

No. 1.

NEW SERIES.

OCCASIONAL PAPER
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

A SYNOPSIS
OF
ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY.

BY
ATHELSTAN RILEY.

1902.

James Parker and Co.
27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;
AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.
1902.

I.—THE HOLY ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH. (1)

		Geographical Limits.	Approximate numerical strength.	Title of Chief Bishop, or of the Governing Synod.	Residence.
<p>(2)</p> <p>Churches which are Greek in nationality and language.</p> <p>The Four Ancient Patriarchates of the East from which all other Oriental Churches, Orthodox and Heretical, are offshoots.</p>	CONSTANTINOPLE.	The whole of Turkey in Europe, including Bosnia, Herzegovina (3), and Bulgaria. The whole of Asia Minor north of the Patriarchate of Antioch and west of the Euphrates. The Turkish Islands in the Aegean.	8,000,000	The Most Entirely Holy Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Œcumenical Patriarch.	Constantinople.
	ALEXANDRIA.	Egypt.	37,000	The Most Blessed and Holy Pope and Patriarch of the Great City Alexandria, and of all Egypt, Pentapolis, Libya, and Ethiopia; Father of Fathers, Pastor of Pastors, Archpriest of Archpriests, Thirteenth Apostle and Œcumenical Judge.	Alexandria.
	ANTIOCH.	Cilicia, all Syria north of Palestine, and Mesopotamia.	80,000	The Most Blessed and Holy Patriarch of the Divine City Antioch, Syria, Arabia, Cilicia, Iberia, Mesopotamia, and All the East; Father of Fathers and Pastor of Pastors.	Damascus.
	JERUSALEM.	Palestine.	50,000	The Most Blessed and Holy Patriarch of the Holy City Jerusalem, and All Palestine, Syria, Arabia beyond Jordan, Cana in Galilee, and Holy Sion.	Jerusalem.
	CH. OF GREECE.	The Kingdom of Greece.	2,000,000	The Holy Synod of the Kingdom of Greece.	Athens.
	CYPRUS.	The Island of Cyprus.	160,000	The Most Blessed and Holy Archbishop of Nova-Justiniana and All Cyprus.	Nicosia.
	CH. OF RUSSIA (including the old Church of Georgia).	The Russian Empire.	80,000,000	The Most Holy Governing Synod of All the Russias. <i>President.</i> The Most Reverend the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Ladoga, Abbot of St. Alexander Nevsky Lavra.	St. Petersburg.
			(and 1,500,000 in Georgia)	(The Exarch of Georgia, a member <i>ex officio</i> of the Holy Synod.)	(Tiflis.)
	CH. OF SERVIA.	Servia.	2,300,000	The Archbishop of Belgrade and Metropolitan of All Servia.	Belgrade.
	CH. OF MONTENEGRO.	Montenegro.	206,000	The Metropolitan of Scanderia and the Sea Coast, Archbishop of Tsettin (Cetigne), Exarch of the Holy Throne of Pek.	Cetigne.
		Bukowina and Dalmatia.	550,000	The Most Reverend the Archbishop of Czernewitz, Metropolitan of Bukowina and of Dalmatia.	Czernowitz.
		The Banat, Croatia and Slavonia.	800,000	The Most Holy and Reverend the Archbishop of Carlowitz, Servian Metropolitan and Patriarch (5).	Carlowitz.
		The Banat and Transylvania.	220,000	The Most Reverend the Archbishop of Hermannstadt, Metropolitan of the Orthodox Roumanians in Hungary and Transylvania.	Hermannstadt.
	CH. OF ROUMANIA.	Roumania.	4,550,000	The Holy Synod of Roumania. <i>President.</i> The Archbishop and Metropolitan of Hungaro-Wallachia, Primate of All Roumania.	Bucharest.
Out of Communion BULGARIAN CH. (6)		Bulgaria, Thrace and Macedonia.	1,500,000	The Exarch of Bulgaria.	Constantinople.

Slavonic Churches. The liturgical language is in each case some Slavonic dialect. The rites differ very slightly from those of the Greek Churches.

The Orthodox Eastern Church in Austria-Hungary, divided into three independent National Churches.

- (4)
- a. THE METROPOLITAN CHURCH PROVINCE OF BUKOWINA AND DALMATIA.
 - b. THE SERVIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN HUNGARY, CROATIA AND SLAVONIA.
 - c. THE ROUMANIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN HUNGARY.

II.—THE SEPARATED CHURCHES OF THE EAST (7) (CUT OFF FROM THE UNITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH DURING THE FIFTH CENTURY).

		Geographical Limits.	Approximate numerical strength.	Title of Chief Bishop.	Residence.	Part of the Catholic Church from which it severed.
<i>Eutychian.</i> Recognizing the first three Ecumenical Councils (Nicea, Constantinople, and Ephesus).	CH. OF ARMENIA.	Nearly two millions of Armenians live in Armenia, the rest are scattered over the whole East, the remainder of the Turkish Empire, Russia, Persia, and India, with small groups in Western Countries.	3,750,000	The servant of Jesus Christ by the Grace of God Catholicos of All the Armenians, and Patriarch of the Holy Convent of Etchmiadzin (8).	Etchmiadzin, in Russian territory, near Mount Ararat.	Patriarchate of Constantinople.
	(COPTIC, or EGYPTIAN CH. (including the Abyssinian Ch.))	Egypt and Abyssinia.	250,000 and (?) 2,000,000 in Abyssinia.	The Patriarch of Egypt, Jerusalem, the Holy City, Nubia, Abyssinia, the Five Western Cities and all the preaching of St. Mark. (The Catholicos or Metropolitan of Axum or Abyssinia.)	Cairo.	Patriarchate of Alexandria.
<i>Monophysite.</i> Recognizing the first three Ecumenical Councils.	WEST SYRIAN, or JACOBITE CH.	The country which lies between Antioch and Mosul, comprising the ancient province of Syria Superior, the western part of Cilicia, and the northern part of Mesopotamia and India.	400,000	Mar Ignatius (9), by the Grace of God Patriarch of the Apostolic Throne of Antioch, of India, and of all the East.	Mardin.	Patriarchate of Antioch.
<i>Nestorian.</i> Recognizing the first two Ecumenical Councils (Nicea and Constantinople).	ASSYRIAN, CHALDEAN, or EAST SYRIAN CH.	That part of Kurdistan which lies in Turkey and Persia between the towns of Van, Jezireh, and Mosul on the west and the Lake of Umi on the east. A small congregation in India.	200,000	The Patriarch Mar Shimun (10), Catholicos of the East.	Qudshanis, near Julamerke, on the Lesser Zab.	Patriarchate of Antioch.
	CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS.	Travancore and Cochín.	200,467	Metran of Melankarai (11).	Melankarai.	Patriarchate of Antioch.

III.—EASTERN CHURCHES IN COMMUNION WITH THE POPE.—“UNIAT.”

Organised on lines similar to those of the Orthodox and Separated Churches from which they have been formed. They retain their individual rites in a Latinized form, and to a certain extent the ancient ecclesiastical constitution and discipline of the Churches from which they have been drawn. The policy of the Vatican has been to bring them by degrees into closer conformity with the Roman Church in both rites and discipline.

1. The Maronite Church. The Maronites of the Lebanon (Syria) were originally Monothelite heretics. In the year 1182 the whole Church and nation submitted to Rome.
 2. The Greek Uniat Church, divided into four Rites—*Bulgarian, Melchite, Roumak, and Ruthenian*.
 3. The Armenian Uniat Church.
 4. The Syrian Uniat Church.
 5. The Coptic Uniat Church.
 6. The Chaldean Uniat Church.
- There are nine Papal Eastern Patriarchs. Four of these are Titular Patriarchs of the Latin Rite—*i.e.*, the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and all reside permanently at Rome except the Patriarch of Jerusalem. The other five Patriarchs are Oriental Bishops in charge of the different Uniat Churches, as follows:—The Patriarch of Antioch (Maronite), the Patriarch of Antioch (Greek), the Patriarch of Cilicia (Armenian), the Patriarch of Antioch (Syrian), the Patriarch of Babylon (Chaldean).

IV.—DISSENTERS FROM THE UNIAT CHURCHES.

From time to time rebellions against the Papal authority occur in the Uniat Churches, resulting sometimes in actual schism. These rebellions are chiefly due to the steadily increasing pressure of the Vatican, under which ancient national Canons are overridden or some alterations in a Western direction made in the old Oriental services. These struggles against Rome are practically fruitless; after a longer or shorter contest the malcontents are reduced to submission by political pressure, the influence of France being devoted to the cause of the Roman Church in the Turkish Empire.

V.—ORIENTAL DISSENTERS UNCONNECTED WITH ANY PART OF WESTERN CHRISTENDOM.

A community which appears to be directly connected with the ancient Bogomiles still exists amongst the Slav races to the east of the Adriatic. With this exception pure Oriental dissent seems to be confined to Russia, where the sects are numerous, and include over 11½ millions of the population. These Dissenters may be roughly divided into the Rascolniks, or Old Believers, who broke away from the Church owing to the reforms of Nikon, Patriarch of Moscow in the 17th century, and the successors of the medieval heretics, such as the Dukhoborts, Skoptzi, &c.; of these the Rascolniks are by far the more important, numbering about 10½ millions. The Pashkovists and Stundists (and perhaps the Molokans) would be better included in the subsequent section.

VI.—PROTESTANT ORIENTAL COMMUNITIES.

Small Protestant congregations are scattered over the whole of the Turkish Empire, and are recognized as a distinct religious community by the Porte. These consist for the most part of the converts of the American Presbyterian and Independent Missionaries who have laboured continuously in the East since 1820, are always known as “English,” and are generally confused with the Anglican Church. Proselytes are drawn chiefly from the Armenian Church, but there are also Greeks, Syrians, and a few Jews. Mohammedan converts are rare. In Persia there is a Presbyterian community consisting of proselytes from the East Syrian Church, and an Anglican congregation consisting of proselytes from the Armenian Church, which has come into existence chiefly through the labours of the Church Missionary Society.

VII.—ANGLICAN ORIENTAL COMMUNITIES.

There are several Anglican congregations, especially in Syria and Palestine. There is an Anglican congregation in Persia consisting of proselytes from the Armenian Church. These communities have sprung into existence chiefly from the work of the *Church Missionary Society*.

NOTES.

(1) Or Catholic Church of the East, adhering to the Seven Œcumenical Councils of the Undivided Church. All the parts of the Orthodox Church are in full communion with each other.

(2) But in the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem there are many Arab Christians and the services are frequently said in the Arabic language. It is the practice of the Orthodox Eastern Church to translate her services into the vernacular. Thus, in the Russian Empire, the Liturgy has been translated into various languages, notably into Japanese, for the use of numerous converts in Japan.

(3) The ecclesiastical organization of the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina is in a transitional state. Before the war of 1877 these provinces were directly under the Patriarch of Constantinople. Though the provinces are not wholly separated from his jurisdiction, the right to nominate Bishops to the vacant sees has been transferred to the Emperor of Austria.

(4) This division dates from 1864.

(5) The right of this Primate to the title of *Patriarch* seems doubtful.

(6) A separation from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which began in 1873 and is entirely political in character; it is not as yet recognized as legitimate by any part of the Orthodox Church. The Exarch of Bulgaria resides in Constantinople, and there consecrates Bishops, ordains clergy, and claims spiritual jurisdiction over Bulgarians *wherever they reside*.

(7) These Churches are all in *formal* heresy. The extent of their *actual* heresy varies in each case, and is not here discussed. They are all out of communion with the Orthodox Church, but in certain circumstances *Greek* priests are allowed to communicate individual *Armenians*. There is inter-communion between the Armenians, Copts, West Syrians or Jacobites, and, to a lesser extent, East Syrians or Chaldeans.

(8) There are four other Patriarchs in the Armenian Church besides the Patriarch of Etchmiadzin, i.e., the Patriarchs of *Constantinople, Jerusalem, Sis, Akhtamar*. The last two are only Bishops with the honorary title of Patriarch.

(9) All the Jacobite Patriarchs assume the name of Ignatius, *Mar* = Lord.

(10) Shimun is the dynastic name. The Patriarchate has been confined to the Shimun family for four hundred years.

(11) This Church in South India is a remnant of the missionary work of the Assyrian, Chaldaean or East Syrian Church, and has maintained its existence without break to the present time. Its communion with the East Syrians was interrupted after the Turkish invasion of Central Asia, when the East Syrians were driven back to their present mountain fastness in Kurdistan, and it was subjugated to the Latin obedience through the efforts of Portuguese missionaries at the Synod of Diamper in 1599. In 1653, about three-fourths of them rejected the Latin obedience, being helped in the maintenance of their independence by the Dutch conquest of Cochin, and, in 1665, on the arrival of the Jacobite Gregorius, Metropolitan of Jerusalem, allowed their administrator to receive consecration at his hands. They continued in loose connection with the Jacobites till 1842, when the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch consecrated Mar Athanasius Matthew the Metran of Melankarai, and since that time the Jacobite Patriarchs have claimed more and more authority in the Church.

No. II.

NEW SERIES.

OCCASIONAL PAPER
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

The Church of England and the Eastern
Patriarchates.

LECTURE DELIVERED AT OXFORD TO THE
SUMMER SCHOOL OF CLERGY.

WEDNESDAY, 27th JULY, 1898.

BY THE

RIGHT REV. JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D.,
BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

*With three Appendices describing the recent
relations with the Patriarchates.*

James Parker and Co.
27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;
AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1902.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EASTERN PATRIARCHATES	3
APPENDIX I. Official Interchange with the Orthodox Eastern Church and the Patriarchate of Constantinople	25
APPENDIX II. The Theodore Memorial Press	32
APPENDIX III. Recent Efforts to inform Eastern Churchmen as to the Anglican Position	34

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EASTERN PATRIARCHATES.

Lecture delivered at Oxford to the Summer School of Clergy.

Wednesday, 27th July, 1898.

BY THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

THAT the Church of England needs some kind of a foreign office is a reflection which must have often occurred to others besides myself in the last few years.

In making this remark I do not forget either the debt which our Church owes to existing powers, or the dangers which might accrue from a rash intermixture of our Church politics with those of other Churches. The danger of official rashness is, however, obviously less than that which may arise from unauthorized individual action, such as we may expect from the renewed interest of many of our countrymen, clergy and laity, in movements towards reunion.

As regards existing powers the Church owes a debt both to the representatives of our Sovereign abroad and to our Archbishops of Canterbury at home, which is probably very indistinctly realised by those who have not had occasion to visit foreign churchmen or to be familiar with the history of our relations with foreign Churches. We have also cause to acknowledge with gratitude the quiet, steady, unselfish work of the Bishops of Gibraltar and the Bishop in Jerusalem, to which I may add that of the Bishop for Northern and Central Europe, the coadjutor of the Bishop of London. To Bishop Sandford and Bishop Blyth particularly the Church owes very much in her relations with the Eastern Patriarchates.

But the changes in the relations between Church and State and the more complex and varying conditions of our modern life, the result mainly of rapid personal locomotion and of frequent communication by post and telegraph, make another kind of representation almost a necessity. Our political representatives abroad are in the first place becoming more and more British rather than English, and are taught to be shy of any direct inter-

ference on behalf of Church interests, where they may be considered distinguishable from national rights or the rights of individual British citizens. The personnel of our embassies and consulates also changes somewhat rapidly, and so cannot always be relied on for continuous support even of what we may fairly consider to be our rights as citizens. In any case the times are very different from those when Sir Thomas Roe, who first established the prestige of the English Embassy at Constantinople, in the reigns of James I. and Charles I. (1621—1628), gave his support on behalf both of Church and State to the Patriarch Cyril Lucar. Nor can we wish it otherwise. It would be injurious to our high spiritual interests as a Church if it were supposed that they always coincided with and were determined by our interests as a State; and this is felt by Churchmen in public office as really as by Clergy like ourselves.

In saying this, however, I should like to express my sincere gratitude both to our late ambassador at Constantinople, Sir Philip Currie, and to our honoured chief political representative in Egypt, Lord Cromer, as well as to H.B.M. Consuls, particularly at Alexandria, Port Said, Jerusalem, Beyrût, and Damascus, for much kind help in my recent journey to those parts in January and February last (1898). If I do not speak of Cyprus in this connection, it is because it is administered by the Colonial Office, and is practically part of the British Empire. I hope it may soon become so formally and irrevocably.

As regards our debt to the Archbishops of Canterbury, they will, of course, always consider foreign affairs as one of their special provinces; but, as time goes on, they will need, I venture to think, from the mere weight of business, a permanent foreign Secretary with officials under him, in whose office not only the papers but the traditions and experience of the past centuries might be gathered up, and be ready for immediate use whenever any question or emergency arose. Such an officer should probably not have much, if anything, else to do. He should give his mind to the study of our ecclesiastical relations with other Churches in the past, and should take note of all changes likely to occur in the future. Through him official correspondence with foreign prelates would generally pass, and by him copies of all letters would be preserved, and be accessible for information. He would receive visits on behalf of the Archbishop, and issue letters of in-

troduction to clergy and laity on their travels. In one word he would be the Church's foreign Secretary. This would be an admirable position to be held by some Bishop of large experience who had retired from foreign or colonial service. But he must be something of a linguist and be a man at once profound and versatile.

I make no apology for prefacing my lecture by these general observations, for they are closely connected with the subject I have to speak about, the Church of England and the Church of the Eastern Patriarchates. It is, too, our English way of making progressive changes, for individuals to state their wishes and hopes without expecting too much attention to be paid to them on account of their originators, knowing, however, that, if a thought is good and opportune, God will give it a body and a pair of wings, and send it back to do His work in the world.

With regard to our special subject, whatever we may think of the claims of the modern Greeks to be descendants of the countrymen of Homer and Thucydides, we cannot doubt that the Greek Church has a continuous succession from the great Fathers Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, Chrysostom, and the rest. This thought naturally makes us turn to it with affection and hope. Readers of our early history cannot forget that the unity of the Church of England was due to the energy and genius of our Greek Archbishop Theodore. Even the most uninstructed English Churchman is familiar with and has a veneration for the Nicene Creed, the faith defended by St. Athanasius, and the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom; and when he opens his Prayer-book he is reminded of all three, even though the reminders be wanting in strict literal accuracy. Those who have a little more historical knowledge cannot help remembering that the first general Councils were all Greek, and all connected with the Patriarchate of Constantinople. They will notice as a remarkable thing that in the ninth "Article of Religion," where occasional error is imputed to the Churches of three of the old Patriarchates, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, as well as to Rome, nothing is said in this connection of the Church of Constantinople. Those again who have a more instructed piety have been, many of them, nourished on the devotions of one of our early Jacobean divines, Bishop Andrewes, and, whether they knew it or not, have been thus deeply imbued with the language of the Greek service-books. The special spirit of doxology and

wide intercession, which marks Greek as opposed to Roman types of devotion, has in this way penetrated deeply into the life of the Church of England. And when men so prepared have accidentally or of set purpose been thrown into the company of Greek Churchmen they have found them, like the best men of their own Communion, full of love to holy Scripture, and ready to use it in the most familiar manner. They have found simplicity of life and manners, and faith without cant or prejudice, and generally without religious ambition or controversial intrigue. Thus ever since the beginning of the seventeenth century, when we must date the establishment of direct intercourse between the reformed Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates, there has been a constant and a pleasant sense of brotherhood engendered in the converse of intelligent men, quite irrespective of the common ties of Church policy, or agreement on doctrines and practices, which must be the more formal elements of any alliance.

I propose, as the main subject of my lecture, to recall some of the more prominent historical facts which should be borne in mind by those who try to carry out in practice the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, which aim at "a more definite understanding" and "closer relations" between ourselves and the Eastern Patriarchates. I shall not touch upon the relations to the Russian Church, which have been committed to the hands of another Lecturer admirably qualified to speak on them.

In the first period of the Reformation, under the Tudor Kings and Queens, there are few, if any, traces of direct religious intercourse with the East. Our Reformers indeed frequently appealed to Greek customs and Greek opinions on controverted points, as may be seen from the admirable *General Index* to the series of their works published by the Parker Society, under the word *Church*. But they do not cite them generally with that accuracy of detail which comes from personal knowledge. Indeed my predecessor, Bishop Jewel, says in so many words: "What the Grecians this day think of us I cannot tell" (*Defence of the Apology*, part I., *Works*, Parker Soc. 3, p. 196), and then he proceeds to quote from a Greek letter to the Church of Bohemia to shew their sympathy with the Reformers.

It was not in fact till the year 1579, when the treaty of commerce with Turkey was made, and the Levant Company was founded,

that frequent and regular intercourse with these regions was possible.

It was natural indeed that attempts at co-operation should begin on the continent, where more foreigners were in the habit of collecting at the Universities, especially at Melancthon's lectures, and where in many parts of the country Lutherans and Orthodox met in a common struggle with Latins. Nothing in fact could seem more probable than an alliance between them. Not to speak of earlier intercourse, we have to recollect the long, if inconclusive, negotiations that went on between Lutherans and the Patriarch Jeremiah II. in the years 1573-1582 in regard to the Augsburg Confession. But the most hopeful effort was their practical co-operation in resisting the Roman aggression in Poland and Lithuania, aggression promoted by Sigismund III., the first Roman Catholic King of Poland. It is in this quarter that we first hear of the remarkable man whose strange fortunes brought this country into close connection with the Eastern Patriarchates—I mean, of course, Cyril Lucar. Without attempting to give details, which will be found in Sir Thomas Roe's *Negotiations* and in the special works of Thomas Smith, John Mason Neale, Kimmel and others, I will remind you of some of the more prominent features of his life. He was born, it is said (see *Fragmentum Vitæ Cyrilli Lucarii* per Antonium Legerum, in T. Smith's *Collectanea*, app. p. 77, foll., Lond. 1707), 3 November, 1572, the year after the Battle of Lepanto, which gave new hopes to Eastern Christians. His home was the island of Crete, at that time part of the Venetian Empire, which (strange as it may now seem) was then the nursery and school of many learned men. In early life he travelled much in the West. Of a visit to England we hear, but of it we have no details. His chief sojourn seems to have been in Lithuania, where he held a professorship at Ostrog. Later in the century he returned to the same region as legate of his old tutor and relative, Meletius Pega, then Patriarch of Alexandria. Here he seems to have taken part in the meeting at Vilna (1599), which laid down preliminaries of alliance between Greeks and Lutherans in their severe struggle against their common antagonist (see Hardwick's *Reformation*, chap. vii. p. 315, ed. 1880). Shortly after his return to the East he succeeded Meletius as Patriarch of Alexandria, and it was there that he became known to our countryman, George Sandys (son of the Archbishop of York and

brother of Hooker's pupil Edwin) on his remarkable travels. Sandys thus speaks of him (*Relation of a Journey begun A.D. 1610*, lib. 2, p. 115, ed. 1, 1627): "The name of the Greek Patriarch now being is Cyril, a man of approved virtue and learning, a friend of the reformed religion and opposing the contrary; saying that the differences between us and the *Greeks* be but shels, but that those are kernels between them and the other." This is, as far as I know, the first indication of direct intercourse between ourselves and the Greek Church, intercourse which strikingly coloured the whole after period of our Church life in the seventeenth century. Sandys visited Alexandria in 1611.

Three remarkable foreign prelates, you will remember, have been drawn toward the reformation as exhibited in the Church of England, and have contributed in one way or another to help it. I mean, of course, Hermann von Wied, Archbishop of Cologne, the correspondent of Cranmer, secondly, Marco Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato, and thirdly Cyril Lucar. The lives of all three illustrate the implacability of Rome, at any rate at that period, towards her opponents. All are worth study. But Cyril, I think, produced the most permanent impression. Let me remind you first of the fate of the other two. Hermann, after joining hands with Melancthon, succumbed to the political exigencies imposed upon him by his superior in the Empire, Charles V. He vacated his great see and his electoral dignity, and retired into private life. The second of these two remarkable men had a much closer connection with this country, and a sadder end.

De Dominis^a, who was born about 1560, of a noble Venetian family, became Archbishop of Spalato and Primate of Dalmatia in 1598. He came over to this country 16th December, 1616; and professed his adherence to the Church in St. Paul's Cathedral. He was favoured by King James I., and became in a few

^a There is a rather discursive *Life* of De Dominis, by H. Newland, D.D., Dean of Ferns: Parkers, Oxf. and Lond., 1859. Besides the ordinary sources of information in the Biographical Dictionaries and histories the reader may be referred to the contemporary letters contained in *Negotiations of Sir T. Roe in his embassy to the Ottoman Porte, 1621-1628*, ed. Richardson, Lond., 1740, fol., particularly to letters 63 (Abbot to Roe, 20th Nov., 1622), p. 102; 161 (Branthwaite at Venice to Roe, 6th May, 1624), p. 237; and letters 181 and 203, pp. 259 and 285.

months Master of the Savoy, Dean of Windsor, and Rector of West Ilsley, Berks. On 14th December, 1617, he assisted Abp. Abbot in the consecration of two Bishops, Nicholas Felton to Bristol, and George Montaigne to Lincoln. The latter, I may remark, was one of the consecrators of Abp. Laud. In the same year the first volume of De Dominis' elaborate work, *De Republica Ecclesiastica*, was published in London. When complete it consisted of three volumes in folio; and it is still of importance in the history of controversy. De Dominis also in this period became a correspondent of Cyril Lucar. But he was an ambitious and restless man and soon grew discontented with his position and prospects. He was persuaded by the Spanish ambassador Gondomar to seek reconciliation with Rome, where his old friend Gregory XV. was now Pope, and thereupon received certain promises of advancement. Gondomar, however, merely desired to ruin his influence in England, and betrayed him to James I. He was at last solemnly ordered to leave the country and forbidden to return to it (March, 1622). He accordingly took his journey to Rome, when, unfortunately for him, Gregory XV. died in July, 1623. After a painful and humiliating abjuration, the genuineness of which was suspected, he was thrown into the Castle of St. Angelo as a prisoner of the Inquisition, where he died 8th September, 1624. But even after death his memory was not allowed to rest. His body was brought to trial and judged, some months after his death, and was burnt in the Campo del Fiore.

Cyrl, though in the end he experienced an equally tragic fate, and was constantly a mark for Roman intrigue and persecution, was able to live on as Patriarch of Alexandria from 1602 to 1621, becoming also administrator of the see of Constantinople a short time after Sandys' visit, and Patriarch of Constantinople itself from 1621 to 1638. In the latter office he was four times exiled and restored, but he held it on the whole much beyond the term of average tenure. He was himself the 20th Patriarch since the conquest in 1453. From the year 1616 Cyril was in correspondence with Archbishop Abbot. After 1621 this was conducted chiefly through the medium of our excellent ambassador, Sir T. Roe. The subject of his correspondence was at first the case of Cyril's young friend and protégé, Metrophanes Critopoulos, whom he sent to study here in Oxford, and who was for five years in this University, and connected (like many other foreigners in recent

years) with Balliol College. The request to send such a representative of the Greek Church came at first from the king himself, and Critopoulos seems to have been supported wholly or entirely by Abbot. He was probably 28 years old on his arrival in 1616 and in priest's orders, and therefore not a mere "undergraduate." You will, I think, desire to hear a little more of him. Happily for himself he found a fellow-countryman here in Oxford already teaching Greek in the University, Christophoros Angelos. Critopoulos passed the time at Oxford in a satisfactory manner and made a number of friends, and before he left England he had the prudence to set up an autograph book or album, as the custom then was amongst the Germans. Readers of Walton's *Lives* will remember how our representative at Venice, Sir Henry Wootton, got himself into serious trouble by his facetious definition of an ambassador written in such a book belonging to a foreign acquaintance. Critopoulos' album has had a kindlier fate, and has recently been discovered, to the advantage of its former possessor, and has enabled us to clear up his history after he left England. It was illustrated some five years ago in a very readable essay by a Greek gentleman, M. Renieri of Athens, where the album then was, and probably still is, in the hands of the Metropolitan Germanos^b.

The new light which has thus been thrown upon the career of Critopoulos, especially during that part of it which was spent in Germany, enables us to think better of him than we should have been inclined to do judging merely by the irritated correspondence between Abbot and Roe at the close of his period of study in Oxford. Abbot was very angry with him because he did not at once return to Constantinople. Critopoulos on the other hand wanted to see more of English life, and then to travel on the continent, which he did, apparently with Cyril's goodwill, for some seven years after leaving England in 1624. His whole absence from the East therefore extended over some thirteen years, and he collected some 300 names, mostly of distinguished men in different Universities, in his autograph book. He resided at Helmstadt for about a year, and there composed a Confession of Faith, in 1625, which he put into the hands of one of his hosts,

^b Μητροπόλεως Κρήτης και οί ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ καὶ Γερμανίᾳ φίλοι αὐτοῦ (1617-1628) ὑπὸ Μ. Ρενιέρη, Ἀθην. ἀδ. Πέριη 1893, pp. 114. I have to thank my friend Mr. F. Madan for drawing my attention to this important pamphlet.

Conrad Horneius. It was published in 1661 by his son Johann Horneius, and was republished in the second and posthumous part of Kimmel's *Monumenta Fidei Ecclesie Orientalis* in 1850. Metrophanes, after visiting a number of Universities, spent the latter part of his time in Venice, whence he returned to Constantinople in 1630.

It would have been fortunate for Cyril and for the Eastern Church generally, if Metrophanes had returned sooner; for, to judge by the careful language of the latter in his Confession, he would have pointed out to the Patriarch the immense imprudence of the step which he took in 1629 in publishing an account of his own belief of a very different character, and would probably have prevented it.

The history of Cyril's Confession is one of the most important points of the intercourse between East and West during the seventeenth century. It is evident from a document contained in Roe's correspondence that Cyril had for some years been in the habit of making his private opinions known in writing to his brother Bishops and others. Whether what he put into their hands was the same in substance as his famous Confession is not very clear. On the one hand we have the evidence of Roe, writing shortly after his arrival in Constantinople, that the Patriarch was "in religion a direct Calvinist" (Letter 26, 29 Ap. 1622, p. 36). On the other hand we have Cyril's somewhat inconsistent description of the "little treatise" sent by him to the press, which was brought over by Metaxas from England in 1627, as "a declaration of the faith and tenets of the Greek Church, without any mention of controversy or censure of the opinions of others, principally directed to satisfy the world in divers calumnies spread by the Jesuites that he had introduced new and dangerous doctrines to the scandall of his owne flocke." Roe tells us that Cyril had resolved to dedicate this little treatise "to his late majestie of blessed memory and to send it by me to be printed in England by his license: but now having opportunity to doe it here, he only changed the epistle from the father to the sonne." (Letter 570, p. 760, 10 Feb., 1627.) The dedication to an English King, whether James or Charles, does not now exist as far as I know, though a MS. copy of the printed Confession seems to have been sent, after 1631, to Charles I. We must therefore leave the matter in some doubt. For Metaxas'

press was confiscated and destroyed by the Turks, and Roe, who was, it would seem, Cyril's most prudent adviser, though not a theologian, left Constantinople in April, 1628, as far as we know, without the "little treatise" above mentioned.

After Roe's departure Cyril seems to have been thrown more than ever upon the Dutch ambassador, Cornelius de Haga, to whom he was pecuniarily much indebted, and in a way that must have been somewhat destructive of his independence. He was also very familiar with the Calvinist minister, Antoine Leger, whose memoir of him is printed by Smith.

It was therefore rather due to Dutch and Genevan than to English influence that Cyril's Confession was first printed in the year 1629. It was printed at Geneva in his name, and as representing the faith of the Eastern Church, but curiously enough in the Latin language. When examined it was seen to contain directly Calvinistic as well as Protestant doctrine, though not of an extreme type. It dealt with reprobation as well as with predestination to life, it spoke of the Church as liable to err, it spoke of free-will as dead in those that are not regenerate, it mentioned only two Sacraments without any reference to the other ancient mysteries of the Church, it expressly rejected the term transubstantiation (*μετουσίωσις*), and in other ways it suggested points of difference, some specially with Rome, but others also with common opinions of his own Church. At the same time there was little that could be called directly controversial in it. It was natural that Cyril's own friends in Europe should doubt the authenticity of such a document, and many probably were not aware that from long residence in the West he wrote Latin with fluency. But doubt was for most persons set at rest by the publication of the Confession in a Greek form, also at Geneva, in 1631. It would be interesting to learn what impression it created in England, but this as yet I have not discovered.

The history of this remarkable little work seems to me even now somewhat obscure, and I hope that some scholar of this University may take up the subject, especially as unpublished materials for it exist in our University Library. I do not think that any one of those who have professedly written on Cyril Lucar mentions the fact—which is noticed in Mr. W. D. Macray's very useful *Annals of the Bodleian Library*, ed. 2, p. 209—that a MS. copy of the Confession, in Greek and Latin, and with Cyril's

autograph signature in several places, is to be found here. I have spent some hours in examining it. It is numbered Bodley MS. 12, and was given to our Library in 1708 by the Rev. Thomas Smith, Cyril's biographer. Unfortunately we do not know anything directly of its history except that it was bought by Smith at an auction in London only twelve years before. It must however, I conclude, have been in the Library of King Charles I., as it has the royal arms in the Stuart form in the centre of the outside of both covers. It is a little paper quarto bound in white vellum, in size 6½ inches broad by nearly 8 high. First comes on a vellum leaf a rather carefully drawn and coloured portrait of the Patriarch in his robes with staff in hand, on a light blue background, encircled by his style and title in capitals as follows:—† Κυρίλλος ἐλεω Θεου ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Παρις και οἰκουμένης πρίαρχος. Then follows the Confession in Greek with the subscription, ἰδὲν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει μηνὶ Ἰανουαρίῳ ἀχλα (January, 1631), and the autograph signature † Κίριλλος πρίαρχος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως:

Then, after some blank leaves, follows the Latin (which is clearly stated to have been the original) with the subscription, "Data in Const. in Patriarchatu Mense Martio A.C. 1629."

Then follow the answers to certain questions on Scripture, &c., with the subscription, "Data Constantinopoli Mense Januario, 1631," with the autograph signature, "Cyrillus Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus: composuit istam confessionē et manu propria subscribit:—"

Then follows something hitherto unknown, which occupies about 1½ pages. It is headed, "Ejusdem Epistola in qua nonnulla Confessionis capita exponit." It begins:—"Reverende Domine post salutem. Molestiae infidelitatis quas ego patior hisce diebus plura scribere non permittunt. In articulo de S. Scriptura quae V. R^{ma} desiderat ego quidem non scio dimitti sed ob brevitatem," etc. The letter ends, "Deus misericors liberet suam hereditatem ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης ταύτης. Pro fine omnia bona praecor Tuae Reverentiae," and is signed, "Cyrillus Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus." This letter has apparently never been printed, and I am not aware that the MS. has ever been described before, or that any other MS. of the Confession is known to exist.

There is unfortunately no evidence as to who the clerical person was to whom the final letter was addressed. It may possibly have

been Edward Pococke, the Orientalist, who was chaplain to Roe's successor, Sir Peter Wych, and who resided at Constantinople in the last year of Cyril's life. Pococke certainly was the means of securing for Abp. Laud a number of MSS. from Mount Athos, with Cyril's permission, and he also transmitted to Laud a more personal gift from the Patriarch, in the form of an Arabic MS. of the Pentateuch, which is also in the Bodleian Library (Laud Oriental, 258). I have asked our Librarian, Mr. Nicholson, to be kind enough to have these two remarkable books on view to-morrow afternoon for the benefit of any of my audience who may like to examine them. The portrait of Cyril in one, and his signatures in both, seem to bring his personality very near.

The character of Cyril is very unlike that of a great ecclesiastical statesman or a very profound thinker. He seems to have been a thoroughly simple, affectionate, open-minded and pious man, a great devourer of books and a lover of learning; accomplished and able to write fluently in four languages—Greek, Arabic, Latin and Italian; above all things cordially hating superstition and anxious to promote reformation. One of his last acts seems to have been to assist Maximus Calliopola in his modern Greek version of the New Testament (Geneva or Leyden, 1638). I find also that Metrophanes Critopoulos is said to have translated the New Testament into modern Greek during his sojourn in Germany⁶.

Cyril's intercourse with England was beneficial to both sides, and the gifts that passed were not merely instances of temporary goodwill, but permanent examples of the sort of benefits one Church might receive from another. On the one side were the education of Critopoulos, and gifts of printed books. We must not, I think, count the printing press taken over by the Cephalonian, Nicodemus Metaxas, in 1627, in the ship "Royal Defence," as a gift from Englishmen, since Cyril's biographer, Smith (p. 35) implies that it was procured by Metaxas at his own expense. But he was much indebted to Sir Thomas Roe for protection in its use, though even this did not long avail to save it. To Cyril we owe the splendid gift of the Alexandrine Bible (A) sent to Charles I. by the hands of Roe—a book which has been one of the principal stimulants to Biblical criticism in this country.

⁶ See Kimmel, *Monumenta*, pt. 2, p. xiii., 1850, for this and other writings of Metrophanes.

But over and above this we owe him a break in our isolation and a hopefulness in dealing with the Eastern Churches, which neither his indiscretion nor his tragic death have been able to extinguish. Nor can we count it an unimportant lesson that he gave the country and the Church of the danger of Roman intrigues.

Edward Pococke, the famous Orientalist, and the first Laudian Professor of Arabic in this University, was, as I have said, Chaplain to our Ambassador at the time of Cyril's death. To him, Thomas Smith, Cyril's biographer at the close of the century, was indebted for certain facts about his end. The Patriarch was accused by the Jesuits of high treason to the Sultan, and in particular of stirring up the Cossacks to revolt at a time when Othman was making war on Persia. Cyril was taken to the grim castle of the Seven Towers, well known to every visitor to Constantinople, and told that he was to be sent into exile from the port of St. Stephen on the Sea of Marmora. He was put into a boat apparently for this purpose, but, perceiving his danger, he spent some time in earnest prayer. He was then brutally knocked about and strangled, and his body thrown into the sea, the 26th June, 1638. It was brought to land, but the malice of his enemies did not cease with his death. His enemy and successor, Cyril of Berhoea, had it exhumed; but, after other vicissitudes, it was honourably buried at last, when the second Cyril was deposed and banished in 1641.

We may naturally regret that Lancelot Andrewes was not Archbishop rather than Abbot at the time of Cyril's first intercourse with England. For though Abbot and Roe were not apparently in any degree responsible for his Calvinistic impulses, which he had received in early life, and which were fostered by his Dutch and Genevan friends, Andrewes would certainly have been a more powerful influence than Abbot on the more prudent and orthodox side.

Cyril's enemies secured an immediate triumph after his death by the anathemas which they fulminated against him in the Councils of Constantinople and Jassy (1638 and 1642. See Kimmel, pp. 398—417⁶). The Synod of Jerusalem held a gener-

⁶ It is a terrible slur on the memory of Cyril's younger friend Metrophanes Critopoulos, to whom he had shewn the most conspicuous marks of affection, that he concurred in these anathemas. Metrophanes had returned to Constantinople in 1630, and was appointed by Cyril his Protosyncellos or Chancellor. Shortly afterwards he became Patriarch of Alexandria, but in what

their work at Christ Church, Pera. The best known among them were Dr. Thomas Smith of Magdalen College, Oxford, Chaplain to Sir Daniel Harvey (1668—1671), sometime Prebendary of Heytesbury, in the Diocese of Salisbury, who, like Frampton, afterwards became a non-juror; Dr. John Covel, who was seven years at Constantinople (1671—1678), and was afterwards Master of Christ's College, Cambridge; and Edward Brown, author, I imagine, of a work on the Cossacks. Contemporary with them was an able layman, Sir Paul Rycaut, Secretary to Lord Winchelsea at Constantinople (1661—1669), and then Consul at Smyrna (1669—1678). Of this latter group Rycaut was probably the most judicious churchman, and perhaps had the most insight. Rycaut's small book, *The present state of the Greek and Armenian Churches in 1678*, is still worth reading. Smith's similar book and his collections on Cyril Lucar are also valuable. A number of his MSS. are in the Bodleian Library. Covel was a more diffuse writer and of a less sympathetic temper, but he was a learned man. Some of his collections are in the British Museum. Altogether we have reason to be proud of the men who represented us in the Turkish Empire in the seventeenth century.

The efforts of our countrymen abroad were warmly seconded by leading men at home, such as Archbishops Sancroft and Tension, and Bishops Pearson, Gunning, and Compton. The latter was Bishop of London from 1675—1714. The two most interesting efforts in this country were the building of a Greek Church in London and the establishment of a Greek College in Oxford. The Church still exists in part as St. Mary's, Soho. It was built mainly by the efforts of Bishop Compton, and the inscription on it, dated 1677, mentions the Greek Prelate Joseph (Georgirenes), Metropolitan of Samos, for whose use it was constructed.

The succession of Greek students at Oxford had been kept up to some extent after Cyril's death by the arrival of a trusted officer of his, a Cretan like himself, who took refuge in England after the Patriarch's unhappy death. This was Nathaniel Conopius², who was befriended by Archbishop Laud, and sent, like Metrophanes, to Balliol College. He became a minor canon or chaplain

² See Antony Wood's *Athena Oxon.*, vol. iv. p. 808, ed. Bliss, 1820. Cp. Clarke's *The Colleges of Oxford*, p. 47 (*Balliol College*, by R. L. Poole), 1891.

of Christ Church, from whence he was expelled by the parliamentary visitors. On his return to the Levant he became Bishop of Smyrna about 1651. Conopius was an accomplished man and skilful in ancient Greek. John Evelyn notices him as the first person he had known to drink coffee in this country (about 1636), thirty years before it was common to do so.

The design of a Greek College in Oxford was no doubt suggested by the case of these and other visitors. It was due apparently to the Metropolitan of Samos mentioned above, and was promoted by Archbishop Sancroft and others. It was much talked about (says Wood) as early as 1677^h, but did not become a reality perhaps till 1698. It had been taken up as early as 1692 by Dr. Woodroffe, then Principal of Gloucester Hall, which was almost without students of the ordinary kind. The idea was that there should be twenty students there, five from each Patriarchate, and a number actually came. Unfortunately Woodroffe, who is described as a pushing and whimsical man, was not a very good instrument for such a purpose, and the scheme, after a hopeful beginning, came to an unhappy end. The College was mismanaged and the students were drawn off elsewhere; some led an irregular life, and others were (it is said) lured away by Roman intrigues^l. This fiasco led to the history of the attempt being forgotten, till the account of it written in our own time by Mr. Edmund Ffoulkes in the *Union Review*.

As an instance of the wide-spread influence of ideas tending to a better understanding with the Greek Church in that period, Mr. Williams rightly brings forward the note of the Royal Commissioners on the Prayer-book at the beginning of William III.'s reign on the "Filioque" clause in the Creed: "It is humbly submitted to the Convocation whether a Note ought not here to be added with relation to the Greek Church, in order to our maintaining Catholic Communion" (p. xviii.). Expectations were also no doubt raised by the sojourn of Peter the Great of Russia in this country from February to May, 1698.

^h Wood's *Life and Times*, ed. A. Clark, ii. p. 379, Oxf. Hist. Soc., 1892. Cp. iii. pp. 399, 426.

^l Details on this subject will be found collected by Rev. C. H. O. Daniel in his account of *Worcester College* (into which Gloucester Hall was soon afterwards transformed), in Mr. Andrew Clark's *Colleges of Oxford*, pp. 437-9. See also Chr. Wordsworth's *University Life in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 324, 1874.

The good feeling aroused on the subject of intercourse with the East was not only due to Englishmen, but was promoted by such learned Germans as Ludolph, the historian of Abyssinia, and Grabe, the editor of St. Irenæus,—the latter of whom was permanently settled in this country, and became almost a member of the Greek Church. Ludolph was interested in the circulation of the New Testament in modern Greek and in Greek catechisms. I may also mention that at the beginning of the eighteenth century Cambridge gave a hearty welcome and honorary degrees to Neophytus, Archbishop of Philippopolis, and his staff, Bentley being then Vice-Chancellor.

Unfortunately the defection of the non-jurors did much to alienate from the Church of England some of those who had most interest in the Greek Church. And their further action was in itself injurious to the cause. In the first quarter of the eighteenth century their Bishops made rather pretentious advances to the Greek prelates. These advances were received with civility, but the negotiation ended in a request on the part of the Greeks that they would offer unconditional submission.

It was due to the dignified explanation addressed by Archbishop Wake to Chrysanthus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in September, 1725, that this action of the non-jurors did not compromise our relations more than it seemed likely to do. After this time it seems as if interest in the subject was for a while suspended, but I imagine that careful research into the archives of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and other similar repositories, would yield fruit. In the first four years of its existence the S.P.C.K. gave encouragement to a plan promoted by Ludolph for a catechism to be translated into Greek and circulated among Greeks¹, but I do not know what the result was. I suppose it failed with the failure of Dr. Woodroffe's Greek College.

The quaint self-imposed embassy of Mr. William Palmer in the present century, intended to force the Greek and Russian Churches into a common policy as to Western Baptism, is an instance of the want of method which has characterised many of our dealings in those regions. Yet it is impossible not to honour his honesty, his thoroughness, and his learning, and much may be gathered

¹ *The Minutes of the S.P.C.K.*, 1698—1704, ed. E. McClure, pp. 101-3, 113-4, 124, 126. London, 1888.

from his books, one of which lies before me, entitled, *Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion*, which contains documents not otherwise easily accessible (Masters, 1853). I once had the pleasure of meeting him in Rome and of profiting by his antiquarian knowledge.

I shall not attempt the task of even naming the many travellers, theologians, statesmen, and residents abroad of our own Church and nation, who have promoted the present condition of friendly relations, on which we now hope to build something more solid. Of Oriental prelates who have, in our own times, been most friendly to ourselves, I suppose that it would be right especially to name three distinguished men: (1) Gregory, Metropolitan of Chios, whose *Treatise on the Union of the Armenian with the Catholic Orthodox Church* is highly praised by George Williams as containing principles which ought to regulate any approaches to union between ourselves and his brethren in the faith; and then two others whom I have been privileged to know myself. These are (2) Archbishop Alexander Lycurgus of Syra and Tenos, who visited England in 1870, and (3) Nikephoros Kalogeràs, formerly Archbishop of Patras, whose acquaintance I made at the Old Catholic Congress at Lucerne. The former was guest at my father's house at Riseholme, whence he went with us to the consecration of the first modern Suffragan Bishop, Mackenzie, Subdean of Lincoln, at Nottingham. He was also present at the consecration of Bishop Mackarness of Oxford. I well remember the ceremony of his receiving an honorary degree here in February. Many of my brethren here present will probably know the bright little memoir of the Greek Archbishop by an honoured Oxford resident, Miss F. Skene. Archbishop Nikephoros, who was, I think, never in this country, was, as far as I can judge, a man deserving of high regard, both from his learning, his piety and his open-mindedness. His learning was shewn by his publication of the second part of the Commentary of Euthymius Zigabenus on the New Testament, which he discovered in the Minerva Library at Rome, and by a number of historical essays. His piety is evident in his book on *Pastoral Care*, which appears to me well worthy of translation into English. I cannot profess to a large acquaintance with modern Greek literature, but I know no book which is so calculated to impress readers with a good idea of the practical Christianity of the Greek Church of to-day. I may mention further the *Sermons of*

Abp. Basil, of Smyrna, recently published by the S.P.C.K. in a translation by my friend Rev. Arthur Baker, Chaplain of the H.M.S. *Minotaur*. I must also not forget the kind Archbishop Sophronius of Cyprus, who visited Salisbury amongst other places, when he was in England some years ago, with whom I had the pleasure of renewing acquaintance in January last (1898) in his own home, where he is much respected. It would not, I think, be hard to make up a long catalogue of modern Greek theological writers of eminence since 1840. My friend, Dr. Gennadius (formerly Greek ambassador), has furnished me with a considerable list, which I shall be glad to lend to any one who has leisure to study the subject. It is most important that the number of persons qualified to give some sort of an opinion on the real condition of religion and religious thought in the Greek-speaking world should be largely extended, and the hope of enlarging this circle is the main object which I set before myself in this lecture. I may mention that Dr. Gennadius has done much to give an impulse to a better appreciation of religious problems by his countrymen in a number of articles in the Bucharest *ΠΑΤΡΙΣ* which, I hope, will be reprinted as a book.

I must ask your indulgence for the sketchy character of this summary. It would have been easy to add details to it, but I desired to give as much information as possible in the short space of an hour. I will conclude with a few words about my own simple but not uninteresting experiences.

At the end of last year (30th December, 1897) I set out on a journey to Egypt, Cyprus, Beyrût, Damascus, Galilee and Jerusalem, in order to visit the chief centres of our Church work under the jurisdiction of Bishop Blyth, with the support of which in England I am officially connected. Our Archbishop was good enough to empower me to act as his representative in consecrating the Collegiate Church of St. George at Jerusalem, which Bishop Blyth has so wisely built as the centre of his work, a little distance outside the walls of the mother city of Christianity. The Archbishop was also pleased to commission me to visit the leading Prelates of the Orthodox Eastern Church in the same region, and to present to them in his name the Resolutions of the late Lambeth Conference, particularly those bearing upon Unity among Christians. The consecration had to be postponed, owing to unavoidable delays in the arrival of some of the fittings of the

Church. I hope, I may say, to be permitted to execute that part of my commission in October next. But I was able at once to discharge the second, and perhaps in the end, more important duty, by visiting the Patriarchs Sophronius of Alexandria and Damianus of Jerusalem, and Sophronius, Archbishop of Cyprus. The Patriarchate of Antioch was vacant, but I met many of the Bishops at Damascus. Lastly, as I was able to return by way of Constantinople, I received a supplementary commission to visit the Patriarch of that Church, Constantine Vth., which I did on Ash-Wednesday, 23rd February, 1898. I reached England on Monday, February 28th, having left Constantinople the previous Thursday, and spending Sunday in Paris.

I have elsewhere^k given an account of my impressions of these journeys, and of some of the circumstances of my visits. It was, I may remark, specially interesting to me to meet the Archimandrite Joachim Foropoulos, now keeper of the Archives at Constantinople^l, whom I had previously known as a student at Oxford for about a year, where his friends only regretted the shortness of his stay. The old traditions of friendliness are everywhere kept up, particularly at Jerusalem and Constantinople, and we are fortunate in having representatives there who are desirous of helping our Oriental brethren in the way least compromising to them.

If I am to summarize my experiences in the fewest words I should say that we need to aim at four things, three of which are clearly in our power.

The first is regular intercourse between the representative clergy of England and of the Patriarchates, in the way of letters of information as to changes in the occupancy of our chief sees, and visits properly arranged beforehand made in person.

Secondly, we need to establish a system of mutual charity in regard to Church offices to the sick, the dying, and the dead, where clergy of their own communion are out of reach.

Thirdly, we need to make clear that aggressive action in regard to members of either communion is discountenanced, and as far as possible disallowed, by Church authorities on both sides. This we may call the principle of "Ecclesiastical comity."

^k See *Salisbury Diocesan Gazette* for 1898, pp. 23 foll., 47 foll., 72 foll., and 106 foll., and in the *Supplement* containing the Report of the Diocesan Synod (20 April), pp. 9 foll.

^l Since appointed Bishop of Melnik.

Fourthly, we may have various schemes of co-operation, in which Englishmen may reasonably be expected to take an interest, such as assistance to the Church of Constantinople in the circulation of the Scriptures in a form acceptable to the clergy and people, promotion of education in various directions, and literary co-operation. The great points of thankfulness and encouragement are the love of Holy Scripture, and the desire for education which prevail everywhere among Greek-speaking people. These are points in which we are thoroughly at one with them, and in regard to which we may look forward to great results in God's good time.

The only one of the four objects which I have mentioned, on which there is real difficulty, is the second. Some advance has been made in respect to it, and I believe that further advance will grow naturally as time goes on, and all the more certainly if we are prudent enough to be patient about it. But the others, as I have said, are in our own hands, and I trust that all who hear me will use such opportunities as God puts into their hands, in regard to them, to shew themselves worthy of the Beatitude—"Blessed are the peacemakers."

APPENDIX I.

OFFICIAL INTERCOURSE WITH THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH IN THE PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

(From the 'Guardian' Newspaper, 1 Nov., 1899.)

THE thirty-sixth resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1897 seems to be bearing rather remarkable fruit, and that as quickly as could be expected considering the gravity of the matter contained in it. That resolution (as our readers may remember) recommended intercourse on the part of our leading Prelates with—

"The Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, the *Holy Governing Synod of the Church of Russia*, and the chief authorities of the various Eastern Churches, with a view to consider the possibility of securing a clearer understanding* and of establishing closer relations between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion."

The first move in this direction was naturally made towards the authorities first named, the Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, and that before many months had elapsed since the conference dispersed. The Archbishop of Canterbury seems to have taken advantage of the Bishop of Salisbury's journey to Palestine in the first months of last year (1898)* in order to secure a messenger of Episcopal rank, who could present the resolutions in person to the Patriarchs and, if necessary, offer some explanation of what was intended by them. In consequence of the commission thus received the Bishop visited the four Patriarchates and the Archbishop of Cyprus, and had interviews with the Patriarchs, Sophronius at Alexandria, Damianus at Jerusalem, and Constantine V. at Constantinople,

* Details of this journey and of the Bishop's impressions may be found in his letters to the diocese printed in the *Salisbury Diocesan Gazette* for 1898, pp. 23 foll., 47 foll., 72 foll., and 106 foll., and in the *Supplement* containing the Report of the Diocesan Synod (April 20th), pp. 9 foll.

as well as with Archbishop Sophronius, well known in this country, at Nicosia. The patriarchal throne of Antioch being vacant he had the opportunity of an interview with a large body of the Bishops of the province assembled at Damascus. His reception on all these occasions as bearer of these resolutions was most friendly, and perhaps especially so at the most important Patriarchate, that of Constantinople.

It is not, we imagine, generally realised in this country how immensely the Greek Christian population of the chief Patriarchate exceeds those of the other three and of Cyprus put together. If the figures given by Archdeacon Sinclair in his useful charge of last year (the *Churches of the East*, p. 37, 1898) can be taken as fairly correct, the Greek Christian population of the three patriarchates numbers less than 100,000, and that of Cyprus about 157,000, while that of the patriarchate of Constantinople is put down at eleven millions (11,000,000), or considerably more than forty times the rest. The Patriarch Constantine V. is thus necessarily the actual as well as the nominal leader of these ancient provinces, besides having great influence in the independent National Churches of Graeco-Slavonic lands, towards which he is related very much as the Archbishop of Canterbury is towards the independent branches of the Anglican Communion.

The resolutions of the Lambeth Conference were presented at the Phanar on Ash Wednesday, February 23rd, 1898, Mr. Dowling also being present. The latter, as many of our readers will know, is the successor of Mr. Curtis at the Crimean Memorial Church, Christ Church, Pera. The interview was followed by the immediate despatch of a friendly letter to the Archbishop asking for further details as to what was meant by a "clearer understanding" and "closer relations." This letter the Archbishop at once acknowledged through Mr. Dowling, and replied to it, evidently after full and careful consideration, on August 7th of this year (1899). The Patriarch, who has shown great promptitude in these relations, issued a formal reply, after consultation with his synod, dated September 15—27, accepting all the Archbishop's proposals with the greatest cordiality. In order that there might be no uncertainty as to what he had done, he then went on to print a translation of the Archbishop's letter and his own reply to it in the official gazette of the Patriarchate, which bears the name of Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια, or *Ecclesiastical Truth*.

The letters appear, with a preliminary note, in the forty-second number for this year, dated October 8—20, copies of which have just reached England. We therefore think it a duty to the Church to give their readers the earliest possible information on this important subject.

The Archbishop in his letter of August 7th, 1899, began by referring to his reception and acknowledgment of the first letter, and then proceeded to explain his views of the meaning of the language of the resolution of the Lambeth Conference. He pointed out that the intercourse desired must grow by degrees, but that what we wish to establish is that mutual interest in each others' doings which springs out of continually growing knowledge of each others' hopes and aims, difficulties and perplexities in the service of our Blessed Lord. He went on to assure the Patriarch of the deep respect with which we regard the Hierarchy of the Orthodox Eastern Church, mentioning the brotherly correspondence which has continued for centuries between ourselves and Eastern prelates, and which has become more constant through the action of the Bishop of Gibraltar and the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem. He then suggested that the Patriarch should join him in a declaration discouraging all aggression and proselytism on either side. Further, he suggested that it would add to the friendly feeling if the Patriarch would recommend his clergy who may be resident in London to call on the Archbishop at certain great seasons, he himself being ready to request Mr. Dowling to pay his respects to the Patriarch in the same way.

Thirdly, he suggested that notice might be given on either side of important changes in jurisdiction and similar information, adding that he intended in future to send annually certain books to the Patriarch giving the names and offices of all the clergy belonging to our communion.

Lastly, he suggested that it might be possible for himself and the Patriarch to co-operate in educational work, particularly in the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, mentioning his pleasure at the residence of a Greek deacon, Mr. Teknópoulos, in England for the purpose of study, and indicating his hope that one result of such a residence might be the diffusion of accurate knowledge of our condition in the Patriarchate.

The reply to this letter is dated 15—27 September. One or two points in it require some comment. The criticism on the agents

of Bible societies can, we hope, hardly be applicable to those of the British and Foreign Bible Society, who are, we understand, forbidden to sell other literature besides the Scriptures, and who must be well aware of the danger to their cause of exciting the prejudices of Greek Christians. As to the Greek student mentioned both by the Archbishop and the Patriarch, we understand that he is esteemed as a preacher at Constantinople, and after residing some nine months in England, is now studying at St. Stephen's House in Oxford.

The cordial tone of the Patriarch's letter is very encouraging, and we have good hopes that the overtures so well received may be the beginning of a co-operation in God's work of a much closer character in His own good time.

The letter may be translated as follows:—

"Most Reverend Frederick, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and Primate of All England, most highly esteemed and dearly beloved brother in Christ our God, grace be to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Your Grace's brotherly letter, brought to us by the very Reverend Theodore Dowling about the middle of last August, and read with affection equal to that with which it was written, and with the attention which the nature of this important subject demands, was a cause to us of inexpressible joy and fullest spiritual pleasure. And in our spirit we glorified the Lord of Glory, and prayed from the bottom of our heart that the richly giving right hand of God may multiply your Grace's years, in whom we see embodied that Christian love which is the fulfilling of the law, and from whom, imbued as you are with such pure Christian dispositions and sentiments, the Christian world may expect some noble and great benefit, whenever the idea, which at first was introduced like a grain of mustard seed, of brotherly relation and communion (*ἐνκοινωνία*) between the holy Churches of God, and particularly between the Orthodox Eastern Church and that of the Anglicans, shall grow up to a great and fruitful tree, under the dewy and life-giving shade of which pious and Christ-loving Christian peoples may dwell glorifying the Saviour of the world.

"Now, concerning your Grace's letter to us, written in answer to our requests for details as regards the 'closer relation' between the Churches, of which we are respectively, by the mercy of God, the spiritual leaders, we may inform your Grace that your views

(*σκέψεις*) received on our part full and sincere scrutiny. So holy a work, and one bearing the blessings of God and the ardent desires of our Churches, can with difficulty, or rather certainly cannot, be enclosed in the lines of a programme mapped out beforehand. For we have learnt since our childhood that neither he that laboreth, or he that soweth, or he that watereth is anything, but only God, Who gives the increase, under Whose guidance the work needs no other direction from us, except that we must open and purify our hearts and dispose ourselves entirely to uphold Christian truth, and so the ways of the Lord will be made straight. But inasmuch as the first step towards this is that mutual interest (*ἐνδιαφέρον*) of which your Grace speaks in your letter, and since it has, as it were, two necessary corollaries—*firstly*, the recommendation on our part each to his own clergy to pay their respects in person and to present their Christian salutations on special days, that is to say, our Orthodox clergy in England to the Archbishop, or to the local Bishop of the Anglican Church, and the Anglican clergy in Constantinople to the Œcumenical Patriarch; and, *secondly*, the special notification on the part of each of us of special occurrence in his own Church, we, therefore, with our whole heart accept and endorse (*ἐπικροτοῦμεν*) both these proposals, and to show our agreement will give the necessary orders concerning the first, and concerning the second will give information through your priest, Mr. Dowling, or through our special patriarchal periodical, *Ecclesiastical Truth*; or by letter respecting any ecclesiastical matters worthy of mention which have happened among us and are of interest to you. So at once we make a beginning by announcing to your Grace, with great regret, the departure to the Lord of his lordship Sophronius, Patriarch of Alexandria, who directed the affairs of that throne for nearly thirty years, after his retirement from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which he previously governed for three years. Your Grace will find biographical notices of him in the copies of *Ecclesiastical Truth*, which we now take this opportunity of sending to you.

"We trust that Mr. Dowling has already informed your Grace with how great love and with what sincere joy we received your intimation and expression of a wish that on the one hand all aggression and proselytism may cease, and so one of the most effective causes by which the love of many grows cold may be removed out of the way, and, on the other hand, that earnest

care be taken for the publication and distribution of the Holy Scriptures, and that he told you how great and sincere an interest we showed in regard to these questions. We think it sufficient to say that on the receipt of your letter we hastened to appoint in our own name a committee consisting of our great Protosyncellos, Chrysostom, the Archimandrite Photius, chief secretary of the holy synod, and the Archimandrite Gregory, chief preacher of the Patriarchate, who met together with the priest Theodore Dowling in our Patriarchal buildings, and considered and discussed the above proposals and certain matters on which Mr. Dowling desired explanations and mutual understanding (*συμβουήσις*). We do not doubt that he has assured your Grace that, as this committee itself affirmed, the Eastern Church has never promoted nor even permitted proselytising to the detriment of any Church, and least of all of the Anglican Church, as the established and quite ancient practice of the four Patriarchal Churches affirms more distinctly and strikingly than any other form of human language and special affirmation can do, and it only remains for Anglicans in the East to receive orders (*διαρχθῆναι*) to keep themselves from this unfruitful work, which only creates a gulf of separation (*χάσμα καὶ πῆγμα*) between the faithful of both the Churches.

"Further, as regards the publication and distribution of the Scripture, our Patriarchate, being now equipped with printing machinery of a most complete kind, has determined that it must proceed before all other things to produce an edition of the Holy Gospel. A separate committee of divinity professors of our theological school here has been at work in preparation for this task for nearly a year; and we have good hopes that it will not be long before the Word of God will be distributed in many thousands of copies among the Orthodox population which bears the name of Christ. We hope, too, that the agents of Bible societies who sell along with the Holy Scriptures other publications which give offence to our people, and sometimes give utterance to reckless censures of sacred customs observed by the Orthodox to the injury of their religious sentiments, will completely desist from such a work; and will put to silence passions lurking, perhaps, in the hearts of some of them, which nevertheless seriously hinder the work of peace when they issue from the mouth of those who sell copies of the Holy Scriptures.

"Some other rather important points, discussed between the committee and Mr. Dowling, have been deferred for further discussion at a suitable opportunity, as was unanimously agreed by all its members.

"The end of all this, beloved brother in Christ, is that we grow in love to one another, and that our hearts, and those of the clergy and people under us, be more closely knit together; because it is from hearts filled with love that the glorious-fruited trees of peace and concord, of communion and unity, of Christian faith and hope, are wont to spring. May God multiply the years of your Grace and make them full of health and enjoyment, pouring upon yourself and all your enlightened hierarchy and the Christ-loving English people His gifts in unstinted measure.

"Our deacon, Hierotheos Teknópoulos^b, writes to us to inform us of his infinite gratitude for the hospitality shown to him and the protection extended to him by your Grace and the Bishop of Salisbury. We also offer you many thanks for this kindness, and shall presently send another clergyman of our Church to study in the University of Oxford.

"We remain with entire special love this 15th day of September, 1899, your Grace's affectionate brother in Christ,

CONSTANTINE OF CONSTANTINOPLE."

^b Mr. Teknópoulos is now, I believe, connected with the newspaper *Christianiké Alitheia*, which appears twice a month at Nicosia in Cyprus, as the organ of a religious Association called *Orthodoxia*. It is now in its second year of publication.—J. S.

APPENDIX II.

THE THEODORE MEMORIAL PRESS.

I THINK it worth while to add a few words on another point which exhibits the method of co-operation between ourselves and the Patriarchate of Constantinople in a practical form. In 1898 I found that the Patriarchate desired (as in 1627) to have a printing-press from England, the main object being, as I understood, to print a popular edition of the Greek Testament for wide circulation. The negotiations for this purpose passed through the hands of Mr. Dowling and myself, and were brought to a successful issue in the summer of 1899. In the business arrangements, which were somewhat complicated, I received excellent help from Mr. Horace Hart, Controller of the Oxford University Press, and indeed I should hardly have found time and skill to execute the commission without his assistance. I have also to thank my friend Dr. John Gennadius for the suggestion of the name, "Theodore Memorial Press," which was embossed upon the machine in the words, ΘΕΟΔΩΡΙΟΝ ΜΗΕΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, and for securing considerable subscriptions from Greek friends residing in London. The result was that the sum of rather more than £1,000 was expended in the purchase of a two-colour Wharfedale printing-machine, oil-engine, and other plant, including two kinds of type, and that it was safely erected under the superintendence of an English engineer sent out by Mr. John Esson of Fetter Lane, E.C., from whom the machines were purchased. The type was supplied by Messrs. V. and J. Figgins, Ray Street, E.C.

Of this sum of £1,000 the Patriarch Constantine Vth supplied £625, and about £380 was contributed by friends in England.

The following is an extract from a letter received by me from the Patriarch, dated 15th September, 1899:—

"In the first place we give you hearty thanks for the kindly memories which you do not cease to cherish concerning us, in that you make mention of us also with brotherly affection in your prayers. Next we have joy in informing you that, by the care of Mr. Peddley, who was sent out for this purpose, the different portions of the printing machine, which had safely arrived from Eng-

land, were carefully and accurately fitted into their respective places, having sustained very slight injuries in transit. In this manner our Patriarchal Printing Office has become possessed of a perfect press, at once solid and elegant, which will almost immediately begin its work with an edition of the New Testament, and will be a constant and visible memorial, and a stimulus to draw closer and closer the bonds of mutual brotherly understanding which by God's grace are being renewed, and to persevere in our efforts after inter-communion."

Since then I have had the pleasure of seeing from time to time proof-sheets of a considerable portion of the Gospels, and of observing the use of the Greek type supplied from England in the large print of the *Ekklesiastiki Alithcia*. The New Testament is however printed in a foreign (apparently German) type, which I regret, though of course with the English press.

I will not attempt to summarise the events of more recent years, only observing that the restoration of the Patriarch Joachim III. has in no way impaired the good understanding created in the days of his very kindly predecessor, whose retirement his English friends much regretted. Mr. Dowling has now returned to the jurisdiction of Bp. Blyth, and has divided his time between Jerusalem, where he is a Canon residentiary of St. George's Church (consecrated by Bp. Blyth and myself on St. Luke's Day, 18 October, 1898) and Assouan. His successor at Constantinople, the Ven. Mark Swabey, formerly of Zululand, continues to carry on his conciliatory and friendly policy. Recent events in Syria, especially at Beyrût, where Archdeacon H. C. Frere is at work, have done much to strengthen the right impression of the attitude of the Church of England. Archdeacon B. Potter, in Cyprus, is also working in the same direction, and will consolidate English Church-work in the island—one of the most important ways of promoting a better mutual understanding. Should it be possible soon to have a Bishop for Egypt, we may hope for important developments there both in relation with the Orthodox Patriarch, Photius, formerly of Nazareth, and the ancient Coptic Church. I may conclude by observing that my friend, Mr. George Horner, has just finished printing his edition of the Coptic and Arabic MS. of the Service for the Consecration of Churches, which I received from the Patriarch Cyril in October, 1898. It is now issued to subscribers of £1 by Messrs. Harrison, St. Martin's Lane, London, with English translation, notes, and index.

APPENDIX III.

RECENT EFFORTS TO INFORM EASTERN
CHURCHMEN AS TO THE ANGLICAN
POSITION.

THE 36th resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1897 has already been quoted in part (p. 25). Then follows the sentence: "and that under the direction of the said Committee [viz., the two Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London] arrangements be made for the translation of books and documents setting forth the relative positions of the various Churches, and also of such catechisms and Forms of Service as may be helpful to mutual understanding."

The first result of this resolution was the commission received by me, as in 1888, to translate the body of Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference into Greek and Latin. I found the Greek too laborious an undertaking, but I executed the Latin version to the best of my power, giving the different groups of Resolutions the suitable chapter headings.

The Resolutions were preceded by a Latin letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated 30th August, 1897, and were published as a pamphlet by the S.P.C.K. Unfortunately no very large number were printed, and it is now impossible to procure further copies of this document.

The defect as regards the Greek Resolutions was to some extent remedied by the kindness of Dr. Gennadius, who translated Resolutions 34—37 for me on the occasion of my journey in 1898. As this document has never been published I think it well to print it here. It was of course presented with the Archbishop's personal letters to the Patriarchs whom I visited.

ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΛΑΜΒΗΘΩ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΟΥΛΙΟΝ ΤΟΥ 1897 ΣΥΓΚΡΟΤΗΘΕΝΤΟΣ
ΣΥΜΒΟΥΛΙΟΥ ΤΩΝ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΙΤΑΙΚΑΝΩΝ
ΑΠΟΦΑΣΕΙΣΑΦΟΡΩΣΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΙΚΗΝ ΕΝΩΣΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΙΔΙΑ ΕΙΣ ΕΝΩΣΙΝ
ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΑΤΟΛΙΚΩΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΩΝ.

34.—"Οτι δει δρᾶτεσθαι πάσης εὐκαιρίας πρὸς βεβαίωσιν τῆς θέας προβίσεως ὑπὲρ ὁράτης ἐνώσεως ἐν Χριστιανοῖς ὡς ἀληθείας ἀποκαλυπτικῆς.

35.—"Οτι τὸ Συμβούλιον τοῦτο συνιστᾷ ὡς καθήκον, εἰδικὰς εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ ἐνώσεως τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, κατὰ τὴν εὐχὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

36.—"Οτι οἱ Ἀρχιεπίσκοποι Καντουαρίας καὶ Ἐσθονίας καὶ οἱ Ἐπίσκοποι Λονδίνου παρακαλοῦνται ὅπως ἐνεργῶσιν ὡς Ἐπιτροπῇ, δυναμένη συμπαλαγμῶν καὶ ἐτέρους, ἵνα συμβουλευήται προσωπικῶς ἢ δι' ἐπιστολῶν μετὰ τῶν Ὁρθοδόξων Πατριάρχων τῆς Ἀνατολῆς, τῆς Ἁγίας κυβερνήσεως Συνόδου τῆς Ῥωσσίας, καὶ τῶν κυριωτέρων ἀρχῶν τῶν διαφόρων Ἀνατολικῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπὶ τῷ σκοπῷ τοῦ ἐρευνῆσαι τὸ δυνατόν τῆς ἐπιτελείσεως θετικωτέρας συνεννοήσεως καὶ τοῦ ἰδρῶσαι στενωτέρας σχέσεις μεταξὺ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς Ἀνατολῆς καὶ τῆς κοινωρίας τῶν Ἀγγλικανῶν καὶ ὅτι, καθοδηγούσης τῆς εἰρημένης Ἐπιτροπῆς, ληπτέον μέτρα πρὸς μετάφρασιν βιβλίων καὶ ἐγγράφων ἐρμηνευόντων τὴν σχετικῶς πρὸς ἀλλήλους θέσιν τῶν διαφόρων ἐκκλησιῶν, ὡς καὶ κατηχήσεων καὶ λειτουργικῶν συμβαλλομένων εἰς ἀμοιβαίαν συνεννόησιν.

37.—"Οτι οἱ Ἐπίσκοποι τῶν διαφόρων Ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς κοινωρίας τῶν Ἀγγλικανῶν προτρέπονται εἰς σύστασιν Ἐπιτροπῶν ἐξ Ἐπισκόπων (ὅπου τοιαῦται Ἐπιτροπαὶ οὐχ ὑφίστανται ἤδη) ἐπιλαμβανομένων πάσης εὐκαιρίας πρὸς κοινὰς εὐχὰς καὶ ἀμοιβαίας σκέψεις μεταξὺ ἀντιπροσώπων τῶν διαφόρων Χριστιανικῶν κοινοτήτων, καὶ παρεχόντων συμβουλὴν, ὅπου αἰτέται συμβουλὴ, περὶ τοῦ πράγματος τούτου. "Οτι αἱ Ἐπιτροπαὶ αὐταὶ δεόντως συσκέπτεσθαι καὶ ἀλληλοβοηθεῖσθαι καὶ θεωρεῖν ἐαυτὰς εὐθυνομένους ἵνα ἀναφέρωσι κατὰ τὸ προσεχὲς ἐν Λαμβήθῳ Συμβούλιον τί περὶ τούτων ἐπετελεῖσθαι.

In 1899 followed the correspondence between the Archbishop and the Patriarch Constantine V. described in Appendix I. As one result of it Mr. Dowling reported that a Greek Committee, appointed by the Patriarch, desired information on the following points:—

1. What is the official confession of the Church of England? In what books is it contained, and what is its binding force or validity (κύρος)?

in his attempt to do so; an attempt to which all members of the Eastern Church Association must look forward with great hopefulness. Dr. Gennadius' ungrudging helpfulness in all these movements has only been equalled by his special ability, and I regard his cooperation as a signal gift of divine Providence.

I may mention also the translation into Greek of a catechism drawn up by me for use in this Diocese, entitled *Questions and Answers for the Children of the Church, on the Church, the Ministry and Government of the Church, and Confirmation and Holy Communion*, which was published both separately, and at the end of our *Diocesan Guild Manual*. This translation was made by the Rev. H. T. F. Duckworth during the time of his residence in Cyprus, and published by him at Nicosia in 1899.

Mr. Duckworth's recent publication on *Greek Manuals of Church Doctrine* (for E.C.A. 1901), will be known to all members of the Eastern Church Association. It is a contribution to our knowledge of Greek opinion of considerable value.

I think it right in conclusion to add a few words of warning to any who may be engaged in similar work. We must be careful that our real motives are understood. Our object is to restore the Church's broken unity in fulfilment of our Blessed Lord's designs, and to help our fellow-Christians to be such as He desires them to be. It is a purely religious object, not any personal or professional or national or ecclesiastical ambition that we set before us. There is so much ecclesiastical intrigue in the East, that secondary and ulterior motives are often suspected and imputed where they do not exist. In particular, Roman controversialists sometimes seek to represent Anglicans as suitors for recognition from the Eastern Church. This is a misrepresentation which it is only possible to combat, where it exists, by consistent and dignified assertion of our independence as a National Church, and by shewing that we have positive and unselfish objects in view, viz., to aid Eastern Churchmen in their difficulties and struggles as brothers in Christ.

St. Matthew's Day,

21st September, 1902.

J. S.

PRINTED BY JAMES PARKER AND CO., CROWN YARD, OXFORD.

ADDENDUM.

THE following entry from the record of the Acts of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury should have found a place at the close of Appendix I. :—

Monday, February 18, 1901.

Letter from the Patriarch of Constantinople.—

The President read the following translation made by the Bishop of Salisbury of a Letter from the Patriarch of Constantinople—(P. 47) :—

✠ Constantine, by the mercy of God Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Œcumenical Patriarch.

✠ Most Reverend Frederick, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of All England, our entirely beloved and highly esteemed brother in Christ our God, grace be to you and peace from God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Having in our hands fresh evidence from your Grace of your brotherly love and friendly communion, we proceed to the heartfelt expression of our thankfulness to yourself, informing you that a few days ago we gladly received your Grace's picture, which we have had great pleasure in placing in the saloon of our private secretariat, and, more recently still, two valuable works, the first of which, in two volumes, is entitled *List of the Clergy of the Church of England*, and the other *Official Year-Book of the Church of England*, the perusal and study of which we have committed to those who in our patriarchate are acquainted with the English tongue, that they may gather out of them all knowledge and information that is useful concerning the affairs of the Church of England. And further, we on our part may readily give information concerning the more important events that have taken place in the Eastern Church of Christ. According to your Grace's desire, we make known to you that the most holy patriarchal throne of the Church of Alexandria, which has long been widowed, as is well known, has been filled by the election and enthronement of a new head, bearing, according to ancient form, the title of "Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria," a title which is, of course, simply honorary, and carries no peculiar Papal privilege or right in the hierarchy of our universal Eastern Church. And to this office has been elected one of the Prelates of the Church of Jerusalem, Photius, Lord Archbishop of Nazareth, a man filled with Divine zeal, and having a good share of not common ecclesiastical culture. But the most holy patriarchal throne of Antioch, which has for a long time in like manner been widowed, has fallen, in consequence of the long dispute which has occurred, into painful local troubles, on account of which this throne has not been found in the proper relation and condition as regards the rest of our Churches. May God give peace in His Churches and vouchsafe that the whole community which bears the name of Christ may see in this new twentieth century the brilliant dawn of unity in every point of the spiritual horizon for the confirmation of the holy Christian faith and for His glory. We wish all happiness to your Grace in the new Christian year which with you begins to-morrow according to your kalendar, and we pray God's grace upon you, and His infinite mercy, 18-31 December, 1900. I am, beloved and highly honoured right reverend Lord, your Grace's affectionate brother in Christ,

✠ CONSTANTINE of Constantinople.

THE PRESIDENT directed that the Letter be entered on the Minutes.

No. III.

NEW SERIES.

OCCASIONAL PAPER

OF

THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION

INDEX

LIST OF BOOKS

EASTERN CHRISTENDOM.

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;

AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1902.

INDEX.

	Page
I. GENERAL.	
A. HISTORY AND DOCTRINE	3
B. RITUAL	3
II. ORTHODOX.	
A. HISTORY AND CONDITIONS.	
(i) GREEKS	4
(ii) SLAVS—(a) <i>Russia</i>	5
(b) <i>Balkan States</i>	6
(c) <i>Georgia</i>	6
B. DOCTRINE	6
C. RITUAL	7
D. LAW	8
III. SEPARATED COMMUNIONS.	
I. ARMENIANS	8
II. EAST SYRIANS [NESTORIANS]	9
III. WEST SYRIANS [JACOBITES]	9
IV. COPTS	10
V. ABYSSINIANS	10
IV. RELATIONS OF THE ENGLISH TO THE EASTERN CHURCHES.	11

LIST OF BOOKS ON EASTERN CHRISTENDOM.

- I. GENERAL.
- A. HISTORY AND DOCTRINE.
- J. S. Assemani *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*.
3 vols. in 4, folio. Rome 1719—1728.
- Assemani was Maronite Archbishop and Librarian of the Vatican. The work gives an account of Orthodox, Nestorian, and Monophysite writers and their works, with historical introduction.
- M. le Quien *Oriens Christianus quo exhibentur ecclesie, patriarche, etc., totius Orientis*. 3 vols., folio. Paris 1740.
- An Account of the Eastern Dioceses, their extent, and the occupants of their sees from their foundation to 1732.
- E. Gibbon *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (ed. Bury),
cc. 17, 20, 21, 23, 26-28, 32, 40, 47-49, 51, 54, 55, 60,
61, 66-68.
- A. P. Stanley *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*.
London 1861.
- L. Duchesne *Églises Séparées*. Paris 1896.
- B. RITUAL.
- J. S. Assemani *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesie Unioerse*. 13 vols.
Rome 1749 etc.
- E. Renaudot *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*. 2 vols.
Paris 1716. Ed. 2. Frankfort-on-Main 1847.
- H. A. Daniel *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesie Orientalis*. 4 vols.
Leipsic 1853.
- H. Denzinger *Ritus Orientalium, Coptorum, Syrorum et Armenorum in administrandis sacramentis ex Assemanis, Renaudotio, Trombellio*. 2 vols. Würzburg 1863-4.
- F. E. Brightman *Liturgies. Eastern and Western*. Vol. i.
Eastern Liturgies. Oxford 1896.
- N. Nilles *Kalendarium Manuale utriusque Ecclesie Orientalis et Occidentalis*. 2 vols. Innsbruck 1896-7.

II. ORTHODOX.

A. HISTORY AND CONDITIONS.

(i) GREEKS.

- Lives of the Eastern Saints are contained in the *Menologium Græcum*, recast in Simeon Metaphrastes, and in the *Vite Sandorum* of Laurence Surius. 1587.
- W. Smith and H. Wace *Dictionary of Christian Biography* contains the lives of the important Eastern Churchmen, divines and prelates under their several names, up to 800 A.D. 4 vols. London 1877—1887.
- J. M. Neale *History of the Holy Eastern Church; the Patriarchate of Alexandria*. 2 vols. London 1847: *The Patriarchate of Antioch*. London 1873.
- A. H. Hore *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*. Oxford 1899.
- A. H. Hore *The Student's History of the Eastern Church*. Oxford 1902.
- C. W. C. Oman *The Byzantine Empire*. (Story of the Nations.) London 1892.
- H. F. Tozer *The Church and the Eastern Empire*. London 1893.
- E. de Muralt *Essai de Chronographie Byzantine*. St. Petersburg 1855.
- G. Finlay *A History of Greece from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864*, edited by H. F. Tozer. 7 vols. Oxford 1877.
- W. H. Hutton *Church in the Sixth Century*. London 1897.
- W. H. Hutton *Constantinople*. London 1900.
- G. Macaire *Histoire de l'église d'Alexandrie depuis Saint-Marc jusqu'à nos jours*. Cairo 1897.
- S. Mendham *The Seventh General Council; the Second of Nicaea*. London 1850.
- J. Hackett *A History of the Orthodox Church in Cyprus*. London 1901.
- H. T. F. Duckworth *The Church in Cyprus*. S.P.C.K. 1900.
- Fabrics *Bibliotheca Græca*, vols. vii.—xii., contains accounts of the eminent writers in the Greek Church.
- T. Smith *De Græca Ecclesia hodierno Statu*. Ed. 2. 1678.
- T. Smith *Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucario Patriarcha Constantinopolitano*. London 1707.

- J. Covel *Some Account of the Greek Church*. Cambridge 1722.
- Paul Ricaut (late Consul at Smyrna) *The present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches, Anno Christi 1678*. London 1679.
- de la Croix *État présent des nations et Églises Grecques, Arménienne et Maronite en Turquie*. Paris 1741.
- W. Palmer *Dissertations on subjects relating to the "Orthodox" or "Eastern Catholic" Communion*. London 1853.
- Anon. *An Account of the Greek Church* (with details about Cyril Lucar). London 1880.
- R. F. Littledale *The Holy Eastern Church: A popular Outline of its History, Doctrines, Liturgies, and Vestments*. By a Priest of the Church of England, with preface by Dr. Littledale. London 1873.
- W. F. Ainsworth *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor*. London 1842.
- A. W. Kinglake *Eothen*.
- G. Curzon *Visits to Monasteries in the Levant*.
- Athelstan Riley *Athos: The Mountain of the Monks*. London 1887.
- (ii) SLAVS.
- Count Valerian Krasinski *Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations*. Edinburgh 1851.
- a. Russia.
- Tho. Consett *The present state and regulations of the Church in Russia, &c.* London 1729.
- J. G. King *Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*. London 1772.
- W. Palmer *A Visit to the Russian Church, 1840—1841*.
- W. Palmer and M. Khomiakoff's *Correspondence in Russia and the English Church during the last fifty years*. Ed. W. J. Birkbeck for E.C.A. London 1895.
- A. N. Mouravieff *History of the Church of Russia*. Translated by Blackmore. London 1842.
- L. Boissard *L'Église de Russie*. 2 vols. Paris 1867.
- H. C. Romanoff *Historical Narratives from the Russian*. London 1871.
- Leroy-Beaulieu *L'Empire des Tsars et les Russes*. Paris 1881.
- English Translation by Z. Ragozin. New York 1893.

- Trüber *The Patriarch Nikon*. 1871—1876.
 A. F. Heard *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent*. London 1887.
 W. R. Morfill *Russia*. (Story of the Nations.) London 1890.
The Statesman's Handbook for Russia. St. Petersburg 1896.
 N. Orloff *The Orthodox-Catholic Eastern Church*, reprinted from *Religious Systems of the World*. London n.d.

b. *Balkan States*.

- W. Miller *The Balkans*. (Story of the Nations.) London 1896.
 L. F. Maciejowski *Essai historique sur l'église chrétienne primitive des deux rites chez les Slavs*. Leipzig 1840.
 W. Denton *Servia and the Servians*. London 1862.
 W. Denton *The Christians in Turkey*. London 1876.
 Vacation Tourists *The Church and People of Servia*. 1864.

c. *Georgia*.

- Chardin's *Travels*. Vol. i., pp. 171—174.
 M. Josselian *A Russian History of Georgia*.
 S. C. Malan *A Short History of the Georgian Church* (translated from Josselian). London 1866.

B. DOCTRINE.

- E. F. Kimmel *Monumenta fidei Ecclesie Orientalis*. 2 Parts. Jena 1850.
 E. F. Kimmel *Libri Symbolici Ecclesie Orientalis*. Jena 1843.
 R. W. Blackmore *Doctrine of the Russian Church*. London 1845.
 R. W. Blackmore *A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church*. Aberdeen 1846.
 A. N. Mouravieff *Lettres à un Ami sur l'Office divin*. St. Petersburg 1850.
 A. N. Mouravieff *Question religieuse de l'Orient et de l'Occident*. Moscow 1856.
 A. N. Mouravieff *Quelques Mots par un Chrétien Orthodoxe*. Paris 1854; Leipzig 1855, 1858.
 Macarius *Théologie dogmatique orthodoxe*: traduite par un Russe. 2 vols. Paris 1859.

- N. Bulgari *Holy Catechism*. Translated by W. E. Daniel, edited by R. R. Bromage. London 1893.
 A. C. Headlam *The Teaching of the Russian Church*. London 1897. [E.C.A.]
 Moschakes *Catechism of the Orthodox Eastern Church*. S.P.C.K. 1894.
 Father John *My Life in Christ*. London 1897.
 Whyte *Father John*. Edinburgh 1898.

C. RITUAL.

The Greek ritual books (of which the most important are the *Εὐχολόγιον* containing the administration of the Sacraments and the Occasional Offices, *ὁρολόγιον*, the Divine Service of the Hours, and *Ὁκτώηχος*, *Τριώδιον*, *Πεντηκοστάριον* and *Μηνάιον*, containing the proper seasons and days) are printed at the Phoenix Press in Venice.

- J. Goar *ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ sive Rituale Græcum*. Fol. Paris 1647.
 J. M. Neale *Essays on Liturgiology*. [vii. Vernacular Services.] London 1867.
 J. M. Neale *Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church*. 2 vols.
 J. M. Neale and R. F. Littledale *The Liturgies of SS. Mark, James, Clement, &c.* London.
 R. F. Littledale *Offices of the Holy Eastern Church*, with Translation, Notes and Glossary.
 H. C. Romanoff *Rites and Customs of the Greco-Russian Church*. London 1868.
 Ivan Borovnitsky *The Origin and Composition of the Roman Catholic Liturgy and its difference from that of the Orthodox Church*. Translated by Basil Popoff. 1863.
 Katharine Lady Lechmere *Synopsis: or a Synoptical Collection of the Daily Prayers, the Liturgy, and Principal Offices of the Greek Orthodox Church of the East*, with an Introduction by J. Gennadius. London n.d.
 G. V. Shann *Euchology: A Manual of Prayers of the Holy Orthodox Church*. Kidderminster 1891.
 G. V. Shann *Book of Needs of the Holy Orthodox Church*. London 1894.

- J. N. W. B. Robertson *The Divine Liturgies* (containing Vespers, Lauds, and the Liturgies with English translation). London 1894.
- Octoechos, The General Menaion, and The Ferial Menaion*, translated from the Slavonic. London, J. Davy & Sons, 1898—1900.
- ΚΡΗΘΙΣ νέα στοιχειώδης διδασκαλία. (Ecclesiastical Music.) Constantinople 1875.
- M. L. A. Bourgault Du Coudray *Études sur la musique Ecclesiastique Grecque*. Paris 1877.
- Isaac Habert (Bp. of Vabres, 1668) Ἀρχιερατικόν. *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesie Græcæ*. Folio. Paris 1643. [Uniat collection of Episcopal Offices, constructed like a Latin Pontifical, with notes.]
- D. LAW.
- G. Beveridge Συνοδικὸν sive Pandectæ Canonum. 2 vols. Folio. Oxford 1672—1678.
- Photius *Nomocanon*. Paris 1615.
- Rhalls and Potles Σύσταγμα Κανόνων. 6 vols. Athens 1852, 1859.

III. SEPARATED COMMUNIONS.

I. ARMENIANS.

- S. C. Malan *Life and Times of S. Gregory the Illuminator*. London 1868.
- M. V. de la Croze *Histoire du Christianisme d'Éthiopie et d'Arménie*. La Haie 1739.
- P. de la Croix *État présent des nations et Églises Grecque, Arménienne et Maronite en Turquie*. Paris 1741.
- P. Ricaut *The present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*. London 1679.
- Haxthausen *Trans-Caucasia*. Translated into English. 1854.
- E. du Laurier *Histoire, Dogmes, Traditions, et Liturgie de l'Église Arménienne*. Paris 1859.
- B. F. K. Fortescue *The Armenian Church*. With Appendix by S. C. Malan. London 1872.
- Avedichian *Liturgia Armenia trasportata in Italiano*. Venice 1852.

- F. J. D. Issaverdenz *The Armenian Ritual, translated into English*. 4 parts. Venice 1873—1888.
- Bianchini *Les Chants liturgiques de l'Église Arménienne*. Venice 1877.
- Amy Apar *Melodies of the Holy Apostolic Church of Armenia*. Calcutta 1897.

II. EAST SYRIANS [NESTORIANS].

- J. S. Assemani *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, vol. iv. Rome 1719—1728.
- J. W. Etheridge *The Syrian Churches, their Early History, Liturgies, and Literature*. London 1846.
- G. P. Badger *The Nestorians and their Rituals*. London 1852.
- A. J. Maclean and W. H. Browne *The Catholicos of the East and his People*. S.P.C.K. 1892.
- The Liturgy of the Apostles Adai and Mari, &c.* Translated into English. S.P.C.K. 1893.
- A. J. Maclean *East Syrian Daily Offices*. London 1894. [E.C.A.]
- G. M. Rae *The Syrian Church in India*. [Nestorian period, chapters viii.—xii.] Edinburgh 1892.
- Reports of the Archbishop's Mission to the Assyrian Christians*. Published quarterly since October, 1890. S.P.C.K.

III. WEST SYRIANS [JACOBITES].

- J. S. Assemani *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, vol. ii. Rome 1719—1728.
- J. W. Etheridge *The Syrian Churches, their Early History, Liturgies, and Literature*. London 1846.
- A. J. D'Orsey *Portuguese Discoveries, Dependencies and Missions in Asia and Africa*. London 1893.
- G. P. Badger *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, vol. i., ch. v.—vii. London 1852.
- G. M. Rae *The Syrian Church in India*. [Chapters xvii.—xxi.] Edinburgh 1892.
- O. H. Parry *Six Months in a Syrian Monastery*. London 1896.
- J. W. Bliss *The Maronites*, in *Quarterly Statements of Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1892.

IV. COPTS.

- E. Renaudot *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum*. Paris 1713.
 Sharp *Egypt*. (From the earliest times to the Arab Conquest.) 1846.
 E. W. Lane *Modern Egyptians*. Fifth Edition. London 1871.
 H. P. Liddon *Tour in Egypt and Palestine in 1886*. Fifth Edition. London 1893.
Egyptian Christianity in Church Quarterly Review, January, 1887.
 G. Macaire *Histoire de l'Église d'Alexandrie depuis Saint Marc jusqu'à nos jours*. Cairo 1897.
 M. Fowler *Christian Egypt*. London 1901.
 John Marquess of Bute *The Coptic Morning Service of the Lord's Day*. London 1892.
 G. Horner *The Service for the Consecration of a Church and Altar according to the Coptic Rite*. London 1902.
 A. J. Butler *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*. 2 vols. Oxford 1884.
 F. E. Brightman *The Sacramentary of Sarapion of Thmuis* in 'Journal of Theological Studies,' vol. i., pp. 88—113, 247—277. London 1899—1900.
 J. Wordsworth, D.D. (Bishop of Salisbury) *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book*. S.P.C.K. 1900.

V. ABYSSINIANS.

- J. Ludolphus *Ad suam Historiam Ethiopicam Commentarius*. Frankfort-on-Main. 1691.
 M. Geddes *The Church History of Ethiopia*. London 1696.
 M. La Croze *Histoire du Christianisme d'Éthiopie et d'Arménie*. La Haie 1739.
 W. C. Harris *Highlands of Ethiopia*. 3 vols. London 1844.
 A. E. W. Gleichen *With the Mission to Menelik* 1897. London 1898.
 F. Alvarez (translated by Lord Stanley of Alderley) *Narrative of the Portuguese Embassy to Abyssinia during the years 1520—1527*. Hakluyt Society. London 1881.
 J. Bent *The Sacred City of the Ethiopians*. 2nd ed. London 1896.

IV. RELATIONS OF THE ENGLISH TO THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

- A. C. Headlam *Relations with the Eastern Churches in Church Problems*, edited by H. Hensley Henson. London 1900.
 R. T. Davidson, Bishop of Winchester *The Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 1878, 1888*. S.P.C.K. 1896.
Report of Lambeth Conference, 1897. S.P.C.K. 1897.
Reports of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to Assyrian Christians.
Reports of the Society for Promoting Christianity in Egypt.
 G. Williams *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*. London 1868.
 Joseph Barclay, D.D., *third Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem: A Missionary Biography*. London 1883.
 A (late) Missionary Bishop *Some Notes of Travel, with special reference to the Greek Orthodox and Anglican Churches*. Nutt, London 1890.
 C. W. Sandford, Bishop of Gibraltar, *Pastoral Letters*.
 J. Wordsworth, D.D. (Bishop of Salisbury) *The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates: a Lecture with Appendices*. (Occasional Papers of the E.C.A., No. ii., new series.)
 J. Wordsworth, D.D. (Bishop of Salisbury) *Some points in the Teaching of the Church of England, set forth for the Information of Orthodox Christians of the East in the form of an answer to Questions*. S.P.C.K. 1900. Greek translation by Dr. John Gennadius.
 Gennadius *Introduction to Greek Translations of the Prayer Book*. S.P.C.K. 1901.

*** The Secretary will be glad to receive suggestions for the improvement of this list.

No. IV.

NEW SERIES.

OCCASIONAL PAPER

OF

THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

The Ceremonial Use of Oil among the
East Syrians.

BY THE

REV. F. F. IRVING, B.D.,

VICAR OF EAST CLEVEDON;

FORMERLY OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S MISSION.

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;

AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1902.

THE CEREMONIAL USE OF OIL AMONG
THE EAST SYRIANS.

BY THE REV. F. F. IRVING, B.D.,
*Vicar of East Clevedon; formerly of the Archbishop of Canterbury's
Mission.*

THESE Christians, who dwell in the Kurdish mountain districts of the Turkish frontier and in the plains around Lake Urmia in Persia, commonly known as Nestorians since their rejection of the Ephesine decrees, formerly dependent upon the Patriarchate of Antioch^a, use only olive oil in their services; and their ancient writers give elaborate reasons why they reject chrism, which they regard as a late and unauthorized addition to the rites of the Church.

Thus Mar Yukhanan Bar Zo'bi, a priest and monk who lived in the early part of the 13th century, wrote a tract, which is constantly met with in the later books of the Nestorians, and has often been quoted and translated, on the subject of holy oil, in which he says:—

"The Apostles gave us the horn (*ḥarna*) of baptism, (containing) olive oil, and not precious chrism (*muron*), as is used in the Western Church. And this for four reasons:—

First, that there might be agreement between the two Covenants.

For Moses was commanded to prepare olive oil for the anointing of priests and kings^b; so the Apostles gave the baptismal horn of olive oil, and commanded that the kings of the world to come should be therewith anointed at baptism.

Secondly, because olive oil is easily procured both by rich and poor, which is not the case with costly chrism.

Thirdly, because the olive leaf is a sign of salvation to mortals; as witness the olive leaf brought by the dove to Noah. So holy baptism, wherein we receive the Holy Spirit, and the adoption is bestowed upon us.

^a See Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, Cutts, *Christians under the Crescent*, Maclean and Browne, *The Catholics of the East*.

^b This statement does not accord with Ex. xxx. 22 and seqq.

or some term equivalent to it in an orthodox Eastern, and the "Signation of the Cross" (upon which Mar Audishu merely comments that it is "that by which the Christian is ever kept, and is the completion and perfecter of all sacraments") being placed last, the position usually assigned to "Unction of the Sick" or "Prayer Oil."

This is the more evident if we compare this list with that given in the Holy Catechism of Nicholas Bulgaris, which, in default of the "Orthodox Confession," of which I have not a copy at hand, may, I presume, be regarded as having the definite authority of the Holy Eastern Church. To the question, "How many mysteries are there?" the answer is given, "There are seven mysteries: Holy Baptism, Holy Unction, Priesthood, Repentance, the Divine Eucharist, Marriage, and Prayer Oil."

I do not, however, mean to imply that the Nestorians of to-day consciously distinguish between Baptism and Confirmation; they do not, though they accept the enumeration of Mar Audishu. But what I do think is, that the better instructed among them do recognize a two-fold operation of the Holy Spirit, in what they regard as two parts of the one sacrament of Baptism. This seems to me to be suggested by the structure of the East Syrian Baptismal Service; and in passages of their theological writers, such as the following from the oft-quoted treatise of Bar Zo'bi on Holy Oil:—"In Holy Baptism we are absolved from our sins; and by it (too) we received the grace of the Spirit as an earnest (*rahbona*),"—employing in the latter clause the somewhat uncommon phraseology of the benedictory prayer, which precedes the final signation, or, as we should say, confirmation, of the baptized.

What seems to me remarkable is, not that there should be inexactness of terminology, or disagreement in enumeration in Nestorian writings, but that the seven-fold division of the means of grace should have been current among the separated Christians of the Far East, within a century and a half of its first clear enunciation by the Master of the Sentences. Peter Lombard appears to have died in 1164; Mar Audishu of Soba in 1317.

This digression was necessary to my subject, but I cannot pursue it further. Having, however, explained in what sense it is true to say that the East Syrians acknowledge seven sacraments, and having further suggested, though without any intention of building an argument upon it, a somewhat rough and ready means of

bringing their ordinary enumeration into harmony with catholic tradition, I shall not, perhaps, be misunderstood if I venture to say, with sufficient accuracy for the present enquiry, that they employ oil in the administration of three sacraments, viz., Holy Baptism, Confirmation, and, under certain circumstances, Absolution (accepting the existing service of *khusaia* as representative, in some form, of that sacrament).

Oil, specially blessed at the time by the bishop, is used, too, in consecrating churches.

And unblest oil is employed by priests in making the Eucharistic bread, and in multiplying the Holy Leaven on Maundy Thursday.

In every case it is pure oil of olives that is prescribed.

Oil is not used in Ordination; nor is it now, at any rate, their custom to anoint the sick.

EXTREME UNCTION AND THE VISITATION OF THE SICK.

Respecting the ancient use of Prayer Oil among the Nestorians, much will be found of extreme interest in Assemani (Bibl. Or. iii. 321, &c.; iv. 276, &c.).

For the following extract from Mar Iskhak of Antioch, Catholicos of Seleucia-Ctesiphon[†] (circa 460), I am indebted to Monsieur Salomon, Superior of the Lazarist Fathers in Khosrova, Salmas. Mar Iskhak is reproving certain foolish women who refuse to receive unction at the hands of the priest:—"Sacerdotem visitatorem non probatum habent stultie (mulieres), ideoque signationem ejus contemnunt. . . . At potius, o mulier, donum quidem tribue recluso, sed signationem a sacerdote tuo accipe. . . . crucifixi tantum oleum sit tibi et a sacerdote signationem accipe. . . . Nihiligitur oleum apostolorum et martyrum, qui pro veritate mortem passi sunt, et oleum mendacium splendet in oribus perversarum. . . . &c."

It must be borne in mind that Mar Iskhak lived prior to the separation of the see of Seleucia-Ctesiphon from Catholic unity; which is generally assigned to the year 498, under the Catholicos, Mar Bawai, the first to assume the title of patriarch. He is thus a witness to Catholic, not Nestorian, practice.

It is, however, significant that in the Nestorian ordinal one of the special objects for which the bishop invokes the Holy Ghost,

[†] Written by the Syrians *Slik Ktispon*.

The following objects are in the temple proper: (1) The iconostasis, (2) the soleas, (3) the archieratikos thronos, (4) the kleroi, (5) the ambon, (6) the stasidia, (7) the gynaekites.

(1) *The Iconostasis.*

The solid partition of stone or wood which reaches from the south to the north side of the temple, separating the holy Bema from the other part of every church, and on which holy icons are placed, is called the *Iconostasis*. The purpose of the iconostasis is to prevent the laity from entering the holy Bema and to separate it, as being the holiest part, from the rest of the temple.

The iconostasis being always adapted to the size and height of the church, contains in proportion two, or three, or in some places even four, rows of icons.

On the top of the screen in the middle is raised in large size the precious and life-giving Cross, bearing Jesus hanging upon it, and having in equally large size on the right hand His Immaculate Mother, and, on the left, the Saviour's beloved disciple, John.

In the iconostasis there are also three doors: (1) the middle or *royal gate*, (2) the south gate, (3) the north gate.

The gate in the middle of the iconostasis, opposite the Holy Table, is called the *royal gate*, because through this gate the consecrated precious gifts, or King of glory, invisibly pass. It is also called *beautiful gate* and *holy gate*. To none, therefore, of the laity or persons not in holy orders is it allowed to go in or out by this gate.

The *curtain* with which the royal gate is opened or closed from the top, at certain times in the Liturgy, represents that curtain in the Tent of Witness which hid the Holy of Holies from the eyes of the people. Thus in the Christian temple also, by this veil are hidden from the faithful who are standing in the temple proper the Body and Blood of the Lord.

The south door or gate is the name given to the door in the iconostasis to the right of the royal gate, on the south side of the temple. It is also called more particularly the "deacons' gate," because the deacons usually go in and out by this gate, either fetching what is necessary for the different services from the skeuophylakion (sacristy), or watching over the good behaviour of the faithful in the nave (cf. p. 37).

The north door or gate is the name given to the door in the

iconostasis to the left of the royal gate, on the north side of the temple. It is also called more particularly the candle-lighters' gate, because the candle-lighters usually go in and out by this gate. Accordingly near this gate are kept in all churches all the things necessary for their office, such as coals, water, incense, tapers, &c.

(2) *Soleas.*

The *soleas* is the projecting part of the floor of the holy Bema, which reaches from the south to the north side of the temple, in front of the iconostasis. It is always larger and wider in front of the beautiful gate, because the deacon stands here to offer up prayers and supplications to God during the divine Liturgy.

(3) *Archieratikos Thronos.*

The *archieratikos thronos* (Bishop's throne) is the lofty, handsome and variously adorned throne which is erected opposite the iconostasis on the right-hand side, and in which the arch-priest (Bishop) stands when he is performing divine service. The arch-priest, as he stands there, represents the appearance on earth of our Saviour Christ and His intercourse with men.

(4) *Kleroi.*

The *kleroi* are the raised parts on either side of the floor of the temple, one being on the right hand and the other on the left. The use of the kleroi is that the clergy of the church stand in them divided into two choirs, the right-hand choir and the left-hand choir. The former "singers" sing the appointed troparia, canons, &c., while the latter "readers" read all that is appointed to be read in every service and ceremony of the church.

(5) *Ambon.*

The *ambon* is the raised pulpit in a line with the left-hand choir, almost opposite the Bishop's throne, from which the holy Gospel is read by the deacon, and the Word of God is preached.

The ambon, therefore, represents that great stone which the angel rolled away from the door of the tomb, and sitting upon it, proclaimed to the women who brought the myrrh the resurrection of our Saviour Christ.

Fourthly, because of the properties of the olive. Its leaves do not wither, and never fall. So, those who are anointed at baptism with the olive oil of the horn shall live for ever, and not wither in the judgement day and fall away into Hell. And as olive oil is rich and of a pleasant odour, and affords nourishment to men's bodies, and is useful in all respects, so he who is baptized and anointed with the oil of the horn is rich in the grace of the Spirit, and of a sweet odour in Christ, and giveth nourishment to all by his understanding, and in every way is useful to the Church. * * *

In short, the Apostles gave us the horn of olive oil, and whosoever is not baptized therewith does not receive the Holy Spirit. The chrism of the heretics was appointed in later times, after that the angel had removed the horn and signation (*rushma*) from their Church^e."

THE NUMBER AND NAMES OF THE SACRAMENTS OR MYSTERIES.

The East Syrians usually reckon the sacraments as seven^d. But this enumeration is, naturally, not found in their earlier writers; and the later are not always agreed as to the ordinances to be included in this seven-fold arrangement of the mysteries.

Thus the patriarch Mar Timotheos II., who towards the end of the 13th or in the early 14th century, wrote an important work on *The Seven Ecclesiastical Mysteries*, enumerates them thus: 1. Priesthood; 2. Consecration of Churches; 3. Holy Baptism (including Unction); 4. Holy Eucharist; 5. Monastic profession; 6. Service of the Faithful Departed; 7. Matrimony. (Assemani, Bibl. Or. tom. iii. p. 572.)

But a better known and more generally accepted list is that given by a contemporary of Mar Timotheos, viz., Mar Audishu (Ebedjesu), metropolitan of Soba and Armenia, in his work entitled *The Pearl*. The fourth division of his treatise is entirely upon

^e For a full translation see Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, vol. ii. In the last paragraph, however, he reads "kings" (*malki*), for "the angel" (*malakha*), which I think is the correct reading. I am inclined to think the passage may have a covert reference to Rev. ii. 5, the more so as it certainly seems to imply, and is now so understood, the falling away of the Church of the West. If this be so, it points to an early acquaintance with the Book of Revelation not gained from the P'shitta.

^d On this subject see Assemani, Bibl. Or. iv. p. 240 and foll.

the seven mysteries or sacraments, which he thus enumerates:—

1. Priesthood; 2. Holy Baptism; 3. Oil of Unction; 4. The Offering of the Body and Blood of Christ; 5. Absolution; 6. Holy Leaven; 7. The Signation of the Life-giving Cross. To this list he appends a note:—"Those Christians who have not the Holy Leaven reckon marriage according to Christ's ordinance, the seventh sacrament;" and further, very significantly, at the conclusion of his treatise he adds an eighth section headed, "Marriage and Virginity," in which he treats of the former wholly in its sacramental aspect, and writes thus:—"Marriage is holy in all, and their bed undefiled". The more so, in that blessed Paul declared it a mystery; for these things (*sc.* mysteries) are above the things of this world. This is a great mystery."

If upon the hint this author himself gives (and on the authority of Timotheos II., above quoted), without arguing the point we substitute in his list Holy Matrimony for the Leaven, we have but two of the seven ordinances enumerated by him in apparent divergence from the Catholic Tradition, viz., the "Oil of Unction," and the "Signation of the Life-giving Cross."

But Assemani sees in these a loose nomenclature, and a somewhat vague apprehension of the two remaining sacraments of Confirmation and the Unction of the Sick (Bibl. Or. iv. 240). Moreover he makes the following statement on the high authority of George, Metropolitan of Arbela:—*Itaque extant, vel saltem extabant olim apud Nestorianos, haec duo sacramenta, Confirmationis scilicet et Extremae Unctionis; eorumque materia in duobus diversis cornibus, seu vasis, conservabatur in ecclesiâ quorum unum appellabant cornu olei unctionis (mishkha d'mshikhutha) alterum cornu olei gratiae (mishkha d'taibutha). Hoc ungebant infirmos; illo vero baptizatos.* (Bibl. Or. iii. 326.) I have failed to find the passage of George of Arbela here referred to, and I confess I doubt the distinction drawn by Assemani between the two horns, or oil vessels, inasmuch as the Syriac terms, above transliterated, on which he seems to rely, are used interchangeably, as I hope to be able to demonstrate.

Certainly the position held by these two ordinances in the list of Mar Audishu somewhat favours this theory of Assemani, the "Oil of Unction" being placed immediately after "Baptism," where one would expect to find "Confirmation" in a Western list

^e The P'shitta reading of Heb. xiii. 4.

when laying hands on the candidates for the priesthood, is, "that they may lay hands on the sick that they may be healed." In reference to these words Assemani says, "*quod est clarissimum Extrema Unctionis indicium*" (Bibl. Or. iii. 326). I cannot here discuss the question as to how far this comment is justified, but I would remark that even the ceremony of laying hands on the sick, quite apart from any question of unction, no longer exists, so far as my enquiries have gone, among the East Syrians.

I will briefly describe the order of visitation of the sick which at present is customary in Persia. The priest takes with him the book of the Gospels. On entering the house he gives the accustomed greeting, "Peace be unto you." In some cases a lamp or taper of bees-wax is lit, and placed near the sick person. The priest, standing at the head of the bed, which is ordinarily spread upon the floor, reads St. John i. 1 to 28, concluding with the words, "Where John was baptizing." Then he reads St. Matt. ix. 35 to x. 15 (inclusive), and St. Mark xvi. 20. When he comes to the words "heal the sick" (Matt. x. 8), he repeats them three times, making the sign of the cross with the Gospel-book above the head of the sick person. The priest concludes with a prayer for the man's recovery.

THE HOLY HORN.

Every church must possess its horn of holy oil; the vessel in use being commonly a small glass bottle, kept in the baptistery. When a new church is built a small quantity of the sacred oil is procured from another church. At the consecration of the church this is placed in the baptistery and blessed by the bishop, with the following prayer and the usual benedictory sign of the cross:—"This oil of unction is signed and sanctified, that it may be for a type of incorruption in absolving baptism, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to everlasting."

Nestorians, however, do not attribute the special sanctity of the horn of unction to this episcopal consecration, but to its supposed Apostolic descent. The legend, which is firmly held by them, is as follows:—At our Lord's Baptism St. John preserved some of the water that fell from His sacred person in a vessel which He subsequently, "when the day of His crowning drew nigh," entrusted to St. John, the beloved disciple. When the soldier pierced the

* See *ṭakhsa*, printed by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, p. 146.

side of our Lord on the Cross St. John caught some of the water which issued forth, and mingled it with the water of the Baptism. After the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost the Apostles took this vessel and consecrated and added to it olive oil, each taking a horn of this mixture, to serve for the oil of baptism in the various churches they evangelized.

This tradition, with very slight variations, is to be found in many writings of the East Syrians, and is given, among others, by Mar Yukhanan Bar Zo'bi, who is quoted above.

Similarly Mar Audishu, in his work already referred to, says, "The oil of unction is an Apostolic tradition; for it was consecrated by the Apostles, and from them is handed down in the Church of God until now."

How much stress is laid upon this Apostolic origin of the anointing oil, and how little the notion of more recent episcopal consecration comes in, may be seen from the following incidental conversation I had with Ḳasha Mushi, priest of the church of Ula, Salmas:—

"Who consecrated the baptismal horn?"

"Mar Adai, one of the seventy, who brought us the faith."

"Ah yes, Ḳasha, but for the church of Ula?"

"Oh, it has been here from the earliest times, and at *piṣkha* (Maundy Thursday) I add to it each year; and I always pour into it what remains of the oil used for anointing the child's body in Baptism."

The church of Ula, however, was reconsecrated in the year 1894, after being entirely rebuilt; and the horn was, of course, blessed by the officiating bishop, the late Mar Gauriel of Urmia, with the form which I have already given, as prescribed in the Consecration Service.

As to the increasing of the holy oil on Maundy Thursday, Ḳasha Mushi tells me that his own custom is merely to arrange for a baptism on that day, and then consecrate a larger quantity of oil than is usual in the *laḡna*, the vessel used for the entire unction of the child, and pour what remains over into the *ḡarna*. This, however, involves nothing that could not be done at a baptism on any other day, no exact limit being placed to the amount of oil consecrated by the priest, and I do not think this can be the ancient order.

I have been told by a learned priest of Tkhome, that in former

times the horn was increased only by the bishop, or in his absence by an archdeacon and seven priests, on Holy Saturday, with prayer and imposition of hands; and, further, that this service is called *ṭakhsa d'rubaia d'taibutha*, i.e. the order of increasing the holy oil (lit. "grace"). No copy of this service is at hand, nor is it at all generally known.

It is, however, worthy of mention that in one large diocese of the plain of Urmia, that of Sipurghan, presided over by Mar Yonan, the custom was up till 1898, when he submitted to the Russian Church, for the bishop himself to consecrate oil on Maundy Thursday, and replenish from it the horns of the various churches of his jurisdiction. The priests of that diocese were not permitted at baptisms to pour the superfluous oil of the *laḡna* into the horn; and one priest, Ḳasha Beniamin of Mushabad, told me that he thought such a proceeding would be extremely unseemly, but their custom, at the conclusion of the baptismal service, was simply to cleanse the *laḡna* in the water of the font.

It is curious that two of the *ṭakhsas* of the Sipurghan diocese, which I happen to have examined, those of Mushabad and the village of Sipurghan itself, bear out the practice of the priests on this point; as they contain the rubric ordering the washing of the *laḡna* in the font, without any direction to pour the oil that remains over into the horn. Mar Yonan, in a conversation upon the subject of the *ḡarna*, told me that he had heard that an archdeacon with priests had the power of adding to the holy oil, but said that he always did it himself. He is, however, a man of no learning, and his practice was only interesting as witnessing to the traditional custom of the diocese. But it is, I think, extremely probable that the custom was inaugurated by some former bishop, in comparatively recent times, with a view to keeping the priests in subjection, and, possibly, extorting fees from them for the oil which they cannot do without.

THE USE OF OIL IN HOLY BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION.

The rubrics of the Baptismal Service (*ṭakhsa d'a'mada*) provide:—

(a) For the signing of the child with the oil of the horn (*ḡarna*) in the early part of the service:—"The priest signs each one on the forehead with the sign of the cross, with the oil of unction, by

means of his first finger, from below upward, and from right to left, saying, 'N. is signed in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, for ever.'"

(b) For the consecration of olive oil in a separate vessel (*laḡna*), and the consecration of the water in the font, by the mingling, in both cases, of a few drops of the oil of the horn, poured in making the sign of the cross:—"The priest pours olive oil into the (*laḡna*) He takes the horn of oil (*ḡarna*) and signs the oil in the *laḡna* upon the altar (i.e. a quasi-altar in the baptistery), with oil from the horn, with the sign of the cross, saying, 'This oil is signed, and sanctified, and mixed with holy oil, that it may be for a type of incorruption in absolving baptism, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, for ever.' And he signs upon the water, pouring upon it (oil from the horn) in the form of the cross, and says, 'This water is signed, sanctified, and mixed with holy oil, that it may be a new womb, begetting spiritually in absolving baptism, in the Name, &c.'"

(c) For the unction of the child's body with the oil prepared in the *laḡna*:—"The priest anoints each one of them upon the breast with his three fingers, from above downward, and from right to left, with the sign of the cross, and says, 'N. is signed in the Name, &c.' And those who are present (deacons, or other priests) anoint the whole body of him who was anointed by the priest so that no part remain unanointed."

Up to this point all service books agree. It is to be noted that these ceremonies take place *before* the actual baptism. But there is yet another unction, at the conclusion of the service, about which curious misapprehension has arisen; namely, that which takes place in connection with the following rubrics:—

(d) "The priest goes out by the great door of the sanctuary, and with him the deacons (bearing) the cross, and the gospel-book, and the censer, and lights, and the horn of oil. And they bring those that have been baptized to the door of the sanctuary And he makes to pass his hand upon one and all of them (with an appropriate prayer of benediction). And he signs each of them on the forehead with the thumb of his right hand, from below upward, and from right to left, and says, 'N. is baptized (*a'mad*) and perfected (*eshtamli*), in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, for ever.' And he puts crowns (*kiliṭi*) upon their heads, and says, 'Thou hast put upon his head a

glorious crown: he asked life of thee and thou hast given it him^h."

The anointing with oil at this point, so far as my experience goes (and I have made careful observation and investigation) is never omitted; save in those cases, happily rare, in which the priest is wholly ignorant of the rites of his Church. It appears to me, therefore, that Etheridge ("The Syrian Churches," p. 96) is absolutely correct when he asserts anent the Nestorians—"Anointing the baptized with holy oil immediately follows the ordinance (of baptism), and is considered an indispensable accompaniment."

Yet strangely enough Assemani, whose text of the rubric agrees with that quoted above, does not appear to have known of this final anointing as practised in his time; and he is followed by recent writers, such as Badger, Denzinger, and others, who boldly assert that such anointing is unknown among the Nestorians of to-day; although all are agreed that it was anciently practised at the point indicated above.

Thus, for example, Assemani (Bibl. Or. iv. 283) sums up a lengthy dissertation on the rite of Confirmation among the Nestorians in these words:—"Etsi Nestoriani oleum Chrismatis olim consecrabant, eoque baptizatos ungebant: nunc tamen nullum in eorum ritualibus, vel consecrationis ejus, vel unctionis baptizatorum, vestigium exstat: sed hæc tantum rubrica adnotatur, 'Et signat unumquemque eorum in fronte pollice suo dextero, ab imo sursum et a dextera ad sinistram, dicens, Baptizatus est et perfectus est, etc.' Ubi non exprimitur an sacerdos baptizatos Chrismate signet, an solo crucis signo, quo et catechumeni in eodem rituali signari dicuntur, antequam oleo ungantur."

Denzinger, too (Ritus Orientalium, p. 49), says:—"Evanuisse apud Nestorianos confirmationis usum et distinctam memoriam, res est quæ negari nequit." Then he quotes the rubrics directing what is to be done after the actual baptism, as given above. After which he adds:—"Sed et unctionem hoc loco olim peractam fuisse, quæ perfectionis nomine decoraretur, cuius effectus confirmationis sacramento proprii adscriberentur, ex certissimis monumentis Nestorianæ sectæ, constat Georgius Arbelenensis (tract. ii. de bap. Bibl. Or. iii. 536) quaternam ex eodem olei cornu unctionem fieri refert, pro tertiâ illam habens quæ fit per immixtum aquæ baptismi oleum, quartam

^h For these various rubrics see *takhsa*, printed by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, pp. 57-73.

autem post baptismum ponit, perfectionem vocat, eique confirmationis effectus adscribit."

Again Dr. Badger ("The Nestorians and their Rituals," p. 212) asserts:—"It has been seen that the oil of unction is only used by the Nestorians before Baptism, and that the invocation for grace with imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross *without oil*, form the principal rites of Confirmation with them."

A like assertion is made by Messrs. Maclean and Browne ("The Catholics of the East," p. 272).

My reasons for venturing to question the conclusions of these learned men I will now proceed to shew, for the sake of clearness arranging them under separate heads.

1. THE EVIDENCE OF NESTORIAN DOCTORS TO THE POST-BAPTISMAL ANOINTING.

As there seems to be no dispute respecting the ancient practice of the Nestorians, I will quote only four writers, and those comparatively late, who refer to it. (1) Giwergis (George), Metropolitan of Mosul and Arbelaⁱ in the 10th century, wrote an elaborate work on the services of the Church, entitled, *nuhara tism'shatha*, still much read, and held in high esteem, by the more learned among the East Syrians. The fifth paragraph of the fifth division of this treatise is headed, "Why it is that from the one horn (*ḥarna*) we sign, and anoint, and baptize, and seal (*mḥatminan*)."

In the reference to this passage, quoted above, from Denzinger, it is said "*pro tertiâ illam habens quæ fit per immixtum aquæ baptismi oleum*," which would seem to signify the unction of the water with the holy oil. In fact, however, from the use of the word "baptize" (*ma'mdinan*), as well as from the following passage in the body of the tract, it is clear that the original must refer to the anointing which *the child* receives by being dipped into water, with which the holy oil has been mingled. The passage, which I translate from a Syrian manuscript, is as follows:—"There are four dispensations set forth by the horn; the first having reference to Abraham, the second to the written Law, the third to John, the fourth to Christ. 1. The priest by one finger signs; shewing that

ⁱ In Mesopotamia. Not to be confounded with the biblical Arbela (1 Mac. ix. 2).

forehead with the thumb of his right hand from below upward, and from right to left, and says, 'N. is baptized and perfected in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' And the people answer, Amen. Then he puts crowns (fillets), *kllili*, upon their heads, and says, 'Thou hast put upon his head a glorious crown, he asked life and Thou hast given it him^m.'

These minute directions seem to me clearly to indicate that a special and important part of the service, apart from the actual baptism, takes place at this point; and that this is not simply, as has been asserted, the imposition of the priest's hand upon the head of the baptized, is I think sufficiently indicated by the direction to take out of the baptistery the horn of unction. When making enquiries from Syrian priests as to this final signing, and pointing out that some *takhshas* make no specific mention of oil at this point, I have frequently been met with the rejoinder that its use is clearly implied by the previous rubric anent the horn. One (Salmas) *takhsha* indeed, now open before me, omitting all reference to the other ornaments, directs merely that the priest go out of the door of the sanctuary "with the horn of unction;" the one thing regarded as really essential, and never omitted.

Further, I think that the putting on of the "crowns" at this is very significant. These are simply pieces of thread, of two strands, red and white (explained in the Armenian rite, to which they are common, as having reference to the blood and water from our Lord's side), or sometimes of three, red, white, and blue. They thus bear no sort of resemblance to what we ordinarily understand by crowns; whilst it is easy to see that they may well be a relic of the use of fillets or bandages.

That such was their origin I have very little doubt in the light of ancient custom, to which Pellicia bears witness in the following passage:—"The Godfathers and Godmothers used to bind round the forehead of each of those who had been confirmed a certain linen fillet, so that what was left of the holy oil should not be wiped off, by washing or any other means, before the appointed time. In the 12th century they used to wear the fillet over the chrism on the forehead for seven days, and in the 13th for at least three days. But in the 16th century they either wore their bandages (as they were then called) only during the whole day on which they had been confirmed, or they immediately wiped the anointed fore-

^m See *takhsha*, printed by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, pp. 71-73.

head with a piece of cotton and washed it with the bandage." ("Polity of the Christian Church," Bellett's Translation, p. 26.)

The Armenians employ such a bandage in the present day, not indeed at baptism, when they use (in Persia at least) mere threads, like those of the Syrians; but at ordination, when for seven days the newly-ordained priest wears a linen fillet upon his forehead which has been signed by the holy chrism. It is of course well known that in the Roman rite of Confirmation it is the practice to wipe off the chrism from the brow of the newly-confirmed with a piece of cotton wool, doubtless a substitute for the ancient fillet.

It has been objected that this final signation of the baptized can have no claim to be regarded as in itself denoting, or invoking, a special infusion of sacramental grace, because in the formula accompanying it the verbs "baptized" and "perfected" are both in the perfect tense, implying an act already done.

I confess that I myself recognize the difficulty; though I do not know that it is greater than that presented to a Western mind, by language used concerning the bread and wine of the Eucharist before consecration, in ancient liturgies. I imagine that the use of the perfect may emphasize the completion of the work done at the time, rather than its entirely past character; and further that the formula must not be harshly divorced from the foregoing prayer (or prayers), with which it is closely associated.

But I would point out that the difficulty, whatever it amounts to, is by no means escaped by those who would find the essentials of Confirmation in the priestly imposition of hands and prayer. For the benedictory prayer immediately preceding, the only one which is always found, beginning, "The earnest of the Holy Spirit which ye (have) received," is cast entirely in the perfect, so far as the outpouring of the Spirit, and His gifts, is concerned.

Moreover, the question arises, What is meant by imposition of hands? If actual contact, there is none. For the direction to "make the hand to pass" is commonly understood to mean only the spreading of the hand towards the candidates; much as in the earlier part of the Latin rite the bishop spreads his hands over those to be confirmed. I have never known the East Syrians to lay special stress upon this ceremony; and I have known it, to all appearance, entirely omitted, by priests who would on no account omit the final signation from the horn.

The term *siamida*, too, cannot be pressed; for though its literal

meaning is "laying on of hands," it appears to be used in liturgical books for any benedictory prayer without any imposition of hands being necessarily implied.^a

(b) PARTICULAR. But we are left in no possibility of doubt as to the meaning of the rubric for the final signation of the baptized, when we come to examine copies of the service books themselves. I have inspected carefully a great number of these, many of them now in use in churches belonging to the East Syrians, written at various times, and in various districts ranging between Mosul and the Aras (*Araxes*). I give it as my conclusion that the great majority of such manuscripts contain a definite injunction to use oil at the point in question, over and above the general directions of the rubrics already quoted.

I cannot do more than give a few representative instances, which I take direct from the manuscripts, but these will, I think, suffice to establish my contention.

(1) In a baptismal *ṭakhṣa* used by the late Mar Gauriel, belonging to the bishops of the Ardishai district on the west of the Lake of Urmia, written in that district in the year 2098 of the Greeks (A.D. 1787), the direction is as follows:—"He signs each one of them with the thumb, from above downward, and from right to left, with holy oil, and says, N. is baptized, &c."

(2) In the *ṭakhṣa* in use at Gavilan, on the north-west of the lake, the seat of a bishopric, though now without a bishop, it is written:—"He signs them on the forehead with his thumb, from above downward, and from right to left, with holy oil, and says, &c." Then follows another rubric which is interesting:—"Know that it is written in the commentary of Mar Giwergis of Arbela (already quoted), 'He signs them with the forefinger:' and so he commands that they be signed." I asked the priest, Kasha Yukhanan, the representative of the bishop's house, what his own custom was. He replied that he always used the thumb at this anointing, and considered it more fitting. This manuscript was

^a Compare its use in the daily service of evening prayer, when the deacon exclaims, "Bow your heads for imposition of hands (*siamida*) and receive the blessing," followed by a prayer by the priest for the people; and the same proclamation in the Liturgy of Mar Adai (printed *ṭakhṣa*, p. 5), where the *siamida* which follows is said by the priest kneeling, and facing the altar; similarly it occurs as the title of a prayer in the early part of the Baptismal Service (printed *ṭakhṣa*, p. 65).

written in 1937 of the Greeks (A.D. 1626), in the village of Bitnis, and has been in use in Gavilan for many generations.

(3) In a *ṭakhṣa* belonging to Kasha Oshana of Sipurghan, written in Kudshanis, the present seat of the Catholicos, Mar Shimun, in the year 2098 of the Greeks (A.D. 1787): "He signs each one of them with the thumb, from above downward, and from right to left, with holy oil, and says, &c."

(4) The *ṭakhṣa* in use at Shibani, in the district of Tergawar, bordering on Turkey, reads thus: "He signs them with 'grace' (*ṭaibutha*, a term used for holy oil), with his thumb, and not with his finger, from below upward, and from right to left, and says, &c." This was written in 2143 (A.D. 1832), in the village of Tulu, in Tergawar.

The *ṭakhṣa* of Balulan, also in Tergawar, has exactly the same words, and as it is evidently a much older copy, very probably is the original from which the Shibani *ṭakhṣa* was written, but it has no date.

It is not at all uncommon to find the term *ṭaibutha* used for the oil of the horn. I have met with it in many manuscripts besides those above-named; for instance, it occurs in the *ṭakhṣa* of the important village of Charbakhsh, near to the city of Urmia, written in 2093 of the Greeks (A.D. 1782), and again, in a *ṭakhṣa* of the Turkish village of Mar Bishu on the frontier, and in a Salmas *ṭakhṣa* written in Tergawar. It is, moreover, a term well known to the more learned priests, among whom I specially recall Kasha Oshana of Tkoma, and Kasha Rehana, uncle of the present Metropolitan, as having told me that it is a common term for the baptismal oil of the horn.

(5) In a very interesting, and apparently very old, manuscript in the museum of the American Presbyterian Mission at Urmia, I found the following rendering of this rubric:—"He signs from the oil which is in the *laḡna*," i.e. the vessel containing the oil blessed by the priest during the baptismal service, "from below upward, and from left to right, and says, &c."

The direction to employ the oil in the *laḡna* is curious; the more so as in the previous rubric the priest is directed to take out of the baptistery with him the horn (*ḡarna*); but some priests use the *laḡna* at this last anointing, and they see no difference between the two oils, arguing that after the olive oil in the *laḡna* has been consecrated by the admixture of the drops from the

oil of the horn it is to be regarded as exactly the same as the latter; hence the rubric at the conclusion of the baptismal service ordering that what remains in the *lakna* be poured into the horn (*ḡarna*).

(6) Again, in a manuscript in possession of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, dated (but in a later hand) 2106 of the Greeks (A.D. 1795), I find as follows:—"He signs the children on the forehead with anointing oil, with his thumb and not with his finger, from below upward, and from right to left, and says, &c."

(7) Lastly, I find the following in a manuscript belonging to Kasha Mushi of Salmas, dated 1915 of the Greeks (A.D. 1604). I quote it in full on account of its intrinsic interest, apart from the immediate discussion:—"And he takes the horn of oil and signs them on the forehead with the thumb of his right hand, and not with his finger, in the form of the cross, from above downward, and from right to left, with holy oil, and says, 'N. is baptized and perfected in the Name of the Father, and of the Son' ['and of the Holy Ghost' is omitted, clearly by a scribal error]. And they answer, Amen. And he signs them. If he wishes, he passes the gospel-book before their faces. There are districts, too, in which they hang crosses upon their breasts. And this they do well and fittingly, according to the custom of the country. And they go into the baptistery, having with them the horn of oil and the other ornaments."

It is noticeable that there is no reference here to the crowns or fillets usually placed on the heads of the baptized at this point; but the next page of the manuscript is wanting, and it is probable that it contained directions for this ceremony, as a subsequent incidental reference to the crowns seems to indicate.

It will be observed that there are several minor variations in these extracts, all more or less interesting in themselves, but of no special bearing upon the question before us, viz. whether or not the last signation of the baptismal service of the Nestorians is performed with holy oil.

3. THE EVIDENCE OF EXISTING PRACTICE.

From minute and careful investigation, pursued during five years' sojourn in their country, I am convinced that the custom of using oil at the point under consideration is universal among

the East Syrians; and further, that, so far as it is possible to judge, there has never been a break in the tradition. Certainly the practice is not due, as has been suggested to me, to Roman Catholic influence; it exists in districts, and is performed by priests, wholly free—both now and in the past—from such influence; as it is also found directed in manuscripts written long before the arrival of the Roman Missionaries in these parts.

I think, however, I shall best establish my case by quoting the written testimony of the following living representative men among the East Syrians:—

1. THE TESTIMONY OF THE SYRIAN METROPOLITAN, MAR KHANISHU (the highest ecclesiastical authority after the Catholicos):—

"The custom of the ancient Church of the Syrians as to the completion of baptism (*shumlaia d'ma'moditha*) is this:—after the immersion of the child in the water of the font, the priest and deacons go out through the door of the sanctuary, with the horn, and lights, and the book of the gospels, cross, and censer. Then the priest, after putting his right hand upon the head of the child with prayer, signs the cross with his thumb upon its forehead, with the holy oil of the horn, and says, N. is baptized and perfected, &c."

2. THE TESTIMONY OF KASHA OSHANA OF TKHOMA (TURKISH KURDISTAN), Archdeacon of the Patriarchal Cell, and subsequently for a time priest-in-charge of the church of Mart Mariam, Urmia:—

"Be it known to your honour, O beloved of God, that in the district of Tkhoma baptism is performed for all the country round in our church (only), that of Mar Pithiun. On the Sabbath of Light (Easter Even) and on the Feast of Raban Pithiun, which is the 6th Sunday of the Apostles, there are years when the number of children of the district brought together for baptism amounts to 150 or 200, more or less. The priests who were before me, and those in my time, according to ancient tradition, always at the conclusion of baptism anointed the children with the oil of the horn (*ḡarna*); and every year the oil of the horn was increased before it finished. I, unworthy that I am, am now 54 years of age; in the 12th year of my life I was ordained deacon; eight years later, priest; five years after, archdeacon. The years of my priest-

hood were passed either in Tkhoma or in Kudshanis. Wherever I have been, the sanctifying of baptism has been in my hands. I cannot tell how many children I have baptized, or how many I have seen baptized by old and learned priests my seniors; but I have never seen (any baptize), nor myself baptized, without this signing with the oil of the horn."

The writer also gives the following interesting comment upon this final sealing. After quoting Eph. i. 13, iv. 30, he proceeds: "A seal has upon it the name of its owner; and this signing is a seal in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And the line is traced upon the forehead, from below upward, and from right to left. That is, the Son offered up the baptized to His Father. And from the right, which is the pillar of the priesthood, the Spirit is given to the baptized; and by the left, which is the pillar of kingship, they receive holiness". This is the sign of life, the sign of Christ, the living sign, the seal of the Holy Spirit, the seal of the perfection of baptism, the 'laying on of hands' (*siamida*) of baptism."

With regard to this last expression, *siamida d'ma'moditha*, I have never met with it in Syrian authors as a doctrinal term connoting the confirmation portion of the baptismal service; for this they commonly use the term *shumlaia*, "the perfecting." I cannot speak with authority, but I am inclined to think that it is a quite modern term in this sense, unknown to Nestorian literature. That there is a prayer at the conclusion of the baptismal service called a *siamida*, and said with laying on of hands, forming part of the service of *shumlaia*, I do not of course call in question.

3. THE TESTIMONY OF KASHA MUSHI OF SALMAS (PERSIA):—

"I was ordained deacon by the late Mar Shimun, the Patriarch, in Mart Mariam of the city of Urmia, 51 years ago. From that time I did service in the church of Ula, Salmas, under the hand of the departed Kasha Sawa, a very learned and God-fearing priest, who was very diligent in the service of the Church. His custom was always, in the baptism of children, to perform the final signing with the oil of the horn, whilst pronouncing the words 'N. is baptized and perfected, &c.' I myself became priest of the church

^o A reference, such as is frequently met with in Syriac literature, to the two pillars of the temple. See 1 Kings vii. 21, &c.

of Ula in his place, 22 years ago; and thus I also do. And this is in fact the universal custom of the old Church of the Syrians."

THE QUESTION OF THE VALIDITY OF NESTORIAN CONFIRMATION.

So far I have confined myself to the enquiry whether, as a fact, a rite of Confirmation administered with holy oil exists among the East Syrians, and I claim to have demonstrated that such a rite does exist.

The further question of its validity does not naturally fall within the scope of this paper; but nevertheless it seems irresistibly suggested by what has gone before, and is of such real interest that I cannot leave it altogether untouched.

For my own part, I may say at once—though I am entirely open to conviction on the subject,—that I am disposed to consider it invalid; mainly because of the inadequacy of the matter.

I take it that Catholic custom only recognizes, ordinarily, priestly Confirmation, when administered with matter duly consecrated by the bishop. This covers the customary administration of the sacrament in the Eastern Church, and is, I presume, the ground of its general acceptance. Even if the episcopal consecration of the horn, among the Nestorians, be assumed to suffice in itself, it is yet as a rule so remote, and the matter is generally so much diluted by subsequent addition, that it is difficult to regard it in the same light as the chrism of the Greeks.

What, however, somewhat makes me misdoubt is the fact (which I believe is a fact) that Easterns allow, and presumably Westerns tacitly assent, that Confirmation is equally valid if the chrism has been consecrated by seven priests. Except on the ground of jurisdiction, on which it is possible the whole question may rest, I take it that what seven priests can do one can equally do; and thus if priestly consecration suffices for the matter of Confirmation, it may well be that Nestorian Confirmation, accompanied as it is with what I imagine sufficiently represents the Apostolic ceremony of laying on of hands, is sound.

The question becomes a very practical one in the case of converts made by the Roman Catholic Missionaries among the Nestorians, as well as in the more rare instances of converts to the English Church.

In *theory* Rome does not allow Nestorian Confirmation; and ordinarily a convert, especially if he is to be ordained, is conditionally baptized and absolutely confirmed; and this even in the case of a convert deacon or priest, whose orders are nevertheless accepted. Actual *practice*, however, is, or has been in the past, very lax. The following cases are in point:—

Kasha La'zar, the father-in-law of the present priest of Ula, Salmas, many years ago became a Roman Catholic. He was conditionally baptized and confirmed absolutely. But by a special decree from Rome it was declared that there was no real doubt as to his previous baptism, and his priesthood was allowed to stand.

Similarly a Nestorian deacon of this same village, who became a Roman Catholic some fifteen years ago, was baptized conditionally and confirmed. Shortly afterwards he was ordained priest, but I have it from himself that his deacon's orders were not ratified in any way.

On the other hand I have a letter from a priest in Urmia, a man of considerable ability and some learning, who, after being ordained deacon by the late Mar Gauriel, became a student of the Propaganda, and five or six years ago was ordained priest by the Chaldean (R. C.) Archbishop of Urmia, in which the following passage occurs, "As to your question whether the Church of Rome accepts the Nestorian Confirmation, I answer in the affirmative. . . . I was neither re-baptized nor re-confirmed at Rome, for the Sacred Congregation of Rites was satisfied with and accepted my order, as well as my baptism and confirmation, as valid." As, however, the writer, as appears from another part of his letter, was under the impression that Nestorian Confirmation is administered by "*muron*, or chrism, consecrated by the bishop," he no doubt, unintentionally, misled the Sacred Congregation.

There is, in fact, no doubt as to the non-recognition of Nestorian Confirmation by the Roman Catholic authorities; but I have quite failed to discover the grounds of the adverse decision, if, as I believe, such formal decision exists. The answer commonly given by the converts themselves and their teachers is that the matter used by the Nestorians is not chrism consecrated by a bishop, which is the essential matter of true Confirmation. The same answer seems to be suggested by a perusal of the Chaldean (R. C.) *takhsa*,

printed by the Lazarists at Urmia in 1876, and in common use. It says, absolutely, "The matter of this sacrament is oil of olive mixed with balsam, and consecrated by the bishop; the form, I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and confirm thee with the chrism (*muron*) of salvation."

Stress would seem to be laid upon the fact that chrism is a compound, whereas the oil of the horn is simple oil of olives, on which, as I have pointed out above, the Nestorians themselves insist. But in the light of the fact that "from the beginning of the Church simple oil was used (for Confirmation) as the material of the chrism, both by the Latins and by the Greeks," witnessed to by Pellicia ("Polity of the Christian Church," Bellett's Translation, p. 24) and many other well-known writers, the balm not being introduced till the 6th century, it is altogether unlikely that a learned Roman Congregation, when legislating for a primitive oriental community, would base a decision on such uncertain ground.

A Roman Catholic missionary, by birth a Syrian, but educated in France, of sound theological attainments within his own sphere, to whom I applied in the hope of obtaining the actual terms of the decree, was kind enough to promise to seek for it. Subsequently, failing, as I gather, to find it, he was so good as to send me the following statement:—"Pour le sacrement de Confirmation, il est de foi que les évêques *seuls* en sont les ministres *ordinaires*; les prêtres ne peuvent l'administrer *valablement*, qu'avec la *permission*, expresse pour les latins, et tacite pour les orientaux Catholiques, du Souverain Pontife de Rome. Telle est la doctrine des SS. Pères, clairement approuvée par toute la tradition, et par le grand pape Benoît XIV. La Confirmation faite par un *prêtre* nestorien ne peut pas être *valide*, car la permission de l'évêque ne suffit pas; et le Pape ne l'accorde pas aux *hérétiques*." The italics are the writer's own.

It is obvious, I think, that to persons outside the pale of Rome this statement partakes of the nature of *petitio principii*. Neither does it appear to harmonize with the following statement with which I have been favoured by an Italian clergyman, a Mechitarist working in Persia among the Armenians:—"Parce que nous croyons que les Arméniens schismatiques successivement ont la hierarchie, c'est pour cela nous acceptons tous leurs sacrements comme valides, soit leur ordination, soit leur baptême, et

leur confirmation." Armenians are confirmed, like the Nestorians, immediately after their baptism by the priest, but with the sacred chrism consecrated by the Catholicos at Etchmiadzin.

THE USE OF OIL IN OTHER ORDINANCES.

Apart from the Baptismal Service the use of oil by the Nestorians is insignificant; nor can it be said that it is regarded as of such primary and indeed essential importance in any other rite.

(1) The Service of Absolution (*ṭakhsa d'khusāia*) may perhaps be regarded as in some degree representing the sacrament of Penance. Auricular confession is not now practised by the East Syrians, though it is referred to in clear terms in their ancient writings. Thus in the service of the Supplication of the Ninevites occurs the passage quoted by Mar Audishu in "The Pearl," already referred to:—"Our Lord has committed the medicine of repentance to skilled physicians, the priests of His Church. Whomsoever therefore Satan hath cast into the disease of sin let him come and show his wounds to the disciples of the wise physician, who will heal him with spiritual medicine."

The rite of absolution contained in the *ṭakhsa*¹ is said to have been drawn up by Mar Ishuyav, who was Catholicos of the Nestorians in the middle of the 7th century. It is preceded by a rubric directing its use, "for one who has departed from the faith and again returned; and for the man who has eaten meat on a fast (or, more probably, in the fast, i.e. Lent), or on Friday or Wednesday; or who has committed any other transgression." So far as I know it is only now used, and that rarely, in the case of persons who have left the Nestorian body for some other form of religion and subsequently returned.

Oil, that of the horn (*ḥarna*), is only employed in the case of those who have voluntarily apostatized, in accordance with the following rubric at the conclusion of the Service:—"The priest shall enquire (of the penitent) if by his own will without cause he apostatized. If so, he signs him with oil and says, 'N. is signed and renewed, and sealed, and sanctified, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' But if not by his own will he does not need oil."

¹ See *ṭakhsa*, printed by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, p. 111.

In a *ṭakhsa* belonging to Kasha Mushi of Salmas, probably about 200 years old, fuller directions are given:—"The priest signs him (the penitent) with the oil of unction on the forehead, with the thumb of his right hand, from below upward, and from right to left, and says, 'N. is signed, and sanctified, and renewed, and perfected, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' But if his apostacy was involuntary and in ignorance he is not signed with oil, but with the sign of the cross without oil."

It is significant that the word "perfected" (*mishtamti*) in this formula is the same (save that it is in the present tense) as that used in the final anointing in the baptismal service; with which, having in mind the ancient controversy as to the mode of re-admission of the lapsed, I am inclined to think this unction in the service of absolution was probably closely connected by its author. Nor is it without significance that this signation is immediately preceded, like that at the close of the baptismal service, by a prayer called a "laying on of hands" (*siamida*), which in some old manuscripts I have consulted is ordered to be said with imposition of the priest's right hand upon the head of the penitent².

This rite, as now administered, involves nothing of the nature of confession on the part of the penitent. It is prescribed by a rubric for use on the Sabbath of Light, and apparently may only be used on that day.

(2) In the consecration of churches, commonly called the laying on of hands, or ordination (*siamida*) of churches, a very important position is assigned to oil. The horn, however, is not employed, but the bishop, at the beginning of the service, consecrates olive oil in a vessel placed upon the altar. Then he smears this upon the altar slab with three fingers, "so that no part of it remain unanointed." Similarly he anoints the four consecration crosses, inscribed in stones let into the four interior walls of the sanctuary, and the lintel of the sanctuary door or arch, and other parts and fittings of the sanctuary. The importance of this rite in the eyes of the Nestorians is seen from the fact, already alluded to,

² For example, in a Salmas *ṭakhsa* written A.D. 1604. For this service, see *ṭakhsa*, printed by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, pp. 111-113; in which, however, neither the term *siamida*, nor the injunction to impose the hand, occurs here.

that their patriarch, Mar Timotheos II., reckons it as one of the sacraments.

This service contains also the following rubric concerning oil; interesting, as it *may* be taken to imply a practice of anointing the sick:—"It is not lawful to anoint the altar with the oil of unction of baptism, handed down from the Apostles, but with oil sanctified by the bishop (lit. chief of the priests). The canons of the Church do not permit the use of the oil of tradition, except for the signing and anointing of those who come to baptism. If any one dare to use it for the consecration of churches, or to give it to those who are sick in body, or have evil spirits, or for any other purpose except baptism, let him know that he is acting against the decrees of the ancient fathers^r."

(3) Lastly, oil of olives, but without consecration, is used by the priest in making the Eucharistic bread^s; and also in multiplying the Holy Leaven, or *malika*^t, on Maundy Thursday. The rubrics direct in both instances that a little pure olive oil be mixed with wheaten flour, salt, and water. It would be interesting to know whence the East Syrians derived this custom of introducing oil into the Eucharistic bread, and whether the practice dates from the first ages. I have never heard any special point made of it, either by the Nestorians or their opponents, but I imagine that in this use of oil they stand alone.

F. F. IRVING.

^r See *takhsa*, printed by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, pp. 134—150.
^s p. 105. ^t p. 114.

N.B. By the term "Nestorians" throughout this essay I do not intend to express any opinion as to the actual theological opinions of the East Syrians, but I use it, as they frequently do themselves, as the name by which they are most widely known.—F. F. I.

OCCASIONAL PAPER

OF

THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

The Worship of the Orthodox Church,

A MANUAL OF INFORMATION,

EDITED BY THE

REV. C. R. DAVEY BIGGS, D.D.,

VICAR OF SS. PHILIP AND JAMES, OXFORD.

SECRETARY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;

AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1903.

This manual is adapted from the Catechism of the Archimandrite Gregorios Palama (Constantinople, n.d.), which has been translated for this purpose by Miss M. G. Dampier.

Its purpose is to afford information on all matters relating to the churches and worship of the orthodox.

It is divided into four chapters, of which the first sets forth and explains everything connected with churches and the various sacred vessels, coverings, and other objects used in them. The second treats of the holy persons appointed for the service of the Church, and of their liturgical vestments. The third describes all the common and ordinary services used at appointed times in the Church, and the fourth explains the divine and sacred Liturgy.

It has been found convenient to adopt the position of one assisting at the mysteries in the explanation of the Liturgy, and in the spelling of technical terms to follow the English and not the Greek spelling of words which have become Anglicised and are familiar.

And it is not unimportant to notice that the only service which the Archimandrite thought it necessary to explain in his Catechism to children receiving elementary instruction was the Liturgy, or Holy Communion. The services which correspond roughly or in part to our Morning and Evening Prayer are only mentioned incidentally.

C. R. D. B.

The Worship of the Orthodox Church.

CHAPTER I.

On the Church, its divisions, and the holy vessels, coverings, and other appointments.

Christian Temple is the name given to that building which, being consecrated by a special service, is used by Christians who assemble in it for the public worship of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, at stated times of the day or otherwise.

For this reason it is also called *Church*, *Temple of God*, *House of the Lord*, *House of Prayer*, and *Oratory*.

Christian churches are usually built outwardly either in the form of an *ark* or *ship*, as a symbol that Christians should always be steering straight for heaven, the eternal harbour; or in the form and figure of a *cross*, because the cross is the only firm and immovable foundation of the Church.

Churches are always built facing east, because just as the sun which gives life to all nature rises in the east, so the salvation of the human race rose "as the day-star" in the east.

The *Christian Temple* is divided within into three principal parts: (1) The *holy Bema* or simply the *sanctuary*, (2) the *temple proper*, (3) the *narthex*. This division of the Christian temple into three parts points plainly to the primitive division of Christians into three orders: (i) that of the *clergy and ministers of the Church*, (ii) that of the *faithful*, and (iii) that of the *catechumens and penitents*.

By *holy coverings* are meant all the veils, curtains and priestly vestments of whatever material, which are used in the church.

Holy vessels is the name given to the vessels of various material in churches, which are used in the performance of the mysteries or for any other sacred rite and purpose according to the various needs of the church; or also for the adornment of the holy churches.

THE HOLY BEMA.

The *holy Bema* is the eastern part of the church, which is divided from the rest of the church by the iconostasis, and constitutes the most sacred part of every Christian church.

The *holy Bema* represents heaven, where God is invisibly present. On this account only the ministers of the church and her clergy are allowed to enter the *holy Bema*, which is also called for these reasons *altar*, *sanctuary*, and the part of the church which is specially *holy*.

In the *holy Bema* the following objects are contained: (1) The *Table* called *holy*, (2) the *prothesis*, (3) the *synthronon*, (4) the *skeuophylakion*.

(1) *Holy Table*.

"*Holy Table*" is the name given to the table placed in the middle of the *holy Bema*, and it is called *holy* because the bloodless sacrifice for our sins is offered upon it.

The *Holy Table* is made of gold or silver or marble or stone or imperishable wood, and is square in shape symbolically, because the Body and Blood of Christ are communicated from it to the four quarters of the inhabited earth. And when the *Holy Table* is supported on four pillars, these pillars represent the four Evangelists: when it is supported on one pillar in the middle only, then this pillar represents Jesus Christ, the one foundation of the Church. When it is filled in on all sides, it represents the Lord's tomb and also the burying-places of the *holy martyrs*.

The *Holy Table* represents (1) the table on which the Lord ate the last Passover with His disciples.

(2) The tomb in which the body of Jesus was laid by Joseph and Nicodemus.

(3) The throne of glory of God the great King, and

(4) The Mount of Olives, from which the Saviour ascended with glory.

As the *Holy Table* symbolises Christ's tomb, it has been covered from very early times with a simple white cloth, which is called "*katasarkion*," and symbolises the grave-cloth in which the body of Christ was wrapped when it was laid in the tomb. But as the *Holy Table* also symbolises God's throne of glory, another more

beautiful and richer covering is laid on the top of the grave-cloth, which is called "*endyton*," or "*endyte*." This is a symbol of the glory or of the raiment of Christ, which at the Transfiguration became white as the light and shone as the sun.

The following objects are always placed upon the *Holy Table*: (1) The *eileton*, (2) the *antiminsion*, (3) the *holy Gospel*, (4) the precious *Cross*, and (5) the *Pyx*.

The *eileton* is that piece of cloth which lies folded up in the form of a square in the middle of the *Holy Table*. It signifies the napkin which was upon our Saviour's Head when He was laid in the tomb.

The *antiminsion* is a square of linen or silk material, in the middle of which is represented the taking down of our Saviour Christ from the Cross, and round the border the four Evangelists and the instruments of the Lord's passion. The *antiminsion* takes the place of the *Holy Table*, so that where there is no *Holy Table* which has been consecrated by a dedication service—as in the oratories on board ships, or the movable churches in camps—there the mystery of the divine Eucharist can be celebrated on the *antiminsion*.

The *antiminsia*, therefore, are always consecrated at the dedication of a church. The *antiminsion* on the *Holy Table* always lies wrapped up inside the *eileton*. Both these are unfolded and spread out upon the *Holy Table* after the reading of the *holy Gospel* in the Liturgy. The *Gospels*, the *Cross* and the *Pyx* are upon the *Holy Table* because the *Gospel* represents our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, Whose life upon earth it relates, the *Cross* represents the sufferings which our Saviour endured for our sins, the *Pyx* suggests the Lord's tomb, because in it are kept the Body and Blood of Christ for the exceptional needs of Christians.

(2) *Prothesis*.

The *prothesis* is the little table which stands by itself to the left of the *Holy Table*. It is called *prothesis* because the gifts usually offered by the faithful—that is the bread and wine—are laid out upon it. The *prothesis* represents (i) Bethlehem and the cave there in which our Lord was born and laid, and (ii) Golgotha, where He was crucified.

On the *prothesis* are placed the following vessels: (1) The *holy*

poterion, (2) *diskos*, (3) *asteriskos*, (4) *lonche*, (5) *spongus*, (6) *labis*, (7) *zeon*, all of which are made of metal. Of coverings there are (1) two small veils, and (2) one large veil, which is also called the *aer*.

The holy *poterion* (chalice) represents (1) that Cup in which the Lord gave His Own Blood to His disciples at the mystic supper, that all might drink It under the form of wine. (2) The spotless side of our Saviour, out of which, when pierced by the soldier's spear, there came forth blood and water. The holy *poterion* is used for the water and wine which the priest pours into it at the offertory, and which are changed after the Consecration into the Blood of the Lord.

The *diskos* (or *paten*) represents the manger in the cave at Bethlehem, in which the infant Jesus was laid after His birth, by the Virgin Mary. It is used for holding the holy bread which the priest separates from the oblation at the offertory, and which is changed after the Consecration into the Body of Christ.

The *asteriskos* (star) signifies that star which appeared to the Magi in the East, announcing the birth of the Saviour of mankind. Just as the star came and stood over where the young Child was, so the asterisk stands over the holy Bread, which represents Christ who was born at Bethlehem.

The *lonche* (spear) represents the centurion's spear by which the side of the crucified Saviour Christ was pierced, and immediately there came forth blood and water. It is used for separating the lamb from the oblation, the right side of the lamb being pierced for a memorial, and the different portions for the living and the dead being taken out of it.

The *spongus* (sponge) represents that sponge which the soldiers filled with vinegar and put on a reed to the lips of the crucified Jesus, that they might give Him drink when He cried from the Cross "I thirst." It is always used for cleansing the inside of the holy Cup after Communion, and is placed in the Cup when the latter is empty.

The *labis* (spoon) or *kochliarion*, represents that spoon with which one of the seraphim took a live coal from the altar, and, touching the lips of the prophet Isaiah, took away his sins. So now, the Body and Blood of our Saviour taken with this spoon by Christians purifies them from all iniquity and sin.

The *zeon* is that little metal vessel, in which the hot or warm

water is put, which the celebrant pours into the holy Cup during the singing of the Communion hymn before the Reception, to symbolise the living and fervent faith with which everyone should draw near to receive the Holy Mysteries.

The two *small veils* represent :—(1) The swaddling clothes in which Jesus was wrapped after His birth, and laid in the manger amidst the brute beasts, and (2) the napkins which were used for His burial. They are used, the one for covering the holy *poterion* and the other for covering the holy *diskos*.

The *aer* signifies (1) the winding-sheet in which the lifeless body of Jesus was wrapped to be laid in the tomb after it had been taken down from the Cross; (2) it recalls the great stone with which Joseph and Nicodemus concealed the door of Jesus' tomb. It is used for covering the holy *poterion* and *diskos* at the appointed time.

(3) *Synthronon*.

The *synthronon* or *upper seat* is that lofty throne which stands opposite the Holy Table at the east end, in the middle of the apse of the holy Bema. The celebrating patriarch or bishop sits there at a definite moment in the Liturgy, and on either side of him sit the remaining bishops or priests who are ministering with him at the same time.

As the *synthronon* is only used as a seat for the Patriarch or bishop who is the spiritual head over each church, it represents—as being a symbol of the highest spiritual authority—the heavenly seat of our supreme High Priest and Saviour Jesus Christ. For He is the one and only Head of the Church, who rules her invisibly.

(4) *Skeuphylakion* or *Diakonikon*.

The *Skeuphylakion* (Sacristy) is the name given to a particular part to the right of the Holy Table, in which are stored and kept all the various holy coverings and vessels necessary for the temple, and also other valuable ornaments of the church. The keeping of these was always entrusted to a special clerical personage, called the *Skeuphyllax* (sacristan).

II.

ON THE TEMPLE PROPER.

In every temple the part in which the faithful stand, extending from the iconastasis to the narthex, is properly called the temple.

and in the company of the faithful, cannot be present at the celebration of this Awe-ful Mystery. These exclamations, therefore, concerning the catechumens are still used in the Church to stir up feelings of penitence in the faithful.

III.

THE LITURGY OF THE FAITHFUL.

The Liturgy of the Faithful is the name given to all that part of the liturgy which, beginning with the deacon's exclamation, "As many as are of the faithful!" extends to the dismissal, that is to the exclamation by the priest, "The blessing and mercy of the Lord be upon you, through His grace and loving-kindness."

This part of the liturgy is called the Liturgy of the Faithful because only the faithful, that is the baptized, ought to remain in church and be present at the celebration of the Sacrament of the Divine Eucharist.

The Liturgy of the Faithful begins with the deacon's exclamation, "As many as are of the faithful, let us pray to the Lord. Help, save us, have mercy upon us, and guard us, O God, by Thy grace!"

He then again repeats directly the same petition twice, finishing it each time with the exclamation "Wisdom."

The repetition of this word "Wisdom" announces, so to speak, the beginning of the Sacrament of the Divine Eucharist, and warns Christians to prepare their mind, heart and body for it.

During the repetition of this supplication, which is said aloud by the deacon, the choir of singers in the nave—as representing all the faithful—ought to respond with "Lord, have mercy upon us," with deep contrition and devotion. In the holy Bema the priest, in front of the Holy Table, as the representative of all the faithful, offers up, still more fervently, prayer to God.

At the end of the deacon's petitions the priest says the conclusion of this fervent supplication aloud, in the hearing of all, as follows: "That being always protected by Thy power, we may ascribe glory to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit now and ever."

After this exclamation the right-hand choir begins singing slowly and melodiously what is called the Cherubic Hymn, in which

the Christians who are praying in the nave are exhorted to lay aside all worldly cares, and to prepare, with due fear and devotion, to receive the King of Kings, the Son of God, Who is now coming willingly to His voluntary Passion.

While the Cherubic Hymn is being sung, the priest, standing before the Holy Table, prays at length to the Lord that He would make him worthy of offering up the gifts which have been spread forth. After this, having censed the Holy Table, the chapel of the prothesis, the holy icons on the iconostasis, and having kissed the Holy Table with the deacon, he enters the chapel of the holy prothesis, unveils the precious gifts which are veiled there, puts the aer on the deacon's shoulders and the diskos with the holy bread on his head, and taking the holy cup himself with both hands, he comes out through the north door of the sanctuary, preceded by the deacon, and thus they make what is called the Great Entrance. They come through the nave both saying aloud these words: "May the Lord God remember us in His Kingdom, now and ever, world without end."

They then enter the Holy Sanctuary through the beautiful gate, opposite the Holy Table, on which the priest places the Holy Gifts.

This Great Entrance with the Holy Gifts represents symbolically how our Lord's pure Body was taken down from the Cross and carried from Golgotha to the tomb.

When we Christians who are praying in the nave see the Holy Gifts passing before us, we ought to bow our heads in deep humility, and each to cry in true penitence and perfect contrition of heart, like the penitent thief from the Cross, to the Lord, "Remember me, O Lord, when Thou comest into Thy Kingdom."

Since this moment is the most suitable for all the faithful who are in the nave, uniting their minds and hearts, to seek with one voice God's loving care for all their needs, therefore our Mother the Church has taken care to direct that immediately after the Holy Gifts have been deposited, the deacon—or in his absence the priest—as the representative of all the Christians, should offer up aloud to the Lord six different petitions, in which the Lord is besought that He would not only vouchsafe us to pass this day in health and sinlessness, protecting us from all evil, and giving us all that is profitable for our bodies and souls,

(6) *Stasidia*.

The *stasidia* are the wooden seats fixed all round the north, south and west walls of the temple proper, and elsewhere, where the size of the temple permits, in rows.

The use of these *stasidia* is to afford a little relief to the bodily weakness of the worshippers; so that the faithful can either support themselves by them when standing, or sit in them during the reading of the appointed lessons, which for this reason are called "kathismata."

(7) *Gynaekites*.

The *gynaekites* is the part above the narthex, opposite the iconostasis, which is separated off in every church and entered by its own door and staircase. Here the Christian women usually stand at time of prayer, having no intercourse with the men.

III.

THE NARTHEX.

Narthex is the name given to the third and last part of the Christian Church, the part between the temple proper and the entrance.

As this part is separated off on every side by its own walls, and forms, so to speak, a holy place entirely distinct from the rest of the temple, it is also sometimes called the portico (*pronaos*).

The narthex, in the early days of the Church, was used by those who were not yet baptized—that is the catechumens—who stood there during the time of public prayer, and by those of the faithful, who, having fallen into sin, were put under penance by the Church.

As, through the progress of time on the one hand, catechumens have ceased, and, on the other, public penance has been replaced by the confession of each individual to the spiritual father, who is appointed for every church, the narthex, where it exists, is used for various other requirements of the church's service.

IV.

ON VARIOUS SYMBOLICAL OBJECTS USED IN EVERY CHURCH.

The objects used in every Christian church, either in its outer or inner adornment, or for various ecclesiastical ceremonies, and

having at the same time a certain symbolical meaning and signification, are as follows:—(1) the cross, (2) the icons, (3) the epitaphios, (4) the seraphim, (5) the oil, the lamps, the polyelaioi, (6) the candle, the candlesticks, the tapers, (7) the incense and the censer, (8) the diptychs, (9) the font, (10) the crowns, (11) the semantra and the bells, (12) the kollyba, (13) artoklasia, (14) the myrophorion or myrodocheion, (15) the lectern or diskelion, and (16) the oblation.

(1) *Cross*.

The *cross* is that piece of wood which was used in olden times for hanging the worst criminals. It reminds Christians of the cross on which our Lord Jesus Christ was hung by the Jews, and in general represents all the sufferings which He endured for our salvation.

Since, as we have said, the Cross is the sanctified instrument of our salvation, we use this sign of the cross sometimes as an outward ornament, fixing it on every church as a trophy kind of signal, since by it the devil has been conquered by force, sometimes as the unique, most valuable decoration for any object which is used in the holy churches.

(2) *Icons*.

The *icons* are likenesses engraved or painted in oil on wood or stone or any sort of metal, of our Saviour Christ, of the Mother of God, and of the holy men who from Adam have been well-pleasing to God.

From earliest times the icons have been used not only to give internal dignity and beauty to every Christian church and house, but, which is much more essential, for the instruction and moral education of Christians. For when any Christian looks at the icons, he at once recalls the life and deeds of those who are represented upon them, and desires to conform himself to their example.

On this account also the Church decreed in early times that due reverence and proper honour should always be paid by Christians to the holy icons, which honour of course is not rendered to the image before our eyes, but to the original of the picture.

(3) *Epitaphios*.

The *epitaphios* is the picture painted in oil or embroidered in gold on a sheet, which represents the dead body of Jesus Christ,

It recalls the taking down from the Cross by Joseph of His spotless body, and of its being wrapped in a pure shroud.

(4) *Hexapteruga*.

Hexapteruga (Seraphim) is the name commonly given to those circular-shaped icons of gold or silver or some other metal, which have the six-winged seraphim carved on either side. They represent the heavenly armies of the holy angels.

These metal hexapteruga are used particularly at the great and notable services and feasts of the Church, especially when the bishop is ministering. Borne aloft by the readers on wands, they are carried on either side of the precious cross, both at the little and great entrances in the divine liturgy, and also at funerals and various other processions which take place outside the church, as trophies and symbols of our victory over the devil.

(5) *Oil, Lamps and Polyelaioi*.

Every church has in different parts of it many kinds of hanging lamps of various sizes, full of oil, which shed an abundant light during each divine service. These receptacles for holding light are called in general *lamps*, or commonly *kandelai* or *kandelai*.

Each lamp from the position in which it is hung and the number of lights which it bears, has not only its own name but also its particular meaning and signification. Thus the lamp which hangs in the middle of the iconostasis above the beautiful gate, as also the one hanging in front of the Holy Table, is called *akoimetos* ("unsleeping"), as burning continually and representing symbolically the true light, our Lord Jesus Christ. The lamps which hang in a circle from the middle of the ceiling of the nave proper, and the lamp with many lights in the middle of them, which is called in particular the *polyelaios*, are known altogether by the one name of *choros* ("choir"), and represent the stars, while the circle marked out by them represents the firmament.

The lamps which have three lights signify the holy Trinity; the lamps which have seven lights, and are called *heptaphotoi*, represent symbolically the seven mysteries and the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit.

The lamps composed of twelve lights, or the *dodekaphoton*, represent the twelve apostles, the large one in the middle representing the God-man, our Saviour Christ.

Lamps which have more than twelve lights are called in general *polyelaioi*. All the lamps without exception, small and large, which light the various parts of every Christian church, represent symbolically the bright stars shining in the firmament of Christ's Church, that is the choirs of righteous men, saints, prelates and martyrs of the Christian faith.

For two reasons: firstly because oil is a symbol of the mercy and compassion of God towards the human race, and secondly because oil is the purest of all light-giving substances, and pure ought the deeds of Christians to be.

(6) *Wax, Tapers, Candlesticks*.

The *wax* which is offered and burnt in the church, from being a very pure mixture, represents the purity of our souls and the blamelessness of our offering. As it is very soft and pliable, it illustrates our obedience and desire for repentance after any sort of sin.

The *tapers* of different size and thickness which Christians usually carry and light in the holy temples, represent symbolically the zeal which we have in our hearts for the Lord's house, and our reverence for the sacred and holy things in it.

The flame sent forth by these tapers represents the flame of love in us towards God our Saviour.

The names *candlesticks* and *manualia* are given to the two—or in some churches more—stands of marble or some kind of metal, which are placed on either side of the beautiful gate, in front of the iconostasis. In each is fixed one wax light of extra size and thickness. They represent that pillar of fire which shewed the Hebrews the way leading to the land of Canaan, and so these lights being kindled at time of divine service and lighting up the holy icons in front of us, lead us in the way to imitation of the saints whose pictures are lighted up by them; for only such an imitation can lead every Christian safely to the heavenly kingdom.

The lamp which is held and carried in front of the bishop signifies symbolically (1) the brightness of divine grace in the bishop, (2) the light of knowledge and teaching, (3) the light of virtue which bishops should always have bright and unquenchable within them, (4) the duty of the bishop both by word and by deed to guide all in the way which leads to everlasting life.

(7) *Incense and Censer.*

The *incense* which is used in church signifies symbolically to Christians who come there two things: (1) The love of the omnipresent God which fills the whole of creation, just as the incense which is burnt spreads over and fills the whole church, (2) the fragrance of the Spirit which gladdens every living soul, just as the fragrance of the incense gladdens all the worshippers.

The *censer* is used in church for carrying with the incense the necessary fire, so that at regular and appointed times in every service, the ministers may cense the divine temple, the holy icons and the Christians. This use of incense shews the faithful that just as the incense is always burning in the fire of the censer, and ascends with sweet odours upwards, so in the same way ought their prayers to be kindled and inflamed unceasingly by the fire in their hearts of faith, hope and love towards God, and that these prayers should ascend fragrant and acceptable before the throne of the divine majesty.

(8) *Diptychs.*

The *diptychs* are two tablets of card or vellum standing on the table of the prothesis, on which are written and arranged for a memorial for ever the names of Christians.

(9) *Kolymbethra.*

The *kolymbethra* (font) is the tank of marble or metal in every Christian church, made of small size so that it can be easily carried about, and holding about a cubit's depth of water. It is used for water to be poured into it, and the children of Christians baptized.

The font represents the river Jordan, in which our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was baptized by John the Baptist.

(10) *Stephanoi and Stephana.*

Stephanoi (crowns) or *Stephana* (wreaths) are the two circular garlands elegantly made of metal in the shape of a royal diadem, which in the course of the marriage service the priest or arch-priest places on the head of the bridegroom and of the bride. In many places, instead of this metal crown they use crowns of artificial orange blossom. On this account the mystery of marriage is often called *Stephanoma*.

The crowns signify symbolically the victory which those who are united in the fellowship of marriage win over the devil, by the grace of God and the blessing of the Church. They teach them at the same time that they are the rulers and head of the rest of the household.

(11) *Semantra and Kodones.*

Semantra is the name given to the pieces of wood or iron upon which, from the earliest Christian times, and up to the present day in many places, the *kandelanapies* (candle-lighter or Church-officer) beats repeatedly at fixed times in the day to summon the faithful to assemble in church for public prayer.

From the middle of the ninth century the place of *semantra* in the eastern Church was taken by the use of *kodones* (bells), by the ringing of which the faithful are now called in many places to prayer.

The sound of the *semantra* and the bells in Christian churches has also a symbolical meaning. It signifies (1) the preaching of the apostles and prophets, (2) the sound of the archangel's trumpet, which will be heard before the second glorious appearance of our Saviour on earth. Just as both these call man before God, so the sound of the *semantra* and bells calls him equally to prayer before God.

(12) *Kollyba.*

When we bury our brethren who have fallen asleep in Christ, or perform a memorial service for them on the third, ninth or fortieth day after their death, and on any other appointed days of the year besides, we usually offer in churches and on the tombs of the dead some grains of boiled wheat flavoured with sugar and other sweetmeats on a plate. The wheat thus offered for a memorial of the dead is generally called *kollyba*.

The corn signifies that the dead person will be raised again from the tomb, because corn also is buried in the ground, but afterwards, at the appointed time, it springs up and bears fruit.

The other sweetmeats with which the corn is flavoured signify symbolically that the future life after the resurrection will be, to the faithful, sweet and pleasant, and full of all blessedness.

(13) *Artoklasia*. On the vigils of great feasts a little table is placed in the middle of the church, having on it five loaves and around them a small quantity of corn, wine and oil, which are blessed by the priests of the church at a special service at the end of the *Orthros*. Afterwards these loaves, being broken into little pieces, are distributed as a blessing (*eulogia*) among the faithful who are at church. This sacred service is called *artoklasia*. It signifies symbolically the five loaves through which the Lord in the wilderness fed five thousand men, besides women and children.

(14) *Myrophorion* or *Vessel for Holy Chrism*. The *myrophorion* or *myrodocheion* is the little vessel of silver or some other substance, full of holy ointment (*Chrism*) which the priest uses at the mystery of baptism.

(15) *Analogion* or *Diskelion*.

Analogion (Lectern) is the name usually given to the little square table, resting upon four supports, and about two cubits in height, with the upper part sloping towards the front and covered with a veil (hanging). When it folds up it is called *Diskelion*, from being made with two legs, which is, indeed, the older shape in churches.

The lectern or diskelion is used in every Christian church for holding, at the *Orthros* on Sunday, the holy Gospel, and on great feasts the icon of the feast for the worship of the faithful. Sometimes, also, from the lectern is read by the deacon or priest, the Gospel.

(16) *Prosphora*.

The *Prosphora* (oblation) is the bread which from the earliest times of the Church Christians who assemble in the holy churches for prayer have brought with them and offer in church for the celebration of the mystery of the holy Eucharist. It is distinguished from ordinary bread both by its quality and by its having stamped upon it the seal of a cross, bearing in its four corners these words: "Jesus Christ conquers."

CHAPTER II.

On the holy persons appointed for the service of the church and their liturgical vestments.

WITH respect to the performance of divine service in the Christian Church, there are special persons consecrated for this purpose, each for particular sacred functions. These persons constitute the *ecclesiastical hierarchy*, that is the sacred, liturgical body of officials belonging to every Christian Church. These persons are distinguished from the rest of the faithful by their name and by their outward dress.

The persons consecrated for the performance of the divine mysteries and all other sacred actions in Christian churches, are divided into three ranks, which constitute the *three degrees of Holy Orders*. They are those of *bishop*, *priest* and *deacon*.

These three orders are distinguished from one another, firstly by their functions, and secondly by the different liturgical dress which each wears when ministering, and they are consecrated to the service of the Church by the *laying on of hands*.

I.

THE BISHOP.

In the Christian Church the *bishop* is he who has, on the one hand, the supreme authority and supervision over the souls of Christians, and on the other, the direction and management of everything which concerns the Christian Church.

The bishop is also called, in general, *arch-priest*, as being the head of the priests, and *spiritual shepherd*, as being bound to guide the faithful entrusted to him into safe pastures.

From the position which he holds in the hierarchy and in the ecclesiastical administration, he is called either *chorepiscopus*, or *archbishop*, or *metropolitan*, or finally *patriarch*.

The bishop, being spiritually the leading and principal person in the Christian Church, is elected by the entire synod of the remaining bishops of the throne, and is consecrated by three bishops.

The consecration of the bishop takes place directly after the *trisagion* hymn, so that the newly consecrated may bless and greet the people with the "Peace be to all" before the reading of the holy Gospel.

The duties of every bishop are as follows :—

(1) He celebrates all the mysteries and all the other sacred services of the orthodox Christian Church in any church within his episcopate.

(2) He alone has the right of ordaining priests and deacons, and of laying hands on the lower orders of clergy in his own diocese, such as readers, sub-deacons, &c.

(3) He blesses and consecrates the holy Chrism.

(4) He dedicates the holy churches and the antiminsia.

(5) He blesses the people with both hands.

(6) He gives the divine Eucharist to the priests in the liturgy.

(7) He teaches, catechises and preaches the sacred word, and

(8) He governs and directs all the spiritual affairs of his flock.

The dress which every bishop wears when performing divine service includes the following garments :—

(1) Sticharion, (2) epitachelion, (3) girdle, (4) epimanika, (5) epigonation, (6) saccos, (7) large and small omophorion, (8) cross, (9) enkolpion, (10) mitre, (11) pastoral staff, (12) dikierion and trikerion, and (13) mandyas.

(1) *Sticharion*.

The *sticharion* (alb) is the tunic with sleeves, reaching from the shoulders to the feet and covering the whole body, which is worn over their ordinary clothes by all, without exception, who minister in the church—bishops, priests, deacons and readers.

The sticharion, which is usually made of white material, signifies :

(1) The spiritual purity and blameless life which all who wear it should have.

(2) It represents symbolically the bright and shining garment which the angel wore who rolled away the stone from the life-giving tomb of our Lord, and proclaimed His resurrection to those who brought spices, and who, as the holy gospel testifies, was *clothed in a white garment*.

(3) It represents the robe in which Herod arrayed Jesus and sent Him to Pilate.

(2) *Epitachelion*.

The *epitachelion* (stole) is the narrow oblong piece of stuff which only the bishop and priest wear from the neck, and which, covering their breast, reaches down nearly to the feet. At the bottom it has a row of tassels hanging.

The epitachelion represents symbolically :—

(1) The effective grace of the all-holy Spirit, descending from above on bishops and priests, and which was given under the old Covenant by the anointing with oil.

(2) It represents the easy yoke of Christ's priesthood, and

(3) It represents the cross which our Lord bore upon His shoulders when going up to be crucified.

(3) *Girdle*.

The *girdle* is the piece of stuff with which bishops and priests are girded round their loins above the alb and stole.

The girdle signifies symbolically :—

(1) The work which our Saviour wrought here, and promised in the future, for our salvation.

(2) The strength and power of the all-holy Spirit, which strengthens His ministers.

(3) The soberness and purity of soul and body with which bishops and priests should gird the loins of their minds and senses, walking blamelessly in the path of God's saving commandments.

(4) *Epimanika*.

The *epimanika* (gauntlets) are the little pieces of stuff which celebrants wear round the wrists of their right and left hands. In general the epimanika represent the bonds with which our Saviour's hands were bound when He was brought as a malefactor before Pilate. But in particular that on the right hand signifies symbolically the Creative Omnipotence of God, and that strength and might by which our Lord was glorified when He had crushed all His visible and invisible enemies. That on the left hand signifies the readiness and zeal which ministers of the altar should have in the careful fulfilment of their ministry, and in the keeping of the divine commandments and ordinances.

(5) *Epigonation*.

The *epigonation* is the square of stuff on the thigh, fastened from the girdle and resting on the knee.

It usually bears the likeness of the Saviour and other holy pictures richly painted or embroidered upon it.

The *epigonation* signifies symbolically :—

- (1) The victory of Jesus over death.
- (2) The two-edged sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, by which the spiritual shepherd must conquer and overthrow the visible and invisible enemies of our faith. On this account the *epigonation* is shaped like a sword, and is fastened from the loins.

(6) *Saccos*.

The *saccos* is the second sticharion which the bishop wears above the sticharion and stole, and which differs from the first because—

- (1) It has the sleeves and upper part much broader.
- (2) It is made infinitely more rich and handsome than the first, and
- (3) It is not sewn together at the two sides, but is put on in two pieces, which are joined together on the shoulders only, round the bishop's head. It is fastened there by the deacons, being buckled together on either side with little round silver, sweet-toned bells.

The *saccos* signifies symbolically the purple garment or robe, in which the Saviour of the world was clad, when He was mocked by the Jews and the soldiers. The bells which the *saccos*, like the *mandyas*, has upon it, signify symbolically that bishops should, in church, like golden bells, always give forth the word of God for the instruction, admonition and moral training of Christians.

(7) *Large and Small Omophorion*.

The *omophorion* is the rich piece of stuff, narrow and oblong in shape, which is placed on the shoulders round the bishop's neck.

There are two sorts of *omophoria*; the large, as it is called, which, being bigger, is folded double cross-wise over the bishop's breast, with one end in front and the other behind, and the *small*, which is simply put on the bishop's shoulders, with the two ends hanging down on either side of his breast, the one on the right side and the other on the left.

The *omophorion*, which constitutes the principal mark of the episcopal dignity, signifies symbolically :—

- (1) The erring nature of man, which our Saviour took and put upon His shoulders, as the Good Shepherd put the lost sheep, and bore it to His Heavenly Father's house.

- (2) The cross, which the Lord bore upon His shoulders, when He went forth to be crucified, and

- (3) The persecutions insults and ill-treatment, which every one must bear with patience who follows after Christ.

The bishop wears the large *omophorion* from the beginning of the Liturgy until the moment when the reading of the holy Gospel begins, because until then he stands as the shepherd and type of Christ. During the reading of the holy Gospel he lays it aside, signifying thus the humility and the service, which, as a servant, he renders to the Son of God, whose Gospel is being read.

The bishop wears the little *omophorion* from the cherubic hymn until the end of the liturgy, because he stands more as a simple minister of God and celebrant of the divine mystery.

(8) *Cross*.

The *cross* fastened on the bishop's breast above the *omophorion*, signifies that the bishop taking up Christ's cross, must follow Him faithfully, keeping all His commandments, and carefully fulfilling all His divine and saving ordinances.

(9) *Enkolpion*.

The *enkolpion* is the little icon, usually oval in shape, which is also fastened on the bishop's breast beside the cross. It is richly ornamented in various ways, and bears the image of our Saviour Christ and of Our Lady, the Theotokos. The *enkolpion* signifies that the bishop must always reverence and honour the Leader and Founder of our faith and Our Lady, the Theotokos, who bore Him, by purity of heart and uprightness of spirit.

(10) *Mitre*.

The *mitre* is the crown which the bishop wears on his head when ministering. The *mitre* represents symbolically both the glory of the Lord and the crown of thorns, with which the soldiers

encircled the brow of our Saviour, when they mocked Him as king of the Jews, before the death on the cross. It also represents the highest dignity of the priesthood and the supreme spiritual authority which the bishop has in the Church of Christ, just as among secular rulers and kings the crown or diadem shews their supreme authority and power in the state.

(1) *Pastoral Staff.*

The *pastoral staff*, which is commonly called the *pateritsa*, represents symbolically :—

(1) The spiritual authority which every bishop has in his diocese, and

(2) The fatherly care and solicitude which he should have continually as spiritual father and shepherd for the flock of his episcopate, guiding it into the pastures of salvation, teaching the word of truth, bringing back those who have strayed, into the bosom of the Church and the way of virtue, disciplining the unruly and disobedient, and driving away everyone who attempts, by false teaching, to disturb the consciences of his flock.

(12) *Dikerion and Trikerion.*

The *dikerion* is the union of two tapers which are fixed on one stem slanting towards each other, so that they make one flame. The *dikerion* signifies symbolically the union in one person of the two natures of Christ, that is, the divine and human.

The *trikerion* is the union of three tapers on one stem, slanting towards each other so that they make one flame. It signifies the union and indivisibility of the three persons of the Holy Trinity.

They are both used by the bishop when ministering, to sign and bless the people with, for with them he makes the sign of the cross over the people, signifying thereby that he blesses them in the name of the consubstantial Trinity, and of the God-man our Saviour Christ.

(13) *Mandyas.*

The *mandyas*, which represents the coat woven from the top throughout of our Saviour the God-man, is a symbol of the dignity and calling of the bishop.

It further signifies, firstly, the supreme spiritual authority and power of the bishop in the Church, and secondly, the divine and saving grace with which the bishop should always care for and attend to the salvation of the souls committed to him by God, preserving and protecting them from every attack of the enemy.

II.

THE PRESBYTER.

A *presbyter* (elder) is the second person in the Christian Church after the bishop, that is to say the second in rank in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and he is immediately dependent on the bishop, for he cannot celebrate or perform any other function in church without the bishop's licence.

The presbyter is also called *hierews* (priest).

The presbyter is elected and appointed by his parish. He is ordained by one bishop after the Cherubic Hymn, when the precious gifts having been brought from the prothesis to the Holy Table, are about to be consecrated by the invocation of the Holy Spirit. For the most essential duty of the presbyter in church is the celebration of the mystery of the divine Eucharist.

The presbyter, being the representative of the bishop in the parish to which he has been appointed by him, has the following duties :—

(1) He has the right to celebrate all the mysteries and all the other divine services, excepting the mystery of Ordination, that is laying on of hands, the consecration of the chrism, and the dedication of the church and the antiminsia.

(2) He confesses the Christians, having the authority to impose upon every Christian who has sinned the proper ecclesiastical penalties according to the canons of the Church.

(3) He blesses the faithful with his right hand.

(4) He gives the divine Communion to the deacon in the Liturgy ; and

(5) He should teach the people, preaching the word of God and guiding them both by his word and manner of life into the path which leads to eternal life.

The dress which every presbyter wears when ministering in the Church of Christ comprises the following holy garments :—

(1) Sticharion, (2) epitachelion, (3) girdle, (4) epigonation, by

special permission of the bishop, (5) epimanika, and (6) phenolion (chasuble), which takes the place of the bishop's saccos.

III.

THE DEACON.

The deacon, who constitutes the third and last degree of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, is chosen and appointed by the bishop, and ordained by him after the consecration of the Holy Gifts, because the sole and principal work of the deacon is to minister to the bishops and priests at the celebration of the divine Mysteries and other sacred services.

The deacon not being able to perform any of the Mysteries, or any other priestly action, serves the bishop and priest, ministering together with them, reading the portion appointed for the Gospel at divine service, and offering up earnest prayers and supplications to the Most High. In addition to these things the deacon may, with the bishop's licence, preach the word of God in church.

The dress which the deacon wears at divine service is as follows:—

(1) Sticharion, (2) epimanika, (3) orarion.

The *orarion* is the narrow and long piece of cloth which the deacon wears over his left shoulder and wound round under the shoulder of his right arm, one end of which hangs down in front and the other behind.

The orarion signifies symbolically the wings of the angels, and the deacon therefore, imitating the Cherubim and Seraphim who veil their faces with their wings, is girded with the stole as a sign of fear, trembling and reverence when preparing to approach for the reception of the precious Gifts.

CHAPTER III.

On the regular and ordinary services which are said in church.

THERE are seven holy services appointed for the day and night, which the Church requires every Christian to attend, namely:—

(1) Matins, (2) Lauds with Prime, (3) Terce, (4) Sext, (5) None, (6) Vespers, and (7) Compline: because the prophet-king, David, said: "Seven times a day will I praise Thee, because of Thy righteous judgments."

Our Mother the Church, taking into consideration the daily cares of Christians, orders the performance of these seven holy services at three different times of the day only, in accordance with the number of the three Persons of the one Godhead.

These three times are: the early morning, mid-day, and the evening. In the early morning, Matins and Lauds with Prime; at the third hour of the day, Terce and Sext are said; and in the evening, None, Vespers and Compline.

1. Matins is the little service made up of certain verses, psalms and prayers, with which we begin our prayers in the early morning or at day-dawn, rising about midnight. For the silence of the night makes it easier for man to raise his mind and heart to God, for which reason the apostles too, as it is written, "prayed and sang hymns to God at midnight."

Matins represent:—(1) The watchfulness of the angels and their ceaseless praise and worship of God. (2) The calmness of mind and senses which is requisite for prayer. (3) The resurrection of the Saviour, who rose from the dead very early on the first day of the week; and (4) The second coming of Christ, which will take place at midnight.

2. Lauds is the second service, made up of various psalms, verses, prayers, hymns, canons and doxologies, which is said in church very early at day-break. In this service Christians thank God that He has vouchsafed them to pass the darkness of the night in safety and to see the light of day again, and pray and beseech Him that He would enlighten their minds and direct their steps towards the fulfilment of His divine ordinances and commandments. The service of Lauds is joined immediately to that of Matins.

While the *hirmoi* of Lauds are being sung, the priest comes out of the sanctuary, and standing in the middle of the church, opposite the beautiful gate, salutes reverently, with a short spiritual prayer, the icons of our Lord and the Theotokos, Mother of God, and of the Patron Saint of the church. He then goes at once into the holy Bema, where having devoutly kissed the Holy Table, he puts on his priestly vestments.

The priest having put on his priestly garments, and washed his hands, goes into the holy prothesis, where are laid out already the holy vessels and the holy gifts for the celebration of the Sacrament, that is the bread and wine. The priest taking this bread in his hands, first crosses it three times with the holy spear, repeating each time these words, "For a memorial of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ." After this he separates from the bread with the spear the whole square made by the seal on the bread, reciting the prophetic words of Isaiah concerning the sufferings of our Saviour. The part thus taken from the bread is called Amnos (the Lamb), as representing the Son of God our Lord Jesus Christ, Who suffered and died for us.

The priest then continuing this symbolical representation of the sufferings of Christ, divides the Lamb cross-wise with the spear. After this, representing in a certain manner that centurion who pierced the Saviour's side with a spear, he also pierces with the spear the right half of the Lamb, and at the same time pours wine and water into the holy chalice, saying, "And one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and forthwith there came out blood and water."

After the priest has prepared the Lamb in this manner, he then takes out with the spear from the remaining portion of the oblation, first one portion, which he places on the right side of the Lamb, saying, "In honour and to the memory of our most blessed, glorious Lady, Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary," and then nine other portions, which he places on the other side of the Lamb, according to the number of the nine angelic orders. These portions are to the honour and memory of John the fore-runner and Baptist, of the prophets, apostles, holy priests, holy martyrs, holy and God-bearing fathers, holy unmercenaries and workers of miracles, of the righteous grandparents of Christ, Joachim and Anna, with all the saints.

The priest places the last portion in memory of St. John Chry-

sostom or St. Basil, when the liturgy composed by them is being celebrated.

After this the priest, taking another oblation, or the same one, cuts out of it various other portions, praying God for the salvation of all orthodox Christians of every degree, rank, race, and age, and especially for those who offer these gifts, and for those for whom they are offered on the holy altar.

The commemoration of all departed orthodox Christians follows immediately after this commemoration of the living.

The priest therefore continues to cut out more portions from the same or another oblation, reciting at the same time the names of all Christians who have fallen asleep in faith and piety, and especially of those for whom the offerings are made at the holy altar, praying for the remission of their sins and the eternal rest of their souls.

The celebrant makes the sign of the cross over all these portions, with a portion reserved for himself in particular.

After this commemoration the priest at once covers the holy gifts which have been thus prepared with the appointed holy coverings.

Afterwards, when he has censed the holy offerings thrice, he kisses them reverently above the veil, and prays to God that He would bless these gifts and receive them to His heavenly altar.

While the proskomide is being performed in the sanctuary by the priest, if the liturgy is not conjoined with matins, the penitential psalms of the Hours are read outside in the church. But when the liturgy follows immediately after matins, then the *hirmoi* and the ninth ode are sung during the proskomide, followed by the praises and doxology, with which begins the second part of the liturgy, that is, the liturgy of the catechumens.

II.

THE LITURGY OF THE CATECHUMENS.

All that part of the Liturgy which begins with the priest's exclamation from the sanctuary, "Blessed be the kingdom of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," and extends to the short intercession said by the deacon after the reading of

the Gospel, "As many as are catechumens, depart," constitutes the Liturgy of the Catechumens.

This part of the liturgy is called the Liturgy of the Catechumens, because in the ancient Church the catechumens—that is those who were being prepared by instruction for baptism—were allowed to be present at this part of the liturgy, and used to stand listening in the porch together with such of the baptized as were under penance for having fallen into some sin or heresy.

The priest begins the liturgy with the exclamation of these words:—"Blessed be the kingdom of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," because through the incarnation of our Saviour Christ—for a memorial of which the Sacrament of the Divine Liturgy is celebrated—we are clearly taught that God is three Persons, that is, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

After "Blessed be the kingdom," the faithful who are praying in the nave are immediately exhorted to offer up various prayers and supplications in peace to the Lord, for without peace no supplication, no prayer, no request, can ever be acceptable to God and listened to by Him.

This litany contains ten different supplications to God, which shew the breadth and depth of Christian love, which ought to reach out to the whole world. We finish our prayers with the name of the most holy Mother of God and of all the saints, commending ourselves and one another and all our life to Christ our God.

After these petitions the antiphons, or two psalms, are immediately sung by the choirs, in which the name of God is praised and glorified, or His various wonderful deeds are set forth in accordance with the particular festival which is being celebrated in the church.

They conclude with that theological hymn to the Only-begotten Son and Word of God, consubstantial with the Father and the Holy Spirit, Who vouchsafed for our salvation to come down to earth, to take flesh and to become perfect man.

This hymn, therefore, is at once followed by what is called "The Little Entrance," with the Gospel, which represents symbolically the entrance into the world of Jesus Christ, when He began to preach and teach. The lights borne before the Gospel represent the holy Apostles, whom our Lord sent into the world to teach and enlighten all men.

The Christians who are praying in the nave, on beholding the Saviour and Redeemer of the world passing symbolically before their eyes, ought to stand at this moment with deep fear and devotion.

The Church, therefore, knowing the failings and weaknesses of men, always takes care, like a loving mother, to rouse in us the proper attention and devotion by ordering that before this entrance the deacon or priest should always exclaim with a loud voice these words:—"Wisdom, stand up."

The Church in appointing the exclamation of these words, "Wisdom, stand up," has no other purpose than to make the Christians who are standing in the nave watchful through them and detached from all earthly matters, so that they may keep their minds and hearts pure from every vain thought, and their bodies free from any unbecoming attitude and movement. For the Lord Himself, the heavenly Wisdom, stands before us, Who, by His holy Gospel, has conquered all the world.

Immediately after this imperative exclamation, the choir of those who are ministering or of the singers, as representing the faithful who are in the nave, sings the "O come let us worship and fall down before Christ. Save us, O Son of God, &c."

After the Little Entrance the choir in the nave sings the apolytikia of the feast and of the patron saint of the church in which the liturgy is being celebrated, and finally the kontakion of the feast or of the day, as appointed in the typicon.

In the meanwhile the celebrant in the holy sanctuary, standing before the Holy Table, prays to God.

At the end of this prayer the priest at once exclaims these words aloud:—"For holy art Thou, O our God, and to Thee we ascribe glory, to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, now and ever."

The object of this exclamation by the priest is to exhort the choir of singers that in the name of all the faithful who are praying in the nave, they may glorify the one God in Trinity, by singing the Trisagion hymn with the angelic hosts.

The singers, therefore, after this exclamation, having first confirmed the truth of the priest's words by the "Amen," at once begin singing in response the "Holy God, holy and mighty, holy and immortal, have mercy upon us."

Immediately after the Trisagion hymn we hear the deacon in-

voking the piety and attention of the faithful who are in the nave, with the exclamation "Let us attend."

And since the mind of man cannot be properly attentive unless it is inwardly at peace, the priest—directly after the deacon—asks this peace from God by his blessing and by his exclamation to the people, "Peace be to all."

Attention and peace are necessary for Christians because the Church prepares her children beforehand for hearing the portions read which are appointed for the Epistle and Gospel.

Every Christian, therefore, when thus called upon, ought to listen to the portions of the Epistles which are read with as much attention as if he were listening to the holy Apostle himself.

Just as the Lord sent His Apostles to preach, and in the meantime followed Himself preaching everywhere and teaching the will of His Heavenly Father, so we, in the same way, first hear the teaching of the Apostles, and afterwards the Lord Himself proclaimed in the Gospel.

After the reading of the Epistle, the choir sing slowly and melodiously the hymn "Alleluia," which signifies "Praise God who has come or been made manifest," because it is through the preaching of the Apostles that we have been taught about the coming of God into the world.

After this the attention of Christians is first specially invoked by the priest with the exclamation: "Wisdom, stand up; let us hear the holy Gospel"; then the reading of the section appointed for the Gospel begins, before which we are again exhorted by the priest to be extremely attentive, by the exclamation: "Let us attend!"

We ought to listen standing to the reading of the Gospel with the greatest attention and devotion of mind and heart, as though we were listening to the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, teaching us and bringing us good tidings of the forgiveness of sins, and salvation.

After the reading of the holy Gospel the choir sings melodiously: "Glory be to Thee, O Lord, glory be to Thee."

These words the faithful in the nave should also repeat in their minds, thanking God that He has vouchsafed to us, although unworthy, to hear His Divine Word.

After this the priest or deacon begins repeating litanies and supplications answering to the needs of the various members of

the Church, both living and dead, clergy and laity, and praying the Lord that He would have mercy on us, according to the multitude of His mercy, and would pour down His compassion upon us and upon all the people who are awaiting His great and rich mercy.

To shew the fervour of these petitions, the Church has commanded that each of them should be concluded with the three-fold repetition by the choir of "Lord, have mercy."

This litany is therefore also called "duplicated."

After this duplicated litany, the deacon exhorts the catechumens to offer up their prayers to the Lord, with the words: "Ye catechumens, pray to the Lord," because the time is drawing near when they must leave the church. Then with the words "Ye faithful, pray for the catechumens," he exhorts the faithful at the same time to pray for the catechumens, that the Lord would have mercy upon them, would enlighten them and would make them worthy, through baptism, to be numbered amongst the company of the faithful. The deacon finishes these prayers by exhorting the catechumens to bow their heads before the Lord, who is invisibly present, as a sign of the entire devotion which from their whole heart and soul they feel towards God.

While the deacon is thus exhorting the faithful to pray for the catechumens, the priest, standing before the Holy Table, himself prays silently to the Lord for the catechumens.

The purpose of this mercy which is besought for the catechumens, the priest declares aloud in the hearing of all who are praying, "that they with us may glorify the Great and Glorious Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

While the priest is saying these words, he unfolds the consecrated Eileton, which shews that the Liturgy of the Faithful, that is the celebration of the Sacrament of the Divine Eucharist, is about to begin. The deacon therefore bids the catechumens four times in succession to leave the church, saying with a loud voice, "As many as are catechumens, go forth." "Ye catechumens go forth." "Ye catechumens go forth." "Let none of the catechumens remain."

Although since infant baptism has been allowed, the order of catechumens in the Church has ceased, the Church nevertheless by these exclamations, desires to shew symbolically that even to-day there are many amongst Christians who, although baptized

but that He would also grant that the ends of our lives may be good, peaceful and painless.

While these petitions are being said aloud by the deacon, the priest standing before the Holy Table is praying secretly to God, that He would send down the grace of His all-holy Spirit both upon the Precious Gifts now laid before Him, and upon all the Christians. The choir of singers in the nave responds for the faithful to each of the above petitions with "Grant this, O Lord."

Since our Lord commanded us that we should always make all our petitions to the Father in His Name, therefore the priest says aloud at the end of these petitions, "Through the mercies of Thy only-begotten Son, with whom Thou art blessed, together with Thy all-holy good and life-giving Spirit."

After this, turning towards the people, he blesses them, and prays for their peace, saying aloud: "Peace be to all." The deacon also commending this same peace and mutual love and concord to the faithful who are present, says directly after the priest: "Let us love one another, that with one mind we may confess."

After this exclamation the choir of singers, as representing all the faithful, confesses with deep contrition their heart-felt faith in the Triune God, by singing, "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Trinity consubstantial and indivisible."

While the Christians' salutation is being given by the priests in the sanctuary, the choir on behalf of all, promises due love to our Lord and Saviour, singing these sacred words: "I will love Thee, O Lord my strength; the Lord is my stony rock, and my refuge and my deliverer."

The Church, desiring to deepen and intensify the attention of the faithful who are present, that each may hear and understand the confession of the highest truths of the Christian faith, has appointed that immediately at the end of this hymn the deacon should cry with a loud voice, "The doors! the doors! In wisdom let us attend!"

These words, "The doors, the doors," repeated with so much stress, refer to those who in the ancient Church were appointed to guard the doors of the church, and did not allow anyone, either of the catechumens or of the faithful, to come in or go out of the church during the whole time that the Christian faith was being solemnly professed.

After this earnest exclamation of the deacon's, we see the veil of the beautiful gate drawn aside, and the priest standing before the Holy Table and moving the aer up and down over the Precious Gifts, while he secretly repeats the symbol of our Faith (i.e. the Nicene Creed).

The drawing aside of the veil represents symbolically the rolling away of the stone from the door of Jesus' tomb, while the aer lifted up and waved above the Holy Gifts represents the earthquake which took place at the resurrection of the Saviour Christ, and that fear and trembling which seized the soldiers who were guarding His tomb.

Outside the sanctuary in the nave, where the faithful have been already prepared by the mutual bond of peace, love and concord, some one person, as representing all who are present, begins to read the holy symbol of the Faith slowly and distinctly with a loud voice.

While the creed is being read, all the rest of the faithful who are in the nave ought to follow the reader in their minds with fear and devotion, repeating to themselves word for word the confession of those truths which form the foundation of our faith.

After the reading of the creed, the deacon at once says with a loud voice these words:—"Let us stand well, let us stand with fear, let us be attentive to offer the Holy Offering in peace."

This exclamation means that since the Son of God is offered as a sacrifice for our sins upon the Holy Table, therefore if we wish also to have a share in this bloodless sacrifice, we ought not only to keep our hearts free from all enmity, hatred and ill-feeling, but our bodies also in a becoming and reverent attitude.

We ought to stand full of piety and devotion, not looking about us foolishly and frivolously, not disturbing the prayers and the celebration of the Sacrament by going to and fro, or by talking to one another, or by growing weary at the length of the service.

The choir, and with them all the faithful who join in secretly, responds at once to the deacon's exclamation by singing these words, "A mercy of peace, a sacrifice of praise."

This signifies that we ought always to respond to this call, as to the other commands and exhortations of the Church, thus:—"Yea, O Lord, we are in love and peace, we shew mercy and

gentleness and compassion to one another; behold the only sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving which alone we venture to offer to Thee our Saviour and our God."

The priest hearing and valuing the readiness and pious desire of the faithful, turns immediately to the people and blesses them with these apostolic words:—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." Whereupon we also pray in response that he too may obtain these heavenly and saving blessings, in the words which the choir sings:—"And with Thy spirit."

After this, as if the last exhortations addressed by the deacon to the faithful were not sufficient nor strong nor comprehensive enough, the priest again bids the faithful who are in the nave to lift up their minds and hearts from earth to God who dwells in heaven, saying:—"Lift up your hearts." To this the choir at once replies with fervent zeal for all the faithful, "We lift them up unto the Lord."

When the priest has been thus assured by our confession of our full and perfect devotion to God, he then urges the faithful to offer up due praises and thanksgivings to the Triune God, saying:—"Let us give thanks unto the Lord." He then at once begins the celebration of the Sacrament of the Divine Eucharist. The veil of the beautiful gate is therefore immediately drawn, because unfortunately the faithful are not all worthy of looking upon the Precious Gifts which are spread forth.

The choir, fulfilling the priest's request, sings this hymn on behalf of all the faithful:—"It is very meet and right to worship Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one Trinity consubstantial and indivisible."

While this hymn is being sung by the choir, the priest, following the example of his Lord, Who when He ate the last Passover with His disciples gave thanks to God and the Father for the offered gifts, also himself glorifies the infinite greatness of God and gives thanks for His infinite goodness. And not being able, so to speak, through the weakness of human language to render worthy praise to God, he imitates the heavenly armies and cries aloud these words in the hearing of the whole church:—"The triumphal hymn, singing, crying, shouting and saying":—

Since we, the faithful, who are praying in the nave during the celebration of the Divine Eucharist, represent mystically the

Seraphim, we too after this exclamation by the priest, sing by means of the choir, as though we were in heaven, that triumphal hymn which the prophet Isaiah heard being sung by the Seraphim:—"Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory."

To this we also add that hymn which the Hebrew children sang when they went to meet Jesus as He rode in triumph into Jerusalem, before His passion, with palms and branches, crying:—"Hosanna in the highest! Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest!"

While the triumphal hymn is being sung by the choir of singers, the priest standing before the Holy Table also glorifies God secretly. Then calling to mind that last supper which our Lord celebrated with His apostles before His death, he says aloud in the hearing of all the following sacred words, with which our Lord offered His own Body and Blood to His disciples, saying:—"Take, eat; this is My Body which is broken for you for the remission of sins."

And again immediately afterwards he repeats:—"Drink ye all of this; this is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

To both these exclamations by the priest the choir, assenting mentally and through faith to these words of our Lord, replies (to each) by singing the word "Amen." By this it confirms and confesses, so to speak, the indisputable truth of these words of our Saviour, and prays at the same time for their fulfilment in us.

After this the priest, to shew his thankfulness to the most high God for all the many and various blessings and benefits which He has lavished upon us from the foundation of the world to this present moment, offers to Him with a loud voice the very same Precious and Holy Gifts which He gave to us through His holy disciples and apostles.

He therefore says aloud these words: "Thine own of Thine own, we offer to Thee, on behalf of all and for all."

Immediately after this exclamation the following soul-piercing hymn is sung slowly and melodiously: "We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we give thanks to Thee, O Lord, and we beseech Thee O our God."

This hymn expresses in the most lively manner on behalf of

the whole Christian assembly present their heart-felt praise, worship, and thanksgiving to God.

While this hymn is being sung melodiously in the nave, the priest prays and beseeches God that He would send down His all-holy Spirit upon all of us, and upon the gifts here spread forth.

Invoking thus God's all-powerful blessing, he first blesses the holy Bread, making the sign of the cross three times and saying devoutly: "And make this bread the Precious Body of Thy Christ;" and then the holy Cup, repeating, "And that which is in this cup the Precious Blood of Thy Christ;" and finally blessing both the holy things at once he adds, "changing them by Thy Holy Spirit."

To each of the two first invocations of the priest the deacon answers "Amen," but the third and last he confirms by this three-fold repetition, "Amen, Amen, Amen," as if to say, "So be it, O Lord, so be it, so be it."

This moment is the highest and holiest moment of the Divine, that is, of the Holy Liturgy, because that which up till now has been simple bread and simple wine lying upon the Holy Table, is changed essentially by the invisible and mysterious descent of the all-holy Spirit into the true Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ.

Since the mystery of the Divine Eucharist is the only true sacrifice to God for all men, both living and dead, the priest commemorates all those who have gone to their rest in faith, —forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, ascetics, and all holy and righteous men made perfect in faith.

But he mentions the name of the most holy Mother of God in a louder voice and in the hearing of all, saying: "Especially of our all-holy, pure, most blessed, glorious, Lady, Mother of God, and ever-virgin Mary."

The name of Our Lady, the Mother of God, is mentioned aloud so that all the faithful who are praying in the nave may join with the priest in praising and glorifying her.

The choir of singers therefore immediately after this exclamation of the priest, praises and glorifies her by singing this verse slowly and melodiously: "It is very meet to bless thee, the Mother of God, the ever-blessed and all-spotless Mother of our God," or some other similar verse, according to the various feasts and festivals.

After this the priest prays for the whole world, for the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, and for all her holy ministers, for all who are living in purity and godliness, and for all Christ-loving kings, beseeching for each of them a peaceful reign, and for us a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and godliness.

After this commemoration the priest, with the exclamation, "And first of all remember, O Lord, our Archbishop," prays and supplicates in a loud voice in the hearing of all, that God would also preserve our spiritual ruler in health and length of days, so that he may fulfil the sacred pastoral duties which have been laid upon him.

After this commemoration of the Archbishop, the deacon standing by the beautiful gate, and turning towards the faithful who are in the nave, says with a loud voice: "And all men and all women." This means, "Remember, O Lord, all Christians, both men and women, of every age, rank and state in life, and of all who have been commemorated by name, and of those who have not been so commemorated."

When the priest has mentioned all the names which happen to be written on the holy diptychs of the church, he then prays to God in a loud voice, in the hearing of all, that He would make us worthy with one mouth and heart to glorify and praise the Precious and Majestic Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

After this, turning from the altar to the faithful who are outside the sanctuary, he blesses them, and prays that they may receive the mercies and grace of Jesus Christ, saying, "And may the mercies of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ be with you all."

The choir, praying that he too may receive mercy from our Lord and God, answers immediately: "And with Thy spirit."

After this, the deacon coming out of the holy sanctuary, offers up with a loud voice in the middle of the nave, on behalf of all the faithful, fervent prayers and supplications to the Lord for the Precious Gifts which have been offered and consecrated, that God in His love to man would send down upon us in return His divine grace, and would preserve us from all affliction, wrath, danger, and necessity, and would pour upon us whatever is profitable and necessary both for this present life and that which is to come, and most especially he prays for the unity of the faith

and the communion of the Holy Ghost. To each of the supplications of the deacon the choir answers, "Lord, have mercy," and to each of his petitions, "Grant this, O Lord."

While the deacon is praying, the priest before the altar prays and supplicates and implores our loving God and Master for all of us Christians, that He would make us worthy to be partakers of His Awe-ful Mysteries, for the remission of sins and for the fellowship of the Holy Ghost.

After this he says the following exclamation aloud: "And make us worthy, O Lord, that we may dare with boldness and without condemnation to call upon Thee, our God and Father in heaven, saying."

After this exclamation of the priest, someone immediately, on behalf of all the faithful who are in the nave, reads the Lord's prayer, that is, the "Our Father, which art in heaven, &c.," in a loud voice, clearly and distinctly. While he is reading we ought all to repeat this same prayer word for word to ourselves secretly.

While the Lord's Prayer is being read, the deacon, who is preparing to approach to administer the Pure and Awe-ful Mysteries of Christ and to partake of the same, girds his orarion cross-wise over his shoulders and breast, as a sign of the fear and trembling with which he should draw near to the altar.

After the reading of the Lord's Prayer, the priest again prays from the sanctuary for peace for the faithful, saying aloud: "Peace be to all;" while the deacon with the words, "Bow your heads to the Lord," exhorts them that as obedient children of God they should bow their heads before the greatness of their Heavenly Father, as a sign of their filial humility, obedience and devotion, and should await with reverence His divine mercy.

The priest, continuing again his secret prayer to God, beseeches Him fervently and with deepest penitence and contrition of heart, that, descending from the throne of the glory of His kingdom, He would come to us for our sanctification, he would Himself, with His own powerful hand, impart to him, the priest, and through him to all of us, His own Pure Body and Precious Blood.

Immediately after this, the priest inside the sanctuary and the deacon who is standing outside the sanctuary, first repeat each to themselves three times with great fear and reverence these words: "God be merciful to me a sinner." Then the deacon,

addressing the faithful who are standing and praying in the nave, exclaims "Let us attend!" thus exhorting them all to lift up their minds and hearts to God.

The priest, responding at once to this from the sanctuary, also declares with a loud voice that only certain Christians can worthily draw near to these Precious and Holy Gifts, for he says these words aloud: "Holy things for holy people!" which mean that the Holy Things can only be given to those who are holy.

The faithful who are in the nave, confessing truly their own unworthiness and resting all their hope solely on the mercy of our one and only holy Lord Jesus Christ, reply immediately by the choir to this exclamation of the priest, as follows: "One holy, one Lord, Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father."

In the sanctuary, the priest first divides and separates into portions the Lamb of God which is lying on the diskos. He then pours into the Holy Cup the warm water which is offered to him by the deacon.

After this, both having prayed fervently and with deep contrition to the Lord, the priest first partakes of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and afterwards the deacon from the hands of the priest.

Outside the sanctuary the choir sings various hymns, slowly and melodiously, relating to whatever festival is being celebrated in the Church of Christ, as appointed in the Typikon.

When the reception of the Spotless Mysteries has been accomplished by the ministers in the sanctuary, then the beautiful gate is opened, and the deacon holding in his hands the Holy Cup in which the Precious Gifts have already been placed, appears before the faithful who are standing in the nave, and summons all who are prepared to receive the Divine Mysteries, saying with a loud voice, "Draw near with the fear of God, with faith and love!" Then all those Christians who are prepared by fasting and repentance approach to the Divine Communion.

After this, or if there are none who wish to communicate, the priest at once blesses the people, saying: "O God save Thy people, and bless Thine inheritance."

The people, at the deacon's exclamation, bow their heads as if they saw before them the very Saviour Christ Himself, while the choir sings this soul-piercing hymn: "We have seen the true Light, we have received the heavenly Spirit, we have found the true faith, in worshipping the undivided Trinity, for this Faith saved us."

After this, the priest having censed the Precious Gifts which are lying on the Holy Table, gives the paten—bearing the asterisk and aer—to the deacon, and the latter, approaching silently, places them on the Holy Table of the prothesis.

The priest himself meanwhile takes the Holy Cup and says secretly, "Blessed be our God"; then turning to the people through the beautiful gate, and shewing them the Holy Cup, he says aloud: "Now and ever world without end," and immediately proceeds to the holy prothesis, where he also sets down the Holy Cup.

This last shewing of the Precious Gifts to the people by the priest represents symbolically the Ascension of the Saviour into heaven.

After this the deacon, coming out of the holy sanctuary, exhorts aloud all who have received the Body and Blood of the Lord to thank the Lord, because—as the priest says aloud directly after the deacon—He alone is our sanctification, and to Him alone, one God in Three Persons, we ought to ascribe all glory and honour.

Immediately after this exclamation the priest, when he has folded up the antimission—which has been unfolded on the Holy Table—as a sign that the divine and sacred liturgy is finished, turns to the faithful in the nave, saying, "Let us depart in peace."

This means that when we go out of church we ought to be in peace, love and concord with one another.

To this exclamation by the priest the people at once reply through the choir with these words: "In the name of the Lord, blessed Father," thus asking God's blessing through him.

The priest therefore comes out at once from the holy sanctuary, and standing like a father in the midst of his children, in front of the icon of our Saviour Christ, he prays with a loud voice to God that He would grant peace and concord to the whole world.

The choir of the faithful confirms this prayer of the priest with "Amen." Then the priest enters the holy sanctuary and gives thanks secretly to Christ our God. The faithful in the meantime outside the sanctuary, also praise and give thanks to God our Saviour, the choir singing this hymn for them: "Blessed be the Name of the Lord, from this time forth for evermore."

After this thanksgiving and doxology from the faithful, the priest once more, for the last time, as in the person of our Lord, blesses

the people present, who are called by Christ's Name, and invokes upon them the blessing and mercy of the all-merciful God in these words: "May the blessing and mercy of the Lord come upon you, by His divine grace and love to man." Then standing in the centre of the beautiful gate, he finishes the Divine Liturgy with this doxology to the Divine Name: "Glory be to Thee, O Christ our God, glory be to Thee!" and completes it with the prayer of dismissal in which he prays and supplicates our God and Saviour Jesus Christ to save and protect us through the prayers of the Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, and of all the saints, from every danger which threatens us, for He our God is good, merciful and loving to man.

After the Liturgy is finished and the prayer of dismissal has been said, the priest distributes to all the faithful who are in the nave the antidoron, that is a portion of bread which has previously been consecrated, which recalls the love of the early Christians.

INDEX.

Aer, 7, 35, 37, 44
Akoimetos, 12
Alleluia, 32
Ambon, 8, 9
Amnos, 28, 43
Analogion, 16
Antidoron, 45
Antimision, 5, 18
Apolytikia, 31
Archbishop, 17
Archieratikos thronos, 8, 9
Archpriest, 17
Artoklasia, 16
Asteriskos, 6, 44
Bells, 15
Bema, 3, 4, 27, 34
Bishop, 9, 12, 17
Candle, 13
Candle-lighter, 9, 15
Candlesticks, 13
Catechumens, 10, 30, 33, 34, 36
——— Liturgy of, 29—34
Censer, 14
Chalice, 6
Cherubic hymn, 23, 24
Chorepiscopus, 17
Choros, 12
Chrisin, 16, 18
Compline, 26
Confession, 10
Contakion, 31
Creed (Nicene), 37
Cross, 5, 11, 12, 21, 29, 40
Crowns, 14
Deacon, 17, 24, 28
Diakonikon, 7
Dikerion (Dikir), 22
Diptychs, 14, 41
Diskelion, 16
Diskos, 6, 35, 43, 44
Dodekaphoton, 12
Eileton, 5, 33
Endyton, Endyte, 5
Enkolpion, 21
Entrance, Little, 30
——— Great, 35

Epigonatia, 20, 23
Epimanika, 19, 24
Epitaphios, 11
Epitrachelion, 19, 23
Epistle, 32
Faithful, Liturgy of, 34—45
Fasting, 43
Font, 14
Gate, Beautiful, Royal, 8, 28, 35, 37, 38
——— Candle-lighters', 9
——— Deacons', 8
Girdle, 17, 23
Gospel, 5, 30, 32
Gynaekites, 8, 10
Heptaphoton, 12
Hexapteruga, 12
Hiercus, 23
Hymn, Triumphal, 38, 39
——— Cherubic, 34
Icon, 11, 16, 28, 35
Iconostasis, 8, 35
Incense, 14, 29, 35, 44
Katasarkion, 4
Kathismaia, 10
Kleroi, 8, 9
Kochliarion, 6
Kollyba, 15
Labis, 6
Lamps, 12
Lauds, 25, 28
Lectern, 16
Lights (processional), 30
——— (stationary), 12, 13
Litany, 39, 42
Liturgy of Catechumens, 29—34
——— of Faithful, 34—45
Lonche, 6, 28
Mandyas, 22
Manualia, 13

Matins, 25, 29
Metropolitan, 17
Mitre, 21
Myrodocheion, 16
Myrophorion, 16
Narthex, 3, 7
Nicene Creed, 37
None, 26
Oil, 12
Omophorion, 20
Orarion, 24, 42
Pastoral Staff, 22
Paten, 6
Paterisa, 22
Patriarch, 17
Penance, 10, 30
Phenolion, 24
Polyelaioi, 13
Poterion, 6, 28, 35
Presbyter, 23
Priest, 17, 23, 27, &c.
Prime, 26
Pronaos, 10
Proskomide, 27—29
Prosphora, 16, 28
Prothesis, 4, 5, 27, 28, 35, 44
Pyx, 5

Readers, 9, 12
Saccos, 20
Semantra, 15
Sext, 26
Singers, 9, 30, 31, 34, &c.
Skenophylakion, 4, 7
Solcas, 8, 9
Spongos, 6
Stasidia, 8, 10
Stephanoi, 14
Stephanoma, 14
Sticharion, 18, 23, 24
Synthronon, 4, 7
Table, Holy, 4, 28, 33, 34, 35
Tapers, 13
Temple, 3, 7
Terce, 26
Trikerion (trikir), 22
Trisagion, 18, 31
Triumphal hymn, 38, 39
Typikon, 31, 43
Veils, 7, 29
Vespers, 26
Zeon, 6, 43

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

NEW SERIES.

ALREADY PUBLISHED.

- No. I. A SYNOPSIS OF ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY.
By ATHELSTAN RILEY. 1902. 8vo., price 3d. *net*.
- No. II. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EASTERN PATRIARCHATES. Lecture delivered at Oxford to the Summer School of Clergy, Wednesday, 27th July, 1898. By the Rt. Rev. THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY. With three Appendices describing the recent relations with the Patriarchates. 8vo., sewed, price 1s. *net*.
- No. III. LIST OF BOOKS ON EASTERN CHRISTENDOM. 8vo., sewed, price 3d. *net*.
- No. IV. THE CEREMONIAL USE OF OIL AMONG THE EAST SYRIANS. By the Rev. F. F. IRVING, B.D., Vicar of East Clevedon; formerly of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission. 8vo., sewed, price 6d. *net*.
- No. V. THE WORSHIP OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH, A MANUAL OF INFORMATION, Edited by the Rev. C. R. DAVEY BIGGS, D.D., Vicar of SS. Philip and James, Oxford, Secretary of the Eastern Church Association. 8vo., sewed, price 1s. *net*.
- No. VI. THE HOLY SYNOD AND THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE. Correspondence on the subject of Reunion. With Introduction by W. J. BIRKBECK, M.A. 8vo., sewed, price 6d. *net*. *Nearly ready*.

JAMES PARKER AND CO., 27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;
AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

No. VI.

NEW SERIES.

OCCASIONAL PAPER
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

EPISTLE OF THE RUSSIAN HOLY SYNOD

TO

THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE,

ON THE SUBJECT OF REUNION,

WITH INTRODUCTION BY

W. J. BIRKBECK, M.A.

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;

AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1904.

For permission to make use of the matter contained in the following pages, which is with a few alterations and corrections reprinted from The Guardian of Aug. 26 and Sept. 2, 1903, the Eastern Church Association is indebted to the courtesy of the proprietors of that paper.

In the 'Εκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια of November 22 (O.S.) and the Moniteur Occidental of November 26, appeared a summary of answers received from the various autocephalous Churches to the enquiries of the Œcumenical Patriarch.

Those of Roumania and Montenegro were almost in exact unison with that of Russia; Greece did not regard present circumstances as favourable to the discussion of the subject. Servia agreed that the Orthodox Churches needed strengthening. From Jerusalem came the suggestion of a yearly Congress of representatives of all the autocephalous Churches, and in regard to Unity the opinion that something might be done in the direction of the Anglican Church and the old Catholics, if a Committee of Theologians from all the Orthodox Churches could be appointed to consider the matter.

The Russian Holy Synod and the Patriarch of Constantinople.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Epistle of the Russian Holy Synod to the Patriarch of Constantinople is a document of exceptional interest, not only as expressing the mind of the Russian ecclesiastical authorities upon certain important questions, but as illustrating the relations which exist between the various autocephalous Churches of which the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church is composed, and the means by which, under existing circumstances, Orthodox unity is maintained. For English Churchmen it possesses the further interest of being known to have been drawn up on the initiative and under the guidance of the present presiding member of the Holy Synod, the Metropolitan Antonius, of St. Petersburg, who, at that time Archbishop of Finland, represented the Russian Church at the celebration of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee in 1897, and during his stay in this country made such an excellent impression upon all with whom he came in contact.

The Epistle was written in reply to a letter of inquiry, addressed by the Œcumenical Patriarch, Joachim III., and his Holy Synod to the Russian Holy Synod, informing them of certain questions which had arisen in the Church of Constantinople, with regard to the attitude of the Orthodox Church towards Roman Catholics, Protestants, Anglicans, Old Catholics, and other non-Orthodox bodies of Christians, and asking for information as to the attitude of the Russian Church towards these questions, and for brotherly counsel as to the best mode of dealing with them in accordance with the spirit of the Orthodox Church.

This method of securing unity of action between the various autocephalous Churches of the Orthodox East by means of an interchange of information and counsel between their chief representatives, although it has often been forgotten by certain Western bodies, who, in their eagerness to introduce their wooden horses into the Orthodox citadel, have attempted to negotiate

terms of reunion with one or other of them separately, will at once be recognised as no new departure by all who are conversant with the history of the Eastern Church since the schism of East and West. Temporary misunderstandings and petty jealousies of a racial, political, or personal character may indeed from time to time arise among Orthodox as among other Christian ecclesiastics or communities, and a great many hard things may be said or written. But whatever Greeks and Russians, Roumanians and Servians may have to say about one another's shortcomings, and however little pains may be taken to conceal such differences from the knowledge of interested non-Orthodox foreigners, no sooner does any question assume a form which is likely vitally to affect the practice, constitution, or faith of the Church than all the fears of the friends, and the hopes of the enemies, of Orthodoxy are very quickly set at rest. Eastern Church history is full of such instances of the failure of such intrigues, from the time when Jaroslav the Wise gave refuge and hospitality to the legates of Leo IX. on their flight from Constantinople, down to the present day.

More especially has this mode of regulating their affairs, and of maintaining unity of faith and practice, been noticeable since the downfall of the Eastern Empire, when the Œcumenical Patriarchate passed under the dominion of the infidels. The recognition of the Russian Church as autocephalous immediately after that disaster, the erection of a fifth Patriarchate at Moscow—the "Third Rome"—in the sixteenth century, the troubles of the Orthodox at about the same time in Poland, the substitution of the Russian Holy Synod for the Patriarchate of Moscow in the time of Peter the Great, the relations between the Orthodox Church and the British Non-Jurors, and many other instances down to quite recent times might be quoted of a similar interchange of communications between the authorities of the Orthodox Churches upon important matters affecting the life of the Church as a whole.

The principles underlying this method of dealing with fresh problems as they arise could not be more clearly set forth than in the earlier portion of the Russian Epistle given below. It is, in effect, an adaptation of that which makes the decrees of a general council to be the authoritative decision of the Church, to the circumstances of a time when the actual assemblage of the representatives of all the autocephalous Orthodox Churches in one place

is not possible; the main point being that the traditions, teaching, and practice of every local Church should be ascertained before coming to a decision, and that that decision, when arrived at, should be accepted by the whole Church as a true expression of her mind.

It is interesting to notice that since the great schism between East and West, whereas the tendency of the Western Church has been more and more to develop the Patriarchal authority into what Latin authors write of as "La Monarchie Pontificale," and Eastern writers describe as "Papalo-Cæsarism"^a, and to leave less and less place or practical need in their ecclesiastical system for a General Council, exactly the opposite has been the case in the East. At the time of the Great Schism, although the Patriarch of Constantinople was still in theory merely *primus inter pares* among the other Eastern Patriarchates, the losses these latter had incurred through heretical defections and infidel conquests had practically left him in a not dissimilar position in the East to that occupied by the Roman Pontiffs in the Western Church. The daughter Churches, which were afterwards to become autocephalous, were as yet in their infancy, and were entirely willing to remain in a state of tutelage under the immediate jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Throne. That the history of the West was not repeated in the East is due partly, indeed, to historical circumstances; but the main reason is to be sought in an entirely different conception of the nature of the Church and of the conditions of ecclesiastical unity. Whereas in the West the idea of the Church being divided into an *ecclesia docens* and *ecclesia discens* became more and more prominent, and the former tended more and more to a system of graduated hierarchical subordination under a more or less autocratic head, the Easterns held fast to their belief that the custody of the faith was committed to the whole body of the Church, which could be expressed when needful through the voices of its local representatives, whether by means of their general assemblage in a Council, or through an interchange of views by means of letters or personal intercourse. Accordingly the history of the relations between the Patriarchate and its daughter Churches presents a marked contrast to what occurred in the West. To take the

^a A very obvious repartee to the term "Césaro-Papism" which the Roman controversialists of the beginning of the last century applied to the Russian Church.

Russian Church as an example. It began by being as completely Greek as the English Church of Augustine's time was Roman. But first we find the services gradually translated from Greek into Slavonic, and the Greek Metropolitans at Kieff no longer requiring Greek books and singers from Constantinople. Next we have native Russian Metropolitans, but still, when possible, consecrated by the Patriarchs. Next we have Metropolitans elected and consecrated in Russia, but still confirmed at Constantinople. Some time after we find the latter condition dispensed with, and admitted by the Patriarch to be superfluous; and lastly, at the end of 600 years, the see of Moscow is acknowledged as a Patriarchate equal in authority to the mother see. To adapt Bishop Creighton's aphorism concerning England and Rome to Russia, she retained the supremacy of Constantinople so long as she found it a help and got rid of it so soon as she found it a hindrance. The difference between the two processes consists in the fact that in Russia each stage was arrived at with the full consent of the Patriarch, who found in it nothing that was not entirely consistent with Orthodox conceptions of ecclesiastical unity. The result has been that Russia, if lost to the Patriarchs of Constantinople as a merely dependent appanage, has not been lost to the Church of which they occupy the primatial throne, as the present interchange of letters very clearly shows.

We have now arrived at that part of the Russian Epistle which, deals *seriatim* with the Œcumenical Patriarch's inquiries respecting the attitude of the Russian Church towards the various bodies of Christians lying outside the communion of the Orthodox Eastern Church.

In the first place, we have the relations of the Russian Church "towards two great Ramifications of Christianity, the Latins and the Protestants." The first point to be noticed is that the Latins and Protestants are treated together as representing merely two forms of one and the same apostasy (*otpadjenije*). If we are to understand the Eastern Church at all, it is essential that this attitude of hers should be realised. She is, indeed, proudly conscious of the fact that, while all other Christian bodies have either added to or subtracted from the faith of Christendom as once held by the undivided Church, she has maintained her traditions unbroken and her faith unchanged. But by this she does not mean that she looks upon herself as a *via media*, still less as

a half-way house, or a sort of compromise between the conflicting tendencies of Rome and Protestantism. To her the separation of the West from the East presents itself as a great revolt on the part of the Western Church against the authority of the Catholic Church as a whole, and the present divided state of Western Christendom as nothing more or less than the logical outcome of the principles which lay at the root of that revolt.

This view has been worked out in detail by the Russian theologians of the last century in connection with the unauthorised insertion of the *Filioque* clause into the Œcumenical Creed of Christendom. If one patriarchate ignores the existence of the other patriarchates, and takes upon itself to alter the Creed of the whole Church as decreed by the General Councils without even consulting them, what more natural than that the heaven of revolt should gradually work its way further in the isolated mass, and that whole regions and provinces of that patriarchate should claim a similar right to manage their own affairs independently of the rest, and that next the clergy should defy their Bishops, or even get rid of them altogether, or that the laity should repudiate the authority of the clergy? Again, the alteration of the Creed, although not initiated by the Popes, had eventually to seek its justification under their authority, and they were thus committed to claiming spiritual powers differing entirely in kind from, and altogether superior to, those of any other Bishop, or indeed of the collective Episcopate of the Catholic Church. The Russian theologians point out that, inasmuch as "ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you," and "without contradiction the less is blessed of the better," a Bishop, whether he be the most insignificant of Suffragans or the most exalted of Patriarchs, must receive his spiritual powers from a source which is essentially superior to himself and to every other Bishop. Whatever the local arrangements for his election to fill his particular see may be, he receives his spiritual powers and Divine commission from the whole Church, the Body of which Christ is the Head, at his consecration by a council of not less than three, or at least two^b, Bishops, whose action she recognises as her own act for the purpose, just in the

^b Can. Apost. 1, Conc. Carth., can. 60. The Eastern Church does not acknowledge the validity of the consecration of a Bishop by a single Bishop. On this ground the Russian treats the so-called "Austrian" succession amongst the Old Believers as null and void.

same way as when she recognises the decree of a Council of Bishops concerning the faith as her own voice, she thereby makes it to be of Ecumenical authority. But when once this order of things is reversed, and an authority over the whole Church is claimed by one who is promoted thereto by means of no sacramental ordinance appointed by the Church, but owes his exceptional spiritual powers as contrasted with those of all other Bishops, and his plenary authority over them, to the mere votes of those who, be they the people or clergy of his cathedral city, or be they a committee of subordinates appointed for the purpose by his predecessors, are, in any case, whether individually or in their corporate capacity, his inferiors, how does this differ in principle from what obtains amongst Protestant communities, whether it stops short, as in the old Lutheran States or in the modern Evangelical Church in Prussia, at such conventionalities as deriving the spiritual authority of the clergy from the appointments of a secular sovereign, or whether, as in some sects, the principle be carried to its logical conclusion, and each congregation claims to appoint and confer spiritual authority upon its own minister?

From this it will be seen that the Easterns regard Romanism and Protestantism as simply two aspects of the same heresy, that heresy being the rejection of the authority of the Church. The extreme forms of Protestantism represent to them nothing more than the logical development^c of the false principles to which the West committed itself in breaking away from the rest of Christendom, and in claiming for the Western Patriarch an authority superior to, instead of derived from, and therefore subject to, the Church of God.

Before leaving this part of the Epistle, we would call attention to the very important passage with regard to the validity of Western baptisms. In this letter the Russian Church, for the first time, officially sets forth its definite theological reason for not rebaptising Westerns, as is still done in some parts of the Greek Patriarchates. Passing over in silence the whole dispute concerning immersion or affusion, as well as the historical and canonical side of the question, the Epistle simply asserts that as both Rome and the

^c The Russian theologians have traced the process in every department of the ecclesiastical life of the Western confessions—in the Sacraments, Invocation of Saints, prayers for the departed, relations between Church and State, philosophy, &c., but the subject is too large for the limits of this article.

Protestants believe rightly concerning the Holy Trinity, in whose Name baptism is administered, their baptism is valid, and ought not to be repeated, as if it were the baptism of Arians or of some other sect which rejected the Catholic Doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Such a principle is capable of a very wide application, and constantly appears in the controversial and apologetic writings of the Russian Theologians of the present day.

The section concerning the Anglican Church shows an accurate knowledge of facts, and contains nothing which ought to wound the feelings of any English Churchman. Indeed, if we remember that the Easterns are quite as sure of their position as the Latins, if not more so, the friendliness of its tone as compared with that assumed towards us by the Roman authorities is most striking. If the Eastern ecclesiastical authorities are able to meet the advances of those who are outside their communion in a friendly spirit, and to treat misunderstandings "with all possible indulgence" instead of with a determination to make the very worst of them, the reason is to be sought in that fundamental difference in their conception of the nature of the Church which we have already seen to exist between Easterns and Latins. The Pope, by the very nature of his claims, is bound to look upon all those who are outside the Roman Church as rebels against his own divinely bestowed authority. "*Parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*" must ever be his motto: The more faithful he is to what he believes to be the truth the less easy does it become for him and for his subordinates to enter into friendly relations with those who do not acknowledge his sovereignty. With the Eastern hierarchy it is quite otherwise. No member of it, not even the Patriarch of Constantinople himself, lays claim to universal spiritual sovereignty; this would be, according to Eastern views, nothing more than to change the Church upon earth into a kingdom of this world. Accordingly, while they are bound by their sacred trust to guard the frontiers of their Church and to maintain its doctrine and discipline, the Russian and other Orthodox Bishops are able to meet any friendly acts on the part of members of the English hierarchy in the spirit in which they are made.

With regard to what is said about the "Calvinistic current" in the Anglican community, no one who knows anything of the Eastern Church would expect her to admit Anglicans to communion as things are now. To do so would be to acknowledge the

peculiar circumstances of the English Church at the present day, which are eminently local, and which friends and foes alike can see to be in a state of transition, as the normal and permanent condition of the whole Church of God. It will naturally be felt by English Churchmen that there is some exaggeration in speaking of the "perceptible, if not exclusive influence" of these Calvinistic tendencies "upon the Church policy, and, in general, upon the whole Church life" of Anglicanism. But if it be remembered that the Metropolitan Antonius' acquaintance with the English Church began in the year 1897, that since then he has followed the affairs of the English Church with great care, and that during that time the most prominent official pronouncements made in England have been Archbishop Temple's Visitation charge in October, 1898, and the two "Lambeth Opinions," the inference which he draws from them cannot be looked upon as altogether surprising. As the letter says, "much still remains to be done" before there can be a thought of any definite step in regard to reunion with the East, either for or against it. Time alone can show in which direction things are destined to move.

The section concerning the Old Catholics will be read with additional interest in connection with the articles on the same subject which have recently appeared in the *Guardian*. The section dealing with the heretical communities in the East will meet with the complete approval of those Churchmen who are interested in the Archbishop of Canterbury's Assyrian Mission and other similar undertakings in the East. The paragraph concerning the change of the Calendar will disappoint the Roman Catholics, who in Russia and other Orthodox countries have to keep their Easter sometimes five weeks after it has been kept in the West. But the advantages to be gained by a change of style do not seem sufficiently great to justify the risk of retarding the return to the Church of the Russian Old Believers, who would certainly be scandalised by the change.

W. J. B.

EPISTLE OF THE RUSSIAN HOLY SYNOD.

To the Most Holy Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Œcumenical Patriarch, the Lord Joachim III., together with the Holy and Sacred Synod of the Great Church of Christ at Constantinople, we send a brotherly salutation in Christ.

It was with especial joy and love that the Most Holy Synod of All the Russias received the revered and Spirit-bearing epistle of your Holiness and of your Sacred Synod, impressed, as it was, with that zeal for the welfare of the Church of God, and that invariable care for the salvation of all men, to which we are accustomed from the throne of Chrysostom, and, likewise, with its especial love and affinity to the Church of Russia; and, after attentive investigation and discussion, it now proceeds to reply to your love, and to communicate to you its opinion upon the questions so opportunely proposed by your wise solicitude.

First of all, remembering the words of the Psalmist, "Behold how good and how joyful a thing it is, brethren, to dwell together in unity," and the commandment of the Apostle "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," we greet with love your thought, dear to God, as to the necessity of consolidating unity and extending the circle of mutual intercourse between those sisters in the faith, the local Holy Orthodox Churches of God, deeming that it is only in mutual love, and in constant and active communication one with another, that the Holy Churches will find the requisite support and strength for their great "wrestling against the rulers of the darkness of this world"—against infidelity, indifference, and other noisome blasts. By far the best and most perfect expression of this holy fraternal love and most blessed communion of the Churches of God, and the most effectual means for the healing of our social disorders, would be, without doubt, special assemblies of Orthodox Bishops, and especially of the chief representatives of the Churches, and that they should confer immediately together, "mouth to mouth," upon questions which, at the time being, were agitating their spiritual flock. If the

Bishops, when their hearts are so inclined, stimulated by the duties laid upon them as chief pastors, assemble themselves together, and, without dissimulation, regarding themselves as before the face of Christ Himself, Who, in very truth, has promised to be in the midst of those who are gathered together in His Name, with a pure conscience, and with unanimous prayer, pronounce before all the world the confession of their faith, or lay down a decision healing the disorders and wounds in the Church, then the Holy Ghost, dwelling in the Church universal, and moving her, without doubt speaks in such a case by the mouths of the Bishops who have assembled themselves together in prayer, although each one of them acknowledge himself to be the most sinful of men. And if of old the place was shaken where the Church was assembled together after prayer, and after having boldly invoked the all-powerful Right Hand of Divine Providence against the foes which surrounded her, so now, without doubt, the united prayer of the representatives of the Church likewise "availeth much," nor would any forces of the enemy be able to withstand the confession of faith boldly proclaimed by their council; and the life of the Church, having found such a clear expression for itself, would without doubt shine forth with an inexplicable light before the face of all the world, and would attract to itself the hearts of all who are seeking the truth, rousing also at the same time the slumbering consciences of those who were begotten in the faith, but have forgotten, or waxen cold towards it.

But, however desirable such an assemblage of all the Orthodox Bishops might be, at the present time, when the local Holy Churches are divided from one another by the boundaries of States, and when every sort of inter-ecclesiastical relation of necessity touches also upon international relations, it is scarcely possible that such an assemblage of Bishops, or any such general and universal deliberation by them on Church questions, could be brought about. For the time being one may pray and wish for this. But a more immediate undertaking for the local Holy Orthodox Churches, and for their wise representatives, presents itself—to approach as near as possible to the bright ideal, just mentioned, of the œcumenical intercourse of the early Church, by maintaining one with another a constant and living connection by means of written and other intercourse, exchanging brotherly messages upon the occasion of all joyful and sorrowful events in their Church life, asking for

brotherly counsel and information in difficult cases, each sharing its own experience in the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs with the rest. And more especially is such an exchange of opinions among the sister Churches indispensable in questions which concern the essence of the faith and the fundamental position of the present organisation of the Church, or in such as have an inter-ecclesiastical character. May it ever be that in cases when in some local Church any kind of reform has to be entered upon which deeply affects the established order of the Church, when this local Church is required to pronounce, or there has been already pronounced, a sentence upon any kind of new religious movement, more particularly if its influence may be supposed to extend beyond the bounds of the Church in question—may it ever be that on such occasions the representative of that Church, by means of an epistle or in some other way, shall inform the representatives likewise of the other local Orthodox Churches, asking of their brotherly experience for their advice, and putting them in possession of the facts of what has taken place in his own region. Such constant mutual help and sharing in a common life will without doubt serve as a real and living bond, strengthening all the local Churches in the one body growing up into "an habitation of God through the Spirit." But likewise in its own particular life each autocephalous Orthodox Church must always (as, indeed, it does at present) preserve the memory and consciousness of its union with the other Orthodox Churches, and of the fact that only in communion and agreement with them has it the pledge of truth and of eternal life, or manifests itself as the Church of God, and that, if it has lost this communion and union, it must perish and wither as a branch which has fallen away from the vine. May the constant and active introduction into their life and ecclesiastical practice of this principle of œcumenicity (*vselenskosti*), the training of a feeling of its necessity in his ecclesiastical community, be the subject of the special care of the wise representatives of the local Churches, and we believe that their unremitting and sincere zeal will not be slow in bringing forth abundant fruit in the blessed field of œcumenical union, enlivening at the same time the Church life of each local Church, strengthening the faith of its children, perfecting them in the hope of eternal life, and together with this likewise revealing to all the world the truth in all its splendour, and the power of the orthodox faith of Christ.

As regards our relations towards two great ramifications of Christianity, the Latins and the Protestants, the Russian Church, together with all the autocephalous Orthodox Churches, ever prays, awaits, and fervently desires that those who in times of old were children of Mother Church and sheep of the one flock of Christ, but who now have been torn away by the envy of the foe and are wandering astray, "should repent and come to the knowledge of the truth," that they should once more return to the bosom of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, to their one Shepherd. We believe in the sincerity of their faith in the All-Holy and Life-origivative Trinity, and on that account we accept [as valid] the baptism of both one and the other. We respect the Apostolical Succession of the Latin hierarchy, and those of their clergy who join our Church we accept [as validly ordained] in the Orders which they then possess, just as we do in the case of Armenians, Copts, Nestorians, and other bodies that have not lost the Apostolic Succession. "Our heart is enlarged" (2 Cor. vi. 11), and we are ready to do all that is possible in order to promote the establishment upon earth of the unity which we so much desire. But, to our great regret and to the common grief of all true children of the Church, at the present time we are obliged to think, not so much of the softening of our relations towards Western Christians, and of a love-abounding drawing of their communities to union with us, as of the unwearied and ever-watchful defence of the rational [*slavesnikh* = λογικῶν] sheep committed to our charge from unceasing attacks and multifarious seductions on the part of the Latins and the Protestants.

Well known to our dearly beloved and highly esteemed fathers and brethren are the secular desires of Rome, which indeed in their time served as the cause of her apostasy; well known in history her various artifices, both open and secret, directed with the object of subjecting to herself the Orthodox East; and well known are the costly schools, the missionary societies, the special monastic orders and other institutions, which indeed exist down to the present day, and whose number does not cease to grow, whose sole object is to ensnare, if possible, the children of the Orthodox Church. Upon Russia, in particular, the eyes of Latinism have long been directed. Not being able to seduce our common people, simple, but pious and devoted to the Church as they are, they turn to members of the higher aristocracy, who

have been accustomed to living abroad, and who, for many generations, have been in constant communion with the spirit of the West, and by means of secret propaganda, of literature, the press, &c., they strive to unsettle them in the faith of their fathers, and to establish Roman Catholicism amongst them. The conversion of Russia and of the Russian people constitutes the secret dream and unconcealable goal of the yearnings of the Papacy of our times. Therefore, however pacific the speeches of the Latins may be, however assiduously they may express and emphasise in all sorts of ways their especial love and respect for the Orthodox Church, and in particular for the Russian people and State, these fair words must not, nor can they, conceal the real desires of Rome from our attention: and we, of necessity, shall only all the more increase our watchfulness and our determination to stand stedfastly upon the immovable soil of Orthodoxy, and not to be lured away by any appearances of peace falsely understood, notwithstanding all our longing for the union of faith enjoined upon all Christians by Christ our Saviour Himself.

And just as inaccessible, if not even more so, Protestantism shows itself to be at the present time. Having no understanding of Church life, and requiring for themselves external works evident to the senses, chiefly of a general social character, the Protestant communities look upon our Eastern Church as a region of ecclesiastical stagnation, of error and darkness unredeemed by a ray of light, not even stopping short of bringing accusations of idolatry against us, and therefore out of falsely understood zeal for Christ they do not spare material means and forces for the spreading of their Protestant errors amongst the children of the Orthodox Church, losing no opportunity of undermining the authority of the Orthodox hierarchy and of unsettling the faith of the people in the sanctity of the traditions of the Church. Religious exclusiveness and even fanaticism, mixed with a contemptuous arrogance in relation to Orthodoxy, is the distinguishing mark of the Protestants, one may say, even more than of the Latins. Of course, much of this may be explained by the secular prejudices and general narrowness of the horizon of the German school of theology, and, consequently, likewise of the Protestant Church agents, and this fact imposes upon our scholars the duty of revealing before the consciousness of the West the true majesty and the really Christian purity of Orthodoxy. But until this

onerous and thankless sowing of seed upon the stony ground of cultured pride and mutual misunderstanding shall come to bear fruit, it behoves us representatives of the Church, and especially of the Russian Church, to exert all our strength in the fight against the multiform allurements of this dangerous enemy of the Church, making prayer without ceasing unto her Chief Shepherd to defend His faithful sheep against its assaults.

The Anglicans assume a somewhat different attitude towards Orthodoxy. With rare exceptions they do not aim at the perversion of Orthodox Christians, and upon every occasion and opportunity strive to show their special respect for the Holy Apostolic Eastern Church, admitting that she, and not Rome, is the true conservator of the traditions of the Fathers, and in union and agreement with her seeking a justification for themselves [*i.e.*, for their own position]. Love and goodwill cannot but call forth love on our side also, and nourish in us the good hope of the possibility of Church union with them in the future. But here, also, much still remains to be done and to be explained, before that it will be possible to think of any definite step in one or in the other direction. And, first of all, it is indispensable that the desire for union with the Eastern Orthodox Church should become the sincere desire not only of a certain fraction of Anglicanism (the "High Church"), but of the whole Anglican community, that the other purely Calvinistic current which in essence rejects the Church, as we understand her, and whose attitude towards Orthodoxy is one of particular intolerance, should be absorbed in the above-mentioned pure current, and should lose its perceptible, if we may not say exclusive, influence upon the Church policy and in general upon the whole Church life of this confession which, in the main, is exempt from enmity towards us. On our side, in our relations towards Anglicans, there ought to be a brotherly readiness to assist them with explanations, an habitual attentiveness to their best desires, all possible indulgence towards misunderstandings which are natural after ages of separation, but at the same time a firm profession of the truth of our Ecumenical Church as the one guardian of the inheritance of Christ and the one saving ark of Divine grace.

The so-called Old Catholics, who courageously raised their voice against "him that loveth to have the pre-eminence over them" (3 John 9), and to this day are not ceasing to make every sacrifice

in their great fight for the truth and for conscience, from the very first steps which they took, found sympathy for themselves amongst our active Churchmen and representatives of theological science, some of whom took a very lively interest in their cause, working unweariedly on their behalf both in literature and at congresses. In response to a general desire a special commission was instituted in St. Petersburg for the investigation of the question concerning the Old Catholics and for intercourse with them. (This Commission, indeed, exists up to the present time.) Our workers were animated by the very best feelings towards the Old Catholics, and understanding all the diversity in national, historical, ecclesiastical and other conditions and traditions, maintained throughout a patient attitude towards the disagreements and misunderstandings of the Old Catholics which arose, and were ready to do everything to smooth a way for their entry into the Church. At first this much-to-be-desired work appeared to be near and realisable without any special difficulty. But time goes on. The chief pillars of the Old Catholic Movement, brought up in traditions which, although not Orthodox, were at least ecclesiastical, are one after another passing away from the arena of life, and giving place to new men, it may be, just as sincere and self-denying, but not so firm in their Churchmanship, they not having lived a Church life; while they are surrounded, for the most part, by a Protestant world, to which, moreover, they are near, both in language and in a common civil life, and in University Education, and, lastly, in their very struggle with Rome. To these new men, not particularly firm in Churchmanship, under the circumstances of their being far distant from the East, and of having no clear but a dim conception of it, the Protestant world may naturally appear congenial and near, and it is not easy for them to bear up against its imperceptible but constant influence. And this is the reason that our Russian Church, while not ceasing even now to sympathise with, and admire, the Old Catholics, or to co-operate in every way with their praiseworthy search for Church truth, is beginning to look with some anxiety upon the future of this movement, and to ask the question whether the Old Catholics will keep to their original resolution to belong only to the real Ecumenical Church, and will aim at union with her; or whether, carried away by an alluring day dream, so natural to the rationalistic West, of reinstating the true Church amongst themselves at home by their own powers

of learning and by their intellect, they will turn aside into the byways of Protestantism, to the great grief of all their true friends? The task that lies before us in respect to them ought, in our opinion, to consist in this—that while we should not place superfluous obstacles to union in their way by misplaced intolerance or suspiciousness, nor on the other hand be carried away by the easily understood desire to have useful and extremely learned allies against Rome, we should seriously and steadfastly, according to conscience and before Christ, reveal to them our faith and unchangeable conviction in the fact that our Eastern Orthodox Church, which has inviolably preserved the complete deposit of Christ, is alone at the present time the Œcumenical Church, and that thereby in very deed we should show them what they ought to have in view, and upon what they ought to decide, if they really believe in the savingness of abiding within the Church and sincerely desire union with her.

And, lastly, the question of the change, or merely of some reform of the Calendar, has been troubling the minds of the Orthodox in our country not a little for some time past, just as it has with you. At the command of our Most Religious Sovereign a Special Commission of learned representatives of the various branches of knowledge bearing upon this subject was formed at the Imperial Academy of Science expressly for the purpose of investigating this question. But the labours of this Commission, which are extremely complicated and many-sided, are up to the present not concluded, and it is impossible to say beforehand what will be their final result. It is only necessary, in our opinion, to keep in view the fact that this question has many sides, which respectively admit of an elucidation and settlement by no means identical the one with the other. The application of the New Style to the civil reckoning of time only, without changing the Paschalia, and without transferring the Church festivals, but merely changing the figure of the dates agreeably to the New Style (*i.e.*, the day which is now dated January 6th would then be dated January 19th, but would still remain the Feast of the Theophany), would, of course, not particularly affect the interests of the Church, inasmuch as in Church practice the Julian Calendar would still remain in full force (except that the Feast of the New Year would then no longer coincide with the Feast of the Circumcision of the Lord, but with the memorial of St. Boniface the Martyr on December 19th of the Old Style, just as

is now the practice, for instance, in the Orthodox Church of Japan, which has to date its festivals by the New Style which is used in Japan). But if we are to touch upon the question of the purely scientific worth of this or that reckoning of time, the scholars of most weight amongst us incline rather in favour of the Julian Calendar, with merely certain corrections admitted into it, and not at all to exchanging it for the Gregorian Calendar, which, according to the conclusion they have come to, is less skilfully contrived. And this authoritative voice of the scholars constrains us, the guardians of the Church, to maintain an attitude of great caution towards the desire of some people to change the calendar, if thereby is meant an alteration of the Paschalia and of the whole chronology of the Church. Such a change, disturbing the immemorial order of things which has repeatedly been hallowed by the Church, would, without doubt, be accompanied by certain disturbances in the life of the Church, and meanwhile, on the present occasion, such disturbances would not find sufficient justification for themselves, either in the exclusive rightfulness of the proposed reform, or in the needs of the Church being ripe for the change. Wherefore, for our part, we would stand up for the conservation of the Julian Calendar in Church practice, admitting at the most only the formal alterations with regard to the New Year, and the renumbering of the dates as we have explained above.

Proposing all that we have enunciated above to your love, and to your wise and favourable judgment, we cannot help turning the attention of the representatives of the holy Churches of God to the sorrowful fact that even within the Orthodox Church itself we see a weakening of love worthy of tears, dissensions and division, sometimes going so far as a rupture of ecclesiastical communion. Let our love be extended to our erring brethren who dwell in our midst. Side by side with us stand those ancient Christian communities, the Nestorians, the Armenians, the Copts and others, which have been separated for many centuries from the Church, but have not lost their Church organization nor their hierarchy, and which at the present time, in the persons of their leading members, are in some cases beginning to arrive at a sense of the wrongfulness of their apostasy. To draw once more into the bosom of the one Church these men, who live side by side with us, and are extremely near to us in culture, manners and customs, and more particularly in the fashion of their Church life and in the

type of their religion, appears to be the most immediate object for our Church to undertake, and our direct and absolute duty, in fulfilling which we not only should revive these ancient communities into a new Church life, but in time should discover for the Church herself a new source of strong and zealous labourers in the common work of the Church.

Most heartily beseeching our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ that He may confirm His Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in unanimity, and may strengthen the principle of mutual love and communion within her, and that He may grant unto your Holiness and the Holy and Sacred Synod surrounding you, together with all the great Church of Constantinople, peace and prosperity and good success in all things, we remain, with brotherly love in Christ our God,

ANTONIUS, Metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Ladoga.

VLADIMIR, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna.

VLADIMIR, Bishop of Vladikavkaz and Mozdok.

NICHOLAS, Bishop of Tavrida and Simferopol.

JOHN, Bishop of Saratoff and Tzaritzyn.

MARCELLUS, Bishop.

February 23, 1903.

PRINTED BY JAMES PARKER AND CO., CROWN YARD, OXFORD.

OCCASIONAL PAPER
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

THE ESSENTIAL UNITY
OF THE
CHURCH OF CHRIST.

EXTRACTED FROM "AN EIRENICON"

By E. B. PUSEY, D.D.,

Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

WITH THE SANCTION OF THE AUTHOR.

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;

AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1904

It has been thought likely to be of use that Occasional Paper VI of this New Series should be followed by a reissue as VII. of Occasional Paper II. in the Old Series. Forty years, or nearly so, have passed since its concluding portion was penned, and reflection on the fact may perhaps encourage those who regret that not more has been done, than has been done, to promote "Reunion," to possess their souls in patience.

INTRODUCTION.

The following Treatise on the Unity of the Church, embodied in the author's Letter to the Rev. John Keble^a, is now republished in a separate form, by the Eastern Church Association, in the hope of promoting the object which they have at heart. The remarks of the revered writer, contained in the letter which conveys his assent to this republication, will serve to connect it with the special work of the Association:—

"December 23, 1865.

"My dearest Friend,—The thoughts expressed in these pages have been my comfort now to hoar hairs. Amid this disunion of Christendom—disunion which the unhappy Council of Florence (while perhaps it laid, in regard to the 'Filioque,' a basis for future reunion, yet) through its demands upon the Greeks, aggravated for the time—it has been my deep joy to think that these prolonged misunderstandings need not break supernatural Unity. And they do not, if they do not break charity. It is through no fault of ours, we hope, that we are not in communion with the great Greek Church. We had no part in the requirements of the Council of Florence. We do not love the Greek Church less because we have been involved, without our wills, in this loss of communion. And then it is a joy to think of our Organic Union with one another, through our Union with our One Lord, and the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, ministered in each by the Successors of the Apostles; holding, as we believe, the same common faith. God grant that we may be one through intercommunion also. All Christian blessings.

"Yours most affectionately,

"E. B. PUSEY.

"The Rev. G. Williams,

"King's College, Cambridge."

^a "The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity. An Eirenicon, in a Letter to the Author of 'The Christian Year.'" By E. B. Pusey, D.D., &c., &c. London, 1865. The passage here extracted occurs in pp. 44—66.

Essential Unity of the Church of Christ.

THAT the Church of England really holds and teaches the indissoluble unity of the Church upon earth is clear, seeing that we cannot approach the Holy Communion without confessing, "I believe *one* Catholic and Apostolic Church." In our Litany, we pray for "the Holy Church Universal," and not for our Bishops only, but for "*all* Bishops," all, accordingly, throughout the whole world, east and west. In our Ember Weeks, we pray "Our Heavenly Father, Who hast purchased to Thyself an Universal Church by the precious Blood of Thy Dear Son, mercifully look upon the same, and at this time so guide and govern the minds of Thy servants, the Bishops and Pastors of Thy flock." We pray accordingly for God's special guidance of the Bishops of the Universal Church. At Holy Communion we pray God to "inspire continually the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord," and for "all Bishops," not our own only. Certainly, since prayer is the voice of the soul to God, we express not our inmost belief only, but a loving belief, that the Church is one.

How it is one, the Church nowhere defines; but the faith is kept alive by prayer more than by definitions. Yet, whatever duties may follow upon the Unity of the Church, it is plain that no harmony of men's wills can constitute a supernatural and Divine Unity.

Unity, in part, is the direct gift of God; in part, it is the fruit of that gift in the mutual love of the members of the Church. In part, it is a spiritual oneness wrought by God the Holy Ghost; in part, it is a grace, to be exercised by man, a consequence and fruit of that gift. In one way, it is organic unity derived from Christ, and binding all to Christ, descending from the Head to the Body, and uniting the Body to the Head; in another, it consists in acts of love from the members one to another. Christ our Lord, God and Man, binds us to Him by the indwelling of His Spirit, by the gift of His Sacraments, administered by

those to whom He gave the commission so to do, by the right faith in Himself. We are bound to one another, in that we are members of Him, and by the love which He sheds abroad in our hearts through the Spirit which He giveth us, and by common acts of worship and intercommunion.

Of these, the highest and chief is that which binds us to Christ Himself. Our highest union with one another is an organic union with one another through union with Him. It is not chiefly an union of will, or of mind, or of love, although these ought to be the fruits of it in its most perfect state, but an union through His indwelling Spirit. It is an union, in a degree, corresponding with the union of the Father and the Son. "As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us." It was the perverseness of the Arians to say, that the oneness of the Father and the Son was no other than that of Their creatures with Them, that either we too are of the Father's own substance, or the Son is not so. The words do not express identity, nor equality*. Else it might be said, that "to be perfect as the Father is perfect," implied that the creature would become such as the Creator; or, that to be "harmless as doves," implies that we should have the harmlessness of irrational animals, not that which is inwrought through the Holy Spirit of God. The words do express a certain relation and analogy, an actual, real oneness, not in ourselves, but with God. As we are called "sons by adoption and grace," as being members of the Son, and are even called "gods," says S. Athanasius, through the indwelling of God the Holy Ghost; so we become one in Them, in that the Father is in the Son, and the Son cometh to be in us." "Since Thou," our Lord saith (it is S. Athanasius's paraphrase of His words), "art in Me, because I am Thy Word, and I in them, because of the body, and for Thee the salvation of man is perfected in Me, according to its perfection, I ask that they too may become perfect, having oneness *with* It, and having become one *in* It, that all, carried as it were by Me, may become one body and one Spirit, and may grow up into a perfect man." This oneness, then, is an actual mystical oneness, inwrought by Christ our Head, uniting the whole Church together in one with Himself in His Body; an actual oneness produced

* S. Ath. c. Arian. iii. 22, p. 431, Oxf. Tr.

by grace, corresponding to the Oneness of the Father and the Son by nature. S. Cyril points out more distinctly the way of this union: 1st, with our nature, through the Incarnation, and then, with us, through His indwelling, by the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, and by His Spirit. S. Cyril speaks first of imitation, next of indwelling. "Above," he says^b, "we have said, that the union of believers through likeness of mind and soul ought to imitate the manner of the Divine Unity, and the essential identity of the Holy Trinity. But on these words we will essay to show that the oneness, according to which we are bound to one another and all to God, is, in a manner, one of nature, and, may be, not lacking in a bodily oneness with one another, although our bodies are different from one another, and each has his own personal being. There being confessedly a natural oneness of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (for One Godhead in the Holy Trinity is believed and glorified), let us consider in what way we too are found one, both bodily and spiritually, both towards each other and towards God. The Only-Begotten, having shone upon us from the very Essence of God the Father, and having in His own Nature all which the Father is, became Flesh according to the Scriptures, having, as it were, mingled Himself with our nature, through the ineffable concurrence and union with this body which is from the earth. Thus He, by nature God, was truly called and became a Heavenly Man (not 'bearing God,' as some say who do not accurately understand the depth of the mystery, but) being, in one, God and Man, that having, in a manner, co-united in Himself what by nature was far apart and alien from all sameness of nature, He might make man to communicate in and partake of the Divine Nature. For the communication and abiding of the Spirit passed through to us also, having taken its beginning through Christ and in Christ first, being, as Man, anointed and sanctified, although, as He was by Nature God (as He appeared from the Father), He Himself with His own Spirit hallowing His own temple and the whole creation made by Him, and whatsoever admits of being hallowed. The mystery of Christ, then, was made a sort of beginning and way whereby we too might partake of the Holy Spirit, and of oneness with God. For in Christ are we all hallowed in the way afore

^b S. Cyril Al. on S. John xvii. 21. L. xi. c. 11, pp. 997—1000.

spoken. In order, then, that we ourselves too, although differing both in souls and bodies through that which is personal to each, might come together and be commingled into an unity with God and one another, the Only-Begotten contrived a way, devised through the wisdom befitting Him, and through the counsel of the Father. For by One Body, His own, blessing through the mystical communion those who believe in Him, He makes us incorporate with Himself and with one another. For who should separate and remove from a natural oneness with one another, those who through the One Holy Body are bound up into oneness with Christ? For if we all 'partake of the One Bread,' we are all made 'one Body.' For Christ cannot be divided. Wherefore the Church is called also 'the body of Christ,' and we too 'are members in particular,' according to the mind of Paul. For we all, being united by One Christ through the Holy Body, in that we have received in our own bodies Him the One and Indivisible, owe our members more to Him than to ourselves.—But that, by partaking of the Holy Flesh, we obtain that union with Christ which is in a manner bodily, Paul will testify, speaking of 'the mystery of godliness which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, but is now revealed unto His holy Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be co-heirs, and conporate and co-partakers of His promise in Christ.' But if we are all conporate with one another in Christ, and not only with one another, but with Himself, in that He is in us through His own Flesh, how are we not all clearly one both with each other and with Christ? For Christ is the Bond of oneness, being, in One, God and Man.

"But as to the Oneness in Spirit, we all, having received One and the same Holy Spirit, are in a manner mingled with each other and with God. For although in us, being many, Christ giveth the Father's and His own Spirit to dwell in each of us, yet is He One and Indivisible, holding together in oneness through Himself the spirits which, in their several existences, are severed from oneness, and making all to appear as one in Himself. For as the power of the Holy Flesh maketh those conporate, in whom It is, in like way, I deem, the One Indivisible Spirit of God, dwelling in all, bringeth all together to the spiritual unity. For

^c Eph. iii. 3—5.

since One Spirit dwelleth in us, God the One Father of all will be in us, through the Son, holding in oneness, both to one another and to Himself, whatsoever partaketh of the Spirit."

S. Hilary is even at pains to show, against the Arians, that the unity spoken of is not an unity of will, but an unity of nature; and so he overthrows the more their sophism that the Unity of the Father and the Son was an unity of will only. "I^d ask those who thrust upon us an unity of will between the Father and the Son, whether Christ is at this day in us by truth of nature, or by harmony of will? For if the Word is truly made Flesh, and we truly receive the Word, being Flesh, in the Food of the Lord, how must He not be thought to abide by nature in us, Who, being born Man, took the nature of our flesh inseparably to Himself, and under the Sacrament of the Flesh to be communicated to us, blended the nature of His Flesh with the Divine Nature?"

And as to the other Sacrament, S. Hilary^e says, "The Apostle teacheth, from the nature of Sacraments, that this is the unity of the faithful. 'As many as have been baptized unto Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus^f.' But that in so great variety of nations, conditions, sexes, they are one, is this from consent of the will or from the unity of the Sacrament, in that they both have one Baptism and all have put on one Christ? What has concord of minds to do here, seeing they are thereby one, that by the nature of One Baptism, they are clothed with One Christ?"

The first then and very chiefest character of Unity is not any thing which comes forth from us; it is infused into us by God. But this it is man's part to receive, and he receives it by faith. "There is One Body and One Spirit;" "One Body," as held together by the "One" Holy "Spirit;" "One Body," of all which are and have been and shall be, all too who before Christ's Coming believed in Him and pleased Him. "For to this end," says S. Chrysostom^g, "was the Spirit given, that He might unite those who are separated by race and by different manners; for old and young, rich and poor, child, youth, and man, male and female, and

^d De Trin. viii. 13.

^e Ib. § 8.

^f Gal. iii. 27, 28.

^g Ad loc. Hom. 9, p. 207, Oxf. Tr.

every soul become, in a manner, one, and more entirely so than if there were one body."

S. Paul also, following our Lord, places the origin of unity in God. God maketh us one body, by giving to us One Spirit, ingrafting us into One Christ through One Baptism, regenerating us to "one hope of our calling," freely giving to us, sonship, heaven, infusing into us One Faith; for "faith," he says, "is the gift of God."

But from this also S. Hilary^h argues, that our union is an union of nature, not of will. "They who were of one heart and of one soul, I ask, were they one through the Faith of God? Yes; through faith was the heart and soul of all one. And the faith was it one or more? One certainly, since the Apostle himself sets forth 'One Faith' as 'One Lord,' and 'One Baptism,' and 'One Hope,' and 'One God.' If then through faith, i.e. by the nature of one faith, all were one, why is there not an unity by nature in those who are one by the nature of One Faith?"

But it is of man to retain the faith which he has received. *They* have not the same Lord, who do not believe the same truth as to Him. The heretics of old who did not believe that the Son was Consubstantial, Co-Eternal, and Co-Equal with the Father, or that, when Incarnate, He had a human soul, or true flesh truly taken of the Virgin Mary, or that the Blessed Virgin bare Him Who was God, or who held that God dwelt only in the Man Christ Jesus, or contrariwise, that the Manhood was absorbed into God, or that our Lord had no human will—these and whatsoever else there was of ancient heresy on the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, believed not the same Lord; as neither did the Pelagians believe in what He wrought for us, and the Donatists denied the existence of that mystical body, whereof He was the Head.

The Faith, S. Paul says, is one, one unchangeable faith, admitting neither of enlargement, nor diminution, so that either what the Apostles believed and taught the whole Church as faith, should cease to be faith, or that any thing should become faith which they, full of the Holy Ghost, knew not and taught not as the faith. But since the faith is one, one whole, then whosoever parteth with, or altereth any portion of the one faith, in fact changes the whole, so that it is not the same faith, whence the stress in the Athanasian Creed on "keeping the faith whole and undefiled."

^h l. c. § 7.

This unity, derived from Our Blessed Lord as Head of the Church, is imparted primarily through the Sacraments. S. Paul says, that "all, baptized into Christ, have put on Christ," and, having put Him on, are one in Christ. And of the Holy Eucharist, "We, being many, are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one Bread!" By Baptism we are ingrafted into the mystical Body of Christ; by partaking of His Body, we continue to be members of His Body. But as Christ Himself worketh all things in all, He baptizeth invisibly, He consecrateth, He strengtheneth those who stand, He restoreth those who fall; yet to signify to us that He doeth it, He useth the outward ministry of men, appointed in succession, from the day when He breathed on the Apostles and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained^k." Such an organization, as essential to the transmission of grace from Christ our Head, seems to lie in the words of S. Paul, "holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together^l," "according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, increaseth with the increase of God^m." The "joints and bands" are, in the image of the body, naturally those ministers by which the whole body is held together in one, and through which spiritual nourishment is ministered to the growth of the whole. Certainly, the Apostolic ministry was to continue to the end of the world. "Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers," or those in their stead, He set in the Church, "for the edifying of the Body of Christ, till we all come, in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Thus, then, we have from Holy Scripture, as means and conditions of the unity of the Church, One All-Perfect Author, the "One God and Father of all;" one end to which all tends, the "one hope of our calling;" "One Head," the Head of the Church, our "One Lord;" "One Spirit," giving life to every living member; the same Sacraments, "One Baptism," and "One Bread," by which we are all ingrafted into or maintained in the One Body

^l 1 Cor. x. 17.

^k S. John xx. 22, 23.

^m Eph. iv. 16.

^l Col. ii. 19.

of our One Head; one Apostolic descent of the Bishops and Pastors of the flock, coming down from One; "One" common "Faith," that which was given once for all, with the anathema that we hold no doctrine at variance with it, although an Angel from Heaven were to preach it. Of these we are receivers only.

These if any wilfully reject, they reject Christ. They sever themselves, not only from the Body of Christ, but directly from the Head, loosing the band which binds them unto Him. These while Christian bodies retain, they are, so long, like the river which "went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted and became into four heads." They come from the Fountain of blessedness; they flow down to the Ocean of the Eternal Love of God; they water the parched land; they cool and refresh the weary and the thirsty in the places which God has appointed for them with the one stream coming down from Him. They are one in their One Original, from which they continually and unchangeably derive their being. They adore God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, with the same new song of the Gospel; they confess Him in the same words of Apostolic Faith; they offer to Him the same incense of praise, and the same Holy Offering whereof Malachi foretold, "from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same," pleading on earth to the Eternal Father that One Sacrifice, as presented in Heaven; they receive the same "Bread which came down from Heaven to give life to the world." Unknown in face, in place separate, different in language, opposed, alas! in some things to one another, still before the Throne of God they are One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church; each several portion praying for itself and for the rest, united in the prayers and oblation which it offers for all, by the One Bread and the One Spirit which dwelleth in all. "In which mystery" (the Holy Eucharist), says S. Cyprian, "our people are shown to be united, so that, as many grains collected and ground and mingled together make one bread, so in Christ, Who is the Heavenly Bread, we may know that there is one Body wherewith our whole number is conjoined and unitedⁿ."

But is then the whole unity of the Church from God and to God alone, so that it involves duties to God only, and none from man to man? Of the early Christians, the Holy Ghost bears witness

ⁿ Ep. 63, ad Cæcil. § 10, p. 191, Oxf. Tr.

that they were at first "of one heart and of one soul." The intensest conception of human affection, which the range of heathen poetry could imagine as having been once realized, that they were "twain in body, one in soul," was brought into being by the Day of Pentecost, not in two, but in thousands. For there was, what no imagination could conceive, not one soul in all, but One Holy Spirit, dwelling indivisibly in each, One and the Same filling each soul, the very Same in each, binding them together by the virtue of the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity, melting all into a perfect oneness of will by the fire of love which God is. Well might the heathen say then, "God is among them of a truth." For the glory which Christ gave them was greater than that of miracles; it was the greatest of all miracles, when souls purified, by His indwelling, from passion and envy and all unlove, presented no longer let or hindrance to His all-pervading warmth, but through the love of Christ were one, He says, "as We are One," Whose Oneness is indivisible.

The Divine gift of Unity requires, as a corresponding duty, mutual love as the exercise of that "love of God which is shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which is given to us." This has been called "subjective" unity, or "unison of wills," and of this, intercommunion is the natural expression. But is all unity forfeited, where the unity of intercommunion is suspended? No one, in the face of Church-history, can or does maintain that all interruptions of intercommunion destroy unity. For Church-history records too many such interruptions, which (although never probably without fault, on the one side or on both) yet did not exclude either side from the body of Christ. Unlove began its work even in Apostles' times. At Corinth, already, our Lord's words, "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another," were in a degree eclipsed. Divisions began within the single Church. In the next century, was that first wider rent in the Christian body, when the Bishop of Rome, against the remonstrance of many Bishops, renounced the communion of the Asiatic Churches, because they followed, as to the keeping of Easter, a tradition different from that of Rome and of the other Churches. "The East," says S. Epiphanius, "differing from the West, they received not from each other tokens

^o Hæc. 70, n. 9, p. 821.

of peace." The strife ceased not until the Council of Nice. Again, in the next century, was the temporary severance between Rome and both Asiatic and African Churches, through the Bishop of Rome, of whom one, now counted a saint, said^p, "While thinking that all may be excommunicated by him, he excommunicated himself alone from all." This was allayed seemingly by a subsequent peace-loving Bishop of Rome, but the question on which they disagreed was settled by the large Council of Arles, not by the Bishop of Rome.

Lucifer, once an exile for the faith, and ready to suffer death for it, created a schism between Catholics. Paulinus, whom he hastily^q consecrated against S. Meletius, was recognized at Alexandria and Rome; S. Meletius remained in the communion of the Easterns. S. Basil toiled in vain to heal the schism^r, and blamed the Westerns for their "pride, haughtiness, precipitancy." S. Meletius, out of communion with Rome, presided (as it were, marked out by God) at the Second General Council. On his death, the fathers of the Council, with the people of Antioch, filled up his place, maintaining the rights of the Eastern Church, and after fifty-six years the schism was healed, a successor in the line of S. Meletius bringing back all into one flock. S. Meletius, when departed, was owned to be a saint by those who, in his lifetime, owned him not as a Bishop. Lucifer, who created the schism, himself closed a life of labour for the faith by forming a small schismatic body in Sardinia; yet, for his faith's sake, is called by S. Jerome, who wrote against his sect, "the blessed Lucifer^t."

What, when in the troubles as to S. Chrysostom, saints were on opposite sides, and, in the cessation of intercourse between Rome and Alexandria, the African Bishops had to exhort the Bishop of Rome, that "each^u Church should keep towards the other the peace which the Lord commandeth?"

The Fifth General Council, overruled by God to good, yet assembled by an heretical emperor, at the instigation of a heretic, was (in part through the vacillation, the alternate assent and dissent, of Vigilius) the occasion of a schism which rent the West, Africa,

^p S. Firmil. in S. Cyprian, Ep. 75, § 25, p. 284, Oxf. Tr.

^q Preperus, Ruf. H. E. i. 27.

^r See Pusey's "Councils," pp. 243-252.

^s Ib. p. 252.

^t Adv. Lucif. c. 20, Opp. ii. 193.

^u Conc. Afr. c. 68. Conc. T. ii. p. 1334, Col.

Upper Italy from east to west, and even Ireland, nor was the schism wholly healed for 150 years *.

Our own heathen ancestors, in our S. Augustine's time, were in great measure converted by those who were not in communion with Rome, yet God blessed the zeal of both for His glory.

More miserable was that great breach, prepared perhaps for centuries, and which has lasted until now, between the East and West. Miserable in its origin and its issue. A quarrel begun by two Christian Patriarchs about authority over a province newly recovered to the Christian Faith[†], strengthened subsequently by offensive answers to an offensive writing, and anathema answered by anathema; involving a people which was acknowledged to be orthodox; embittered, in later times, by the mixture of this world's politics, the capture of Constantinople under the banner of the Cross, amid excesses from which even the Saracens abstained; the establishment of Latin Emperors of Constantinople and multiplication of Latin Patriarchs and Bishops, sometimes scandalous in their lives, oppressive to the Greeks, whom they ejected, banished, or at times destroyed. "The Latins," says Fleuri[‡], "defeated the very end they had in view. The conquest of Constantinople drew after it the loss of the Holy Land, and made the schism of the Greeks irremediable." The conditions of reconciliation were, absolute submission to an authority which had grown up since the separation. They were to purchase help against heathen or Mohammedan invaders by the surrender of the Patriarchal system which they had from the times of General Councils[§], which had the sanction of the Universal Church, and was bound up with all their memories of all the victories of the Faith over heresy. Or lands were offered to princes to whom they did not belong, on the condition that they would renounce obedience where it was due, and transfer it where it was not due. If we may judge

* See Hefele, Concilien-Gesch. ii. 899.

† Bulgaria. The province had originally belonged to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. When Arian emperors expelled the orthodox Bishops and put Arians into the see, it put itself under the Patriarchate of Rome. The inhabitants were driven out by the heathen Bulgarians, who were converted from Constantinople. Rome claimed them, and pronounced anathemas to S. Ignatius as well as to Photius on this ground, as indeed the dispute was first with S. Ignatius.

‡ Disc. 6. sur l'Hist. Eccl. T. 18, § 5.

§ Conc. Const. i. can. 2, Chalced. can. 28.

of the sentiments of the Greeks from one of their able and moderate writers, Elias Meniates, Bishop of Zerniza, towards the end of the 17th century, says, "I hold the dispute about the supreme power of the Pope to be the principal cause of our divisions. This is the wall of division between the two Churches. The chief controversy I hold to be about the sovereignty of the Pope. For this is at this time the great wall of separation which divides the two Churches. If all Christians were agreed on this chief point, viz. how the Church was to be governed, whether by aristocratical rule as we think, or monarchical as the Latins think, there would be very little trouble in agreeing about the rest *."

And can we think that the whole guilt of this miserable rent has fallen upon one side only, that, when both East and West confess the same Mysteries of the Faith, the East is no part of the Church of Christ, because it does not subject itself to the West under which God did not place it? Moses and Aaron pleaded with God, "Shall one man sin, and wilt Thou be wroth with all the congregation ^b?" And are we to assume, whatever were the original wrong tempers of two Greek Patriarchs, that their sin either then involved the innocent, or now lives on so fatally, after so many centuries, when terms are imposed, so different from those in the first quarrel? And that, when the great Russian Empire, converted to the faith by the preaching of Monks and Missionary Bishops since the separation of the East and West^c, is a witness to the Greek Church, that she is a true member of the One Church! "Rome cannot show, since she has been divided from the East, a conversion on so large a scale, so complete, so permanent ^d." And now too, the Russian Church has been and is, through Apostolic Bishops, winning tens of thousands beyond the bounds of the Russian Empire to the faith of Christ.

In the great schism of the Western Church, in which the Churches of the West were for forty years nearly equally divided,

* Lapis Offensionis, L. 2, c. 1 init., quoted by M. Trevern, Discuss. Amicale, T. i. p. 231.

^b Numb. xvi. 22.

^c See the Archimandrite Macarius' History of Christianity in Russia, p. 394, in Allies' Church of England cleared from charge of Schism, pp. 498, 499, supplied by Rev. W. Palmer.

^d Allies, ib. p. 500.

each party was by the other regarded as schismatic, yet we cannot doubt that each belonged to the true Church of Christ.

"After domination in temporals and spirituals was multiplied in the Church," says Gerson, "men began intrusions and schisms in the Roman Church, for the sake of which dominations and powers, there were continually hatreds and rancours between the Supreme Pontiffs, the Roman Emperors, and temporal Lords."

There is then no ground to assume that suspensions of inter-communion (sad and mournful as they are) in themselves hinder either body from being a portion of the Body of Christ. The Donatists were not merely separated from the Catholic Church throughout the world, but denied its existence, and claimed to be the whole Church. The body was formed on a heresy, rejected by the English Church^f. Probably real schism is always united with heresy, whether as springing from it or degenerating into it. There may be schismatic acts, which have not the deadliness of the sin of schism, as there may be degrees of unlove in an individual, which do not cast the Spirit of God out of his soul. We believe the Church to be universal, although there are large tracts of the world which it has not reached, or from which it has been driven out; we believe the Church to be holy, notwithstanding that the evil is more on the surface than the good; we believe the prophecy to have been fulfilled, "neither shall men learn war any more," although peace has been in these last days the exception among Christians; we believe our Lord's words that love is the test of His disciples, and that thereby shall they be known among men, although unlove and jealousy and self-interest and anger are far more visible. Well then may we believe that the several Churches, owning the same Lord, united to Him by the same Sacraments, confessing the same Faith, however their prayers may be hindered, are still one in His sight, Whom all desire to receive; Whom all confess; Whose Passion all plead before the Father; in Whom alone all alike hope. And so as to ourselves, our divines maintained (under appeal to a free general Council of the whole East and West, while there was yet hope, and God's Arm is not shortened, that He should not yet turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the children to the fathers) that we have done nothing to forfeit the Communion of the rest of Christendom.

^e Status Ecclesie in V. et N. T. Opp. T. ii. p. 155.

^f Art. XXVI.

[The following passage from the same work^e, on the position of the English Church with reference to the Orthodox Church, is here given in anticipation of a fuller discussion of the supposed dogmatic difference between the two Churches, in the hope that the spirit which pervades these remarks may find a response in the hearts of many, and dispose them rather to extenuate than to aggravate the difference, and to seek a solution of the difficulty, rather than to find in it an argument for perpetuating division.]

"And now God seems again to be awakening the yearning to be visibly one, and He Who Alone, the Author of peace and the Lover of concord, must have put it into men's minds to pray for the Unity of Christendom, will, in His time, we trust, fulfil the prayer which He Himself has taught. It is not our insular self-importance; it is from beyond the seas that the voice has come, yea, it is, we trust, His Voice, 'Who ruleth the seas and the noise of his waves, and the tumult of the people,' Who has called to us to prepare ourselves to be such as He may employ for the reunion of Christendom. The authorities of the great Russian Church (we hear, as sounds floating on the breeze) look favourably on the wish for restored communion. Our position gave us an advantage towards her also; because, while we are wide-spread enough to be no object of contempt, there can be no dread on either side of any interference with the self-government of each, in the portion of God's heritage which, in His Providence, each occupies. We have no ground to fear in regard to her, lest she should force back upon us that vast practical system, still prevalent in the Western Church, which was one occasion, and is the justification, of our isolated condition. We had nothing to do with the great schism of the East and West. Convinced that (as the Council of Florence states) the Greek and Latin Fathers, though using different language, meant the same as to the Procession of God the Holy Ghost, we should have nothing to ask of her,—except Communion. With regard to her too, we may have a Providential Office, that we too have received the Filioque, not by any act of our own, but as circulated insensibly throughout the Latin Church^h; and while we could not part with what, through

^e Pp. 262—266.

^h The clause does not appear to have been formally received in the West until the Council of Florence. The conjecture of Baronius seems to be most probable,

so many centuries, has been the expression of our common faith, we might still reject with Anathema the heresy¹ which, since Photius, has been imputed to it, and which the Greek Church now seems, by an inveterate prejudice, to think to be involved in it. Yet it is plain that, long after the schism, her great writers and Bishops did not think so. Else they could not have proposed to the Latin Church, only to remove the word from the Creed, while continuing to teach or sing it elsewhere as they pleased^k. For had they thought the formula to contain heresy, this would have involved connivance in, and assent to, heresy. But if the objection lies only to the informality or mistake of altering the common Creed, this, it seems, was unintentional on the part of the Western Church^l; and we clearly had nothing to do with it; nor had we with what seems

that when, at the instance of Henry II. Emperor of Germany, the Nicene Creed came to be sung at all at Mass at Rome (A.D. 1014), it was sung, as it was in Spain and France and elsewhere, with the clause, "et Filio" (H. E. A.D. 447, n. 24). Baronius (A.D. 883, n. 38) expresses himself uncertain what Pope received it. He expresses his regret that the Nicene Creed came to be chanted at all at Rome (A.D. 1014, n. 5). The statement of Andr. Rhod., at the Council of Florence, that it was received by a large Western Council (Sess. 7, T. xviii. p. 124, Col.), seems a pure mistake.

¹ That there are two Ἀρχαὶ in the Godhead.

^k Blackmore, *Harm. of Eng. Doctr.*, &c., pp. 57—59, cites Theophylact, of the eleventh century, as quoted by John Beccus, "On other occasions, I will grant you (the Latins) the use of the expression, of the Holy Ghost 'proceeding from the Father and the Son,' as may suit your speech; in common discourses, I mean, and in Sermons in the Church, if ye please; but in the Creed, and in that alone, I will not grant it you." This was renewed by the Bishops in the time of the Emperor John Ducas, A.D. 1249, that "the interpolation should be put out of the Creed, but might be retained and used in any other form." Pachymeres, v. 12. This was drawn out by Michael Palæol. (A.D. 1273), quoting from the Register of the Church. He appealed to the written declarations of the Primates of that time, "bidding them notice how those Fathers had entirely abstained from taxing the Italians with impiety or heresy on account of their attempt to interpolate the Creed; leaving them free to retain and read the words as they pleased, anywhere else." The only complaint, then too, was as to "the scandal of innovation in changing the Creed." Tract. Zörnica, ii. 972. In the Council of Florence too, Mark, Abp. of Ephesus, confined himself to this one question, "Expunge this clause from the Creed, and then place it where ye will, and sing it in your churches on occasion, as is sung ἐκ μονογενὲς λόγος." Ib.

^l The "Filioque" was first adopted in the Creed in Spain, after the recovery from Arianism, the Council supposing, by mistake, that such was the original Creed of Constantinople. From Spain, it passed into France.

to have been a mistake^m on the part of the Council of Florence, who, laying down that the two formulæ had been used in the same sense by the great fathers, the δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ by the Greek, the *Filioque* by the Latin, drew the strange inference that the Greeks should adopt the formula used by the Latin fathers. We had no share in this; we only ask to continue to use the formula, which, without any act of our own, has been the expression of our faith immemorially. The Greeks, who value so much an inherited faith, could not, we trust, be insensible to the claim. If, on such terms and on such explanations of our belief as she may require and we could give, communion should be restored between us, a great step would have been gained towards the reunion of all Christendom."

^m It may be rather be termed "a mistake," because the Church of Rome does not now require of the Greeks, united with her, what she then required of the whole Eastern Church.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

NEW SERIES.

ALREADY PUBLISHED.

- No. I. A SYNOPSIS OF ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY.
By ATHELSTAN RILEY. 1902. 8vo., price 3*d.* net.
- No. II. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EAST-
ERN PATRIARCHATES. Lecture delivered at Oxford to
the Summer School of Clergy, Wednesday, 27th July, 1898.
By the Rt. Rev. THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY. With
three Appendices describing the recent relations with the Patriar-
chates. 8vo., sewed, price 1*s.* net.
- No. III. LIST OF BOOKS ON EASTERN CHRISTENDOM.
8vo., sewed, price 3*d.* net.
- No. IV. THE CEREMONIAL USE OF OIL AMONG THE
EAST SYRIANS. By the Rev. F. F. IRVING, B.D., Vicar
of East Clevedon; formerly of the Archbishop of Canterbury's
Mission. 8vo., sewed, price 6*d.* net.
- No. V. THE WORSHIP OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH,
A MANUAL OF INFORMATION, Edited by the Rev. C. R.
DAVEY BIGGS, D.D., Vicar of SS. Philip and James, Oxford,
Secretary of the Eastern Church Association. 8vo., sewed, price
1*s.* net.
- No. VI. EPISTLE OF THE RUSSIAN HOLY SYNOD TO
THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, on the Subject
of Reunion. With Introduction by W. J. BIRKBECK, M.A.
8vo., sewed, price 6*d.* net.
- No. VII. THE ESSENTIAL UNITY OF THE CHURCH
OF CHRIST. Extracted from "An Eirenicon" by E. B.
PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of
Christ Church, Oxford. 8vo., sewed, price 6*d.* net.
- No. VIII. Reports made to the Convocation of the Province of
Canterbury, by the Committees on INTERCOMMUNION
WITH THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES. Ed-
ited by WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L., Vicar of Alton, Staffor-
dshire, and Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Lichfield.
8vo., sewed. *Nearly ready.*

JAMES PARKER AND CO., 27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;
AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

No. VIII.

NEW SERIES.

OCCASIONAL PAPER

OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

REPORTS

MADE TO THE

CONVOCAION OF THE PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY

BY THE COMMITTEE

ON INTERCOMMUNION WITH
THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES,
1865-1869.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L.,

*Vicar of Aston, Staffordshire, and Proctor in Convocation for the
Diocese of Lichfield.*

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;

AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1904.

INTRODUCTION.

IN reprinting for general circulation, by the permission of the Chairman, the Reports which have been from time presented by the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation on the subject of "Intercommunion with the Eastern Orthodox Churches," it will be well to furnish the reader with a brief historical sketch of the several stages through which the question has passed in the Holy Synod or Convocation of Canterbury.

In the Session of April 15, 1856, a Representation was drawn up by Canon Wordsworth, now the Bishop of Lincoln, which was signed by eighteen members of the Lower House, and was sent up to his Grace the President^a and their Lordships of the Upper House, referring to the erection of the English Church at Constantinople (which has recently been consecrated by the Bishop of Gibraltar), and submitting that it might be desirable that "The foundation of the proposed Church of Constantinople should be accompanied with a communication from this Synod, expressive of sentiments of Christian fellowship, to the Bishops and Clergy of the Eastern Church, and with such other demonstrations as in your Lordships' judgment might seem most conducive to promote the cause of true religion and Christian unity, and to represent the Church of England to our Eastern fellow Christians in her true character as a pure and Apostolic branch of the Universal Church of Christ." The Upper House had a brief discussion, but took no action on this.

On July 1, 1863, a petition from several members of the Lower House was presented to the Upper House by the Bishop of Oxford. It set forth that "the Synod or Convention of the Bishops and Clergy of the United States of America were taking certain steps with a view to promote Intercommunion between the Russo-Greek Church and the Anglican Communion; that the present time might

^a Then the Right Honourable and Most Reverend John Bird Sumner, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England.

be more favourable than former times have been for efforts in that direction; and prayed that the Upper House would use their endeavours to bring about such Intercommunion." On this the Bishop of Oxford moved, and the Bishop of Chichester seconded,—

"That his Grace the President be requested to direct the Lower House to appoint a Committee to communicate with the Committee appointed at a recent Synod of the Bishops and Clergy of the United States of America as to Intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church, and to communicate the result to Convocation at a future Session."

This motion was agreed to; and on the following Session of July 2, 1863, the Committee was appointed accordingly; and in the Session of February 15, 1865, Chancellor Massingberd, the Chairman of the Committee, brought up and read Report I., which was ordered to be printed and circulated. This Committee was dissolved with the Convocation in 1865; but in the Session of February 9, 1866, of the new Convocation, the President^b directed the re-appointment of the Committee, which was in due course re-appointed. In the Session of June 26, 1866, Chancellor Massingberd, on behalf of the Committee, expressed a wish that "their powers should be extended to a consideration of the question with regard to the Oriental Churches generally." This was embodied in a Report, and taken by the Prolocutor to the Upper House on June 29, 1866, when the President granted the requested permission. In the Session of June 6, 1867, a short Interim Report was brought up by the Chairman of the Committee; and on the next day's Session, of June 7, Report II. was presented to the Lower House, but no debate ensued on it then. In the Session of July 4, 1868, Chancellor Massingberd brought up Report III., and founded on it the following Resolution:—

"That this House humbly prays his Grace the President that he will be pleased, in conjunction with his brethren of the Episcopal order, to take steps towards opening direct negotiations with the Eastern Patriarchs and Metropolitans, with a view to establish such relations between the

^b Then the Right Honourable and Most Reverend Charles T. Longley, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England.

two Communion as shall enable the laity and Clergy of either to join in the Sacraments and Offices of the other, without forfeiting the communion of their own Church."

This was seconded by Dr. Fraser; and, after a lengthened debate, was carried unanimously. Lord Alwyne Compton then moved, and the Rev. H. Burton seconded,—

"That, as the General Convention of the American Church will meet in the autumn of this year, his Grace the President be humbly requested to communicate the above Resolution to the presiding Bishop of that venerable Assembly."

This also was carried unanimously; and Reports II. and III. were ordered to be presented with the Resolutions to the President and the Upper House.

The Convocation of 1866 was dissolved shortly after; and a new Convocation was summoned, which was formally constituted December 11, 1868, and met for business on February 23, 1869, under the Presidency of the Right Honourable and Most Reverend Archibald Campbell Tait, D.C.L., Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England: and by his direction the Committee on "Intercommunion with the Orthodox Eastern Churches" was on the following day's Session re-appointed.

The Committee, in the interval between the groups of Sessions, met and deliberated on the question entrusted to them, which appeared then to have assumed a more defined and practical form than it had previously presented; and they therefore drew up the Report IV., which was presented by their Chairman, Chancellor Massingberd, in the Session of June 15, 1869, and was debated at length on June 17, 1869, in the Lower House. The Chairman moved, and Lord Alwyne Compton seconded the first Resolution appended to the Report, which repeated the Resolution which had been unanimously adopted by the Lower House on July 4, 1868, and it was again carried. And then Dr. Fraser moved, and the Dean of Westminster seconded the second Resolution:—

"That, in view of the interest evidently felt in this matter by many members of the Eastern Church, this House, considering it possible that some communications might be

made on their side, expresses a confident hope that any such communications, if made, will meet with the most cordial welcome and consideration."

This also was adopted by the House, *nemine contradicente*.

On the same day the Prolocutor of the Lower House took up the Reports and the Resolutions to the President and the Upper House; where on the following day, June 18, on the motion of the Bishop of Oxford, a Committee of the Upper House was appointed to confer with the Committee on Intercommunion of the Lower House.

And this is the present stage at which proceedings on promoting the Intercommunion of the Anglican and Orthodox Eastern Churches have arrived in the Holy Synod or Convocation of Canterbury.

W. FRASER.

ALTON VICARAGE, STAFFORDSHIRE,
St. Peter's Day, 1869.

Report presented February 15, 1865.

IN CONVOCATION.

*REPORT of the COMMITTEE on INTERCOMMUNION
with the RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.*

The Members of the Committee.

Rev. Chancellor Massingberd, *Chairman.*

The Prolocutor.	Rev. Lord Alwyne Compton.
Archdeacon of Taunton.	Rev. J. Randolph.
„ of Westminster.	Rev. Canon Mackenzie.
„ of Gloucester.	Rev. J. Fendall.
The Warden of All Souls' College.	Rev. R. Seymour.

THE Committee appointed by command of his Grace the President and their Lordships of the Upper House, 1863, "to communicate with the Committee appointed at a recent Synod of the Bishops and Clergy of the United States of America, as to Intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church, and to communicate the result to Convocation at a future Session," report as follows:—

That, as the limited power conferred upon your Committee by the terms of their appointment did not authorize them to enter into direct intercourse with the authorities of the Eastern Church, the report of their proceedings will be mainly occupied with the account of their communications with the Committee of the Convention of the Church in the United States on the same subject.

The action of Convocation in appointing this Committee was hailed with great satisfaction by the American Church, and the intercourse between the members of the two Committees has been of the most friendly and cordial character.

Your Committee were favoured by the Honourable Mr. Ruggles, a distinguished statesman and eminent member of the American Committee of Convention, with some particulars of his visits to Russia.

And at their first meeting they had the advantage of personal communication with the Rev. J. F. Young, the Secretary of the Committee of the American Convention; and whom, in compliance with the terms of their Commission, they had invited to attend their meeting.

But your Committee, not being required by the terms of their Commission to report at the next Session, were induced, in consideration of the extreme delicacy of the questions involved, to defer their Report until the present time*.

They now proceed to record the progress that has been made.

Mr. Young and Mr. Ruggles were both received in the most cordial manner by the Metropolitans of Moscow and St. Petersburg and other members of the Holy Governing Synod, who expressed their earnest interest in the question, and their desire to co-operate in any measures having for their object the restoration of Unity.

The Committee of the American Convention have begun to issue a series of papers with the object of recording their own proceedings, and giving information as to the principles and practices of the Eastern Church.

It is an instance of the increasing interest that is taken in this question at home, that your Committee are enabled to state to the House that there has been formed in England an Association called "the Eastern Church Association," which already numbers among its patrons the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Belgrade, the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Dublin, with several more of our English Bishops, the principal objects of which are to inform the English public as to the state of the Eastern Churches, and to make known the doctrines and principles of the Anglican Church to the Christians of the East.

Your Committee have been favoured, at their last meeting, with the presence of the Very Reverend Archpriests Popoff and Wassilieff, Chaplains to the Imperial Embassies of Russia at London and Paris, from both of whom they have received the most cordial assurance of personal co-operation.

It would be premature to lay down any principles or conditions on which it may seem to your Committee that such Intercommunion as is contemplated may be brought about, further than this:—

I. To establish such relations between the two Communions

* See *Chronicle of Convocation*, Feb. 5, 1864, p. 1442.

as shall enable the Laity and Clergy of either to join in the Sacraments and Offices of the other, without forfeiting the communion of their own Church.

II. That any overtures towards such an object should be made, if possible, in co-operation with those Churches with which the Church of England is in communion; and,—

III. That such overtures, whenever made, should be extended to the other Eastern Patriarchates, and not confined to the Russo-Greek Church."

With this view, your Committee ask leave to sit again; and suggest that, if the Convocation of York should think fit to delegate any of its members to sit with them, they should be authorized to confer with them, and also to co-operate with any Committees of other branches of the Anglican Communion.

Your Committee, citing the words of the Venerable Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople^b, that "the Orthodox Church of the East has never ceased to offer, with tears, fervent prayers to her God and Saviour, Who maketh of two one, breaking down the middle wall of separation between them, that He may bring all Churches into one Unity, giving them sameness of Faith and communion of the Holy Ghost," conclude with the words of the prayer familiar to us all, "That, as there is but one body, and one Spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart and of one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Signed, on behalf of the Committee,

F. C. MASSINGBERD.

^b Addressed to the Very Rev. Archpriest Wassilieff and the Very Rev. Abbé Guettée, editors of *L'Union Chrétienne*, and quoted at p. 291 of the First Paper of the Russo-Greek Committee of the American Convention.

IN CONVOCATION.

INTERCOMMUNION with the EASTERN CHURCH.

INTERIM REPORT.

Your Committee are unable to present their final Report. But they have satisfied themselves that it will be ultimately necessary to the settlement of the whole question of Intercommunion, that some discussion should take place between persons authorized to speak on behalf of the Anglican Communion on the one hand, and of the Orthodox Eastern Church on the other. And your Committee recommend that this their Interim Report be laid before his Grace the President, with the request of this House that he may, should he see fit, bring the question before the meeting of Bishops of the Anglican Communion at their assembling in the ensuing autumn.

(Signed) F. C. MASSINGBERD,

Chairman.

Presented and ordered to be printed, June 6, 1867.

Report presented June 7, 1867.

IN CONVOCATION.

REPORT of the COMMITTEE on INTERCOMMUNION with the ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES.

Feb. 9, 1866. Committee on Intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church.

Mr. Chancellor Massingberd, Chairman.

Archdeacon of Taunton (Mr. Denison).	Mr. Canon Hawkins.
" of Westminster (Dr. Wordsworth).	Dr. Leighton.
" of Gloucester (Sir G. Prevost, Bart.).	Dr. Fraser.
" of Nottingham (Mr. Mackenzie).	Dr. Jebb.
	Lord Alwyne Compton.
	Mr. Randolph.
	Mr. Seymour.

YOUR Committee beg leave to report as follows :—

At their first meeting on their re-appointment in the present Convocation, June 25, 1866, your Committee agreed that a communication should be made to his Grace the President, praying that the terms of their appointment, which had been limited, as before, to Intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church, might be extended to the Oriental Churches, or Orthodox Communion, in general.

This communication having been conveyed to his Grace the President by the Prolocutor, his Grace was pleased to signify his assent to the same.

Your Committee rejoice to be able again to report the most gratifying instances of deep anxiety on the part of Bishops and other members of the Orthodox Communion to meet any overtures which we may have to make.

The Most Reverend the Primus of the Scottish Church, having then recently returned from his visit to Russia, favoured your Committee with his presence, June 26, 1866, and gave highly interesting details of that visit, which he has since been kind enough to embody in a letter, addressed to the Chairman, with permission to make public use of it^b. The Primus had interviews with Bishop Ivan, Suffragan of St. Petersburg and Rector of the Spiritual Academy, with Count Poutiatine, late Minister of Public Instruction, and a most earnest labourer in the cause, who introduced him to all the chief persons in St. Petersburg, and even followed him to Moscow for the same purpose; with Count Dmitry Tolstoi, the present Minister of Public Instruction, and Over-Procureur of the Sacred Synod; and, finally, with the Grand Duke Constantine. At Moscow he was received in the most affectionate and cordial manner by its venerable Metropolitan Philaret—"gentle, humble, and pious, and simple in his mode of life, who gives away in charity almost the whole of his large income," and who expressed the deepest interest in the proposed re-union. He wisely said, that, "in his opinion, the Bishops and other learned men on either side may be able to reconcile the differences between the Eastern and the Anglican Churches, but that the *difficulty* will be *with the people*." The Primus had interviews also with two suffragans of Moscow, Bishop Leonidas and Bishop Anthony, the latter the President of

^b It has been printed for circulation by "The Eastern Church Association."

the Spiritual Academy at the Troitza, near Moscow. In all these communications he assures us that he adhered to the plan of not introducing the subject of Intercommunion, and yet that his Russian friends were evidently full of it, and never failed to introduce it themselves. Of these, the Grand Duke Constantine was as much alive to the question as the Ecclesiastics, and showed considerable acquaintance with the religious condition of England. The chief objection raised by those with whom he conversed seems to have turned upon the validity of our English Orders. It appears certain that religious persons among the laity, men and women, and youths at their academies, are taking up the matter warmly.

The Primus has, since his return, delivered a Charge to his Clergy, on the subject of the "Intercommunion of Churches," in which he lays down the principles on which Intercommunion was based in the primitive ages, as an indication of the terms on which, if it should please God, the like Intercommunion might be restored in the present day, among the separated Branches of Christ's Church. He says, "To this purpose only two things were necessary, first, that every Church shall keep her Liturgy free from all superstitions and idolatrous worship, and should not make any unlawful terms or conditions of communion; and secondly, That every Christian, when he came to a Foreign Church, should readily comply with the innocent usages and customs of that Church where he happened to be, though they might, in some circumstances, differ from his own; for as it was impossible, so neither was it necessary, that every Church should have the same rites and ceremonies, or exactly the same form of worship." And he instances the well-known case of Anicetus and Polycarp, on the visit of Polycarp to Rome, when, notwithstanding the difference which even then existed between East and West about the time of keeping Easter (known as the Quarto-deciman controversy), which they were unable to settle, Anicetus, the then Bishop of Rome, received the venerable successor of St. John with the affection of a brother, and invited him to celebrate the Holy Communion in his church. Your Committee believe that these principles will be found to be the same in substance as those which were laid down in the Report presented by the former Committee to the late Convocation, in February, 1865, viz.: "To establish such relations between the two Communions as shall enable the Laity and Clergy of either to join in the Sacraments and Offices of the other, without forfeiting

the communion of their own Church. That any overtures towards such an object should be made, if possible, in co-operation with those Churches with which the Church of England is in communion. And, That such overtures, whenever made, should be extended to the other Eastern Patriarchates, and not confined to the Russo-Greek Church."

Your Committee are fully persuaded that such Intercommunion as this is all that can be aimed at, and that any claim on their part that we should submit to them so as to become a part of the Orthodox Church of the East would be fatal to any hope of union whatever.

They are further enabled to record, which they do with unfeigned thankfulness, the results of the recent visit to the East of the Rev. George Williams, B.D., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, fortified as he was by letters commendatory from the two Archbishops of Canterbury and York, which were received with the utmost respect, and laid up in their archives. Mr. Williams has brought to the knowledge of English Churchmen the learned labours and yearnings after Unity especially of the Metropolitan of Chios, Gregory of Byzantium, which, originating in an effort to promote re-union between the Armenian Christians and the Orthodox, are peculiarly applicable to our own case also. This learned and large-hearted Prelate has been publishing in a Greek periodical, *The Byzantist*, a series of papers on the above subject, in which he lays down the principles on which the negotiations for such a purpose should be conducted, and proposes that a "Commission should be appointed for the explanation of differences, and the consideration of the preliminaries of Ecclesiastical Union;" that "No inquiry shall be made concerning the validity of the Orders, and of the Baptism of the Armenians;" and that "It shall be agreed that neither of the two Churches claims to impose its own Ecclesiastical discipline or its own usages and customs upon the other; but, on the contrary, should be ready to waive or even abandon them, so far as they shall be proved contrary to Catholic tradition, and to admit the customs of the other, no longer as Hellenic or Armenian, but as Ecumenical." The same venerable Metropolitan has also given, in another publication, entitled, "The Voice of Orthodoxy," a far more favourable report of the position and claims of the Anglican Church than is commonly entertained in the East, in which he

particularly refers to the Oriental origin of the Church of England. It was under such circumstances that Mr. Williams paid a visit to the Metropolitan of Chios in the summer of the year 1866, by whom he was received with more than cordiality, and who expressed the liveliest interest in the objects which your Committee is appointed to promote. The following is an extract from a letter afterwards addressed by the Metropolitan to Mr. Williams: "In order that we may have some common standing-ground in the interchange of our sentiments respecting this important object, I consider it necessary to lay down certain general and indisputable principles. Such are the two before-named, namely, on the one hand, the Catholic and Living Tradition, which is preserved, one in substance and harmonious in expression, in the writings of the divine Fathers—in other words the inspired and infallible authority of the Catholic Church in the interpretation of the Divine doctrines of the Faith, which are contained implicitly in Holy Scripture. . . . The other is logical and intelligent inquiry and investigation." The favourable sentiments of the Metropolitan of Chios are become so much the more valuable at the present time in consequence of the appointment of his uncle, the elder Gregory of Byzantium, to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and his own appointment under him to be the Secretary to the Holy Synod of Constantinople, which will cause him to reside much at that capital. It is matter of deep regret that this Patriarch was deprived of the Patriarchate twenty-five years ago by the Sultan at the instance of the then English Ambassador. It is to be hoped that England may never again interfere to frustrate the free elections of the Oriental Church by means of her political influence with their Mohammedan Master, but may rather remember the prayer of our own Bishop Andrewes, "Deliver, O Lord, the once glorious Churches of the East from the cruel tyranny of infidels."

Mr. Williams had interviews with many of the other Metropolitans of the East—with the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem—and he assures us that among them all he met with only one instance where the idea was entertained that union was to be obtained by our *submission* to the Orthodox Church.

Your Committee are further desirous of calling attention to the circumstances attendant upon the late terrible calamity of the earth-

quake at Cephalonia^c, and the miserable condition of the fugitives from Crete. They learn that the Bishop of Gibraltar has expressed the hope that the sympathy of England, evoked as it has already been, and may be expected to be still further, may become "the means of drawing the hearts of Christians in different branches of the Church towards each other, and so promoting the restoration of Unity, for which we pray;" a work in which it is said that the King of Greece himself takes an interest. In further testimony to the kindly feeling entertained towards us by the Eastern Church, we learn that the Bishop of Gibraltar was received in a cordial manner, both by the Archbishop of Athens and the Archbishop of Corfu^d.

In placing these facts upon record, your Committee do not conceal from themselves, but rather feel it their duty to proclaim, the enormous difficulties which beset the question on both sides. On the side of the Christians of the East, there is the still remaining doubt as to the validity of our English Orders, and the not less formidable difficulty in regard to the introduction of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as the Father into the Creed of Constantinople.

^c Described in a statement lately communicated to a periodical by Dr. Fraser, a member of the Committee. "In one of the districts devastated by the earthquake, containing a population of 25,000 souls, not a single church has been left standing, or in a condition to be entered with safety. Divine Service is performed in the open air. The Priests are compelled to bestow themselves in mean hovels constructed from the wrecks of their parsonages, and their principal fare is wild herbs. If they have bread to eat, it is the bread of charity. Surely, were these facts brought to the knowledge of those in England who are warmly interested in the cause of Intercommunion, they would not be slack to contribute of their abundance towards the relief of their suffering brethren in the Ministry. It would be a noble work to promote such real charity among the members of the Church of England. Good would not fail to come of such efforts. We owe the Ionian Greek Clergy some little gratitude; for, when we had no English chaplains here, they made no difficulty about baptizing the children of British parents; and when we had no graveyards, they buried our dead even in their churches, with all the solemnities of the Orthodox Communion. These are facts not to be forgotten. The slightest interest taken by the English clergy in their present calamitous position will open all hearts, and tend powerfully to promote a genial and more cordial intercourse on the ground of our common Christianity. The most enlightened among the Clergy in this island are no strangers to the movement in this direction, and would, I feel assured, be glad of an opportunity of manifesting their best wishes for the success of this sacred object. Let us meet them halfway."—*John Bull*, June 1, 1867.

^d See *Colonial Church Chronicle*, June, 1867.

There is also the danger, already referred to, of its being supposed by them that the intention of the Anglican Church, or of some portion of it, is to set up an Orthodox Communion in our country; than which nothing can be conceived more fatal to all hope of Intercommunion between the Church of England, as such, and the Churches of the East. This idea cannot be too strongly repudiated.

The want of better information respecting English Orders can be corrected only by time and mutual intercourse. The objection seems to rest upon the supposition of an *absence of intention* on the part of the consecrators of Parker; and this mistake appears to be founded on the words of the Ordinal of King Edward VI., in which the word "bishop" did not occur in the sentence which accompanies the Laying-on of hands. But it is impossible to read the Ordinal itself without perceiving that it was clearly and unequivocally an Office for the Consecration of Bishops, apart from the Offices for Ordination of Deacons and Priests. The Office by which Parker was consecrated is entitled "An Office for the Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops." The Bishop who presents the elect to the consecrator says, "Right Reverend Father, I present to you this learned man to be consecrated a Bishop." And the Rubric, before the laying-on of hands, directs that the Consecrator shall lay his hand on the head of him "who is to be made a Bishop," and say the prescribed words. It has always been acknowledged that, with such unquestionable proofs of intention, the use of the word "Bishop" in the actual Laying-on of hands was not requisite, though the word was afterwards inserted in the Ordinal at the Restoration *ex abundanti* to obviate the cavils of Romanists. The whole record of this, in the case of Parker, is preserved in the Archiepiscopal Register at Lambeth, and no doubt can exist of the fact of his having been consecrated in this form, and by the Laying-on of hands. As for the recent cavil discovered of late years by Romanists, when they find themselves compelled to give up the shameful slander about "the Nag's Head Tavern," because of the absence of the register of the original consecration of Bishop Barlow, that is equally incredible in the minds of all unprejudiced and competent judges. The Romanists choose to say that Henry VIII. would be flattered by the idea that *he could make a Bishop*, and that Cranmer was so mean a sycophant as to humour the King's vanity by admitting it. The whole history of the King's

conduct proves, on the contrary, that, while he rejected Papal supremacy, he adhered to the principles of "the Catholic Church" to his dying day. And there is no proof whatever of Cranmer's being indifferent to the question of Episcopacy, but all testimony to the contrary. In the multitude of Consecrations, some few omissions occur in every register, and the almost immediate translation of Barlow from his first See to another, where he was received as already a Bishop, accounts for the neglect of the Registrar of the See to which he had been consecrated, unless, indeed, he was already a "Suffragan," as some were at that time. But that he could have been accepted as a Bishop in the time of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. without consecration, is quite as incredible as it would be in the present day in England. The translation of the whole of the Ordinal either into Greek or Latin, accompanied, perhaps, by a transcript from the Register at Lambeth of Archbishop Parker's consecration, would, your Committee believe, entirely remove any such supposition as that which your Committee learn with equal surprise and regret to have been lately conceived among some of their friends of the Orthodox Communion.

The question of the *Filioque* is more difficult. If it were a question of *submitting* to the Orthodox Communion, it might seem insuperable; but when the question is of Intercommunion only, there seems no absolute hindrance to such explanations on our part as might be accepted by them, without requiring us to exclude the words from our Creed which we have received with the rest of Western Christendom. We need not scruple to admit the fact that the words were not in the original Greek, as settled by the Council. We may plead that they were added from a sincere desire to guard the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in every possible way, while we utterly repudiate making two first Principles in the Deity. The proposal also of the Commissioners for the Revision of our Prayer Book in the year 1689, though that revision did not take place, may be worthy of notice. It was to the following effect, on the clause in the Nicene Creed, "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son:" "It is humbly submitted to the Convocation whether a note ought not here to be added with relation to the Greek Church, in order to our maintaining Catholic Communion." The Commissioners also proposed to omit the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son in the suffrage of the Litany.

There will be, of course, difficulties also on our side. And it is

above all to be desired that this great matter might, if possible, be kept clear of party prejudice. None would be obliged or required to communicate with the Eastern Churches, though they might be at liberty to do so, nor would occasion to do so arise, except in very rare instances. This point being understood, it might be hoped that the questions as to the Invocation of Saints and as to the nature of the Sacramental Presence, and others, might be left to be settled by mutual explanations, without requiring any change in their authorized practice or formularies, which it is next to certain the Orientals would never make.

Your Committee must regret that, owing to the miscarriage of some letters between their Chairman and the Rev. J. Freeman Young, D.D., the Secretary of the Committee of the American Convention, on this same subject, they are not in a condition to report any thing further respecting the proceedings of the American Branch of the Anglican Church in this great matter. They are in daily expectation of hearing tidings from them, which may possibly have been delayed through the reported election of Dr. Freeman Young to the American Episcopate, an event in which your Committee would cordially rejoice. They can only assure the House that no efforts have been or shall be wanting on their part to co-operate with their brethren of the Church in America, according to the terms of their commission.

Whether it shall be thought that the time is yet come for any further steps to be taken—and if so, what steps—must now be left for the consideration of those on whom it more immediately depends, the Bishops of the Church.

May it please the God of all Grace and Love to hear the devout Prayers of His Church, and in His own good time and in His own way to knit together once more the severed members of His Body in visible Communion as well as in the blessed Bonds of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity!

F. C. MASSINGBERD,
Chairman.

Report presented July 4, 1868.

IN CONVOCACTION.

THIRD REPORT of the COMMITTEE on INTERCOMMUNION with the EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCHES.

The Members of the Committee.

Mr. Chancellor Massingberd, <i>Chairman</i> .	
Archdeacon of Taunton (Mr. Denison).	Mr. Canon Hawkins.
" of Westminster (Dr. Wordsworth).	Dr. Leighton.
" of Gloucester (Sir G. Prevost, Bart.).	Dr. Jebb.
" of Nottingham (Mr. Mackenzie).	Dr. Fraser.
	Lord Alwyne Compton.
	Mr. Seymour.
	Mr. Woodford.

YOUR Committee beg to refer to their Report presented to the Lower House, June 7, 1867, and further to report as follows :—

They record with feelings of the liveliest satisfaction the transmission, by his Grace the President, of the Lambeth Encyclical to the Patriarchs and Metropolitans of the Eastern Orthodox Church, in their own language, with the letter from himself which his Grace has been pleased to address to each of those Prelates. And they cannot but cherish the hope that these communications, exhibiting as they do the desire on our part for the restoration of brotherly intercourse, may lead, by God's blessing, to some further progress in this great matter.

To obviate the possibility of misapprehension or misrepresentation, your Committee would adopt and reiterate the statements already made as to the objects which they propose to themselves, and as to what they understand by Intercommunion. "It is not, as many persons imagine, the fusion of one Church into another; there is no question of submitting ourselves to the authority of the Orthodox Church of the East, or requiring such submission from her. Neither is it, on the one hand, to engraft into our own Church any of the doctrines, rites, or ceremonies peculiar to other Churches; nor, on the other hand, to require them to abandon what may seem to us superfluous, and to conform themselves to the measure of our simplicity. No; the Intercommunion which we seek is simply the mutual acknowledgment that all Churches which

are one in the possession of a true Episcopate, one in Sacraments, and one in their Creed, are, by their union in their common Lord, bound to receive one another to full communion in prayers and Sacraments as members of the same household of Faith^e." In order to this we have already declared, and we here again emphatically declare, our object to be—

"To establish such relations between the two Communions as shall enable the Laity and Clergy of either to join in the Sacraments and Offices of the other, without forfeiting the communion of their own Church^f."

And in confirmation of the belief that such a principle may be accepted by the Orthodox Churches as the basis of reunion, your Committee have it in their power to produce the following extract from the concluding letter of the Orthodox Patriarchs to the Non-jurors, dated Constantinople, September, 1723 :—

"Now from thence you may know and understand the certain holy and orthodox sentiments of the Eastern Church among us, to which if you will be content to agree, you shall be altogether one with us, and there shall be no difference between us. And as for matters of custom and ecclesiastical order, and for the form and discipline of administering the Sacraments, they will be easily settled when once a union is effected. For it is evident from ecclesiastical history, that there both have been, and now are, different customs and regulations in different places and Churches, and yet the unity of faith and doctrine is preserved the same."

Your Committee are of opinion that, considering the steps which have been taken by the American Church, our own Church, and by the Primus of the Scottish Church, and considering also the cordial way in which these overtures have been received, the time has now arrived when some further and definite effort should be made in this direction.

Your Committee, therefore, recommend that this Report be sent to the Upper House, with the prayer that his Grace will be pleased, in conjunction with his Brethren of the Episcopal order, to take some further steps towards opening some direct negotiations with the Eastern Patriarchs and Metropolitans.

"F. C. MASSINGBERD,
July 2, 1868." *Chairman.*

^e Second Report of Eastern Church Association, p. 10.

^f First Report of Russo-Greek Church Committee of Convocation.

Resolutions to be moved thereon :—

- I. "That this House humbly prays his Grace the President that he will be pleased, in conjunction with his Brethren of the Episcopal order, to take steps towards opening direct negotiations with the Eastern Patriarchs and Metropolitans, with a view to establish such relations between the two Communions as shall enable the Laity and Clergy of either to join in the Sacraments and Offices of the other without forfeiting the communion of their own Church."
- II. "That the above Resolution of the House be presented to his Grace the President, together with the two Reports of the Committee of this present Convocation on Intercommunion with the Eastern Orthodox Churches."

Report presented June 15, 1869.

IN CONVOCATION.

REPORT of the COMMITTEE on INTERCOMMUNION with the ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES, Re-appointed by Authority of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Session of February 24, 1869.

The Members of the Committee.

Mr. Chancellor Massingberd, *Chairman.*

Archdeacon of Taunton.	Dr. Jebb.
" of Gloucester.	Dr. Kay.
" of Nottingham.	Lord Alwyne Compton.
" of Bedford.	Mr. Perry.
The Warden of All Souls' College.	Mr. Popham.
Dr. Fraser.	Mr. Seymour.

YOUR Committee beg leave to begin their present Report by reminding the House that the last Report of the similar Committee, in the late Convocation, was presented on July 4, 1868, when the Resolutions proposed by the Committee were unanimously adopted by the House.

These Resolutions were as follows :—

- I. "That this House humbly prays his Grace the President that he will be pleased, in conjunction with his Brethren of the Episcopal order, to take steps towards opening direct negotiations with the Eastern Patriarchs and Metropolitans, with a view to establish such relations between the two Communions as shall enable the Laity and Clergy of either to join in the Sacraments and Offices of the other without forfeiting the communion of their own Church."
- II. "That the above Resolution of the House be presented to his Grace the President, together with the two Reports of the Committee of this present Convocation on Intercommunion with the Orthodox Eastern Churches."

These Resolutions having been adopted by the House, another was added to the following effect :—

"That, as the General Convention of the American Church will meet in the autumn of this year (1868), his Grace the President be humbly requested to communicate the above Resolutions to the Presiding Bishop of that Venerable Assembly."

Accordingly, the late venerated Primate was requested to convey all the Reports of the Committee to the President of the American Convention, the Bishop of Kentucky, which his Grace, with his accustomed kindness, undertook to do immediately after his return from abroad, before his last illness.

At the same time, very gratifying assurances of co-operation and sympathy were received from the present Bishop of Florida, the Secretary of the American Committee on the same subject, by whom the information was communicated to them of the re-appointment by the General Convention of their Committee also.

Your Committee cannot review without thankfulness the instances which have continued to arise of increased interest in the great matter they have had in hand now during three successive Convocations. Among these may be mentioned the numerous publications of the Eastern Church Association, the learned work of the Metropolitan of Chios entitled "The Voice of Orthodoxy," and the circulation throughout Russia of documents bearing on Intercommunion in *The Moscow Diocesan Gazette* and other periodicals. Your Committee can only ascribe the increasing desire for the

renewal of Christian Union which has thus manifested itself at once in England, America, Russia, and the East, to the influence of that Holy Spirit Whose work is unity and truth.

It is impossible to estimate too highly the importance of Inter-communion between these long-severed branches of Christ's Universal Church, at a time when the Bishop of Rome has convoked on his own authority what he calls an Ecumenical Council, at which none of the Patriarchs or other Prelates of these Churches can be present consistently with Canonical order and primitive precedent. The answers of the Patriarchs and other Prelates of the Orthodox Communion to the summons addressed to them have sufficiently vindicated their grounds of refusal, while the now famous "*Responsio Anglicana*" of the Bishop of Lincoln equally establishes our own.

In pursuance of the prayer of the last Convocation, that his Grace and their Lordships will be pleased to open communication with the Eastern Patriarchs and Metropolitans, your Committee desire to set forth the following practical considerations as the basis of the recommendations which they are prepared to submit to the House:—

- (A.) Considering the large number of members of the English Church who reside in the East, at places very distant from the stations of our Chaplains, and also the number of our sailors engaged in the extensive trade in the Levant and the Black Sea, who die without the possibility of receiving Religious Offices from their own Clergy, your Committee perceive that the only mode of avoiding the Burial of such persons in unconsecrated ground, and without words of Christian Hope and Prayer, is, that the rites of Christian burial should be accorded to them by the local Orthodox Clergy. The fact, that in the hot climate of the East interment takes place within twenty-four hours after death, must, in most cases, quite preclude the possibility of obtaining the services of any English Clergyman from a distance.
- (B.) In the same way, your Committee feel that it is desirable that the children of English parents born in the East should, at their parents' request, be able to receive the Sacrament of Baptism from an unauthorized Minister, especially in the case of danger of death, wherever the ministrations of an English Chaplain are unattainable. But, at the same time, they desire that it be distinctly understood

and admitted, that the relations of such children to the Church of their parents should not be considered modified or changed by their having been so baptized, and that, where any law may exist to that effect, it may be relaxed. There may also be cases, although not of so frequent occurrence, where the services of an Eastern Clergyman might be required for the celebration of marriage between English people, or where one only is English, in which case the same condition should be required.

- (C.) Nor can they omit also to submit for consideration one other point, namely the administration of the Holy Communion to persons dying or in danger of death, and to persons travelling and at a distance from an English Church. It would often be a source of deep comfort and a work of the greatest Christian benevolence, if such persons, when earnestly desiring Holy Communion, being previously furnished with commendatory letters from their Clergyman and their Bishop, could in their need receive that Blessed Sacrament from the hands of the Eastern Clergy.
- (D.) The English Church would always willingly in her turn minister these offices of Religion, of Charity, and Christian Relationship to the members of the Eastern Church on the same terms, as indeed she has always been ready to do, and has as a Church considered herself bound to do.

Your Committee therefore believe that we might at this time appeal with success to the enlightened judgment and Christian consideration of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the other Patriarchs and governing Synods of the Orthodox Church, in asking, in view of the increased intercourse of our countrymen with the countries of the East, for the reciprocation of all these offices of Christian Charity for those members of our Church who stand in need of them, and may desire them, within the countries under their Spiritual jurisdiction.

Your Committee therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:—

- I. That in communicating this Report to the Upper House, the attention of their Lordships be called to the Prayer of the last Convocation:—

"That this House humbly prays his Grace the President that he will be pleased, in conjunction with his Brethren of the Episcopal order, to take steps towards opening direct negotiations with the Eastern Patriarchs and Metropolitans, with a view to establish such relations between the two Communions as shall enable the Laity and Clergy of either to join in the Sacraments and Offices of the other without forfeiting the communion of their own Church."

II. That, in view of the interest evidently felt in this matter by many members of the Eastern Church, this House, considering it possible that some communications might be made on their side, expresses a confident hope that any such communications, if made, will meet with the most cordial welcome and consideration.

F. C. MASSINGBERD,
Chairman.

PRINTED BY JAMES PARKER AND CO., CROWN YARD, OXFORD.

OCCASIONAL PAPER
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

REPORTS

MADE, TO THE

CONVOCAION OF THE PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY

BY THE COMMITTEE

ON INTERCOMMUNION WITH
THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES,
1870—1872.

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;

AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1904.

Report presented April 28, 1870.

IN CONVOCATION.

REPORT on INTERCOMMUNION with EASTERN
ORTHODOX CHURCHES.

The Members of the Committee.

Mr. Chancellor Massingberd, <i>Chairman.</i>	
Archdeacon of Taunton.	Dr. Jebb.
" Gloucester.	Dr. Kay.
" Nottingham.	Lord Alwyne Compton.
" Bedford.	Mr. Perry.
The Warden of All Souls.	Mr. Popham.
Dr. Fraser.	Mr. Seymour.

YOUR committee beg leave to report as follows :—

A joint Committee of both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury having been appointed in a recent session,

Your Committee have not felt themselves at liberty to propose any definite step on their separate responsibility.

They confine themselves, therefore, to recording the progress of events since their last report, in connection with the matter committed to them.

Of these events, the first and the most important is the letter of the Œcumenical Patriarch to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in answer to the letter addressed to him by the Archbishop in accordance with the prayer of the Lower House of Convocation, accompanied by a copy of the Book of Common Prayer.

The fact itself of such a reply having been received, conceding with so much charity and cordiality the request of our Primate, as to the burial of our fellow-churchmen, indicating a most friendly and Christian-like recognition on his part of the position of the Church of England as a branch of Christ's Universal Church, and a liberal-hearted willingness to proceed to more intimate relations with us, is a matter of deep thankfulness.

The object which we propose to ourselves in promoting 'Inter-communication' with the Eastern Orthodox Churches, is not that

we should adopt any parts of their Ritual or of their Ecclesiastical institutions which differ from our own, but that we should mutually recognise the Sacraments and Rites of either Church within their respective jurisdictions. Bearing this in mind, your Committee believe that there are a few matters touched on in the letter of his Holiness which are capable of immediate and satisfactory explanation. We give the Patriarch's letter in extenso, after which we also subjoin a copy of the Patriarch's Encyclic to his Metropolitan on the subject of the Burial of Members of the English Church :—

LETTER OF THE PATRIARCH TO THE PRIMATE.

✠ Gregory, by the mercy of God, Archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, and Œcumenical Patriarch, to the most holy Archbishop, the Metropolitan of Canterbury, and Exarch of the Christians of the Anglican confession in Great Britain, the Lord Archibald Campbell; peace from God and brotherly salutation in Christ.

Having received, with the greatest joy, the highly esteemed letter sent by your venerable Sanctity to our Humility, we were moved to the inmost heart, as was meet, both at the thanks you so kindly expressed to us, for the fulfilment of what was at once a Christian and canonical duty, in sending our Protosyncellus to the consecration performed by the most beloved of God, the Bishop of Gibraltar, the Lord Charles Amyand, and also at the communication in a spirit of brotherly love of your desire and prayers, that there may be on earth one elect flock and one Chief Shepherd—our Lord, uniting those that are divided, and guiding all, so that they may think and speak the same thing, and work together for the increase of His Kingdom. We also, night and day praying our God and Saviour for these very things, do not cease, on every occasion, both to rejoice and, so far as we can, to co-operate readily in every good work and every good design tending to the edification and perfection of our neighbour, and to the enlightenment and common agreement of all, and to the unity that is in Christ Jesus. Nor do we only pray for this; but we also expect and anticipate it from the common Father, and from God the Saviour, and His Spirit; when many shall be taught, and the knowledge of the most ancient and unadulterated Orthodoxy shall be extended with the primitive and Catholic Church of Christ delivered to us free from error through

the Apostles, the Heralds of God, and the God-inspired Fathers, the seven venerable and God-moved Ecumenical Councils.

But, as to the burial of your countrymen, be it known to your much desired Holiness, that even if we had not been expressly exhorted and requested by any of the venerable British bishops, we would of ourselves have granted every permission to bury deceased English strangers within our cemeteries, at the request of their relations; well knowing that "the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." This, then, we will much rather permit for the future, from consideration to your Holiness, beloved of Christ, and in recompense, as is meet, of the tribute of brotherly kindness, on the sole condition that no private right of property is in any case acquired in the ground in which they are buried.

Having very gratefully received the sacred Prayer Book of your Anglican Confession, presented to us by you, we have deferred an answer chiefly on this account, that having more leisurely perused this Ecclesiastical Book, we might more accurately ascertain how far it inclines to or diverges from genuine Evangelical and Catholic teaching; and how far it confirms that statement of the Preface (p. 7), that 'it contains nothing contrary to the Word of God, and to sound doctrine.'

In the meantime, having gladly received the Encyclical Epistle published by the Anglican Bishops assembled two years since in England, to which is prefixed the commendatory letter of your ever-to-be remembered Eminence, and perceiving from it that they distinctly confess and affirm, simply and in general, that they hold firmly and immovably the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God, and that they maintain the Creeds of one Holy and Apostolic Church, and keep pure and undefiled its ancient order and worship (whether ceremonial or devotional) and reject all novelty, and are endeavouring to publish abroad in all the earth the saving preaching of the Gospel—perceiving, we say, all this so distinctly and generally affirmed in words, we rejoiced greatly in our soul, looking forward to the approach and dawn of the gathering together in one and the same fold of the Lord, and of the union of all the spiritual sheep elsewhere.

But on descending to the particulars of the contents of the Prayer Book, and of the distinguished confession of the Thirty-nine Articles contained in it—since in the perusal of them, both the

statements concerning the eternal existence of the Holy Spirit, and those concerning the Divine Eucharist; and further, those concerning the number of the Sacraments, concerning Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Tradition, the authority of the truly genuine Ecumenical councils, the position and mutual relations of the Church on earth, and that in heaven; and moreover the honour and reverence due from us to those who are, in theory and practice, the heroes of the faith, the unconquerable martyrs and ascetics—since, we say, these statements appeared to us to savour too much of novelty, and that which is said (p. 592, Art. 19), "As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith," deprives the Eastern Churches of the orthodoxy and perfection of the faith (let us be permitted to say that accusations of our neighbour are out of place in a distinguished confession of faith)—these statements throw us into suspense, so that we doubt what we are to judge of the rule of Anglican orthodoxy. We would therefore pray with our whole soul to the Author and Finisher of our salvation, to enlighten the understanding of all with the light of His knowledge, and to make of all nations one speech of the one faith, and of the one love, and of the one hope of the Gospel; that with one mouth and one heart, as tender-hearted children of one and the same Mother, the Church—the Catholic Church of the First-begotten—we may glorify the triune God.

May His saving Grace be with your Holiness, dearly beloved to us in Christ, and with all the God-beloved flock subject to you.

Sept. 26th, 1869.

ENCYCLIC OF THE PATRIARCH TO HIS METROPOLITANS.

"Grace be to your Holiness, and peace from God.—Forasmuch as we have lately received from the Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England, Archibald Campbell, a request that, whenever death shall befall any of the Christians of the Anglican Church resident in these parts, the burial may take place in our cemeteries of the Orthodox; which request this Church hath with sisterly love accepted: We, therefore, by this present our Encyclical Epistle, write to exhort and enjoin your Holiness, that,

whenever hereafter any Anglican shall de cease in any part of this Eparchy where there is no cemetery of the Protestants, you shall be ready to permit the burial to take place in the cemeteries of our Orthodox, only without giving any right of private property in the ground of such burial. And if there be no Anglican priests at hand and the kindred of the deceased request that our own priests may accompany the corpse, your Holiness shall appoint two of our priests to do so, saying the Trisagion hymn, the 118th Psalm* from the Funeral Order, together with the reading of the epistle and the Gospel. But where they have priests of their own, let not ours interfere in the Service. For the accomplishment and good performance of which things may the grace and boundless mercy of God be with your Holiness."

October 11, 1869.

Your Committee observe, that certain of the statements contained in the Thirty-nine Articles appear to the Patriarch to savour too much of novelty. This remark deserves consideration. The Articles are not strictly a Confession of Faith, but are, as their title declares, "Articles of Religion," drawn up more than three centuries ago in special relation to the controversy of the Church of England with the See of Rome, in regard to the novelties introduced into Christian doctrine by the latter. In order to avoid novelty, they declare (Art. VI.) that Holy Scripture is the basis of all dogmatic teaching. In this the Orthodox Church would agree with us; as they would agree with us in maintaining that Christian antiquity is the true interpreter of Holy Scripture.

The Patriarch points out that in our XIXth Article we say that, "As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith," and alleges that such a statement "deprives the Eastern Churches of the Orthodoxy and Perfection of the Faith." On this we would say in explanation:—

It is most certainly not the intention of those who assent to that Article to bring any inopportune accusations against their orthodox neighbours. But that Article, as your committee conceive, contains

* 118th Psalm of the Septuagint is the 119th in Hebrew and English.

a controversial argument against the claim to inerrancy and infallibility made by the Pope and the See of Rome, as being founded by St. Peter. The See of Antioch was also founded by St. Peter, yet that fact conferred no privilege of inerrancy or infallibility upon its Bishop, for Peter the Fuller, and others who filled the See of Antioch, fell into grievous error. In the same way the See of Alexandria was founded by St. Mark, the disciple of St. Peter, yet the Bishops or Popes of that See were not thereby secured from error, as is shown in the case of Dioscorus. Nor had even the See of Jerusalem, first filled by "the Lord's brother," the privilege of inerrancy, for Sallustius, Bishop of the See, signed the Henoticon. In the same way, it appears to us to be the intention of the Article to argue that the See of Rome, although founded by St. Peter, has not on that account any supernatural privilege of inerrancy or infallibility, nor can its Bishops claim such, either in Faith or Ceremonial, for Honorius erred grievously respecting the two Wills in Christ, and Eugenius IV. declared, *ex cathedra*, that the character of the priesthood was conferred by the delivery of the instruments, a doctrine repugnant to the tradition of the Eastern Church and of our own alike. In confirmation of this view we think it important to notify the significant fact, that the Church of Constantinople, the chief of the Eastern Patriarchates, is omitted in this Article. And as the censure was evidently designed against the assumptions of the Roman Patriarchate, we cannot but hope that the Œcumenical Patriarch would believe that it was by design that our English Reformers, at a time when all intercourse with the East had been so long interrupted, abstained from passing any censure on his own Patriarchal See.

In regard to the other points referred to in the letter of the Œcumenical Patriarch, your Committee do not understand that a detailed explanation of them lies within their province; nor do they conceive that it is essential to such intercommunion between the Churches as is at present contemplated. But in case it should be considered that a fuller discussion of such points is necessary, they would refer to the proposal contained in their report, presented June 6th, 1867, viz., that "a discussion should take place between persons authorised to speak on behalf of the Anglican Communion on the one hand, and of the Orthodox Eastern Church on the other."

Your Committee have lately received a communication from Bishop Young, of Florida, who continues to conduct the correspondence and affairs of the Committee of the Convention of the Episcopal Church in America, in which he assures them of their cordial co-operation, and informs them that their Committee has been re-appointed by the recent Convocation, with enlarged powers.

Your Committee have forwarded to him the complete collection of their Reports, and will not fail to keep up the correspondence which their Chairman is authorised to hold with Bishop Young on their behalf, and to keep him informed of all that takes place in England on this momentous subject.

Amidst many signs of encouragement your Committee cannot but hope that the announcement lately made by an organ of the Russo-Greek Church in France, as if some design were entertained, by the Holy Governing Synod of Russia, of setting up a schismatical branch of their communion in England will prove unfounded. Nothing could so entirely frustrate the hopes of future re-union as such a step.

It is impossible here to overlook the reception lately accorded in England to the Greek Archbishop of Syros, Tenos, and Melos. Coming as he did to consecrate a church at Liverpool, to consecrate a church for members of his own communion, the Archbishop was welcomed in all parts in England, and by the Laity equally with the Clergy of the Church of England, in such a way as to show their cordial appreciation of the idea of union between our long separated communions.

Your Committee did not feel themselves at liberty to make any communication to this distinguished visitor in their collective capacity. But their chairman sent him, through Mr. Williams, the complete collection of their several Reports, bound up for his acceptance, with a letter from himself, of which he received a cordial acknowledgment.

They also think it well to give some extracts from expressions of brotherly kindness towards us to which the Archbishop gave utterance. At Liverpool he said, speaking of the English and Oriental Churches, in reply to an address from some of the clergy and laity of that place :—

“Your Church ever stretching forth the hand of love to this Church, and preserving always a fervent desire to tread in the

footsteps of the ancient Church, will doubtless contribute much by her example towards the removal of the differences which now unhappily prevail among Christians, and towards the speedy accomplishment of the union of the Churches, for which our Church ceases not to pray night and day.”

To the Primus of Scotland, on his presenting to him an address from the Eastern Church Association, he said :—

“I trust that even I, the least, may be able to render as fruitful as possible the results of the negotiations for an understanding with the Ecumenical Patriarch and other leading members of our Hierarchy, which your Association has so laudably proposed to the clergy of both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury. With this assurance I express to you my heartfelt thanks for those sentiments of sincere love and sympathy by which you honour the Eastern Church in my person; offering to you the salutation of love, I invoke on you and on your work the blessing of the Lord, and pray for all good things for the clergy and people of England.”

The Archbishop was present at Nottingham on the occasion of the consecration of one of the most eminent members of our own committee, on the prayer of the Bishop of Lincoln, to assist him as his Suffragan, with the title of Bishop of Nottingham, and spoke as follows, in reply to an address delivered to him by the Bishop of Lincoln :—

“May we ourselves, by means of love, attain to the Unity of the Faith, and fulfil those words of the Apostle, ‘one Spirit and one Body, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, who is over all, and through all, and in us all.’ This I pray with all my heart, and I give to you, in the fulness of love, the embrace of Christ; and I invoke on you all the blessing of the Lord in all its richness. And may the God of all grace Himself make you all perfect, strengthen, stablish, settle you.”

Finally, your Committee desire to put on record the Archbishop's farewell letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, of which the following is a translation :—

FAREWELL LETTER OF THE GREEK ARCHBISHOP.

To the Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, Alexander, Archbishop of Syros, Tenos, and Melos, health and greeting in the Lord.

Now that the time for my departure to my own land has come, on the eve of leaving the Christ-loving and thrice-blessed land of England, in which I have met with brotherly reception and great honour from the august Prelates and other Clergy of the English Church, and from many eminent men, as well men in authority as private persons, and from the Venerable Universities of this country—in which, moreover (and this is a privilege the most glorious and precious of all), I have enjoyed the honour of a personal interview and conversation with your most powerful and Christ-loving Queen, I feel that I owe a great, nay, a boundless, debt of gratitude for all the many kindnesses conferred upon me, feeling, as I do, that in my humble person honour has been paid to the whole Orthodox Eastern Church, of which, by God's pleasure, I myself am a lowly minister. How, then, could I better display my feeling of gratitude for all I have experienced than by addressing your Grace, the chief Primate of the English Church, and my brother in Christ and honoured friend? For your Grace, on the moment of my arrival, not only honoured me with a letter and a friend, but also commissioned the Rev. George Williams, a friend of the Greeks, and true to the faith, to escort and befriend me. This gentleman constantly attended on me, and in every matter so readily gave me aid and entertained me, that I am deeply indebted to him for his unwearied attention, and have gained in him a truly excellent friend. Add to this that I was admitted to the presence of your Grace, and those moments I shall never forget in which you received and embraced me as a brother in Christ.

Accept, therefore, most Reverend Sir, the heartfelt expressions of gratitude which I offer to your Grace, and through your Grace to the Christ-loving clergy over whom you preside. And with confidence and joy I add that not only I, but all the holy Clergy and Christ-loving Laity in our land, among whom the news of the honour conferred upon me has already spread far and wide, are also full of gratitude, and they with just reason consider that these honours are paid to themselves. All this contributes to draw tighter the bond of love, in which our most Holy Œcumenical Patriarch so nobly and befittingly first united us, and which now through Divine grace has been strengthened by my visit to your thrice glorious land.

We must needs be of one mind in Christ, and unite in arming ourselves to form a compact phalanx, strengthened by God,

against those devices of the Evil One which in these days of ours make havoc of the Church, and array ourselves against them under Christ as our Leader, and withstand the torrent of materialism and strange doctrines opposed to God. For thus alone can the evil plots, which in our day have sprung up like tares in the pure harvest of the Lord, be repressed to the discomfiture of the plotters and the glory of the Church of Christ, of which it has been promised, by the mouth of Him who cannot lie, "that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."

I am now departing for Constantinople, and will there announce, both by word of mouth and by letter, to our Most Holy Œcumenical Patriarch and to all the august Prelates in the East, and above all to the Most Blessed Patriarch of Jerusalem, my own spiritual Father, from whom it was my privilege to receive the blessing of consecration in the Holy City itself, the many things pleasing and acceptable to God that I have seen and heard in this country. And for the time to come I will never cease nor shrink from labouring to the utmost of my power to bring about the harmony of the Churches, considering it to be a most noble work and one approved by God, and most befitting for those who have been set apart to tend and teach the faithful.

And may the God of peace and love, from whom is every good gift and every perfect gift, grant to us all in love and unity of mind to glorify and celebrate His Holy Name, and with one spirit and one heart to fulfil His Divine Will, which He committed unto us when He said "This is My commandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you."

Inspired with feelings such as these, I take my leave of your thrice-blessed and thrice-glorious land, invoking an abundant blessing from on high upon its noble and Christ-loving people, and for your Grace, praying that a perfect recovery may be vouchsafed to you by the only Physician; and in all sincerity I salute you in the Lord.

Your Grace's brother beloved in Christ our God,

(Signed) ✠ Ὁ Σίβου καὶ Τήνου Ἀλέξανδρος.

Signed, on behalf of the Committee,

F. C. MASSINGERD, *Chairman.*

IN CONVOCATION.

July 4, 1872.

INTERCOMMUNION BETWEEN THE EASTERN AND THE
ANGLICAN CHURCHES.

The Bishop of Winchester—As Chairman of the Joint Committee for Promoting Intercommunion between the Eastern and Anglican Churches, I have to present the following report on such joint Committee :—

At a meeting held at Winchester House of the joint Committee of the two Houses of Convocation for promoting Intercommunion between the Eastern and the Anglican Churches—present, the Bishop of Winchester, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, the Bishop of Ely, and the Bishop of London; also Lord Alwyne Compton, Archdeacon Sir G. Prevost, Bart., Canon Seymour, Canon Edwards, Prebendary Jebb, and Prebendary Fraser, after discussion resolved—that the Bishops present request the Archbishop to communicate with the Patriarch of Constantinople touching the ordination and mission of the Rev. R. S. Hatherly.

The report was received and ordered to be entered on the minutes, and on July 3, 1873, Dr. Fraser reported in the Lower House that a monition had been sent by the Patriarch to Mr. Hatherly expressly forbidding any attempts to proselytise from the English Church, and expressing very distinctly the most friendly feelings and dispositions on the part of the Patriarch towards the English Church.

IN CONVOCATION.

Report presented May 9, 1873.

REPORT of the COMMITTEE on INTERCOMMUNION
with the EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCHES.Dr. Fraser, *Chairman*.

The Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham.
The Prolocutor.
The Archdeacon of Taunton.
The Archdeacon of Gloucester.
Lord Alwyne Compton.
The Warden of All Souls.

Dr. Jebb.
Mr. Campion.
Mr. Edwards.
Mr. Joyce.
Mr. Perry.
Mr. Seymour.

Your Committee, on presenting this their third report during the present Convocation, cannot but put on record their sorrowful sense of the loss which the cause of Christian Intercommunion has sustained through the decease of their Chairman, the late Chancellor Massingberd, whose theological and historical learning and graceful eloquence were only equalled by his lovingness of character and earnest zeal for the reunion of the divided portions of the Church of Christ.

Your Committee, following the line which their late Chairman adopted in their last Report, continue to register the progress of events in connection with the matter committed to them.

They have to report that some discouragement was for a time thrown upon the work of Promoting Intercommunion between the Anglican and Orthodox Eastern Branches of the Church by the fear that an off-shoot of the Russo-Greek Church was about to be set up in one of the Dioceses of England, not for the legitimate and praiseworthy object of the religious edification of foreign members of that Church, but for the purpose of making proselytes among the people of England. This obstacle to Intercommunion was the subject which chiefly engaged the attention of the Joint Committee of both Houses, which was appointed on June 18th, 1869, by order of the Upper House :—

"To consider the Report of the Committee as to the best action to be taken on the two Resolutions concerning Intercommunion with the Eastern Churches communicated to this House."

That Joint Committee has held but one meeting as yet. At that meeting were present the Bishop of Winchester, Chairman, the Bishops of London, Ely, and Gloucester and Bristol, also Lord Alwyne Compton, Archdeacon Sir G. Prevost, Prebendary Edwards, Dr. Fraser, Dr. Jebb, and Canon Seymour; and on July 4th, 1872, the Bishop of Winchester presented their Report to the Upper House as follows:

"At a meeting held at Winchester House of the Joint Committee of the two Houses of Convocation for promoting Intercommunion between the Eastern and the Anglican Churches, after discussion, resolved:—That the Bishops present request the Archbishop to communicate with the Patriarch of Constantinople touching the Ordination and Mission of the Rev. R. S. Hatherly."

Your Committee have not learned what the result of the communication of the Archbishop to the Patriarch has been. But they are told that the Metropolitan of Athens had protested against anything which might look like an act hostile to the English Church. And, in connection with this difficult and disquieting subject, they would refer to the well-weighed and encouraging words of the Report of the Committee of the American Convention.

The Committee also notice with pleasure the contemplated publication of the works of the Holy Fathers, already commenced with St. Chrysostom, in a cheap form, so as to be within the reach of the poorer parish priests of the Eastern Church. This scheme, set on foot by the Synod of Athens, has been brought before the Church in England, with the formal sanction of the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin; and the appeal of the Archbishop of Athens in behalf of it has also received the approval of sixteen Bishops and Bishops Suffragan of the Church of England, and of two Bishops of the Scottish Church. In the words of the Venerable Theophilus, Archbishop of Athens, "contributions to this publication will imperceptibly but assuredly bring forth those fruits which we all expect from the diffusion of the sacred works among the Christians of the East."

Your Committee have received the Report of the Joint Committee of the General Convention of the American Church. This

Letter to Rev. W. Denton dated Athens, April 19th, 1872.

Committee was re-appointed in 1868, "with power to correspond with the authorities of the Russian and other branches of the Oriental Church, for the acquisition of further authentic information, and to report the result to the next General Convention." Their Report was presented to both Houses of the Convention in Baltimore on October 24th, 1871. It embodies large extracts from the Reports presented by your Committee to the Convocation of Canterbury on June 15th, 1869, and on May 4th, 1870, commenting upon and approving them; it recites the Encyclic of the Patriarch of Constantinople in regard to the burial of members of the Anglican Church, and details at length the salient features in the visit of the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos to England, and especially the Conference which took place at Ely Palace on February 4th, 1870, between the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos, attended by the Archimandrite Stratulis and Mr. Tymbas, and the Lord Bishop of Ely, attended by the Rev. G. Williams and the Rev. F. Meyrick; of which Conference a full report is given in their Appendix. After referring to the answers of the Patriarch of Constantinople and of the Patriarchal Vicar of Alexandria to the Papal Citation to the Council of the Vatican, the Report thus sums up the other events bearing on the Intercommunion of the Churches, which appear to them worthy of notice; and your Committee think that they cannot do better than to adopt the words of the American Committee. They say:—

"At the funeral of Chrysanthus, Archbishop of Smyrna, in September, 1869, several Anglican Priests were present, duly

The Joint Committee on communication with the Russo-Greek Church, as reconstituted by the General Convention of 1871, consists of the following:—

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Maryland.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Illinois.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of New Jersey.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Western New York.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Florida.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Long Island.

The Rev. John Fulton, D.D., of Alabama.

The Rev. Richard Abercrombie, D.D., of New Jersey.

The Rev. Charles R. Hale, of Central New York, Secretary.

Mr. Samuel B. Ruggles, LL.D., of New York.

Mr. Edward Stanley, of California.

Mr. Henry E. Pierrepont, of Long Island.

vested. One of them took part in the services, as did also an Armenian Archbishop. The *Neogolos*^a of Constantinople, referring to this, gives utterance to the prayer that 'the good and gracious God would vouchsafe to grant that the walls which now separate us from our Armenian and Anglican brethren might fall down, so that with one heart and one mouth we might together glorify the chief Shepherd, Jesus, the Head of His own Divinely-founded Church.'

"Interesting debates have taken place in regard to Intercommunion at various meetings of the Convocation of Canterbury. At the Church Congresses at Liverpool and Southampton, the Eastern Church was a prominent subject. The Eastern Church Association has been quietly pursuing its aim of diffusing by its publications a knowledge of what the Orthodox Church of the East is, and of making known the doctrines and principles of the Anglican Church to the Christians of the East.

"In Russia and Greece there have been, during the past three years, many tokens of renewed life. The Czar has ratified the regulations of a Russian Bible Society, whose object is the circulation of the Holy Scriptures among the people in their mother tongue.

"The Orthodox Society in behalf of Missions' was inaugurated in Moscow in January, 1870, under the presidency of Innocent, Metropolitan of that city, heretofore known as the Apostle of Kamschatka; and committees were to be formed in every city under the local bishop.

"The object of the foundation is the conversion of non-Christians in all parts of the Empire, except the Caucasian and Trans-Caucasian provinces, this ground being already occupied by the 'Society for the Restoration of Christianity in the Caucasus,' founded in 1860.

"The Russian Church has also resolved upon, and, we believe, already commenced, a mission to Japan. In Greece a remarkable degree of interest has been taken by the Clergy in catechising children—a movement of which fuller reports will no doubt be presented to the Convention in another mode through the Board of Missions by that venerable and most successful labourer in the holy work of aiding our brethren in the promotion of Christian

^a A Constantinopolitan Newspaper.

education, the Rev. Dr. Hill. More attention, too, has been paid, both in Greece and in other parts of the Eastern Church, to preaching than formerly, and the improvement is going on in a remarkable degree."

To these important facts your Committee would add, the foundation of the English Church at Patras on Feb. 21st, 1872, when Cyril, Archbishop of Patras, laid the foundation-stone with his own hands; and the public thanksgivings offered by the Patriarch, the Archbishop of Salonica, and the Bishop of Pera, in their cathedrals, for the recovery of the Prince of Wales from his dangerous illness; and during the present year, at the funeral of General Sir R. Church at Athens, the Burial Service, which was conducted by Dr. Hill, was attended by Theophilus, Archbishop of Athens, and other Bishops and dignitaries of the Hellenic Church.

The American Committee conclude their report with these forcible words :—

"The work of restoring lost unity in the Church is one requiring much patience and mutual forbearance. It may be long ere God shall see fit to grant us the fulfilment of our desires. We are to 'learn to labour and to wait.' Misconceptions there doubtless are and will be on either side. There has been until lately too little intercourse between the Eastern Church and ourselves to permit of our knowing each other well. Misrepresentations, too, of one to the other, have abounded, and will abound, with more or less of evil intention. That, under the influence of misconceptions and misrepresentations, serious mistakes should be made on one side or the other, would be by no means strange. Allusion was made in a report to the Convocation of Canterbury, quoted above, and in a debate in Convocation, March 14, 1871, to a rumoured intention of setting up a branch of the Eastern Church in England, and proselytising from the English Church. It is, indeed, to be hoped that the intention of setting up such an organisation within the jurisdiction of Anglican Bishops (which would be rightly styled schismatical), if ever entertained, has been quite abandoned. To authorise proselytising from the Anglican Church would be an act of hostility to her; would tend to retard the work of unity, and inflict a new wound on Catholicity. Yet, can we say that even such a step would 'entirely frustrate the

hopes of future reunion?' No. We believe that the false step taken would soon be retraced, and that God would overrule all for good. Our longing for unity is not from considerations personal to ourselves, but we seek the fulfilment of our Saviour's prayer on the night in which He was betrayed, that 'All may be one.'

"Let us pray to our Heavenly Father, the Author of peace and Lover of concord, to unite the members of His family on earth 'in the bond of faith, hope, and charity now, and in an external communion when it shall seem good in His eyes.'

"It becomes us to study the doctrines and usages of the Church from which we are now dissevered with coolness of judgment, yet with warmth of charity; not hastily concluding, because we would think so, that all is as we wish, nor, on the other hand, being quick to impute an evil meaning, where, perhaps, it only exists in our imagination; while our eyes should not be shut to the plain evidence of important differences. If there should be such differences, it still behoves us to follow that golden rule in controversy: 'When an expression is used which seems to have an erroneous meaning, let it be at once concluded that this is so, but let it first be ascertained what was the force and intent of the expression in the mind of him who used it.'

"Such consideration we claim as our right; let us not forget that it is our duty also."

On this report being received by the General Convention, the following Resolutions were passed by both Houses on October 24th, 1871, viz. :—

Resolved,—“That this Convention cordially reciprocates the expression of fraternal regard so frequently received within the past three years from the Most Reverend the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Most Reverend the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Most Reverend the Metropolitan of Athens, and the Holy Governing Synod of the Orthodox Church in Russia, by dignitaries of the Church of England, and by members of this Church, both of the clergy and laity, and it takes grateful recognition of the courteous action by which the administration of holy rites for the burial of the dead of our communion has been provided for by the authorities of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church; and it earnestly desires the continuance and increase of such intercourse and mutual good offices of love.”

Resolved,—“That the Joint Committee on the subject of intercourse with the Russo-Greek Church be continued, and charged with the communication of the foregoing resolution to the venerable authorities of the several branches of the Holy Orthodox Church of the East.”

Resolved,—“That the said Joint Committee be also charged with the duty of taking further steps for the acquisition and communication of such information as may be mutually important and interesting to this Church and to the Orthodox Church of the East, with such publication thereof from time to time as may be deemed needful and prudent.”

These Resolutions of the Convention were sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the other Patriarchs and governing bodies of the Eastern Orthodox Church, by the Rev. Charles R. Hale, the Secretary to the Russo-Greek Committee, who has since received the following replies from the Ecumenical Patriarch and from the Archbishop of Athens :—

“ANTHIMUS, by the Grace of God Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarch :

“✠ To the Reverend Charles R. Hale, Rector of St. John's Church, Auburn, New York, Secretary of the Committee, &c., Greeting in the Lord :

“We received with pleasure your letter, with the resolutions of the General Convention of the Church in the United States of America, and for the pious sentiments expressed through you towards our most holy Ecumenical Throne, rendering you no ordinary thanks, we offer praise to God, the Author of peace, that of His boundless love and goodness He hath deigned to smooth for us the way toward a nearer approach of our two Churches, a matter which first began to be agitated three years since, during the patriarchate of our revered predecessor, Gregory VI., who so well arranged for the administration of holy rites at the burial of the dead of your communion, and lately made more plain through the manifestations of brotherly kindness toward the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Syra in his recent visit to England.

“Now, when the base designs of evil-minded men surrounding the Church of God do not cease, on every side, to hurl against her the poisonous darts of unbelief, it seems to us that the present is the fitting time to quench, by mutual concession, the feelings

of division of the Churches, one from the other, which have till now held sway—for reasons known only to the Lord—on account of dogmatic difference, and that we should hold out friendly hands, in order to join together, by the help of the Almighty, what have been separated, and to fulfil the words of our Saviour which He spake, calling upon His Heavenly Father just before His willing death, "That all may be one."—St. John xvii. 21.

"Announce, then, these things, and bring them before the right reverend bishops and the others, clergy and laity, composing the Synod of the Anglican Church in America, and be an interpreter of our desires for mutual conference through writing, and that we shall not cease, so far as in us lies, to strengthen and draw closer, by a nearer fellowship, the holy bond of love, for we are persuaded that thus, and by an evangelical love toward each other, we shall come, by the gift of God, to the God-wrought miracle of the unity of the Churches.

"Since toward the original and archetype of our Orthodox Eastern Church your Church has shown a reverence beyond all other, we also, heartily loving it, give to its reverend members, as also to you, beloved, our prayers, and bless you with both our hands, invoking the best and saving blessings from God, the Giver of all good, whose grace and boundless mercy be with you.

✠ [The Patriarch] of Constantinople, your fervent well-wisher in Christ.

"September 9—21, 1872."
Athens, September 20, 1872.

REVEREND CHARLES [R.] HALE.

✠ "We received with pleasure yours of the 24th of October of the year past, in which we read with joy the resolutions of the most reverend of the American Church concerning their hearty desire for fellowship, in a spirit of Christian love, with the Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ.

"This desire and the prayer of the Episcopal Church in America have been harbingers of unspeakable joy to my aged soul, in these last days at least of my life, beholding from afar the rising hope of a coming, prayed for, brotherly drawing near and reunion of the

Churches of Christ, to the glory of the Lord, whom the Gospel declares to us, our Saviour Christ, the unity of His Holy Church.

"The heart of every true Christian is rent at the distressing sight of the present religious separation and dissension, and, sometimes, even the enmity, of Christians, in the world of ideas and of the spirit in which all ought to make up again one loving flock, tended invisibly by the one Good Shepherd.

"It is high time, then, that we all agree together in this, that it is altogether an un-Christian and an unworthy thing that Christians should, in the name of Christ Himself, slander, hate, and persecute one another. It is time that, leaving to the world and to its rulers, hates, passions, and manifold divisions and differences, in the supernatural dominion of the kingdom of Christ, we should be inspired by His Holy Spirit alone, all of us perfecting in variety a spiritual unity. Fortunately, no one can charge the Eastern Church with being a deserter and a renegade from these cardinal principles of Catholic Christianity. By almost all falsely accused, at times persecuted, and often treated with utter unfairness, to no one has she in an anti-Christian, brother-hating spirit returned the like, but from the first she continues holding up supplicating hands to God in behalf of those who persecute and oppress her.

"Sorrowful so often as, for the safety of the Divine principles of the Saviour, she is compelled to take in her hands the scourge to drive out of the Temple those making 'the house of God an house of merchandise,' with gladness she offers most heartily her right hand to all desiring her spiritual fellowship.

"Never seeking any worldly advantages, pursuing no devious or hidden political or national aim, leaning upon no earthly support but being the pure, spiritual fellowship of the faithful wherever they may be, the Eastern Orthodox Church is neither Greek, nor Russian, nor Græco-Russ, nor Russo-Greek, as in your letter it is characterized, as I would it had not been, but one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church binding together, and at the same time raising up, all nations and all peoples into a spiritual unity above all distinctions of race. In this, Reverend Sir, consists the unity of the Eastern Church; manifold in its members, it is one in its cohesive force and life-giving spirit.

"Unity, then, and union with the Orthodox Church, is not a fusion or a taking away of the natural and ethical diversity inwrought

by God; it is not a slavish subjection of some to others; it is not a despotic raising up or a tyrannical levelling of national peculiarities and differences; but a certain brotherly, harmonious binding together of spirit, manifested through a common creed, voluntarily accepted, of the fundamentals of the faith, which the Divine Scriptures, the Apostolic tradition, and the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church have defined for us.

"Those who, in all places, are thus bound one to another, realise 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic' Orthodox Church. But that Church, proceeding on the universal and eternal principles of Christian love, does not by any means, being asked, deny even to those not thus realising her Catholic integrity her fraternal anxiety for Christian love, and the Christian performance of those fraternal offices to which our human nature gives a claim. In the Orthodox Church, to every one that asketh shall be given; to him that knocketh, it shall be opened.

"Acquainting you, Reverend Sir, and the Right Reverend Bishops of the Church in America, of these things, in all love, and with the best hopes, I praise the All-Wise and All-Good God to pour out upon you and upon the whole nation of the United States, His blessings. Giving to you all brotherly greeting in the Lord, I remain, in the Lord, your fervent well-wisher,

✠ THEOPHILUS, of Athens,

"President of the Holy Synod."

Your Committee also notice with interest and approval the series of Occasional Papers issued by the American Committee, the second of which contains a list of the Sees and Bishops of the Orthodox Church of the East.

A question which has been forcibly pressed upon the attention of your Committee by the recent debates in both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury on the Confession of Faith commonly called the Athanasian Creed, is the bearing of certain Clauses in that Confession on the Eastern Orthodox Church. It was asserted, more than once or twice in the course of those debates, that whoever recites that Creed does condemn to perdition all the members of the Eastern Orthodox Church. As the Eastern Church herself sanctions the use of that Creed among her clergy and laity with

but one alteration in one clause, it is evident that these assertions apply to the clause "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." From this clause the Eastern Orthodox Church omits the words "and of the Son" in her versions of this Creed. The words are used by the whole of the Western Church, from which the Church of England has inherited them; but the Church of England has neither the will nor the intention to condemn the Christians of the East who adhere to the Constantinopolitan Creed in the form in which it was recited at Chalcedon; and the words of the Athanasian Creed, if carefully examined, do not involve the Eastern Church in any condemnation. In order, however, to make our intention in reciting these words more clear, and also to explain, if it can be done to the satisfaction of the Eastern Church, the sense in which we understand the addition "and the Son" made to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Symbol, it has been proposed to adopt the suggestion of the Royal Commissioners of 1689, that a note or declaration of the Synod should be drawn up "with relation to the Greek Church in order to our maintaining Catholic communion." Some such Synodical Declarations have already been proposed to the Synod of Canterbury, and notice has been given of moving, at a fitting time, for their adoption; one by the late Chancellor Massingberd, on May 5th, 1870, to this effect:—

"When we speak of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, we by no means understand that there are two Principles in the Godhead, but that the Son hath received of the Father to send unto us the Holy Ghost from Him."

And of another, notice was given in the Upper House by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, May 3rd, 1872:—

"This House declares, that while it believes and professes in the Athanasian Creed, as well as in the Nicene Creed and in the Litany, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, inasmuch as Holy Scripture testifies that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6; 1 Pet. i. 11), and receives of what is Christ's (St. John xvi. 14), and is sent by Him

sition *ἐκ* is never used for *διὰ* nor *vice versa* *διὰ* for *ἐκ*, from many testimonies, but especially from that great Divine, John Damascen, in the 60th chapter of the first book of his Theology, when he says, 'The Spirit of the Father, as proceeding from the Father, and the Spirit of the Son, not as proceeding from Him but by Him from the Father; for the Father only is the Cause.' Here *διὰ* is applied to the Son, and *ἐκ* is declared to be inapplicable to Him, 'not as from Him,' says he, 'but as by Him.'

The prepositions *ἐκ* and *διὰ* are not therefore equivalent; for, if they were, what should hinder him from saying that He proceeds from the Son? For he said that He proceeded from the Father by the Son. We therefore of the Oriental Orthodox Church, being taught by the Fathers, say, that the Holy Spirit proceeds absolutely from the Father with regard to that procession, which is natural, eternal, and before time; and upon that account make use neither of the preposition *ἐκ* nor *διὰ* when we speak of the Son. For we do not say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from or by the Son in that respect; for, as the Son was not begotten of the Father by the mediation of the Holy Spirit, so neither does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father by the mediation of the Son. But, as to His temporal and outward procession, we agree, that He proceeds, comes, or is sent, by the Son, or through the Son's mediation, and from the Son, in this sense of an outward procession, for the sanctification of the creature. But this *πρόεσις*, or emission, we do not call Procession, lest we should be as unhappy as the Papists, who, because of the limited dialect of the Latin language, which is unable to express *πρόεσις* or emission by one word, and the *ἐκπόρευσις* by another, have called them both *processionem*; which afterwards grew into an error, and made them take the eternal Procession for that *πρόεσις* which was in time. Therefore, to avoid this equivocation of terms, we call that Procession, which is inward and eternal, and not that emission, or effusion, or projection, which is eternal and in time. And this is the reason of that false opinion of the Latins, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, which is contrary to the doctrine of our Lord and the Holy Fathers. Now that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, according to that Procession which is before time, take the words of the above cited Father, in the 8th chapter of the 4th book of his Theology, which are these: 'We both say the Spirit which is from the Father,

and the Spirit of the Father; but we do not say the Spirit from the Son, but the Spirit of the Son. For says the Holy Apostle, If any one says he has not the Spirit of Christ,* and we acknowledge that 'the Spirit is made manifest and communicated to us by the Son,' what can be clearer than these words?"

And with regard to the second condition they suggest that inquiries should be made, and counsel should be taken with learned and pious theologians of the Eastern Orthodox Church as to the particular points on which explanation may be required, in order to carry out fully such an Intercommunion of the Churches as is proposed in the first Report of your Committee to the present Convocation.

Signed by order of the Committee,
WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L.,
Chairman.

Jerusalem Chamber,
May 9th, 1873.

RESOLUTIONS to be moved when this REPORT comes before the LOWER HOUSE for discussion :—

I. That this House recognises with thankfulness the directions of the Patriarch of Constantinople, contained in his Encyclic to his Metropolitans, in regard to administering the rites of Christian Burial to such members of the Anglican Church as die within his jurisdiction.

II. That this House hereby prays his Grace the President, in conjunction with his brethren of the Episcopal order, to take such further steps as shall establish relations between the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglican Churches which shall enable the members of the one Church to obtain the Sacraments of Baptism for their children, and of the Eucharist for themselves, in the other Church, in cases where they are at a distance from the ministrations of clergy of their own Church.

III. That the Prolocutor be requested to carry up the foregoing Resolutions, together with copies of the Report, to the Upper House.

* *The Orthodox Church in the East in the Eighteenth Century.* By Rev. G. Williams, B.D., pp. 39—41.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

NEW SERIES.

ALREADY PUBLISHED.

- No. I. A SYNOPSIS OF ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY.
By ATHELSTAN RILEY. 1902. 8vo., price 3d. net.
- No. II. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EAST-
ERN PATRIARCHATES. Lecture delivered at Oxford to
the Summer School of Clergy, Wednesday, 27th July, 1898.
By the Rt. Rev. THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY. With
three Appendices describing the recent relations with the Patri-
archates. 8vo., sewed, price 1s. net.
- No. III. LIST OF BOOKS ON EASTERN CHRISTENDOM.
8vo., sewed, price 3d. net.
- No. IV. THE CEREMONIAL USE OF OIL AMONG THE
EAST SYRIANS. By the Rev. F. F. IRVING, B.D., Vicar
of East Clevedon; formerly of the Archbishop of Canterbury's
Mission. 8vo., sewed, price 6d. net.
- No. V. THE WORSHIP OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH,
A MANUAL OF INFORMATION, Edited by the Rev. C. R.
DAVEY BIGGS, D.D., Vicar of SS. Philip and James, Oxford.
Secretary of the Eastern Church Association. 8vo., sewed, price
1s. net.
- No. VI. EPISTLE OF THE RUSSIAN HOLY SYNOD TO
THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, on the Subject
of Reunion. With Introduction by W. J. BIRKBECK, M.A.
8vo., sewed, price 6d. net.
- No. VII. THE ESSENTIAL UNITY OF THE CHURCH
OF CHRIST. Extracted from "An Eirenicon" by E. B.
PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of
Christ Church, Oxford. 8vo., sewed, price 6d. net.
- No. VIII. Reports made to the Convocation of the Province of
Canterbury, by the Committee on INTERCOMMUNION
WITH THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES, 1865
—1869. Edited by WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L., Vicar of
Alton, Staffordshire, and Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese
of Lichfield. 8vo., sewed, price 6d. net.
- No. IX. Reports made to the Convocation of the Province of
Canterbury, by the Committee on INTERCOMMUNION
WITH THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES, 1870
—1872. 8vo., sewed, price 6d. net.
- No. X. Reports made to the Convocation of the Province of
Canterbury, by the Committee on INTERCOMMUNION
WITH THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES, 1874
—1876. Edited by WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L., Vicar of
Alton, Staffordshire, and Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese
of Lichfield. 8vo., sewed, price 1s. net.

JAMES PARKER AND CO., 27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;
AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

No. X.

NEW SERIES.

OCCASIONAL PAPER
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

REPORTS

MADE TO THE

CONVOCATION OF THE PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY
BY THE COMMITTEE
ON INTERCOMMUNION WITH
THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES,
1874—1876.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L.,

*Vicar of Alton, Staffordshire, and Proctor in Convocation for the
Diocese of Lichfield.*

James Parker and Co.

27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;

AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.

1904.

THE Committee on Intercommunion with the Eastern Orthodox Churches^a presented, in the Session of July 10th, 1874, a Report to the Lower House on the matters referred to them. But that Report has not as yet been considered, and the Resolutions appended to it have not been discussed, in consequence of the Sessions of the House having been continuously taken up by the question of the Revision of the Rubrics referred to it by the Crown in the Letters of Business dated July 6th, 1874.

As during this interval the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has been in Session; and a Conference between the members of the Eastern Church, the Old Catholics, and members of the Anglican communion has twice been held at Bonn; and other important events bearing on the Intercommunion of the Churches have taken place; it has appeared to your Committee to be their duty to report on these matters to the House at the present time.

Their Report will naturally divide itself into two parts.

- I. A historical review of the events connected with Intercommunion which have occurred since the last Report.
- II. A doctrinal review of certain of the documents on that subject which have appeared during this period.

I.

In looking back upon the Church history of 1874, the Committee first dwell upon the meeting of the General Convention of the American Church, and the presentation to its two Houses of the Report of the Russo-Greek Committee^b.

^a Committee :

The Prolocutor (Dr. Bickersteth).
The Bishop of Nottingham (Dr. Mackenzie).
The Archdeacon of Gloucester (Sir G. Prevost).
" Taunton (Mr. Denison).
" Oakham (Lord Alwyne Compton).
Dr. Fraser, *Chairman*.
Dr. Jebb.

Canon Butler.
Prebendary Campion.
" Edwards.
" Joyce.
" Perry.
Mr. Pigott.

^b For this Report see the *Journal* of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, 1874, pp. 540-58.

This valuable Report gives numerous extracts from the Reports of this Committee. In return we take from it the following interesting paragraph :—

Several Greek newspapers have come to the notice of the Committee in which reference is made to the Resolutions [of General Convention in 1871] and the letters [of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and of the Metropolitan of Athens] above mentioned. The *Echo of Orthodoxy* of Athens, reprinting the Resolutions and the Metropolitans of Athens' reply to them, says—"This American Committee and the Eastern Church Association of England, testifying the reverence felt towards our venerable Eastern Church by the Episcopal Churches of England and America, may be the means of great good to the Church of Christ, coming as they do into direct spiritual relations with the Hierarchy of the Orthodox Eastern Church. For then, many things on either side of doubtful meaning or not fully understood being explained, they will remove many difficulties, which now seem great, in the way of the work which God so loves, of brotherly love."

And in the following the history of events, it appears to your Committee that they have been so ably summed up by the Committee of General Convention, that it will be most expedient to adopt a considerable portion of the *resumé* which is given in their Report. They say :—

"Another notable item is the information received by a recent letter from Constantinople, that great interest is now manifested there in the study and preaching of the Word of God. Our informant, one long resident in the East, says: "In sermons, letters, speeches, this topic is dwelt upon more frequently than I have ever before known. A new movement in this direction seems to have taken its first impulse from the sermon preached by the former Protosyncellus of the Œcumenical Patriarch on the occasion of the enthronisation of the latter. The preacher, discarding compliments, reminded the Chief Pastor of the dangers and defects of the Church over which he was appointed to watch. 'Thou canst not but see that the Word of God doth *not* dwell in us richly.' That was the key-note of his strain. The preacher on that occasion has recently been advanced to the Episcopate as Metropolitan of Chortiza.

"The Rev. Dr. Hill writes us from Athens, that, being present at the enthronisation, in June last, of Procopius, successor to the late lamented Theophilus, in the Metropolitan See of that city, he awaited the prelate's exit from the sanctuary to offer his congratulations. While so doing, he received an invitation, through one of the clergy, to go within the sacred inclosure, where the Metropolitan most kindly received him, and gave him his blessing, with

the kiss of recognition. A week after, Dr. Hill had the pleasure of receiving the Primate, accompanied by the Bishop of Hydra and Spetzia, and several of his clergy, in his study. They came to be present at the annual examination of the schools under Dr. Hill's superintendence.

"The Holy Synod of Greece, desirous of raising the standard of learning among the Greek clergy, who are, the most of them, too poor to buy many books at the rates at which they are ordinarily published, have given their sanction and warm encouragement to a plan for publishing the writings of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, St. Cyril, and St. Athanasius at a cost which would enable the poorest parish priest to purchase them. To this end, they have appealed for offerings to defray, so far as might be, the expense of putting these in type. The late Metropolitan, Theophilus, took especial interest in this good work. A letter from Theophilus to the Rev. Wm. Denton, of London, touching this matter, is published in the Report of the Eastern Church Association for 1872. The Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin, the Primus of Scotland, and twenty other Bishops of the Anglican Church, have given the plan hearty approval. From the Report of the Eastern Church Association for 1873, we are happy to learn that this Association has already sent to the Metropolitan of Athens £100, and that the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge has made a grant of like amount, in aid of what Theophilus well styles a 'goodly work for the glory of Christ and His Gospel.' We are informed that the publication of St. Chrysostom's works, according to this scheme, has already commenced^e.

"An Association entitled, 'The Friends of Religious Enlightenment,' was formed in Moscow in 1862, having for its object to 'promote the spread and improvement of religious knowledge among the Clergy and laity, by means of publications adapted to the various grades of intelligence, and of lectures on various subjects connected with the Orthodox Faith, the Church, and the Christian Life.'

"In 1872, there was established a St. Petersburg section of this Society, having for special ends: '(1) To contribute toward bringing about closer relations between the Clergy and the Laity, and

^e The Commentaries of St. Chrysostom on St. Matthew, St. John, and the Acts have already (1876) been published.

to an exchange of ideas on questions concerning the Orthodox Church. (2) To aid in spreading just notions concerning the true doctrine, the historic destinies, and the present needs of the Orthodox Church, by means of publications and lectures both popular and scientific. (3) To hold relations with the champions of orthodoxy abroad, to give them moral support, and to aid in imparting to the foreign public clearer ideas concerning the Orthodox Church.' This St. Petersburg section held, during its first year, eight meetings. A full report of these meetings lies before us. Among the papers read, and addresses made, we find accounts of the Old Catholic Congress at Cologne, by the Archpriest Yanisheff, and by Colonel Kiréeff, the Secretary of the Section; a *resumé*, by Prof. Katansky, of former attempts at union between East and West; and an address on Anglican Missions in India delivered by the Rev. John Long, an English Clergyman of the Diocese of Calcutta, who was passing through St. Petersburg. At the first of six meetings held during the year beginning March, 1873, Prof. Tchistovitch read a paper on the Old Catholic Movement and the requisites for Church Unity. At the second, the Archpriest Wassilieff made a report of the Old Catholic Congress at Constance. Dr. Von Schulte having, Christmas, 1873, notified the Section of the appointment of a Committee of Old Catholics, with Dr. Langen as Chairman, to discuss terms of unity with the Eastern Church, and having requested the Council of the Society to draw up a statement of the chief points of difference, such a statement was read before the Section at its fifth meeting; the comments on this paper of the Old Catholic Committee at the sixth^d.

"A very important conference concerning Intercommunion was held at Bonn, Germany, September 14—16, 1874, under the presidency of Dr. Döllinger, attended by as many as forty representatives of the Anglican, Eastern, and Old Catholic Churches. Among those of our communion were, the Bishops of Winchester and Pittsburgh, Canon Liddon, Professor Mayor, of Cambridge; the Warden of Keble College, Oxford; Drs. Langdon and Nevin, of the American Chapels at Geneva and Rome, and the Rev. H. F. Hart-

^d The correspondence of Dr. Langen and Colonel Kirejew, with the schedule of the Dogmatic, Ritual, and Canonical points of difference between the East and West, is given in the Appendix to the Report of this Committee presented to the Lower House, July 10th, 1874.

man; the Archpriest Yanisheff and Col. Kiréeff, of St. Petersburg; the Russian Chaplain at Weisbaden; the Counsellor of State, Soukhatine, of Moscow; and Dr. Rhossis, Professor of Theology at Athens, represented the Eastern Churches. An excellent spirit prevailed; a brotherly concurrence, more wide than had been expected, was manifested as to several important doctrines. On the vexed question of the *Filioque*, the following statement was, after much discussion, finally unanimously determined upon:—

“We agree that the way in which the word *Filioque* was inserted into the Nicene Creed was illegal, and that, with a view to future peace and unity, it is much to be desired that the whole Church should set itself seriously to consider whether the Creed could possibly be restored to its primitive form without sacrifice of any true doctrine expressed in the Western form.”

“We regret that we are not able to give here a full account of this interesting and important Conference. But one point we must refer to as having special bearing on the question of Intercommunion. The following statement was submitted to the Conference: ‘We acknowledge that the Church of England, and the Churches derived through it, have maintained unbroken the Episcopal succession.’

“On this point the Russian delegate from Moscow begged that he and his Eastern associates might be excused from voting, as it expressed a statement of historical fact into which they had not themselves examined. In granting this, Dr. von Döllinger, ‘wished to say, in the strongest manner, that he had examined into it as a question of history, and that in regard to the validity of the English orders he had no shadow of doubt. They stand fast beyond question, and further, that he was satisfied that there was just as real ground on which to raise objections against the Roman, as against the English, orders; that there existed the same difficulties in the Roman practice in the early centuries.’ Bishop Reinkens rose also, to say, ‘As one who, although not pretending to compare himself with the Chairman as an authority, had yet been engaged specially in the field of Church history; that, after careful review of the charges made against it, he had not the slightest doubt in regard to the English succession.’ The Bishop of Pittsburgh, acknowledging this, said that ‘our Episcopate did not stand on trial for us, and that no pronouncement from other Churches upon it would increase our certainty in regard to the ground

on which we stand; but that he felt the need and value *here* of such a pronouncement from those who had been exposed to the false objections busily circulated by the late Roman Church.’ Dr. von Döllinger expressed then, in the most unqualified way, the entire satisfaction of the German Old Catholic theologians, *as a body*, in the orders of the Churches of England and America. The Russian Archpriest Yanisheff expressed his personal satisfaction with the conclusions of Dr. von Döllinger and his associates in the matter, and gave the assurance that this would be received with much gladness in St. Petersburg, where there was only good will felt towards the English Church. Canon Liddon stated, in reply to a remark of a Russian delegate, that in the writings of Philaret doubts had been expressed as to the validity of Anglican Orders; that Philaret had said to him that ‘he had not examined the matter for himself, but had accepted the testimony of Romish writers.’ The Canon then gave, in a very few words, a clear statement of the three objections made to the English succession, and the refutation of them. And with a reference from the Bishop of Pittsburgh to the mingling of the unbroken Irish line in the English Episcopate the discussion came to an end.”

The Report of the American Committee also gives at length, and in *fac-similes* of the originals, the letters from the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and from the Synod of Athens, in reply to the Resolutions of the General Convention of 1871, of which letters your Committee have given translations in former Reports; and also a letter from the Archbishop Chorene de Nar-Bey, the President of the Armenian Holy Synod at Constantinople. This letter “prays the Head of the Church to bless the labours of the Committee and to crown them with full success,” and proceeds to give very full and interesting details of the present organisation of the Armenian Church, and a list of the Sees in which the Archbishops and Bishops of that Rite reside. The Report of the Committee of General Convention concludes thus:—

“The Committee also learn that strong desires have been expressed by Bishops of the Coptic Church for friendly relations with the Anglican.

“In view of all these facts, your Committee venture to suggest the question whether our Church has not a work to do in behalf of the smaller, as well as with the greater, Churches of the East. We have been appointed to communicate with the Russo-Greek

Church; but we have reason to believe that messages of Christian charity would be most kindly received also by the Armenian, the Syrian, the Coptic, and the Assyrian Churches, and that, contending as these have to do with great difficulties from without, and the three latter especially being now in a very depressed state, kindly sympathy would be most useful to them. They claim to have been misunderstood in time past, and at the present. They have evidently also, to some extent, misunderstood others. Might not the friendly offices of a distant Church, which had manifestly no thought of interfering with their independence of action, whose members had clearly no earthly ends in view, help towards bringing them into better relations with the Church Catholic? This is the precise ground occupied by the Eastern Church Association of England, which was founded 'to take advantage of all opportunities which the providence of God shall afford for intercommunion with the Orthodox Church, and also for friendly intercourse with the other ancient Churches of the East.'

"But at the stage to which your Committee have arrived in the progress of their labours the conviction forces itself upon our minds that the great work yet remaining to be done, which will be mainly correspondence with the Hierarchy of the several branches of the Oriental Church, would be more fitly and efficiently done by the Bishops of our Communion than by a mixed Committee, such as ours has been. In this conviction, your Committee would ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject committed to them.

"We offer and recommend the following resolutions:

Resolved, That this General Convention has had great satisfaction in learning the courteous and brotherly tenor of the letters received from the most Reverend Anthimus, Patriarch of Constantinople; Sophronius, Patriarch of Alexandria; Hierotheus, Patriarch of Antioch; and Theophilus, Metropolitan of Athens, and President of the Holy Synod of Greece, in answer to the communication of the action of the last General Convention, through the Joint Committee, as now reported.

Resolved, That we regard the establishment of full and free reciprocal relations of Christian brotherhood, between the great Eastern Churches and our own Communion, as daily growing in importance and in hopefulness, and heartily pray the great Head of the Church that His Spirit may so rule in all our councils as to

remove all hindrances which the pride, prejudice, or error of human frailty may present to impede its consummation.

Resolved, That we desire the continuance and increased frequency of friendly correspondence with our brethren of the Holy Eastern Churches, in the assured confidence that on either part there will be the fullest recognition of all feelings and rights which might be imperilled by undue or inconsiderate interference.

Resolved, That the Rev. Charles R. Hale, as Secretary of the Russo-Greek Committee, has merited the cordial thanks of the Church for his efficient labours and for his liberal devotion of his private means to the furtherance of the work of the Committee.

Resolved, That as the work to be done in the future in the cause of intercommunion will consist in great part in correspondence and conferences with the Hierarchy of the various branches of the Holy Eastern Church, which can be more fitly done by the Bishops of the Church, as occasion may arise, your Joint Committee ask to be discharged from the further consideration of this matter.

W. R. WHITTINGHAM, Bishop of Maryland. W. H. ODENHEIMER, Bishop of New Jersey. A. CLEVELAND COXE, Bishop of Western New York. JOHN FREEMAN YOUNG, Bishop of Florida. A. N. LITTLEJOHN, Bishop of Long Island. JOHN FULTON. R. M. ABERCROMBIE. CHARLES R. HALE. SAMUEL B. RUGGLES. HENRY E. PIERREPONT."

These Resolutions were proposed and carried in the General Convention of 1874. In regard to the fourth of these Resolutions your Committee personally would echo the words of "cordial thanks," with which his own Church has recognised the efficiency of the labours of the Secretary to the Russo-Greek Committee.

From the Report of the Anglo-Continental Society for 1875 (pages 46, 47) the Committee transcribes this account of the visit of the Bishop of Gibraltar to the Patriarch of Constantinople in that year, as described by the Rev. C. G. Curtis.

After due notice had been given to the Œcumenical Patriarch, the Bishop, attended by one of the interpreters of the British embassy, and by some of the resident English clergy, was received with every mark of courtesy and respect. But the visit was not one of mere ceremony, for, after the usual interchange of compliments and expressions of good will, points of special and potent interest were introduced. The Patriarch, observing that the Greek theologians invited to

the approaching Congress at Bonn would not go thither officially, the Bishop remarked that in the same way the English Bishops who attended the meeting held there last year were not present as representatives of the English Church at large. The Bishop asked whether members of the English Church, if they desired to join the Orthodox Church, would be required to submit to a second baptism. The Patriarch answered with great caution that he could give no reply to that. Though unanswered, it was not out of place, for the question of baptism had been already brought forward at the Patriarchate a few months before. A young Englishman living at Cavallo, the Neapolis of the Acts, a married man, came to Constantinople. At my instance he applied personally at the Greek Patriarchate to learn on what conditions his infant could receive baptism from a Priest of the Greek Church. The Protosyncellus, the Patriarch's chief chaplain, replied that the child must be brought up as a member of the Greek Church, but added that attempts were being made by the Greek and English Churches to meet such cases. The Archbishop of Syros named the matter of such baptisms, I believe, in his Report written from Constantinople to the Synod of the Greek Church.

The chief event of the year last past has been the second Conference of Bonn, held August 12—16. The Committee extract from the same Report of the *Anglo-Continental Society* the following details. Their importance is sufficiently obvious:—

“The Conference of 1875 was much more largely attended than that of 1874. The following members of the Anglo-Continental Society were present:—The Lord Bishop of Gibraltar, Vice-President; Prebendary Meyrick, Secretary; Rev. G. E. Broade, Corresponding Secretary for Germany; Rev. Dr. Langden, Secretary for Switzerland; Rev. F. S. May, Secretary for Scandinavia; Rev. Dr. Nevin, Secretary for Italy; Rev. H. A. Boys, Corresponding Secretary for Algeria; Rev. J. D. M. Crofts, Corresponding Secretary in Bonn; Prebendary Bullock, C. H. E. Carmichael, Esq., Rev. A. Plummer, Rev. Dr. Perry, members of the Committee; Rev. H. M. Bennett, Rev. W. Denton, Rev. H. Farley, Rev. L. M. Hogg, Rev. J. Long, members of the Society. About thirty other Anglicans were there, including the Dean of Chester, Canon Liddon, Lord Plunket, Master Brooke, Rev. M. MacColl. Rather more than twenty members of the Russo-Greek Church were present, the chief of whom were the Archbishop of Syros (Greece), Archbishop Gennadios (Roumania), Bishop Melchisedek (Roumania), Archimandrites Sabbas (Belgrade), Anastasiades and Bryennios (Constantinople), Professors Damalas and Rhossis (Athens), Archpriest Janyscheff, Professor Ossinine, and Colonel Kiréef (St. Petersburg). Among the Germans the best-known names were those of Dr. von Döllinger, Bishop Reinkens, Professors Reusch,

Langen, Knoedt. Switzerland was represented by Herr Herzog, who in all probability will be the first Old Catholic Swiss Bishop.

“The Conference was intended to last for three days; the gravity of the subjects under discussion caused it to be extended over two additional days. At the morning sessions the German language was used, with which the Russians and Orientals were intimately acquainted; in the afternoon the English language was employed. The Presidential Chair was occupied by Dr. von Döllinger, who however had courteously and affectionately pressed the Lord Bishop of Lincoln to occupy it, and on the afternoon of the first day of meeting invited the Lord Bishop of Gibraltar to take his place.

“Attention was mainly directed to the doctrine which has kept the East and West apart for the last thousand years, the doctrine of the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost. The other questions brought before it were the validity of Anglican Orders, purgatory, infallibility, and the Papacy.

“I. The Procession of the Holy Spirit was the subject of discussion at six public meetings of the Conference. At the end of the fourth of these meetings a Committee was appointed, which held three lengthy sittings. The Committee consisted of the Archbishop of Syros, Archpriest Janyscheff, Professor Ossinine, Archimandrite Anastasiades, Archimandrite Bryennios, Dr. von Döllinger, Bishop Reinkens, Professor Langen, Canon Liddon, Prebendary Meyrick, and Dr. Nevin; Professor Reusch and Rev. G. E. Broade acted as Secretaries. On one occasion Colonel Kiréef attended, on another Privy Councillor von Philippoff. After many proposals had been made and abandoned, the two following sets of Propositions were agreed to by the Committee and unanimously adopted by the Conference.

I.

1. We agree in receiving the Œcumenical Creeds and dogmatic decisions of the ancient undivided Church.
2. We agree in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.
3. We acknowledge on all sides the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

4. We reject every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgment of two principles of ἀρχαί or αἰτίαι in the Trinity may be contained.

II.

We accept the teaching of S. John Damascene on the Holy Ghost, as it is expressed in the following paragraphs in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church.

1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father, as the Beginning (ἀρχή), the Cause (αἰτία), the Source (πηγή), of the Godhead^e.

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ), because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (ἀρχή), one Cause (αἰτία), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced^f.

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son^g.

4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father^h, issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son as His revealing powerⁱ.

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 God declarative of the Word^k.

6. The Holy Ghost forms the link between the Father and the Son, and is linked to the Father by the Son^l.

^e *De Rectâ Sententiâ*, n. 1; *Contr. Manich.* n. 4.

^f Ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγεται, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ἀνομιζόμεν. (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 8.)

^g Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντορικῇ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς Θεότητος δυνάμει τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη. (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 12.) Υἱοῦ δὲ Πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. (*Ibid.*) Διὰ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον. (*Contr. Manich.* n. 5.) Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ Λόγου προῖον. (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28.) Τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τὸ λατρευόμενον . . . Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον· ὅπου καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κρίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν. (*Hom. in Sabb.* s. n. 4.)

^h Εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα. (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 13.)

ⁱ Τοῦ Πατρὸς προερχομένη καὶ ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ἀναπανομένη καὶ αὐτοῦ αὐτὴν ἐκφαντικὴν δύναμιν. (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 7.) Πατὴρ διὰ Λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ Πνεύματος. (*Ibid.* i. 12.)

^k Τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν, Υἱοῦ δὲ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ὡς Πνεῦμα στόματος Θεοῦ, Λόγου ἐξαγγελτικόν. (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28.)

^l Μέσον τοῦ ἀγενήτου καὶ γενήτου, καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ τῷ Πατρὶ συναπτόμενον. (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 13.)

"The way towards agreement was opened by a Sermon of the Lord Bishop of Lincoln on the Procession, copies of which had been sent by our Old Catholic and Oriental brethren, calling out from Dr. von Döllinger a marked expression of his approval. The attention of Russian theologians was drawn to its suggestions by a communication from our Secretary to Colonel Kiréef.

"II. The question of the Validity of Anglican Orders has taken quite a different position in the minds of Russian and Oriental Churchmen from that which it occupied a year ago. The Roman Catholic cavils and calumnies, which have hitherto been the chief sources of information to the Russians, have been dissipated. The Nag's Head fable is rejected with scorn; our Ordinal is regarded as adequate; and the only difficulty now remaining in the mind of our Eastern brethren is a doubt whether a sufficiently high estimate of the grace of Orders is entertained in the Anglican Church.

"Two addresses were made to the Orientals by Dr. von Döllinger, in which he loyally defended the Anglican position, showing that our episcopal succession was undoubted, our Ordinal sufficient, and our view of the sacramental character of the ordinance adequate. The Lord Bishop of Gibraltar confirmed the arguments of Dr. von Döllinger, by stating that, as a matter of fact, he was himself received by the Patriarch of Constantinople and other Eastern prelates as a brother bishop. We believe that the validity of Anglican Orders will not be much longer questioned by any of the more learned members of the Russo-Greek Church.

"The Conference was brought to a conclusion with a speech from the Lord Bishop of Gibraltar, in which he said:—

"Within the last few months I have had the privilege of meeting the Archbishops of Corfu, Syros, Smyrna, Roumania, and the Patriarch of Constantinople. This intercommunion between the Churches, which we have been endeavouring here to promote by theological discussion, I have been endeavouring to promote in practice. The other day at Smyrna I held two services, at which were present not only Bishops and congregations of the Church of England, but also an Archbishop and Bishop of the Eastern Church, with many members of their flock, and at which we offered together to our heavenly Father our common supplications in the

name of our common Lord and Redeemer. As God breathed into our hearts this desire for union, He will show in His own good time the way in which that desire is to be fulfilled. If Christians ever had a good cause for singing a *Te Deum*, we have one in the success which has attended our endeavour to re-unite the Churches of the East and West in the holy bonds of Christian truth and love.¹

"The *Te Deum* and the Lord's Prayer were then recited in Latin by the Conference, led by Bishop Reinkens, who added to them a prayer for the unity of the Church, with which the Conference closed."

The Committee, following the course of events, cannot leave unnoticed the thoughtful and eirenical sermon on the Holy Procession preached before the University of Oxford, by the Very Rev. the Prolocutor of the Lower House, on Whitsun-Day, 1875, which has been translated into modern Greek and re-published at Constantinople.

During this last year, and not long after the Bonn Conference, his Holiness the Archbishop of Syros and Tenos departed into peace. Learned, pious, and courteous as he was, sorrow for his loss will long linger in the memories not only of those who formed an acquaintance with him during his visit to this country, but of English Churchmen generally. The Committee also lament the loss of the Very Rev. Eugene Popoff, the Russian Chaplain in London, who was present at and gave his assistance to the Committee on Intercommunion at its first appointment in 1863^m.

The establishment at Athens of "The Brotherhood of the Friends of Christ," which has been promoted by that learned layman Dr. Damalas, author of *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* and other theological works, ought not to be passed over without being put on record. Its programme is this:—

THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE LOVERS OF CHRIST.

The desire which is manifested in every quarter for the removal of the barrier which separates us from the other brethren in Christ, and the results of the deliberations at Bonn which so far appear full of promise, and the condition of the Clergy of our Church, deprived for the most part of the ecclesiastical teaching and training needful for fulfilling as it ought the pastoral office assigned to it, and moreover the imperfection among us of the religious guidance of the Laity

^m See the *Chronicle of Convocation* for 1865, p. 1918.

which arises from such a condition of the Clergy as this, have led us to the consideration and the setting-out of a desire and aim long entertained for the establishment of "a Brotherhood of the Lovers of Christ;" that we may be supplied with the means, both spiritual and material, for the pursuit and attainment of those sacred aims, both the drawing nearer and if it may be the uniting of the Christian Churches, and also of the needful training of the Eastern Clergy and the great body of the Eastern Orthodox.

And now publishing the Rules of this Brotherhood, we expect all our brothers who love Christ, and who are inspired by the same sentiments with ourselves, to concur in this sacred work; contributing yearly a certain sum, establishing sub-Committees in all, if it may be, the cities of Greece, and of the East, and wherever in other places there may be men of like mind; and coming into immediate relation with the Central Committee in Athens, which consists of the undersigned, and has already commenced its labours.

And we trust that as genuine disciples of the Saviour, the distinctive mark of whom the Lord Himself proclaims to be love towards one another, you will show that you are filled abundantly with this love, manifested, as the Divine and Evangelist says, "not in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth."

Athens, 24th October, 1875.

The Committee wish "God speed" to this new Society in their work of piety and amity.

In the Session of 15th February, 1876, in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Very Reverend the Prolocutor having formally communicated to the House the Resolutions adopted at the Bonn Conference, on the motion of Dr. Fraser, seconded by the Archdeacon of Rochester and St. Alban's, it was carried—

"That the Resolutions adopted at the Second Conference at Bonn, held August 12th to 16th, 1875, on the subject of the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost, be referred to the Committee on Intercommunion with the Orthodox Eastern Churches, with instruction to the Committee to report thereon to this House."

And in the Session of February 16th the following Resolution of the Upper House at which they had arrived, after debate, in the previous Session, was communicated to the Lower House—

"That the Resolutions lately adopted at Bonn by representatives of the Old Catholics, and certain members of the Eastern Church, the English Church, and other Christian Communities, concerning the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost, be referred to the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation on Intercommunion with the Eastern Churches."

II.

The Resolutions of the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury have made it a duty incumbent on the

Committee to examine carefully the Doctrinal Documents which have been put forth during the past year by the Conference held at Bonn, a work in which some progress had already been made when the Resolutions were passed.

The Committee have in former Reports expressed their opinion that it was desirable that "some discussion should take place between persons authorised to speak in behalf of the Anglican Communion on the one hand, and of the Eastern Orthodox Church on the other". They consider that this would have been the preferable mode of procedure. But, as no authority has yet been given to English divines for such a discussion, they have welcomed the unofficial and voluntary discussions which have taken place, and have admired the spirit they displayed, and the ability with which they were conducted.

With respect to the Resolution of the Bonn Conference of September, 1874, which is quoted *supra*, in page 6, the Committee consider that it will be better to pass over it, and to deal only with the 2nd of the Resolutions of 1875, which refers to the same question, and which is far more accurate in its expression. It is clear from history that the words "and the Son" were inserted in the Creed without the authority of a General Council. It is of course a thing to be desired that a true General Council should finally decide upon the question of their presence in the Creed. But the prospect of such a Council being assembled is at present hopeless; and in the interim it is the work of enlightened charity to consider how Eastern and Western Churches may be enabled to enter into Intercommunion without encroaching upon the office of a General Council. For although these words have come into the Creed without due authority, yet as they are now there, and have been recited in and accepted by many local and provincial Councils in the West, it is certain that the members of the Western portion of the Church, who have inherited them from their forefathers, cannot agree to omit them on any authority other than that of a General Council, or, at least, of a Council representing the whole Western Church. The Committee, taking this as an axiom, feel it consistent with the most perfect loyalty to their own Church to consider freely any propositions, explanations, or eirenica which

ⁿ *Chronicle of Convocation for 1867*, p. 958.

may tend to prepare the way for such an Intercommunion of Churches as they have aimed at since their first appointment. What this Intercommunion was is stated in the Report of the Committee presented July 4th, 1868, and is shown in the paragraph from that report which follows:—

"Intercommunion is not, as many persons imagine, the fusion of one Church into another; this is no question of submitting our Church to the authority of the Orthodox Church of the East, or requiring such submission from her. Neither is it, on the one hand, to engraft into our own Church any of the doctrines, rites, or ceremonies peculiar to other Churches; nor, on the other hand, to require them to abandon what may seem to us superfluous, and to conform themselves to the measure of our simplicity. No; the Intercommunion which we seek is simply the mutual acknowledgment that all Churches which are one in the possession of a true Episcopate, one in Sacraments, and one in their creed, are by their union in their common Lord bound to receive one another to full communion in prayers and sacraments, as members of the same household of faith."

Premising thus much, the Committee proceed to review the Bonn Resolutions of 1875^o.

In examining propositions on this mysterious doctrine of the eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost, our first duty is to see what Holy Scripture expressly teaches us upon it.

Next we have to examine the Thirty-nine Articles and the other formularies of our Church on the question: and lastly, the opinions which have been propounded by, and entertained in regard to it by, eminent divines of the Church of England.

From Holy Scripture we learn that the Holy Ghost

a. Proceedeth from the Father:

The Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father. (St. John xv. 26.)
Τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται.
Vulg. Spiritus veritatis qui a Patre procedit.

The Spirit which is of God. (1 Cor. ii. 12.)
Τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
Vulg. Spiritus qui ex Deo est.

^o For these Resolutions in their original form see Appendix A.

β. Is the Spirit of the Father :

The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God. (1 Cor. ii. 11.)
 The Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you. (St. Matt. x. 20.)
 The Spirit of God dwelleth in you. (1 Cor. iii. 16.)
 He hath given us of His Spirit. (1 St. John iv. 13, compare iv. 10.)

γ. Receiveth of the Son's :

He shall receive of mine. (St. John xvi. 14.)
 Ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται.
 He shall take of mine. (St. John xvi. 15.)
 Ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει.

δ. Is the Spirit of the Son :

God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts. (Gal. iv. 6.)
 Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His. (Rom. viii. 9.)
 The Spirit of Christ which was in the prophets. (1 Peter i. 11.)
 The supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. (Phil. i. 19^p.)

ε. Is sent by the Father :

The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name. (St. John xiv. 26.)
 God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son. (Gal. iv. 6.)
 He shall give you another Comforter. (St. John xiv. 16.)

ζ. Is sent by the Son :

The Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father. (St. John xv. 26.)
 If I depart I will send Him unto you. (St. John xvi. 7.)

The following are the passages in the Articles and Formularies of our Church in which the Procession of the Holy Spirit is set forth :

a. Article V. says :—"The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son [a Patre et Filio procedens^q] is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, Very and Eternal God."

^p Add, perhaps, also the text Acts xvi. 7, according to the more approved readings, "the Spirit of Jesus, τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ, Vulg. Spiritus Jesu, suffered them not." These readings are those of Lachmann.

^q The third Article of the Wittenberg Confession, from which this Article appears to have been taken almost word for word in other respects, had the expression "procedens ab aeterno."

β. The Creed in the Order of the Holy Communion :—"And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son [Qui ex Patre Filioque procedit], Who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets."

γ. The Confession of Faith commonly called the Creed of S. Athanasius :—"The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son [Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio] : neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding [procedens]."

δ. The Litany :—"O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son [a Patre et Filio procedens], have mercy upon us, miserable sinners."

ε. In the following passage in the Hymn in the Ordering of Priests :—

"Teach us to know the Father, Son,
 And Thee of both to be but One,"

the Committee draw attention to the original, which is 'Te Utriusque Spiritum.'

Thirdly, we may set forth certain extracts containing opinions propounded and entertained by Divines of the Church of England on the doctrine of the Eastern Church. To certain passages in these the Committee draw attention by Italicising them.

A.—The Teachings of the Eastern Church.

I. I will note the beginnings and the proceedings in this controversy. The Grecians, saith Peter Lombard, affirm that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father only, and not from the Son, yet we must know that the *Greeks do acknowledge the Holy Ghost to be the Spirit of the Son as well as of the Father*, because the Apostle saith "the Spirit of the Son," and Truth itself in the Gospel "the Spirit of Truth." Now, seeing that it is no other thing to be the Spirit of the Father and the Son than to be from the Father and the Son, they seem to agree with us in judgment touching this Article of Faith, though they differ in words. Grossthead, the famous and renowned Bishop of Lincoln, writing upon a part of Damascene, delivereth his opinion touching this controversy in these words : "The Grecians are of opinion that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of the Son, but that He proceedeth not from the Son, but from the Father only, yet by the Son. And this opinion seemeth to be contrary to ours ; for we may say that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son. But haply if two wise and understanding men, the one of the Greek Church, the other of the Latin, both lovers of the truth, and not of their own sayings because they are their own, might meet to consider of this seeming contrariety, it would in the end appear that this difference in deed and in truth is not real, but verbally only. (Dean Field in the *Book of the Church*, book iii. ch. 1.)

II. The Greek Church appearing not guilty of heresy, by any evidence of Scripture reason or the consent of the Primitive Church, nothing is left to make

good the charge but that the Church of Rome hath defined it to be so. (Bishop Stillingfleet in *A Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion*, ch. 2, "Fundamentals in General," p. 44.)

III. "And sure it would have grated the foundation if they had so denied the procession of the Holy Ghost as that they had made an inequality between the Persons. But since their form of speech¹ that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son, and is the Spirit of the Son, without making any difference in the consubstantiality of the Persons, I dare not deny them to be a true Church for this, though I confess them an erroneous Church in this particular." (Archbishop Laud in *Conference with Fisher*, p. 19, Ox. 1839.)

IV. Here was certainly a very unhappy dispute; inconsiderable in its original, but fatal in its consequences.

We of this Church, though we abhor the crudity of condemning the Eastern Churches for such a difference, yet do receive the Creed according to the usage of the Western Churches; and therefore, though we do not pretend to explain what "Procession" is, we believe, according to the Article, that the Holy Ghost proceeds both from the Father and the Son: because in that discourse of our Saviour's that contains the promise of the Spirit, and that long description of Him as a Person, Christ not only says that the Father will send the Spirit in His name, but adds, that He will send the Spirit; and, though He next says, "Who proceedeth from the Father," yet since He sends Him, and that He was to supply His room and act in His name, this implies a relation, and a sort of subordination in the Spirit to the Son. This may serve to justify our adhering to the Creeds as they had been for many ages received in the Western Church; but we are far from thinking that this proof is so full and explicit as to justify our separating from any Church, or condemning it, that should stick exactly to the first Creeds, and reject this addition." (Bp. Burnet on the *Thirty-nine Articles*, Art. 5.)

B.—The Authority of St. John Damascene.

I. The schoolmen . . . very handsomely, and with wonderful subtilty, bring him off [St. John Damascene], by admiring the wisdom and caution he useth in these words. So your own St. Bonaventura, whose testimony you think so considerable as to produce at large: "Tamen ipse cautè loquitur, unde non dicit quod 'Spiritus non est a Filio,' sed dicit, 'non dicimus a Filio,' which you put in great letters, the more to be taken notice of. But, I pray, what was it which Damascene was there delivering of? 'Was it not the sense of the Greek Church concerning the Persons of the Trinity?' and how could he otherwise have expressed it than by 'non dicimus?'" (Bishop Stillingfleet in *A Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion*, p. 30.)

C.—The Doctrine of the Procession.

I. Stanislaus Orschovitus . . . sheweth how the differences touching the proceeding of the Holy Ghost, where they seem especially to be contrary to us, may be agreed and composed. Thomas a Jesu resolveth clearly that this question touching the proceeding of the Holy Ghost is only *de modo loquendi*, and that the difference is not real, which he sheweth to be true in this sort: "The Greeks, who deny the Holy Ghost to proceed from the Son, acknowledge that He is the Spirit of the Son, and that He is given unto us by the Son." "We do not say," saith Damascene, "that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, but we name Him the Spirit of the Son." "If any man," saith the Apostle, "have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His;" and we affirm, that He appeared by the Son, and was given unto us by Him; for He breathed on His Disciples and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; but we never say that the Son is the Son of

the Holy Ghost or proceedeth from Him. They teach, therefore, that the Spirit is, and proceedeth from the Father by the Son, as the brightness is from the sun by the beam; and that, as we may say, the brightness is the brightness of the sunbeam as well as of the sun, but not that the beam is the beam of that brightness; so the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, but the Son is not the Son of the Spirit. So then, we say, the Holy Ghost proceedeth or receiveth essence and being from the Father only as from the original and fountain, but by the Son as a middle Person, in order of subsistence between them, receiving Being immediately from the Father, and so mediately deriving and communicating it to Him. Neither Greeks nor Latins therefore deny the Holy Ghost to receive being and essence from the Son, and consequently to proceed from Him as from a middle Person in order of subsistence between the Father and Him, in such sort as the brightness that floweth from the sun is from the sunbeam between the sun and it. Neither of them deny the Father to be the fountain and the original; as the sun is the fountain wherein floweth both the beam and brightness of light. And both agree that the Father from Whom and the Son by Whom the Spirit receiveth being are one cause or one beginning; and that by one eternal breathing the Spirit receiveth essence or subsistence from them both, in such sort as the sun and beam are one cause and do by one action send forth that shining brightness that floweth from them. (Dean Field, *Of the Church*, book iii. ch. 1.)

II. And since you pretend so much to understand these depths, before you renew a charge of heresy against the Greek Church in this particular, make use of your theological reason in giving an intelligible answer to these questions:—1. Why the Spirit may not be equal and consubstantial to the other Persons in the Trinity, supposing His Procession to be only from the Father, as the Son to be equal and consubstantial with them when His generation is only from the Father? 2. If the Procession from the Son be necessary to make the Spirit consubstantial with the Son, why is not generation of the Son by the Spirit necessary to make the Son consubstantial with the Spirit? 3. If the Spirit doth proceed from Father and Son as distinct Hypostases, how can He proceed from these Hypostases as one Principle by one common spiration, without confounding these Personalities? Or else show, how two distinct Hypostases, always remaining so, can concur in the same numerical action *ad intra*? 4. If there be such a necessity of believing this as an article of Faith, why hath not God thought fit to reveal to us the distinct emanations of the Son and Spirit? and wherein the eternal generation of the Son may be conceived as distinct from the Procession of the Spirit, when both equally agree in the same essence, and neither of them express the Personality of the Father? Either, I say, undertake intelligibly to resolve these things, or else surcease your charge of heresy against the Greek Church, and upbraid not his Lordship [Archbishop Laud] for not entering into these depths. Methinks their being confessed to be depths on both sides might teach you a little more modesty in handling them, and much more charity to men who differ about them. For you may see the Greeks want not great plausibleness of reason on their side, as well as authority of Scripture and Fathers, plain for them, but not so against them. As long, therefore, as the Greek Church confesseth the Divinity, consubstantiality, Eternal Procession of the Spirit, and acknowledgeth it to be the Spirit of the Son, there must be something more in it than the bare denial of the Procession from the Son, which must make you so eager in your charge of heresy against her. Bishop Stillingfleet in *A Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion*. (Ch. 1, "The Defence of the Greek Church," pp. 33, 34.)

III. Our Church is not singular in this assertion that the Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father, for the ancient Fathers of the Church of Christ did generally teach the same; the Latin Fathers expressly avouching it that the Spirit did in plain terms proceed both from the Father and the Son. And the Greek Fathers, Though they do not expressly deliver that He proceeds

from the Son (because the Scriptures do not expressly assert it) yet they say that He "receiveth from the Son," that He is the "Spirit of the Son," the "Word of the Son," yea "God of the Son," plainly implying that what He hath is communicated from the Son as well as the Father, which is the same thing the others understood by His proceeding from the Father and the Son. (Bishop Beveridge on Art. V. *Works*, vii. 176-7-8.)

IV. However, it is certain that some of the Fathers expressed that they conceived of this mystery in one sort, and some in another. Tertullian saith, The Holy Spirit is from the Father *by the Son*; his words are, "Spiritus non aliunde puto quam a Patre *per* Filium." Hilary saith, He is from the Father and the Son; his words are, "De Patre et Filio authoribus confitendus est." "When the Holy Spirit is sent," saith Hierom, "He is sent of the Father and the Son; and in Scripture He is called sometimes the Spirit of the Father, sometimes of the Son." And again, "Spiritus de Patre egreditur et propter societatem nature a Filio mittitur;" that is, "The Spirit proceedeth from the Father, and in that He is of the same nature and essence with the Son, He is sent of Him." "Why should we not believe," saith Augustine, "that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Son also, seeing He is the Spirit of the Son?" The Greeks say not expressly that He proceedeth from the Father and the Son; for in the Creed of Athanasius, as it is found in the Greek, the words are: "The Spirit is of the Father, not made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding," without the addition of the Son. But some of them say, He is, or received being from the Father, that He appeared by the Son, and is a *perfect Image of the Son*; others that not only the Father, but the Son also sendeth the Holy Spirit. Some that, He proceedeth from the Father and receiveth of the Son; and others that, He is from the Father by the Son. In all which diversity of words and forms of speaking there was one and the same meaning, and therefore, no exception was taken by one against another. (Dean Field in *Book of the Church*, book iii. c. 1.)

V. In like manner He is called the Spirit of the Son. . . . And so surely is this the case that the Greeks themselves were even willing to call the Holy Ghost *the Spirit of the Son*; confessing that "He proceedeth from the Father, and is the Spirit of the Son." And hence many of our Divines, and even Divines of the Church of Rome, have concluded that their difference on this point from the Western Church was but *in modo loquendi*, in manner of speech, not in fundamental truth. (Bishop Browne in *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, Art. V.)

VI. Spiritus Sancti appellatio proprie tribuitur ratione ineffabilis Spirationis, quæ ex Patre *per* Filium Tertia Persona procedit.—(Bp. Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* i. 2. 5.)

D.—The Doctrine of the Monarchia.

I. We must not therefore so far endeavour to involve ourselves in the darkness of this mystery as to deny that glory which is clearly due unto the Father, whose pre-eminence undeniably consisted in this, that He is God not of any other, but of Himself, and that there is no other person who is God but is God of Him. It is no diminution to the Son to say He is from another, for His very name imparts so much; but it were a diminution to the Father to speak so of Him; and there must be some pre-eminence where there is place for derogation. What the Father is, He is from none; what the Son is, He is from Him: what the first is, He giveth; what the second is, He receiveth. The first is a Father indeed by reason of His Son, but He is not God by reason of Him; whereas the Son is not only so in regard of the Father, but also God by reason of the same.

. . . Neither can we be thought to want a sufficient foundation for this priority of the first Person of the Trinity if we look upon the numerous testimonies of the ancient doctors of the Church who have not stuck to call the Father the origin, the cause, the author, the root, the fountain, and the head of the Son, *or of the whole Divinity*. . . . So that the proper notion of the Father in Whom we believe is this, that He is a person subsisting eternally in the one infinite essence of the Godhead; which essence or subsistence He hath received from no other person, but hath communicated the same essence, in which Himself subsisteth, by generation to another person, Who by that generation is the Son. However, it is most reasonable to assert that there is but one Person Who is from none; and the very generation of the Son and procession of the Holy Ghost undeniably prove that neither of those Two can be that Person. For whosoever is generated is from Him who is the genitor, and whosoever proceedeth is from him from whom he proceedeth, whatsoever the nature of the generation or procession be.—(Bishop Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. 1.)

II. Every beginning is a Father unto that which cometh of it, and any offspring is a son unto that which out of it groweth. *Seeing therefore the Father alone is originally that Deity* which Christ originally is not (for Christ is God by being of God, Light by issuing out of Light), it followeth hereupon that whatsoever Christ hath common unto Him with His Heavenly Father, the same of necessity must be given Him, but naturally and eternally given, not bestowed by way of benevolence and favour as the other gifts both are. (*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book v. c. 54.)

E.—The Doctrine of the Circumcession or Coinherence.

The Persons of the Godhead, by reason of the Unity of their substance, do as necessarily remain one within another as they are of necessity to be distinguished one from another. . . . The Father, therefore, is in the Son and the Son in Him, They both in the Spirit, and the Spirit in both Them. (*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book v. c. 56.)

The Fathers held that the Father is the head and fountain of Deity (Πατήρ Θεοῦ ἡρώς), from whom the Son and Holy Spirit are from all eternity derived, but so derived as not to be divided from the Father, but they are in the Father and the Father in them by a certain *περιχώρησις* or Inhabitation. So then, though they acknowledged the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be really three Persons; yet they hold them to have no divided or separate existence as three different men have, but to be intimately united and conjoined, one to another, and to exist in each other, and by the said ineffable *περιχώρησις* or Inhabitation to pervade or permeate one another.—(*An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, by Bishop Browne, Art. i.)

The Committee now proceed to consider those Resolutions of the Bonn Conference, which are styled "Preliminary." They appear to require chiefly an examination by the historical method.

I. We agree together in receiving the Œcumenical Symbola and the Doctrinal Decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

The Creed set forth by the 318 Fathers assembled at Nicæa is of course received by the Church of England as the Creed of the first General Council and as part of the *Lex credendi* of the Church. It is not recited in her Formularies, except so far as it is included

in the Constantinopolitan Creed next to be referred to. It ended with the words "and in the Holy Ghost," followed by an anathema.

In the second General Council, as it is believed, certain alterations in and additions to the Creed were brought forward, not composed by that Council^r, but recited in it and sanctioned by it, among which are the words respecting the Holy Ghost as they are recited in our Communion-office, but without the words "and the Son." This Creed was known as the Creed of the 150 Fathers, and found its way gradually into the use of the Church.

In the General Council held at Ephesus, A.D. 431, the Creed of Nicæa only was recited as of authority; any other creed having been rejected as heterodox:—

"The Holy Synod defined that it should be lawful to no one to propose another Creed (*τέριον πίστις*) or to write or compile one beside that defined by the Holy Fathers collected in the city of Nicæa with the Holy Ghost, and that those who dare either to compile another Creed, or to produce or to propose it to those wishing to turn to the knowledge of the truth either from Hellenism or Judaism, or any heresy whatever, that such, if they be Bishops or Clergy, be deprived, the Bishops of their episcopate, and the Clergy of their office, and if they be laity be anathematized."

Obviously this Canon applies to the Creed of Nicæa. But equally obviously it is not intended to forbid the compilation of another form of words, but of any form of words expressing another, that is a contrariant, Faith. This is clear from what took place in the next General Council of 600 Bishops held at Chalcedon, A.D. 451. Here both the above mentioned Creeds were recited and accepted as symbols of the Church, and placed on the same footing. That Council says, in its definition^s: "This Creed [of Nicæa] had been sufficient for the perfect knowledge and confirmation of religion . . . for concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it sets forth completeness of teaching (*ἐκδιδάσκει τὸ τέλειον*), . . . but the Holy Council, wishing to show that the doctrine of the Church is unalterably the same, has defined, first of all, that the Creed of the 318 Fathers remains inviolable. Moreover, in

^r They are to be found in the treatise of St. Epiphanius called *Ancoratus*, which was written at least seven years before the Council of Constantinople was assembled. It has been argued that this Creed is based on that of Jerusalem, and not that of Nicæa.

^s Mansi, vol. vii. p. 108. See also S. Th. Aquinas, *Summa*, 1^{ma}, Quæst. xxxvi. 2.

opposition to those who fought against the Holy Ghost, it confirms the doctrine, afterwards handed down by the 150 Fathers assembled in the royal city, concerning the being of the Holy Ghost, not because they thought the former exposition incomplete, but to leave on record their opposition to all gainsayers."

The Resolution appears to the Committee to be one which may be properly agreed to.

II. We agree in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner.

It is quite uncertain at what time the words "and the Son" were first repeated in the Creed which had been ratified by the 4th, 5th, and 6th General Councils. It is generally agreed that this addition originated in Spain in the reaction against the Arian heresy. In the first of the series of Councils, or more strictly Conventions, held at Toledo, A.D. 400, the assertion of the double Procession appears to have been dealt with. But it is more distinctly set forth by the 3rd Council of Toledo, A.D. 589, which says in its 3rd Canon: "Whosoever doth not believe in the Holy Ghost, or hath not believed that He proceedeth from the Father and the Son, and hath not said that He is co-eternal with the Father and the Son, and co-equal, let him be anathematized." This Council was held by Reccared, King of the Visigoths, on his recantation of Arianism; and it would appear that the words *Filioque* were recited in the Creed at this Council; and that it became the practice throughout Spain to sing the Creed with the additional words in the office of the Holy Communion. But whether the words were inserted by the Council in opposition to the Arian heresy, or whether the Spanish Church believed that they were reciting the Creed in its original form, is uncertain. In the 16th Council of Toledo, A.D. 693, the words *procedens a Patre et Filio* are used in certain definitions of doctrine which have a great resemblance to the Confession of Faith called the Athanasian Creed. The custom by degrees prevailed in the West of adding these words to the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed during the Communion Office. The further history of them may be stated in the words of Bishop Pearson:—

This being first done in the Spanish and French Churches, and the matter being referred to Leo the Third Bishop of Rome, he absolutely concluded that no such addition ought to be tolerated: for in the Acts of the Synod held at Aquisgranum, we find it so determined by the Pope, upon the conference with the legates: Ergo, ut video, illud a vestra Paternitate decernitur, ut primo illud de

quo quaestio agitur, de sepe fatis Symbolo tollatur, et tunc demum a quolibet licite ac libere, sive cantando sive tradendo discatur et doceatur; so one of the legates. To which Leo answered thus: Ita procul dubio a nostra parte decernitur; ita quoque ut a vestra assentiantur, a nobis omnibus modis suadetur. Beside, lest the Roman Church might be accused of joining with the Spanish and French Churches in this addition, the same Pope caused the Creed publicly to be set forth in the Church, graven in silver plates, one in Latin and another in Greek, in the same words in which the Council of Constantinople had first penned it: Hic pro amore et cautela Orthodoxae Fidei, fecit in B. Petri Basilica scuta argentea duo scripta utraque Symbolo, unum quidem literis Graecis et alium Latinis, sedentia dextra laevaque super ingressum corporis. (*Anastasius in vita Leonis III. De Vit. Pontif. Rom. XCIII.*) Leo Tertius (Symboli) transcriptum in tabula argentea, post altare B. Pauli posita posteris reliquit, pro amore, ut ipse ait, et cautela Fidei Orthodoxae. In quo quidem Symbolo in processione Spiritus S. solus commemoratur Pater his verbis: "Et in Spiritum S. Dominum vivificantem, ex Patre procedentem, cum Patre et Filio co-adorandum, et glorificandum." (P. Lombardus I. distinct. 11, 2.) These were taken out of the Archiva at Rome, saith Photius, and so placed by Leo, that they might be acknowledged and perpetuated as the true copies of that Creed, not to be altered. . . . This was the great and prudent care of Leo the Third, that there should be no addition made to the ancient Creed authorised by a General Council, and received by the whole Church; and by this means he quieted all distempers for his time. But not long after, the following Popes, more in love with their own authority than desirous of the peace and unity of the Church, neglected the tables of Leo, and admitted the addition *Filioque*. This was done in the time and by the power of Pope Nicolaus the First, who by the activity of Photius was condemned for it. "Tunc inter alias accusationes hoc principaliter posuit Photius ipsum (Nicolaum) fore excommunicatum, quod apposuerat ad Symbolum Spiritum S. a Filio procedere. Similiter et depositum, quod ipse Nicolaus Papa incidisset in sententiam Tertii Concilii. (*Antonin. Part. 3. tit. 22. c. 13.*)" This was it which Photius complained of so highly in his Encyclic Epistle to the Archiepiscopal Sees of the Eastern Church. . . . Thus far Photius against Nicolaus before he was deposed. After he was restored again, in the time of Pope John VIII., in the eighth general council as the Greeks call it, it was declared that the addition of *Filioque* made in the Creed should be taken away.

After this the same complaint was continued by Michael Cerularius, and Theophylact, in as high a manner as by Photius. . . . καὶ τοῦ Δουλου τοῦν ἐντὶ μὲν περὶ τὸ δόγμα διαμαρτυρεῖται τὴν πατρικὴν πίστιν σαλευόν, ὅλον δὲ τὸ ἐν τῷ συμβόλῳ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος πρότιθέν, κ. τ. λ. (*Theoph. ad Ioan. c. 3.*)

Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental for adding *Filioque* to the Creed, contrary to a general Council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the authority of another Council; and so the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, never to be ended until those words *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*, or *Filioque*, are taken out of the Creed. The one relying upon the truth of the doctrine contained in those words, and the authority of the Pope to alter anything; the other either denying or suspecting the truth of the doctrine, and being very zealous for the authority of the ancient Councils. This, therefore, is much to be lamented, that the Greeks should not acknowledge the truth which was acknowledged by their ancestors, in the substance of it; and that the Latins should force the Greeks to make an addition to the Creed, without as great an authority as hath prohibited it, and to use that language in the expression of this doctrine which never was used by any of the Greek Fathers.

Admitting that the authority of an Œcumenical Council is necessary to make an addition to a Creed formulated by an Œcumenical Council "ecclesiastically regular," it cannot but be acknowledged,

that as the addition of the *Filioque* was not made by an Œcumenical Council, the Resolution must be agreed to.

III. We acknowledge on all sides the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church¹.

This Resolution may be agreed to without discussion.

IV. We reject every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgment of two principles or ἀρχαὶ or αἰτιαὶ in the Trinity may be contained.

In the Eternal Unity of the Divine Essence there are subsisting Three Persons or Ὑποστάσεις; and between these Persons there are relations, which are essential, and an order consequent on these relations, which is not an order of time or of majesty. These mutual relations and this order are expressed by the names Father, Son, and Spirit, and by the terms "begotten" referring to the Son, and "proceeding" referring to the Holy Spirit, as St. Augustine says (*con. Max. ii. 14*), "Ille genitus est, Iste procedens." In these terms the relations of the Persons are revealed to us, and therefore in the mode denoted by these terms they become the subjects of human thoughts and of human belief. As the name "Son" necessarily implies a "Father" from whom He is begotten, being Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, and the name "Spirit" implies a cause from which He proceeds, so in the Trinity there is but "one Father, not three Fathers," and one Cause or Principle. This the Western Church has acknowledged; and the II. Council of Lyons, A.D. 1274, anathematized all who should maintain that there were two Principles in the Holy Trinity².

The Resolution may be agreed to.

The Committee now proceed to examine the Resolutions accepted at Bonn which have especial regard to the doctrine of the

¹ For a collection of testimonies from the Greek Fathers on this point consult throughout Dr. Pusey's Preface to the translation of St. Cyril on St. John, in which the Western doctrine is lucidly set forth.

² Sicut relationes in rebus creatis accidentaliter insunt, ita in Deo sunt ipsa essentia divina. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 1^{ma}, Quæst. xxxix. 1.

³ For the definition of this Council, and the Latin Doctrine of the Procession, see Appendix B.

eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost, and they adopt for convenience' sake the translation of the Anglo-Continental Society. They were prefaced by this statement :—

We accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus respecting the Holy Ghost, as the same is expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided Church.

The propositions which follow are taken from the works of St. John Damascene, as being a writer in whom the Eastern Church has full confidence as a dogmatic teacher, just as the English Church has in Bishop Pearson, while Latin theologians hold him in high respect⁷. They seem at first sight to tend somewhat to an excess of definition and refinement on this mysterious subject. St. John Damascene being a Father of the Eastern Church subsequent to the division, the Bonn Conference are careful to provide that they are "accepted in the sense of the teachings of the ancient undivided Church."

I. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father (*ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς*) as the beginning (*ἀρχή*), the Cause (*αἰτία*), the Source (*πηγή*) of the Godhead. (*De rectâ Sententiâ*, n. 1; *Contra Manich.* n. 4.)

The Holy Ghost, as Scripture teaches, proceedeth eternally from the Father; that is, He has His Processional origin, He issues from, goes forth out of, the Person of the Father, in whom is the substance of the Godhead, and who is the Principle⁸ of the Godhead, as St. Augustine says (*De Trin.* lib. 4, c. 20) "Pater est Principium totius Deitatis." In this both Greeks and Latins⁹ agree.

⁷ Hunc porro Ioannem Pithæcus suspicatur fuisse Damascenum, illum sanctissimum et eruditissimum monachum, qui Spiritum Sanctum nequaquam *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*, id est e Filio, existere disertissime post Theodoretum professus est. (Petavius *De Trin.* lib. vii. ch. 1.)

⁸ The Committee take the words of the document presented to the House, but they would prefer the technical theological word "Principle" as the translation of the German "Anfang" of the Resolutions. Græci utuntur in Divinis indifferenter nomine Cause sicut et nomine Principii: sed Latini doctores non utuntur nomine Cause, sed solum nomine Principii. (S. Th. Aquinas, *Summa*, 1^{ma}, Q. xxxiii. Art. 1.)

⁹ Pater enim cum sit Fons, Origo et Principium totius Deitatis, ita alias Personas producit ut Ipse a nulla aliâ Personâ producatur, aut produci possit. (Costanzi *Assertio Dogmaticæ Substantialis Processionis Spiritus S. a Patre et Filio*, cap. iii.)

This proposition therefore may be accepted.

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (*ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*), because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (*ἀρχή*), one Cause (*αἰτία*), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced. (*De Fide Orthodoxâ*, i. 8: *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγεται Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ἀπομάζομεν*.)

The Greek Fathers, and especially St. Cyril of Alexandria, use not seldom the expression *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ* of the Holy Spirit; yet is it always with reference to His being of the same substance or essence, and of the same Godhead, with the Son. As St. Epiphanius says against Sabellius, "Not foreign to the Father and the Son, but from (*ἐκ*) the same essence, from (*ἐκ*) the same Godhead, from the Father and Son (*ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ*), ever subsisting with the Father and Son is the Holy Spirit." (*Hæres.* lxii. 4.) The word *ἐκπορεύεται* to the Greek mind is equivalent to the expression "has His processional origin;" and there are no instances which can be quoted of the Greek Fathers using the expression *ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*^b. Bishop Pearson says :—

The ancient Greek Fathers, speaking of this Procession, mention the Father only, and none, I think, express the Son, as sticking constantly in this to the language of the Scriptures. . . . This word *ἐκπόρευσις* or the verb *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* was not used by the Greeks in reference to the Son, but only, as the Scriptures speak, in relation to the Father. *On the Creed*, Art. viii.

This proposition, therefore, which at first sight seems to contradict the terms of our Articles and Creeds, does so in appearance only.

For it must be borne in mind that the Western Church, in asserting the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son also, has ever declared that the Son has His being from the Father. Hence the Holy Spirit is not said to proceed from the Son in precisely the same sense as He is said to proceed from the Father: and we take it to be the intention here to point out this difference, as indeed

^b These Greek words, etymologically and grammatically considered, are far more definite and precise than the Latin words *procedit et a Filio*, by which they are generally translated by the Westerns. And the controversy as to doctrine appears to have arisen from the employment of the vaguer phrase in defining the dogma of the *ἐκπόρευσις*. See the Sermon by the Bishop of Lincoln on the Procession.

will appear further from the next proposition. Estius deals thus with this doctrine:—

"Principaliter Spiritus Sanctus a solo Patre procedit. Quia licet Pater et Filius sint ambo Spiritus Sancti principium, solus tamen Pater est principium sine principio: Filius autem principium ex principio. Item propriè Spiritus Sanctus a Patre procedit, quia Pater ab alio non accipit ut ex Ipso procedat Spiritus Sanctus; Filius autem hoc accipit a Patre." (Estius in *Senten.* lib. I. dis. xii. § 3.)

We agree, then, that to say that "the Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son, as from a *Principium sine Principio*," is in accordance with sound doctrine, and on this understanding we allow the proposition.

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son, (*De Fide Orthodoxa*, i. 12: τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἐκφαντορικῇ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς θεότητος^c δύναμις τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη. *Ibidem*: Υἱοῦ δὲ Πνεύμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. *Contra 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 προῖόν [οὐχ νικῶς δε]. *Hom. in Sabb.* s. n. 4: τούτ' 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 μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν.)

The Holy Ghost does not issue out of, or goes not forth out of the Person of the Son, as from a "*Principium sine Principio*;" for that there are not two such Principles in the Godhead; neither may the Persons be confounded. His hypostatic emanation is from the Father, yet not without the Son: therefore the sense in which He may be said to proceed "from the Son also" is not, and cannot be, in every way co-extensive with that in which He is said to proceed from the Father. And so that Procession is better expressed by the words "by" or "through the Son," as by Tertullian, "*Spiritum non aliunde puto quam a Patre per Filium*."^d He pro-

^c 1 Cor. ii. 10.

^d Itaque ipsis locutionibus promiscue usi sunt . . . ex Latinis S. Hilarius Pictav. qui . . . Lib. xii. de Trinitate num. 56. Deum Patrem alloquens inquit, "quod ex Te per Eum Unigenitum Tuum Spiritus Sanctus Tuus est, etsi sensu quidem non percipiam, sed tamen teneo conscientia." Et *Ibid.* num.

ceeds hypostatically from the Father and ineffably through the Son. As Dean Field expresses it, "We say that the Holy Ghost proceedeth or receiveth essence and being from the Father only as from the original and fountain, *but by the Son as a middle Person in order of subsistence between them.*" This was the reconciling formula recognised at the Council of Florence, and it is acknowledged to be sound and unexceptionable both by the Eastern and Western Churches. Again, as His procession is from (ἐκ) the Father, as Very God, and from the Son, as from Very God of (ἐκ) Very God, the words "and the Son" must be theologically equivalent to (διὰ) "through the Son."

This proposition we judge agreeable to the analogy of Faith, but we should have preferred that the word "eternally" had been explicitly introduced.

4. The Holy Ghost is the image of the Son, who is the image of the Father (*De Fide Orthodoxa* i. 13: εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα) issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son as His revealing power.

De Fide Orthodoxa, i. 7: δύναμις τοῦ Πατρὸς προσρχομένη καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἀναπανομένη^e καὶ αὐτοῦ οὖσαν ἐκφαντικὴν. *Ibidem*, i. 12; Πάτρῃ διὰ λόγου προβαλεὺς ἐκφαντορικῷ Πνεύματι.

The first sentence of this proposition runs thus in St. John Damascene—"The Son is the image of the Father, and the Holy Spirit of the Son, through whom Christ dwelling in man imparts to him

57. . . . Et Filium Tuum una Tecum adorem, et Spiritum Sanctum Tuum, qui ex Te per Unigenitum Tuum est, promerear." (Costanzi, *Assertio dogmatis Substantialis Processionis Spiritus S. a Patre et Filio.*) Ch. v. 22.

^e See Appendix C. Also St. Th. Aquinas, *Summa*, 1^{ma}, Quaest. xxxvi. 3. Utrum S.S. procedat a Patre per Filium.

^f Ex his primum maxime insigne est *Imaginis* nomen, quod Græci Theologi Spiritui Sancto perinde tribuunt cum ad Filium refertur, ac Filio quando cum Patre componitur. (Petavius *De Trin.* quoting St. Gregory Thaumaturgus; St. Basil against Eunomius; St. Cyril, lib. xi. com. in St. John.) See also St. Th. Aquinas, *Summa*, 1^{ma}, Quaest. xxxv. 2.—Utrum nomen *Imaginis* sit proprium Filii.

Nyssen. in *Vita* Greg. Thaumaturg. "Ἐν Πνεύμα ἁγίον ἐκ Θεοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξιν ἔχον· καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ πεφηνὸς δηλαδὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· εἰκὼν τοῦ Υἱοῦ τελείου τελεία. (iii. 546.)

^g See also *Ibid.* i. 8 and i. 13.

proposals for revising the Book of Common Prayer, made this suggestion when they came to the Nicene Creed :—

It is humbly submitted to the Convocation whether a note ought not here to be added with relation to the Greek Church in order to our maintaining Catholic communion.

They did not contemplate a change in the Creed as we have received it, which it would not be practicable for Convocation to make; but they contemplated the formulating some explanations in regard to the *Filioque* which might be so sufficiently satisfactory to the Eastern Churches as to enable our Church to "maintain Catholic communion" with them.

The Resolutions passed at Bonn appear to the Committee to answer these requirements; and they therefore submit to the Convocation, whether they do not constitute an explanation, such as was desired in 1689, which being received by the Eastern Churches might serve for promoting and maintaining Catholic communion.

The Committee would recall to the remembrance of the Convocation, that in a Report presented to a former Convocation by Chancellor Massingberd on June 15th, 1869, this Committee set forth certain practical considerations in regard to Intercommunion, to the first of which effect was given by an Encyclical of the Patriarch of Constantinople, whose directions to his Metropolitans in regard to administering the rites of Christian burial to such members of the Anglican Church as might die within his jurisdiction were recognised with thankfulness by a resolution of the Lower House.

The considerations contained in that Report were these :—

B. "In the same way your Committee feel that it is desirable that the children of English parents born in the East should, at their parents' request, be able to receive the Sacrament of Baptism from an authorised Minister, especially in the case of danger of death, wherever the ministrations of an English Chaplain are unattainable. But, at the same time, they desire that it be distinctly understood and admitted, that the relations of such children to the Church of their parents should not be considered modified or changed by their having been so baptized, and that where any law may exist to that effect it may be relaxed. There may also be cases, although not of so frequent occurrence, where the services of an Eastern Clergyman might be required

for the celebration of marriage between English people, or where one only is English, in which case the same condition should be required.

C. "Nor can they omit also to submit for consideration one other point, namely, the administration of the Holy Communion to persons dying or in danger of death, and to persons travelling, and at a distance from the English Church. It would often be a source of deep comfort, and a work of the greatest Christian benevolence, if such persons, when earnestly desiring Holy Communion, being previously furnished with commendatory letters from their Clergyman and their Bishop, could in their need receive that Blessed Sacrament from the hands of the Eastern Clergy.

D. "The English Church would always willingly in her turn minister these offices of Religion, of Charity, and Christian relationship to the members of the Eastern Church on the same terms, as indeed she has always been ready to do, and has as a Church considered herself bound to do."

The Committee are of opinion that if, in accordance with the suggestion of the Patriarch of Alexandria, a like course were pursued with regard to these considerations with that which was carried to a successful issue in regard to Burial, the Intercommunion and Christian relationship at which they aim would be attained¹. The formularising of the above resolutions at Bonn will doubtless facilitate this good work, and prepare the way for that complete recognition of the obligations of Christian brotherhood, which is earnestly desired, not only by many among ourselves, but by large and in-

¹ In his letter of April 10, 1873, to the Secretary of the Committee of the General Convention of the Church of the United States, the Patriarch Sophronius of Alexandria says; "Concerning the extension of the use of the office at the Burial of Anglicans by the orthodox Priests, and the converse, to the case of Baptism, Marriage, and the communion of the all pure Mysteries, we speak our own opinion, that it is necessary as regards this, that an official request, as in the matter of Burial, from the Archbishop of Canterbury, should be a preliminary; and then all the Patriarchs, having had a hearing, can in common announce their opinion." See Report of this Committee, presented July 10th, 1874, p. 5.

creasing numbers of Christians in Germany and the East. They cannot close this Report without thankfully noticing the recent multiplication of acts of Intercommunion which, if informal and unofficial, are yet indications of the general desire for the restoration of what was once the privilege of the whole Church of Christ. Such acts, by increasing mutual knowledge and sympathy among Christians, they are assured will, in God's good time, lead to the fuller recognition of the oneness which still exists in that Body, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

Signed by order of the Committee,

WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L.

Chairman.

Jerusalem Chamber,
May 4th, 1876.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

1. Wir stimmen überein in der Annahme der ökumenischen Symbole und der Glaubensentscheidungen der alten ungetheilten Kirche.
2. Wir stimmen überein in der Anerkennung, dass der Zusatz des Filioque zum Symbolum nicht in kirchlich rechtmässiger Weise erfolgt sei.
3. Wir bekennen uns allerseits zu der Darstellung der Lehre vom h. Geiste, wie sie von den Vätern der ungetheilten Kirche vorgetragen wird.
4. Wir verwerfen jede Vorstellung und jede Ausdrucksweise, in welcher etwa die Annahme zweier Principien oder ἀρχαί oder αἰτλαί in der Dreieinigkeit enthalten wäre.

Wir nehmen die Lehre des heiligen Johannes von Damaskus über den heiligen Geist, wie dieselbe in nachfolgenden Paragraphen ausgedrückt ist, im Sinne der Lehre der alten ungetrennten Kirche an.

1. Der h. Geist geht aus aus dem Vater (ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς als dem Anfang (ἀρχή), der Ursache (αἰτία), der Quelle (πηγή) der Gottheit. (*De Rectâ Sententiâ*, n. 1.: *Contra Manich.* n. 4.)
2. Der h. Geist geht nicht aus aus dem Sohn (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ), weil es in der Gottheit nur Einen Anfang (ἀρχή), Eine Ursache (αἰτία) gibt, durch welche alles, was in der Gottheit ist, hervorgebracht wird. (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 8: ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγεται, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν.)
3. Der h. Geist geht aus aus dem Vater durch den Sohn (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 12: τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντικὴ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς θεότητος δύναμις τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεται. *Ibidem*: Υἱοῦ δὲ Πνεῦμα, οὐχ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύομεν. *C. Manich.* n. 5: διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύομεν. *De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28: Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ λόγου προῖν.)
Hom. in Sabb. s. n. 4: τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἔστι τὸ λατρευόμενον. . . . Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύομεν, ὑπερ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κτίσει μεταδιδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξιν.
4. Der h. Geist ist das Bild des Sohnes, des Bildes des Vaters (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 13: εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα,) aus dem Vater ausgehend und im Sohne ruhend als dessen ausstrahlende Kraft (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 7: τοῦ Πατρὸς προερχομένη καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἀναπαυομένη καὶ αὐτοῦ οὖσαν ἐκφαντικὴ δύναμις. *Ibidem.* i. 12: Πατήρ . . . διὰ λόγου προβαλεῖς ἐκφαντικὸν Πνεύματος.)
5. Der h. Geist ist die persönliche Hervorbringung aus dem Vater, dem Sohne angehörig, aber nicht aus dem Sohn, weil er der Geist des Mundes der Gottheit ist, welcher das Wort ausspricht. (*De Hymno Trisag.* n. 28: τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐννοῦσταν ἐκπόρευμα καὶ πρόβλημα ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν, Υἱοῦ δὲ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ὡς Πνεῦμα στόματος Θεοῦ, λόγου ἐξαγγελτικόν.)
6. Der h. Geist bildet die Vermittlung zwischen dem Vater und dem Sohn und ist durch den Sohn mit dem Vater verbunden. (*De Fide Orthod.* i. 13: μέσον τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ τῷ Πατρὶ συναπτόμενον.)

APPENDIX B.

The dogmatic definition of the Double Procession as held by the Latin Church will be found in the Decretal promulgated in the Second Council of Lyons held by Pope Gregory X. A.D. 1274.

Fideli et devotâ professione fatemur quod Spiritus Sanctus aeternaliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ex uno, non duabus spirationibus, sed unâ spiratione procedit. Hoc professus est et hactenus docuit Sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia mater omnium fidelium et magistra; hoc habet Orthodoxorum Patrum atque Doctorum Latinorum pariter et Graecorum incommutabilis pariter et vera sententia. Sed quia nonnulli irrefragabilis praemissae ignorantia veritatis in errores varios sunt prolapsi, nos huius modi erroribus viam praecludere capientes, sacro approbante Concilio, damnamus et reprobamus omnes, qui negare praesumpserint aeternaliter Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre et Filio procedere, sive etiam ausu temerario asserere, quod Spiritus Sanctus et Patre et Filio, tanquam ex duobus principiis, non tanquam ex uno procedat.

And a full exposition of the doctrine of the Latin Schoolmen is contained in the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, 1^{ma} Pars. Quaest. xxxvi. and xxxvii.

APPENDIX C.

THE DEFINITION OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE, A.D. 1439.

SANCTAE UNIONIS LITTERAE.

Eugenius Episcopus servus servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam; consentiente ad infrascripta charissimo filio nostro Joanne Palaeologo Romanorum Imperatore illustri, et loca tenentibus venerabilium fratrum nostrorum Patriarcharum, et caeteris Orientalem Ecclesiam representantibus. Laetentur coeli, et exultet terra, sublatus est enim de medio paries, qui Occidentalem, Orientalemque dividebat Ecclesiam, et pax, atque concordia rediit, illo angulari lapide Christo, qui fecit utraque unum vinculo fortissimo charitatis, et pacis, unumque iungente parietem; et perpetuae unitatis foedere copulante, ac continente, postque longam moeroris nebulam et difidii diuturni atram, ingrathamque caliginem, serenum omnibus unionis optatae jubar illuxit. Gaudeat et mater Ecclesia, quae filios suos hactenus invicem diffidentes, jam videt in unitatem, pacemque rediisse; et quae antea in eorum separatione amarissime flebat, ex ipsorum modo mira concordia cum ineffabili gaudio omnipotenti Deo gratias referat.

Cuncti gratulentur fideles ubique per orbem, et qui Christiano censetur nomine matri Catholice Ecclesiae collaentur. Ecce enim Occidentales, Orientalesque Patres post longissimum dissensionis, atque concordiae tempus, se maris, ac terrae periculis exponentes, omnibusque superatis laboribus, ad hoc sacrum Œcumenicum Concilium desiderio sacratissimae unionis, et antiquae charitatis reintegrandae gratia, laeti alacresque convenerunt, et intentione sua nequaquam frustrati sunt. Post longam enim, laboriosamque indaginem, tandem, Spiritus Sancti clementia ipsam optatissimam sanctissimamque unionem consecuti sunt.

Quis igitur dignas omnipotentis Dei beneficiis gratias referre sufficiat? Quis autem divinae miserationis divitias non obstupescat? Cuiusve ferreum pectus tanta supernae pietatis magnitudo non molliat? Sunt ista prorsus divina opera, non humanae fragilitatis inventa, atque ideo eximia cum veneratione suscipienda

et divinis laudibus proseguenda. Tibi laus, tibi gloria, tibi gratiarum actio, Christe, fons misericordiarum, qui tantum boni sponse tuae Catholicae Ecclesiae contulisti, atque in generatione nostra tuae pietatis miracula demonstrasti, ut enarrarent omnes mirabilia tua. Magnum siquidem, divinumque munus nobis Deus largitus est oculisque nostris vidimus, quod ante nos multi cum valde cupierint, aspicere nequiverunt. Convenientes enim Latini, et Graeci in hac sacro-sancta Œcumenica Synodo magno studio invicem usi sunt, ut inter alia, etiam articulus ille de divina Spiritus sancti processione summa cum diligentia, et assidua inquisitione discuteretur. Prolati vero testimonis ex divinis Scripturis, plurimisque auctoritatibus Sanctorum Doctorum Orientalium, et Occidentalium, aliquibus quidem ex Patre et Filio, quibusdam vero ex Patre per Filium procedere dicentibus Spiritum Sanctum, et ad eandem intelligentiam aspicientibus omnibus sub diversis vocabulis; Graeci quidem asseruerunt, quod id, quod dicunt Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre procedere, non hac mente proferrent, ut excludant Filium, sed quia eis videbatur (ut aiunt) Latinos asserere Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre, Filioque procedere, tanquam ex duobus principiis, et duabus spirationibus, ideo abstinuerunt a dicendo quod Spiritus S. ex Patre procedat et Filio. Latini vero affirmaverunt, non se hac mente dicere Spiritum S. ex Filioque procedere ut excludant Patrem, quia sit fons, ac principium totius Deitatis, Filii scilicet, et Spiritus Sancti: aut quod id, quod Spiritus S. procedit ex Filio, Filius a Patre non habeat; sive quod duo ponant esse principia, seu duas spirationes, sed ut unum tantum asserant esse principium unicamque spirationem Spiritus Sancti prout hactenus asseruerunt: et cum ex his omnibus unus et idem eliciatur veritatis sensus, tandem in infrascriptam sanctam Deo amabilem eodem sensu, eademque mente unionem unanimiter concordarunt, et consenserunt.

In nomine igitur Sanctae Trinitatis, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, hoc sacro universali approbante Florentino Concilio diffinimus, ut haec fidei veritas ab omnibus Christianis credatur, et suscipiatur, sique omnes profiteantur, quia Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre, et Filio aeternaliter est, et essentiam suam, suumque esse subsistens habet ex Patre simul, et Filio, et ex utroque aeternaliter tanquam ab uno principio, et unica spiratione procedit, declarantes, quod id, quod Sancti Doctores, et Patres dicunt, ex Patre per Filium procedere Spiritum Sanctum, ad hanc intelligentiam tendit, ut per hoc significetur, Filium quoque esse secundum hanc intelligentiam causam, secundum Latinos vero principium subsistentiae Spiritus Sancti, sicut et Patrem. Et quoniam omnia, quae Patris sunt, ipse Pater unigenito Filio suo gignendo dedit, praeter esse Patrem, hoc ipsum, quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit ex Filio, ipse Filius a Patre aeternaliter habet, a quo aeternaliter etiam genitus est. Diffinimus insuper explicationem verborum illorum "Filioque" veritatis declarandae gratiae, et imminente tunc necessitate licite, ac rationabiliter Symbolo fuisse appositam.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
OF
THE EASTERN CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

NEW SERIES.

ALREADY PUBLISHED.

- No. I. A SYNOPSIS OF ORIENTAL CHRISTIANITY.
By ATHELSTAN RILEY. 1902. 8vo., price 3*d.* net.
- No. II. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EAST-
ERN PATRIARCHATES. Lecture delivered at Oxford to
the Summer School of Clergy, Wednesday, 27th July, 1898.
By the Rt. Rev. THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY. With
three Appendices describing the recent relations with the Patriar-
chates. 8vo., sewed, price 1*s.* net.
- No. III. LIST OF BOOKS ON EASTERN CHRISTENDOM.
8vo., sewed, price 3*d.* net.
- No. IV. THE CEREMONIAL USE OF OIL AMONG THE
EAST SYRIANS. By the Rev. F. F. IRVING, B.D., Vicar
of East Clevedon; formerly of the Archbishop of Canterbury's
Mission. 8vo., sewed, price 6*d.* net.
- No. V. THE WORSHIP OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH,
A MANUAL OF INFORMATION, Edited by the Rev. C. R.
DAVEY BIGGS, D.D., Vicar of SS. Philip and James, Oxford,
Secretary of the Eastern Church Association. 8vo., sewed, price
1*s.* net.
- No. VI. EPISTLE OF THE RUSSIAN HOLY SYNOD TO
THE PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, on the Subject
of Reunion. With Introduction by W. J. BIRKBECK, M.A.
8vo., sewed, price 6*d.* net.
- No. VII. THE ESSENTIAL UNITY OF THE CHURCH
OF CHRIST. Extracted from "An Eirenicon" by E. B.
PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of
Christ Church, Oxford. 8vo., sewed, price 6*d.* net.
- No. VIII. Reports made to the Convocation of the Province of
Canterbury, by the Committee on INTERCOMMUNION
WITH THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES, 1865
—1869. Edited by WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L., Vicar of
Alton, Staffordshire, and Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese
of Lichfield. 8vo., sewed, price 6*d.* net.
- No. IX. Reports made to the Convocation of the Province of
Canterbury, by the Committee on INTERCOMMUNION
WITH THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES, 1870
—1872. 8vo., sewed, price 6*d.* net.
- No. X. Reports made to the Convocation of the Province of
Canterbury, by the Committee on INTERCOMMUNION
WITH THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCHES, 1874
—1876. Edited by WILLIAM FRASER, D.C.L., Vicar of
Alton, Staffordshire, and Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese
of Lichfield. 8vo., sewed, price 1*s.* net.

JAMES PARKER AND CO., 27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD;
AND 31 BEDFORD-STREET, STRAND, LONDON.