

Variétés

Objektyp: **Group**

Zeitschrift: **Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review**

Band (Jahr): **4 (1896)**

Heft 16

PDF erstellt am: **14.09.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

VARIÉTÉS.

I. — Zur Frage über den Altkatholizismus und seine Beziehungen zu der orthodoxen orientalischen Kirche.

Unter diesem Titel setzt das Organ der Geistlichen Akademie von St. Petersburg, der „Kirchliche Bote“, in Nr. 24, 25 und 27 seine sympathische Beschäftigung mit dem Altkatholizismus fort, im Anschluss an den ersten Artikel, den wir in der letzten Nummer unserer Zeitschrift (S. 563—567) in Übersetzung wiedergegeben haben.

Zunächst weist der Verfasser dieser Artikel darauf hin, dass seine im ersten Artikel ausgesprochenen Gedanken dadurch eine bedeutsame weitere Bestätigung gefunden haben, dass seither das Organ des Patriarchen von Konstantinopel, die *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια*, eine Übersetzung der Bemerkungen von Prof. Michaud über das Rundschreiben des Patriarchen brachte, in welchen der altkatholische Gelehrte erklärt hatte, dass die dogmatischen Grundsätze der Altkatholiken dieselben seien, wie diejenigen, welche der Patriarch vorträgt.¹⁾

Nachdem auch die orthodoxe Kirche des Königreichs Griechenland in ihren gelehrtesten Vertretern der altkatholischen Bewegung von Anfang an warme Sympathie gezeigt hatte, in den letzten Jahren auf dem Kongress von Luzern, und seither dadurch, dass Männer wie der Erzbischof Nikephoros Kalogeras und der Professor Diomedes Kyriakos, der gegenwärtige Rektor der Universität Athen, sich als eifrige Mitarbeiter der „Internationalen theologischen Zeitschrift“ be-

¹⁾ *Michaud*, *Simplees remarques sur l'Encyclique du patriarche Anthimos de Constantinople*; *Revue intern. de Théol.*, No. 14, p. 217—223. *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 1896, No. 7.

thätigten, war es um so befremdlicher, dass nun im vergangenen Jahre ein paar athenische Theologen auf einmal eine überaus leidenschaftliche Polemik gegen den Altkatholizismus begannen, und dass es ihnen eine Zeit lang gelang, dadurch die öffentliche Meinung in Griechenland zu beeinflussen und sogar den jetzt verstorbenen Metropoliten Germanos auf ihre Seite zu bringen. Aber gerade in der masslosen Leidenschaftlichkeit des Angriffs verriet sich dessen Schwäche. Die Freunde des Altkatholizismus unter den griechischen Theologen ihrerseits blieben die Widerlegung der Angriffe nicht schuldig, und besonders der kräftige Artikel, den Prof. Kyriakos in der „Anaplasia“, Nr. 3 vom 20. Januar, erscheinen liess, brachte wieder einen gänzlichen Umschwung in der öffentlichen Meinung hervor. Als beste Orientierung über den ganzen Streit teilt das russische Blatt nun diesen Artikel (den wir unsern Lesern in Nr. 14, S. 321—329 ebenfalls mitgeteilt haben), dem Hauptinhalte nach in russischer Übersetzung mit, da darin einerseits die Argumente der Gegner angeführt und kritisch geprüft werden, und andererseits der Artikel nach der positiven Seite seiner Ausführungen als der beste Zeuge dafür dienen könne, wie die gegenwärtige kirchenhistorische Wissenschaft in Griechenland in der Person ihres bedeutendsten Vertreters den Altkatholizismus betrachtet.

An die Mitteilung des Artikels von Prof. Kyriakos knüpft das russische Blatt (in Nr. 27) die weiteren Bemerkungen an: „Aus dem Angeführten, dünkt uns, wird es hinlänglich klar, wie grundlos die von den zwei athenischen Theologen gegen den Altkatholizismus gerichtete Polemik war. Auf eine falsche Auslegung der 2. These des Luzerner Kongresses gestützt, die nur möglich war durch das ungenügende Verständnis der deutschen Sprache und durch die Nichtbeachtung der klar, offen und oftmals ausgesprochenen Grundprinzipien des Altkatholizismus, bewies diese Polemik nur, zu welcher Verblendung auch angesehene Theologen kommen können, wenn sie die Grundregel aller (wissenschaftlichen) Polemik vergessen, die ruhige und objektive Beschäftigung mit dem Gegenstand, welche die Klarstellung der Wahrheit als alleiniges Ziel haben darf, ohne alle Rücksicht auf Partei-Interessen. Daran fehlte es den athenischen Polemikern, und darum gerieten sie auch in die grösste Ungerechtigkeit nicht nur gegen die Altkatholiken

selbst, sondern auch gegen ihre Freunde unter den orthodoxen Orientalen. Diese Polemik war aber nicht nur höchst ungerecht, sondern auch höchst schädlich, indem sie auf der einen Seite die öffentliche Meinung in Griechenland zu einem Irrtum in Bezug auf den Stand der Frage verleitete, und auf der andern Seite den grimmigsten Feinden des Altkatholizismus und der orientalischen Orthodoxie direkt in die Hand arbeitete, nämlich den Jesuiten und dem Papsttum, die nur davon träumen, wie sie diese ihnen ausserordentlich gefährliche Bewegung unterdrücken könnten, die in der ganzen abendländischen Welt die Erkenntnis der kirchlichen Unwahrheit des Papismus zu erwecken droht. Schädlich war diese Polemik in beiden Beziehungen, besonders aber in der letzteren. Die Altkatholiken, die sich zu denselben Prinzipien bekennen, wie die orthodoxe orientalische Kirche, müssten, selbst wenn man annehmen wollte, dass sie nicht vollkommen von ihrem Geiste durchdrungen seien, dennoch von den orthodoxen Orientalen schon deshalb wertgeschätzt werden, weil sie den Kampf gegen die unwahren kirchlichen Prinzipien des Papismus aufgenommen und seine neu erfundenen Dogmen abgelehnt haben, und sich fest auf die Grundlage der alten ungeteilten Kirche zu stützen begannen. Für den Papismus war dies ein noch gefährlicherer Schlag als der Protestantismus. Der letztere brachte zwar dem Papsttum auch einen grossen Schlag bei, indem er ihm den ganzen Norden Europas und überhaupt die Hälfte der Völker der abendländischen christlichen Welt wegnahm, aber er konnte sein Werk nicht zu Ende bringen und nicht mit dem System des Papismus fertig werden, da er selber von einem Extrem in das andere geriet und darum diejenigen nicht für sich gewinnen konnte, denen die von den Protestanten verworfenen Grundlagen der alten ungeteilten Kirche der sieben ökumenischen Konzilien teuer waren. Der Altkatholizismus hielt sich von diesem Extrem fern, und umgekehrt besteht das ganze Wesen seines Protestes gerade darin, dass er das System des Papismus vom Gesichtspunkte gerade der ungeteilten ökumenischen Kirche widerlegt, von der sich der Papismus direkt abgewendet hat.

„Indem also der Altkatholizismus den Auswuchs des päpstlichen Systems am Körper der abendländischen Kirche verwirft, stellt er eben dadurch diese Kirche auf den ökumenischen

Grundprinzipien wieder her, von denen sie abgewichen war, an denen aber die orthodoxe orientalische Kirche immer unwandelbar festhielt. Dieser Protest gegen die Unwahrheiten des Papismus und seiner Werke, der nicht erhoben wurde im Namen unklarer Prinzipien eines abstrakten Christentums, wie das in der Zeit der Reformation der Fall war, sondern im Namen der klar erkannten, historisch feststehenden, bestimmten Prinzipien der ungeteilten Kirche, ist geeignet, unter günstigen Verhältnissen grosse Sympathie bei denen zu finden, welchen die kirchliche Wahrheit teuer ist, und darum ist im Altkatholizismus die Möglichkeit enthalten, das System des Papismus vollständig zu stürzen, mit Bewahrung der Grundlagen der Kirche selbst. Gerade deshalb rief das Erscheinen des Altkatholizismus furchtbare Aufregung im Vatikan und bei dessen wichtigsten Dienern, den Jesuiten, hervor, welche mit dem ihnen eigenen Scharfsinn gleich die Gefahr erkannten und deshalb Allarm schlugen und alle ihre erprobten Mittel in Gang brachten, Polemik, Verläumdung, Anrufung der weltlichen Gewalt, um auf diese oder jene Weise diese dem päpstlichen System gefährliche Bewegung zu unterdrücken. Und es ist interessant, zu beobachten, wie scharf die Organe der Jesuiten auf alle Bewegungen im Altkatholizismus aufmerken, während sie sich gewöhnlich bemühen, seine Bedeutung auf jede Weise herabzusetzen, nicht anders von ihm sprechen, als von einer «unbedeutenden Sekte», die aus innerer Schwäche dem Erlöschen nahe sei; besonders unbehaglich ist ihnen natürlich die Beobachtung der Fortschritte in den freundschaftlichen Beziehungen der altkatholischen zu der orientalischen Kirche, während jede etwaige Trübung dieser Beziehungen nur ihre Schadenfreude erregen könnte. So können die athenischen Gegner des Altkatholizismus überzeugt sein, dass sie mit ihrer Polemik nur den natürlichen Feinden desselben im päpstlichen Lager eine Freude gemacht haben.“

Sodann wird auch noch auf den eigentümlichen Widerspruch hingewiesen, in den Rhosis mit seiner Polemik gegen den Altkatholizismus mit sich selbst trat, auf den wir nach der „Anaplasie“, die ihn ans Licht gestellt hatte, in Nr. 15, S. 623 f. bereits ebenfalls hingewiesen haben.

„Angesichts aller dieser Sonderbarkeiten in der Polemik des Rhosis und seines Genossen ist es nicht zu verwundern,

dass die Resultate derselben sich als gänzlich unstichhaltig erwiesen haben.“ Dass dieselbe auch allen Einfluss auf die massgebenden Kreise der Kirche des Königreichs Griechenland wieder völlig verloren hat, wird darauf nach dem von Herrn Prof. Kyriakos in der „Hestia“ vom 9. März darüber veröffentlichten Artikel ausgeführt. Die von der griechischen Synode dieses Jahres getroffenen Massregeln in dieser Beziehung, um die von dem verstorbenen Metropoliten Germanos und der Synode des letzten Jahres unter dem Einfluss jener Polemik gemachten Fehler gut zu machen, wurden von der griechischen Presse wie von der öffentlichen Meinung in Griechenland sehr sympathisch begrüsst, und sie machten besonders auch dem in Griechenland manche verwirrenden Irrtum ein Ende, als ob in jenen polemischen Artikeln zweier athenischer Theologen die offizielle Ansicht der Kirche Griechenlands über den Altkatholizismus zum Ausdruck gekommen wäre, während es doch nur rein persönliche, aller weiteren Tragweite entbehrende Meinungsäusserungen von zwei einzelnen Personen waren.

II. — „Der Bote der serbischen Kirche“ über den Altkatholizismus.

Durch die vorzügliche Zeitschrift, die „Revue internationale de Théologie“, ist den Lesern der *Aufruf* des Herrn Bischofs Nik. Ruzitschitsch im „Boten der serbischen Kirche“, Heft IV, 1896, an die ganze orthodoxe Hierarchie, dass sie wärmer und energischer Anteil an der Entscheidung der altkatholischen Frage nehmen sollte, bekannt. Der Herr Verfasser verteidigt die altkatholische Kirche und er fordert die orthodoxe Hierarchie auf, milder zu sein in der Beurteilung der Differenzpunkte, besonders insofern sie nur Äusserlichkeiten des Gottesdienstes und des Ritus betreffen. Jetzt wendet derselbe Herr Verfasser sich im folgenden Heft des „Boten der serbischen Kirche“, als warmer Beschützer der altkatholischen Kirche, besonders an den Kaiser von Russland, als den grossen Beschützer der Orthodoxie und der orientalischen orthodoxen Kirche, und an die Hierarchie der russischen Kirche mit der höflichen Bitte, der Kaiser und die Hierarchie der russischen Kirche mögen den

Bitten und den Wünschen der Altkatholiken grössere Beachtung zuwenden und sie nicht mit kalter und übermässiger Strenge behandeln.

Der interessante Aufruf an den Kaiser von Russland und an die Hierarchie der russischen Kirche lautet in der Hauptsache:

„Die russische orthodoxe Kirche — als die grösste wie nach der Zahl der Anhänger, so auch nach der Zahl der gelehrten Theologen — *hat ein Recht*, am meisten auf alle Bewegungen in der orthodoxen Kirche, welche auf die Förderung oder Schädigung der Orthodoxie gehen, zu achten. Besonders würde es sehr gut gewesen sein, wenn der Kaiser von Russland selbst seine wohlgeneigte und hohe Aufmerksamkeit auf diese brennende Frage der Altkatholiken, welche die Vereinigung mit der orthodoxen Kirche wünschen und suchen, gerichtet hätte.

Der grosse und mächtige Beschützer des orthodoxen Christentums, der Kaiser von Russland, und die hochwürdigsten Hierarchen der russischen Kirche werden wohl einsehen können, dass die Vereinigung der Altkatholiken mit der orthodoxen Kirche eine noch stärkere Bewegung in die russischen Uniaten bringen könnte, so dass sie in den Schoss der russischen orthodoxen Kirche zurückkehrten. Und nicht nur dies, sondern es würde das schöne Beispiel der Altkatholiken allen anderen Sekten in dem russischen Reiche sehr viel nützen, wenn sie dann auch den heilsamen Weg der Altkatholiken gehen würden. Und auf diese Weise würde nach und nach die Zahl der Sekten, welche jetzt einen guten Fortschritt und die Entwicklung ziemlich stören, verkleinert und die Zahl der Rechtgläubigen vermehrt und der Ruhm und die Macht des grossen Russland verstärkt werden.

Unsern besten Dank den schätzenswerten russischen Gelehrten, welche warm und energisch dafür eintreten, den Altkatholiken die Vereinigung mit der heiligen, ersten, apostolischen, orthodoxen Kirche möglich zu machen. Wir können nur noch wünschen, dass sie nicht müde werden in ihrer heiligen Arbeit, und dass die orthodoxe Welt, besonders die Hierarchie der russischen Kirche, stärker und energischer ihnen in dem gottgefälligen und sehr guten Unternehmen helfe, damit endlich diese Frage erledigt würde und die Orthodoxie durch eine

Zahl von guten und frommen Christen noch vermehrt und verstärkt würde.

Wir wagen nicht, der gottgewählten Hierarchie zu viel vorzuschlagen; aber doch giebt es eines, was wir nicht verschweigen dürfen, und es ist dies, dass sie wissen muss, dass die Entscheidung der vorliegenden Frage am meisten von ihr abhängt. Denn heute blickt die ganze orthodoxe Welt bei allen Erscheinungen in der orthodoxen Kirche auf das mächtige orthodoxe Russland und auf den grossen Kaiser und die Kirche von Russland. Und wenn diese schönen und guten Wünsche der Altkatholiken nach der Vereinigung mit der orientalischen orthodoxen Kirche sich nicht erfüllen, dann fällt der grössere Teil der Verantwortung vor Gott auf die Hierarchie der russischen Kirche.“

R. R.

Note de la Direction. Cet appel de M. l'évêque Nicanor Ruzitschitsch nous touche profondément et nous le prions d'en agréer tous nos remerciements. Nous n'avons point à insister auprès du T. S. Synode de Russie, qui connaît suffisamment les intentions toutes chrétiennes de l'Eglise ancienne-catholique. Ce n'est pas seulement à l'Eglise de Russie, mais à l'Eglise universelle tout entière que sera utile l'union de l'Eglise ancienne-catholique et de l'Eglise orthodoxe orientale, union absolument sincère et entièrement désintéressée dans la foi même de l'ancienne Eglise indivisée et dans la libre autonomie de chacune.

III. — Reunion Notes.

1) The *Guardian* of July 22 (p. 1163—1164) contains a noteworthy address of Abbé Portal, the head of the *Revue anglo-romaine*, which he had delivered at a meeting, convoked by Lord Halifax, for the purpose of discussing the recent Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*. We refrain from any comment on the speech, but simply reproduce it. Abbé Portal said:

“He who stands before you is a French priest, and a humble son of St. Vincent of Paul. You are prepared to give him your welcome and sympathy, not because you expect him to identify himself entirely with you in all your sentiments, or to speak to you altogether in the same terms as one of your own communion, but because you know that like you and with you he

earnestly desires to further the great work of the union of the hearts of all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in one visible Church. Yes, I am a humble disciple of St. Vincent of Paul, whose name soars in a region above all human strife and all human divisions, that great apostle of charity both human and divine, who in modern times has done so much to heal so many sorrows and to soothe so many pains, and I like to hope that his children, animated by that same spirit of single-mindedness, humility, and love which it was his object to inculcate among his followers may, by God's blessing, be instrumental in healing the wounds by which the Church, the suffering Bride of Christ, is afflicted. And I am also a priest of the Church of France—that Church so close to your shores which, as Cardinal Vaughan in a letter addressed to a French priest has lately reminded you, has in past days rendered some not unimportant services to your own Church—that Church of England which you love so well. And I am also a priest of the Holy Catholic and Roman Church, which is so dear to her own sons, and I am bound to that Church by all the cords of my inmost being, in regard to which you need no assurances from me that I would rather die than not believe as she believes, and not reject what she condemns. In particular I believe in the divine prerogatives of the Holy See and the successors of St. Peter. Nor could you yourselves for a moment doubt my belief, since were it otherwise I should be unworthy to be associated with you in that noble struggle which above all things demands the most perfect loyalty and truth, the struggle to win back for Christendom the reunion in one visible Church of all its members. If we are unhappily divided in certain ways, we are completely at one in a common resolution. We desire, with that energetic resolution which is stopped by no obstacle, we desire, I say, to bring our unhappy divisions to an end. Gentlemen, the reunion of Christendom is so beautiful a thing, that from the very beginning of our campaign we have been accused of seeking a Utopia which can never exist. This reproach has been addressed to greater people than ourselves. When I had the honour of speaking for the first time to his Holiness about the reunion of the Churches, Leo XIII. said to me: "People have come to me in this very room where we are, and have told me that this reunion at which I am aiming is a Utopia." We are then in good company, the company of the

Pope himself. Further, we are told that we are not only Utopian in our aims, but are also under a complete illusion as to the means by which those aims are to be accomplished, and that we do not see the obstacles which stand in our way. The fact is that those who speak in this way are themselves completely mistaken. When Leo XIII. did me the great honour of admitting me to an audience, he asked me what, in my opinion, were the obstacles to reunion. I replied—‘Holy Father, strictly speaking there are but two obstacles—one, an obstacle having to do with doctrine, the other one relating to practice. The doctrinal obstacle concerns yourself, Holy Father.’ This I said smiling. ‘The practical obstacles are—’ But, gentlemen, it is, perhaps, better not to name them here. Human passion, human feelings, and human rivalries are facts which cannot be ignored, and as to other difficulties which stand in the way they were foreseen, and those who are opposed to us know that we are doing our best to surmount them. Neither let them impute to us aims absurd in themselves and which have never been ours. We have never desired a federal union of separate Churches. Neither have we desired merely an invisible union. We seek for the real, complete and visible union which our Lord willed for His Church; we desire to promote the reunion of Christendom on the basis of one united Church, with its hierarchy, its government, and its faith. In reality these objections all proceed from one source. Those who make them do not believe that corporate reunion is a practical possibility. This is the exact point of divergence. The only solution of the question is in their view by means of individual conversion. I need not enter into the question why this view is adopted, but I can confidently retort upon its holders the imputation of entertaining illusions and aiming at Utopias. If people will face the facts, every one must surely see that England can never be brought back into Christian unity merely by individual conversions. No doubt the number of Catholics in England has largely increased, but to what is that increase chiefly due? To the Irish immigration. Moreover, the individual conversions which have already taken place have not produced the results which were expected from them. The conversion of Cardinal Newman and others, although it has deprived the Church of England of some of her most illustrious children, has not permanently weakened the Church of England. The progress of the great religious

revival within the Church of England is stronger than ever. In presence then of the Church of England, intimately connected as it is with the national life both on its political and on its intellectual and on its social side, our position as Roman Catholics stands thus. The forces of the Catholic Church in England consist chiefly of Irishman—a considerable majority of the clergy are Irish themselves. Is it probable, if we are to limit ourselves to individual conversions, that England will be won back by such influences? No one can doubt the sympathies which have always existed between France and Ireland, and which assuredly are felt most deeply by me; but here you are in presence of a question of race which really presents an insuperable obstacle to your desires. Further, the English Catholics themselves are not uninfluenced by certain tendencies, the result of their isolation and of their persecutions in times past—tendencies which hinder sympathetic relations with the National Church, and so deprive them of that influence on its members which they might otherwise possess. On the other hand, the English Church seems to be growing stronger every day. Her members find in her services and sacraments and in the revival of the religious life the satisfaction of their spiritual wants; the conclusion of all which is that the method of individual conversions is not likely to produce any great effect on the mass of the population. For these reasons and without forming any judgment as to the duties which might be binding upon individuals, corporate reunion would seem to be the method which ought to be preferred when we are considering the action of one Church upon another. And this is not only because it is the only method likely to lead to any large practical results, but also because it is most in harmony with our principles. Our fundamental principle is the principle of authority; moreover, this method of corporate reunion is more in conformity with the principle of authority, because it saves the individual from the torture of doubt, and other risks incurred by a personal investigation of the faith. You say to a soul which by its past, by its education, by the graces it has received is bound by all the cords of its being to this or that Church—you say to such soul, You are in error, and outside the true fold. Who does not see the suffering and doubt which is thus produced? It is not, however, the suffering on which I wish to dwell. Who does not see the danger of such a shaking

of the whole roots of the spiritual life? We hear much of conversions; but we are not told so much of those converts who have gone back to their original faith, or who have lost their faith altogether. One might name instances of men who were first Anglicans, then Catholics, and have finally ended in the most absolute scepticism. Such cases are the consequence of a method of proceeding which may be necessary, but which is often dangerous in itself. And this is the only method which in the opinion of some people is to be adopted for the restoration of unity. All souls are to be subjected to this torment of doubt and deadly disquietude. They have to ask themselves whether the graces they have received are real graces, or the illusions of the devil—whether the Holy Ghost has been acting on the soul or whether the soul has merely been the plaything of its own imagination. And if it must be owned that these distresses have been the necessary lot of Anglicans in the nineteenth century; at least, if it be possible, let the Anglicans of the future be spared such torments. I plead again that it may not be deliberately insisted upon if another course is possible, and that members of the English Church may be spared all this anguish by the adoption of that other and better method, the method of corporate reunion. But is such union possible? According to those who oppose our efforts it is not, and is merely put forward as a lure to prevent individual conversions; but, gentlemen, that is not my opinion. Corporate reunion is possible because it is necessary. Consider the present state of the Christian world. You are confronted by three great religious centres—Russia, England and Rome. In Russia you are in presence of a people which has remained more profoundly Christian than perhaps any other people in Europe. The power of Russia is increasing not only by its conquest in the East, but by the spread of its influence in the West. What England is, you yourselves know well. I need not remind you what power and vitality marks its religion, or how great is the political influence which it exercises on the Continent, in India, and throughout its colonies. Rome, on the other hand, as in other things, so conspicuously in this, appeals to the minds of men by her wonderful organisation and by her spirit of government; but Rome has lost the people of the north, she suffers from the loss of the Teutonic element, while among the Latin races, and even in

France, which is more and more abandoning her traditional position of the defender of Catholic interests outside her own border, and chiefly in the East, the clergy, in spite of their apostolic zeal, their virtue, and their learning, in no way exercise the influence they ought to have on the affairs of the country. England and Russia then are centres of religious influence of the greatest importance, and if, as thoughtful observers are beginning to think is not improbable, the Churches of England and Russia should be brought into a closer relationship than exists at present, it is impossible not to see that such a union cannot be without its effect on the Catholic Church and the Latin races. Union is necessary for us, if in view of the contingencies of such a future combination we are not to find our own action hampered. And union is also necessary for you. Have you nothing to gain in the greater strength such union would give in your relations with the State and in regard to your discipline? Do you not feel the need of having a centre and a Head? Have we nothing to gain by union with you, by being brought into closer contact with your political and intellectual life? Our Lord has, indeed, promised that He will be with His Church to the end, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, but He has not promised her prosperity, and her prosperity or the reverse depends on the exertions of her members. If we are united we are strong, if divided we are weak—weak and incapable of resisting the enemies of religion and society. Union, therefore, is possible, because it is necessary; let us unite, then; let us insist that union shall take place for the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ. And, gentlemen, I say again, such union is possible, and without compromise of principle. It is possible—nay, it is easy, in regard to all sacramental doctrine; for, as Dr Pusey insisted, there are no irreconcilable differences between your formularies and the teaching of the Council of Trent. There remains the serious obstacle of the decrees of the Vatican Council; but, gentlemen, allow me to say neither is that an obstacle which is insurmountable. I will not, on an occasion like the present, enter into elaborate discussion; but I do say, apart from theology, when such men as the Abbé Duchesne and Father Puller think an understanding—an understanding, mark the word, *not a compromise*—might be arrived at, then such an understanding is and must be possible. Nor,

gentlemen, is the Encyclical *Satis cognitum* any fresh obstacle either. To say that it is meant to give a back-handed death-blow to the hopes of those who are endeavouring to promote corporate reunion is to attribute to Leo XIII. something that is not worthy of him. I say that it is no obstacle if it is studied with calmness and patience. The Encyclical lays down the oneness of the Church, and the means appointed by our Lord for preserving the Church in unity. It shows how the government of the Church depends on an Episcopate and a Head, a constitution which enables the Church, always in subordination to the inherent rights of both powers, to centralise or decentralise her forces according to the needs of the times. After stating the prerogatives of Rome, the Pope points out that these are nothing new, not the result of a certain theory of development which would be inadmissible, but what was intrusted by our Lord to St. Peter and to His Apostles. The teaching of the Church to-day is not different from the teaching of the primitive Church from the beginning. The prerogatives of the Pope are of Divine right, Holy Scripture and the consensus of the Early Fathers attest it. Surely the Anglican Church cannot refuse this meeting point to which Leo XIII. invites her? The Encyclical is very beautiful. It gives us the impression we experience when we penetrate into the essence of things. I repeat again—the constitution of the Church, as Leo XIII. points out, is to be found in the powers of the Pope and of the Episcopate, and the rights of both have to be preserved. The constitution is Divine; but there is also the human element. It is Divine power, but Divine power intrusted to men. Hence it is that scandals have arisen, and do arise; but we confess our faults, and in confessing our faults we find the road to unity. Gentlemen, in conclusion, let me end by words of confidence. Those who oppose us, who declare that the idea of corporate reunion is an ideal dream, imagine that we shall be discouraged by their opposition. They are much mistaken. We know indeed that there are obstacles, obstacles many and great, but we did not begin the work because we believed it to be easy of accomplishment, but because we believed it to be God's will; and we shall continue to strive on its behalf for the same, and for no other reason. Who would have thought two years ago that we should have seen the results which are already apparent? In France, two

years ago, we hardly knew you. Lutherans, Calvinists, Protestants of every description, and members of the Church of England, all were thought to be the same, and no distinction was made between them. It is not so now. In every part of France this question of reunion with you excites the keenest interest. You know what you are and have been doing on your side on behalf of the same cause. To me, personally, it has been a source of the keenest and deepest interest to see what I have seen with my own eyes. That Mr Gladstone should have spoken as he has is a fact of the greatest importance and destined to bear much fruit. There is no one who has not been profoundly moved by the greatness of the ideas expressed by Mr Gladstone and the touching humility, in all that regards himself, of him who says them. I would say to you all, Have confidence in Leo XIII. Despite all that has been said, despite all that has been done to hinder the accomplishment of his wishes, Leo XIII. loves England. He said to me himself—and I may surely repeat it to you—“Ah, if I could only see the beginning of what might lead to the reunion of the Church of England with the Catholic Church, with what joy should I sing my *Nunc dimittis*—England in union with Rome would mean the conquest of the world to the faith of Christ.” “England,” as a Cardinal said to me, “has powerful friends at Rome.” When hearts are united the union of heads is not far distant. For the success of all works which relate to God sacrifice is necessary. Who would not be ready to sacrifice himself, to give his life, if need be, to promote the great work of reunion? But God does not ask our life, He is content with less. He asks only our self-devotion. Let us give Him our hearts, our wills, all the powers of our being to further this great work of reunion in the full confidence that He, Who has inspired us to begin the work, will, in His own good time and His own good way, enable, if not us, those who come after us, to bring it to its perfect and successful end.”

2) In the *Illustrated Church News* of July 24 (p. 695), we read: “The Abbé Portal gave a valuable contribution to the reunion controversy in his speech at the meeting convened by Lord Halifax . . . We agree with the Abbé that the obstacles to Christian Reunion are not insurmountable. The unity of the Holy Catholic Church must be brought about, of this we are

convinced; but when or by what means, and in what manner we dare not presume to prophesy. In any case, however, there is much to be learned on all sides, and the more we have of calm and kindly discussion of the question from all points of view, the nearer we must get to a satisfactory and practical issue. In the course of his address the Abbé Portal touched upon a point which we have emphasised again and again, that the Churches of Rome and England are not the only Churches to be considered in the matter of Reunion. He said:—"England and Russia are centres of religious influence of the greatest importance, and if, as thoughtful observers are beginning to think not improbable, the Churches of England and Russia should be brought into a closer relationship than exists at present, it is impossible not to see that such a union cannot be without its effect on the Catholic Church and the Latin races."

3) In the Nr. of July 17 (p. 686): "The recent Encyclical of the Pope has disappointed many hopes. That its tone is courteous, and differs much from former pronouncements from the same quarters, may be readily conceded. We on our side are accustomed also to hold different language to that we used to hold in the days when Englishmen felt that Rome was to be feared. All this is matter for the deepest thankfulness, and justifies the hope which has been so freely expressed that the door is now open to a better understanding between us and our Roman Catholic brethren. At the same time no really clear-sighted person could help seeing beforehand that there could have been no other conclusion to the investigation which has just taken place than that which has been reached. Though doctrinally *semper eadem* is the last motto to which the Roman Church can honestly lay claim, yet it is unquestionably a fitting one for the spirit of the Vatican since the days of the forged Decretals. And the Vatican Council, as was seen by many at the time, has closed the door of negotiation between us and the Pope, it may be for centuries. With Roman Catholics we may come to an understanding. But never with the Pope until he has abated his pretensions to universal sovereignty over the Church. We are too apt to forget that even were we to reunite with him by the admission of his position as Patriarch of the West, the countless millions of orthodox Churchmen in the East, whose numbers,

as well as their political and moral influence, are daily increasing, would still refuse to grant him any position but that of *primus inter pares* among Patriarchs, even if their resentment against his treatment of the Eastern Churches in the past would permit them to go as far as that. Those who know how strong that feeling of resentment continues to be in the East will feel that our recognition of the Pope, instead of promoting, would at present actually retard the reunion which is so much to be desired. And, on the other hand, the Infallibilist party in the Church of Rome is so strong that it is practically impossible for the Pope to do anything to minimise the Vatican decrees, much less to retrace the steps which have been taken. Lord Halifax seems to have hoped that something might be done. But Cardinal Vaughan has taken a far more accurate measure of the situation.

However desirable, therefore, it may be to cultivate friendly relations with individual Roman Catholics—and it is *most* desirable—it is but time wasted to attempt to secure a pronouncement of a favourable kind from the Vatican. But there is another point which is entirely lost sight of by that well-meaning and enthusiastic section of Churchmen who have been pressing for such a pronouncement. This is the fact that the question between us and Rome is not merely one concerning the authority of the Pope. There are broad fundamental differences both of doctrine and principle between us and the Church of Rome. And though that party is most *en évidence* just now in the Church which seeks to ignore those fundamental differences, and to represent the question at issue between us and Rome simply as a question of ecclesiastical order, it will be found that the old Anglicanism, so feebly represented just now in the Church Press, is not dead, but only sleeping, and that any attempt at reconciliation of the Church of England with Rome, until she has entirely reconsidered her whole system, is absolutely futile. To a vast number of us the worship of the Blessed Virgin is not merely a mistake, but a blasphemy. The abuses connected with purgatory and indulgences seem to many of us to strike at the very root of all true conceptions of God. The doctrine of Transubstantiation, as popularly taught, appears to us not only to overthrow the notion of a Sacrament, but to substitute the local for the spiritual presence of God and of His Son Jesus Christ. These are conside-

rations of which we cannot, must not, lose sight. Even D^r Pusey, who can hardly be accused of bitterness against the Church of Rome, was reprimanded by D^r Newman for 'discharging his olive branch as if from a catapult,' because he spoke plainly of the necessity of some reformation in Roman popular teaching on some of these points before any union between ourselves and her could be regarded as possible. Nor is this all. The practical working of the Roman system is such as few English Churchmen would find it possible to endure. The number of new cults constantly being introduced is legion, and each of them is more absurd and superstitious than its predecessor. The practice of making confession compulsory, instead of merely recommending it; the notion that the penitent must confess every sin he or she can remember, instead of those, and those only, which burden the conscience and make the hope of forgiveness impossible, would permanently alienate a vast number of sound English Churchmen and Churchwomen. The scandals connected with the enforced celibacy of the clergy, though carefully concealed, are far graver and more frequent than most of us have any idea of. We have our own occasional scandals, no doubt, and very terrible they are; sufficient to deter us from wantonly casting a stone at any other communion. And yet it is known to the writer of this paper, and it is only just that it should be generally recognised, that the number of scandals which occur in the Church of Rome are far more numerous and far more serious than those which occur among ourselves. It stands to reason that it should be so, for our system is not, and the Roman is, contrary to nature. And when connected, as the latter is connected, with a rigorous system of private confession, it is obvious what a wide opportunity there is for spreading demoralisation in the case of all but the very lowest and most brutalised classes of society. And beyond and beside all these very grave grounds of protest against the practical working of the Church of Rome, there remains a strong objection to the fundamental principle on which all her work is based. Rome is an ecclesiastical despotism, and the day of despotisms, civil or religious, is past. The Catholicism of the Anglican and Eastern Churches is what may be termed a Constitutional Catholicism. Resting as it does on the creeds and the dogmatic decisions of the undivided Church, it allows scope for freedom of action and

freedom of thought. So deep is the gulf that yawns between Rome and England on this point, that if the amiable enthusiasts who have lately approached the Vatican had precipitated the Church of England into union with Rome the causes which now keep Rome and England apart would soon reassert themselves, and either Rome would have had—as she ultimately will have—to modify her system, or a fresh schism, accompanied by a fresh outburst of bitterness and rancour must have taken place. These amiable enthusiasts have, moreover, forgotten that there is an extreme party gaining ground in the Roman Church which teaches that there are two additional Incarnations of Christ in the Church—the one in the Eucharist, the other in the Pope! Nothing can be more degrading than the policy of suppression of all free discussion which for centuries has been dominant at the Vatican. And it is quite impossible that, in the present state of men's minds, it can much longer be maintained.

The true policy of the Church of England, it is the firm belief of the writer, is to co-operate as heartily as possible with those forces on the Continent of Europe which are opposing themselves to Vaticanism. Union between ourselves and the East is only hindered by two considerations—our objection to the honour paid to icons, and to the invocation of the Blessed Virgin in the public services of the Eastern Church. In all other respects she presents to our view a system which by its elasticity, its respect for nationality, the scope it gives to individual opinion, corresponds very closely to our own Old Catholicism, so much misapprehended and misrepresented among ourselves, is not only waging a successful war against Vaticanism in the West, but is also successfully prosecuting its negotiations with the Churches of the East. Work for union in this direction is not a mere chimera; it is practical and practicable. Cardinal Vaughan is no doubt perfectly correct when he says that no scheme of reunion is possible which leaves Rome out of consideration. But it by no means follows from this that we must seek union with Rome as she is. If she persists in laying down conditions of union which the rest of Christendom cannot accept, the rest of Christendom need not therefore feel itself condemned to do nothing. We may go on our own way, discuss proposals for union, formulate schemes, and ultimately reunite on the broad basis of a free federation of National Churches holding the universal creed of

Christendom, and united in no other bonds but those of fraternal love. Opposed to such a federation, the power of Rome will be found to grow weaker and weaker, until at last she will be compelled to seek for union on our terms. Even now we see the game she is compelled to play becoming daily more difficult, and her attempts to maintain her supremacy over the policy of the nations becoming daily more desperate. There is no need of harsh language. The tide which once flowed so rapidly has long since begun to ebb. The authority once so overweening is beginning to be questioned, even by those who have hitherto acknowledged it. We have only to go on our way quietly, pursue a rational and practicable policy, seek union where it may be had, and leave Rome to herself. And, however wise it may be never to prophesy 'unless you know,' the writer ventures to predict that England and the East will be reunited, a formidable opposition will be organised against Ultramontaniam in the countries where it once was dominant, Protestantism will once more accept the Catholic idea, and that then the successors of Leo XIII. and Cardinal Vaughan will be glad to seek reconciliation with the rest of the Catholic Church on reasonable terms."

4) In the *Anglican Church Magazine* of August (p. 291-292), Mr J. H. Fry writes: "In certain quarters there seems to be much disappointment caused by the Papal Encyclical *De Unitate*. I do not share this disappointment, as I anticipated nothing else. The principle of the Roman Church has long been policy, not truth, and it is therefore beyond the limits of hope that she will admit any claims of a Branch of the Catholic Church which does not recognise papal supremacy. The mode of expression of Pope Leo XIII. may be unusually gentle and courteous, but in reality the baseless assumptions of Rome were never more arrogantly asserted than in the lately issued document. Until Rome unromanize herself, until a Pope arise who will return to the old paths, trod by Gregory the Great, *rapprochement* between the Roman and Anglican Branches is neither possible nor desirable. We may well pray that the Almighty will bring about the retractation of error, and so open the door to unity, and, though it may seem beyond the bounds of hope, it cannot be more *impossible* for a Pope, or a Church, to take away, than to add; but at present the tendency of Rome seems to be in the

opposite direction. New cults are constantly being formed, and these will probably lead to the invention of new dogmas. Possibly in a future generation the climax will be reached, and the whole edifice of error, built, as it is, on rotten foundations, will become overweighted, and cause its own downfall. What, for example, would be the logical result, if (and it is not improbable) the immaculate conception of the carpenter Joseph were declared to be an article of faith?

The lesson to be learnt from the Encyclical is to cease from illusory aspirations after unity, to be patient, and to remain staunch to the purer and more Catholic Branch of the Holy, Apostolic Church, to which we belong.”
