

**Zeitschrift:** Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review  
**Band:** 3 (1895)  
**Heft:** 12  
  
**Artikel:** The Rev. George Williams and his part in the reunion movement  
**Autor:** Churton, W.R.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403320>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 07.09.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# The Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS

## AND HIS PART IN THE REUNION MOVEMENT.<sup>1)</sup>

---

### II.

The next event of importance was the institution of the Eastern Church Association, to cooperate with the Russo-Greek Committee of the General Convention of the Church in the United States in cultivating intercourse with the Oriental Churches. The scheme had been originally proposed in 1857 in connexion with the Mission founded at Constantinople by the Society for the propagation of the Gospel: "This mission, established primarily to supply the wants of our own people, affords a natural opportunity for cultivating intercourse with the Oriental Churches. The object of the proposed Association may be generally stated as follows: 1. To support and encourage the English clergy in Constantinople and other Eastern cities in which they are engaged. 2. To circulate information by the translation of Liturgies, Catechisms, etc., respecting the principles and present condition of the English Church on the one hand, and the various Eastern Churches on the other. 3. To seek all opportunities of cultivating friendly relations with the Churches of the East. Reference being made to Dr Hill's work at Athens, it is added that the general principle of the effort should be to benefit the members of the various Christian Communities in the East in and through their own organization, and to avoid proselytism and the encouragement of divisions among them. (*Christian Remembrancer*, vol. 34, 1857, p. 351.) The scheme however was

---

<sup>1)</sup> Voir la *Revue*, N° 11, juillet-septembre 1895, p. 538—552.



not matured till 1864, when the Rules of the 'Eastern Church Association' were adopted. The first report appeared in June, 1866. The list of patrons included the Archbishop of Dublin, the Archbishop of Belgrade, the Metropolitan of South Africa, the Primus of the Church in Scotland, two bishops of English sees, two Scotch Bishops, and two of the Church in the United States. At the second anniversary of the Association in June, 1867, George Williams was the preacher: in the course of his sermon he said, We Anglicans have been involved in the scandalous schism between East and West through no fault of our own. We have inherited as a consequence of our long subjugation to the Roman see, centuries of misrepresentation and misunderstanding of our brethren of the Oriental Churches: but we have now learned to estimate more justly their claims to Catholicity and to weigh in a more equal balance the merits of the questions at issue between them, and the historical incidents which first produced, and have since continued the schism through so many centuries, baffling all attempts at reconciliation. He spoke earnestly of our debt to the Christian East for its careful maintenance and faithful transmission of the faith once for all delivered to the saints; its consistent opposition to Papal usurpation, and its witness against Western innovations in doctrine and practice, as well as its constancy under oppression and persecution. It would, he said, be a narrow and sectarian spirit, which would lead us to stand aloof from a Church so venerable, so sound in all fundamental points, so tried in the furnace of affliction, approved by the experience of 18 Centuries as a faithful witness to the Gospel of Christ." The Reports and Occasional papers of the Association from 1866 onwards shew his unwearied activity in collecting evidence bearing upon the relations between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, both past and present. In 1866 George Williams published a short paper on 'Yearnings towards Unity in the East', consisting of extracts from the works of the Metropolitan of Chios, who in 1863 had published his *Φωνὴ τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας*, a most able exposition of the position of the Orthodox Church with regard to Papal claims and usurpation. The same prelate afterwards prepared a scheme of union between the Orthodox and Armenian Communions, which was embodied in a series of articles in the *Byzantis*, 1864—1866. He continued



to plead for the substantial orthodoxy of the Armenians to the end of his life, as may be seen from two letters printed in the appendix to the *Ἀκολουθία τῆς Θείας λειτουργίας κατὰ τὰς διατάξεις τῆς Ἀρμενικῆς Ὁρθοδόξου ἐκκλησίας*, ὑπὸ Δημητρίου I. X. ΤΖΟΛΑΚΙΔΟΥ, Constantinople, 1883, p. 63. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ ἐσωτερικὸς ἐν τῇ πίστει δεσμὸς τῶν δύο Ἐκκλησιῶν οὐ διερξάγη, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς ὁ ἐξωτερικὸς τῆς πνευματικῆς ἐπικοινωνίας, ἄλλως εἰπεῖν, ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς ἀγάπης, ὡς ἐκ τῆς συνδρομῆς ἀντιξόων περιστάσεων, εὐκταῖον ἐστὶ καλλιιεργεῖν ἀπανταχοῦ, ὅση δύναμις, καὶ προάγειν τὴν ἀδελφικὴν ἀγάπην τῶν δύο μεγάλων ἐν τῇ ἐώρᾳ λήξει χριστιανικῶν καὶ οὐσιωδῶς ὁμοδόξων λαῶν, Ἑλλήνων, φαρμέν, καὶ Ἀρμενίων· τοῦτο δ' ἔσται ἡ μόνη ὁδός, ἡ ἀναμφιλέκτως πρὸς τὴν ἐξωτερικὴν ἐπικοινωνίαν ἄγουσα, ἥτοι πρὸς τὴν συρραφὴν τοῦ, ὡς μὴ ὥφελε, διαρραγέντος ἐξωτερικοῦ δεσμοῦ. This happy expression of the continuance of the 'esoteric bond' between Churches which are 'exoterically divided', represents his sentiments in some measure towards the Anglican as well as the Armenian Communion. In 1867 George Williams published a letter received from the Metropolitan of Chios by the Secretary of the Eastern Church Association, in which he states his view of the possibilities of agreement (*συμφωνία*) between the Anglican and Orthodox Communion. 'The Anglican Church accepts the same fundamental principles (*θεμελιώδεις ἀρχαί*) in the investigation of dogmatic truth and the interpretation of Holy Scripture as our Orthodox Eastern Church.' He seems however to have been misinformed as to the acceptance by Anglicans of the Divine authority of the *seven* holy Œcumenical Councils. In the earlier treatise, the *φωνὴ τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας*, he had expressed similar sentiments: 'The Anglican Church alone of the Protestant Communions, which have rejected both Fathers and Synods and Sacraments and Hierarchy, and in short, all Ecclesiastical tradition, has been able after a long struggle to preserve from the flood of innovation a portion of orthodox truth; as having received the power of Synods, the authority of Fathers, and an Episcopal Hierarchy.' When George Williams went to the East in 1866, he was the bearer of a letter to the Metropolitan of Chios from the Eastern Church Association expressing their gratitude to him for his exertions in behalf of the union of Christendom, which the Metropolitan received with many flattering expressions of appreciation. He reached Chios early on Sunday, July 15, and at once sent to



inform the Metropolitan of his arrival. He gave him a most cordial reception, and during his stay in the island until the 18<sup>th</sup> he was in frequent communication with him. On the morning of the 16<sup>th</sup> he had a special celebration of the liturgy, and the great bells of the Metropolitan Church rang out an unexpected summons to the citizens. The Church was crowded, and the service was solemn and impressive. Mr Williams was invited to the bema, and at the conclusion of the liturgy he received the antidoron. Before his departure he gave him letters of introduction to the Œcumenical Patriarch, and others; he also gave him copies of his *φωνὴ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας* and other works. There was no prelate of the Orthodox Church whose friendship George Williams prized so highly as that of this excellent Metropolitan. That the regard and esteem was mutual may be inferred from a letter which I received from his Eminence in July, 1878, after the decease of George Williams:

*Μεγάλως ἐλυπήθην ἐπὶ τῇ θλιβερᾷ ἀγγελίᾳ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ ἐν μακαρίᾳ τῇ λήξει γενομένου ἐναρέτου καὶ πολυτίμου φίλου ἡμῶν κυρίου Γεωργίου Γουλλιέλμου, οὗτινος τὴν μακαρίαν ψυχὴν κατατάξαι ὁ τῆς ἀγάπης Θεὸς ἐν χώρᾳ ζώντων καὶ ἐν σκηναῖς δικαίων, ὅτι ἠγάπησε πολὺ, ζῆλον ἐπιδειξάμενος ἀκραιφνῇ ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἐνώσεως τῆς Ἀγγλικανῆς πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν Ὀρθόδοξον · οὐδέποτε ἐπιλησθήσομαι τῆς ἐν Χίῳ πολυημέρου καὶ ὄντως Χριστιανικῇ ἀγάπῃ ἀποπνεύσεως συνδιαλέξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς περὶ τοῦ σπουδαιοτάτου τούτου ὑποκειμένου, ὡς καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἐμὲ ἀδελφικῆς συμπαθείας, ἣν καὶ ἔργῳ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξεδήλωσε κατὰ τὴν ἐν ἔτει 1871 στυγεράν κατ' ἐμοῦ συκοφαντίαν τῶν ἐκεῖ Ἰησουιτῶν, ἂν θ' ὦν χάριτας ὅτι πλείστας τῇ προσφιλεῖ μνήμῃ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀνομολογῶν (ὡς καὶ τῇ ἐντιμοτάτῃ κυρίῳ Γλάδστον) καθῆκον ἱερὸν ἡγοῦμαι εὐχεσθαι διηνεκῶς πρὸς τὸν ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου δεσπόζοντα Θεὸν καὶ Σωτῆρα ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἀναιμάκτῃ θυσίᾳ ὑπὲρ αἰωνίου ἀναπαύσεως τῆς μακαρίας αὐτοῦ ψυχῆς.*

The occurrence to which the Metropolitan refers was the attempt of the Jesuits to bring him into trouble with the Turkish authorities for performing a service at the residence of the Greek Consul in honour of the King of the Hellenes. This was a retaliation for his success in bringing back to the Orthodox fold, certain of his flock who had been brought under the influence of the Latin propaganda. Some years after this persecution, he was transferred by the Patriarch Joacim to the important see of Serres in Macedonia, a Greek municipality



greatly disturbed by turbulent factions, amongst whom he did much to preserve peace as long as he remained in the see. Mr Maroules, the teacher of the Academy, well described the position of the Metropolitan of Serres as a thorny one. He was afterwards raised to Heraclia, the third see in the Patriarchate, with the dignity of Exarch of Thrace and Macedonia.

Next in interest to George Williams' intercourse with Gregory of Chios is his correspondence with his venerable uncle, Gregory VI., Œcumenical Patriarch from 1834 to 1840, and again from 1867 to 1871, and celebrated for his worthy and dignified reply to the missive of Pope Pius IX. in September, 1868. The Eastern Church Association published a full account of the interviews of the Eastern Patriarchs with the bearers of the Papal message, with a biographical sketch of the career of the Œcumenical Patriarch. But his relation to the reunion movement appears more evidently in a letter addressed to Archbishop Tait in 1869. The Archbishop had expressed his thanks to the Patriarch for sending his Protosyncellus to attend the dedication of the new Anglican Church at Constantinople, and had asked permission for the burial of English strangers within the cemeteries of the Greek Church. He had also presented the Patriarch with a copy of the Prayer book, and the Encyclical Epistle of the Bishops assembled two years previously in conference at Lambeth. The Patriarch, having courteously granted the request, and acknowledged the gift, expressed his special interest in the "illustrious confession" of the 39 Articles (*ἐπισήμω των λθ' ἁρθρων ὁμολογίᾳ*) in which he found much that was agreeable to orthodoxy. He thought, however, that they contained statements which savoured of novelty, and quoted the words: "As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith", which appeared to him to deprive the Eastern Churches of the orthodoxy and perfection of the faith: also he judged that such accusations of our neighbour are out of place in an illustrious Confession of Faith." The following letter by the Ven. E. Churton, Archdeacon of Cleveland, dated Nov. 11. 1869, indicates a mode of reply to this objection:

"The Patriarch's words in the last paragraph are cautious and general, but the substance seems to be that he cannot do



with the Thirty Nine Articles. And he fixes on the words about the Eastern Churches in Article XIX to which I referred in a letter to George Williams, some six months ago, as presenting the strongest difficulty in the way of reconciliation with the Easterns. But what those words in the second paragraph of Article XIX mean, I really do not profess to know, unless it be, what is indeed little better than a truism, that neither those Churches, nor their teachers have at all times held and taught the truth without admixture of error. All the expositors of the Articles which have fallen in my way, from Burnet to B<sup>p</sup> Forbes, pass over the words as an unimportant parenthesis, and the worthy old Beveridge in particular seems to think that the Orientals would of course agree to it, for they never pretended to infallibility as the Church of Rome does. What divers notions people have of the Thirty Nine Articles! An orator at the Liverpool Church Congress made use of the phrase, that he hoped his notions were 'as broad as the Scriptures and the Church's Articles'! As if he thought our assent to the one was the same in kind and degree as our assent to the other. The language of our subscription does not quite amount to this. Could not George Williams explain to the Patriarch that all we mean is that, as we do not believe all the bishops of Rome,—especially that exemplary person Sergius III who is said to have first added the Filioque clause to the Creed (Vossius de tribus symbolis III, 41)—to have been infallible or impeccable, so we do not suppose that they would claim the like exemption for Nestorius, Dioscorus, or Timothy Ælurus? But as to the main question, what degree of assent we give to the Articles, my notions are these: 1. our assent to every proposition offered to us ought to be in proportion to its importance. Assent to an Article of Faith is not the same as an assent to an Article of Religion. The first demands acceptance with all one's heart and soul: the second is satisfied by one's willingness to abide by it, and not to contradict it. The Patriarch should be informed that the Articles are regarded like old Canons of the Greek Church, not repealed, but a little antiquated, and not at all 'de fide'. Some may wish their authority diminished for bad reasons: but high Churchmen must for good reasons wish them not to be exalted above the level of their proper temporary object. Our old Divines discouraged making



commentaries upon them; and Thomas Rogers who first attempted it in 1607 had no thanks for his pains." On another occasion in a letter to Dr Hook, he observed, 'I certainly do not hold the Thirty Nine Articles as Articles of Faith. I should hold myself a mere Sectarian if I did. The Church of England is no Sect: and I abhor all attempts to govern it in the spirit of a sect, or make it speak the language of a sect.' He in this followed the principles of Chillingworth and Jeremy Taylor in their pleas for liberty of prophesying, and their sense of the great danger of treating theses of polemical Theology as if they could be set on the level of the Creeds of the Universal Church. It would be an error similar to that of the Jewish scribes who exalted 'the hedge of the Law' above the Law itself.

The Reunion movement may be said to have reached its climax at the time of the visit to England of the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos in 1870; since which date there is but little to record in the way of progress. George Williams in an Essay in the 'Church and the Age' refers with regret to the new hindrances to union in the East owing to a Pan-slavist policy, which had produced a serious breach between the Greek and Slav divisions of the Orthodox Communion. A paper of the Eastern Church Association in an account of the Bulgarian controversy, deplored the dismemberment of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the events which led to the second retirement of the Patriarch Gregory. Very full reports were published of the visit of the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos and of the two conferences on the points of difference of the Orthodox and Anglican Churches in doctrine and practice;—the first in the Bishop's palace at Ely, and the second in Dr Pusey's lodgings at Oxford. In these Conferences the Filioque difficulty was the one which occupied most attention, and though the Archbishop shewed no disposition to relax his rigorous view of the Western teaching and formularies, the views of George Williams and others were probably modified by the discussion. It became evident that the Anglican Church had derived the doctrine of the Double Procession from an earlier source, and not from Spain or Rome. Dr Pusey urged strongly the testimony of Cyril of Alexandria,—his son Mr Philip Pusey (whose energy and devotion to literary research in the midst of extraordinary bodily infirmities was the admiration of all



who had the privilege of his acquaintance) having spent much time in examining Greek manuscripts of Cyril, and having proved to his satisfaction that he used the words *ἐκ τοῦ νόου* over and over again. In a letter to George Williams he wrote: 'I send the passages from S. Cyril. My son has verified them all from Mss. by Greek scribes. The passage from the treatise 'de recta fide' *τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ* is ascertained to be S. Cyril's by the contemporary Syriac translation of Rabbulas, B<sup>p</sup> of Edessa. This ought to be decisive as to the lawfulness of using the expression, which is all which we have to contend for. I wish you would put them together in a letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and print it in one of the Eastern Church Association papers. It would be good for our own people. For I fear lest heresy should spring up through these negotiations with the Greeks. The idea was, I think, to send them to the Greek Patriarch, disavowing any wish that they should conform themselves to the Latin type, but claiming that this should, in case of reunion, be tolerated in us, which was so explicitly and reiteratedly said by this great father, the greatest mind, I suppose, that they ever had,—and that while defending the faith in the Divinity of the Holy Ghost." In 'the Church and the Age', p. 233, George Williams said that the passages were sent to the Archbishop, and he undertook to lay them before the Patriarch of Constantinople, but nothing has been heard of them since. In an address at the Southampton Church Congress in 1870, he said: 'What we ask of the Orthodox Church is this: to examine the claims of the Anglican Church to orthodoxy and apostolicity by the light of history and of her authorised formularies: and if her credentials are found to be satisfactory, to admit her on equal terms to a place in that confederation of free and independent Churches which constitutes the great Christian polity of the one Catholic Church. But then let this investigation be conducted in no narrow sectarian spirit, but in a spirit worthy of the eminent Fathers of their Church, who in their large charity knew how to temper the most rigid orthodoxy with the fire of Christian love, and had so great a horror of heterodoxy that they hesitated to impute it to any but self convicted and avowed heretics.' (This may be said to be the spirit of S. Athanasius and S. Hilary as opposed to that of S. Philastrius or S. Epiphanius.) 'It is a



historical fact beyond controversy that the doctrine of the double procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son was delivered to the English Church as part of the original deposit of faith by that eminent oriental Prelate, whom we delight to honour as the second Founder of our National Church, and to recognise as an early link between our insular communion and the ancient Churches of Asia Minor,—Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury. If the formal repudiation of the Theological errors which the Greeks suspect to underlie the words might avail to remove their scruples, and to vindicate our orthodoxy (in the manner suggested by the Royal Commissioners on the Prayer book in 1689), the difference would be easily adjusted. But if, as I greatly fear, the *exigencies of polemical theology* seem to them to demand the *unconditional surrender* on our part of the obnoxious and avowedly unauthorised interpolation in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed as a condition of intercommunion, then I am persuaded the spirit of controversy must continue to triumph over the Royal law of Christian love.'

It will be seen from the above that the result of the conferences with the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos was to give a new emphasis to the doctrine of the Double Procession, and to bring into clearer light the difficulties of surrendering it. Dr Pusey maintained that the testimony of S. Cyril was so strong a confirmation of the teaching of S. Augustine and other doctors of the West that it should be decisive as to the 'lawfulness of using the expression'. Much therefore will depend upon the weight attached to the sayings of Cyril. In describing him as the greatest mind which the Churches of the East produced, some qualification may be necessary, owing to his great faults of style and general haste and carelessness in composition. There is much truth in the criticism of Dupin, *Auteurs Ecclésiastiques*, vol. IV, p. 52: 'Il est assez surprenant qu'un Evêque d'un aussi grand siège que celui d'Alexandrie, occupé de tant d'affaires, et traversé par une contestation aussi grande que celle qu'il eut avec les Orientaux, ait eu le loisir de composer tant d'ouvrages. Mais saint Cyrille avoit une merveilleuse facilité pour composer, et s'estoit appliqué à un genre d'ecriture, où il est facile de fournir. Car ou il copie des passages de l'Ecriture, ou il fait de grands raisonnements, ou il debite des allegories.



Il est aisé de faire bien vite de gros ouvrages de cette nature, principalement quand on ne s'attache pas à polir son discours, ni à le resserrer dans de certaines bornes, et qu'on abandonne entièrement sa main et sa plume à toutes les pensées qui viennent dans l'esprit. C'est ainsi qu'écrivait saint Cyrille; et il s'étoit tellement accoutumé à cette manière d'écrire, qu'il s'étoit fait, comme remarque Photius, un style tout particulier, qui paroît contraire aux autres, et dans lequel il a *extrêmement négligé la justesse et la cadence des expressions*. Il avoit le génie subtil et métaphysique, et debitoit facilement la plus fine Dialectique.'

This 'negligence' of S. Cyril, though it may not diminish his merits as a spiritual expositor of Holy Scripture, does to some extent lessen his 'authoritative force in controversy'. Thus in his Commentary on S. John XIX, he seems to use language about the Blessed Mother of our Lord which is incautious, and inconsistent with the honour which he claims for her in his other writings. He speaks as if she not only was tempted to doubt, but like the other disciples actually doubted the truth of our Lord's claims and His Divine Mission. Cardinal Newman indeed pleads that he did not go so far as S. Chrysostom in imputing a fault to her, but only argued that her weakness as a woman exposed her to temptation. But his words are scarcely capable of this defence: "If the chosen one of the disciples, Peter, once was scandalized, so as to cry out hastily, Be it far from Thee, Lord, what paradox is it, if the soft mind of womankind was carried off to weak ideas?" (Newman, Letter to Pusey, 1866, p. 135.) Cardinal Newman observes with some reason that the 'authoritative force in controversy' of such expressions is of little value in 'opposition to Catholic teaching'. "The main force of passages which can be brought from any Father in controversy, lies in the fact that such passages represent the judgment or sentiment of their own respective countries: and again, I say, that the force of that local judgment or sentiment lies in its being the existing expression of an Apostolical tradition. I am far, of course, from denying the claim of the teaching of a Father on our deference, arising out of his personal position and character: but in a question of doctrine we must have recourse to the great source of doctrine, Apostolical tradition." (Ib. p. 137—8.) In estimating



the authority of S. Cyril as an individual writer, it must be remembered also that he is the Father who gave currency to the use of the word *κένωσις* in connexion with the doctrine of our Lord's humiliation,—a word which has led to much unsound speculation in the present day. The conclusion is that he is a writer to be alleged with caution, and with less implicit reliance than such writers as S. Chrysostom, S. Basil, or S. Gregory Nazianzen. The assertion that the 'Filioque' has been received by the Anglican Church as part of 'the original deposit of faith', appears also to need some reservation. If it were so, it must be proved to come within the saying of Vincentius: 'In ipsa item catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere propriæque catholicum, quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quæ omnia fere universaliter comprehendit. Sed hoc demum fiet, si sequamur universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem.' The testimony of individual writers of the East or West does not suffice to establish this. A larger 'Consensus Patrum' is necessary. The defence of the doctrine of the double procession might therefore take a more modest form. It might be regarded as a buttress or rampart to the fabric of the Catholic faith, rather than as an essential part of the fabric itself: its object might be taken to be to repel error rather than to add anything to the completeness of the Creed. Such seems to have been the purport of the resolution of the Bonn Conference of 1874: "We acknowledge that the proceeding whereby the Filioque was added to the symbol of Nicæa was illegal, and that in order to future peace and unity it is much to be desired that the whole Church should seriously enquire whether some means can be found to restore the symbol to its primitive form without the sacrifice of any true doctrine expressed in the existing Western form.' (R. I. p. 751.)

Dr J. M. Neale supposed that the Filioque was designed as a safeguard against Arianism, from which the Church in Spain had suffered much damage. But he maintained that there were counterbalancing errors on the other side. "The desire to exalt our Lord's Person at one time led the Western Church to the verge of Tritheism. It drew Calvin into downright heresy when he taught, The Son, as God hath not His



essence from the Father, neither is He God of God, but God of Himself." Dr Neale commended Joseph Bingham and others, who by preaching the Monarchia, incurred thereby a suspicion of Arianism.

On the other hand there are reasons to assert that a desire to exalt our Lord's Person has not been the prevailing error in the West. In the ancient hymns and Liturgies Christ is worshipped as the Eternal Word of the Father. In the West His office as Mediator has been more prominent than in the East, and the worship of His humanity has in some measure taken the place of the ancient adoration of His Deity. There has been a gradual descent from the higher and more spiritual worship, to the lower and materialistic cultus, which the ancient writers would have disclaimed as a 'knowing of Christ after the flesh'. (Cassiodorus in Cant. VIII, 14.) Such a descent from the higher to the lower worship was well expressed in one of the Theses discussed in the Jesuit College of Louvain, July, 1875:

Thesis XLII. Christus Deus-Homo cultu latriæ adorandus est. Ratio autem excellentiæ, seu *objectum propter quod* Christus adoratur, est sola Divinitas. *Objectum quod* adoratur, integrum quidem est Christus totus, partiale vero est tum humanitas tum singulæ ejus partes, quatenus sunt Verbo hypostatice unitæ: *objectum* demum *manifestationis*, in quo Christus sese exhibet propter speciales rationes a nobis colendum, sunt præter humanitatem integre sumptam, partes hujus humanitatis, quæ præ ceteris Christo sunt vel fuerunt organa ad nostram redemptionem et sanctificationem peragendam. Congruit igitur germanis fidei principiis cultus S. S. Cordis qualis ab Ecclesia proponitur. The manner in which this is expressed indicates a sense of the importance of the belief in Christ's true Deity as the foundation of the cultus, whilst it indicates the successive steps by which material conceptions, such as are promoted by the act of the painter and sculptor, are introduced to distract the worshipper from the primary object of adoration. If the addition of the Filioque was in any way a remedy for this debasing of the idea of the worship of Christ, it may have had its use.

But it is important to give it the right place in the fabric of Christian belief and opinion. The Faith once delivered to the Saints is the inner fortress. For this we resort to the Niceno-



Constantinopolitan Creed in its original form and to the ancient Liturgies. All polemical Theology is outside this fabric. It consists of the buttresses and bulwarks by which the various branches of the Church have found it necessary to guard their teachers against the perils to which their faith has been exposed at different periods. For Christian union it is necessary that this distinction should be observed. In the service of the Eucharist, the great bond of union, polemical Theology should find no place, it should be excluded entirely. On this principle the Filioque should be omitted from the Ordo Missæ, and the Eastern Churches might well require the restoration of the *ἐπίκλησις* to the Canon. The offices of the Church would admit of more variety: but in those which are appointed for the edification and devotion of the faithful at large, care would be taken to avoid points of controversy. The place for polemical and scholastic definitions such as those of the 39 Articles would be in the professions required of Bishops, Priests, Deacons and other orders of the Ministry at their consecration and inauguration. Without adding to the Creeds, the various branches of the Church have at different times prescribed such professions to her Bishops, such as was made by Theodore and accepted by the local Council over which he presided. Thus the rulers of the Church besides professing adhesion to the Catholic Creeds were required to renounce the errors against which their own branch of the Church provided its special safeguards. In these doctrinal standards of secondary rank the dogma of the Double Procession might find place. On the other hand a due sense of the proportion of faith would lead to its exclusion from a position of excessive prominence which it has received in some of our hymns and services, as in a modern version of the Hymn *Veni Creator*, where for the Latin *Te utriusque Spiritum credamus omni tempore* we have the translation, 'And this be our unchanging Creed, that Thou dost from them both proceed.' The 'unchanging Creed' was better expressed by the brief rendering of Cosin: 'Teach us to know the Father, Son, and Thee, of Both to be but One.'\*)

W. R. CHURTON.

---

\*) See *Chronique*.