

***Ressourcement* in the Age of Migne: The Jesuit Theologians of the *Collegio Romano* and the Shape of Modern Catholic Thought¹**

C. MICHAEL SHEA
Seton Hall University
South Orange, NJ

GIOVANNI PERRONE and the nineteenth-century theological movement he initiated known as the Roman School assume at best only a meager place in histories of modern Roman Catholicism. Both, however, were of major and even defining significance for the development of the contemporary Church. Perrone was responsible for the first Roman theological curriculum designed to teach Church leaders a theological method for responding to intellectual and social changes that swept through Europe during the nineteenth century. Perrone and students of his curriculum dominated papal congregations involving doctrine from the 1840s until the early pontificate of Leo XIII. Members of the Roman School played seminal roles in the development of magisterial teaching on the Church, papal authority, the Immaculate Conception of Mary, faith, reason, revelation, tradition, and a number of issues relating to the Church's relationship to the modern world. The Roman School provided Roman Catholics with a comprehensive response to ground-shifting developments in the social,

¹ I wish to thank Professors Frédéric Gabriel, Dominique Iogna-Prat, and Alain Rauwel for their generous invitation to present a version of this work at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris on December 3, 2015, as part of their seminar "Ecclésiologie: éléments pour l'histoire d'une discipline (XVIIIe–XXe s.)." I also wish to thank Fr. Guy Mansini, O.S.B., at St. Meinrad Seminary for his help translating some of the more difficult Latin passages used in this article.

religious, political, and intellectual landscape of the post-revolutionary West. These changes would have a profound impact upon modern Catholicism as a global institution.

Yet, the Roman School numbers among the most neglected movements in modern Catholicism. One of the goals of this article will be to show that Perrone and the movement he inaugurated were no less important than, for example, Baroque Scholasticism, Jansenism, the Neoscholastic Revival, or *la Nouvelle Théologie* for the formation of contemporary Catholicism.

The following pages offer an overview of Perrone's thought and the Roman School under four headings. The first sketches the basic features of the Roman School, including the movement's main figures, institutions, and questions of periodization and geographical expanse. The second offers an outline of the Roman School's major theological themes and priorities. The third section explores Giovanni Perrone's theological curriculum, the *Praelectiones Theologicae*, and shows how the curriculum provided a framework for subsequent representatives of the Roman School. These younger members of the Roman School also made significant contributions to theology and magisterial teaching and are covered in the fourth section. The fifth and final section traces features of the Roman School's influence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and offers suggestions for future study.

Historiography

It will be helpful to trace a few features of the Roman School from a historiographical perspective at the outset, since the term itself was first used in the twentieth century and calls for certain qualifications. The first scholar to employ the term "Roman School" was Heribert Schaaf in his 1938 study, *Carl Passaglia und Clemens Schrader: Beitrag zu Theologieggeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, which Schaaf completed as a doctoral dissertation under Sebastian Tromp at the Gregorian University in Rome.² Walter Kasper later used the term in 1961 in his important *Habilitationsschrift* under Josef Geiselman at the University of Tübingen, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der Römischen Schule*.³ Since then, the category has slowly come into use among a small number of

² Heribert Schaaf, *Carl Passaglia und Clemens Schrader: Beitrag zu Theologieggeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Rome: Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1938).

³ Walter Kasper, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der Römischen Schule* (Freiburg: Herder, 1961; repr. 2011).

specialists focusing on this period.⁴ However, even today, the category remains underutilized outside of German and Italian historiography and is almost unknown in English and French scholarship.⁵

The term “Roman School” must be understood in both a narrow and broad sense. It refers specifically to a group of influential Jesuits who taught dogmatic theology at the *Collegio Romano*—today called the Pontifical Gregorian University—during the middle decades of the nineteenth century: Giovanni Perrone (1794–1876), Carlo Passaglia (1812–1887), Clemens Schrader (1820–1875), and Johann Baptist Franzelin (1816–1886). More broadly, though, the “Roman School” must also be understood to include theologians and Church leaders who trained in Rome during this period—especially at the *Collegio Romano*, the *Collegium Germanicum*, and the *Propaganda*—for many of these figures impacted the Church well beyond Italy and Rome. These “foreign representatives” of the Roman School included Joseph Kleutgen, Matthias Scheeben, Heinrich Denzinger, Franz Hettinger, and Willibald Maier in Germany;⁶ Henry Manning and William George Ward in England; Jean-Baptiste Malou in Belgium; and to some extent also Archbishop George Darboy in France (as well as a host of less-prominent figures).⁷

⁴ Karl Neufeld, “‘Römische Schule’: Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur genaueren Bestimmung,” *Gregorianum* 63 (1982), 677–99.

⁵ The degree to which Anglophone scholarship remains adrift from German and Italian historiography can be observed in Oliver Rafferty’s recent article “The Thomistic Revival and the Relationship between the Jesuits and the Papacy, 1878–1914,” *Theological Studies* 75.4 (2014): 746–73, which remains dependent upon Gerald McCool’s unbalanced *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism: The Search for a Unitary Method* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1977). Compare Rafferty’s work with a German scholar’s recent overview of the Neoscholastic movement: Peter Walter, “‘Den Weltkreis täglich von Verderben bringenden Irrtümern befreien’ (Leo XIII): die Internationalisierung der theologischen Wissenschaftswelt am Beispiel der Neuscholastik,” in *Transnationale Dimensionen wissenschaftlicher Theologie*, ed. C. Arnold, and J. Wischmeyer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 319–53.

⁶ Karl Neufeld, “Zur ‘Römischen Schule’ im deutschen Sprachraum,” in *Geist und Kirche: Studien zur Theologie im Umfeld der beiden Vatikanischen Konzilien, Gedenkschrift für Heribert Schaaf*, ed. H. Hammans, H.-J. Reudenbach, and H. Sonnemans (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1991), 323–40; Augustin Kerkvoorde, “La formation théologique de M. J. Scheeben à Rome, 1852–1859,” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 22 (1946): 174–93; Aidan Nichols, *Romance and System: The Theological Synthesis of Matthias Joseph Scheeben* (Denver, CO: Augustine Institute, 2010), 6–9.

⁷ Charles Shea, “Giovanni Perrone’s Theological Curriculum and the First Vatican Council,” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 110.3–4 (2015): 790–816.

Periodization for the Roman School can also be regarded in both a broad and a narrow sense. Although the first of the Roman School's theologians, Giovanni Perrone, began teaching at the *Collegio Romano* in 1824, an initial date for the Roman School as a movement might best be placed in 1835, the year of the publication of Perrone's influential theological curriculum, the *Praelectiones Theologicae*. One could reasonably date the end of this movement either in 1879, the year of Leo XIII's encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, or in the year of Johann Baptist Franzelin's death, 1886. This periodization can be projected forward, however, to include certain aspects of the Roman School's influence upon theologians and Church leaders who would otherwise be regarded as associated with the Neoscholastic Revival. These include figures like Leo XIII, Louis Billot, Martin Grabmann, Sebastian Tromp, Heribert Schaef and others who, in their own ways, helped to spread the Roman School's influence beyond the 1880s and into the twentieth century.

The precise limits and influence of the Roman School pose challenges from a historiographical standpoint. By the early 1850s and beyond, it is important to recognize a host of complex relationships between the Roman School and the Neoscholastic Revival that partially overlapped with the movement and ultimately surpassed it. There were significant differences between these two currents of thought in priorities of theological sources, methodology, training, and style. There were also generational differences in mindset involving complex relations to political developments on the Italian Peninsula and in Europe. Furthermore, there were shifting generational disparities between the two theological movements in terms of institutional representation within the Church. By the late 1850s, for example, studies at the *Collegio Romano* itself underwent comprehensive reform to bring the instruction there into closer alignment with the thought of Thomas Aquinas.⁸ Yet, at the First Vatican Council in 1870, the Roman School's theological vision remained predominant. Between the 1850s and 1870s, there were also representatives of the Roman School, such as Johann Franzelin at the *Collegio Romano*, who shared certain traits in common with the Neoscholastic Revival, and others, such as Joseph Kleutgen and Matthias Scheeben, who could be said to belong to both movements in equal measure.

⁸ Pontificia Università Gregoriana, *L'Università Gregoriana del Collegio Romano, nel primo secolo dalla restituzione* (Rome: Tipografia Cuggiani, 1924), 24–25.

Major Themes of the Roman School

The major theological themes of the Roman School differed markedly from other movements of the period. For the sake of manageability, the following discussion focuses on its central representatives who taught at the *Collegio Romano*: Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, Clemens Schrader, and Johann Baptist Franzelin.

A few preliminary clarifications are needed, however, in order to orient this discussion toward the Roman School's relationship to the Neoscholastic revival, which is often conflated with the movement and comes closest to it in time, geographic, and institutional representation. First, one can indeed characterize the Roman School as "scholastic" in a general sense. The major theologians of this group produced a body of writings that was largely in question-and-answer or thesis form, and the social context and purpose of much of these theologians' work reflected concerns of maintaining ordered theological formation in a time of great intellectual experimentation and social change. It would be incorrect, however, to characterize the Roman School as merely conservative theologians who were concerned to preserve or revive a specific theological tradition within the Church. The distinctive features of this movement were more complicated. On the one hand, the theologians of the Roman School were all broadly Thomistic on the question of faith and reason. Yet they were open to interpreting Aquinas creatively, and in virtually every other theological question, the Dominican provided only one authority among many others.⁹ The Roman School could be referred to broadly as a movement of eclectic scholasticism, since their representatives drew upon figures like Juan de Lugo, Francisco Suárez, Denys Pétau, Louis Thomassin, and Johann Adam Möhler just as readily as they drew upon the fathers of the Church or the schoolmen of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Yet this characterization also leaves out certain features that could be said to make up the heart of the movement and that distinguished the Roman School from proceeding, contemporary, and subsequent currents in Roman Catholic thought.

Three major themes need to be recognized in order to grasp the distinct contours of the movement adequately: 1) The Roman School was an apologetic and ecclesiocentric movement that emphasized the authority of the Church and, in particular, that of the papacy. 2)

⁹ Heribert Schaaf, *Die Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes: Die Lehre von der nichtapropriierten Einwohnung des Heiligen Geistes als Beitrag zur Theologiegeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der beiden Theologen Carl Passaglia und Clemens Schrader* (Freiburg: Herder, 1941), 30.

The Roman School was also a movement of positive theology that emphasized creative retrieval of the past, particularly of the patristic period. These two features culminate in the third major characteristic, arguably the most distinct and lasting contribution of the movement: 3) a robust renewal and expansion of the theology of tradition. Each of these features deserves elaboration in turn.

First, the Roman School was an apologetic and ecclesiocentric movement, emphasizing the authority of the Church and the papacy. From a certain vantage point, the Roman School represents a continuation and heightening of anti-Protestant apologetics found among classic authors of the post-Tridentine period such as Bellarmine and Bossuet.¹⁰ Like these figures, the representatives of the Roman School emphasized that Scripture alone was insufficient for establishing a stable rule of faith for individual Christians or Christian communities. In breaking away from the authority of the universal Church, Protestants raised the individual believer to the status of ultimate judge in matters of truth in practice and in principle. This exultation of the individual led, in consequence, to endless ecclesial divisions and social and political strife. Theologians of the Roman School drew upon this classical anti-Protestant view and developed a more elaborate and abstract approach to apologetics for the nineteenth century. They attempted to account not only for Protestantism but also for Enlightenment rationalism, atheism, religious indifferentism, and secular democratic and social movements, which they regarded as threats to Christian faith and civilization. According to theologians of the Roman School, the perilous features of the nineteenth century could be traced directly to the Protestant Reformation and to Protestantizing tendencies among Roman Catholics in places like Germany and France.

The key issue for the Roman School was the question of divine authority and how that authority was mediated to the human race. According to Perrone and his students, Enlightenment rationalism, religious indifferentism, and democratic liberalism were formally identical to Protestantism, even if they differed in the contents of

¹⁰ For remarks on this apologetic tradition, see: Stefania Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 13–30; Sylvio de Franceschi, “Bossuet ultramontain: Le centre et l’unité de l’Église: saint Pierre dans l’œuvre bossuetienne,” *Les amis de Bossuet* 36 (2009): 14–35; and Frédéric Gabriel, “Politique, puissance ecclésiastique, et nature de l’institution chez Bossuet,” *Les amis de Bossuet* 36 (2009): 36–61. See also Avery Dulles, *A History of Apologetics*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), 150–73.

their beliefs. Each raised the human individual to the level of ultimate judge in matters of religious faith. Such tendencies had been present in various forms in and outside of the Church during the early modern period. But in an age of increasing social and political disenfranchisement of the Church, these same tendencies were combated from Rome and reflected upon with renewed urgency and depth. New questions of authority's center and periphery, of regional ecclesiastical authority, of faith's relation to modern philosophy and science, and of the Church's relationship to secular political power placed pressure on the Church from all sides and forced dogmatic reflection upon a number of issues that once had been within the domains of canon law, diplomacy, and local custom.

Second (2 above), the Roman School was a movement of positive theology that emphasized creative retrieval of the past, and in particular the patristic period. The term "positive theology" or "positive theologian" has roots in sixteenth-century humanism and was used among some of the Roman School's contemporaries to contrast the movement with representatives of the Neoscholastic revival. The term "positive theology" implies an emphasis on the sources of theology, such as Scripture, tradition, and the study of history and philology, as opposed to the approach of "speculative theology," which tends to prioritize the development of a conceptually rigorous and cohesive vision of the Christian faith.¹¹

This positive-theological approach had roots in the broader context of early nineteenth-century Rome. Until recently, scholars have paid little attention to Rome of the 1820s and 1830s, when the major features of the Roman School first took shape. Most European contemporaries considered Rome as intellectually retrograde during this period, especially in the popular press, and this perception persisted into later literature in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. However, more recent research has shown that Rome during this age was in fact enjoying a renaissance of sorts in the fields of archeology, classics, philology, oriental studies, and the arts.¹² Gregory XVI (r. 1832–1846) encouraged these developments and raised

¹¹ Fernando Dominguez, "Positive Theologie," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (Freiburg: Herder, 1999), 8:447.

¹² Christopher Korten, "Converging Worlds: Paul Cullen and the World of Mauro Capellari," in *Paul Cullen and His World*, ed. D. Koegh and A. McDonnell (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), 34–46. See also the contributions in *Gregorio XVI: tra oscurantismo e innovazione*, ed. R. Ugolini (Rome: Fabrizio Serra, 2012); and Philippe Boutry, "Papauté et culture au xix^e siècle: Magistère, orthodoxie, tradition," *Revue d'histoire du xix^e siècle* 28 (2004): 31–58.

a number of intellectuals to positions of prominence in recognition of their scholarly achievements (Antonio de Luca, Angelo Mai, Giuseppe Mezzofanti, Gaetano Moroni, Nicholas Wiseman, and others).¹³ The development of these fields had a significant impact upon the approach to theology that germinated in the Roman School during this period.

Representatives of the Roman School stressed the importance of history, languages, and philology, both in the practice of theology and in their methodological reflections on the subject. Some of its members stated that theology was primarily an inductive science of God's word as a fact or *φαινόμενον* that must always begin and end with an investigation of the sources of Christian faith.¹⁴ In approaching the published works of the Roman School, one will be struck by their extensive use of biblical and patristic sources in their original languages. For Passaglia and Franzelin this sometimes included references to works in Arabic and Syriac. The Roman School's broad positive-theological approach can be seen practically in the earliest works from the School from the 1830s, after which it developed systematically in the 1840s and was expounded in the 1850s in explicit contradistinction to the burgeoning Neoscholastic revival. The Neoscholastic movement would retain elements of the Roman School's view of apologetics, yet the principled approach to theology as a fundamentally positive science was largely set aside. The Roman School's priority of history, tradition, and the sources of faith most clearly distinguished the movement from the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Neoscholastic revival. The Roman School was, in fact, a self-conscious, eclectic, and largely successful movement of theological *ressourcement* during the age of Migne.

Finally (3 above), these two distinguishing features of the Roman School—an emphasis on ecclesial apologetics and on positive theology—culminate in a third feature of defining significance: a robust and ecclesiocentric theology of faith and tradition. The Roman School's passionate interest in history and ecclesiology was grounded

¹³ Korten, "Converging Worlds," 40–41, and Philippe Boutry, *Souverain et pontife: recherches prosopographiques sur la curie romaine à l'âge de la restauration (1814–1846)* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 2002), 410, 427, 688, 767. For a lively view of the Roman theological scene from a contemporary's perspective, see Nicholas Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last four Popes and of Rome in their Times* (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1858), 435–51.

¹⁴ Carlo Passaglia and Clemens Schrader, "Editorum Praefatio," in *Dionysii Petavii Aurelianensis e Societate Iesu Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus*, 2 vols. (Rome: Propaganda Fide, 1857), 1:iii–v, at iii.

in the conviction that the Church, as a social and sacramental institution, was the living continuation of the body of Christ in history. This conviction governed the way in which the theologians of the Roman School approached theology. In fact, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that, for the Roman School, the Church constituted the *locus locorum* of theological inquiry and Christian life.

There were different expostulations of sacred tradition within the Roman School, but these contributions shared a number of defining themes. In keeping with the movement's positive theological approach, the theologians of the Roman School emphasized that faith rested upon the trustworthiness of the deposit of revelation as speech or as an historical phenomenon or fact revealed by God. Since the deposit of revelation was ultimately grounded in a divine person, the theologians of the Roman School understood the *depositum* to be certain, sufficient, and infallible. These qualities, moreover, extended by necessity to the medium of the Church, which communicated revelation, and to the custodians entrusted with safeguarding the Christian deposit. Thus, the teaching office of the Church was regarded as integral to tradition in history and the individual act of faith was understood as oriented toward the magisterial structures of the visible Church. Although Scripture enjoyed a certain ontological and methodological priority in the theology of the Roman School, the contemporary magisterium was understood as the extension of theological tradition and functionally the ultimate arbiter of Christian truth.

Perrone and the *Praelectiones Theologicae*

To understand how these three major themes of the Roman School figured cohesively into their theological vision, one has to take note of the movement's historical origins and development. Walter Kasper briefly summarized the relationship between the central representatives of the Roman School in his 1961 study. He referred to Perrone as a precursor who set forth the fundamental conditions for the Roman School and regarded Passaglia and Schrader as the movement's central representatives. Franzelin he considered a transitional figure who belonged within the sphere of the Roman School but also shared affinities with the Neoscholastic revival.¹⁵

¹⁵ Kasper, *Die Lehre von Tradition*, 9. For a contemporary appraisal of Franzelin as a transitional figure between Perrone and Billot, see Lorenzo Bedeschi, *La curia romana durante la crisi modernista: episodi e metodi di governo* (Parma, IT: Ugo Guanda Editore, 1968), 67n75.

Kasper's characterization of the Roman School has been followed in subsequent scholarship and is accurate enough as a basic description. To grasp the complexity of the movement, however, one must also recognize certain asymmetrical relationships between these thinkers and their theological contributions. In my own work, I have come to regard Giovanni Perrone and his theological curriculum, the *Praelectiones Theologicae*, not only as a precursor to the Roman School but also as a normative context for the movement's intellectual development.¹⁶ Perrone's curriculum served a key social and institutional function. As a central component of a social ritual, the curriculum provided a longstanding and repeated set of authoritative parameters and heuristics for ascertaining theological orthodoxy and also a driving reactionary ethos that shaped the intellectual atmosphere within which the theologians of the Roman School approached their work.¹⁷ The curriculum and an abridged version of the text went through more than eighty editions in the nineteenth century.¹⁸ Thus, any adequate treatment of the Roman School or of this period of Roman

¹⁶ For recent literature on Perrone with bibliographic references, see Charles Shea, "Giovanni Perrone's Theological Curriculum," 790–816; Shea, "Faith, Reason, and Ecclesiastical Authority in Giovanni Perrone's *Praelectiones Theologicae*," *Gregorianum* 95.1 (2014): 159–77; and Jérôme Rousse-Lacordaire, "La cabale au service du christianisme au xix^e siècle," *Revue de sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 96.4 (2012): 703–49.

¹⁷ Relatively little methodological reflection has been done on how the reciprocal relationships between ideas and institutions manifest themselves in rule-infused rituals such as seminary lectures, ecclesiastical court cases, etc. Such reflection will be useful in bringing research in intellectual history into deeper engagement with seminal contributions in the institutional history of modern Catholicism that have appeared in recent years—such as Carlo Fantappiè's *Chiesa romana e modernità giuridica* (Milan, IT: Giuffrè Editore, 2008) and François Jankowiak's *La curie romaine de Pie IX à Pie XI: le gouvernement central de l'Église et la fin des États Pontificaux, 1846–1914* (Rome: École Française de Rome, 2007)—and with *Geistesgeschichtliche* approaches such as in Manuel Borutta's *Antikatholizismus: Deutschland und Italien im Zeitalter der europäischen Kulturkämpfe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011). A few schematic reflections related to the subject include Gunnar Schuppert, *Verflochtene Staatlichkeit: Globalisierung als Governance-Geschichte* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2014), 28–35; Giuseppe Lorini, "Meta-Institutional Concepts: A New Category for Social Ontology," *Rivista di Estetica* 56 (2014): 127–39; and Françoise Waquet, *Parler comme un livre: l'oralité et le savoir (XVI^e – XX^e siècle)* (Paris: Albin Michel, 2003), 72–112.

¹⁸ Giacomo Martina, *Storia*, 62; Carlos Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jesus. Nouvelle Édition*, 12 vols. (Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1890–1932), 6:558–72, at 558–60.

Catholic thought more generally must involve a substantial discussion of Perrone's curriculum.

Perrone's *Praelectiones Theologicae* first appeared in published form in 1835 and was divided into four years. The curriculum devoted considerable space to traditional doctrines such as *de Deo Uno et Trino* and *de Sacramentis* in the first two years. But it is the second half of the curriculum and the broader structure of the *Praelectiones* as a whole that are important for understanding the Roman School's distinctive priorities and departure points in theological inquiry.¹⁹

Perrone introduced the *Praelectiones Theologicae* with a lengthy prolegomena entitled *Tractatus de vera religione contra incredulos et heterodoxos* that often appeared as a separate text and sometimes in vernacular translation during this period.²⁰ In this prolegomena, Perrone outlined the philosophical and theological assumptions of the *Praelectiones* as a whole. The first portion of the treatise argued for the probability of revelation as a historical and external fact on the basis of external signs and miracles.²¹ The second section, *Contra hereticos*, argued for the necessity of the Church as the medium and custodian of revelation in history.²² Perrone held revelation to be beyond the reach of any individual interpreter to determine and insufficient in itself for providing a stable basis for Christian belief.²³ The Church therefore was required for the correct understanding of revelation and, in fact, functioned as the ambit in which potential believers came into contact with faith's motives of credibility.

These themes that inaugurated the *Praelectiones Theologicae* also structured the curriculum as a whole. The third and fourth years of the curriculum were devoted to theological methodology, or *de locis theologicis*, in conscious retrieval of Melchior Cano's treatise of the same name in the sixteenth century.²⁴ Perrone's version of *de locis*

¹⁹ The edition of Perrone's curriculum cited for present purposes will be *Praelectiones theologicae, quas in Collegio Romani habebat, Johannes Perrone e Societate Jesu in eod. Coll. Theol. Prof.*, 2 vols. (Paris: Montrouge, 1841–1842). English translations are my own.

²⁰ For overviews of the treatise, see Peter Walter, *Die Frage der Glaubensbegründung als innerer Erfahrung auf dem I. Vaticanum, die Stellungnahme des Konzils vor dem Hintergrund der Zeitgenössischen römischen Theologie* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald, 1980), 19–27; and Kasper, *Die Lehre von Tradition*, 29–32.

²¹ Perrone, *Praelectiones Theologicae*, 1:17–164.

²² *Ibid.*, 1:163–232.

²³ *Ibid.*, 1:20.

²⁴ Melchior Cano, *Reverendissimi D. Domini Melchioris Cani Episcopi Canariensis, Ordinis Praedicatorum, et Sacrae Theologiae Professoris, ac Primariae Cathedrae in*

theologicis departed from Cano's in key ways, for it placed explicit emphasis upon tradition, the Church, and the papacy in providing a set of governing principles for the practice of theology.

Cano's *Tractatus de locis theologicis* had an impact upon theological instruction at the *Collegio Romano*.²⁵ By the nineteenth century, Perrone considered Cano's treatise to be of universal importance for Catholic theology, yet he also regarded it as insufficient for the nineteenth century and revised it almost completely.²⁶

Perrone's reconfiguration of Cano's work simplified the treatise and provided it with a rigorous internal logic. Cano's treatise, for example, offered ten theological loci with relatively minimal order. These included seven *argumenta propria*: 1) the authority of sacred Scripture, 2) apostolic tradition, 3) the authority of the Catholic Church, 4) the authority of councils, 5) the authority of the Church of Rome, 6) the authority of saints, and 7) the authority of doctors of the schools. To these seven, Cano added three additional loci that he referred to as *argumenta aliena*: 1) arguments from natural reason, 2) the authority of philosophers, and 3) the authority of human history.²⁷

Cano's schema involved a certain degree of methodological order, since he understood *argumenta aliena*, such as arguments from history and natural reason, as serving an auxiliary function to *argumenta propria*, such as church councils and the authority of saints. There was also some degree of precedence in Cano's treatise, since Scripture and tradition held first and second place in the treatise, followed by the authority of the Catholic Church. However, aside from this minimal order, there was little in Cano's treatise to clarify the relationship between theological loci and how these loci were to be applied collectively in the practice of theology. Cano's *Tractatus* provided a handbook of sorts for theologians, but no clear point of departure and method. Perrone regarded this schematic character of Cano's work as a significant deficiency in the nineteenth century.²⁸

Academia Salamantinensi olim Praefecti, De Locis Theologicis Libri duodecim (Salamanca, ES: Mathias Gastius, 1563).

²⁵ Juan Belda-Plans, *La escuela de Salamanca y la renovación de la teología en el siglo XVI* (Madrid, ES: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 2000), 853–61.

²⁶ Perrone, *Praelectiones Theologicae*, 2:687.

²⁷ A succinct overview of Cano's treatise can be found in Juan Belda-Plans, "Introducción general histórico-teológica," in Melcho Cano, *De Locis Theologicis*, trans. and ed. J. Belda-Plans (Madrid, ES: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 2006), lxxxiii–lxxxix.

²⁸ Perrone, *Praelectiones Theologicae*, 2:687.

The third and fourth years of the *Praelectiones Theologicae* were devoted to offering a new version of Cano's treatise that would meet the needs of Church leaders in the age of revolutions. In Perrone's version of *De locis theologicis*, four themes stand out, which the reader will likely recognize as having significant roles to play in the First Vatican Council in 1870: 1) the authority of the Church—especially the papal magisterium, 2) the authority of Scripture, 3) tradition, and 4) the role of faith and reason in theological inquiry.

Perrone's version of theological loci assumed the following order: [third year] Part I) the Authority of the Church and the Roman Pontiff; Part II) the Authority of the Word of God Written, and On Tradition; and [fourth year] Part III) The Analogy of Reason and Faith. The order of these theological loci was of great significance for Perrone's curriculum. The text was clear that the Church—specifically the Church's *anterioritas*—provided the basis for all theological inquiry.²⁹ This was the case because the Church acted as mediator and custodian of the Word of God. Hence, the individual act of faith, regarded from its human side, was understood as a response to divine authority mediated by and manifested within the Church.

It is in Perrone's theology of faith that one can best observe his commitment to theology as a positive science and his view of the mediated and historically concrete nature of authority. Perrone's definition of faith began with God as revealer: he defined faith as an intellectual assent, aided by grace, to God's Word as divinely revealed.³⁰ Yet faith's formal motive was divine authority mediated by the Church. In this way, Perrone could create the impression that Christian faith itself was little more than a system of authority.³¹

As a textbook for training priests, the *Praelectiones* arguably lacked balance in its almost singular focus on authority. However, it would be misleading to characterize Perrone's thought—or the Roman School as a whole—as promoting an exclusively top-down vision of the Church. Because authority assumed such a central role in Perrone's curriculum, it was of key importance to explore the variegated dynamics of authority in the Church in addition to its mechanisms and limits. Perrone's treatment of the Church in the *Praelectiones* attempted to balance its institutional and juridical emphases by proposing two foundational dimensions of the Church

²⁹ Ibid., 2:688–89.

³⁰ Ibid., 2:1360–01.

³¹ Ibid., 1:277.

to be held in unison. Perrone's vision of the Church first built upon traditional Bellarminian doctrines of institutional authority and structure, but the curriculum also incorporated a renewed emphasis on patristic sources that envisioned the Church from the standpoint of the mystical body of Christ.

These two dimensions of the Church—the institutional and the mystical—were presented as a polar, co-supporting synthesis in Perrone's curriculum. On the one hand, the Church was a society of believers instituted by Christ as the medium of human salvation.³² This society was governed by the successor of Peter and hierarchically ordered as a sacramental expression of Christ's relationship to the world. Yet, Perrone also claimed that, "the society of the Church constitute[d] an *organic* unity."³³ This unity was fundamentally multi-centered and relational in character, and had to do with the relationship between priests, laypersons, bishops, and the papacy. Each constituent participated actively in the Church's life by the inner motive of obedience and faith.³⁴ This obedience and faith was also an orientation to the Church as a whole according to one's place within the Church's mission and the body of Christ. "Since from this mutual commerce, life may flourish," he wrote, "unity too flourishes, in just the way that the unity of the person, or of the individual in a human supposit, and life flow forth from the mutual commerce of soul and body."³⁵

This ecclesial orientation involved the vicar of Christ prominently as head of the universal Church. The *Praelectiones Theologicae* taught that the *commercium mutuuum* of head and members in the Church constituted the Church's essence and life.³⁶ There was, however, relatively little middle ground between head and members in Perrone's curriculum, and one could legitimately question whether the vision of the Church in the text provided meaningful space for the magisterial activity of individual bishops, synods, or councils. While this may be a genuine deficiency of the *Praelectiones*, it is clear that Perrone's view of how ecclesial authority was to be exercised in practice was more balanced. John Henry Newman's famous "Essay on Consulting the Faithful" from 1859, in fact, began with a six-page exegesis of

³² Ibid., 2:691–97.

³³ Ibid., 2:713–14.

³⁴ Ibid., 2:733.

³⁵ Ibid., 2:734. See also *ibid.*, 2:722–27, 739.

³⁶ Ibid., 2:733–35.

Perrone's subsequent work on how the magisterium consults the laity in teaching so that doctrine arises ultimately from a *conspiratio pastorum et fidelium*.³⁷ Although the *Praelectiones*'s language of the Church as a *commercium mutuum* stressed the functional distinction between head and members, the notion of active reciprocity on the part of all members implied a dynamic and multi-centered reality.³⁸

Perrone's synthesis of the juridical, institutional, doctrinal, and mystical dimensions of the Church was an important moment in the development of modern ecclesiology. One can legitimately claim that Perrone's theology of the Church provided a model for dogmatic developments concerning papal authority in the later nineteenth century and also served as a precursor to *communio* ecclesiologies in the century to follow.³⁹ Perrone's curriculum reinforced and elaborated aspects of the early modern ultramontane theologies of papal authority while providing the framework for a politically disestablished and non-territorial exercise of ecclesiastical authority and Catholic identity.

The political disestablishment of the Church in nineteenth-century Europe helped to inaugurate the centralization, or Romanization, of Catholicism as a modern global institution. Perrone's curriculum helped the Church to navigate this shift with a comprehensive pedagogy that involved intense methodological reflection on the theological plane. These developments facilitated the de-identification of modern Catholic praxis and belief with local commitments and provided a renewed governing ideal of the Church as the Body of Christ, a sacramental reality that transcended political and territorial imaginaries.

³⁷ This formulation can be traced directly back to Perrone's writings; see Charles Shea, "From Implicit and Explicit Reason to Inference and Assent: The Significance of John Henry Newman's Seminary Studies in Rome," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 67.1 (2016): 143–71.

³⁸ It merits suggesting that the dual ecclesiological emphasis of (a) authority/obedience and (b) individual agency may emerge in part from Perrone's experience as a Jesuit. This hypothesis would be difficult to substantiate on the basis of Perrone's published work, but a study relying on unpublished materials may shed significant light on the role of Jesuit spirituality in the development of Catholic doctrine in the nineteenth century. Perrone's personal papers and correspondence can be found in the *Archivio Pontificia Università Gregoriana* (APUG 105 I–IV).

³⁹ Peter Walter made a similar case for Perrone's student Carlo Passaglia in "Carlo Passaglia: auf dem Weg zur Communio-Ekklesiologie," in *Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts: eine Einführung*, ed. P. Neuner and G. Wenz (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002), 165–71.

Other Members of the Roman School

Perrone's *Praelectiones* exercised a decisive influence upon the subsequent representatives of the Roman School at the *Collegio Romano*: Carlo Passaglia, Clemens Schrader, and Johann Baptist Franzelin. Each of these theologians went through Perrone's course of study and lectured from the text at certain points in their careers. The imprint of this formation is also evident in the writings of these theologians, and each figure stands out in contributing individually to the theological achievement of the Roman School as a whole.

The two figures responsible for developing the methodology and ecclesiological vision of the Roman School in its most unique direction were Perrone's students at the *Collegio Romano* during the 1830s and early 1840s: Carlo Passaglia and his protégée Clemens Schrader.⁴⁰ These Jesuits of a younger generation worked together closely on a number of theological projects during the late 1840s and 1850s, and they can be said to have taken Perrone's ecclesiological vision in a more mystical and devotional direction that was increasingly distinct from Neoscholastic approaches to theological instruction, which gained influence as the century progressed.

Passaglia and Schrader worked together on a massive and unfinished treatise, *De Ecclesia Christi commentariorum libris quinque*.⁴¹ Here, much in alignment with the basic contours of Perrone's thought, one encounters a vision of the Church that alternated between visible and invisible dimensions. Yet it was the mystical dimension that captured these authors' imaginations. Passaglia and Schrader provided space for the historical origins of the institutional Church and spent numerous pages in book 1 (*Liber I: Εισαγωγικός, Ecclesiae Hypotiposis*) exploring

⁴⁰ For bibliographic references on Passaglia, see Gianluca Carlin, *L'ecclesiologia di Carlo Passaglia 1812–1887: Mit einer deutschen Zusammenfassung* (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2000), 296–378. For literature on Schrader, see Gabriel Andriányi, “Die Mitarbeit des Dogmatikers Clemens Schrader S.J. an der Provinzialsynode zu Kalocsa 1863,” *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 44 (2012): 95–104; and Heribert Schauf, “Die Unfehlbarkeit der Kirche: die Lehre des Konzilstheologen Clemens Schrader,” in *Bestellt zum Zeugnis: Festgabe für Bischof Dr. Johannes Pohlschneider zur Völlendung des 75. Lebensjahres und zur Feier des 50 jährigen Priesterjubiläums*, ed. K. Delahaye, E. Gatz, and H. Jorissen (Aachen: Einhard-Verlag, 1974), 339–54.

⁴¹ For vols. 1 and 2, see Carlo Passaglia and Clemens Schrader, *De Ecclesia Christi Commentariorum Libri Quinque* (Regensburg: G. Iosephus Manz, 1853). Vol. 3 was published in 1856 in the same series, and vols. 4 and 5 were never completed.

Hebrew and Greek and imagery from Scripture.⁴² They then spent the bulk of their labor describing the Church simultaneously as the Temple of God indwelt by the Holy Spirit and as the Body of Christ (*Θεάνθρωπον*), consisting of head and members. As they claimed, “the Church [is] aptly and admirably called the mystical body of Christ—that is, the assembly of all those in which Christ manifests himself, and interprets his life, through which he visibly lives among men, and through which he so offers and continues the work of the economy of salvation, that through it [the assembly] he frees men from captivity, teaches them the truth, justifies them, and leads them to an eternal crown.”⁴³

The individual believer’s membership in the Church was understood as an active participation in Christ’s salvific mission. This membership was also seen correlatively as a spousal and Marian participation in Christ’s dynamic relationship to the Father and the Holy Spirit.⁴⁴ Passaglia and Schrader adopted Perrone’s idea of the Church as a *commercium mutuum* as a point of departure, but they elaborated this vision along a Trinitarian horizon that emphasized theological relationships between divine hypostases in correlation with the economy of salvation.⁴⁵ The various strands of their reflections converged upon the Church as the incarnation of Christ and provided a framework for a rich and multivalent theology of history and tradition. After a lengthy discussion of scriptural analogies of the Incarnation and of the Church as *historia Christi et apostolorum*, Passaglia and Schrader summarized their vision of Christ and the Holy Spirit in history, which implied a dynamic, lived reality:

And is this not of course true when at first the Only Begotten, made flesh, ἐσχήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, *dwelt among us*? Or when first he could be seen by the eyes, perceived, and touched with hands? Not before He was conceived in Mary by the power of the Spirit coming upon and overshadowing her, might the

⁴² Ibid., 1:1–29.

⁴³ “Ecclesiam apte luculenterque vocari corpus Christi mysticum, id est eorum omnium coetum in quo se Christus manifestat, suamque vitam explicat, per quem conspicuus inter homines degit, et per quem salutaris oeconomiae opus ita profert atque continuat, ut per eum homines a captivitate liberet, veritatem doceat, iustitia donet, et ad sempiternam coronam perducatur” (ibid., 1:30–38, at 38).

⁴⁴ Ibid., 1:70–80.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 2:107–25. See also especially 3:1–26.

holy Offspring come into the light. If therefore the history of Christ, the history of the Head, the history of the First Born, can be thought analogously [ἀναλόγως] to be a paradigm [παράδειγμα] for all Christians, for all members, for all second-born brethren, then it seems to me not unreasonable to be able to conclude that no man has access to the Church, to the mystical body of Christ, and to the communion of saints, before a kind of breath of the Spirit should have blown on him, and drawn him out of darkness, and, by the font of light and truth, in some way at length joined him to God.⁴⁶

Passaglia and Schrader developed these Marian and Christological themes in book 2 (*Liber II: Πραγματικός, De Ecclesiae Existentia*) to articulate a theology of the visible Church that regarded apostolic functions as expressive of the theandric and pneumatological missions of divine persons in history.⁴⁷ Apostolic tradition, the life of Christ, and the temporal and eternal missions of Christ and the Spirit were regarded here as distinct but related spheres forming a single life. The approach taken in *De Ecclesia Christi* presupposed that the most appropriate way of exploring the Church was to recognize Christ as παράδειγμα and, indeed, to presuppose a genuine communication of idioms between the Church and Christ.⁴⁸

Schrader and Passaglia developed these themes further in book 3 (*Liber III: Αιτιολογικός, De Ecclesiae Causis*), which explored the relationships between the Church as visible *societas* and as *corpus mysticum*. This section of *De Ecclesia Christi* investigated these relationships in terms of various modes of causality (efficient, instrumental, exemplary, formal, material, and final) in relation to Trinitarian missions and temporal dimensions of the Church. Book 3 is a work of extraor-

⁴⁶ “Et re sane vera quando primum Unigenitus caro factus ἐσχήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, habitavit in nobis? aut quando primum videri oculis potuit, perspicui, manibusque contrectari? Non antea quam virtute supervenientis in Mariam Spiritus, illamque obumbrantis conciperetur, conceptusque sanctus in lucem veniret. Si ergo historia Christi, historia capitis, historia primogeniti censerī ἀναλόγως potest παράδειγμα cuiusque christiani, cuiusque membri, fratrisque minoris; mihi videor colligere non inepte posse, nullum antea hominibus ad ecclesiam, ad mysticum Christi corpus, communionemque sanctorum aditum patere, quam illos aura quaedam Spiritus afflaverit, e tenebris secreverit, et cum Deo lucis veritatisque fonte aliquo tandem pacto coniunxerit” (ibid., 2:34; emphasis original).

⁴⁷ Ibid., 2:83–91.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 1:35.

dinary detail and cannot be adequately summarized here, but some illustration of the authors' vision in the book will provide a sense of the depth and originality of *De Ecclesia Christi* as a whole.

The book opens with a discussion of the Church according to three dimensions of efficient causality: the Father, as principle motive cause of the economy of salvation; the Son, as the principle cause *through whom* the Church exists; and the Holy Spirit, as the principle cause by which the Church was drawn together, nourished, and perfected.⁴⁹ Passaglia and Schrader develop the meaning and connotations of each type of causality through elaborate philological commentary upon scriptural and patristic writings and then circle back upon these Trinitarian dimensions in subsequent chapters, each time along a different plane of causality and temporal expression, so that the visible and invisible dimensions of the Church elucidate one another from a kaleidoscopic array of vantage points. The various institutional and historical features of the visible Church thus emerge recursively from within a biblical and Trinitarian vision.⁵⁰

For example, *Liber III* discusses the formal cause of the Church as the power or principle drawing the various members of the Church into unified activity and then approaches this causality from distinct but interrelated sub-perspectives.⁵¹ Passaglia and Schrader regarded the Trinity as the "interior" formal cause of the Church, taking revelation as their point of departure:

Again, if the Scriptures are consulted, it is plain that men are joined to the Church and made her members in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. But just as men are added [to the Church in the name of the Trinity], so also they compose the Church in the name of the Trinity: *in this way the Church herself is the tabernacle and temple of the Trinity*. Indeed we read, "For do you not know that you are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? If one will then violate the temple of God, God will ruin him; the temple of God is indeed holy, and you are [that temple]." We read, "You indeed are the temple of the living God." We read, "for you will know I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you." We read, "If one loves me and will keep my word, my Father will love him, and

⁴⁹ Ibid., 3:3–26.

⁵⁰ See for example, the discussion of Peter (ibid., 3:237–58).

⁵¹ Ibid., 3:801–02.

we will make a dwelling with him.” And on the contrary we read, “I pray so that all may be one, as you Father are in me and I in you, so that they may be one in us. I in them, and you in me, so that they may be consummated in one.”⁵²

Yet, for Passaglia and Schrader, the Trinity is no less the formal interior cause of the Church than the Word of God made flesh. Christ, as son of the Father and of Mary, manifested the inner *commercium* of the Trinity within the temporal order and drew the *societatem fidelium* together into a united activity of obedience, charity, and worship. Passaglia and Schrader marshaled an impressive field of scriptural and patristic evidence to illustrate their case, ranging from Christ as head, body, spouse, and life of the Church, to the one in whom all fullness of divinity dwelt.⁵³

They further developed this line of approach to highlight the Holy Spirit, whose mission was united with Christ’s during his temporal life and who was later sent to guide the Church into the perfection of unity and truth.⁵⁴ Passaglia and Schrader then returned upon the subject of the Trinity and the various causes of the Church in order to incorporate this pneumatic dimension:

And so there can be no fuller harmony between the *efficient and first* cause of the Church and her *internal formal* cause. For just as the efficient cause is God the Trinity and particularly the Word made flesh and his Spirit, to whose divine power the origin and the growth of the Church are most indebted, so also the

⁵² “Porro consultis Scripturis, palam est adiungi homines ecclesiae, eiusque membra effici in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus-sancti. Quemadmodum vero ecclesiae adiunguntur homines, ecclesiamque componunt in nomine Trinitatis; ita ecclesia ipsa tabernaculum est templumque Trinitatis. Legimus enim: ‘Nescitis quia templum Dei estis, et Spiritus Dei habitat in vobis? Si quis autem templum Dei violaverit, disperdet illum Deus; templum enim Dei sanctum est, quod estis vos.’ Legimus: ‘Vos enim estis templum Dei vivi.’ Legimus: ‘Cognoscetis quia ego sum in Patre meo, et vos in me, et ego in vobis.’ Legimus: ‘Si quis diligit me, sermonem meum servabit, et Pater meus diligit eum, et mansionem apud eum faciemus.’ Ac rursum legimus: ‘Rogo ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu Pater in me et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint. Ego in eis, et tu in me, ut sint consummati in unum’” (ibid., 3:803; emphasis original). The authors paraphrased 1 Cor 3:16–17, 19; 2 Cor 6:16; John 14:20, 23 and 17:20–24 of the Latin Vulgate respectively, along with commentary upon the Greek text in the footnotes.

⁵³ Ibid., 3:804–17.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 3:820–22).

Trinity is what fills the temple of the Church by its divinity; Christ is he who, with the Church—as a head with his body and as a bridegroom with his bride and by his own flesh—come together into a certain extraordinary kind of unity; and the Spirit is the one who by the sharing and influx of himself and of his gifts makes the Church grow and fashions her and raises her up to an almost heavenly preeminence.⁵⁵

Passaglia and Schrader then circled back to discuss “external formal causes” of the Church, which they delineated according to four distinct *regulae* (*fidei, actionis, communionis, rituali ac liturgica*). They described each *regula* in social and historical terms according to the Church’s various functions of evangelical proclamation, charity, obedience, and sacramental participation.⁵⁶ Thus, *De Ecclesia Christi* exhibits a basic openness to an elaboration of the Church’s visible dimensions.

The specific institutional functions of the Church—such as the authority of bishops and the papacy—were not set aside altogether in Passaglia’s and Schrader’s work, but such features were presented in close view of their final causes and without the same degree of development in practical institutional matters, as in Perrone’s curriculum.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, in *De Ecclesia Christi*, Passaglia and Schrader offered a paradigm for conceiving of Christian revelation, tradition, ecclesiastical offices, and individual life that was of arresting grandeur and drew deeply from biblical sources and the broad course of Christian tradition. The vision of *De Ecclesia Christi* would provide a theological foundation for a number of the Roman School’s later contributions. Even though the unfinished treatise is nearly forgotten today, it undoubtedly ranks among the most extraordinary ecclesiological works in the modern era.

The achievement of Passaglia and Schrader in *De Ecclesia Christi* offers a captivating example of how a specific vision of the Church

⁵⁵ “Itaque plenior nequit esse concentus inter *efficientem principemque* ecclesiae causam, et *internam* eiusdem causam *formalem*. Sicut enim illa est Deus Trinitas, ac nominatim Verbum caro factum, eiusque Spiritus, quorum divinae virtuti origo, incrementaque ecclesiae in acceptis maxime referuntur; ita Trinitas est quae ecclesiae templum suo numine replet, Christus est qui cum ecclesia, tamquam caput cum suo corpore et sponsus cum sua sponsa, suaeque carne in eximium quoddam unitatis genus concurrit, et Spiritus est qui suimetipsius suorumque munerum communicatione et illapsu ecclesiam vegetat, fingit et ad praestantiam fere caelestem extollit” (ibid., 3:824–25; emphasis mine).

⁵⁶ Ibid., 3:827–29.

⁵⁷ See also ibid., 3:124–72.

can develop along divergent paths under the influence of personality and circumstance. It is significant that both authors began expostulating their work on the Church while in exile from Rome during the Republican Revolution between 1848 and 1850.⁵⁸ While the return of Pius IX and the Jesuits to the city marked a clear shift in the political and theological atmosphere in Rome for the next several decades, reactions to this shift took different forms. Figures like Perrone, Passaglia, and Schrader tended, during the 1850s, to focus on more properly dogmatic or theological questions in theology, which was a turn that largely began in exile in England and Belgium. Others, such as the theologians who founded the journal *La Civiltà Cattolica* in 1850 or members of the new generation like Joseph Kleutgen and Henry Manning, emphasized philosophical, pedagogical, and practical questions.

These shifts in the political atmosphere in Rome after the revolutions of 1848 did not occur without friction among members of the Roman School. It was in part due to these shifts that Passaglia and Schrader began work on a new edition of the seventeenth-century French Jesuit Denys Pétau's (1583–1652) *Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus*.⁵⁹ They believed that Pétau's work offered a model of their positive-theological approach and a wide-ranging introduction to patristic theology. In a programmatic introduction to the edition, Passaglia and Schrader offered a defense of their theological method, and it is here that one finds the closest attempt at a self-conscious articulation of the distinctive positive-theological approach of the Roman School.⁶⁰

The collaborative labors of Passaglia and Schrader were interrupted in 1857 when their Jesuit Superior, Pieter Beckx, transferred

⁵⁸ Pietro Galletti, *Memorie storiche intorno alla Provincia Romana della Compagnia di Gesù, dal'anno 1814 all'anno 1914*, vol. 1, 1814–1849 (Prato, IT: Tipografia Giachetti, Figlio, E. C., 1914), 548–61.

⁵⁹ Denys Pétau, *Dionysii Petavii Aurelianensis e Societate Iesu Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus*, ed. C. Passaglia [and Clemens Schrader] (Rome: Propaganda Fide, 1857).

⁶⁰ See Christoph Beginner, “Die pneumatologisch–anthropologischen Ansätze in der Trinitätslehre des Dionysius Petavius und ihr Einfluss auf die ‘Römische Schule’ um Carlo Passaglia und Johann Baptist Franzelin,” *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 62 (2011): 343–55. The most concise summary of the Roman School's theological method can be found in Catalino Arevalo, *Some Aspects of the Theology of the Mystical Body of Christ in the Ecclesiology of Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, and Clemens Schrader: Theologians of the Roman College in the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Rome: Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana, 1959), 3–8.

Schrader to Vienna, where he remained until 1867.⁶¹ Schrader's move took place over the objections of both theologians, and Passaglia's fiery temperament caused problems for his standing in the Church before and after the event. Shortly after Schrader's departure, Passaglia resigned from his chair of theology at the *Collegio Romano*, and in 1859, he left the Jesuit order altogether.⁶² The two theologians' lives and theological activities shifted markedly after these events, and their subsequent writings can be regarded as two distinct paths along which the theology of the Roman School could develop.

Schrader's appointment in Vienna was designed to bring clerical instruction there in line with the increasingly ultramontane atmosphere of Rome. His success in the city was debatable, but the work he accomplished clearly reflected the Roman interests during a time of increased assertiveness of secular powers, which included the Austrian Empire.⁶³ Schrader's two-volume theological lectures, *De Unitate Romana Commentarius*, published in 1862 and 1866, represent the fullest development of the Roman School's understanding of papal authority in relation to the Church.⁶⁴ In the first book (*Liber I: Διδακτικός*), Schrader retained the same Christocentric point of departure from his days working on *De Ecclesia Christi* with Passaglia in the 1850s, but he refocused this approach primarily for the purpose of expounding upon the Church as a visible institution:

But if the foundation is guarded by statute law and rule, so that the society of men be human, the form and exemplar is prescribed by catholic and Roman unity, namely the God-Man [ὁ Θεάνθρωπος], so that it should be more perfect and noble, so that it should be a Christian society. For if the natural society of men follows the analogy of a human body physically [φυσικῶς]

⁶¹ Carlin, *L'ecceologia di Carlo Passaglia*, 29–45.

⁶² Giacomo Martina, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia, 1814–1983* (Brescia, IT: Morcelliana, 2003), 147–51.

⁶³ See Laurence Cole, “The Counter-Reformation's Last Stand: Austria,” in *Culture Wars: Secular-Catholic Conflict in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, ed. C. Clark and W. Kaiser (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 285–312; and the various contributions in *Kulturkampf in Tirol und in den Nachbarländern: Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums des Tiroler Geschichtsvereins (Sektion Bozen) im Kolpinghaus Bozen, 9 November 2012*, ed. G. Pfeifer and J. Nössing (Innsbruck, AT: Universitäts Verlag Wagner, 2013).

⁶⁴ Clemens Schrader, *De Unitate Romana Commentarius. Liber I: Διδακτικός*. (Freiburg: Herder, 1862); Schrader, *De Unitate Romana Commentarius. Liber 2: Πραγματικός* (Vienna, AT: Sumptibus Mayer & Soc., 1866).

animated, and therefore of a human composite, then nothing is [more] manifest than that Christian society is to be completed after the analogy [ἀναλογίαν] of Christ the man in whom dwells bodily the whole fullness of divinity, and therefore after the analogy [ἀναλογίαν] of that composed hypostasis, so that it may truly be what it is called. But then the association of human society with Roman unity will be no more harmful to it than it is harmful to human nature if it be drawn into the intimate association of divinity by the eternal Word.⁶⁵

Schrader's second volume (*Liber II: Πραγματικός*) developed the juridical dimensions of the Church and offered a lengthy compendium of biblical, patristic, medieval, early modern, and magisterial sources in support of a nearly uncompromising version of ultramontane papal authority. At over seven hundred pages in total and covering every age of Christianity, the treatise was the most formidable elaboration of ultramontane ecclesiology written during this period.

Carlo Passaglia's path was quite different from that of his younger collaborator. After leaving the Society of Jesus, Passaglia moved to Turin where he joined the cause of Italian unification and employed his creative skills as a writer to that end. Although most of Passaglia's writings during this period were brief or ad hoc, the vision of the Church found in this work remained in alignment with the Trinitarian focus of his earlier writings. Passaglia stressed the spiritual claims and beauty of the Church while emphasizing that the pope's temporal authority remained only accidental to his office as pastor of the faithful and guardian of the deposit of faith.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ "Verum custodito per statutam legem ac normam fundamento, ut hominum societas esse humana possit, ab unitate catholica eaque romana simul etiam praestituitur forma atque exemplar, ὁ Θεάνθρωπος, ut perfectius illa et nobilius, ut christiana societas sit. Si enim naturalis hominum societas humani corporis animati φυσικῶς, humanique adeo compositi ἀναλογίαν sequitur: nihil manifestus est, quam societatem christianam ad ἀναλογίαν hominis Christi in quo habitabat omnis plenitudo divinitatis corporaliter, adeoque ad ἀναλογίαν compositae illius hypostaseos esse exigendam, ut vere sit quae vocatur. Sed tum consociatio humanae societatis cum romana unitate non minus illi nocebit, quam humanae naturae nocuit, ut a Verbo aeterno in intimum divinitatis consortium attraheretur" (ibid., 1:41–43).

⁶⁶ See for example, Carlo Passaglia, *Il pontifice ed il principe, ossia la teologia, la filosofia, e la politica messe d'accordo in ordine al principato civile del papa. dialoghi* (s.l.: s.n., 1860); and Passaglia, *La Causa di sua Eminenza Reverendissima il Cardinale Girolamo D'Andrea, Vescovo Suburbicario di Sabina, Abate Ordinario di Subiaco*. (Turin: Tipografia Torinese, 1867). This latter text summarized books 1–3 of

Passaglia was suspended of his priestly faculties on account of these political activities for the rest of his career, but he was undeterred by the measures and went on to criticize the *Syllabus of Errors* and aspects of the burgeoning Neoscholastic movement.⁶⁷ His writings nonetheless never crossed over into heterodoxy, and he openly accepted the definitions of the First Vatican Council and was reconciled to the Church a few months before his death in 1887.⁶⁸

The last central representative of the Roman School was Johann Baptist Franzelin, who became a Professor of Oriental Languages at the *Collegio Romano* and later replaced Passaglia as Chair of Dogmatic Theology in 1858.⁶⁹ Franzelin made a lasting impact upon Roman Catholic thought on tradition in the wake of the Vatican Council. His 1870 *Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura*⁷⁰ was described by Yves Congar in 1960 with ambivalent admiration as “almost a classic work” that inspired numerous other writers between the First and Second Vatican Councils.⁷¹

Franzelin has been somewhat accurately regarded as a transitional figure, falling between the currents of the Roman School and the Neoscholastic Revival.⁷² This has to do, in part, with the fact that Franzelin’s 1858 appointment in Dogmatic Theology was part of a broader initiative to bring the *Collegio Romano*’s curriculum more into alignment with the thought of Thomas Aquinas.⁷³ A recent article by Hector Scerri has shown in what ways Franzelin’s published reflections on God and the sacraments, which came out of this appointment, were indebted to Aquinas’s thought in both structure

De Ecclesia Christi Commentariorum (1853, 1856) on pp. 61–104. The rest of the treatise (on pp. 105–470) was devoted to articulating elaborate distinctions regarding the limits of papal authority and the rights of bishops.

⁶⁷ Carlin, *L’eccesiologia di Carlo Passaglia*, 223–25.

⁶⁸ See Passaglia’s published articles from 1880 (listed in Carlin, *L’eccesiologia di Carlo Passaglia*, 377).

⁶⁹ For a sketch of Franzelin’s life and thought, see Peter Walter, *Johann Baptist Franzelin 1816–1886, Jesuit, Theologe, Kardinal* (Bozen, IT: Verlaganstalt Athesia, 1987); for his concept of tradition and bibliographic references, see Franz Gaar, *Das Prinzip der göttlichen Tradition nach Joh. Baptist Franzelin* (Regensburg: Joseph Habbel, 1973), 339–52.

⁷⁰ Ioannis Bapt. Franzelin, *Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura*. (Rome: Typis S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1870).

⁷¹ Yves Congar, *La tradition et les traditions*, 2 vols. (Paris: Cerf, 1960; repr. 2010), 2:251–52.

⁷² Kasper, *Die Lehre von Tradition*, 70–71.

⁷³ Pontificia Università Gregoriana, *L’Università Gregoriana del Collegio Romano*, 24–27.

and content. Yet, for Scerri and virtually every other reader of Franzelin's work, the theologian remained a patristic thinker at heart.⁷⁴ A mere glance at the footnotes throughout Franzelin's work reveals an abiding fascination with the Eastern patristic writers and a prodigious facility in oriental languages.

Franzelin's work also falls squarely within the sphere of the Roman School on the question of faith and tradition. His *Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, in particular, brings the Roman School's themes of faith, reason, authority, history, the Church, and the primacy of the sources of revelation into an impressive synthesis. The treatise represents the culmination of the movement's contributions to the theology of tradition.

Franzelin began the treatise with a prolegomena on the positivity of divine revelation and the necessity of the believer's response of faith. Revelation, according to Franzelin, originated with God's Word and the divine initiative of grace.⁷⁵ As such, faith's origin enjoyed a supernatural certitude that was distinct from natural forms of knowledge, and the contents of faith fell into the natural domain only in part. The human act of faith (*fides qua*) was an assent to this Divine Word with the aid of grace. Similar to Perrone's work, however, the discursive *credenda* of Christian belief, such as the three persons of the Trinity, constituted only the material object of faith.⁷⁶ Faith's formal motive was the human will's grace-assisted response to divine authority. In this way, faith as an act had no necessary relationship to premises of human reasoning. Authority was understood rather as *recognized* with the aid of grace and, as such, authority invested the Christian message with an epistemically self-warranting dimension.⁷⁷ The act of faith in Franzelin's work had as much to do with obedience as it did with intellectual assent.

Moreover, in Franzelin's treatise, faith fundamentally involved the Church. The certitude and objective infallibility that faith enjoyed had its origin in God's power and trustworthiness. Yet, in order for this certitude to go beyond an abstract ideal and extend to the contents of faith in a meaningful way, the same certitude and infallibility needed to extend to the Church, the medium through

⁷⁴ Hector Scerri, "The Revival of Scholastic Sacramental Theology after the Publication of Aeterni Patris," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 77.3 (2012): 265–85, at 276.

⁷⁵ Franzelin, *Tractatus de Divina Traditione et Scriptura*, 23.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 520–23.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 526–33.

which faith was presented to believers in each age.⁷⁸ This infallibility applied to the whole Church not only by a certain functional necessity but also by Christ's promise. However, Franzelin drew distinctions regarding the dynamics of this feature. The Church as a whole enjoyed what he referred to as the *infallibilitas passiva*, since the Church remained safeguarded by Christ's promise and the active guidance of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁹ This infallibility could also express itself in an active way, however, through the magisterium. For these reasons, Franzelin regarded the proclamation of the Church as the supreme norm for the interpretation of Scripture.⁸⁰

Franzelin referred to these ecclesial features of faith, authority, and obedience as the "internal principles" of tradition, which were inextricably bound with the objective integrity and continuance of Christian faith through history.⁸¹ Hence the act of assenting intellectually to the Christian message involved a concrete response to divine authority manifested in the contemporary magisterium. There was, as Franzelin argued, an "intrinsic nexus between the principles of tradition and the properties of Christian religion," as well as a necessary relationship between the Church and the deposit of revelation as an integral whole.⁸²

The Roman School and Modern Catholicism

This overview of Perrone's work and of the main proponents of the Roman School has only covered a handful of their most important and representative contributions and, so far, has not included a discussion of their wide-ranging influence in the nineteenth century and beyond. The impact of the Roman School is too broad to be covered in a single article, but since very little research has been done on this legacy, a few general remarks are necessary.

Any discussion of the Roman School's influence needs to begin with the diffuse contemporary impact of Perrone's theological curriculum. The *Praelectiones Theologicae* and an abridged version of the text went to over eighty editions during the nineteenth century.⁸³ This figure is all the more striking when one considers that the *Praelectiones*

⁷⁸ Ibid., 23, 28–32.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 94–95.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 182–93.

⁸¹ Ibid., 37–49.

⁸² Ibid., 37.

⁸³ Martina, *Storia della compagnia di Gesù in Italia*, 62; Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 6:558–72, at 558–60.

was an expensive, multi-volume Latin text that was not intended for general consumption. The places where the curriculum was in use were also significant. The *Collegio Romano* alone trained over three hundred bishops during the nineteenth century, and the curriculum was also employed in other educational centers in the city such as the *Germanicum* and the *Propaganda*.⁸⁴ In addition to widespread use in Italian seminaries, Perrone's curriculum spread to other parts of Europe by way of those who studied in Rome. Nicholas Wiseman used the curriculum for training Oxford Movement converts, for example, and George Darboy used the text after he became Archbishop of Paris.⁸⁵ The curriculum was also used in other important theological centers such as Würzburg, Innsbruck, and Louvain.⁸⁶

The Roman School's direct influence upon magisterial developments in the nineteenth century was not unrelated to the status of the *Praelectiones* and was highly significant. Perrone published several important works against the followers of Georg Hermes in the 1830s, and he was later involved in the scrutiny directed toward Louis Bautain's work. This theological labor quickly became instantiated in papal teachings and formed precedents for definitions later in the century.⁸⁷

The Roman School's work for the definition of the Immaculate Conception of Mary emerged from central themes in the movement's theology of tradition and the Church and was also decisive. Perrone published the first major treatise on the definability of the Immaculate Conception in 1847 at the request of Pius IX. The treatise was designed to precede the Pope's encyclical *Ubi Primum* (1849), which surveyed the world's bishops on the possibility of a new definition and had an impact upon their responses. Perrone's Latin treatise went through eleven editions between its first appearance in October of 1847 and the definition of the dogma in December of 1854. Perrone and Carlo Passaglia produced schemata for the preparatory commission that was responsible for drafting the

⁸⁴ Shea, "Giovanni Perrone's Theological Curriculum," 800–01.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 811.

⁸⁶ For Innsbruck, see Neufeld, "Zur 'Römischen Schule' im deutschen Sprachraum," 323–40; for Louvain, see Johan Ickx, *La Santa Sede tra Lamennais e San Tommaso d'Aquino: la condanna di Gerard Casimir Ubaghs e della dottrina dell'Università Cattolica di Lovanio, 1834–1870* (Vatican City: Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 2005), 80–87, and Leo Kenis, *De Theologische Faculteit te Leuven in de negentiende eeuw, 1834–1889* (Brussels, BE: Paleis der Academiën, 1992), 221.

⁸⁷ Walter, *Die Frage der Glaubensbegründung als innerer Erfahrung*, 17–44.

definition, and their work played an important role in shaping the final decree.⁸⁸

It was in the years preceding and immediately following the definition of the Immaculate Conception that the Roman School was at the height of its social prestige. In 1849, John Henry Newman reflected on his time in Rome as a recent convert and claimed that Perrone practically represented the highest theological authority in Rome.⁸⁹ Heinrich Denzinger, a student of Perrone and Passaglia, began publishing his famous *Enchiridion Symbolorum* in 1854 and included the propositions that Perrone drafted for the fideist writer Louis Bautain to sign in the 1856 edition.⁹⁰ These propositions remain in Denzinger to this day, in its forty-third edition. It was around this time that Perrone was referred to in a French edition of his work as the “prince of contemporary theologians.”⁹¹

The Neoscholastic movement increasingly gained influence after the return of the Jesuits to Rome in 1850, and by the end of the decade, the movement began to overtake the Roman School’s influence in the theological instruction of aspiring priests. However, the influence of the Neoscholastic revival involved primarily younger generations whose formative experiences were the revolutions of 1848 and the loss of most of the territory of the Papal States in 1859 and 1860. By the end of the 1860s, those holding offices of power in the Church were still predominately those formed by Perrone’s curriculum and by other representatives of the Roman School, and

⁸⁸ Perrone’s schema for the bull *Ineffabilis* can be found in *La solenne definizione del Dogma dell’Immacolato Concepimento di Maria Santissima: Atti e documenti II*, ed. Vincenzo Sardi, 2 vols. (Rome: Tipografia Vaticana, 1905), 2:22–38. His influence on the decree of the Immaculate Conception is covered in Giulio da Nembero, *La definibilità dell’immacolata concezione negli scritti e nell’attività di Giovanni Perrone, S.J.* (Milan, IT: Centro Studi Cappuccini Lombardi, 1961). See also Charles Shea, “Father Giovanni Perrone and Doctrinal Development in Rome: An Overlooked Legacy of Newman’s *Essay on Development*,” *Journal for the History of Modern Theology / Zeitschrift für neue Theologieggeschichte* 20.1 (2013): 85–116, at 110–16.

⁸⁹ See Shea, “From Implicit and Explicit Reason to Inference and Assent,” p.66.

⁹⁰ Heinrich Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum quae de rebus fidei et morum a conciliis oecumenicis et summis pontificibus emanarunt*, 3rd edition (Würzburg: Sumptibus Stahelianus, 1856), no. 123. Denzinger’s theological formation in Rome is treated in Joseph Schumacher, *Der “Denzinger”: Geschichte und Bedeutung eines Buches in der Praxis der neueren Theologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), 56–59, 83–88.

⁹¹ Frédéric-Édouard Chassay, “Notice bibliographique,” in Giovanni Perrone, *Le protestantisme et la règle de foi*, trans. A. Peltier (Paris: Louis Vivès, 1854), vi.

although the Neoscholastic movement was beginning to reach its early height at the time of the First Vatican Council, the Roman School still enjoyed nearly hegemonic influence in circles nearest to the Pope in the years preceding the event.

The Roman School's impact upon the decrees of the First Vatican Council was in fact decisive. It would be no exaggeration to claim that the First Vatican Council represented the Church's de facto enshrinement of Perrone's and the Roman School's theology in magisterial teaching, even if that appropriation was cut short when the Council was adjourned in the summer of 1870 and remained an incomplete expression of the Roman School's overall theological vision.

I have made a broad case for the Roman School's impact upon the Council elsewhere, but a few remarks will serve to illustrate this influence here.⁹² The Theological Preparatory Commission for the First Vatican Council was established in 1867 and dominated by members of the Roman School and their former students. This commission was charged with producing the schemata that would ultimately become, with relatively minor changes, the documents defined at the Council in 1870. Perrone, Franzelin, Schrader, and two of their students, Joseph Kleutgen (1811–1883) and Franz Hettinger (1819–1890), would play important roles in this commission's work, for they each produced and redacted schemata that formed the foundation for texts proposed and ultimately adopted on the floor of the Council.

The Constitution on the Catholic Faith, *Dei Filius*, was originally drafted by Franzelin and later redacted by Kleutgen, who was charged with only altering the presentation of the original schema.⁹³ The final

⁹² For more detailed treatments of the Roman School's influence on the Vatican Council, see Shea, "Giovanni Perrone's Theological Curriculum and the First Vatican Council"; José Vallar, "La Escuela Romana y la const. *Pastor Aeternus* de Concilio Vaticano I," *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 35 (2003): 104–49; Schauf, "Die Unfehlbarkeit der Kirche," 339–54; José Gómez-Heras, "La constitution *Dei Filius* y la teología del cardinal J.B. Franzelin" *Revista española de teología* 23 (1963): 137–90; Gómez-Heras, "La constitution *Dei Filius* y la teología del cardinal J. B. Franzelin (continuación)," *Revista española de teología* 25 (1965): 79–114; and Gómez-Heras, "La constitution *Dei Filius* y la teología del cardinal J.B. Franzelin (continuación)," *Revista española de teología* 27 (1967): 375–97.

⁹³ For the sake of accessibility, citations from the officially promulgated texts will come from Heinrich Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionem et*

version of *Dei Filius* closely conformed to Kleutgen's revised schema and to the Roman School's theological vision.⁹⁴ The text assumed a positive-theological stance on the deposit of faith,⁹⁵ highlighting divine authority and the Church's role in maintaining the integrity of revelation and providing the context in which the act of faith was possible.⁹⁶ The words of *Dei Filius* are worth citing in full: "In fact, it is to the Catholic Church alone that belong all those signs that are so numerous and so wonderfully arranged by God to make evident the credibility of the Christian faith. In fact, the Church by herself, with her marvelous propagation, eminent holiness, and inexhaustible fruitfulness in everything that is good, with her catholic unity and invincible stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an irrefutable testimony of her divine mission."⁹⁷

Dei Filius was explicit about the necessity of receiving faith through the teaching authority of the Church, but the text did not go into detail regarding the precise dynamics of faith as a divine and human act.⁹⁸ Even a cursory reading of the document and its overall structure, however, demonstrates its indebtedness to the labors of the Roman School on these matters.

The Vatican Council's constitution *Pastor Aeternus* equally demonstrated the influence of the Roman School and, in particular, the vision of the papacy set forth in Perrone's *Praelectiones Theologicae*. In the *Praelectiones*, the authority of the papacy was treated independently from the authority of the Church on account of the subject's importance, which was a procedure also followed in the

declarationem de rebus fidei et morum, ed. P. Hünermann, 43rd Latin-English ed., trans. R. Fastiggi, and A. Nash (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius 2012), and will be abbreviated DS and numbered according to sections standardized in recent editions. The Latin editions used for the Vatican Council in Denzinger come from *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collection*, ed. I. Mansi, et al., 53 vols. (Leipzig: H. Welter, 1758–1927), 51:430–6 (*Dei Filius*) and 52:1330–4 (*Pastor Aeternus*), and are normally the preferred texts among specialists.

⁹⁴ For a side-by-side comparison of Franzelin's and Kleutgen's schemata with the final text of *Dei Filius*, see "Anhang V–VI," in Hermann Pottmeyer, *Der Glaube vor dem Anspruch der Wissenschaft: Der Konstitution über den katholischen Glauben "Dei Filius" des Ersten Vatikanischen Konzils und die unveröffentlichten theologischen Voten der vorbereitenden Kommission* (Freiburg: Herder, 1968), 478–98.

⁹⁵ DS, no. 3008.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

dogmatic preparatory commission. One of Perrone's students, Franz Hettinger, completed the first schema for the decree in April of 1869, and it largely followed the lines of Perrone's *votum* presented earlier in the year.⁹⁹ Clemens Schrader then revised the schema into nearly the form it assumed at the early stages of the Council. The question of papal infallibility, however, was reserved for the Council itself.¹⁰⁰ During the Council, a further student of the Roman School and translator of Perrone's work, Willibald Maier (1823–1874), who was Ignaz of von Senestrey's *peritus*, was responsible for producing the final *caput addendum* on papal infallibility (April 1870).¹⁰¹

Although Maier's contribution would be debated intensively by the Council participants, the broad contours of the final text conformed strikingly with Perrone's teaching on papal authority from the third year of the *Praelectiones Theologicae*. The Council taught that the pope receives his authority directly from Christ by virtue of his promise to Peter (*Praelectiones*, 2:920). This authority, when exercised *ex cathedra* for the definition of faith and morals, is also infallible (*ibid.*, 2:1018–21), since the certitude of revelation itself requires the infallibility of its safeguards and instruments (*ibid.*, 2:929). The pope finally exercises this authority through the power of his office, not from the consent of the Church (*ibid.*, 2:974). In short, the First Vatican Council's dogmatic teachings on faith, reason, tradition, and papal authority represented an adoption of central themes from the third and fourth years of Perrone's theological curriculum while including further nuances from the influence exerted on the preparatory commission and later deputations by representatives of the Roman school, most importantly Schrader, Franzelin, Joseph Kleutgen, Franz Hettinger, and Willibald Maier.

The definitions of the First Vatican Council clearly stand as one of the Roman School's most significant contributions to modern Roman Catholicism, but this achievement has been largely forgotten today. To some degree, this was because the prominence of the Roman School was quickly losing ground at that time to the

⁹⁹ José María Gómez-Heras, *Temas Dogmáticos del Concilio Vaticano I: Aportación de la Comisión Teológica preparatoria a su obra doctrinal, votos y esquemas inéditos*, 2 vols. (Vitoria: Eset, 1971), 2:562–63; for Perrone's *votum*, see document A–8c (*ibid.*, 2:661–74); for Hettinger's schema, see document A–8i (*ibid.*, 2:777–84).

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 2:564.

¹⁰¹ Klaus Schatz, *Vaticanum I, 1869–1870*, 3 vols. (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1992–1994), 3:19.

Neoscholastic Revival, and by the end of the century, Perrone's work had been virtually abandoned in Roman circles.¹⁰² Yet, even despite this rapid eclipse, the achievement of the Roman School continued to shape the Church in important and subtle ways.

For example, Gioacchino Vincenzo Pecci, the future Pope Leo XIII (r. 1878–1903), can be regarded as expanding the Roman School's vision in magisterial teaching. As a seminarian (1824–1832), Pecci studied under Perrone at the *Collegio Romano*¹⁰³ and went on to use the *Praelectiones Theologicae* as archbishop of Perugia.¹⁰⁴ At the First Vatican Council he also headed a group of bishops in examining an important schema on the Church produced by the Theological Preparatory Commission.¹⁰⁵

Scholars have observed recently that Pecci later consulted drafts from the Vatican Council and that these drafts played a significant role in his magisterial teaching as Pope.¹⁰⁶ In particular, Leo's encyclical on the Church, *Satis Cognitum* (29 June 29, 1896), strikingly displays the theological achievements of the Roman School on the Church, the magisterium, tradition, the act of faith, and papal authority.¹⁰⁷ The encyclical can be interpreted as filling in the largely implicit ecclesiological lineaments that connected *Dei Filius* and *Pastor Aeternus*, but the intellectual roots of *Satis Cognitum* have never been studied.¹⁰⁸ Though it seems likely that the Roman School had

¹⁰² This is according to a student at the *Germanicum*, Konrad Gröber, in Klaus Schatz, *Geschichte der deutschen Jesuiten (1814–1983)*, 5 vols. (Münster: Aschendorff, 2013), 2:165.

¹⁰³ Benno Kühne, *Unser heiliger Vater Papst Leo XIII: in seinem Leben und Wirken* (Einsiedeln: Karl & Nikolaus Benzinger, 1880), 21–23.

¹⁰⁴ *Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentionum. Collectio Lacensis*, 6 vols. (Freiburg: Herder, 1870–1892), 6:761.

¹⁰⁵ Bruno Bellone, *I vescovi dello Stato Pontificio al Concilio Vaticano I* (Rome: Pontificia Università Lateranense, 1966), 158–60. The schema “Decretum et canones de ecclesia Christi” can be found in Gómez-Heras, *Temas Dogmáticos del Concilio Vaticano I*, 2:466–78.

¹⁰⁶ John Dick, Jürgen Mettepenningen, and Karim Schelkens, *Aggiornamento? Catholicism from Gregory XVI to Benedict XVI* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 59.

¹⁰⁷ *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, XXVI:708–39; English translation can be found in Claudia Carlen, *The Papal Encyclicals 1878–1903* (Raleigh, NC: Pierian Press, 1990), 387–404.

¹⁰⁸ For an overview of research, see Giovanni Tangorra, “Il concetto di Chiesa in Leo XIII,” *Lateranum* 76 (2010): 293–317; and Philippe Levillain, “L’historiographie du pontificat de Léon XIII,” in *Le pontificat de Léon XIII. Renaissance du Saint-Siège?* ed. P. Levillain and J.-M. Ticchi (Rome: École Française de Rome, 2006), 9–33.

a significant impact upon Leo's teaching, this impact will never be traced fully until the background of his thought is explored in greater detail.

It is probable that the influence of the Roman School in the twentieth century was also significant, but this question remains untouched in the scholarship. Sebastian Tromp, for example, was known to have worked extensively with the ecclesiological writings of the Roman School in the Gregorian University archives, and these writings formed an important part of Tromp's classroom instruction during the 1930s.¹⁰⁹ As many readers of this journal will be aware, Tromp is widely regarded as the primary author behind Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* (June 29, 1943) and, as secretary of the Theological Preparatory Commission, played a significant role in the composition of *Lumen Gentium* at the Second Vatican Council.¹¹⁰

Tromp's student Heribert Schaaf was the first major scholar of the Roman School in the twentieth century and a *peritus* at the Second Vatican Council. He worked closely with Tromp in the Theological Preparatory Commission at the Council and worked on *Lumen Gentium* and *Dei Verbum*.¹¹¹ Schaaf also prepared editions of previously unpublished ecclesiological works from Passaglia and Schrader in 1959 and 1961, which was early enough to have had an impact upon discussions among preparatory commission members or general session participants.¹¹² The contributions of both Tromp and Schaaf remain largely untreated in the literature on Vatican II,¹¹³ and the

¹⁰⁹ Heribert Schaaf, intro. to *De Corpore Christi mystico sive de ecclesia Christi theses: die Ekklesiologie des Konzilstheologen Clemens Schrader S.J., an Hand seines veröffentlichten und unveröffentlichten Schrifttums*, ed. H. Schaaf (Freiburg: Herder, 1959), Einführung, 7.

¹¹⁰ Stefano Alberto, "Corpus Suum mystice constituit" (LG 7): *La Chiesa Corpo Mistico di Cristo nel primo capitolo della "Lumen Gentium": storia del testo dalla "Mystici Corporis" al Vaticano II con riferimenti alla attività conciliare del P. Sebastian Tromp, S.J.* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1996), 49–54.

¹¹¹ *Personenlexikon zum zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, ed. C. Carl, M. Quisinsky, and P. Walter (Freiburg: Herder, 2012), 239.

¹¹² Heribert Schaaf, *De Corpore Christi mystico sive de ecclesia Christi theses*; Schaaf, *De conciliis oecumenicis: theses Caroli Passaglia de conciliis deque habitu quo ad Romanos Pontifices referuntur* (Freiburg: Herder, 1961).

¹¹³ Tromp's diary of the Council, for example, was edited only recently in Sebastian Tromp, S.J., *Konzilstagebuch mit Erläuterungen und Akten aus der Arbeit der Theologischen Kommission II. Vatikanisches Konzil*, ed. A. von Teuffenbach, 2 vols. (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2006). Schaaf's three-volume diary remains unedited in the Domarchiv in Aachen with a photocopy version in the Archiv der Hochschule St. Georgen, Frankfurt am Main.

legacy of Perrone and the Roman School up until our own time will never be known fully until their contributions are better explored.

Particularly in the French- and English-speaking worlds, Perrone and the Roman School have been almost completely lost in the collective memory of scholars. Yet it remains undeniable that their influence upon the development of modern Catholicism was of defining significance. The movement served as a driver for the development of Roman Catholic doctrine on the act of faith and its relationship to ecclesiastical authority and tradition during an age of great transformation on all levels of society. In meeting the challenges of the nineteenth century, the Roman School built upon early modern contributions but also embarked upon a monumental collective project of theological *ressourcement*. Without their renewed exploration of the Fathers of the Church and other ages of the Christian past, the movement's contributions to tradition, papal authority, Mariology, and the theology of faith and reason would hardly be imaginable.

These contributions had a broad and lasting impact upon the Church as a modern institution. The Roman School helped to establish a new balance of center and periphery in the Church and helped to reorient the juridical and magisterial functions of the papacy for the Church to meet the challenges of an era that was and remains increasingly pluralistic, global, and multi-centered in outlook. In attempting to meet these needs, the Roman School provided the Church with a broad constellation of principles and conceptual tools for navigating the modern world intellectually and as a social institution, and these contributions remain important features that shape Catholic thought up into our own time. Perrone and the Jesuits of the *Collegio Romano* may be almost forgotten in the twenty-first century, but it would be difficult to envision the Church today without their achievements. N&V