

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

FOR

OCTOBER 1876 : JANUARY 1877

*VOLUME III.*

LONDON

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE & CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE, E.C.

1877

made no practical difference; for from the first the entire power was engrossed by Buonaparte. And when, before the end of the year, the Constitution was modified, and, instead of a Board of three Consuls of equal rank, he was appointed First Consul, the duties of the second and third Consuls were confined to assisting him with their advice, but they had no authority to control his actions.

Here for a time we must pause. We have seen by what a brilliancy of military genius he concentrated on himself the confidence of the army, and the admiration of the peaceful citizens. And also with what political skill and resolution, displayed at a most critical moment, he availed himself of those feelings to make himself absolute master of both classes. On a future occasion we hope to examine the use which he made of the authority which he had thus acquired.

#### ART. VII.—THE *FILIOQUE* CONTROVERSY AND THE EASTERNS.

1. *On the Clause 'and the Son' in regard to the Eastern Church and the Bonn Conference.* A Letter to the Rev. H. P. LIDDON D.D., by the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. (Parker and Rivingtons, 1876.)
2. *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, from the Apostolic Age to the Death of Charlemagne.* By H. B. SWETE, B.D. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1876.)
3. *Report of the Proceedings of the Reunion Conference at Bonn, 1875.* Translated from the German, with a Preface, by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. (Pickering, 1876.)

HISTORY, we are told, never repeats itself. The aphorism can only be applied with considerable reserve either to secular or ecclesiastical history; least of all, is it applicable to the history of philosophical and religious thought. Theological controversies may become extinct when they have been finally settled by the verdict of the Church, though even so the old questions are not unlikely to reappear in a new form, and with an altered name, not only without, but sometimes within her pale. The mysterious problem of predestination and free will, which in its philosophical aspect had perplexed

the schools of Athens, might seem to have been set at rest by the paramount authority of S. Augustine throughout Western Christendom; yet the dispute was revived centuries afterwards; first, between the Thomists and Scotists, and then, with more than its original bitterness, by Calvin without, and by Jansenius within, the fold of the Latin Church. The course of heresy, which is never a true development, is almost proverbially monotonous, and thus nearly all the mediæval sects reproduced, with variations, the Manichean dualism of an earlier age. It is not wonderful that a writer of Dean Stanley's quite abnormal incapacity, whether natural or acquired, for apprehending the point of theological distinctions, should have spoken of the *Filioque* question not very long ago as 'an excellent specimen of the race of extinct controversies.' But it is certainly a significant and, in one sense, a hopeful illustration of the startling rapidity of the great religious movement of our own day that, within ten years of these words being written, the controversy thus contemptuously dismissed should have again emerged, not as a scholastic speculation, but as a practical question affecting the future reunion of East and West. Dr. Stanley could not, of course, have foreseen in 1861 the Vatican Council and the Old Catholic reaction; but a theologian would have been aware that a controversy bearing directly on the truth of the Divine Nature could never become 'extinct' till it had been decided to the satisfaction of the rival disputants, and no believer in the promises of Christ to His Church has a right to assume that East and West are to remain in perpetual isolation.

There is some difference in the object and method of the two works before us, but they have much in common; and while it is evident that the writers have taken their own line quite independently of each other, there is a remarkable concurrence in the results. Both Dr. Pusey's work and Mr. Swete's may be described as what the Germans call a *Zeitschrift*, for both are occasioned by the proposed articles regarding the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, which emanated from the Bonn Conference of 1875. Mr. Swete's professed aim is simply to collect and arrange materials for the history of the dogma from the Fathers and Councils of the first eight centuries. Dr. Pusey writes with the express aim of showing that the Bonn articles are doctrinally inadequate, to say the very least, and give a wrong version of the history. But both writers set to work in the same way, by a careful examination and citation of authorities, only that Mr. Swete stops at the death of Charlemagne in 814, while Dr. Pusey carries down

the investigation to a later period. We may add that, while Dr. Pusey's citations are usually the fullest, Mr. Swete's book has the advantage for scholars of giving the authorities in the original Greek and Latin. But the passages cited in the two works are, as might be expected, very constantly the same; nor is there much difference, or reasonable ground for difference, in the interpretation put upon them. There are, it will be observed, three questions at issue in the discussion, which require, as far as possible, separate treatment, though the two first partially intersect each other. First, we have to examine what is the true doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit as gathered from the tradition of the Church; and what judgment, therefore, must be pronounced on the controversy between East and West on the subject. Secondly, comes the subordinate inquiry, which is practically of hardly less importance in its bearing on the schism, as to the insertion of the disputed clause in the Nicene Creed. And, thirdly, there is the question which Dr. Pusey has directly raised, and which Mr. Swete's book is equally designed to illustrate, though he refrains from any decisive expression of his own opinion upon it, as to the conformity of the Bonn articles with the results of the inquiry on the two former points.

And here we may just premise that, although Mr. Swete is usually accurate in his theological statements, his book opens with a passage which, if taken alone, would seem to betray a fundamental misapprehension of the point at issue. 'It is,' he tells us, 'to be remembered that the Eastern limitation ["from the Father only"] has reference *only to the essential and eternal derivation* of the Holy Ghost; while the Western addition [*Filioque*] has been authoritatively explained to mean that the Third Person of the Holy Trinity proceeds from the First Person and from the Second as from One Principle and by one spiration.'<sup>1</sup> This is true, of course, as a fact; but the antithesis suggested is a false one. The

<sup>1</sup> The italics are our own. It may be worth while in this connexion to reprint the text of the explanatory canons proposed for the acceptance of both sides by the learned Jesuit Father De Buck, the Bollandist, in his *Essai de Conciliation sur le Dogme de la Procession du Saint Esprit*, quoted at p. 5 of Tondini's *Pope of Rome and Popes of the Oriental Orthodox Church*:—

'Si quis dixerit Patrem solum non esse unicum fontem Trinitatis, anathema sit.

'Si quis dixerit Patrem, gignendo Filium, huic non dedisse ut simul secum produceret Spiritum Sanctum, anathema sit.

'Si quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum non procedere ex Patre principaliter, seu tamquam ex principio primordiali, et ex Filio non tamquam principio primordiali, sed tamquam habente a Patre ut a se quoque

Western doctrine is, that the Holy Ghost proceeds *essentially and eternally* from the Father and the Son by one spiration, and it is on this point that the controversy hinges; His temporal mission from the Father and the Son has never been denied on either side. The Latin explanation, formally sanctioned at Lyons and Florence, 'from one Principle and by one spiration,' is designed to meet the Greek objection based on the *μοναρχία* of the Eternal Father, not in any way to limit the essential and eternal derivation of the Spirit from the Son also.<sup>1</sup> We cannot doubt that Mr. Swete is aware of this, but his language (on p. 2) is misleading; and the importance of the subject renders a passing word of caution to his readers desirable.

I. It will be convenient, in considering the history of the doctrine, to follow Mr. Swete's arrangement, who takes his authorities in chronological order, noting, as we proceed, Dr. Pusey's use of the same or kindred passages. And here it is important to take note that, in starting from the critical passage on the Procession of the Holy Ghost in S. John's Gospel (xv. 26), Mr. Swete points out that *procedit* was the rendering of *ἐκπορεύεται* in the old Latin version, as known to Novatian, S. Hilary, and S. Ambrose. In the earliest instance of its theological use out of the Canon, Tertullian applies the term to the Generation of the Son, while Marcellus, writing at a later date against the Arians, recognises in the Spirit an essential dependence on the Son, which he cannot distinguish from *ἐκπόρευσις*. The arbitrary distinction, therefore, attempted to be drawn at Bonn between *ἐκπόρευσις* ('issuing out of') and 'procession,' in order to justify the language of the second and fifth articles—to which we shall have to return further on—falls to the ground. The passage of S. John stands alone in the New Testament for

*Spiritus Sanctus existentiam, subsistentiam, et essentiam acciperet, anathema sit.*

'Si quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum procedere ex Patre et ex Filio de eo in quo alii sunt ab invicem et non de eo in quo unum sunt, anathema sit.

'Si quis ergo dixerit duo esse principia, duasve productiones Spiritûs Sancti, et non unum principium unamque productionem, aut Patrem et Filium non esse principium Spiritûs Sancti per unam Utrique communem spirationem, anathema sit.

'Si demum quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum ita procedere ex Patre ut simul non sit Spiritus Filii, aut ita esse Spiritum Filii, ut a Filio non simul ac a Patre existentiam, subsistentiam et essentiam accipiat, et secundum hanc notionem ex Filio non procedat, anathema sit.'—p. 346.

<sup>1</sup> In the Florentine decree of union, 'ex Utrouque æternaliter tamquam ab uno Principio et unica spiratione procedit.'

its theological use of the term *ἐκπορεύομαι*, nor did it find its way before the middle of the fourth century into any creed or rule of faith. It is very seldom applied by ante-Nicene writers to the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and, indeed, they are, for the most part, silent on the subject altogether. We perceive, however, in the Ignatian Epistles, a tendency to represent the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son as corresponding with that of the Son to the Father, but as yet no accurate discrimination has been made between the cognate ideas of Generation and Procession; and Tertullian, as we have already seen, uses the terms interchangeably.<sup>1</sup> The attention of the Apologists was first directed to the Person of Christ, and thus S. Justin Martyr scarcely touches on the relation of the Spirit to the other Divine Persons. His scholar, Tatian, whose orthodoxy, it need hardly be said, is more than questionable, calls Him 'the minister of the Incarnate Son.' S. Theophilus of Antioch distinguishes Him from the Logos as the Wisdom of God; and Athenagoras declares Him to be 'the Effluence of God (*ἀπόρροια*), flowing from and evermore returning to the Fountain of the Godhead.'

It is a commonplace of theology, that the progress of heresy is a principal factor in the development of Catholic belief, and the history of the Procession dogma forms no exception to the rule. Here, as elsewhere, to adopt Mr. Swete's language, 'heresy introduces us to a fresh stage in the history of Catholic dogma.'<sup>2</sup> The first principles of Gnosticism were incompatible with the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity; and, accordingly, in that system the Holy Spirit becomes an emanation or an *Æon*. Montanism, which was a reaction from Gnosticism, set itself primarily to deal

<sup>1</sup> 'Temporalis Processio' is used by Aquinas (*Summa*, Pars I. Q. 43, Art. 2) of the Incarnation, 'Æterna Processio' of the Eternal Generation of our Lord. That is to say, generation is a kind of procession, but not *vice versa*.

<sup>2</sup> 'Wonderful, to see how heresy has but thrown that [Catholic] idea into fresh forms, and drawn out from it further developments, with an exuberance which exceeded all questioning, and a harmony which baffled all criticism; like Him, its Divine Author, who, when put on trial by the Evil One, was but fortified by the assault, and is ever justified in His sayings and overcomes when He is judged'—Newman's *Oxford University Sermons*, p. 317, 3rd edit. Further on, in reference to this very doctrine, the writer says: 'The doctrine of the Double Procession was no Catholic dogma in the first ages, though it was more or less clearly stated by individual Fathers; yet, if it is now to be received, as surely it must be, as part of the Creed, it was really held everywhere from the beginning, and, therefore, in a measure, held as a mere religious impression, and perhaps an unconscious one.'—*Ibid.* p. 323. The unconsciousness, however, cannot be extended, as we shall see presently, beyond the ante-Nicene period.

with the mission of the Paraclete, and thereby brought out more fully the truth concerning His Person. One phase of the Ebionite heresy identified the Spirit with the Son; the *Recognitions* make Him a creation of the Son; and here, curiously enough, the phrase *a Filio* first appears, but in a purely heretical sense, which has no connexion whatever with its subsequent adoption by the Church—‘habet quod est ab Unigenito, *factus est enim per factum*, subconnumeratur autem Patre et Filio.’ In the same way the formula *per Filium*, which also has Catholic authority, and which found more favour with the Easterns at Bonn, had an Arian origin, and was anathematized in this sense by Pope Damasus: ‘Si quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum *facturam aut per Filium factum*, anathema sit.’ What little is known of the *Alogi*, an obscure sect of the last quarter of the second century, goes to show, as Dorner observes, that they were vehemently opposed to the Montanist development of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and thus paved the way for the heterodox Monarchianism of the next century.<sup>1</sup> And Monarchianism, whether in its Ebionite or its Patripassian form, could admit no true Procession of the Spirit from the Father or the Son. One of the earliest statements of Catholic doctrine—not, however, including as yet the Procession from the Son—occurs in a protest of Dositheus, Bishop of Seleucia, against the Sabellian view:—‘Pater enim ingenitus, Filius genitus, *Spiritus Sanctus procedens ex Patre* cœqualis per omnia Patri et Filio.’ To sum up the results of heretical teaching on this subject during the first three centuries—

‘In some systems the Spirit is but a synonym of the Father and the Son, or a particular manifestation of the Divine life. In others He is a Person, but distinct from God: an Æon or an Angel, produced or made by the Supreme. Of this latter class of hypotheses, some represent Him as the *σὺζυγος* and co-equal of the Son: whilst others regard Him as subordinate and the creature of a created Logos. But amidst these contending voices, none was heard to anticipate the judgment of the Church.’

To the Catholic reaction against Gnosticism we owe the great work of S. Irenæus (*Contra Hæreses*) and part of the works of Tertullian. Irenæus at least foreshadows the doctrine of the *Filioque*, when he says, ‘Pater enim conditionem simul et Verbum Suum portans, *et Verbum portatum a Patre præstat Spiritum omnibus*, quemadmodum vult Pater;’ and again that Christians receive through the Spirit, the Father

<sup>1</sup> Neander’s brief reference to the sect (*Church History*, vol. ii. pp. 223, 301) is in harmony with this view.

and the Son, and again that the Spirit is 'communicatio Christi.' We have already seen that Tertullian applies the term *procedere* to the Generation of the Son, as did Novatian afterwards, but he does not use it of the Holy Ghost. He does, however, without employing it, actually state in equivalent terms the doctrine of the Double Procession when he says, in his treatise against Praxeas, 'Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo *et Filio*, sicut tertius a radice *fructus ex frutice*, et tertius a fonte *rivus ex flumine*, et tertius a sole *apex ex radio*.' Elsewhere he says, without any metaphor, 'Filium non aliunde deduco sed de substantia Patris. . . . *Spiritum non aliunde puto quam a Patre per Filium*;' on which Mr. Swete remarks, with perfect justice, that the doctrine conveyed by the *Filioque* is not appreciably different from what Tertullian expresses by *per Filium*. If we turn from the West to the East, Alexandria, the centre alike of the Neoplatonic revival and of Gnosticism, was the birthplace of Christian theology, as both Döllinger and Newman have reminded us. There is little in the extant works of S. Clement of Alexandria bearing on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, though it is referred to in a passage, variously ascribed to him and to his namesake of Rome, in connexion with His Temporal Mission from the Father. Origen is naturally more diffuse on the subject. He speaks of the Father as 'the Origin and Fount of the Son and the Holy Spirit,' who are yet co-eternal with Himself. And he indicates the Procession from the Son when he says, 'Spiritus Dei et Spiritus Christi unus atque idem mihi Spiritus dici videtur.' Dr. Pusey and Mr. Swete are agreed in thinking that he held substantially the Eternal Procession from the Father through the Son, though he cannot, as Dr. Pusey justly observes, be taken as an accurate exponent of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and rather needs explanation than explains. S. Dionysius of Alexandria, in a passage quoted by both our authors, teaches the same doctrine. So does also S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, who says that 'there is One Holy Spirit, who has His substance (*ὐπαρξιν*) from the Father and is manifested through the Son, being the perfect Image of the perfect Son.' If we sum up the general result of Catholic theology on the subject at the close of the ante-Nicene period, we find that many writers, especially in the West, are almost or altogether silent upon it. But the doctrinal development, prompted in great measure by the questionings of heresy, is already in progress, and from Alexandria and North Africa the answer has been, more or less distinctly given, that the Holy Spirit is from the



Father and through the Son. No one has yet distinctly asserted that He proceeds from Both, but still less has it been even faintly hinted that He is from the Father alone. And so we are brought to the great Arian controversy of the fourth century, the age of heresies, of Councils, and of Creeds.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Swete examines in separate chapters the Eastern and Western theology of what may be called the Arian period, extending from the Nicene Council in 325 to 431, the date of S. Augustine's death and of the Council of Ephesus, when a new series of heresies, bearing on the doctrine of the Incarnation, was opened with the Nestorian controversy.<sup>2</sup> And here Dr. Pusey's work, which is less full in its treatment of the earlier period, comes in to supplement him. In this period are included the two first Œcumenical Councils and the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, the latter of which, in its original form, defines the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. This Creed, however, as Dr. Pusey has clearly shown, was not generally received till after it had been endorsed by the sanction of the Fourth Œcumenical Council, held at Chalcedon in 451, and in 430 S. Cyril had not even heard of it. It was the Nicene Creed, without the later additions, and containing, therefore, no reference to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, which was recited at the Council of Ephesus, and to it alone applies the famous Ephesine Canon against imposing any other creed on heretics returning to the Church, which is often so absurdly quoted against the *Filioque*; but to that point we shall have to return presently. Arianism, of course, made short work of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. 'For an eternal procession from the Father it from the first practically [not to say doctrinally] substituted *creation by the Son*.' And Eusebius, in controverting the views of Marcellus, who was accused of Sabellian tendencies, uses language which not only 'anticipates the modern [Greek] view of the procession, as being simple mission,' but can only be acquitted of Arianism by explaining it away. S. Cyril of Jerusalem, though he dwells on the office and work of the Spirit, declines to go beyond the actual words of Scripture in speaking of his Divine Nature and Person. It was hardly possible for the great protagonist of orthodoxy to be equally reticent. Athanasius does not lay down in so

<sup>1</sup> Hahn has collected (*Bibliothek der Symbole*) twelve forms of 'acatholic' creeds of the fourth century, nearly all of which assert the mission of the Paraclete from the Son, but ignore His eternal Procession.

<sup>2</sup> See Translator's Preface to vol. ii. of Hefele's *History of Councils*.

many words the doctrine of the Double Procession, but he states it 'substantially,' to quote Mr. Swete, when he affirms the relation of the Spirit to the Son to be the same as that of the Son to the Father; that He is according to His Essence the very own Spirit of the Son, as the Son is of the Essence of the Father; that the Son being with the Father is the Fountain of the Holy Spirit; and still more explicitly (in a passage which appears to have escaped Dr. Pusey's notice), that 'He is said to proceed from the Father, since He shines forth from (*ἐκλάμπει παρὰ*) the Word, who is confessed to be from the Father, and is sent and given by Him.' Didymus, the teacher of S. Jerome and Rufinus, goes further in the treatise on the Holy Spirit, translated by the former, and expressly asserts the full Western doctrine over and over again, if we may trust the MSS. which Dr. Pusey quotes without any misgiving. Mr. Swete points out that there are variations of reading in the two first extracts given below, but not in the third, which, if genuine, would alone be sufficiently decisive of the writer's belief.<sup>1</sup> But if there is some doubt in the case of Didymus as to the genuineness of the text, there is none in the case of S. Epiphanius, whose language is, if possible, still more explicit. Petavius is fully justified in saying that the passages are so clear 'ut nemo clarius ac dilucidius etiam Latinorum Patrum locutus sit.' It is true, indeed, as Mr. Swete observes, that in two creeds which he has inserted in his *Ancoratus*, he does not state the Double Procession, but he had, of course, no right, as an individual theologian, to formulate new articles of faith. Of his own opinion there can be no doubt, but our readers shall judge for themselves. Considering the importance and clearness of his testimony, it will be well to put on record here the passages cited by Dr. Pusey, from which Mr. Swete has extracted the critical phrases in the original:—

'S. Epiphanius nowhere uses the word "through," but always [*ἐκ*] "from," when speaking of the Eternal being of the Holy Spirit. And these are no chance passages of S. Epiphanius, but passages

<sup>1</sup> § 34. *Salvator, qui et Veritas, ait, non enim loquetur a semetipso; "hoc est, non sine me et sine meo et Patris arbitrio, quia inseparabilis a mea et Patris est voluntate: qui non ex se est sed ex Patre et me. Hoc enim ipsum quod subsistit et loquitur a Patre et me illi est. Ego veritatem loquor: id est, inspiro quæ loquitur, siquidem Spiritus veritatis est."* § 36. "Non potest Filio loquente audire quæ nescit, cum hoc ipsum sit quod *profertur a Filio, id est, procedens a Veritate*, consolator manans de consolatore, Deus de Deo, Spiritus veritatis procedens." § 37. "Neque enim quid aliud est Filius exceptis his quæ ei dantur a Patre; neque alia substantia est Spiritus Sancti præter id quod datur ei a Filio"—(Swete, p. 94.)

in which he is carefully stating and guarding the truth as to the existence of the Holy Trinity. The first is against the heresy of Sabellius.

“For the Spirit ever is, with the Father and the Son, not in relation of brother with the Father, not begotten, not created, not brother of the Son, not grandson of the Father, but ever proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son : not alien from Father and Son, but *from* (ἐκ) the same Essence, *from* (ἐκ) the same Godhead, *from* (ἐκ) the Father and the Son, with the Father and the Son, ever subsisting Holy Spirit, Divine Spirit, Spirit of glory, Spirit of Christ, Spirit of the Father. For it is *the Spirit of the Father, Who speaketh in you, and My Spirit standeth in the midst of you, the Third in appellation, equal in Godhead, not alien from the Father and the Son, the Bond of the Trinity, the seal of the confession.*”

‘And in his elaborate exposition of the faith, which he partly embodies in his writing against “the blasphemers of the Holy Ghost :”

“The Holy Spirit ever is, not begotten, &c., but *from* (ἐκ) the same Essence of the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit. For God is Spirit.” “He is the Spirit of the Son ; not by any composition (as in us, soul and body), but in the midst of the Father and the Son, *from* (ἐκ) the Father and the Son, the third in appellation.” “Whole God is Wisdom ; so then the Son is Wisdom from Wisdom, in Whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom. Whole God is Life ; therefore the Son is Life from Life. For ‘I am the way, the truth, and the life.’ But the Holy Spirit *from Both* (παρ’ ἀμφοτέρων) is Spirit from Spirit ; for God is Spirit.”

“But some one will say : Do we then say that there are two Sons ? How then is He Only-begotten ? But who art thou, who speakest against God ? For since He calls Him Who is from Him, the Son, and That which is *from Both* (τὸ παρ’ ἀμφοτέρων) the Holy Spirit ; which being conceived by the saints through faith alone, being lightful, lightgiving, have a lightful operation, and by the light of faith are in harmony with the Father Himself ; hear thou, that the Father is Father of Him, Who is the True Son and wholly Light, and the Son is of True Father, Light of Light (not, as things created or made, in title only), and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth, the third Light *from* (παρὰ) Father and Son.” “As there are many sons by adoption or calling, not in truth, because they have beginning and end, and are inclined to sin, so there are very many spirits by adoption or calling, although inclined to sin. But the Holy Spirit is Alone entitled *from* (ἀπὸ) the Father and the Son, the Spirit of Truth, and Spirit of God, and Spirit of Christ and Spirit of grace.” “If then He proceedeth *from* (παρὰ) the Father ; and, the Lord saith, He shall take of Mine, then in the same way, in which no one knows the Father save the Son, nor the Son, save the Father, so, I dare to say, that no one knoweth the Spirit, save the Father and the Son, *from* (παρ’) Whom He proceedeth and from Whom He taketh, and neither doth any one know the Son and the Father, save the Holy Spirit, Who truly glorifieth, Who teacheth all things, Who tes-

tifieth concerning the Son, Who is *from* (παρὰ) the Father and *of* (ἐκ) the Son." "The Father then ever was, and the Spirit breatheth *from* (ἐκ) the Father and the Son, and neither is the Son created, nor is the Spirit created. But all things, after Father and Son and Holy Ghost, being created and made, once not being, came into being from Father Son and Holy Ghost through the Eternal Word, with the Eternal Father."

"Since Christ from (ἐκ) the Father is believed to be God from (ἐκ) God, and the Spirit is from (ἐκ) Christ or from (παρ') Both, as Christ saith, 'Who proceedeth (παρὰ) from the Father and He shall take of Mine.'"<sup>1</sup>

S. Basil and the two Gregories, of Nyssa and Nazianzus, do not speak with the same decision. S. Basil, however, in a passage quoted by Dr. Pusey, where he is dwelling on the co-eternal order of the Three Divine Persons, says that, 'as the Son is to the Father, so the Spirit is to the Son, according to the order of the word delivered in Baptism.' And he often speaks of the procession of the Spirit *through* the Son (ἐκ Θεοῦ δι' Υἱοῦ). Mr. Swete says that 'he never passes from δι' Υἱοῦ to ἐκ Υἱοῦ or παρ' ἀμφοτέρων.' But he does use παρὰ of the relation of the Spirit to the Son, in a passage which was brought forward in the Council of Florence, but was disputed by the Greeks, and is disallowed by the Benedictine editors. Dr. Pusey cites authorities to prove that it was in a MS. 600 years older than the Council, and anterior to the beginning of the controversy on the Procession. We may add that S. Basil's refraining, if he did refrain, from using the formula 'from the Son,' so little indicates his disbelief of the doctrine, that throughout his treatise on the Holy Spirit, expressly composed against heretics who denied His Divinity, he studiously abstains from giving Him the name of God. S. Gregory of Nyssa virtually asserts the Western doctrine, not only in saying, in a passage quoted by Bessarion, that the Spirit 'is manifested through the Son,' but more directly in making the Son the μεσίτης in the Holy Trinity, through whom the essential life of the Father flows eternally to the Holy Ghost. We append the passage in a note.<sup>2</sup> In a fragment of his third Oration on the Lord's Prayer the formula ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ occurs, and is shown by Cardinal Mai to have good MS. authority; Petavius disputes the ἐκ on grounds of internal evidence. S. Gregory of

<sup>1</sup> Pusey's *Letter to Rev. H. P. Liddon*, pp. 119-121.

<sup>2</sup> Τὸ μὲν γὰρ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου, τὸ δὲ διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου. ὥστε καὶ τὸ μονογενὲς ἀναμφίβολον ἐπὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ μένειν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ ἀμφιβάλλειν τῆς τοῦ Υἱοῦ μεσσιτίας καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ μονογενὲς φυλαττοῦσης, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς φυσικῆς πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα σχέσεως μὴ ἀπειργούσης.—(Swete, p. 103.)

Nazianzus is content to establish the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and declines to follow the heretics of his day into an analysis of the mystery of His Being.

We have thus traced the course of Eastern theology through the Arian period to the date of the Council of Ephesus. And the outcome of its testimony in favour of the Double Procession is certainly rather understated than overstated by Mr. Swete, who, be it remembered, does not profess to be arguing for that doctrine, but simply examining authorities, when he says—the italics are our own—that the ‘Procession of the Holy Ghost *through* the Son was undoubtedly maintained by a majority of the great Church teachers who flourished in the East during the fourth century; by one of them, *perhaps* by two, the Father and the Son was regarded as the joint Source from which the Spirit issues forth.’ It must be borne in mind that ‘through’ has been shown to be really equivalent to ‘from,’ unless otherwise explained; and no hint of a disclaimer of the *Filioque* has yet been heard from any orthodox writer. It would be more accurate to say that the great majority of the Eastern Fathers of this period regarded the Father and the Son as the joint Source of the Holy Spirit, though only two of them certainly, Didymus and S. Epiphanius—for it is hardly conceivable that *all* the passages cited from Didymus should be spurious—and perhaps four, have expressly said so.

Mr. Swete is probably right in thinking that the Nicene Council gave a powerful impetus to theological activity in the West. Certainly the fourth and fifth centuries are much richer than those which preceded in great theological names, not to add that S. Augustine is a host in himself. It is true that what has been called the anthropological side of theology took more permanent hold of the practical Western mind than those speculations on the Divine Nature which had so special an attraction for the philosophical mind of the East. But the Arian and Nestorian controversies compelled attention to this class of questions also, and S. Leo is the great doctor of the Incarnation as S. Athanasius is of the Trinity. It was, in fact, in the West that the full and perfect harmony of the various explanations of the revealed doctrine of the Person and Nature of the Holy Ghost, which had been struck out in the progress of theological discussion, was first distinctly recognised and proclaimed. S. Hilary all but anticipates the final solution. He tells us that the Holy Spirit ‘*Patre et Filio Auctoribus confitendus est*,’ and that He comes through Him, ‘*per Quem omnia et ex Quo omnia* ;’ that is, through the

Son. And he asks, without directly answering the question, whether 'a Filio accipere' is the same as 'a Patre procedere,' 'evidently inclining,' says Mr. Swete, 'to the affirmative,'—we should rather say implying it.<sup>1</sup> In the *Opus Historicum*, he says more directly, 'Cum sit Pater in Filio et Filius in Patre, et Spiritus Sanctus accipiet ex Utroque.' Passing over the African rhetorician, Marius Victorinus, whose somewhat ambiguous language is in substantial accord with Hilary's, and S. Phæbadius of Agen, who explicitly asserts the Procession from the Son in his treatise *De Fide Orthodoxâ*, we come to the great S. Ambrose, whose work *De Spiritu Sancto* is the first Latin treatise on the Holy Ghost. It is largely based on Eastern authorities, but, as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Swete are agreed, it distinctly implies, if it does not actually assert, the Procession of the Spirit from the Son as involved in His Temporal Mission: 'Non ergo quasi ex loco mittitur Spiritus aut quasi ex loco procedit quando procedit ex Filio . . . cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur a Patre, non separatur a Filio.' He calls the Son the Fountain of Life, because He is the Fountain of the Spirit who is Life. He not only speaks of 'goodness and sanctification and the imperial right of eternal power being derived from one Father through one Son to one Holy Spirit,' but treats the Spirit's receiving from the Son as at least analogous to His procession from the Father. The Spirit receives from the Son His Divine Attributes and His very Essence; and all these statements are repeated in various forms. It matters therefore little that the words 'procedere ex Filio' do not occur with direct reference to the Eternal procession of the Spirit in S. Ambrose's genuine works. But, moreover, his contribution to the development of this great doctrine is not to be measured by his writings only. To Ambrose, under God, the Church owes the master mind to whom it was reserved to complete the fabric of which, curiously enough, his fellow-countryman Tertullian had laid the foundations nearly two centuries before. The last word on this great mystery was to be spoken by S. Augustine.

In the chapter on the Holy Spirit in his early work *De Fide et Symbolo*, S. Augustine acknowledges the difficulty of handling a subject which had never as yet received any complete treatment in the theology of the Church. But he lays down certain points already ascertained, as that He is consubstantial with the Father and the Son, but personally distinct,

<sup>1</sup> 'Ascendit in cœlos. . . misit nobis Spiritum Sanctum de propria Sua et ipsâ unâ Substantiâ. . . "De meo," inquit, "accipiet," ex eo utique quod est Filius; quia et Filius de eo quod Pater est.'

that He is not derived from Either by Generation, and yet is not *ἄναρχος*, and he further intimates that He is the Divine Bond of Charity between them, who is at the same time Himself a Person. In his later work, *De Trinitate*, S. Augustine enters more deeply into the question, carefully distinguishing between Mission and Procession, and enunciating for the first time the two great principles that Mission depends on Procession, and that the Procession from Father and Son is by one Spiration and as from one Source :

“Nec possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat . . . Flatus ille corporeus [S. John xx. 22] . . . fuit . . . demonstratio per congruam significationem non tantum a Patre sed et Filio procedere Spiritum Sanctum.” “Fatendum est Patrem et Filium principium esse Spiritûs Sancti : non duo principia ; sed sicut Pater et Filius unus Deus . . . sic relative ad Spiritum Sanctum unum principium.” In these few words we at length have the statement to which Western, and to a considerable extent Eastern thought had been tending for two centuries. Tertullian’s *a Patre per Filium*, Hilary’s *Patre et Filio auctoribus*, the *καρ’ ἀμφοτέρων* of S. Epiphanius, the *διὰ τοῦ μένου* of S. Gregory of Nyssa, find at last their logical outcome and expression in the *Pater et Filius unum principium* of the greater Bishop of Hippo.<sup>1</sup>

The doctrine is more fully worked out in the *Tractatus in S. Joannem*. We again quote Mr. Swete :

‘In Tract xcix. (on S. John xvi. 13) the question of the Spirit’s procession from the Son is formally raised : “hic aliquis forsitan quærat utrum et a Filio procedat Spiritus Sanctus. Filius enim solius Patris est Filius, et Pater solius Filii est Pater ; Spiritus autem Sanctus non est minus eorum Spiritus, sed amborum . . . Cur ergo non credamus quod etiam de Filio procedat Spiritus Sanctus, cum Filiique ipse sit Spiritus ? . . . Quid aliud significavit illa insufflatio [S. John xx. 22], nisi quod procedat Spiritus Sanctus de ipso ?” Then, boldly facing the obvious objection that “the Son Himself speaks only of a procession from the Father,” the preacher replies, “Cur putas, nisi quemadmodum ad eum [*sc.* Patrem] solet referre et quod ipsius est, de quo et ipse est ?” *E.g.* in S. John vii. 16 our Lord says, “My doctrine is not mine.” It was not his, it was the Father’s, inasmuch as He Himself is of the Father. Yet it was His nevertheless, since He and the Father are One. “Quanto magis illic intelligendum est et de ipso procedere Spiritus Sanctus, ubi sic ait ‘de Patre procedit’ et non diceret, ‘de me non procedit.’” From Augustine’s point of view, the *παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς* is not exclusive : it asserts the *μοναρχία*, but does not lose sight of the *ὁμοούσιον* ; does not shut out the Consubstantial Son from being with the Father, though subordinately to Him, the One Principle of the Holy Ghost. “A quo autem habet Filius ut sit Deus (est enim de Deo Deus), ab

<sup>1</sup> Swete’s *Doctrine of Procession*, &c. pp. 125-126.

illo habet utique ut etiam de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus ; ac per hoc Spiritus Sanctus ut etiam de Filio procedat sicut procedat de Patre, ab ipso habet Patre." The procession from the Son must not, however, be regarded as posterior in time to the procession from the Father, or as distinct from it in fact : " Spiritus Sanctus non de Patre procedit in Filium et de Filio procedit ad sanctificandam creaturam, sed simul de utroque procedit."'<sup>1</sup>

In the fifteenth chapter of the *De Trinitate* the relations of the Divine Persons are illustrated by the memory, understanding, and will of man, but an important caution is added against pressing this analogy, as though there could be any priority or posteriority of time in the eternal life of God :

'Quapropter qui potest intelligere sine tempore generationem Filii de Patre, intelligat sine tempore processionem Spiritûs Sancti de utroque . . . intelligat sicut habet Pater in semetipso ut de illo procedat idem Spiritus Sanctus, sic dedisse Filio ut de illo procedat idem Spiritus Sanctus, et uterque sine tempore . . . Si enim quidquid habet de Patre habet Filius, de Patre habet utique ut et de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus . . . Filius autem de Patre natus est, et Spiritus Sanctus de Patre principaliter et ipso sine ullo temporis intervallo dante communiter de utroque procedit.'"'<sup>2</sup>

And finally in his treatise *Contra Maximum*, written shortly before his death, the great doctor thus distinguishes between Generation and Procession : 'Non omne quod procedit nascitur, quamvis omne procedat quod nascitur.' And He is said by Christ to proceed from the Father, 'quoniam Pater processionis Ejus est Auctor, qui talem Filium genuit, et *gignendo Ei dedit ut etiam de Ipso procederet Spiritus Sanctus*.' It would be easy to multiply quotations ; but these will suffice to prove how completely the true doctrine of the Double Procession is brought out by S. Augustine under all its aspects ; and it is impossible, as Mr. Swete reminds us, to set aside these decisive passages as either interpolated or ambiguous.<sup>3</sup> Nor is he conscious of any divergence of opinion on the subject within the Church : the doctrine of the *Filioque* forms part of his reply to Arian and Macedonian assailants of her faith from without. Dr. Pusey, who brings forward the same passages, clenches his argument by a weighty consideration as to the authority of S. Augustine, and of two great Latin writers who preceded him in the enunciation of the same verity :

<sup>1</sup> Swete's *Doctrine of Procession*, &c., pp. 126-127.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 129.

<sup>3</sup> It is to be regretted that a writer of the calibre of the late Dr. Neale should have allowed himself to suggest interpolation, manifestly on grounds quite independent of the evidence.



'These Latin fathers, S. Hilary, S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine, have been quoted as authorities on other matters of doctrine at General Councils, and so have been formally acknowledged as authorities in the Church by the Greeks also. At the Council of Ephesus, S. Cyril quoted S. Ambrose as well as S. Cyprian : at the end of the tome of S. Leo, read at the Council of Chalcedon, are quoted S. Hilary, Bishop and Confessor, S. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, with S. Gregory of Nazianzus, and S. Chrysostom and S. Cyril ; in the 5th General Council, S. Augustine was quoted ; in the 6th, S. Augustine and S. Ambrose are quoted, as holy and select fathers, together with S. Athanasius and S. Chrysostom : and in a later session S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, and S. Leo.'<sup>1</sup>

The general reception of this distinctive teaching is further illustrated by the incidental testimony of two Latin poets of the same period, S. Paulinus of Nola and the well-known Prudentius. The former says :

'Spiritum ab Unigenâ Sanctum et Patre procedentem.'

Prudentius, to take one example only, concludes his fifth hymn :

'Qui noster Dominus, qui Tuus unicus  
Spirat de Patris corde Paraclitum.'

Henceforth the doctrine of the Double Procession passes in the West out of the region of discussion, and becomes a recognised and integral portion of the faith of the Church, though it has not yet found formal expression in the Creed. We cannot pause to follow our authors in detail through the long string of extracts in evidence of this fact which they have collected from Latin fathers and theologians, who repeat in the most explicit and almost identical terms their dogmatic belief in the procession of the Holy Spirit *a* or *de* or *ex Patre et Filio*, *de* or *ex Utroque*, or *de Ipsorum Substantiâ*. But it is worth noting that S. Leo says *de Utroque processit*, inasmuch as the Greeks to this day annually anathematize on 'Orthodox Sunday' (our Trinity Sunday) all who reject his teaching! Among these Latin writers, of different countries, are S. Eucherius of Lyons, Gennadius of Marseilles, Julianus Pomerius of Arles, Agnellus, Archbishop of Ravenna, S. Gregory, Archbishop of Tours, Cæsarius, Archbishop of Arles, Faustus of Riez, Archbishop Avitus of Vienne, Ferrandus of Carthage, Paschasius, Boëtius, Cassiodorus, S. Fulgentius, Pope Hormisdas (who is addressing the Eastern Emperor Justin), S. Leo, and S. Gregory the Great, who sums up the *rationale* of

<sup>1</sup> Pusey, p. 148.

the doctrine in saying that Mission is to be understood '*juxta naturam Divinitatis. Missio ipsa processio est quæ de Patre procedit et Filio.*' On the character of these testimonies Dr. Pusey makes a comment which is the more important as it turns also on another controversy of historical and theological interest, as to the date of the Athanasian Creed :

'Any one, who has looked over the statements on this doctrine, collected by Petavius and others from Latin writers of the Vth and VIth centuries must, I think, have been struck by the naked simplicity of their statements, as contrasted with the reasoning of S. Hilary, S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine. At first sight, they disappointed me, as looking meagre. Observing, however, that two of the earlier, S. Paulinus and Prudentius, were connected with Spain, I cannot but think that the conciseness of the rest arises from their being repetitions of a common formula, that of the Athanasian Creed. They are a remarkable contrast with the rich and varied language of Greek fathers. Their identity with the Athanasian Creed lies on the surface.'<sup>1</sup>

'All this naked identity of language implies, I think, an identity of a formula whose language it is, and that formula, I doubt not, was the Athanasian Creed. If successive writers, in speaking of the Divinity of God the Son, were to repeat, one after the other, "we believe that He is 'Very God of Very God'" and were to confine themselves to this one saying, no one, I think, would doubt, that they were using the one formula of the Nicene Creed. As little room, I think, there is for doubting that these writers, using the one formula, "proceeding from the Father and the Son," were using the Athanasian.'<sup>2</sup>

To which it may be added that a canon at the beginning of the sixth century imposed a penalty on any cleric who neglected to learn the Athanasian Creed by heart. The precise date of the Creed is not indeed a question of any great doctrinal importance. Its authority is not derived, like that of the forged decretals (to which it has been most absurdly compared), from the supposed date of its authorship, or from the name which it probably came to bear, not as being considered the composition of Athanasius, but as being demonstrably known to enshrine his faith. If, therefore, its history was really 'gangrened with imposture,' as Dean Stanley has audaciously asserted, that would not affect its dogmatic weight. But the value of his criticism may be estimated by the remark that 'Quesnel conjectured that it was the work of the African Bishop Vigilius of Thapsus, chiefly from the unfortunate reputation which he acquired for passing off his own works under fictitious names.' Mr. Brewer has shown that Quesnel says nothing of the kind, and that Vigilius never attempted to pass

<sup>1</sup> Pusey, p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 60.

off any of his works under a fictitious name. It is, in fact, proved by an accumulation of evidence, external and internal, which is simply conclusive, that the Creed cannot have been composed after the fifth, and is probably a work of the fourth, century; the absence of all definite reference to the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies—still more to the later heresy of Adoptionism—would alone settle that point, as Waterland argued long ago; and the wholly unsuspecting testimony of Sir Duffus Hardy as to the age of the MS. of the Utrecht Psalter confirms this conclusion. In external authority, indeed, the *Quicumque vult* stands second only to the Nicene Creed, and far higher than the so-called Apostles' Creed, which to this day is unknown in the East, and upon which every charge which has been brought against the former, of doubtful authorship, variations of text, late or partial reception, and spurious nomenclature, might be retorted with more than equal force. It is truly marvellous that Mr. Swete should still think it an open question, in the face of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, whether this Creed may not have been composed, according to Mr. Ffoulkes's exploded paradox, in the time of Charlemagne; and it is hardly less surprising that he should also attach any value to what Mr. Brewer designates 'the grossly heretical nonsense' of Professor Swainson's arguments on the subject. Our readers will pardon this brief digression, if such it can be called, in view of the probable influence of the *Quicumque vult*, as will appear further by and by, on the development of the Western doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

And now, before coming to the first insertion of the *Filioque* into the Creed, let us take up the thread of doctrinal history in the East, which we have already traced to the beginning of the fifth century. We have seen that during the Arian period procession 'through the Son' was already the general teaching of the Eastern Fathers, while procession 'from the Son' was explicitly affirmed by some of the greatest of them. No one asserted it more distinctly than Apollinaris, who, in his zeal against Arianism, unhappily fell into the opposite error of denying the Human Soul of Christ. It was, perhaps, partly on this account that Theodore of Mopsuestia, who undertook to answer him, is altogether silent as to the procession of the Spirit through or from the Son, while the *Ecthesis*, which bears his name, expressly denies it. But Theodore's teaching is more profoundly heretical than that which he opposed, and his 'impious' writings were accordingly anathematized by the Fifth Œcumenical Council.

Nestorianism had a more important bearing on the course of orthodox theology. The peculiar and perverse manner in which Nestorius represented the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Sacred Humanity, in which he was partially supported by Theodoret, led his great antagonist, S. Cyril, to draw out with elaborate fulness and precision the true doctrine on the entire subject. He is, as Dr. Pusey says, 'a library in himself.'

'(1) He saw that if the Son is True God, the Spirit of God must be His very own : οὐκ ὀθνεῖον . . . ἄλλα τὸ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἴδιον Πνεῦμα. (2) Next, this relation of the Spirit to Christ involves an immanence in the Son, and a dependence upon the Person of the Son, with which the procession from the Father does not interfere. Thus, in the commentary on S. Luke xi. 20, we read, ὥσπερ ὁ δάκτυλος ἀπήρτηται τῆς χειρὸς, οὐκ ἀλλότριος ὢν αὐτῆς ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ φυσικῶς· οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον τῷ τῆς ὁμοουσιότητος λόγῳ συνῆπται πρὸς ἑνωσιν τῷ Υἱῷ, κἂν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύηται. (3) Further, from the essential relation of the Son to the Father and of the Spirit to Both, it follows that the Spirit in proceeding from the Father, goes forth (a) through, (b) from, and (c) out of the Son.' <sup>1</sup>

Mr. Swete proceeds to illustrate these points in detail from the writings of Cyril, showing clearly that he uses 'from' and 'through the Son' interchangeably to denote the essential derivation of the Spirit from the Son, as being One in Essence with the Father.<sup>2</sup> And, though he does not use the word *ἐκπόρευσις*, he makes it perfectly clear, as Dr. Pusey points out, that the Temporal Mission of the Spirit from the Father and the Son is one and the same, because it depends on the Eternal Procession, and He is eternally by nature the Spirit of Both. And thus, in Mr. Swete's words, 'following the tradition of his own Church, and the guidance of the earlier Greek theologians, S. Cyril reached substantially the same result' as S. Augustine had reached in the West, 'and his teaching received at least the tacit assent of contemporary Eastern Catholics.' It received, in fact, something more, for his third letter to Nestorius, with an explanation containing the doctrine of the Double Procession, was publicly read out at the Council of Ephesus. Meanwhile Theodoret's reply to S. Cyril, which supplies the solitary and somewhat doubtful example in any Greek father of an explicit denial of procession through or from the Son, was

<sup>1</sup> Swete, p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> Thus, e.g. in the *De Adorat.* : εἴπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸν Υἱοῦ τὸ οὐσιώδως ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἵγουν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ προχέομενον Πνεῦμα.

condemned by the Fifth Œcumenical Council.<sup>1</sup> And Theodoret had been a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

This agreement of East and West in the doctrine is further illustrated in the theology of the Syrian Church, as represented by such writers as Severian, Bishop of Gabala, Aphraates, and S. Ephraim of Edessa, in the fourth century; S. James of Sarug, S. Isaac of Seleucia, and S. Maruthas of Tagrit, in the fifth. S. Isaac and S. Maruthas presided in 410 at the Council of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, the second canon of which is entitled 'the Creed laid down by the Bishops of Persia,' and contains the following clause: 'We confess the living Holy Spirit, the living Paraclete, who is from the Father and the Son, in One Trinity, in One Essence, in One Will, in accordance with the creed of the 318 Bishops in the city of Nice.'<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey adds, justly enough, that the Double Procession must have been held by the orthodox Syrians, since both Nestorians and Eutychians took it with them from the Church, though they gradually lost it afterwards, and while heretics lose the faith they take with them in their separation they never gain any which they had not before. This is the first recorded introduction of the *Filioque* into a formal Creed based on the Nicene, but not identical with it, but it did not challenge general attention and it provoked no controversy. Very different was the ultimate result of a similar procedure in the West, to which we must now return.

II. Hitherto, as we have seen, there was no dispute about the doctrine of the Procession between East and West, and the same truth was confessed by both alike. The innocent origin of a breach which has not yet been healed must be sought in the ecclesiastical history of Spain. It is not wonderful that the Spanish Church, between Arianism on the one hand and the Priscillianists on the other, should have been early forced, as Mr. Swete puts it, into a controversial and dogmatic attitude unique in the West. It would indeed be a curious subject of inquiry—which cannot, however, be pursued here—how far the fierce orthodoxy which at a later date produced the Inquisition may be traced to a similar

<sup>1</sup> Neander (iv. 90) thinks it clear that Theodoret only intended, in the passage quoted by Mr. Swete, to deny the heretical notion of the *creation* of the Spirit by the Son; and the words are certainly open to that interpretation, which is rather favoured than otherwise by the extreme vehemence of his language. Cf. also Le Quien, *Diss. Damasc.* p. ii. sq.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey refutes conclusively and at length the objections which have been raised by Hefele and others to the historical reality of this Synod and its acts. Mr. Swete, who refers briefly to the Council and quotes the Creed, does not apparently think them worth noticing.

cause. About the middle of the fourth century was held, by the advice of S. Leo, the second Council of Toledo, to condemn the Priscillianist heresy, and there probably was promulgated the confession of faith which is appended to the acts of the first Council held in 400. It contains the clause: 'Est ergo ingenitus Pater, genitus Filius, non genitus Paraclitus, sed *a Patre Filioque procedens*.' But the circumstance attracted no special notice at the time. It was more than a century later that the famous third Council of Toledo met in 589, when the Visigoths of Spain, with King Recared at their head, renounced Arianism in a body, and submitted to the Catholic Church. At this Synod an anathema was passed on all who did not believe the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son; and the Constantinopolitan Creed was recited with the clause 'Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et Vivificantem, *ex Patre et Filio procedentem*.' It was expressly declared in the second canon to be 'secundum usum Ecclesiarum Orientalium Concilii Constantinopolitani.' That there was no idea of making any innovation is abundantly evident. The addition may have crept in unconsciously, as Mr. Swete suggests, during the period of the Arian persecutions, originating as a gloss on the *ex Patre*, known to be in harmony with Catholic belief; or it may have been adopted, as Dr. Pusey supposes, from the earlier Council against the Priscillianists, or from the Athanasian Creed. At all events, it is morally certain that, whoever inserted the clause, must have thought it had dropped accidentally out of the Latin copies of the Nicene Creed, and that the Bishops of the Third Council of Toledo had no suspicion of its not being an integral part of that Creed. Nor was the mistake discovered till two centuries afterwards. The insertion derived a practical and permanent effect from the fact that the liturgical use of the Creed at Mass was also enjoined by this same Council, for the express purpose of imprinting the orthodox faith on the popular mind; and hence the multiplication of copies, and general familiarity with its language, made subsequent variation impossible.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the *Filioque* was introduced into certain collects of the Mozarabic Breviary, and the Creed with the inserted

<sup>1</sup> The public recitation of the Creed in the Liturgy had been introduced about a century earlier, of course without the disputed clause, in the East. Mr. Swete mentions a custom peculiar to the Mozarabic rite, of reciting the Creed between the consecration and the communion of the clergy and people, while the priest held the Body of the Lord in his hands; and this may have tended to impress a reverence for the *ipsisima verba* still more strongly on their minds.

clause was solemnly reasserted at eleven Councils of Toledo, from the fifth to the fifteenth, during the seventh century. Henceforth, of course, the dogmatic belief of the Spanish, if not of the Western Church generally, was indelibly fixed, and excision of the *Filioque* from the Creed would have appeared nothing short of an abandonment of the faith.

It should be added that the Canon which enjoins the public recitation of the Creed calls it 'the symbol of faith of the Council of Constantinople,' and directs it to be recited 'according to the form of the Eastern Church.' And, as though further to disclaim by anticipation any idea of introducing new articles of faith, they embodied in their canons the famous Ephesine decree already mentioned, which has been so perversely alleged by controversialists on the Eastern side, as though making any such addition as the *Filioque* unlawful. The Bishops at Toledo were evidently quite unaware that they were making any addition to the existing Creed. But there is nothing in the decree of Ephesus to prohibit such additions, still less to prohibit new definitions of faith, when enacted under proper authority and for sufficient cause. To do so would have been to condemn the Council of Constantinople, which had already added several fresh clauses to the Nicene Creed, for it is to the Nicene Creed alone in its original form that the decree refers; and if we are to interpret the decree as the Eutychian and other heretics interpreted it in their own interest, as prohibiting fresh definitions altogether, it would have tied the hands of the Church for all future time in meeting the inroads of any later heresy that might arise. Moreover, it was precisely on this misconstruction of the decree that the heretical *Latrocinium* based its deposition of Flavian, which was reversed and condemned by the Council of Chalcedon. What is really forbidden by the decree is (a) the putting together of any Creed (*πίστιν*) at variance with (*ἐτέραν παρὰ*) the Nicene;<sup>1</sup> (β) by private individuals; and (γ) imposing it on converts from Heathenism, Judaism, or heresy.

'It is obvious, from the history itself, that the prohibition is to individual arbitrary acts. It is, that "no one shall be allowed," and the Council annexes an individual penalty to the transgressors of their decree, degradation or excommunication. It is almost superfluous to say, that it was the substitution of a heretical Creed, which was proscribed. There is not an indication that the Council thought that they could fetter the free action of the Church, or meant to do

<sup>1</sup> *πίστις* is used in the Canon of Chalcedon as synonymous with *σύμβολον*, and it evidently bears the same meaning in the earlier canon of Ephesus, referring in both cases to the Nicene Creed.

so. Even with these limitations, all which is forbidden is, to substitute for the Nicene any such different Creed in receiving Jews, heathen, or heretics into the Church. It obviously could not mean to prohibit *true* additions to the Creed of Nice. For the only Creed, which the Council of Ephesus received, was the actual Creed of Nice, which they rehearsed at the beginning of this session. On that other construction they would have condemned the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople, whose Creed they did not themselves receive. For these *did* add to the Nicene Creed, and require subscription to the Creed so augmented.<sup>1</sup>

‘It is strange that an interpretation of the Canon of the 1st Council of Ephesus, which was abused by the Robber-Council to the deposition of S. Flavian, and for which deposition the heads of that Robber-Council were themselves pronounced liable to the same penalty, should still be held valid. The Robber-Council decided in the interests of its President, Dioscorus, and his heresy. But the heresy was kept out of sight. The Robber-Council put forward simply the Canon of Ephesus, with the interpretation, that it forbade all additions beyond the very words of the Creed; it condemned Flavian on this ground only, and deposed him in conformity with the Canon so interpreted. If their interpretation of the Canon was right, the deposition was right. But those of the Robber-Council, who were present at the Council of Chalcedon, confessed that they had been wrong; the judges and senate at that Council pronounced the chiefs of them “subject to the same penalty from the Synod;” the Council approved of that decision.’<sup>2</sup>

In this sense the decree was explained by S. Cyril, who subscribed, and probably himself framed it, as president of the Council; and in this sense it was understood by the Council of Chalcedon, which renewed it, and yet included in the Creed, thus guarded from unauthorised innovations, the supplementary clauses of the Constantinopolitan Creed,<sup>3</sup> as well as the explanatory definitions of Ephesus and its own, besides condemning the acts of the *Latrocinium*. Whatever may be thought of the insertion of the *Filioque*, or even of the doctrine it contains, it is to be hoped that henceforth no controversialist with a character to lose will follow the example of Eutyches and Dioscorus at the *Latrocinium*, and Mark of

<sup>1</sup> Pusey's *Letter*, pp. 77, 78.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 88.

<sup>3</sup> Hefele says that ‘the more explicit doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost was clearly added in contradiction to the Macedonian or Pneumatomachian errors;’ while the words ‘whose kingdom shall have no end,’ also added to the Nicene Creed at Constantinople, ‘were directed against Marcellus of Ancyra.’ *Hist. of Councils*, vol. ii. p. 350. But inasmuch as the Pneumatomachians held that ‘the Holy Spirit is a creation of the Son, as the Son is a creation of the Unbegotten’ (*ib.* p. 223), the addition of either ‘from’ or ‘through the Son’ would *at that time* have suggested an heretical sense.



Ephesus at Florence, by importing into the discussion a canon which has not really the remotest bearing on the subject.

The original objection of the Easterns, however, was not to the addition to the Creed—which had not then become known to them—but to the doctrine itself, which their own earlier Fathers had so unequivocally taught; and it arose out of a controversy on quite a different subject, in which they were entirely in the wrong. The Greek writers of the sixth century do not generally say much about the Procession doctrine; but there is, on the whole, as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Swete are agreed, ‘a retreat from S. Cyril’s position,’ though no explicit denial of it. But when, in the next century, the Monothelite heresy was condemned by the Lateran Council of 649 under Martin I., ‘the Monothelite East,’ to use Mr. Swete’s expression, ‘smarting under the Roman anathema,’ seized on what they now chose to treat as a departure from the ancient faith, as ‘a not unwelcome opportunity of revenge.’ It furnished, as Dr. Pusey words it, ‘a pretext for those *who wished to pick a quarrel with the West.*’ For the West, after the temporary lapse of the Roman See in the person of Honorius, had, throughout the pending controversy, been maintaining the orthodox faith against them. And they accompanied their denial, now for the first time put forward, of the Latin doctrine of the Procession, ‘with the blasphemy of alleging it to be an error, that the Lord, as Man, was free from original sin.’<sup>1</sup> We can appeal here to the testimony of their own great Father and Confessor, S. Maximus, who expressly affirms the orthodoxy of the Western doctrine, and its conformity with the teaching of S. Cyril, and calls the objections raised against it ‘subterfuges’ (*ὑποκλοπὰς*).<sup>2</sup> For the time, however, the misunderstanding passed away, with the final condemnation of the Monothelite heresy at the Sixth Ecumenical Council, or rather, to adopt Mr. Swete’s language, ‘was suspended till the next outburst of hostilities between Eastern and Western Christendom’ in a fresh controversy in the eighth century, where again the Easterns were in the wrong.

And here, in connexion with the Sixth Council, is the place to notice a significant episode in the history of the doctrine of peculiar interest to Englishmen. The primatial see of Canterbury was at that time occupied by an Eastern, Theodore of Tarsus; and Pope Agatho—who naturally felt

<sup>1</sup> Pusey’s *Letter*, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> Both Martin I. and Maximus were rewarded by the Emperor Constans for their inflexible fidelity in resisting the Monothelite heresy with a cruel and lingering martyrdom.

some anxiety as to whether he might have carried with him to his new home any taint of the Monothelite heresy, then so prevalent in the East—sent John, precentor of St. Peter's, to examine and report on the state of belief in the English Church. In consequence apparently of this, the Archbishop summoned a provincial synod at Hatfield, September 17, 680, within two months of the opening of the Third Council of Constantinople, which was postponed till his arrival, so great was the respect felt for him in the East. At this Hatfield synod a profession of faith was drawn up, which, after reciting its adhesion to the five previous General Councils, and the Lateran Synod of 649, proceeds to define the orthodox belief in a formula including the words '*Et Spiritum Sanctum procedentem ex Patre et Filio inenarrabiliter, sicut predicaverunt hi quos memoravimus supra.*' And this definition is rendered the more remarkable by two circumstances mentioned by Mr. Swete. The acts of the Lateran Synod, of which Pope Agatho had sent a copy to Theodore, contained the original text of the Nicene Creed, which, therefore, the assembled Bishops cannot have supposed they were contradicting by the insertion of *et Filio* in their own 'exposition of the Catholic faith.' And in the next place Bede calls special attention to the fact that all the Suffragans of Canterbury, without exception, subscribed this profession of faith. There can, indeed, be little doubt that the doctrine of the Double Procession had, as Mr. Swete suggests, been brought into England by S. Augustine with Christianity itself, and this may help to account for the peculiar 'tenacity with which the English Church has ever clung to the *Filioque*,' of which he gives several curious and striking illustrations.<sup>1</sup>

There is evidence in the Gallican Liturgy and the works of S. Gregory of Tours, that the doctrine of the *Filioque* was received in Gaul in the sixth century, though the words had not yet found their way into the Creed. But the first synodical discussion of the doctrine, as being matter of dispute between East and West, was at a synod held at Gentilly, near Paris, in 767, the acts of which are not extant. We find, however, from the subsequent statements of Eginhard, Ado,

<sup>1</sup> Thus, *e.g.* every English Bishop at his consecration, and the dying, when prepared for receiving the last sacraments, were expressly required to profess their belief in this as one of the essentials of the Catholic faith. It is worth noting that this national tendency to give prominence to the dogma was rather promoted than checked by the English Reformation, when (1) the simple '*Spiritus Sancte Deus*' of the Latin Litany was expanded into '*O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son;*' and (2) the doctrine was formally reasserted in the fifth of the Thirty nine Articles.

and Regino, that the dispute was connected with the controversy about the religious use of images, which had been condemned by the schismatical Council held at Constantinople in 754, under Constantine V. (Copronymus), and claiming Œcumenical authority. Here again the quarrel was revived by the Easterns, and originated in a controversy bearing, though not so directly as the Monothelite, on the doctrine of the Incarnation, in which they were clearly in the wrong. Even so strong a Protestant as the late Dr. Arnold had the sagacity to discern and the candour to acknowledge, what S. John of Damascus had urged a thousand years before, that the prohibition of sacred images (like the crucifix, *c.g.*) in the Old Testament was *ipso facto* annulled by the Incarnation, and it is significant that the first iconoclasts were the Phantasiasts.<sup>1</sup> The discussion at Gentilly, as far as can be gathered from Ado, whose account is the fullest, turned simply on the doctrine of the Procession, and had nothing to do with the form of the Creed. S. John of Damascus, the last theologian—we can hardly, with Dr. Neale, go so far as to call him ‘the S. Thomas,’—of the Eastern Church, who flourished during this same century, was apparently, as Dr. Pusey observes, unacquainted with the earlier Greek Fathers, whose language he unreservedly rejects; he certainly knew nothing of the Latin Fathers, though we may believe that he shared their faith, and meant to express it by the formula ‘through the Son,’ which he uses in several passages, some of which are cited in the third Bonn article, but not those which refer most unequivocally to the Eternal Procession as distinct from the Temporal Mission of the Holy Spirit. To that point we shall have to return presently.

The year after the Synod of Gentilly, Charlemagne ascended the throne, and it was in his reign that the controversy came to a crisis. In 787 the Seventh Œcumenical Council assembled at Nicæa, which condemned the Iconoclasts and sanctioned the formula ‘through the Son,’ but did not take cognisance in any way of the Western addition to the Creed. In 794 met the Western Synod of Frankfort, in order to discuss the Adoptionist heresy and Iconoclasm, on which last point it blundered;<sup>2</sup> but into these matters we need not follow it here. To the Canons of Frankfort are appended

<sup>1</sup> John of Damascus, whose treatment of the subject is eminently lofty and spiritual, as Neander points out, insisted on the Judaizing and Manichean tendencies of Iconoclasm.

<sup>2</sup> Neander (*Church Hist.* v. 335) points out that the Bishops at Frankfort misrepresented the decree of the Second Nicene Council about images.

four important documents, viz. a Synodical Epistle addressed to the Spanish Bishops from the Bishops of Gaul and Germany; another from Pope Adrian; a letter of Charlemagne; and a treatise of the Italian Bishops against Elipandus (the Adoptionist) composed by Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileia. In the three first of these documents the *Filioque* is expressly laid down as part of the Catholic faith; but the subject was not discussed at Frankfort. Two years later the insertion of the words in the Creed was for the first time openly defended before a Synod, which assembled at Friuli under the presidency of Paulinus. He argued that as the Council of Constantinople had, for sufficient reasons, added to the original Nicene Creed the 'supplementary exposition' which follows 'et in Spiritum Sanctum,' for the fuller elucidation of the faith, so, when the heretical whisper began to be heard that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *alone*, the *Filioque*—which is really involved in the Nicene *ὁμοούσιος*—was inserted also with good reason and without any change of faith, both forms of the Creed being equally orthodox.<sup>1</sup> By this time the insertion had become known in the East, where it provoked angry reclamations; and in 809 Charlemagne assembled a large Synod at Aix-la-Chapelle to discuss the matter.<sup>2</sup> From this Synod deputies were sent to confer with the Pope, Leo III., who declared himself entirely agreed with them in denouncing as heresy the wilful rejection of the doctrine, but no less inexorably opposed to the insertion of the *Filioque* in the Creed, which had been framed by a Council 'illumined both with human and Divine knowledge,' to which he would not presume to equal himself; and he added that there were other dogmas equally essential not specified in the Creed. The deputies replied with much force that the unlearned multitude had gained their knowledge of this truth from hearing the Creed sung in the Mass, and that to expunge the words with which they were so familiar would seriously endanger their faith. Leo admitted this, and suggested that the singing of the Creed—which had never been the practice at Rome—should be gradually discontinued, and then the alteration to the

<sup>1</sup> 'Si ergo inseparabiliter et substantialiter est Pater in Filio et Filius in Patre, quo pacto credi potest ut consubstantialis Patri Filioque Spiritus Sanctus non a Patre Filioque essentialiter et inseparabiliter semper procedat?'

<sup>2</sup> The immediate cause of this assemblage was a dispute about the use of the *Filioque* between some Greek and Latin monks at Jerusalem, the latter of whom appealed to the Pope, and quoted in their own defence the chanting of the *Filioque* in the Emperor Charlemagne's chapel, as well as the Athanasian Creed. This appeal Leo III. forwarded to Charlemagne.

older form could be made without attracting general notice. The custom, however, as we have seen, was endeared to the faithful in Spain and Gaul by long usage, and the Pope's advice was naturally not followed. It was not till two centuries later that the chanting of the Creed in the Mass was introduced at Rome by Benedict VIII., at the urgent entreaty of the German Emperor, S. Henry II. Meanwhile Leo III. caused two silver shields, on which the original text of the Creed had been engraved in Greek and Latin, to be hung up in the Confession of St. Peter's. In what Pontificate the insertion of the *Filioque* was first recognised at Rome is still unknown, if, indeed, it ever received formal sanction before the Second Council of Lyons in 1274.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Neale attributes it to Nicholas I., but of this there is no shadow of evidence; and Photius, who was sufficiently unscrupulous in his controversial statements, though he once hinted at such a charge, in several other places expressly admits the contrary to be the fact.

But the tact and moderation of Leo III., as Mr. Swete observes, did not long avail to preserve the peace of Christendom. Within fifty years of his death the controversy was revived in the East; and here, again, the main contention was not against the formula, but the doctrine, and it was again introduced as an after-thought to embitter a quarrel which had originated on wholly different grounds. We cannot enter here on the details of the long struggle between Ignatius and Photius, a clear and impartial account of which will be found in Neander's *Church History*. Suffice it to say that Rome was unquestionably in the right in taking the side of Ignatius against his opponent, a man of great learning and ability but of 'boundless ambition,' to use Milman's words, and utterly unscrupulous as to the means of gratifying it, and a mere catspaw in the hands of the infamous Bardas, who intruded him—while yet a layman—into the Patriarchal See of which Ignatius held canonical possession.<sup>2</sup> It was not till Photius, being disappointed in his attempt to gain the support of Nicholas I., which he had supplicated in terms of abject flattery, had resolved to take revenge by affecting to

<sup>1</sup> It is generally assumed that it was chanted at Rome, where the practice was introduced, in the form universally received throughout the West; and this was probably the case, but there is no direct evidence of it.

<sup>2</sup> It is true that Nicholas I. appealed in support of his supreme authority, in perfectly good faith, to the Isidorian decretals, but that has no bearing on the merits of the controversy itself, wherein, as Neander justly says, 'he was solicitous only for the triumph of right; and to secure this was ever ready to employ the power, which he was convinced that he had received from God.'—*Church Hist.* iv. 305.

excommunicate and depose him, that he issued an encyclical to the Eastern Bishops, in which he accused the Roman Church of teaching erroneous doctrines to the Bulgarian converts in regard to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, the celibacy of the priesthood, and the proper seasons of fasting. And thus, as Neander expresses it, 'the quarrel was turned from a personal one into a controversy between the two Churches.' And to promote this end Photius denounced, not the interpolation, but the doctrine of the *Filioque*, as 'impious and diabolical.'

The fourth and last outbreak of the controversy, which immediately preceded the final breach between East and West, was due to what Neander calls the 'passionate and bigoted zeal' of the Patriarch Michael Cerularius (1043-58), who would not tolerate the use of the Latin rite in certain churches and monasteries at Constantinople. But he put forward as the head and front of their offending, not the *Filioque*, but the heretical use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, in which he chose to detect a Judaizing spirit—whence the Latins were nicknamed 'Azymites' in the East—and he declared this to be the only point in which they erred, and that there was no difference of faith on the Trinity. His attack was answered in an able and temperate treatise by Cardinal Humbert. It was not till after the mission of Papal legates to Constantinople had failed to restore peace—mainly, it would seem, through his own violence and impracticability of temper<sup>1</sup>—that Cerularius put out a fresh and more sweeping indictment against the Roman Church, including all sorts of charges, true and false; among which, *e.g.* is included the alleged refusal of the Latins to honour images and relics. And here, for the first time, reappears the old accusation about the Latin doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, which was taken up by Peter of Antioch and Theophylact, who, however, dwelt more on the difference of doctrine than on the form of the Creed. Here again, as Dr. Pusey says, it was clearly but an after-thought in the progress of the schism.<sup>2</sup>

We have seen then, that, down to the middle of the seventh century, there was no dispute between East and West on the doctrine of the Double Procession, which had been maintained, both in the forms of 'from the Son' and 'through

\* <sup>1</sup> This is evidently Neander's opinion.—*Church Hist.* pp. 335, 336. There were, of course, faults on both sides.

<sup>2</sup> Milman, speaking of this as 'the controversy which prolonged for centuries the schism between the Greek and the Latin Churches,' does not even mention the Procession doctrine, but dwells only on the charges of Cerularius about the use of unleavened bread and clerical celibacy.—*Lat. Christ.* iii. 404.

the Son,' by the leading Fathers on either side, though the Greeks, during the sixth century, had become gradually oblivious of the teaching of their own earlier theologians. We have seen further that between the middle of the seventh century and the formal separation in the middle of the eleventh, the controversy broke out four times, originating in each case with the Easterns, and in each case growing out of a previous quarrel on some entirely different question where they were in the wrong. It was first introduced when they were smarting under the Roman condemnation of the Monothelite heresy; it was secondly renewed in connexion with Iconoclasm; it was thirdly taken up by Photius, in order to make capital out of it in his personal quarrel with the legitimate occupant of the Patriarchal See which he had usurped; and it was, lastly, put forward, amidst a medley of heterogeneous and merely trivial accusations, by Michael Cerularius, as an after-thought, to justify the schism which he had already precipitated on grounds independent of it. We may add that in the two former controversies the *doctrine* of the Procession was the sole question at issue, without any reference to the additional clause in the Creed, while in the two latter the principal matter in dispute is still the doctrine, and a very subordinate interest attaches to its insertion in the Creed. That the doctrine itself is, by consent of Greek and Latin Fathers alike, involved in the revealed doctrine of the Holy Trinity, being necessarily implied in the Procession from the Father coupled with the Nicene *ὁμοούσιος*, and that a deliberate denial of it logically involves Tritheism, must by this time have become evident to our readers, and will become more evident if they examine for themselves the authorities cited in the volumes under review. As to the insertion of the formula in the Western Creed we cannot do better than sum up the facts of the case in the weighty words of Dr. Pusey:—

‘The Greek Church, until the Council of Chalcedon, was in the same condition relatively to the West, as the Westerns are now to the East. The Council of Constantinople became a General Council, because its Creed was, after 71 years, accepted by the whole Church. The Council was not acknowledged by the Council of Ephesus, as neither did the Council of Ephesus receive its Creed. It was received on the ground of its sound exposition of the faith, which the Council of Chalcedon accepted for the whole Church: that faith was not accepted upon *its* authority.

‘The subsequent reception of the Creed of Constantinople by the Latins does not alter the original fact, that that Creed was first framed, upon the model of the Nicene Creed, by the Greeks for themselves, to meet heresies, which had sprung up among them. The case was

urgent. Perhaps, in the then state of disharmony between the Churches of Antioch and Rome, it was impossible to wait for the Latins, or for the Greek Emperor to invite the Latins. Had this been done, who knows but that the Creed of Constantinople might have been so worded, that this question as to the *Filioque* might never have arisen? But anyhow the principle was established, that the East might, for its own necessities, modify the existing Creed [the Nicene]. Even then, if those in the West, instead of receiving the *Filioque* under a mistaken idea of dutifulness, had introduced the *Filioque*, on any ground of necessity, for their own use, I do not see how this would have been different from the act of the 150 Fathers of Constantinople A.D. 451. They were not a General Council *then*, but a Greek Council.

'So long then as the Latins did not attempt to force the addition upon the Greeks, I cannot see, why they might not have used, without blame, the same formula in the Nicene Creed, which they already had in the Athanasian. It would have been strange that our Western priests should have had to confess in their early prayers, that "the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son," and then in the Communion service to have confessed, "Who proceedeth from the Father." This difference could not, I think, have continued. The Latins need not have sung the Nicene Creed at all. It was an act of devotion adopted from the Greek Church, and intended to assimilate us to it. When the discrepancy was discovered, there was no remedy, without injury to the faith of the people. Leo III., on this ground, advised, not the omission of the clause, while the use of the Creed remained, but the omission of the Creed altogether. Devotion, however, prevailed. The Nicene Creed held its ground against the advice of the Pope; and while it remained, all thought it to be a necessity, that the clause should remain also.

'Since, however, the clause, which found its way into the Creed, was, in the first instance, admitted, as being supposed to be part of the Constantinopolitan Creed, and, since after it had been rooted for 200 years, it was not uprooted, for fear of uprooting also or perplexing the faith of the people, there was no *fault* either in its first reception or in its subsequent retention.'

Dr. Pusey adds that the Greeks would condemn their own forefathers if they pronounced the *Filioque* to be heretical, since the Church cannot hold communion with an heretical body; 'but from the deposition of Photius, A.D. 886, to at least A.D. 1009, East and West retained their own expression of faith without schism,' *i.e.* each retained its own version of the Nicene Creed; the Latins, as they said at Florence, 'did not consider the *Filioque* an addition but an explanation.' Nor was this ever at bottom the real cause of separation. All historians are agreed that the Crusades, the horrors of the

<sup>1</sup> Pusey's *Letter*, pp. 70-72.



second capture of Constantinople (1204), and the ill-omened establishment of a Latin Empire and Latin Patriarchate there, had hopelessly estranged the Churches. Milman confirms this view, and Fleury says that the Greeks always believed, whether rightly or wrongly, that the occupation of Constantinople was quite as much an object of the Latins as the recovery of the Holy Land.<sup>1</sup> The reunion overtures at the Councils of Lyons and Florence failed, because they were merely political on the side of the Greeks, while, on the other hand, Rome claimed no longer a primacy only—which the East would have allowed—but the ordinary and absolute jurisdiction asserted in the false decretals. ‘The Council of Florence was hopeless from the first, not as to the possibility of harmonizing the two modes of expression as to the Procession of God the Holy Ghost, (which *were* harmonized so happily in its decree,) but because the Emperor miscalculated the temper of his own people,’ who were resolved to have no communion with the West unless all their own demands were complied with, including, as the irreconcilable Mark of Ephesus insisted, the excision of the *Filioque* from the Western Creed. It does not clearly appear whether the Pope insisted on the insertion of the clause in the Eastern form, but there was evidently a disposition in other matters to ask too much.<sup>2</sup> And this failure of the last attempt at reunion is the more deeply to be deplored, since, as Mr. Gladstone has lately reminded us, ‘had it not been for the religious divisions of East and West, the Turks never could have established their dominion in Europe;’<sup>3</sup> and, we may add, it is only through the continued operation of the unhappy divisions of Christendom that they are able to retain it.

III. The greater part of our task is now accomplished,

<sup>1</sup> Even here, however, the fault was not all on one side. The horrors of the second taking and sack of Constantinople were provoked, though not excused, by the memory of the yet greater horrors of the treacherous massacre of Latins in the same city a century before (1083), of which Gibbon has given so graphic a description (*Decline and Fall*, vii. 454). And it is only fair to remember, as Dr. Pusey observes, that Innocent III. not only sharply denounced the atrocities of the victorious army, but had condemned the whole scheme beforehand, while his subsequent treatment of the matter was marked, according to the impartial testimony of Gibbon, by ‘blended prudence and dignity.’ Still the establishment of the Latin Empire and Patriarchate, however it be accounted for, and whoever is mainly responsible for it, could not but serve to embitter and perpetuate the schism.

<sup>2</sup> This point is not noticed in the decree of union, which simply defines ‘explicationem verborum illorum *Filioque*, veritatis declarandæ gratiâ, et imminente tunc necessitate, licite et rationabiliter symbolo fuisse appositam,’ but orders nothing as to the future.

<sup>3</sup> *Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1876, p. 6.

but it is necessary, in conclusion, to exhibit the bearing of the results ascertained on the historical and theological character of the Bonn articles of 1875. This is the leading object of Dr. Pusey's book. Mr. Swete, whose aim is professedly historical, goes over, as we have seen, much of the same ground, but he does not directly discuss this question, though his Essay throws much light upon it. He quotes the text of the doctrinal articles in a footnote, but in an incomplete form, for he omits the appended passages from S. John of Damascus, which form an authoritative (and not very satisfactory) gloss upon them, and, in some cases, materially modify the sense. We need hardly premise here our cordial assent to what Dr. Pusey says as to the duty of doing all we can, by way of explanation, to heal the breaches of Christendom, whether in East or West,<sup>1</sup> and as to the supreme importance, both in principle and practice, of a restoration of visible unity. There is indeed scarcely any sacrifice but one that should not be readily made for an object so dear to every earnest Christian heart; so dear, we may add with all reverence, to the Heart of Christ. But we are still obliged to say, according to the old proverb, '*Amica unitas, magis amica veritas.*' As Dr. Liddon himself very justly remarks in his Preface to the English Translation of the *Report*, 'To a serious Christian what God is in Himself must be of much greater importance than any effect of a particular belief about Him upon the political or social fortunes of His creatures.' The proposal to bring these articles under the official notice of the English Convocations led Dr. Pusey to examine the question as one of pressing practical moment; the more so because, as he observes, 'the doctrinal propositions were taken from a writer [S. John of Damascus], who, although he held the same faith with us, formally rejected our language, *whereas there was not a syllable in defence or explanation of that language.*' It will be most convenient, in the first place, to give in full the text of these articles as they stand in the authorised *Report of the Bonn Conference*.

The four preliminary Articles are as follows:—

- '1. We agree in accepting the Œcumenical Creeds and the dogmatic decisions of the ancient undivided Church.
- '2. We agree in admitting that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Symbolum was not made in a canonical manner.
- '3. We adhere on all sides to the form of the doctrine of the

<sup>1</sup> Thus, the late Cardinal Wiseman said in his famous *Letter to Lord Shrewsbury*, of 1841, now out of print: 'We must explain to the utmost;' and he proceeded to argue that in this way the Thirty-nine Articles might be reconciled 'with the decrees of the Tridentine Synod.'

Holy Ghost as it is taught by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

'4. We reject every notion and every mode of expression in which in any way the acceptance of two principles, or *ἀρχαί*, or *αἰρίαι*, in the Trinity would be involved.'<sup>1</sup>

The six doctrinal Articles run thus :—

'1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father (*ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς*) as the Beginning (*ἀρχὴ*), the Cause (*αἰρία*), the Source (*πηγὴ*) of the Godhead. (*De recta sententia n. 1. Contra Manich. n. 4.*)

'2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (*ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*), because in the Godhead there is but one Beginning (*ἀρχὴ*), one Cause (*αἰρία*), through Which all that is in the Godhead is produced. (*De fide orthodox. I. 8* ; *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν.*)

'3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son. (*De fide orthodox. I. 12* ; *τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντορικῇ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς Θεότητος δυνάμει τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη.—Ibidem* ; *Υἱοῦ δὲ Πνεῦμα, οὐκ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον.—C. Manich. n. 5* ; *διὰ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον.—De Hymno Trisag. n. 28* ; *Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ λόγου προίον.* [The following is the subsequent addition made by the Orientals, to enable them to accept the article.] *Hom. in sabb. s. n. 4* : *τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τὸ λατρευόμενον . . . . Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, ὅπερ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κτίσει μέτα διδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν.*)

'4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, Who is the Image of the Father (*De fide orthodox. I. 13* ; *εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱός, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα*), issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son as the power radiating from Him. (*De fide orth. I. 7* ; *τοῦ Πατρὸς προερχομένην καὶ ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ἀναπανομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ οὔσαν ἐκφαντικὴν δυνάμιν.—Ibidem I. 12* ; *Πατὴρ . . . . διὰ Λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ Πνεύματος.*)

'5. The Holy Ghost is the personal production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of the Deity, and utters the word. (*De Hymno Trisag. n. 28* ; *τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐννόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν, Υἱοῦ δὲ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ὡς Πνεῦμα σώματος Θεοῦ, λόγου ἐξαγγελτικόν.*)

'6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is united to the Father through the Son. (*De fide orth. I. 13* ; *μέσον τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ τῷ Πατρὶ συναπτόμενον.*)<sup>2</sup>

The first and third of the preliminary articles offer no matter for criticism. But this cannot be said of the other

<sup>1</sup> Report of Conference held at Bonn, 1875, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> Report of Conference held at Bonn, pp. 103, 104.

two. And, while we are concerned here directly with the articles themselves, not with the debates upon them, it is impossible, in estimating the precise force of the language, where there is any room for ambiguity, to put out of sight the comment supplied in the speeches of those who framed or recommended them. The second preliminary article states, as Dr. Pusey accurately renders the German text, 'that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner' ('*nicht in kirchlich rechtmässiger Weise*'); and this, as he observes, 'cannot mean simply that the acceptance of it could not be required of the Orientals,' since that would be a truism. Moreover, Dr. Döllinger stated that the *Filioque* 'was arbitrarily and unlawfully added to the Creed,' that it was 'an illegal addition,' that 'a fault had been committed,' and that this article was 'an admission of the fault,' and 'rectifies, so far as lies in our power, an old wrong.' Bishop Reinkens added that 'the addition was illegally made, by the command of an Emperor,' which is clearly contrary to fact, and that, by acknowledging the illegality, 'the addition is removed from its place as a dogma;' in other words, as Dr. Pusey puts it, the *Filioque* 'is no longer matter of faith.' We have shown already that there was no 'fault' in the matter, and that this proposition accordingly contains a direct misstatement of fact. But that is not the worst. Dr. Döllinger's language suggested the practical inference which Professor Damalas of Athens was not slow to draw, that 'the necessary preliminaries for further examination and discussion are wanting, if you do not remove the "*Filioque*" from the Creed, in accordance with your admissions;' and he therefore very consistently 'prayed our Lord God' to enlighten them further in the matter. It is due to Dr. Liddon to say that he assures us in his Preface that the admission in this article 'was made, not with an eye to any subsequent concessions, but in deference to what was believed [mistakenly, as now appears] to be historical truth.' And no one will doubt that it was in this sense only he accepted, or would ever have accepted, it himself. But we have quoted enough already, and might quote a great deal more, to show that his disclaimer cannot be held to represent the mind of either the Old Catholics or the Easterns. And he himself allows that some 'American divines hinted—'it would be more accurate to say that all of them who touched on the question, either in 1874 or 1875, openly asserted—'that their Church might effect the change for itself.' And although Dr. Liddon states his conviction that 'to eject the *Filioque* from the Western Creed would entail on the

English Church certain and serious disaster,' other Anglican members of the Conference, such as Dean Howson and Mr. F. Meyrick, spoke in an exactly opposite sense.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Pusey suggests, in place of this misleading and dangerous proposition (second preliminary article) the following amendment:—

'2. "We agree together in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* in the Latin copies of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, having come in under a wrong impression, that it was part of the Creed settled at the Council of Constantinople, and not having itself the authority of any General Council, ought never to have been enforced upon the Greek Church."'<sup>2</sup>

On the fourth preliminary article he observes that its language is 'at best ambiguous,' if it does not involve a distinct repudiation of the *Filioque*. For it was precisely 'the calumny of Photius that' an 'acknowledgment of two principles, or *ἀρχαὶ* or *αἰτίαι*, is contained in' that formula. He would, therefore, substitute for a rejection of 'every proposition,' &c., in which such an acknowledgment '*may be* contained,' a rejection only of every proposition in which it *is* contained; or more simply—

'4. "We deny the supposition of two principles in the Trinity, as contrary to our belief in the Unity of God."'

We come now to the six doctrinal articles, and here Dr. Pusey proposes in the first place to substitute for the prefatory statement about 'accepting the teaching of S. John of Damascus'—which, as we have seen, is defective if not erroneous in form—the simple statement that

'"We accept the following propositions as agreeable to the teaching of the undivided Church."'

To the first article he has, of course, nothing to object. On the second article he observes, what is plain on the face of it, that in its natural and obvious sense it contains a flat denial of the Procession from the Son. It does not state that the Holy Ghost 'goeth not forth out of the Son, *as* a Beginning;' and a formula to this effect, when suggested by Dr. Liddon, was rejected, as considered 'insufficient' to satisfy the Orientals, by Dr. Döllinger and Mr. F. Meyrick. The article

<sup>1</sup> Lord Plunket expressly advocated 'the simple removal of the *Filioque*' from the Creed, on the ground that it is desirable to diminish dogmas rather than to multiply them, while another Irish member of the Conference, Master Brooke, repudiated the doctrine itself as unscriptural.—*Report*, pp. 69, 74.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey's *Letter*, p. 182.

states *absolutely* that 'the Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son, *because* there is in the Godhead but One Beginning,' &c. And this, as Dr. Pusey points out, is as much as to say exactly what Mark of Ephesus insisted upon at Florence, that any statement of Procession 'from the Son' *must* imply that there is more than one ὑπαρξί in the Godhead. He proposes, therefore, the following amendment :

'2. "The Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ) as a distinct Source of Being, because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (ὑπαρξί), one Cause (αἰτία)."

Or, more briefly :

'2. "The Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son as a Beginning or Primary Cause."

The third doctrinal article is the only one which can by any possibility be represented as a concession on the part of the Easterns to the Western doctrine. They neither consented nor were asked to recognise the truth of the Western formula 'from the Son,' however fully it might be explained. The utmost that could be wrung out of them, and that not very easily, was the statement that 'the Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father *through* the Son.' Dr. Liddon devotes several pages of his Preface to arguing, with much ingenuity, that this is a *virtual* concession of the point at issue;<sup>1</sup> and this in spite of the very suspicious circumstance, on which Dr. Pusey insists, that not one of the explanatory citations from S. John of Damascus defines the Procession through the Son to be eternal, as distinct from temporal mission—although many such passages in his writings could have been found—while the last extract, '*subsequently added by the Orientals to enable them to accept the article,*' refers expressly and exclusively to the Temporal Mission. To say the least, therefore, the Greeks are committed by their third article to nothing beyond the Temporal Mission of the Holy Spirit through the Son, which is less than what they have always unequivocally affirmed. It is true, no doubt, as was shown just now, that 'through the Son,' and 'from the Son,' are expressions applied interchangeably by the Fathers, both Latin and Greek, to the Eternal Procession of the Spirit, and that *per Filium* is therefore equivalent, *in their use of it*, to *Filioque*. This is carefully set forth in the Florentine decree of union, where, as Dr.

<sup>1</sup> He admits that, in 1874, they rejected the Western doctrine absolutely, but thinks that by accepting this article in the second Bonn Conference they 'tacitly abandoned that position'—*Preface*, p. xxxii.

Pusey remarks, 'the two modes of expression are so happily harmonized.' But he adds that 'although "through the Son," in the language of the Greek Fathers, expressed the same doctrine, yet it admitted also a meaning compatible with a denial of the faith, as contained in the baptismal formula given us by our Lord.' It is true also, as Dr. Liddon urges, that 'the Mission of the Spirit from the Son is only a temporal manifestation of an antecedent, or rather eternal relationship in the inner Being of God;' or, in other words, the Mission depends on the Procession. But all this only proves that the orthodox doctrine of the Double Procession is a necessary theological inference from the third Bonn article, rightly understood. So, too, the Catholic doctrine of the *ὁμοούσιος* is a necessary inference from language which the Arians, and still more the Semiarians, did not hesitate to use, when rightly understood; but, inasmuch as the very question at issue was whether they did rightly understand it, their professions were held to be insufficient unless they accepted the crucial test of the *ὁμοούσιος*. Now it is notorious that the Easterns have always maintained the Temporal Mission of the Holy Spirit from the Son, when most strenuously denying that Eternal Procession on which, as Dr. Liddon quite correctly insists, it really depends. What is there, then, to show that in this third article, carefully guarded as it is by explanatory citations, of which, as Dr. Pusey points out, 'the only unambiguous one [which they made a *sine qua non* of signing it] relates only to the Temporal Procession,' they meant to acknowledge the Eternal Procession through or from the Son? On the contrary, so far as any indication of this meaning can be gathered from the discussions, it points, unfortunately, entirely the other way. Thus, *e.g.* a synodical letter of the Oriental Patriarchs of the seventeenth century was read out by Dr. Overbeck, without a syllable of protest or dissent from any of his brethren, which states that 'there is a twofold Procession of the Holy Spirit; one natural, eternal, prior to time, *according to which He proceeds from the Father alone*; the other Procession is in time and deputative, according to which He is externally sent forth, derived, proceeds and flows from both the Father and the Son.'<sup>1</sup> And, in strict accord with this exposition of doctrine is the statement, more than once repeated, of Professor Janyschew—who took throughout a very leading part in the debates both in 1874 and 1875—that 'the existence of the Holy Spirit' is to

<sup>1</sup> *Report*, p. 7.

be ascribed to the Father only; but His 'manifestation and working,' or 'mission' (πέμψις), also to the Son. And he actually maintains that the passages in Greek Fathers speaking of Procession from the Son refer to this temporal manifestation only. It is clear, then, unless we are to put a still greater strain on their spoken words than on the text of the articles, that the Orientals distinctly repudiated the orthodox inference whereby Dr. Liddon endeavours to establish the soundness of this third article. The addition of a single word, suggested by Dr. Pusey—to which there could have been no possible objection, if they really intended to accept the article in the only sense consistent with the Western doctrine—would have removed all ambiguity. He simply proposes as an amendment—

“The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father through the Son eternally.”

Dr. Pusey does not criticise in detail the three last doctrinal Articles. But he intimates generally that they are based on an inadequate consideration of the range of teaching, in both Greek and Latin Fathers, on the subject, and evidently thinks them needlessly obscure and verbose. He also takes pains to show, by copious extracts, that there is abundant authority of Greek Fathers for the procession or production of the Holy Spirit 'from the Son' (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ), which is a second time denied in the fifth article. True, the word *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* (*ausgehen*) is not again used in the denial, but that is immaterial to the sense. For we have already found that there is as little traditional as historical or critical ground for the arbitrary distinction between *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* and 'procedere,' by which it has been sought to vindicate the denial in the first Article. Dr. Pusey puts the matter very clearly when he says that 'the Greeks attach to it a meaning which, by the force of the term, it has not . . . *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* in itself only signifies to "proceed out of." It does not in itself signify "to proceed out of as the original Source of Being." Nor have they any authority to blame us for not attaching that meaning to our Lord's word in Holy Scripture, or to our own substitute for it, "to proceed from." It does not lie in the word itself, nor has the Church authoritatively so limited its use.' For these three last articles, therefore, which do not further elucidate the point at issue, but rather stand in need of explanation, he proposes to substitute the simple and unambiguous amendment:

‘4. “The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son



*together, since they are essentially one, but principally from the Father."*

As the articles stand in the *Report* it is obvious that the concessions are all on one side. The Westerns explain their doctrine of the Procession to the very verge of explaining it away, or, rather, in two articles—the second and fifth—they virtually deny it; but no reciprocal pledge is offered, or was apparently asked for, from the Easterns, of their readiness to admit the orthodoxy of the doctrine when it had been explained. On the contrary, the only article which can by any ingenuity be represented as implying this is so framed as to 'admit also of a meaning compatible with a denial of the Faith, as contained in the Baptismal formula,' even assuming it to refer to the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost, while the explanatory citations from S. John of Damascus seem to have been studiously selected with a view of restricting it to His temporal mission. We are not here engaged in discussing the policy or results of the Reunion Conference at Bonn, but the great Catholic verity which forms the subject of the two treatises before us, and are only so far concerned with the Bonn articles as they bear upon it. It is not, therefore, necessary to make any comment on the 'unwise and premature' proposal, as Dr. Pusey calls it, which appears to have immediately prompted his *Letter*, and which he so strongly deprecates, that these articles should be submitted for official sanction to the Convocations of Canterbury and York. But whatever may be thought of the propositions in the abstract, and even though they should be deemed 'patient'—some of them certainly cannot be called 'ambitious'—'of a Catholic interpretation,' it is not surprising that he should consider them wholly inadequate, to say the least, to form the basis of a doctrinal concordat, on this question, between the Eastern and Western Churches.

Nor can we omit to notice, in this connexion, a very startling proposition enunciated in a paper 'debated and approved by the Orientals,' and laid by Professor Ossinin, of St. Petersburg, before the Conference, to the effect that 'the Oriental Church calls itself the Orthodox Church, for the very reason that it considers its whole system of doctrine *closed, and rendered for ever unalterable*, by the decisions of the seven ancient Œcumenical Councils, and by the doctrine of the ancient Fathers in agreement with those Councils.'<sup>1</sup> If

<sup>1</sup> *Report*, p. 2. There must surely be some misprint at p. 92 (p. 83 of the German text), where Dr. Döllinger is made to say that 'the Council of Ephesus pronounced no dogmatic decisions.'

this merely means that no doctrine can be propounded *inconsistent with* the faith thus authenticated, it is little more than a truism. But if it means, as the context and occasion of the announcement conspire to imply, that no doctrine not explicitly avouched by these authorities can ever, under any circumstances, be defined, that is to bring back in an exaggerated form the monstrous principle, so forcibly exposed by Dr. Pusey, which had been engrafted by heretics, for the protection of their errors, on a misconstruction of the decree of Ephesus against additions to the Creed.<sup>1</sup> It would be, as he points out, to invest the early Councils with something *more* than infallibility, 'for it would require a Divine prescience that no error would arise in the Church against which it might be necessary to guard by any fresh definition.' It is just as arbitrary to draw such a line at the Seventh Council as at the First or the Fourth, except on the wildly paradoxical hypothesis that thenceforth the Church neither has had, nor ever will have, any fresh assaults of error to contend with. 'Almighty God, who alone knows the future of his Church, could alone know this' beforehand; and experience proves that it is the reverse of being true as regards the past. As a matter of fact we have found that there is the most explicit patristic testimony to the doctrines under review within the limits of time thus specified, though it was not included in any conciliar decree. But even were this otherwise, it would not follow that its promulgation might not become necessary afterwards to guard the integrity of the original deposit against new forms of misbelief, as Dr. Pusey considers that it has actually, 'in the good Providence of God, been a great preventive against heresy, which would not have been guarded against by the Greek formula "through the Son."' If, then, the statement read out by Professor Ossinin means that since the Seventh Council (A.D. 787) all further definitions are unlawful, and it is also meant, as the context seems to indicate, that in this 'whole system of doctrine closed, and for ever unalterable,' is included the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father *alone*, it follows that no reconciliation between East and West is possible, except on condition of the absolute

<sup>1</sup> The more orthodox objectors to the *Filioque*, like Mark of Ephesus and Bessarion, never dreamt of maintaining that the Church could not impose fresh obligatory definitions, but only that they were not to be inserted in the Creed. This is the view maintained by Mr. Ffoulkes, in *Is the Western Church under Anathema?* But even this view we have seen to be untenable.

surrender, not only of the formula, but the substance of the *Filioque* of the Western Creed.<sup>1</sup>

It should be added, in justice to Dr. Liddon, who manifested throughout an appreciation of the gravity of the doctrinal issues at stake, which we are left to desiderate in the speeches of many other members of the Conference, both English and German, that he distinctly asserted his own conviction 'that the *Filioque* expresses a revealed truth with regard to the Divine Nature which can be deduced by a chain of necessary reasoning from Holy Scripture, and is sufficiently testified by tradition from the earliest times.' And he accordingly maintained that the expulsion of the formula from the Creed, in which it had been for many centuries incorporated throughout the whole West, was out of the question, except with the sanction of an Œcumenical Council. This is in substantial harmony with the deliberate judgment of Dr. Pusey, than whom there is probably no man living who has more zealously laboured, through good report and evil report, in furtherance of the great end of the reunion of Christendom, and who tells us, with a pathetic earnestness, that he is now offering his last contribution to a future he will not live to see. These considerations give additional weight to the solemn avowal, here put on record by the great Nestor of Anglican theology, of his conviction on this point:

'One thing is certain, that we must not, in a desire for a premature union, abandon the expression of our faith for at least 1,200 years. However the faith may be maintained by tradition in the East, but, in fact, is certainly, more or less widely, *not* maintained there,'<sup>2</sup> we,

<sup>1</sup> In point of fact, we have seen that a profession of faith composed by Tarasius, who presided, and approved by all the other Eastern Patriarchs, was formally sanctioned by the Seventh Œcumenical Council, which defines the Procession of the Holy Spirit 'through the Son'—(Swete, p. 206). The Greek Church at this day requires of converts from Judaism two professions of faith besides the Nicene Creed. (See Le Quien, *Diss. Damasc. de Sp. Sanct.*) An elaborate profession required of the Princess Dagmar on her reception into the Russian Church, corresponding in many particulars with the Creed of Pius IV., will be found at pp. 307 sqq. of Romanoff's *Rites and Customs of the Greco-Russian Church*. The Eastern Patriarchs, moreover, put out a long and precise Confession of faith in 1643, to meet the Protestant tendencies of Cyril Lucar, under the title of *Orthodox Confession of Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church*, which was formally sanctioned by the Synod of Bethlehem in 1672. A great part of the Princess Dagmar's profession appears to be taken from it.

<sup>2</sup> Illustrations of this deplorable fact from past history are supplied in a note. It is true, as Mr. Ffoulkes argues (*Is the Western Church under Anathema?* p. 41), that the doctrine is guarded in the Roman Catholic Church by the decrees of Lyons and Florence (as it is guarded in the

by parting with our inherited expression of it, should forfeit the belief itself, and become misbelievers in our God.'

It can hardly be necessary to add any words of our own to what has been so eloquently urged both by Dr Pusey and Dr. Liddon—that what God is in Himself, as the latter puts it, must be of incalculably greater importance than the practical effect of any particular belief about Him on the fortunes of His creatures. For the point at issue here is no question of ecclesiastical policy, however serious, like the dispute about 'the thrones,' which precipitated the original schism, Constantinople desiring to arrogate a pre-eminence over the other Eastern Patriarchates which did not belong to her, and Rome claiming, in virtue of the forged decretals, a supremacy which was not supported by the general tradition of the Church. It is no question of varying discipline, as in the different practice about clerical celibacy, and the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, which helped to widen the breach. It is not even a question about a divinely ordained hierarchy or the mysteries of sacramental grace. It is a question about the revealed nature and attributes of Almighty God Himself. When all disputes are hushed and all doubts for ever solved, and the Church herself, no longer militant, is transfigured with the light of the Uncreated Vision, and musical with the echoes of the *Sanctus* which dies not day nor night before the Throne, her faithful children, seeing no more through a glass darkly, will gaze face to face on the transcendent Reality, dimly but truly reflected in our earthly creeds, and it will be the sight of the Living God.

The third appendix of Dr. Pusey's book contains a terse and lucid summary of facts respecting the origin of the *Filioque* and its introduction into the Western Creed, in correction of some grave historical errors into which Bishop Pearson has fallen. And this will be found the more serviceable for purposes of reference, inasmuch as the authorities cited in the body of the work are not arranged, as in Mr. Swete's book, in chronological order, but according to their relation to different articles of the Bonn Conference. It is well for readers to bear this in mind, as they might otherwise be perplexed by a seeming want of methodical sequence. And here a remark suggests itself which may have a certain practical value, though it has no proper bearing on the merits of the controversy. There cannot be a more ludicrous mistake than to re-Church of England by the Fifth Article), but that does not meet the *practical* force of Dr. Pusey's argument, which has in fact been recognised from the time of Charlemagne.

gard the *Filioque*, as Orientals, and Orientalisers, if the phrase may be allowed, are apt to do, as a Roman and ultramontane innovation. On the contrary, it found its way into the Creed through a spontaneous popular impulse, spreading from one country to another, not only independently of any Papal authority, but against it; and 'it has been shown,' as Dr. Pusey says, 'that the last place in which the innocently enlarged Creed was received was Rome.' Mr. Swete supplies incidentally a striking illustration of this point in exhibiting the peculiar 'tenacity with which the English Church has ever clung to the *Filioque*.' For the mediæval English Church was conspicuously the reverse of ultramontane. Its most eminent prelates—and we include under that category men so unlike one another in many respects as S. Anselm, S. Thomas of Canterbury, S. Edmund, and Grostête—took their own line irrespective of the policy of Rome, and were either coldly supported by the Popes, or brought into direct collision with them; while, on the other hand, the premature ultramontaniam of Bishop Pecock not only excited popular tumults, but exposed him to actual persecution.<sup>1</sup> The two national Churches in communion with Rome, most markedly distinguished for their sturdy—sometimes almost fierce—spirit of independence, were the Gallican and the English. And it is precisely these two which have all along most resolutely adhered to the doctrine of the *Filioque* and its formal definition in the Creed. We might almost apply to the attitude of Rome towards the great body of the faithful in the West, during the controversies on what has been called with paradoxical infelicity a Roman interpolation, the famous comment of S. Hilary on an Arianizing episcopate, '*Sanctiores sunt aures plebis quam corda sacerdotum*.' If ever there was a doctrine authenticated through centuries of persevering enthusiasm, by the *consensus fidelium*, which is one main test of apostolic tradition, it is the doctrine of the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Pecock of Chichester,—whom Foxe, with characteristic mendacity, has manufactured into a Protestant confessor before the Reformation—was in fact a zealous apologist for the doctrine, then recently broached, of the supremacy of Popes over Councils. He was called upon by Archbishop Stafford to explain his teaching, but escaped further censure, for the moment. Under Archbishop Bouchier he was prosecuted for heresy, condemned, deprived of his See, and imprisoned for life; his works were burnt by the public executioner, and he only escaped a similar fate himself by abjuration. The Pope, to whom he appealed, issued three Bulls in his favour, but the Primate refused to receive them. The facts are briefly given in Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. v.

This fact is brought out with equal and unmistakable distinctness in both the works before us. And it is not a little remarkable that two writers so diverse, if not in theological opinion, in their academical training and antecedents and their whole temperament and habits of thought, who approach the question from different points of view and handle it by different methods, should agree so clearly in the results of the inquiry. Meanwhile we may well cherish the hope with which Dr. Pusey concludes his *Letter*, that the forcible testimonials of their own Fathers, which have now been collected, will not be without effect on the judgment of our Eastern brethren ; and that He, in whose Hand alone are the wills and affections of His creatures, will, in His own good time, 'turn the hearts of the children to the fathers,' and once more give us peace.

---

*William Ewart Gladstone.*

ART. VIII.—LIFE OF THE PRINCE CONSORT.

*Life of the Prince Consort.* By THEODORE MARTIN. Vol. II.  
(London, 1876.)

THE production of a Biography in a series of single volumes would not commonly be a safe experiment on the appetite or patience of the public. But, in the present instance, reliance may be placed upon an interest sustained and stimulated by the reason of the case. The whole career of the Prince Consort, and the free exhibition of the life of the Sovereign and the surroundings of the Throne, which it has drawn with it, form a picture which must be interesting, so long as Britons conceive their Monarchy to be a valuable possession ; and must be edifying, so long as they are capable of deriving benefit from the contemplation of virtue thoroughly 'breathed' with activity, guided by intelligence, and uplifted into elevated station as a mark for every eye. Mr. Martin's handiwork is well known to the world. It neither calls for criticism, nor stands in need of commendation by way of advertisement. In producing all that can give interest to his subject, free scope seems to have been judiciously allowed him. In one respect only, so far as we can judge, he has been rather heavily weighted in running his race. Perhaps with a view to grati-