins, nous croyons être d'accord avec Mgr. l'évêque d'Orléans, peu partisan (quoique toujours fort mêlé aux journaux) des libertés de ce qu'il appelle 'une certaine presse'.²⁹

This dubious consideration, however, did not prevent Veuillot from remarking how Orlean's brochure was part of a campaign "contre la doctrine de l'infailibilité du Vicaire de Jésus-Christ",³⁰ and reminding his Ultramontane readers that this campaign had been characterized by the defection of Father Hyacinthe: "A travers ces assauts le pauvre père Hyacinthe a passé comme une fusée qui avorte."³¹

Was he advocating here that the reforms Dupanloup suggested for the Church were similarly heretical? Dupanloup's pamphlet, he continued, had given "une tête épiscopal... à cette prise d'armes."³² He reminded his readers that the article was made for "la publicité militante."³³

And he concluded that Dupanloup's opposition to infallibility made a solution of that problem necessary:

23. Cochin, H., op. cit., V. 2, p. 253.

25. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 197.

26. See O.C., V. 27, pp. 154, 249.

27. Ibid., p. 335.

28. Ibid., p. 228.

28a. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cclxiv, p. 485.

29. Ibid., p. 486.

30. Ibid., p. 483.

31. Ibid., p. 483.

32. Ibid., p. 483.

33. Ibid., p. 484.

On ne peut empêcher, qu'un immense cri s'élève de la conscience catholique pour demander une solution . . . Une question vitale s'est invinciblement posée; sur cette question, les uns nient, les autres affirment. Ad Quem Ibimus?³⁴

In all this Veillot pretended not to be contesting Orleans brochure!³⁵

This article was followed in two days by another. In 1863, Bishop Pie of Poitiers had published a synodal letter on the principal errors of modern times, the Instruction synodale sur les principales erreurs du temps. Among the errors castigated in this document was to be found Catholic liberalism. Veillot, wishing to repudiate the assertions of Dupanloup while at the same time retaining some semblance of respect for his superiors, decided to use this synodal letter. Pie was the most conservative prelate in France and a great enemy of the Liberal Catholics.³⁶ Veillot, in publishing Pie's Instruction would be able to refute Dupanloup's ideas with the arguments of another bishop and at the same time would not be exposing himself to Orleans' censure. He proceeded then to publish a document in which the Liberal Catholic ideas were termed "destructeurs de tout ordre chrétien."³⁷ The view that Catholic liberalism was heretical was one thing when Veillot propounded

34. Ibid., p. 486.

35. Veillot was both tactless and sarcastic when he remarked: "Déjà une fois, usant assez strictement d'un droit incontestable à propos d'une discussion littéraire où il s'estima contredit, il [Dupanloup] crut devoir condamner l'Univers et en prohiber la lecture à plusieurs prêtres de son diocèse. Nous ne trouverions pas séant de l'amener à renouveler cet éclat". Ibid., p. 485.

the idea - he was only a laymen - but it was yet another thing when it was delivered with the authority and prestige usually associated with the episcopacy. This was a far-reaching manoeuvre on Veuillot's part. The Liberal Catholics were in no position to weather yet another condemnation of their principles. Veuillot continued his policy of setting one bishop against another when he cited the arguments of certain French prelates who favoured infallibility in opposition to Bishop Dupanloup's thesis.

He also quoted from Bishop Plantier's Instruction pastorale sur les Conciles généraux ("ouvrage plein de science et de maturité" according to Veuillot).³⁸ Plantier had argued that there was no good reason why the Council could not proclaim Papal infallibility by acclamation. "L'Esprit Sainte... n'exige pas rigoureusement sur les questions a trancher des débats preliminaires."³⁹ This was a crucial point. The Liberal Catholics hoped that the Council would openly debate and discuss the problems facing the Church. Any thought of acclamation filled them with horror. Veuillot, on the other hand, argued in this article that debate and discussion were not necessary. He reminded his readers that the Holy Spirit could manifest itself at the Council as

36. Pie and Veuillot sometimes dined together and talked "Haute Politique". Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 152.

37. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cclxviii, p.1204. There was absolutely no doubt that Pie's synodal letter was aimed by Veuillot at Bishop Dupanloup. He publicly acknowledged this fact in the article. Ibid., p. 1202.

38. Ibid., p. 1205.

39. Ibid., p. 1206.

it had done at the Cenacle. "Il est à remarquer", he said "qu'aucune discussion ne précéda cette invasion de l'Esprit de Dieu. . . et ce qui s'est fait dans cette première forme peut se faire encore."⁴⁰

Veillot must have known that arguments like this were irrefutable. The idea of conferring infallibility on Pius IX by acclamation seemed to be a natural result of the process of 'Romanization' that had begun in the 1850's.⁴¹ The Roman newspaper Civiltà cattolica had itself made similar pronouncements,⁴² Pius IX had often been apotheosized in the Roman Catholic writing of this period and infallibility, in the minds of many believers, was naturally a part of his God given prerogative.⁴³ Because of these facts it is not difficult to see that Dupanloup's Observations were a grave tactical error on the part of the Liberal Catholics. These men knew that their ideas were suspect in the Church and that they were in no position to debate with their Ultramontane opponents.⁴⁴ It was desperation that caused Orleans to publish his commentary on the eve of the Council, and like the Correspondant manifesto of 10 October it caused more harm than good to the liberal cause.⁴⁵ Veillot was able

41. See pp. 40-50 above.

42. See p. 119 above.

43. See Professor Dansette's estimation on p. 46 above.

44. See note 1 on p. 167.

45. Professor Aubert has discovered a letter written by Ladislas Kukrycki to the editors of the Correspondant concerning Dupanloup's Observations. "La lettre de Mgr. Dupanloup à propos de l'infailibilité du pape a éclaté comme la foudre à Rome. On y est dans la stupeur. On ne supposait même pas que l'illustre prélat put se prononcer aussi ouvertement. [...] Chez Mgr. Nardi et dans les cercles des nombreux amis de M. Veillot, on crie à tue-tête que l'évêque d'Orléans est un

to use this incident in order to argue that papal infallibility was not even open to discussion - it was a matter for the Holy Spirit to decide. He made it appear that even a legitimate discussion of the prerogatives of Pius IX betrayed a lack of affection for the Holy See that was not becoming of Roman Catholics. His commentary on Orlean's pamphlet appealed to the lower clergy, and their influence on the episcopate was very real.⁴⁶ It required a great deal of courage for a bishop to appear less devoted to the Holy See than the priests in his diocese. It is highly possible that the small support Orleans received among the episcopacy during the Council resulted in part from the bad press Veuillot had given him on the eve of that convocation.

hérésiarque." Aubert, R., "Mgr. Dupanloup...", p. 99.

46. See p. 41 above. On 16 December 1869 Madame Forbin wrote that: "Tout le clergé de ce diocèse, mais absolument tout, les vicaires généraux, comme les curés de village, les dominicains, fils indignes du P. Lacordaire, comme les Jésuites et les Benedictins, contre, Mgr. Placeet l'Evêque d'Orléans; l'Univers est l'oracle des curés qui ne lisent pas d'autre journal...". Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin", p. 74.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE MEASURE OF VEUILLOT'S SUCCESS

1.

On 16 December 1869, Madame Forbin wrote that:

Tout le clergé de ce diocèse, mais absolument tout, les vicaires généraux, comme les curés de village, les dominicains, fils indignes du P. Lacordaire, comme les Jésuites et les Benedictins, contre Mgr. Place et l'Evêque d'Orléans; l'Univers est l'oracle des curés qui ne lisent pas d'autre journal....¹

It would appear from her letter that Orleans' tactic had failed. Like the Correspondant article of 10 October, it had given Louis Veillot an opportunity to set forth his conservative philosophy even further. Perhaps Bishop Dupanloup felt that since he was a ranking prelate his Observations would be given the kind of safe passage that the article in the Correspondant lacked. The Observations, after all, implicitly carried his own imprimatur and it is reasonable to expect that this factor would guarantee them from the attacks of the Ultramontanes. But Louis Veillot was not deterred by this tactic. In his first commentary on the Observations he pretended not to attack the article, but at the same time made it clear that Orleans' ideas were mistaken ones. In his second article he opposed the teachings of conservative bishops to those of Dupanloup

1. Palanque, J., "Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin...", p. 74.

in order to confound the latter's views concerning papal infallibility.

An indication of Veuillot's success in this matter is to be found in the reaction his commentary had on Dupanloup himself. Orleans, seeing that he had only given Veuillot another opportunity to make conservative speculations concerning the Council, lost his head. He addressed an official Avertissement a Louis Veuillot which appeared on November 21. Under canon law Orleans had no right to do this because Veuillot did not belong to his diocese. In this document Bishop Dupanloup attempted to discredit the Ultramontane jouranlist just before the Council opened. The document is an eloquent testimony of the influence Louis Veuillot had acquired in the French Church.

Veuillot was accused of assuming a role in the Church "qui n'est plus tolérable",² of passing judgement on the episcopate "pour déshonorer les uns et dominer les autres",³ and of taking sides in theological questions "les plus graves, les plus délicats, et les plus complexes."⁴

J'accuse vos usurpations sur l'Episcopat, et votre intrusion perpetuelle dans ses plus graves et plus délicates affaires.

J'accusesurtout vos exces de doctrine, votre déplorable gout pour les questions irritantes, et pour les solutions violentes et dangereuses.

2. Cecconi, E., op. cit., doc. cclxxxix, p. 1317.

3. Ibid., p. 1317.

4. Ibid., p. 1317.

5. Ibid., p. 1318.

Par-dessus tout je vous reproche de rendre l'Eglise complice de vos violences, en donnant pour sa doctrine, par une rare audace, vos idées les plus personnelles.⁵

Veillot, he said, had disfigured the Church.⁶ Without taking care to be precise he had condemned en bloc "libéralisme", "progrès", "Civilisation", "société moderne".⁷ He had rendered the Papacy odious⁸ by exaggerating its prerogatives out of all reasonable proportions. He had perpetuated the misunderstandings that divided the Christian world, "ces affreux malentendus qui nous dévorent".⁹ "Vous êtes catholique pur", wrote Dupanloup, "et vous avez le plaisir d'ecraser/ les faux catholiques, les indignes catholiques, qui ne marchent pas derrière vous."¹⁰

After these general remarks Orleans went on to consider Louis Veillot's campaign regarding papal infallibility. The tone he adopted in this part of the Avertissement betrays a conviction that Veillot had indeed been more than successful in refuting the Liberal Catholic interpretation of the Council. Why, he asked, had Veillot broached a "si délicate et si grave question", in the French press?¹¹ "De quel droit vous êtes-vous permis de tracer aux Evêques un programme?" He reminded his adversary that many bishops who held ideas on in-

6. Ibid., p. 1327.

7. Ibid., p. 1319. These are Bishop Dupanloup's italics.

8. Ibid., p. 1331.

9. Ibid., p. 1332.

10. Ibid., p. 1331.

11. Ibid., p. 1331.

fallibility that differed from Veuillot's had to suffer his attacks.¹² He cited the petitions Veuillot had listed in the Univers and labelled him the "grand agitateur dans l'Eglise".¹³ Dupanloup then quoted from Veuillot's own writings on infallibility and especially from his commentary on the history of that doctrine concluding that Veuillot was a theologian "comme certains docteurs à la voix retéissant sont mèdeins."¹⁴

The important thing about the Avertissement was its timing. Veuillot's commentaries on the Observations appeared on November 18th and 20th. The Avertissement appeared on the 21st. It is a lengthy and exhaustive document of 34 pages and could not have been formulated in a matter of days. It was a long time in preparation and even Veuillot realized this. "Je la voyais confectionner depuis longtemps", he wrote the abbé Lamaron, "J'étais certain qu'elle éclaterait un jour...".¹⁵ Orleans must have had the Avertissement ready for some time but he required an excuse in order to deliver it. Veuillot's criticism of his Observations gave him the pretext he needed. This is in itself a revealing fact.

Louis Veuillot's utterances, especially those concerning the Holy See, were of dubious theological value. Orleans realized this but he hesitated to condemn them, the reason being that Veuillot's exag-

12. Ibid., p. 1333.

13. Ibid., p. 1333.

14. Ibid., p. 1338.

15. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 232.

generations were not suspect to either the Pope or to the Ultramontanes in France who constituted the majority of Roman Catholics. That a respected member of the episcopacy required a pretext to attack teachings that were manifestly unsound testifies both to the extent to which these teachings were accepted in the Catholic world and more precisely to the strength of Louis Veillot, their chief exponent in France.

A similar compliment was paid to Veillot's influence in the way of a brochure entitled: M. Veillot et les Evêques de France Au Concile. It was written by a Liberal Catholic, the abbe Ansault, and appeared in 1869. The precise date is unknown but internal evidence suggests that it appeared at the end of the year before the Council opened. In his preface Ansault remarked that the most important task awaiting the Council was that of formulating the attitude of the Church to modern times - "à l'égard de la civilisation moderne."¹⁶ "Voilà la question qui préoccupe tous les esprits."¹⁷ But there exists in France a religious party "dont M. Louis Veillot est l'organe, disons mieux, le chef",¹⁸ which opposes any reconciliation between Church and society. This party will be represented at the Council and will attempt to have that conclave sanction "ses anathèmes contre la société contemporaine."¹⁹ Ansault could not abide such a possibility:

16. Ansault, M. M. Veillot et les évêques de France au Concile, Dentu, Paris, 1869, p. 8.

17. Ibid., p. 8.

18. Ibid., p. 9.

19. Ibid., p. 10.

Mais en voyant un laïque [Louis Veuillot] s'arroger avec tant d'audace l'enseignement de la doctrine, le gouvernement des consciences, . . . n'avons nous pas le droit d'espérer que le Concile s'élèvera contre une si dangereuse usurpation. . . .²⁰

Aware of the strength Louis Veuillot had acquired in the Church, Ansault wanted to insure that the bishops at the Council would not follow his directives concerning the posture of the Church in the modern world. To insure this end he undertook to discredit the Ultramontane journalist. His pamphlet was divided into three parts. The first section dealt with the Syllabus of Errors and showed how that document had been interpreted in a liberal manner by some of the "plus illustres Evêques de France".²¹ The second part attempted to prove that Louis Veuillot, in castigating the Liberal Catholics, had condemned those bishops who were favourable to "la société moderne."²² The last section entitled l'histoire des variations de M. Veuillot écrite par lui-même, attempted to delineate the errors in Veuillot's own thinking.

Did these brochures, Dupanloup's and Ansault's, succeed in discrediting Veuillot on the eve of the Council? A letter to his brother written from Rome on 4 December suggests that they did not. "Je me suis présenté hier au Vatican en habit long. Tout est notre."²³

20. Ibid., p. 10.

21. Loc. cit.

22. Ibid., p. 10.

23. Veuillot, L., O.C., V. 10, p. 236. Italics added.

CONCLUSION

In 1855 a group of French Catholic celebrities under the leadership of Rene Forbes count de Montalembert founded the Correspondant. It was their intention to show Roman Catholics that the Church was not, by definition, inimical to the new developments in science, history and higher criticism. They wanted also to show that the Church was amenable to the changes wrought by the Revolution of 1789 - to parliamentary government, religious toleration, and separation of Church and State. The Liberal Catholics felt that the faith must accommodate these new developments in order to minister to the needs of men in the modern age. The group, although it never attracted a large following, was still a force to be reckoned with. It had the support of the Orleanist aristocracy, the Academy, half the episcopate, and the Parisian intellectuals. Yet it failed in its attempts to modernize the French Church.

The religious climate of the period under study militated considerably against any progressive reforms in the Church. The claims of reasoned argument could not be successfully made in a situation in which the lower clergy and the Ultramontane masses were preoccupied with the more mystical and devotional aspects of the faith. This was especially so in an age when Renan and Taine were themselves

attacking the divine nature of the Church, also in the name of reason.

To this must be added the immense influence of the Holy See. Pius IX who had been forced by the Italian nationalists to flee Rome was not one to encourage Catholic liberalism especially since Mazzini and Cavour also called themselves liberals.

The movement then was beset by its times; but this is not in itself a satisfactory explanation for the failure of French Liberal Catholicism in this period. Great movements like great men are said to be able to mould and change their times. French intellectual history is rich in this particular phenomenon. Coincident with the miracles at Lourdes and LaSalette were Comte's lectures on positive philosophy; yet the times did not prevent Comte's disciples from laying the foundation of naturalism right in the age of miracles. Something more than Zeitgeist is necessary to account for the failure of the movement.

This other factor is Louis Veuillot. If any man personified the New Ultramontanism it was the intrepid journalist from Boynes. To his basically simple religious philosophy "hors de l'Eglise point de salut" - he joined a very real literary talent, one that modern criticism is only beginning to appreciate. From the time of his conversion to Roman Catholicism until the day he died, he celebrated the faith with the most unrelenting apologetic that the 19th century Church has known. He owed his strength in part to his simplicity, to his ability to give

simple solutions to complicated problems. His life philosophy which found its way into every page he wrote was short and to the point. He put his trust in God, the Pope, and the Church - in that order. For what the Liberal Catholics reverently called "la societe moderne" he had no esteem. He was an integralist. The Church was the repository of The Truth and everything that differed from her traditional teachings was stained with heresy. The Church, according to Veillot, had nothing to learn from the civilization of the 19th century; secular society was evil.

For almost thirty years he waged an uncompromising war against some of the most distinguished Roman Catholics of his day. His enemies, it must not be forgotten, were well born, educated, and talented men. He was the self-taught son of a provincial barrel maker. Yet in spite of his modest background Veillot was able to effectively silence the Liberal Catholic celebrities for almost six years. In large part it was his humble background and the simplicity of his thinking that accounted for his popularity. Where the Liberal Catholics wrote in a prose that betrayed an affiliation with the Academie Francaise, Veillot spoke in a language that the Roman Catholic masses and the 51,000 regular clergy could understand.

He also wrote what they wanted to hear. Perhaps no other French Catholic since Lamennais has set forth greater claims on behalf

of the French Church than did Louis Veuillot in the 1850's and 60's. He regularly apotheosized Pius IX. He enthusiastically promoted the alliance of the French Church with the autocratic government of Napoleon III. He waxed nostalgic over the special privileges the Church had enjoyed in better days and argued for their return. Few were his contemporaries, even among the Ultramontanes, who would dare express such ideas in public. Veuillot championed an aggressive Catholicism, one with ever increasing powers and prerogatives. Where the Liberal Catholics reminded their coreligionaries that the age of special privilege was over, Veuillot told them that the Church was on the dawn of a new Middle Ages, another Holy Roman Empire under the presidency of Pius IX was in the offing. He dared to take the offensive at a time when the divine nature of the Church was being put to the test by the new science. The Liberal Catholics were all for accommodating the Church to these new developments, but Veuillot would have nothing of their transaction. He offered Catholics more when it is reasonable to expect that they would be satisfied with less, and it is this fact that makes his apologetic so original and so much more popular than that of his adversaries.

Veuillot made use of this popularity in order to combat what he felt was the greatest heresy threatening the Church: Liberal Catholicism. A consideration of his activities in the period 1864-1869 shows that he, more than any other Frenchman, was responsible for the failure of that movement.

It may be argued that Catholic liberalism was destroyed by the Syllabus of Errors in which Veuillot did not play a role. The liberals, it is true, were definitely on the defensive after the promulgation of that document, but they were not broken. It has been seen how Bishop Dupanloup's commentary saved them from outright extinction. Had they been able to acquire a complimentary brief for Orleans' pamphlet their movement might once again have appeared respectable. But Louis Veuillot prevented the liberals from getting the kind of approbation they could fling into the face of their adversaries as proof of their orthodoxy. The Papal brief they received contained a left-handed compliment and Veuillot was the man who had put it there. He realized that a document formulated in this manner would present more of a liability than an asset to his adversaries hence he encouraged his sister to popularize the so-called complimentary brief. He did more. In the following year he published his own commentary on the Syllabus, the Illusion libérale. In this brochure Veuillot blatantly equated Christian liberalism with heresy. The Liberal Catholic, he concluded, was a "séctaire", "voilà son vrai nom". His adversaries dared not answer this charge (even though he had contrived that they would), such was their pessimism after the Syllabus.

An event in 1867 changed everything. It was announced in that year that a general council of the Church would be held in the near future. Not since the Council of Trent had the bishops of the Catholic

world met in order to discuss the problems facing the Church. The Liberal Catholics were optimistic. Montalembert wrote that the Council event would confound the Ultramontane movement. Bishop Dupanloup expected open debate and discussion on the problems facing Roman Catholics, and he felt that the liberal view would triumph at Rome. So as not to forfeit these expectations the liberals agreed upon a tactic of silence: they would say absolutely nothing until the Council opened.

But these men had not counted on Louis Veuillot. He read between the lines of Aeterna patris and publically interpreted the Pope's real intentions in calling a council of the Church. Pius IX was about to enter into his dictatorship, a new order was on the horizon. Veuillot envisaged a theocracy, a future confederation of Christian states resembling the Holy Roman Empire under the presidency of the Pope. The Liberal Catholics despaired; but they could not openly attack this view. What Veuillot was saying may have been of questionable religious and theological value, but it was accepted by the majority of French Roman Catholics and even by the Curia. In other words, Veuillot was offering the Church more than the liberals were and they could not openly challenge his views without appearing to be lukewarm Catholics. He was the spokesman of the powerful forces of Ultramontanism; the Liberal Catholics, by comparison, were only a coterie. He could say what he liked and they could not.

Thus when he printed the Civiltà article in the Univers calling it a document of "GREAT IMPORTANCE" his conduct seemed irreproachable. The article may have been nothing more than Ultramontane propoganda, an eulogy of Louis Veillot written by a close friend of his, but it carried the prestige associated with the semi-official organ of the Vatican, the Civiltà cattolica. The article seemed to have the imprimatur of Pius IX himself. In throwing this condemnation into the face of the Liberal Catholics, Veillot was only acting as the spokesman of the Roman view but he knew that the Roman attitude was the same as his own. The Liberal Catholics could never find such approbation for their policies. They could never quote Rome to Veillot's disadvantage. His treatment of the petitions regarding the forthcoming Council betrays the same tactic. He employed the adulation that the lower clergy and the Roman Catholic masses felt for Pius IX in order to contradict the expectations the Liberal Catholics harboured concerning the Council. Again he was in the right. "On y entend chanter le large coeur catholique", he remarked as he cited the theological exaggerations of his subscribers. His strategy was irrefutable. How could the Liberal Catholics criticize the affection Veillot's readers felt for Pius IX without calling their own faith into question.

His attitude in the Hyacinthe affair similarly reposed on the assumption that he, Veillot, represented the only orthodox aspect of Roman Catholicism. It was one thing to denounce Father Hyacinthe,

even his colleagues did this, but it was yet another thing to argue that the Carmelite's heresy resulted from his liberalism. Veillot took pains to be clear on this matter. He drew a close connection between Hyacinthe's liberalism and his subsequent repudiation of the Roman Church. Hyacinthe, he argued, had followed a "voie logique", only a difference in degree separated the Liberal Catholics from their fallen colleague.

On this point it seems that he wrote with more logic than his adversaries. The Liberal Catholics refused openly to admit the theological antagonism that existed between their ideas and the teachings of Rome. But Louis Veillot, who never ceased to be in the mainstream of the Ultramontane tradition, analysed that antagonism on their behalf. The man who wrote in the *Illusion libérale* (1867) that every liberal was a "sectaire" was justified in showing that Hyacinthe's apostasy resulted from the principles he had embraced.

On two occasions the Liberal Catholics attempted to refute Louis Veillot's assertions concerning the Council. These were serious miscalculations on their part; they provided Louis Veillot with the opportunity he required to attack their movement and to refute the optimistic interpretation of the Council. In answer to the article Le Concile which appeared in the Correspondant, Veillot wrote an historical survey of papal infallibility in which he confused inspiration,

revelation and infallibility. He made it appear as if God spoke directly to the Pope! He was obviously not very careful about the orthodoxy of his statements, but his arguments were suited to a refutation of the Liberal Catholics who were intent on decreasing the prerogative of Pius IX. The strategy Veuillot adopted allowed him to manifest his own love for Pio Nono and at the same time it enabled him to show that the Liberal Catholic reticence in this matter cast a serious doubt on the sincerity of their belief.

He similarly turned the table on Bishop Dupanloup who, against the advice of his colleagues, decided to take the field against the Ultramontanes with his Observations. Orleans, probably believed that since he was a ranking prelate his brochure would escape the criticism of Louis Veuillot. He was mistaken. The Observations gave Veuillot an opportunity to republish Bishop Pie's synodal letter on the errors of modern times, a violent denunciation of Catholic liberalism. The incident also allowed Veuillot to breach an idea that was anathema to the Liberal Catholics, that of proclaiming infallibility by acclamation. He quoted an argument in favour of this practice from the work of a conservative bishop and then concluded that there was no reason why the Holy Spirit could not speak immediately through the mouths of the bishops at the Council as had been done in other circumstances in the history of the Church.

A study of these confrontations suggests that Veuillot was so imminantly successful in refuting the Liberal Catholics because he never joined issue with them on their own terms. To arguments concerned with 'progress', 'modern society', 'civilization', he answered with an unequivocal "no". Veuillot denied himself an insight into the perspective shared by his Liberal Catholic adversaries. He refused to sympathise even to a small degree with their aspirations. The man who in 1868 prophesized another Holy Roman Empire could not admit that the days of special privilege for the Church were finally over. It was this very refusal to understand the dangers implicit in any extension of the prerogative of the Church in a modern and secular state that accounted for Veuillot's success. He was the spokesman for the Church militant. His diatribes against Christian liberalism were written in the belief that any concessions to the demands of the times would fatally weaken the Church. He took the side of authority, the side of the Pope and the conservative Roman Curia and it was this fact that irritated his adversaries.

The Liberal Catholics knew that Veuillot was the Pope's man and Veuillot also knew it. The nature of his apologetic - his theological exaggerations and the savagery with which he attacked his adversaries - betrays the confidence of a man convinced that his cause can not bear scrutiny. Who else in the Roman Catholic press would dare traduce a respectable prelate of the Church or advise the entire episcopate in the most complicated theological matters?

Because of his self-assurance, Veuillot was able to effectively silence the Liberal Catholics for almost six years, and to discredit their movement on the eve of the most important event in the history of the Church. It is true that he was assisted by other conservatives namely, Bishop Pie of Poitiers; but Pie, even though he was just as extreme as Veuillot, lacked the popularity enjoyed by the editor of the Univers. Other Ultramontane publicists especially Dom Gueranger and Eugene Veuillot made their voices heard in the Univers, but they were not as outspoken as Louis Veuillot and could never match his journalistic talent. Even among the most extreme Ultramontanes, Pie included, one does not find those arguments that are frequently discovered in Veuillot's writings: the eulogy of force as a method of coercing religious uniformity, the appeal to theocracy. In Louis Veuillot all of the concepts that are associated with ultra-conservative Catholic thought - the role of authority and force, paternalistic government of men, the heightened importance attached to the Papacy - are presented in their most extreme form. It was the misfortune of the Liberal Catholic movement that at the very moment it was attempting to reform the French Church, these ideas should find their greatest and most successful champion.

END

APPENDIX A

Published in 1884, the year after Veuillot's death, Huysmans classic study of French decadence contains a revealing picture of French religious life in the late 19th century. The author, who like so many sensitive men in his age took the road that led from naturalism through symbolism and finally to Catholic mysticism, relates the difficulties his protagonist encounters when confronted with the Roman Catholic teachings of the day.

'It ought to be possible to stop arguing with yourself', he [Des Esseintes] told himself miserably; 'it ought to be possible to shut your eyes, let yourself drift along with the stream, and forget all those damnable discoveries that have blasted religion from top to bottom in the last two hundred years.

'And yet', he sighed, 'it isn't really the physiologists or the sceptics who are demolishing Catholicism; it's the priests themselves, whose clumsy writings would shake the firmest convictions! (italics added)

Among the Dominicans, for instance, there was a Doctor of Theology, the Reverend Father Rouard de Card, a preaching friar who, in a booklet entitled The Adul of the Sacramental Substances, had proved beyond all doubt that the majority of Masses were null and void, simply because the materials used by the priests were sophisticated by certain dealers.

For years now, the holy oil had been adulterated with poultry-fat; the taper wax with burnt bones; the incense with common resin and old benzoin. But what was worse was that the two substances that were indispensable for the holy sacrifice, the two substances without which no oblation was possible, had also been adulterated; the wine by repeated dilutings and the illicit addition of Pernambuco bark, elderberries, alcohol, alum, alicylate, and litharge, the bread, that bread of the Eucharist which should be made from the finest of wheats, with bean-flour, potash, and pipe-clay!

And now they had gone even further; they had had the effrontery to leave out the wheat altogether, and most hosts were made by shameless dealers out of potato-flour!!

Now God refused to come down to earth in the form of potato-flour; that was an undeniable, indisputable fact. In the second volume of his Moral Theology, His eminence Cardinal Gousset had also dealt at length with this question of fraud from the divine point of view; according to this unimpeachable authority it was quite impossible to consecrate bread made of oatmeal, buckwheat, or barley, and if there was at least

some doubt in the case of rye bread, there could be no doubt or argument about potato-flour, which, to use the ecclesiastic phrase, was in no sense a competent substance for the Blessed Sacrament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Ansault, M., M. Veillot et les évêques de France au Concile, Dentu, Paris, 1869, pp. 93.

A Liberal Catholic denunciation of the policies of Louis Veillot. An important piece justificative which testifies to Veillot's influence in the Church.

Blakiston, N., (ed.), The Roman Question, Extracts From the Despatches of Odo Russell From Rome 1858-1870, Chapman and Hall, London, 1962, pp. 474.

Russell was a very perceptive diplomat and in spite of his Whig bias, his reports provide one of the best sources of contemporary reaction to the Syllabus and the Vatican Council.

Branchereau, L., (ed.) Journal Intime de Monseigneur Dupanloup, Pierre Tequi, Paris, 1828, pp. 356.

This is the diary of the Bishop of Orleans. The work has been all too judiciously edited. In spite of this there is still some important information regarding the Syllabus of Errors and Dupanloup's commentary on that document.

Broglie, A. de, "Mémoires - IX, Autour du Syllabus", in Revue des Deux Mondes, November (1925), pp. 118-143.

One of the chief Liberal Catholic celebrities recollects his apprehensions on hearing of the Syllabus.

Cecconi, E., Histoire Du Concile du Vatican, d'après les documents originaux, 4 Vol., Victor Lecoffre, Paris, 1887.

This is an indispensable collection of documents concerning the preliminaries to the Vatican Council. All the evidence on both sides of the polemic have been reproduced here.

Charbonnel, J., Pensées De M. Louis Veillot, Poussielque, Paris, 1868, pp. 460.

A collection of Veillot's articles compiled by an Ultramontane friend of his. The work contains a copy of the papal brief Veillot received on the occasion of his Vie de Jesus.

Cochin, H., Augustin Cochin 1823-1872. Ses lettres et sa vie, 2 Vol., Bloud et Gay, Paris, 1926.

Augustin Cochin's letters are the best source for the internal history of the Liberal Catholic movement in the 1860's. The real fears and aspirations of the party can be discerned in his correspondence.

Collection Conciliorum Reventiorum Ecclesiae Universae, 53 Vol., Arnheim, 1923.

This collection contains the secret dispatches from the universal episcopate regarding the forthcoming Council. Especially important are the letters of Cardinal Pie, the leading Ultramontane in the episcopacy.

Cornudet, L., (ed.), Correspondance de Montalembert et de Leon Cornudet 1831-1870, Honore Champion, Paris, 1905, pp. 358.

Only two or three letters in this collection are pertinent to the problems treated in the thesis but these particular letters are very important for the information they provide regarding Montalembert's reaction to the news of the Council.

Dupanloup, F., La Convention du 15 septembre et l'Encyclique du 8 décembre, Charles Douniol, Paris, 1865, pp. 157.

This is Bishop Dupanloup's brochure on the Syllabus of Errors.

Falloux, A. de, (ed.), Correspondance du R. P. Lacordaire et de Madame Swetchine, Auguste Vaton, Paris, 1864, pp. 393.

Lacordaire's letters are a useful source for the religious history of the 1850's.

Falloux, A. de, Discours et Melanges Politiques, 2 vol., Pion et Cie, Paris, 1882.

This collection contains those documents relevant to the early history of the Liberal Catholic party and to its struggle with the Ultramontane movement.

Falloux, A. de, Mémoires d'un Royaliste, 2 vol., Perrin et Cie., Paris, 1888.

An excellent source for the internal history of the Liberal Catholic movement.

Goyou, G., (ed.), Pages Choiesies de Montalembert avec lettres inédits, Victor Lecoffre, Paris, 1920, pp. 342.

Only a few letters in this collection relate to the events under consideration but they are very revealing.

Huysmans, J, - K., Against Nature, translated by Robert Baldick, Penquin Books, London, 1966, pp. 220.

Contains a revealing insight into French religious developments in the last half of the 19th century. Huysmans has also given us a personal assessment of Louis Veuillot.

Lagrange, F., (ed.), Lettres Choiesies de Mgr. Dupanloup, 2 vol., Jules Gervais, Paris, 1888.

This collection like Orleans' diary has been very carefully edited. Still, there are some important letters dealing with Dupanloup's reaction to the news of the Council.

Montalembert, R., de, Des intérêts Catholiques au XIX siecle, H. Geomaire, Bruxelles, 1852, pp. 167

This is the first Liberal Catholic political manifesto. It is a document of the first importance; it officially signals the end of Liberal Catholic support for the Empire.

Montalembert, R., de, Discours de M. le comte de Montalembert, 3 vol., Victor Lecoffre, Paris, 1892.

This collection contains the important speech Montalembert delivered to the Malines Congress.

Ollivier, E., L'Eglise et L'Etat au Concile du Vatican, 2 vol., Garnier Freres, Paris, n.d.,

One of the most perceptive statesmen of the Second Empire gives his first hand impressions of religious developments during the 1860s.

Palanque, J., Le Cercle de Madame de Forbin et le premier concile du Vatican (Documents inédits), Rev. d'histoire de L'Eglise de France, 47-48 (1961-62), pp. 54-79.

These recently discovered documents show how some of the less important Liberal Catholics viewed the polemic with the Ultramontanes.

Pange, J., de, Theophile Foisset et le prince de Broglie avec des lettres inédits, Le Correspondant, October (1929), pp. 113-138.

These letters are very important for an understanding of the early history of the Liberal Catholic party and for an appreciation of the events that led to the Correspondant in 1855.

Oeuvres Episcopales du Cardinal Pie eveque de Poitiers, 5 vol., Librairie Religieuse, Paris, n.d.

All of Pie's important writings are contained in this collection. Especially interesting is the article he wrote concerning the Syllabus of Errors.

Saint-Beuve, C., Les Grands Ecrivains Français, Garnier Freres, Paris, 1930.

An excellent contemporary assessment of Louis Veuillot.

Vaughan, H., The Year of Preparation for the Vatican Council Including the Original and English of the Encyclical and Syllabus and of the Papal Documents Connected with its Convocation, Burns Oates, London, 1869, pp. 146.

Important documents dealing with the religious history of the 1860's.

Viel-Castle, H., de, Petite-Histoire du Second Empire, Presse de l'Opera, n.p., n.d., pp. 337.

An important source for the contemporary assessment of Louis Veillot it contains. This is the diary of a Second Empire aristocrat.

Veillot, L., Oeuvres Complètes, Deuxieme Serie, 40 Vol., Pl Lethielleux, Paris, 1931.

This collection consists of the books, pamphlets, newspaper articles and personal correspondance of Louis Veillot. The collection is extensive but it is incomplete. Many articles must be sought in other sources notably Cecconi. The personal correspondence contains a great deal of information but is not as revealing as that of the Liberal Catholic protagonists.

Secondary Sources

Aubert, R., Le Pontificat de Pie IX (1846-1878), Bloud et Gay, Paris, 1952, pp. 510.

This is the best study of the pontificate of Pius IX. Aubert is a brilliant scholar and all his books and articles combine a meticulous attention to detail with a graceful style.

Aubert, R., Vatican I, Editions de l'Orante, Paris, 1964, pp. 341.

The most recent study of the First Vatican Council. A great deal of hitherto unknown information is introduced in the early chapters dealing with pre-conciliar events.

Bazin, G., Vie de Mgr. Maret évêque de Sura, archevêque de Lepante, Son temps et ses oeuvres, 3. Vol., Berche et Tralin, Paris, 1891.

The official biography of one of the few Gallican bishops in 19th century France. Many relevant documents are reproduced in this study.

Besse, R. P., Le Syllabus, L'Eglise et les libertés, Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, Paris, 1913, pp. 256.

The background to the Syllabus with special attention given to French religious matters.

Brandes, G., Revolution and Reaction in Nineteenth Century French Literature, Russell and Russell, N. Y., n.d., pp. 300.

This study of conservative thought during the Restoration provides an excellent introduction to the Ultramontanism of the 1860's.

Brugerette, J., Le Prêtre Français et la société contemporaine, 3 Vol., Lethielleux, Paris, n.d.

The first volume of this study contains useful information concerning the attitudes of the 19th century French clergy. The work attempts also to assess the Ultramontane influence on the lower clergy. The work is nowhere near as scholarly as Marcilhacy's.

Butler, C., The Vatican Council. The Story Told From Inside in Bishop Ullathorne's Letters, 2 vol., Longmans, London, 1930.

The best study on the Council to appear in English. Butler explodes many of the myths concerning the Council, i.e. that it was a Roman conspiracy.

Bury, J. B., History of the Papacy in the 19th Century, Schocken, N. Y., 1964, pp. 217.

This work contains an excellent analysis of the Syllabus of Errors. Bury is definitely anti-Pius IX, and allowance must be made for this bias.

Dansette, A., Religious History of Modern France, 2 Vol., Herder and Herder, N.Y., 1961.

A general history of the French Church in the 19th century. It provides a good background to the period as a whole.

Fernessole, P., Pie IX, 2 vol., Lethellieux, Paris, 1960.

Next to Aubert's study this work provides the best description of religious events in 19th century France. The appendix to Vol. 2 reproduces some very important documents i. e. Pius IX's brief to Bishop Dupanloup.

Foucher, L., La Philosophie Catholique en France au XIXe siècle avant la renaissance Thomiste et dans son rapport avec elle (1800-1880), Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, Paris, 1955, pp. 280.

The most recent study of French theology in the 19th century. Foucher shows how conservative religious practices were reflected in the official Christian philosophy in this period.

Granderath, P., Histoire du Concile du Vatican, 5 Vol., Albert Deuvil, Bruxelles, 1907.

This is the classic Ultramontane interpretation of the Council. . Granderath's version must be compared with the more liberal account of that event.

Hales, E. Y., The First Vatican Council. The Smith History Lecture 1962, The University of Saint-Thomas Press, Houston, 1960, pp. 40.

This brief introduction contains a very useful survey of the bibliographical material available to the student of the Council.

Hales, E. Y., Pio Nono A Study in European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1956, pp. 352.

This is the finest study in English on Pius IX. There is an excellent chapter on French religious developments in the 1860's.

Hayward, F., The Vatican Council, A Short History. Clonmore and Reynolds, Dublin, 1951, pp. 92.

The introductory chapter in this work provides some useful information concerning the conditions of the European Church in the period 1850-1870.

Hemmer, H., Vie du Cardinal Manning, P. Lethielleux, Paris, 1898, pp. 494.

Contains an important analysis of Cardinal Manning's letter concerning the Council.

Hourdin, G., La Presse Catholique, Artheme Fayard, Paris, 1957, pp. 120.

This is a very general account but it does throw some light on the Roman Catholic press in the 19th century.

Houtin, A., Le Père Hyacinthe dans l'église romaine 1827 - 1869, Emile Nourry, Paris, 1920, pp. 395.

This is the official biography of Father Hyacinthe. Many important documents are reproduced in this study.

Houtin, A., Le Pere Hyacinthe reformateur Catholique 1869-1893, Emile Nourry, Paris, 1922.

The author gives the details of Father Hyacinthe's apostasy.

Lagrange, F., Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup eveque d'orleans, 3 Vol., Poussielgue, Paris, 1883.

This is the official biography of Bishop Dupanloup. Lagrange attempts to give a fair account of Orleans' struggle with the Ultramontanes.

Latreille, A., E. Delarulle, J. Palanque, Histoire du Catholicism en France, 3 Vol., Spes, Paris, 1962.

A very general survey of the French Church. Contains a useful account of 19th century religious developments.

Lecanuet, R. P., Montalembert, 3 Vol., Poussielgue, Paris, 1905.

This is a comprehensive biography of the leader of the French Liberal Catholics. The work contains many unpublished letters and excerpts from Montalembert's private journal.

Marcilhacy, C., Le Diocèse d'Orleans au milieu du IXe siècle, Les hommes et leurs mentalités, Sirey, Paris, 1964, pp. 501.

This is Christian Marcilhacy's doctoral dissertation. There is an excellent account of the religious attitude of the lower clergy and the Roman Catholic masses in mid-century France.

Maynard, U., Monseigneur Dupanloup et M. Lagrange son historien, Societe generale de librairie catholique, Paris, 1884, pp. 366.

An Ultramontane criticism of Bishop Dupanloup's biography. Essential in that it gives the other side of the picture.

Maurain, J., La Politique Ecclesiastique du Second Empire, Felix Alcan, Paris, 1930, pp. 989.

An indispensable work. Maurain has written a painstaking account of religious developments during the Second Empire. The study is limited to the political repercussions of religious events. The study contains much inaccessible material in the way of prefectural reports and dispatches from the French representative at the Vatican.

Mourret, F., Le Concile du Vatican, Bloud et Gay, Paris, 1919, pp. 340.

Mr. Mourret's work is based on the private diary of Father Isoard who took part in the preparations for the Council. It contains much unpublished information. Mourret also had access to many of Bishop Dupanloup's private papers.

Palanque, J. R., Catholiques Liberaux et Gallicans en France face au Concile du Vatican 1867 - 1870, Annales de la Faculte des Lettres Aix-en-Provence, 1962, pp. 20 7.

Palanque's work is useful for the amount of factual information it provides concerning the Liberal Catholic movement in the decade of the 60's. The study is far from satisfactory from the point of view of analysis and interpretation.

Simpson, W., Roman Catholic Opposition to Papal Infallibility, John Murray, London, 1909, pp. 374.

A very general but useful account of the Roman Catholic attitude to infallibility in the 19th century.

Spencer, P., Politics of Belief in Nineteenth-Century France, Faber and Faber, London, 1954, pp. 284.

This is a brilliant analysis of French religious history in the 19th century.

Veillot, E., Louis Veillot, 4 Vol., Lethielleux, Paris, 1913.

This is the official biography of Louis Veillot, written by his brother Eugene and by his nephew Francois. The authors demonstrate partiality to Veillot and to the Ultramontane movement and their narrative ignores important evidence regarding the Liberal Catholic side of the coin.

Veillot, F., Louis Veillot, Vie Populaire, Maison de la bonne presse, Paris, 1913, pp. 148.

This is a 'popular' history of Louis Veillot written by his nephew Francois. The work is very general but it contains a great deal of very necessary information concerning the publication and sale of Veillot's books and pamphlets.

Ward, W., William George Ward and the Catholic Revival, Macmillan, London, 1893, pp. 468.

William Ward was an English laymen who played a role comparable to the one Louis Veillot had in French religious circles. This biography gives an excellent description of the Ultramontane sentiment among English Catholics.

Weill, G., Histoire du Catholicisme Libéral En France, 1828-1908, Felix Alcan, Paris, 1909, pp. 312.

This is one of the best general studies of the Liberal Catholic movement. Its weakness, of course, lies in the fact that it does not deal with the mass of evidence published since 1909.

Articles

Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup et le Syllabus" in Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique, 51 (1956), pp. 77-142, 471-512, 837-915.

A brilliant interpretation of Bishop Dupanloup's commentary on the Syllabus. In his Pieces Annexes Professor Aubert includes many very important documents.

Aubert, R., "Monseigneur Dupanloup au début du Concile du Vatican", in Miscellanea Hist. eccles., Stockholm 1960 (1961), pp. 97-115.

The background to Bishop Dupanloup's Observations.

Aubert, R., "L'Intervention de Montalembert au Congrès de Malinese en 1863", in Collectanea Mechliniensia, 35 (1950), pp. 525-551.

The author gives the background to the Maline's discourse.

Aubert R., "Les réactions suscitées par la publication du Syllabus", in Collectanea Mechliniensia, 34 (1949), pp. 309-317.

A description of contemporary reaction to the Syllabus.

Gurian, W., "Louis Veillot", in The Catholic Historical Review, 36 (1950-1951), pp. 385-414.

This is the fairest assessment of Louis Veillot to be found anywhere.

Huckaby, J.H., "Roman Catholic Reaction to the Falloux Law", in French Historical Studies, 4 (1965), pp. 203-213.

The author shows how the majority of the French episcopate opposed the Falloux Law.

Reichert, R.W., "Anti-Bonapartist Elections to the Academie Francaise During the Second Empire", in The Journal of Modern History, 35 (1963), pp. 33-46.

An excellent description of Liberal Catholic strength in the Academy during the Second Empire.

ABSTRACT OF

Louis Veuillot and the French Liberal Catholics from the Syllabus
of Errors to the Vatican Council (1864-1869).

This thesis undertook to describe the attitudes of the French Liberal Catholics and Ultramontanes in the France of 1860 and to assess the role of Louis Veuillot, editor of the Univers, in the polemics between the movements.

The first part of the study showed how the Catholic Party of the 1840's had broken into two opposing factions represented by a liberal and a conservative wing. It described the religious attitude during the Second Empire and attempted to show how French Catholic thought in this period was amenable to the conservative religious and political ideas advanced by Louis Veuillot.

The remainder of the thesis addressed itself to the specific confrontations between Veuillot and the liberal school. It described how the editor of the Univers was able to silence the liberals for almost five years, confound their optimistic expectations concerning the Vatican Council, and discredit their cause on the eve of that event.

