

THE SYNOD OF BONN
THE CONGRESS OF FREIBURG
THE CONFERENCE AT BONN

CHAPTER V.
THE YEAR 1874

When the year 1874 opened, it became more than ever apparent that, however little such a result might have been anticipated or desired by either party, the religious struggle between the Ultramontanists and the Old Catholics had expanded into a widespread war between the Romish Church and the State. The skeptical in religious matters might deride the notion of investing with importance the Pope's decisions upon points of theology; the devout Catholic might loudly deny that lie had been called upon "to place his loyalty and civil duty as a citizen at the mercy of another;" but indications of feeling too strong to be overlooked, and facts too numerous to be ignored, had slowly compelled the Prussian Government to recognize in those who still avowed supreme allegiance to the Pope the supporters of a doctrine which, in the words of Dollinger, uttered three years before, would, "if it were to become dominant in Catholic Germany, at once plant the seeds of a deadly malady in the new empire." The warnings of Prince Hohenlohe, the protest of the Nurnberg professors, and the declarations of the Munich Congress had now become the avowed conviction of the great Liberal party throughout Germany. On New Year's Day, when bishop Reinkens presented to the Emperor the customary congratulations, the imperial reply to the "Hochwuerdiger Bischof" implicitly admitted that such was the case. "May the conviction which you share with others," said the imperial letter, "and which is certainly correct, continue to gain ground—that in my States respect for the law may easily be reconciled with the exercise of religion on the part of every community."

It was not, however, to be expected that the conversion of Prince Bismarck to the Old Catholic view of the question, and the energy with which he demonstrated his determination to enforce "respect for the law," would not call forth strong protest and even actual resistance; and in the month of January he was fiercely attacked in the Prussian Diet by Mallinckrodt, Schorlemer Ast, and other leaders of the Central or Ultramontane party. The chancellor unflinchingly maintained his ground. "If," he observed, in reply to Mallinckrodt, "the infallibility dogma is so interpreted as to lead to the establishment of an ecclesiastical *imperium in imperio*, if it occasions the setting aside of the laws of this country, because unapproved by the Vatican, I am naturally driven to assert the legitimate supremacy of the State. We Protestants are under the conviction that this kingdom of Prussia ought not to be ruled by the Pope, and we demand that *you*, the Ultramontane section of the Roman Catholics, respect our convictions, as we do yours." "We will not go to Canossa," he more than once observed to members of his party, in allusion to the memorable abasement of the civil power at the feet of Hildebrand; and the Liberals, of every shade, entered into the spirit of the declaration and rallied round the chancellor. The remedy was undeniably a stern one; but it was felt that in a great crisis like that through which the State was now passing, abstract principles must yield to the exigencies of the hour. Enquiries into the political opinions of village school teachers might wear the appearance of tyrannical interference,

but it was only by such measures that the insidious policy of the foe could be really counteracted and frustrated.

Thus Supported, Prince Bismarck pressed on his policy without delay. On the 3^d of February, archbishop Ledochowski, on his refusal to pay the fines incurred by persistent violation of the Falk Laws, was arrested at his palace at Posen and imprisoned at Ostrowa. A few weeks later, a like blow descended on the bishop of Treves and the archbishop of Cologne; and at the latter city, where a strong and influential Ultramontane party has always existed, and the event did not pass without some demonstration of feeling on the part of the populace.

The next step was to call in Federal legislation to the support of that of the Prussian Government, and during the spring session a Bill was submitted to the Federal Council and the Reichstag, debarring those of the clergy who had once been imprisoned from reasserting their claims when their term of imprisonment was over; while any attempt on the part of a priest to resume the exercise of the functions of which he had been deprived, or further refusal to obey the administrative authority, rendered him liable to forfeit his rights of citizenship and to be expelled from the German empire. These provisions were to apply equally to clergymen who should have exercised ecclesiastical functions contrary to the law of the land and thereby incurred a legal sentence in the Government Court. Persons thus forfeiting their right of citizenship in any one of the German States forfeited it in all other States, and could only regain it by a vote of the State Council. Another clause provided that ecclesiastics might be removed from their ordinary place of residence as soon as a prosecution against them had been formally instituted.

The determination of the Diet to support Prince Bismarck was demonstrated by a majority of 257 to 95 on the third reading of the Bill.

At about the same time additional supplementary laws were enacted by the Prussian Parliament, for the purpose of determining the action of the Government in relation to dioceses or cures becoming vacant. With regard to the first, it was decreed that on the dismissal of a bishop the election of his successor by the Chapter should be approved by the Government before it could become valid. If no successor were nominated or approved, a Government administrator of the revenues was to be appointed, and the ecclesiastical government of the diocese to be suspended. In the case of parishes deprived of their priests, it was decreed that patrons might still exercise the right of presentation; if, however, this were not done within a certain time, the right of presentation was to lapse to the congregation; in cases where there was no patron, the congregation was at once to be entitled to this right. The electors were to be the male members of each congregation, possessed of independent means, and were to be summoned for the purpose of carrying out the election by the burgomaster or Landrath of the town, on petition received by him from ten of their number. Such were the measures whereby the Government now proceeded to introduce into the Catholic Church in Germany ideas hitherto foreign to its constitution-the right of the laity to choose their own ministers and consequently to become the administrators of Church property.

The first glance will be sufficient to suggest that these enactments could not fail to meet the approval of the Old Catholic party, and, in fact, they appear in some respects almost a reflex of the scheme adopted at Constance. In a manifesto put forth while the Falk Laws were still under discussion, the leaders of the party did not hesitate to avow their sympathy with the policy of the Government. "The State," said this document, "itself requires assistance, and this assistance Old Catholicism alone can give it." At the same time it made an urgent appeal to all Catholics not identified with Ultramontanism to abandon a neutral line of conduct and enroll themselves under the banner of reform.

On the 27th, 28th, and 29th of May the Synod appointed at the Congress of Constance, as the constitutional organ "to abolish or alter existing Church laws, and to issue new laws," held its first meeting at Bonn.¹ It enunciated as its line of action "to choose in the first instance for topics of deliberation in the Synod those matters which press most earnestly for solution, and on which a unanimous resolution may be confidently looked for as the goal of the debates; and in the next place, to defer those matters which on the one hand are not urgent, and on the other require a previous explanation in detail, oral and written, or, if prematurely taken in hand, might endanger harmony."

Among the reforms which it was decided might be carried out "without any change of the existing Church laws," were:

- (a) The abolition of fees for masses, surplice fees, etc.
- (b) The like treatment of poor and rich in church functions, marriages, burials, etc.
- (c) The avoidance of the abuses and offshoots of indulgences, veneration of the saints, scapularies, etc.
- (d) The carrying out of holy Christian and Old Catholic principles in the administration of the office of preaching and in catechetical instruction, especially by abstinence from all theological Subtleties, confessional bitterness, ecclesiastical-political declamations, etc..
- (e) The administration of the sacrament of penance in a holy Christian spirit.
- (f) The regulation of the affairs of the congregation by the harmonious cooperation of the clergy and of the church officers elected by the congregations.

In addition to this scheme, the Synod adopted a series of declarations on the subjects of auricular confession, fasting and abstinence, and the introduction of the vulgar tongue in divine service. In connection with confession, it was decided that "the necessity or profit of receiving the sacrament of penance is in the main to be referred to the personal judgment and self-knowledge of the individuals themselves;" and the injunction to confess once a year was declared to be "not obligatory on those for whom there exists no inward necessity to receive the sacrament of penance." But although the "terrible abuse" to which the practice was liable was candidly admitted, the conclusion arrived at was, that even if an entire abolition were in itself allowable, it would not be justified, inasmuch as the institution of confession is capable of an administration favorable to true morality, and in particular special confession is to many a source of comfort and tranquility. Fasting, "in the pure, Christian sense," was defined as "not the denial of the nourishment needful to the frame for a sound bodily and spiritual life, but the denying oneself in meat and drink anything beyond the quantity absolutely indispensable. In this abstinence, exercised voluntarily and in the right temper, lies a wholesome self-control of moral and religious value." The employment of the vulgar tongue as the liturgical language in public worship and in the administration of the sacraments was declared to be desirable; but such a reform was indicated as one which could only be carried out "slowly and gradually,"-"the completion of the necessary liturgical books demanding thorough preliminary labors and a careful examination."

The conclusions of the Synod were adopted without hesitation by the party of reform in Switzerland, who, however, showed less willingness to imitate the cautious and moderate policy of their German brethren. Their progress had been singularly rapid, and their triumph was now almost complete. The close of 1874 saw the Old Catholics of Geneva in possession of every Catholic church except that of Notre Dame, and to this they were urging their claim. Father Hyacinthe, who was still identified with the movement, deemed it necessary to restrain rather than stimulate the ardor of his supporters; but he had accepted in their entirety the conclusions of the Bonn Synod; Latin was discontinued in the Church services; five priests had already married; confession was declared to be no longer obligatory.

The movement in the canton of Berne, where the Abbot Deramey, newly appointed cure of Porentruy in the extreme north of the canton, was the chief leader, advanced with even greater rapidity. In a letter written in December 1873, only six weeks after entering on his post, he declared that he and his coadjutors could almost feel persuaded "that they had lived and labored there for six years, so greatly had God been pleased to bless their efforts." Writing in the following month, he observed that in contrast to the progress at Geneva, it was their wish, in which they were supported by the populations themselves, "to remain strictly Catholic." The people of the Swiss Jura, whose associations and sympathies are mainly French, regard the Geneva movement as merely political, and have not as yet placed themselves under the jurisdiction of bishop Reinkens.³

Among the supporters of the Southern movement, on the other hand, the whole question of retaining the episcopal office was openly discussed. On June 14¹¹ a Congress met at Berne, which was attended by Father Hyacinthe, Pfarrer Herzog of Olten, and Keller of Aarau, and upwards of seventy other delegates. On this occasion it was suggested that the episcopal office was unnecessary to the new constitution; but the idea was vigorously opposed by Herzog and Keller, the former of whom pointed out that their continuance as members of the Catholic Church would be virtually forfeited by the nonretention of the office, while the latter loudly advocated what he termed "historic rights," and warned the assembly against "sketching a constitution for the Moon." The Congress finally passed the following resolutions:

- (1) That the title of their community should be "the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland."
- (2) That a bishop should be elected.
- (3) That a Synodical Council should be nominated, consisting of five laymen and four ecclesiastics.
- (4) That a Catholic National Synod should be formed, consisting of the bishop or bishops, the Synodical Council, all priests of the commune officiating in Switzerland, and one delegate from each parish.

At the same time the reforms indicated by the Synod of Bonn were formally adopted, and the use of Latin in the public services, the celibacy of the clergy, the obligation of sacramental confession, were each declared to be no longer part of Church belief or practice. The right of parishes to elect their own priests, and the recognition of the Bible as the sole standard of doctrine, were also unanimously proclaimed.

The counsels of Father Hyacinthe and the more moderate party prevailed at Berne; but on his return to Geneva he found himself unable to restrain the extreme rigor with which the authorities there pressed on their proceedings against the Ultramontanists. The church of Notre Dame, in which the latter had taken refuge after their expulsion from the old town church of St. Germain, and where they had to carry on a regular cathedral service, was, as we have already stated, claimed by the Liberal party. On purely technical grounds, it would seem that this claim was valid. The site had originally been granted by the canton to the State Catholic Church, and of this Church the "Christian Catholics" were now the acknowledged representatives. But, on the other hand, the church had been chiefly built by funds raised by Mgr. Mermillod, to which the Pope himself had been a subscriber; and again, the State authorities had hitherto forbore to expel those cures on the Savoy side of the canton who had refused to take the recently-imposed oath of allegiance to the State. To Father Hyacinthe it seemed that the expulsion of the Ultramontanists from the church of Notre Dame was morally unjustifiable; and he strongly urged that the recusant cures should be permitted to remain at their posts at least until steps had been taken to supply their

parishes with duly qualified priests. But his remonstrances were fruitless.' He was outvoted at the City Council and publicly insulted in the streets; and, as it was sufficiently certain that the Council of the canton would not hesitate, when appealed to, to give effect to the new legislation, he decided that the only course open to him was to resign the cure to which he had been elected nine months before. This he did in the month of July, and in tendering his resignation he thus expressed his sentiments: "Attached from the very depths of my heart to the Church in which I was baptized, whose reform I wish for, but not its overthrow-convinced besides by experience, now sufficiently lengthened, that the Liberal Catholicism of Geneva is neither Liberal in politics nor Catholic in religion-I have the honor to tender my resignation of my functions as cure of this city." Since taking this step he has continued to reside at Geneva as minister of a congregation of some 700 souls, who like himself are not prepared to accept such changes in doctrine and in the relations of the Church to the State as those proclaimed by the main body of the Liberal Catholics in that city. He is, however, a supporter of the separation of Church and State, which he advocates rather as a course of expediency than as a principle.

The Old Catholics had now agreed upon and announced their future policy, and it was consequently only natural that the results of the deliberations of their Fourth Congress should be awaited with somewhat less interest by distant observers. The scheme of innovation and reform, with the exception of details which few but Germans could intelligently follow, had been drawn up the machinery for giving it effect had been set in motion the recent Synod had forestalled a certain portion of the labors that formerly belonged to the Congress-the impending Conference was now the chief subject of discussion-and beyond endeavoring to sustain and extend the interest already excited by the whole movement, the speakers who addressed the public at Freiburg, in the first week in September, had but little to proclaim and enforce. This fact, indeed, was fully recognized in a Declaration prepared by professor Reusch in the course of the business transactions of the Congress. "The Old Catholic Congress," said this document, "will not in future have the same tasks before it as formerly, because questions of ecclesiastical organization and reform will be referred to the yearly Synod for discussion and settlement. But the Congress will still be required to decide upon the means by which the Old Catholic movement may be extended and invigorated, on the basis of the reports and suggestions of the delegates from different parts. And especially there still remains to it the task of awakening a livelier sympathy with the cause and a clearer comprehension of its significance, by means of public addresses delivered by men of eminence. The president of the preceding Congress'... will, therefore, communicate with suitable individuals, for the purpose of agreeing upon subjects adapted for public addresses and likely to sub serve the purpose of instructing and stirring up the laity at large."

The selection of Freiburg in Breisgau as the place of meeting was justified not only by the central position of the *city* but also by the rapid progress which Old Catholicism had recently been making throughout the Grand Duchy of Baden. "The movement," said the preface to the official Report of the Congress, "has acquired a momentum in Baden such as only those could have anticipated to whom this fair country is well known, and who are aware that both its Catholic and Evangelical population are deeply averse to UltraTnontanism, and support with enthusiasm any measures aiming at the purification of the Church from the abuses and excrescences originating with the Roman Curia." The opening speech of Von Schulte, at the first meeting of the delegates, further explains the marked success: "In Baden, the law which regulates the relations between ourselves and the New Catholics' has been sanctioned and promulgated, and thus a firm and legal basis has been afforded us such as we at present possess nowhere outside the Duchy, not even in Prussia. In a number of parishes the voting has taken place, and the constitution of the Church congregations has been recognized by

the State. According to law, the establishment and constitution of a congregation require on the one hand, the sanction of the Old Catholic bishop, and on the other that of the Government itself. This twofold sanction has already been accorded to certain congregations, and a large number of others are looking forward to obtaining it. In all these cases, as the lists testify, the number of independent voters who have declared themselves on our side has proved much larger than it had been supposed it would be, whether from merely approximate calculations or from those formed on the basis of the parish lists. Some congregations; moreover, had not even been in communication with the *Synodal-Reprdsentanz* and were entirely unknown to it; and among these were congregations in which the complete organization had nevertheless been introduced. I can consequently assert that in Baden the movement has made enormous progress."

The above statements will serve to explain the fact, that the majority of the delegates present at the Freiburg Congress were from the Duchy of Baden. Nearly all the leaders of the movement were, however, present, including Reinkens, Von Schulte, Reusch, Knoodt, Langen, Messmer, Huber, Cornelius, etc. Switzerland sent Landammann Keller, and Pfarrer Herzog, Watterich, and Schroter. France was represented by the abbe Midland alone. Dean Howson, professor J. E. B. Mayor, the warden of Keble College, Oxford, the Rev. John Hunt, and some six other clergymen and laymen were present from England; the bishop of Lincoln, unable to attend, conveyed his regrets and his greetings in a graceful set of Latin verses." The Rev. G. E. Broade attended from Dusseldorf; Dr. Heidenheui from Zurich. There were three representatives of the Eastern Church-the archpriest from Wiesbaden, Von Kirejew from St. Petersburg, and Von Sakhalin from Moscow. The Marches Gonzaga was warmly welcomed as a new adherent, especially as coming from Italy. No representatives of the Church of Utrecht attended;" and it was observed with regret that German Protestantism still held aloof-the attendance of professor Boltzmann of Heidelberg, who spoke on behalf of the *Protestanten-Verein*, being looked upon rather as a representation of the rationalistic party.

The language of bishop Reinkens at the preliminary meeting of welcome (Saturday evening, September 5th), as he reviewed the months that had elapsed since the Congress of Constance, was hopeful, even exultant. "Within the last three months," he said, "I have traversed the whole of Germany, have twice been on the confines of Russia, have twice crossed over into Austria, and have finally come hither by the borders of Switzerland, Wherever I came, I was met by some thousand avowed supporters, behind whom appeared two or three thousand sympathizers or secret adherents. I consequently say that, in responding to this your greeting, I speak on behalf of 100,000 Old Catholics." Equally encouraging was the tone of Von Schulte, who dwelt on the proof afforded by the extension of the movement from Bavaria to the Rhine Country as evidence of true German unity of feeling. "In olden times," he said, "the Rhine was called 'the priests' way of the Holy Roman Empire.' In later times, I need scarcely say, we have witnessed the singular phenomenon of the Rhine becoming a Roman Catholic stream. But now the Old Catholics have also laid claim to it; and to the northernmost portion of its course, where it leaves the German land, you may find Old Catholic congregations. I bring you a brother's greeting from the entire river! ""

At the first meeting of delegates, held the ensuing day (Sunday), Von Schulte, on his re-election as president, gave an opening address. He alluded hopefully to the Conference which was to assemble at Bonn in the following week. "I believe," he said, "I shall only express the general sense of this meeting in wishing that this Union Conference may be attended by successful results. We cannot reasonably, indeed, indulge the flattering hope that the work of reunion will be then and there accomplished, but it will be well if such an interchange of ideas serves to pave the way for a complete understanding in the future." ³

No better proof of the consciousness of growing strength and of their real claims upon the German nation could have been given by the delegates than in the business to which they mainly devoted their time—the drawing up of a declaration of their right to be regarded by the State as the true Catholics, in opposition to the Ultramontanists, and a demand for recognition as the conscientious supporters of the Church against the innovations introduced by the Vatican Decrees. The following resolutions showed that they had assumed a new attitude with regard to the Prussian Government, and no longer appeared as petitioners for protection, but as claimants to privileges and support which the Ultramontane party retained in illegal possession:

1. The Old Catholics, as already declared at former Congresses, adhere to their claims to the property of the Church, and demand from the State protection in their rights; without assuming to decide upon legal questions and without prejudice to established rights," they assert that Church property belongs to the congregation, and they repudiate the Romish view that it belongs to the Church in *abstract*, that is, according to Romish ideas, to the Pope.
 2. It is not their design to hinder others from attending public worship, and they claim only a share in the churches, church furniture, endowments, and benefices, according to an equitable adjustment founded upon the numbers of each party; but they assert that the pretext imposed upon the Roman Catholic bishops throughout Germany, that the joint use of churches with old Catholics is prohibited by the canon law, is a mere means of agitation put into the hands of the Ultramontanists.
 3. The numerical strength of the Old Catholic party can only be ascertained, as the result of a census of Catholic electors in each parish on the question whether they acknowledge the decrees put forth in the Constitution of July 18, 1870, respecting the infallibility and supremacy of the Pope, inasmuch as the position of a party in the Church cannot be ascertained by a vote taken upon a merely negative proposition.
 4. The State, whose duty it is to protect the Old Catholics in their rights and to ensure to them a commensurate portion of the Church property, has also as its duty to appoint such a census in all places where it may be demanded and where the rights of Old Catholics are infringed."
- The third resolution, which is given above as amended on the proposition of Dr. Petri, was not carried without considerable discussion. Von Berg of Freiberg and Dr. Knoodt of Bonn concurred in deprecating a proposal to assume what was termed "the guardianship of the indifferent." The latter urged that it was invading religious freedom to compel any man to declare his opinions, and that it would be a serious thing if the earnestness of a small but united party were swamped by large numbers of those to whom the whole struggle was devoid of interest or meaning. The resolution was notwithstanding supported by Reinkens, and carried by a large majority.

The speeches delivered at the two public meetings were enthusiastically listened to by audiences of nearly 3,000 people and presented many points of interest. Schulte spoke with his customary powerful grasp of the whole situation, and pointed out the nature of the work that still lay before them. "Munich had put forth the congregational system; Cologne had established a purified episcopacy; Constance had determined the rules and organization of both. The question of infallibility might be regarded as set at rest. Their battle now was with the indifferentism and laxity of belief among the laity." Huber followed up in a similar strain. Professor Knoodt appealed to the women for their sympathy and aid. Landammann Keller elicited loud applause by his vigorous satire of the Ultramontanists. Messmer made a singularly powerful attack on the policy of the German bishops. Reinkens, in language more decided than any he had hitherto used, expressed his conviction that their hopes lay not in dogmatic consent with other communions but in unity of spirit. He repudiated the theory of a Church and a confession beyond the limits of which there was no salvation. The Reformers of

the sixteenth century had, like the Pope, set up a claim to represent this Church. If one examined the other confessions-whether that of the Scotch, the Belgic, or the Swiss Church-the same theory was to be found. Let not then this dogma be made a reproach to any one communion, but let all alike be prepared to test it by Scriptural proof. Tried by that test, it would be found untenable. "The Church of God," he said, "is one, but it is not confined within the limits of any one formulary of faith. These formularies, even that of Trent, were drawn up in the chambers of learned theologians; and if anyone should say that the chambers of men of learning are barren, I will add, that the chambers of Romish theologians are the barrenest of all."

An examination of these speeches in the authorized report will certainly not suggest any diminution of power or earnestness on the part of the different speakers; but not even the most effective oratory could impart to each oft-treated subject the same freshness that it wore on earlier occasions. Many of the arguments, novel and effective as they might appear to numbers who listened to them for the first time, were necessarily only a repetition of those that have already come under our notice. It was observed that some of the speakers showed signs of the strain on their physical and mental energies undergone during the preceding months; and with the Conference at Bonn awaiting them in the following week, it was not surprising that they should seek to reserve their strength for an occasion which was likely to be one of no ordinary importance and interest.

The objects of the memorable and interesting assembly which held its consultations at Bonn during the 14th, 15th and 16th of September," will be best explained by the following note of invitation, addressed by the great leader of the Old Catholic party to numerous sympathizers with the movement, in the month of August:

On the fourteenth of September and following days a Conference will be held in Bonn of members of different Church communions, actuated by the desire and hope of a future great reunion of believing Christians. It is proposed to take, as the basis and standard of limitation of the endeavors of the Conference, the confessions, teaching, and institutions recognized by the Church in the first centuries, and regarded as essential by both the Eastern and Western communions before the great schism.

The aim specially proposed by the Conference is not a union of different sections of the Church whereby each should become absorbed in the general body and lose its distinctive characteristics, but the re-establishment of intercommunion between the Churches on the basis of *unitas in necessariis*, without interference with those particular tenets of individual Churches which do not affect the essentials of the ancient Church confession.

The Committee for the Promotion of Church Reunion.

-Dollinger.

The meetings were held in the Music Hall of the university of Bonn, and the following list of those present will show how warm a response the foregoing invitation elicited:

From Germany-Reinkens, Dollinger, Langen, Reusch, Knoodt-the last three being professors at Bonn; Lutterbeck, professor of philology at Giessen; Pfarrer Hochstein of Dortmund; Pfarrer Weidinger of Hagen, in Westphalia; Hasenclever, sanitary counselor of Dusseldorf; Max Lessen of Munich. The foregoing were all Old Catholics, while the following represented the Evangelical Church: A. Kamphausen, Krafft, and J. P. Lange, professors of theology, and Jiirgen Bona Meyer, professor of philosophy, from Bonn ; Von Gerlach, chaplain to the garrison at Frankfort; Kritzler, Scheden, G. Schmidt, Wolff, ministers of different Protestant congregations; H. Zwierlein, a doctor of the law and a landholder at Geisenheim.

From Switzerland-P. M. Quily, cure de Chene, Geneva.

From *France*-Prof. Aug. Kerckhoff of Melun; Dr. E. Michaud of Paris.

From *Denmark*-Scholer, chief pastor of Wester Hassing; J. Victor Bloch, provost; P. Madsen, theological candidate, Copenhagen.

From *Russia* Johannes Janice, rector of the Clerical Academy at St. Petersburg; Alexander Kirejew, secretary to the Society of Friends of Spiritual Enlightenment at St. Petersburg; Theodor von Sakhalin, delegate from the branch of the same society at Moscow; Arsenius Tatschaloff, chaplain of the Russian Church at Wiesbaden.

From *Greece*.-Zicos Rhossis, professor of theology and lecturer in the university of Athens.

From *England*-The bishop of Winchester; dean Howson; Dr. Liddon; Rev. E. S. Talbot, warden of Keble College; Rev. Alfred Plummer, master of University College, Durham; professor J. E. B. Mayor of Cambridge; Rev. L. M. Hogg; Rev. D. Trinder, vicar of Teddington, London; Rev. G. E. Broade; Rev. G. V. Reed, rector of Hayes; Rev. W. Conway, canon of Westminster; Rev. J. D. Macbride Croft of Sevenoaks; Samuel Lowndes, Esq., J.P.; James F. Cobb, Esq. of Torquay; L. W. Wilshere, Esq., the Frythe, Welwyn; Rev. John Hunt; Rev. H. N. Oxenham; Rev. J. Macmillan, congregational minister, West Burton.

From *North America*-The bishop of Pittsburgh, and his chaplain, Dr. Hartmann; Dr. William Chauncy Langdon, rector of Emmanuel Church, Geneva; Rev. R. J. Nevin, rector of the American Church at Rome; Rev. G. F. Arnold of Boston ; E. A. Renouf, presbyter of New Hampshire, &c.

At the morning meeting held Monday, September 14th, professor Reusch opened the proceedings with a few explanatory statements. The meetings of the Conference were not public, and it was desirable that those present should exercise the requisite discretion in making known what passed. A short account would be forwarded to the public press of all that might appear to be of general interest. Shorthand reports were not to be taken, but Dr. Döllinger had instructed him to take notes in German, and Mr. Broade in English, It was important to recollect that none of those present appeared as delegates of any Church or religious body; the Conference was simply to be a private discussion between individuals, each of whom was responsible solely in his individual capacity for what he advanced. In pursuance of this theory, it was proposed that the presidency of the assembly should not be assigned to any one of the ecclesiastical dignitaries present, but to one who was known simply as a man of learning. He felt certain that he should have the unanimous consent of the meeting in proposing Dr. Dollinger for the office. The proposal was received with loud cheering, and Dr. Dollinger forthwith took the chair.

He commenced by stating that, the aim of the Conference being the promotion of doctrinal unity, it was proposed to hold special conferences on the points of difference between (1) the Old Catholics and English Churchmen, and (2) between the Old Catholics and the Orientals;" the former would be conducted in English, the latter in German. All present would of course be entitled to take part in both discussions.

He then proceeded to explain in English that Mr. Meyrick, who had unfortunately been hindered from coming, had forwarded a list of the principal points apparently requiring discussion," and had suggested that the consideration of these should be delegated to an English, a Russian, and an Old Catholic member of the Conference. This appeared to him scarcely practicable, as it would prevent the Conference arriving at any immediate understanding *on any* one point. He proposed to make certain explanations, calculated, as he hoped, to remove misunderstandings and set aside some of the obstacles that intervened between them and the English Church. Certain points had accordingly been selected which it was thought they might at once proceed to discuss. It was open to anyone present to make a counter-

proposal; and if it was preferred to take the Thirty-nine Articles in succession, they were quite ready to do so.

Mr. Hogg supported Mr. Meyrick's proposal, whereby the Conference would be able to limit its labors to defining the doctrine of the first five or six centuries, and thus avoid the difficulties that might arise from a discussion of either the Thirty-nine Articles or the Tridentine decrees. He accordingly proposed the appointment of a committee of three, to be appointed by the bishop of Winchester, Dr. Dollinger, and archpriest Janyschew, who should give their report to a Conference next year.

Dr. Dollinger: "In the note of invitation to this Conference the doctrines of the ancient undivided Church were indicated as the basis of discussion. This is, therefore, the same basis as that proposed by Mr. Meyrick. So far as regards the Council of Trent, I believe I am at liberty to state, not only in my own name, but also in that of my colleagues, that we in no way *consider ourselves bound* by all the *decrees of that Council*, which *cannot be regarded as ecumenical*. This declaration will materially assist towards a mutual understanding."

SECOND MEETING

Monday, September 14, Afternoon.

Dr. Dollinger laid before the meeting the following declaration for discussion, first with the English and American representatives, and next with the Orientals:

We agree that the way in which the words Filioque were inserted in the Nicene Creed was illegal, and that, with a view to future peace and unity, the original form of the, creed as put forth by the General Councils of the undivided Church, ought to be restored.

The question, he observed, was twofold. First, there was the more important question concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost, and next there was the question of fact, with respect to the lawfulness of the enlargement of the Symbolum by the addition of the Filioque. He proposed to limit the discussion to the latter question. It was incontestable that, in determining the Confession of Belief, the Ecumenical Councils of the West added the Filioque without the assent of the East. The Symbolum, as formulated at Nicea and Constantinople, and confirmed by subsequent General Councils, formed for centuries the sole bond of union in the entire Church. It was not until later, and in a manner not easy to explain, that the *Filioque* was added. Pope Leo III, in opposition to Charles the Great, declared himself decidedly opposed to the addition. It was, however, subsequently introduced at Rome also in the eleventh century, though not by a formal decree, but rather through oversight or negligence. Since that time it had been generally accepted in the West, and hence a breach had been made between the Eastern and Western Churches. The Eastern Church was justified in complaining of this overthrow of unity by a one-sided and illegal alteration of the Confession of Faith—a confession with respect to which three successive General Councils had declared that nothing could be suffered to be added thereto; and of which it had been said, *Fides sic expressa est perfecta*. "We are bound," he said, "earnestly to consider whether it is not possible to find some remedy for the wound thus inflicted on Church unity."

The Bishop of Winchester: "I confess I was not prepared to find this very difficult subject brought forward for our present discussion. I supposed that our debates would be on the theses laid before us by the president, and on the possibility of intercommunion between the Old Catholic and English Churches. I have conferred on the latter subject with my English friends, and am able to state our conviction that on the part of the English Church no scruples are felt with regard to intercommunion with the Old Catholic body. Old Catholics would be admitted to communion by English clergymen without hesitation. The orders of Catholic priests, both Old Catholic and Roman Catholic, are recognized by us as valid, and any

such priest would be admissible to office in our Church under the same conditions as an English priest. With regard to the *Filioque*, inasmuch as we have had no discussion on the subject, I can of course only express my individual opinion. The English Church has long been painfully alive to the breach which, owing to the introduction of this word, intervenes between her and the Greek Church. "We willingly admit that the word should not have been admitted into the Confession, and that its admission took place in an irregular manner. But we cannot admit that, as the result, a false doctrine was introduced into the *Symbolum*. We hold that the teaching of the Eastern and that of the Western Church are equally orthodox. We admit, with the Orientals, but one *Fons Deitatis*, but we do not admit that the *Filioque* contradicts this doctrine. We can accordingly express our regret at the alteration of the *Symbolum*, but cannot declare that the *Filioque* ought to be expunged; and before it is possible to expunge a word which has stood there for so long a time, and has been received by all branches of the Western Church, it will be necessary to arrive at some more general understanding among ourselves than has as yet been effected. Our aim is to come to an agreement with respect to the doctrine without alteration of the formula which has for centuries been used by the entire Western Church."

Dr. Dollinger: "I can testify that on our part no very strong feeling exists with respect to the removal of the *Filioque*. We could give our assent to it for the sake of agreement, without declaring our opinion concerning the doctrine itself."

The Bishop of Pittsburgh: "With respect to intercommunion, I can, as an American bishop, make the same declaration as the bishop of Winchester. The restoration of the *Symbolum* to its original form would not however, be viewed with the same hesitation in the American as in the English Church. The desire for a revision of the Confession has been loudly expressed in many American dioceses, and the General Convocation, to be convened in October, will have to give its attention to the subject. But the American Church will avoid any onesidedness in the matter and proceed in harmony with all branches of the Church in England. Perhaps we might insert, at the conclusion of the declaration laid before us by the president, the words 'might be restored,' instead of 'ought to be restored.'"

Dr. Liddon: "I should feel considerable hesitation in accepting the Article in the form in which it now lies before us. Dr. Pusey would also be opposed to it. The position we should assume, theologically, if the *Filioque* were expunged, would be altogether different from that which we might assume if the proposal before us were the *insertion* of the word. The expunging of the word would be sure to be interpreted in such a manner as to convey the idea that the doctrine expressed is erroneous or at least doubtful. It were much to be wished we could come to some agreement. Possibly the expressions employed by the Council of Florence might be suitable to our purpose."

Mr. Nevin: "I have no hesitation in giving my assent to the Article in the form in which it has been laid before us by the president."

Dr. Dollinger: "Our idea was, first of all to settle the formal question respecting the insertion of the *Filioque* in the *Symbolum*, and then to proceed to the question concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost. If we fail to arrive at a decision with regard to the formal difficulty, the discussion of the dogma affords no prospect of an understanding with the Orientals. All previous attempts at coming to an understanding have been shipwrecked on the formal aspect of the question. The declaration now before us is designed to set the formal part of the question at rest, without prejudice to any decision respecting the material or dogmatic part. If we are to adhere to the present Western form of the *Symbolum*, any discussion with the Orientals becomes purposeless."

Mr. Langdon: "I am of Mr. Nevin's opinion that we can accept the Article. I see the difficulties that have been pointed out, but I consider that we cannot, on account of these,

abstain from performing a duty which regard for the unity of the Church imposes on us—the duty of declaring that `the original form of the Confession ought to be restored.'"

Dean Howson: "If we allow that an alteration in the Form of Confession which has been in use in the West for eleven centuries cannot be made without a formal decision of the Church, and as the result of mature reflection and lengthened conferences between the several sections of the Western Church, it by no means follows that such an alteration is not admissible or desirable. We are far from requiring the Orientals to accept the addition, or from regarding the difference in the two forms as an essential point of separation. When the archbishop of Syria and Tenos was in England some years ago, he recited the Nicene Creed without the words *xai EK iou ytov*. If, however, we assent to an alteration in our formulary, this ought not to be construed into a renunciation of the doctrine contained in the *Filioque*. I propose in the article before us, instead of the concluding words `ought to be restored,' to read 'might be restored,' and then to add, `such restoration, however, being not understood as an abandonment of the doctrine involved in the *Filioque*.'"

Mr. Oxenham: "Concessions on both sides are necessary to an understanding. The omission of the *Filioque*, after it has stood for seven or eight hundred years in the *Symbolum*, would be a concession on one side only, and certainly one of some importance. Theologians on both sides have admitted that there is no real doctrinal difference between the two Churches. If this be true, we have no interest in demanding from the Orientals the acceptance of the *Filioque*, nor need the Orientals, on the other hand, lay so much stress on its omission. I may add that the word first found its way, in all probability, into the *Symbolum* in the ninth, not the eleventh century, and the question is certainly deserving of more thorough investigation at the hands of both German and English theologians."

Mr. Hogg: "The difficulty will have been practically solved if, just as it has been stated that the English Church will admit an Oriental to communion, even although he adheres to his form of the *Symbolum*, so the Orientals will agree not to regard the retention of the Western formulary as a barrier to intercommunion."

The Bishop of Pittsburgh: "It is not my desire in any way to prevent discussion on the subject. I wish, however, to observe that though the Orientals may be right in demanding the restoration of the *Symbolum* to its original form, they are wrong in making this the occasion, for requiring the alteration from us. I am bound *by my* oath as a bishop to guard the *Symbolum* in all its integrity, and it is consequently out of my power to say that any part of it ought to be altered."

The Bishop of Winchester: "The real difficulty is not with the Westerns but with the Orientals. We do not regard adherence to the Eastern form as an obstacle to intercommunion; but the Orientals are inclined to look upon the retention of the *Filioque* as a heresy. I propose, as a means of effecting an understanding, the following resolution: "We agree that the way in which the *Filioque* was inserted in the Nicene Creed was illegal, and that, with a view to future peace and unity, it is much to be desired that the whole Church should set itself to consider, whether the Creed could possibly be restored to its primitive form, without sacrifice of the truth which is enforced in the present Western form."

Hauptpastor Scholer: "I concur with the majority of the English speakers that it is almost impossible to expunge the *Filioque* from the Nicene Creed. But I wish also to recall the fact that the Apostles' Creed contains all that is essential to salvation, and that the other confessions are to be looked upon as merely explanatory."

Dr. Liddon: "I support the amendment of the bishop of Winchester."

After Dr. Dollinger, in reply to the question whether laymen were entitled to vote, had replied in the affirmative, the amendment was carried and the discussion with the Orientals adjourned to the evening." It was then opened by an address from the

president, who commenced by observing that all present were unanimous in regarding the separation between the two communions as an unmitigated evil. It had been a matter of exultation

to the enemies of the Christian faith, and had diminished the authority and *prestige* of the Church among Mohammedans and other alien communions. Both parties were at fault, but the blame was very unequally divided; and it was impossible to deny that the larger share must be borne by the Western Church. From the commencement, and for centuries after, the Latins had been endeavoring to force upon the East acquiescence in their hierarchical misrepresentations and inventions and in the innovations and pretensions founded thereupon. The greed of power in the Western communion, combined with the apprehension that the spectacle of a free Eastern Church might produce in the West an impression unfavorable to the papal monarchy, culpable ignorance of the history of ancient Christianity, and especially of the traditions and theological literature of the Greeks, had been the true causes of the schism. In the absence of those causes, the dogmatic differences respecting the Holy Ghost would certainly never have attained to such dimensions nor have been pronounced on both sides a damning heresy.

"The Orientals, in their rich patristic literature, their collections of Church laws, their liturgies and conciliar enactments, possessed an undeniable touchstone which enabled them to test and expose the innovations involved in the papal pretensions, and the spuriousness of the passages again and again brought forward by the Popes and the Romish theologians. They had accordingly regarded all overtures and arguments coming from the West with a mistrust but too well founded, and a genuine understanding had never been effected.

"The schism was not the work of Photius, as the Romish Church represented, nor was it that of Cerularius. The communion of the two Churches, though for a time interrupted, could always in those days have been restored without much difficulty. Even towards the end of the twelfth century, Popes and Greek emperors are to be seen carrying on intercourse on the assumption of a still subsisting unity of the Church, It was not until the beginning of the thirteenth century that events occurred productive of a permanent schism and rooted enmity between East and West. The taking of Constantinople, the spoliation and desecration of the Greek churches, the setting up of the Latin empire, and above all the part played by Innocent III in sanctioning these acts of violence with the whole weight of his authority and power, and openly promoting the subjugation and Latinization of the Greek Church-these were the acts which dug the chasm that remains unbridged over to the present day. Then a swarm of Latin ecclesiastics crowded into the East, and though ignorant of the vernacular, confronted the native clergy with the arrogance and tyranny of conquerors. The bishops and priests of the country were compelled to leave it, otherwise their churches and revenues were seized or they were driven to accept the Latin ritual. The Christian world had never before witnessed such a display of overbearing tyranny and rude oppression. The Popes and their legates set up altar against altar, appointed ignorant Italians or Frenchmen as patriarchs and bishops among the Greeks, transplanted the Inquisition itself with its executions on to Greek soil (thirteen Greek priests were burnt in Cyprus); and vainly do we look for the spiritual benefits, the gain to religion resulting to the Christians of the Eastern Church from this long-enduring invasion of the Western communion.²¹

"The pretended reunions of Lyons (1274) and of Florence (1438)," - were extorted from the emperors, in their danger and alarm, amid the strenuous opposition of clergy and people. Romish craft, tyranny, and corruption wove at last a web at Florence; but the will of the people rent it in pieces again in the ensuing years. And all attempts and overtures made by the West, since that time, for the restoration of the Church's unity have really been only disguised demands for the unquestioning submission of the Eastern Church and her

daughter, the Russian Church, to the supremacy of Rome. Greek sees, already occupied by lawfully constituted bishops, were assigned by Rome as titular dignities to Westerns. It is true that the Popes professed their willingness to leave the rites and regulations of the Eastern Church unaltered; but facts clashed sadly with their profession. The treatment of the Greek Christians in Poland and Southern Italy clearly showed what the Orientals, though politically independent of Rome, might expect in this direction, if once the secular power among themselves were arrayed on the side of Romish pretensions and aims.

"Until the year 1870, however, the imputation made by the Westerns against the Orientals was, as a rule, that of schism merely, or resistance to papal authority, not that of heresy. But from the 18th of July, 1870, a change took place in this respect amounting to a complete revolution. For on that day, by a single blow, Pius IX transformed the eighty million Eastern Christians, till then only schismatics, into formal heretics who denied a fundamental doctrine of Christianity that of the absolute and universal sovereignty and infallibility of the Pope." Henceforth the definitions of heresy in the Romish decrees apply also to these eighty million baptized Christians. This greatly simplifies all future negotiations with Rome on the subject of reunion. If the three great Churches of the East-the Russian, the Greek, and that presided over by the patriarch of Constantinople-agree to accept the two new articles of faith promulgated by Pius IX, the reunion will have been consummated, but this will be at the cost of a complete rupture with their own history and traditions.

"Henceforth those of the Western communion who have submitted to Rome have but one word for the East and the North-'unconditional surrender and abjuration of the heresy which gainsays the Pope.'

"Totally different from this is the position which we Germans hold in relation to you. With us, as with you, the fabrication of new doctrine is an abomination. To us, as to you, the Vatican decrees, invented and enacted by Pius IX with so strong a hand, seem to imply a denial of all historic truth and of all the principles of the primitive Church, along with the renunciation of that tradition once the common possession of East and West. In your Churches we recognize the legitimate descendants of the original Apostolic congregations, who have maintained in unbroken and peaceful succession the doctrines and ordinances bequeathed by Christ and his Apostles, without corrupting and falsifying them.

"We are well aware that the ancient Latin fathers, in their interpretation of Holy Scripture, were chiefly indebted to their Greek instructors and predecessors. Your Churches were the mothers and teachers of the West. Before the first Latin treatise on Christianity was penned they were possessed of a Christian literature. The first six General Councils were entirely or in great part composed of Greek bishops, and their doctrinal decisions were the result of Greek tradition and theology. Your Churches, again, have had the incalculable advantage of reading the Apostolic writings in the original, and of thus receiving the fresh, unalloyed, and immediate impression derivable from the original text alone.

"In later times, however, the West has far surpassed the East in the active prosecution of theological enquiry and in the fullness and soundness of her learning. After the time of Maximus the Confessor the Byzantine theology underwent a process of stagnation, and would seem to have ended altogether with John of Damascus. Since then there have been, it is true, learned compilers in the Eastern Church, but of independent theological and biblical research scarcely any traces are to be discerned; while in the West first of all the scholastic theology arose-full of energy and life, though exceedingly one-sided in character-and next the Reformation, whereby a movement was initiated which caused the knowledge of genuine historical theology to be carried to a completeness and precision before unknown. Of this Western learning the results are now, in a variety of ways, penetrating the consciousness of the Eastern Churches with unprecedented effect and power. We have all-

Oriental, Anglo-Saxons, Germans-to impart and to receive, to teach and to learn. If we can succeed in diffusing through distant circles the same spirit of love and peace that has brought us together here, we may cherish a confident hope of a great reunion, which would testify far more eloquently to the indwelling vitality of Christianity than a hundred apologies and panegyrics."

Archpriest Janyschew, in responding, adverted to the highly favorable impression produced upon himself and the other representatives of the Oriental Church by the president's speech. They took their stand upon the ground of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, the Seven Sacraments, and the Seven General Councils. To an observation of Dollinger's, that the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments was not contained in the decrees of the seven General Councils, he replied that they were embodied, though not enumerated, in the ancient liturgies, as well as in the patristic writings recognized by the Councils; and he reiterated his conviction that the three sources of doctrine above referred to must be insisted on, in order to secure a satisfactory basis of reunion. The detailed differences had already been specified in writing in a document forwarded to the Bonn Committee. Dr. Dollinger then explained, that these differences, besides that of the primacy, were the Filioque and the doctrine of Purgatory. With respect to the last they hoped to offer some explanation. The discussion was then resumed on the doctrine of the Filioque, the Article as amended on the proposition of the bishop of Winchester forming the basis of the discussion with the Orientals. Here the latter at once demurred to the words "the truth which is expressed," affirming that they for their part did not recognize in the interpolation any truth whatever. "Our Church," said Janyschew, "acknowledges a temporal Procession or mission of the Holy Ghost from the Son; but she cannot accept as an article of faith an *eternal* Procession from both the other Persons of the Godhead." "The word $\alpha\epsilon\omega\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma$ in John xv. 26," said Rhossis, "refers to the eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father, while the $\alpha\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma$ refers to the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost by the Son." It was thus that he understood the words in St. Augustine *De Trinitate*- "Spiritus Sanctus principaliter ex Patre procedit." He regarded *principaliter* as equivalent to *ab aeterno*; an interpretation to which Knoodt somewhat demurred, preferring to understand by the word that the Father was the *principium* or Fountain of the Godhead. Tatschaloff then said that if *they* were to limit themselves to the teaching of the undivided Church, the rejection of the *Filioque* must follow. At the seventh, the last General Council, the *Symbolum* was recited without this word. All the fathers of the Church, a few only of the Westerns excepted, spoke of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone; and even in the West, so late as the seventh century, when the *Filioque* had become widely accepted, the testimony of Maximus the Confessor showed that nothing more than a temporal mission of the Holy Ghost by the Son was understood. Many still thus understood it in the ninth century, as appeared from Anastasius Bibliothecarius. It was not until later that, in the West, the *Filioque* was explained as implying an eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son.

The amended Article, then, said Dollinger, cannot be accepted by the gentlemen of the Eastern Church.

Reinkens besought the Oriental delegates not to grasp at too much. The concession already made to them, that the insertion of the *Filioque* was illegal, was considerable. "We have declared," he said, "that we do not look upon the *Filioque* as an article of faith. The Eastern Church has held no General Council since the schism, and consequently has not been able to anathematise the *Filioque*." He reminded them that theologians too often forget that the highest duty of all was charity.

Janyschew: "Charity seeks to show its respect for the right, and is inconceivable apart from justice. It is charity that has brought us here. It is, however right that we should call to mind

that it is not we, but the Ecumenical Council which pronounced an anathema against whoever should venture to add anything to the *Symbolum*."

The utmost that the Orientals would concede at this sitting was, that the *Symbolum* should be restored to its original form without any pronounced condemnation of the doctrine conveyed in the *Filioque*. Dollinger suggested that perhaps the words, "the truth that may be expressed" would meet the difficulty; and the discussion was here adjourned to be resumed the following day, in conjunction with the representatives of the English Church.

On the following morning, the amended amendment was submitted to the Anglican members of the Conference. The bishop of Winchester had unfortunately been compelled to leave Bonn, and objections were immediately started against the clause as it now stood.

The Bishop of Pittsburgh: "I cannot personally give my assent to the alteration proposed. The words imply that possibly no truth is conveyed in the *Filioque*, and in this view I cannot concur. Might we substitute instead of 'the truth,' 'the doctrine,' or 'any doctrine expressed in the present Western form'?"

Both Dollinger and Janyschew observed that there was really no difference in the two expressions; while the latter intimated that if "the doctrine" of the eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son were maintained by the Westerns as a truth, he saw but little hopes of a reunion.

Dr. Liddon then proposed to read, "without sacrifice of the truth, which, according to the sense of the whole Western Church, is expressed in the present Western formula."

This was supported by Dean Howson and rejected by archpriest Janyschew; and another amendment suggested by the bishop of Pittsburgh met with no support. At last *Dr. Dollinger's* acumen and tact succeeded in discovering a means of overcoming what threatened to prove an insuperable obstacle. "Our object," he said, "is to recognize, on the one hand, a historical fact, and, on the other, to leave a question of dogma for the present undecided. We are seeking to throw a bridge over the gulf which divides us, and not until that has been accomplished can we hope to build a house in which we may dwell together." He thought they might adopt the expression, "without sacrifice of any true doctrine expressed in the present Western form."

This proposal seemed to be on the point of gaining the assent of all present, when *Janyschew* suggested that instead of "expressed" they should substitute "contained;" while *Rhossis* proposed instead of "without sacrifice" to read "without deciding upon." *Canon Liddon* here explained that the word "contained" had acquired in England, in recent disputes concerning the inspiration of Scripture, a fixed technical meaning which could not be accepted as the language of the present resolution. If adopted, it would be understood in England as implying that the doctrine "contained" in the *Filioque* was not the same as the doctrine "expressed."

On this the Orientals finally gave way, and the following form of declaration was unanimously adopted: We agree that the way in which the *Filioque* was inserted into the Nicene Creed was illegal, and that, with a view to future peace and unity, it is much to be desired that the whole Church should set itself seriously to consider whether the Creed could possibly be restored to its primitive form, without sacrifice of any true doctrine which is expressed in the present Western form.

The "formal" difficulty having thus been surmounted, it was next resolved to appoint a committee to deal with the doctrinal question; and a committee of five, including a representative of the American and Greek Churches, was decided upon, though the members were not named, but their selection left for future consideration.

The discussions to which the retention or rejection of the *Filioque* gave rise in no way impaired the impression produced by the almost unhesitating unanimity with which a

series of Articles of Faith, designed mainly to meet the objections of English Churchmen to Catholic

doctrine, were successively received. The following first four Articles elicited scarcely any criticism:

Art. 1. We agree that the apocryphal or deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament are not of the same canonicity as the books contained in the Hebrew canon.

2. We agree that no translation of the Holy Scriptures can claim an authority superior to that of the original text.

3. We agree that the reading of Holy Scripture in the vulgar tongue cannot lawfully be forbidden.

4. We agree that, in general, it is more fitting and in accordance with the spirit of the Church, that the Liturgy should be in the tongue understood by the people.

The fifth Article, as originally proposed, stood as follows:

We agree, that faith working by love, and not faith alone, is the means and condition of man's justification before God.

To this it was objected that the use of the word "alone" seemed to imply a condemnation of the eleventh Article of the Church of England, and on the motion of the bishop of Pittsburgh it was resolved that the Article should stand as follows:

5. We agree that faith working by love, not faith without love, is the means and condition of man's justification before God.

The sixth Article, as first proposed, stood as follows:

Salvation cannot be merited by "merit of condignity," because there is no proportion between the infinite good of the salvation promised by God and the finite merit of man's good works.

On the proposal of the bishop of Winchester,² the Article was thus modified:

6. Salvation cannot be merited by "merit of condignity," because there is no proportion between the infinite worth of the salvation promised by God and the finite worth of man's works.

The seventh and eighth Articles were then adopted without alteration:

7. We agree that the doctrine of "*opera supererogationis*," and of a "*thesaurus meritorum sanctorum*"-i.e. that the overflowing merits of the saints can be transferred to others, either by the rulers of the Church, or by the authors of the good works themselves, is untenable. We acknowledge that the number of sacraments was fixed at seven, first in the twelfth century, and then was received into the general teaching of the Church, not as a tradition coming down from the Apostles or

from the earliest times, but as the result of theological speculation.

b. Catholic theologians (e.g., Bellarmine) acknowledge, and we acknowledge with them, that Baptism and the Eucharist are principalia, praecipua, eximia salutis nostrae sacramenta.

With reference to these Articles Dr. Dollinger observed that the former was peculiarly important as contravening the modern doctrine of Indulgences, which rested on that of the super-necessary merits of the saints. Of the eighth Article he said that, though only a statement of a historical fact, it was, notwithstanding, one of the highest importance from a dogmatic point of view. The Eastern Church also recognized seven sacraments, but the word by which it designated these, *μυστήριον*, was of yet greater latitude of signification than the Latin *sacramentum*. If at the time of the Reformation the meaning of the word "sacrament" in the history of dogma had been more accurately understood, fewer objections would have been raised to the prevailing doctrine of the sacraments. The Reformers, in limiting the sacraments to two in number, had also given to the name a more restricted signification than that it had formerly received.

The Bishop of Winchester: "I give my assent to the Article. If the English Church holds that only two sacraments are generally essential to salvation, it by no means denies that there are other observances which may, in a more extended sense, be looked upon as 'mysteries' or 'sacraments.'"

Dr. Dollinger: "Not even baptism and the Lord's Supper are equally generally necessary to salvation; the former is more generally necessary than the latter. And, in a certain sense, according to the doctrine of the English Church, ordination is also necessary."

This discussion was resumed on the morning of Tuesday, after the question of the Filioque had been finally agreed upon, and the ninth Article, after some debate, was finally accepted in the following form:

9. a. The Holy Scriptures being recognized as the primary rule of faith, we agree that the genuine tradition-i.e. the unbroken transmission, partly oral, partly in writing, of the doctrine delivered by Christ and the Apostles, is an authoritative source of teaching for all successive generations of Christians. This tradition is partly to be found in the consensus of the great ecclesiastical bodies standing in historical continuity with the primitive Church, partly to be gathered by scientific method from the written documents of all centuries.

b. We acknowledge that the Church of England, and the Churches derived through her, have maintained unbroken the Episcopal succession.

As at first proposed, the Article stood without the preamble in italics.'-' Arch-priest Janyschew enquired who were "the great ecclesiastical bodies" referred to.

Dr. Dollinger: "First of all your own Church, and next the Western Church, with the exception of those sections of it which have severed their historical continuity."

Block: "Are the Churches of the Reformation included?"

Dr. Dollinger: "It would be impossible for me to assert that the Danish Lutheran Church has broken the historical continuity in the same way as, for example, the Church of Geneva under Calvin has done."

Block: "The Swiss Reformed Church has also retained baptism, and its members have accordingly entered into the sheepfold by the door, and hence cannot be excluded from the Church by us Protestants, as the Baptists are."

The Bishop of Pittsburgh: "I assent to the Article, with the understanding that it in no way contravenes the doctrine that the Bible is the rule of faith."

Dr. Dollinger: "It is admitted that the Bible is the rule of faith, and the belief consequently does not require to be expressed, the Articles before us being designed solely for the purpose of betokening agreement on points respecting which some doubt really exists."

Dean Howson: "I must make the same reservation as the bishop of Pittsburgh."

Dr. Liddon: "The Article is quite correct. It might be supposed to contradict the sixth Article of our Church, which says, 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith;' but the expression, 'whatever cannot be proved thereby,' taken in connection with the twentieth Article, which says, 'the Church hath authority in controversies of Faith,' justifies us in giving our assent to the Article."

Both Janyschew and Rhossis intimated that they conceived it would not be practicable to define more closely the relations between Scripture and Tradition; while Dr. Dollinger pointed out that the Article said, "the consensus of the great ecclesiastical bodies." Passing on to paragraph (b), he observed that all they were here concerned with was the historical fact, but that it was of great importance that they should arrive at a unanimous declaration respecting that fact. The succession in the English Church had been recognized by several bishops of the Eastern Church.

Sukhotin: "The late archbishop Philaret, a man of learning and highly respected in Russia, was accustomed to look upon the succession in the English Church as extremely doubtful." Dr. Dollinger: "We know that her succession has been challenged, but in deciding the question we must be guided entirely by historical evidence; and I must avow that, as the result of my own enquiries, I entertain no doubt whatever with regard to the succession in the English Church. The ordination of English bishops since the Reformation was first impugned by now universally rejected fabrications (that of the Nag's Head story, for example), and then attacked by all kinds of objections resting partly on entirely unsupported presumptions, partly on facts which if we were to admit them to have any weight would tell with equal or greater force against the ordination of Roman Catholic bishops and priests. Everything turns upon the question whether the consecration of archbishop Parker and that of his ordinator, bishop Barlow, were, or were not, valid. The ordination of the latter was never called in question until eighty years after, in 1616, and may be looked upon as equally well established with any historical fact unattested by official records. Parker's consecration is not only confirmed by all his contemporaries but also by documentary evidence, so that not even Lingard has suggested any doubt on the subject. In the Western Church, before the Reformation, circumstances occurred which might suggest far more serious doubts, as to an unbroken succession and the validity of many ordinations than anything that has been raised against English orders. Popes have sometimes set aside the ordinations of bishops and priests by their immediate predecessors (Constantinus and Formosus).¹" They have also, for centuries together, and with terrible confusion, declared innumerable ordinations invalid, some on the ground of simony, others on the pretext of the schism or the adherence to the Antipope. The worst of all, however, was that, led by an ignorant scholasticism, they altered the matter and form of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, although, according to their own teaching, all the virtue and validity of the ordinance consists in these. In the decree which he promulgated in the name of the Council of Florence (which bears in every way the character of a solemn definition of faith), Pope Eugenius IV declared that the matter of the Sacrament of Ordination consists in the vessels or instruments, and the words of the bishop when touching these are the form. By this they degraded the imposition of hands and accompanying form of words-which, in the Western Church, had for a thousand years constituted the sole sacramental act-into a non-essential ceremony, which might accordingly be omitted without prejudice to the virtue and power of the act, somewhat like the salt in the ceremony of baptism. The thought unavoidably rises in the mind, that the bishops possessed by this new papal doctrine may, in many instances, and especially in large ordinations, have omitted the act which was regarded as non-essential. If the Orientals, from want of more complete knowledge of the facts, cannot give their assent to the clause, we must be content with affirming the view taken by the Old Catholic theologians present."

Bishop Reinkens having stated that his researches led him unhesitatingly to recognize the validity of the English episcopal orders, both Janyschew and Rhossis declared that it would give them only too much pleasure to see the question decided in the affirmative, and intimated their intention of making it a subject of investigation. The bishop of Pittsburgh then expressed the satisfaction he felt on hearing such explicit declarations from the president and the bishop on the subject, which he looked upon as fresh evidence of the brotherly feeling of the Old Catholics. A statement by canon Liddon to the effect that he had conversed with Philaret in the year before his death, and had been informed by the latter that he had never himself investigated the historical evidence for the English succession, but had taken his view from the statements of Roman Catholic writers, brought the discussion on this Article to a close. The tenth Article was proposed as follows:

10. We reject the new Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as being contrary to the tradition of the first thirteen centuries, according to which Christ alone was conceived without sin.

The discussion that ensued was remarkable for revealing among some members of the Anglican party a certain leaning towards the condemned tenet. Canon Liddon expressed his wish that it could be condemned as "a dogma of faith," but not as "a pious opinion." "I myself," he said, "reject it whether as a dogma or as a pious opinion, but in the interest of liberty I feel bound to make this suggestion." Mr. Oxenham concurred in this view.

Dr. Dollinger's protest was more emphatic than any made by him throughout the Conference. "If," he said, "the doctrine be, as we affirm, at variance with Church tradition during the first thirteen centuries, it cannot be a 'pious opinion.' We theologians of Germany have a twofold reason for declaring ourselves emphatically opposed to the new doctrine. First, because history shows that it was introduced into the Church by a series of intrigues and falsehoods; secondly, because the dogmatization of the doctrine by the Pope was beyond all doubt carried into effect as preparatory to the definition of papal infallibility. The doctrine has been with us a *fons et origo malorum*. We might, however, perhaps say, instead of 'the new Romish doctrine,' 'the new Romish dogma.'"

The president's view was warmly supported by the bishop of Pittsburgh and dean Howson, the latter averring that, although he had no faith in the personal infallibility of theologians, he could say *malo cum Bernardo et Doellingero errare quam cum aliis recte sentire*.

Dr. Liddon's amendment was ultimately rejected by a majority of twenty-five to nine.

The two following Articles passed without discussion: 11. We agree that the practice of confession of sins before the congregation or a priest, together with the exercise of the power of the Keys, has come down to us from the Primitive Church, and, purged from abuses and freed from constraint, it should be preserved in the Church.

12. "Indulgences" can only refer to penalties actually imposed by the Church herself.

The next Article gave rise to more difference of opinion: 13. We agree that the commemoration of the faithful departed, i.e. a calling down of an outpouring of Christ's grace for them, has come down to us from the primitive Church and should be preserved in the Church.

Dean Howson, bearing in mind the abuses to which the perversion of the doctrine had given rise, and the silence of the English Church upon the subject, expressed his wish not to vote upon the Article. Canon Liddon, on the other hand, holding that *usum non tollit abusus*, and that the silence of the English Church might be attributed to the abuses associated with the doctrine of purgatory at the time of the Reformation, gave the Article his support, a course of action which he felt certain, he said, would be approved by Dr. Pusey. The Article was ultimately adopted by a large majority.

The following Article was then brought forward, and was immediately met by a strong demurrer on the part of the Orientals:

We acknowledge that the invocation of Saints is not commanded as a duty necessary to salvation for every Christian.

M. Janyschew said it directly clashed with the decision of his Church, and he looked upon the decision of his Church as indicating his duty. Dr. Dollinger and bishop Reinkens urged that Roman theologians, like Bellarmine and Muratori, had admitted that prayer to the saints was not a duty incumbent on all Christians; but here Rhossis produced Hefele's *History of Councils*, and pointed out that the Acts of the seventh Ecumenical Council expressly referred to the practice. The president then withdrew the

Article, observing that he had not anticipated its acceptance, but had brought it forward in order to meet the wishes of the Anglican party.

The Article which seemed likely to elicit the greatest difference of opinion, that relating to the Eucharist, was deferred to the last, the bishop of Pittsburgh, Dr. Nevin, canon Liddon, the dean of Chester, and Dr. Dollinger having been previously appointed a committee to determine the precise form in which it should be proposed for acceptance. They determined on passing over points which might occasion controversy, and on endeavoring to frame an Article containing only what all might admit. The following was the result of their deliberations:

The Eucharistic celebration in the Church is not a continuous repetition or renewal of the propitiatory sacrifice offered once for ever by Christ upon the cross; but its sacrificial character consists in this that it is the permanent memorial of it, and a representation and presentation (Vegegenwartigung) on earth of the one oblation of Christ for the salvation (Heil) of redeemed mankind, which, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 11, 12), is continuously presented in heaven by Christ, who now appears in the presence of God for us (ix. 24).

While this is the character of the Eucharist in reference to the sacrifice of Christ, it is also a sacred feast, wherein the faithful, receiving the Body and Blood of our Lord, have communion one with another (I Cor. x. 17).

The bishop of Pittsburgh expressed his entire concurrence in the Article.

Rev. *John* Hunt: "Is the Article to be interpreted as implying that we receive the body and blood of Christ in any other sense than we receive them in all other acts of worship?"

Dr. Dollinger: "Yes. A contrary interpretation would be in opposition to the doctrine of both the Eastern and the Western Church, as well as that of the English and American Churches. Moreover, this is hardly the juncture for making an advance in the direction of Calvinistic doctrine."

A proposal made by Mr. Trinder to read "have communion *with Christ* and one with another," was not adopted, the addition being regarded as superfluous.

M. Janyschew, on behalf of the Orientals, requested that the discussion with the Anglican members might be explained to them, in order that there might be no misapprehension with regard to the interpretation placed upon the whole Article.

Dr. Dollinger having explained the general purport of what had taken place, M. *Tatschaloff* said: "I support the Article, although I believe it might be expressed more definitely and clearly. I will endeavor briefly to compare with it the doctrine of our Church. The offering in the Eucharist is essentially the same as the offering on the cross, so far as the same Lamb of God is offered as was once offered on the cross, but with this difference that then our Lord offered the sacrifice visible in his own person, while in the Eucharist the sacrifice is hid from sight under the form of bread and wine-and that then the sacrifice, by the actual shedding of blood, became a bloody sacrifice, while the Eucharistic sacrifice is a sacramental unbloody sacrifice, and certainly not only a thank-offering, but also a sin-offering for both living and dead."

Dr. *Dollinger*: "The Article contains nothing that contravenes the doctrine of the Eastern Church. But, with a view to a more ready agreement, we have thought it better to avail ourselves as much as possible of Scriptural rather than theological language."

M. *Tatschaloff*: "Then I declare my assent to the Article."

M. *Rhossis*: "The Article in no way contravenes the doctrine of our Church, provided that by the expression 'representation and presentation' is denoted not merely an object of contemplation, but an internal relation of the Eucharistic offering to the heavenly offering, and a real connexion between the two."

Dr. *Dollinger*: "That is understood." ~

M. Bloch then intimated his assent to the Article; whereupon Dr. Dollinger observed that if he expressed the views of his Church, it was a matter for rejoicing to find that the Danish Lutheran Church was in harmony with them on this point, and the Article was finally adopted. Dr. Dollinger also subsequently stated, "for the satisfaction of his brethren of the Churches of England and America," that the Old Catholics fully accepted the distribution at the communion of both kinds, and were only waiting the fitting opportunity for the restoration of the ancient discipline.

The bishop of Pittsburgh then desired (in his own name and that of the bishop of Winchester) to thank Dr. Dollinger, as the convener of the Conference, for the great wisdom and kindness which he had displayed in its conduct, and expressed his heartfelt satisfaction at the prospect of reunion which had opened out to them. To have been present at this Bonn Conference would be amongst the most agreeable reminiscences of his life, and he desired to hand a written statement to Dr. Dollinger of these views, which letter he hoped would be inserted in the minutes of the proceedings:

It is understood that these propositions, coming from Dr. Dollinger and his associates in the Old Catholic community, bring out only *some* of the points on which we hope for concurrence more wide, as time goes on, among believers, and that the propositions on some of the points are limited in their expression of the doctrine, though true so far as the proposition goes. That this Conference and its agreements aim now at the promotion of intraommunion, and do not profess to have completed a doctrinal basis of agreement, but to manifest the brotherly concurrence of those here assenting to the propositions, in the truths so far as expressed, and in the hope and prayer that our Lord may speedily make all His members to be of one mind and of one heart, in the communion of His Holy Catholic Church.

JOHN B. KL~EiFOOT, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Pittsburgh.

The sixth and last sitting of the Conference was devoted to a discussion of the points of difference between the Eastern and Western Churches enumerated in the communication forwarded from St. Petersburg to which reference has already been made." The first point raised-that of the doctrine of the Procession-was referred to the committee. The second was twofold in character, being directed against the theory of the Romish primacy as well as against that of papal infallibility. Respecting the latter no difference of opinion was, of course, found to exist; but as regarded the former Dr. Dollinger intimated that the delegates could not "as yet make any definite statement, especially as the question was at present the subject of considerable discussion among themselves." The third, fourth, and fifth points had already been discussed at previous sessions. The sixth involved the consideration of a peculiar theory, differing altogether from that of purgatory, concerning the state of the soul after death, and on which, in Dollinger's opinion, they could not then come to any conclusion. He had, he said, not been aware before that it was a tenet of the Eastern Church. Janyschew thereupon stated that it was embodied in their catechetical instruction, and that he would forward a copy of the catechism. :0

The subject of baptism gave rise to some discussion, the Orientals repudiating the notion that sprinkling was either the primitive method or an adequate mode of administering the ordinance. They also maintained that, properly, the rite of confirmation followed directly upon that of baptism; and Tatschaloff declared the separation of the two to be "a papal invention." The question of the enforced celibacy of the clergy necessarily elicited some discussion. Dollinger pointed out the extreme antiquity of the divergence of the two Churches, the Eastern practice having been formally established by the Quinisext Council in the year 692; while celibacy had become a rule in the Western Church so early as the fourth century. But this difference in practice had not constituted a ground of division in earlier times,

nor was there any reason why it should do so now. To this Tatschaloff rejoined that the establishment of celibacy as a universal rule had been the work of the Popes, and was certainly designed to promote their own absolutism; while Janyschew considered that it would be impossible for the Eastern Church to approve of the celibacy of the clergy being made a law by any particular Church.

Dr. Dollinger: "It would certainly have been better if the two divisions of the Church had been led to discuss this point in the fifth, sixth, or seventh century. But the rule of the Greek Church was similarly enacted at a Council where the Western Church was not represented. If a General Council should ever be again convened, the whole question will probably be discussed, and then the rule of both Churches may possibly be modified. The only real differences between us are two main points which must be reserved for further discussion." The Conference concluded with a joint recitation of the Te Deum and the Lord's Prayer, bishop Reinkens adding a few sentences of improvised supplication that all present might be kept in the bond of peace, charity, and truth.

A few days later an address from the Anglo-Catholic Society, signed by the bishop of Winchester, was forwarded to Dr. Dollinger, congratulating him on the general results of the Conference, and expressing their admiration "of the calm, wise, patient, forbearing, and impartial manner" in which he had guided its proceedings. Of the justice of this tribute to his services none present on the occasion could have felt the slightest doubt. That venerable form and benignant countenance will remain forever in their recollection; nor will they ever forget the wonderful energy displayed throughout the almost uninterrupted exertions of the three days' discussions—the clearness and terseness with which in alternate English and German the tenor of the debate was made intelligible to all—and the calm and courteous consideration extended to every proposition, from whatever quarter.

With regard to the general results of the Conference, the prevailing impression, among those whose interest in its transactions was greatest and whose knowledge of the whole question was most accurate, was undoubtedly that, in the language of the "Guardian," it had been a great success. "In other words," said the same journal, "it was made apparent that when the Old Catholics, who adhere substantially to the Roman faith as laid down in the decrees of Trent, the ecclesiastics of the Greek Church, Anglican and American clergymen of very varying views and party connections, and pastors of the Reformed German and Danish Churches, come to compare notes, there are, so far as doctrines and the outlines of ritual go, not only no impassable chasms between them, but even no differences which do not admit of being treated as of a formal and technical rather than of a fundamental and real nature. In other words, when those who in these discussions approached the topics of difference rather from the Latin or Roman side, came to state the *minimum* on which they must insist, out of that elaborate system of doctrine and discipline in which they had been brought up, and the others took in hand to set forth the *maximum* which they could bring themselves in conscience and consistency to grant, it appeared, when the parties came to explain, that, so far from any gulf yawning between the two, each was ready to go far farther towards the other side than that side would have exacted as a condition of intercommunion."

The view taken by this writer may perhaps appear too favorable, on a close examination of the proceedings of the Congress; but the passage was quoted with approval in the columns of the *Ueutscher Merkur*, and is undoubtedly far nearer the truth than the comments of some of the popular organs of the English press.

To demonstrate the shallowness of criticisms like those wherein it was asserted that the discussions at Bonn had been "based on the convenient principle of pretending that there exists a basis of union when there really is none,"³² or that it was too late to attempt a mere revival of a "Church of the sixth century,"³³ will be superfluous in these pages. To *agree* that certain non-essential differences in doctrine shall no longer be barriers to intercommunion and fellow-feeling among Christian men, is something entirely different from "pretending" that these differences do not exist; and an endeavor to bring back the simpler and more Scriptural creed of the Church, as she existed before medieval abuses and pretensions had vitiated alike her faith and her practice, may more justly be regarded as a reaction of nineteenth century enlightenment against the tyranny which has ruled over the greater part of Western Christendom for nearly twelve centuries.

The language of the bishop of Lincoln at the Diocesan Conference a few days later, and that of the dean of Chester at the Brighton Conference, together with the admirable resume of the whole question by the bishop of Winchester on the same occasion, indicated that truer appreciation of Old Catholicism which, it is to be hoped, is now becoming general among the clergy and the educated and thoughtful laity of this country.