

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXII.

ARTICLE I.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

All branches of the Christian Church hold to an apostolical succession in some sense; for without it there is no ground upon which they can claim, with the slightest color of plausibility, a divine sanction for their existence. Presbyterians, for example, hold that they have the doctrine, the polity, the worship, which were taught and ordained by the apostles. They hold that the succession is to be determined, not by history or tradition, but by a direct appeal to writings which are not only more ancient than the writings of the *Fathers*, but have, according to the confessions of these Fathers themselves, a *divine* authority—the writings of the Apostles. The body which now holds the doctrine of justification without the works of the law, is, *pro tanto*, a truer succession of the church to which the Epistle to the Romans was addressed, than the church now at Rome which denies that doctrine and curses all who hold it. The body which is now governed by a presbytery is a truer successor of the church of Ephesus which was also governed by a presbytery in the days of Paul, than a church of the present day which is governed by a prelate, an officer of which the apostolic records

VOL. XXIII., NO. 3.—1.

enough to receive it. God says so, and it has not yet come to pass that his word has failed.

But let a different course be adopted, let some other way than God's way be tried, let them compromise and scale and shirk their duty as they may—let them attempt by any device, however plausible, to rob God, and the windows of heaven will still be shut, and the overflowing blessing will not come down.

People tell us they cannot afford to give. Can they afford to do without giving? Can they bear the consequences of attempting to rob God? Can they stand it if the drought still continues and the windows of heaven stay shut and the abundant blessing is withheld? They lose and do not gain by keeping back the Lord's portion.

No church under the heavens can have its welfare and efficiency advanced—no church can have the elements of real prosperity that does not honestly and fully meet its pecuniary obligations. NO MEAT, NO BLESSING.

ARTICLE IV.

THE GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Extension and Prestige.—The greater part of the Protestant people of Europe and this country are apt to look upon the Roman Catholic body as if it were distinctively and almost exclusively the Traditionist and non-Protestant element of the Christian world. Herein is a great error; and it has very important practical bearings upon the Tradition controversy, the fundamental one of all the controversies which Protestants have to wage in the battle for truth.* It is probable that our prox-

*These bearings and the importance of them the writer of this article will probably undertake to show in a future number of the *Review*.

imity to the great non-evangelical body just named, and the actual struggle of centuries which Protestantism has had to carry on, in many cases even unto blood and death, have been the means of making this impression.

But, placing ourselves, in imagination, at some point near the centre of Europe, and looking eastward, we behold another nominal Christian body which claims equal authenticity and authority with the Roman Catholic as the representative of the primitive and apostolic Church, and with a better show of a great and even primeval antiquity, looking at the question upon the premises of formal and traceable lineage, her proximity to the original seats of Christianity, and her undoubted possession and use in church services from the very first of the New Testament Scriptures in the language in which they were written, the language spoken, in the early ages, by nearly all of her people, and which, even now, whether intelligently or not, being an antique tongue and not well understood by the masses, nevertheless they employ a large part of them as the medium of their worship—not to speak of the venerable Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, certainly sometimes used as it was sometimes quoted by our Saviour and the Apostles, which, adopting as her version of that part of the Bible, she has also kept in use in her services in the original Greek, from the earliest times, among the Greek-speaking people who for ten centuries formed almost the whole, and even now make up so large a part of her communion. If the first-named Church may affect a proud prestige on any of the grounds above referred to, the latter one can show something yet more imposing. And if the Roman Catholic Church, as residing in more populous parts, can boast larger numbers, in the proportion of one hundred and fifty against sixty-five or seventy millions, the territory of the nations and races belonging to this great communion of the East is vastly more extensive even than her's, at least upon the eastern hemisphere. From the frozen margins of the Arctic and the shores of the Baltic southward and eastward, to the sunny climes of the farthest southerly parts of Greece and Asia Minor, and the borders of Syria and regions lying beyond the Black

Sea, even to the Caspian, her spiritual domain extends itself. It is not only as large as the eastern empire, at the time of its greatest extent, after its separation from the western, in the last years of the 4th century, but probably even larger, inasmuch as the greater part of Russia in Europe and Russia in Asia, as well as the territories of the other Slavonic tribes east of the former have been added to it by the adoption of her faith since that time; most of these last having been brought in during the 9th century. Russia in fact has been acquired since the great ecclesiastical schism of the east and west. And, beside the countries in which this form of Christianity is the prevailing one, it numbers a good many scattered children in Austria (where there are ten bishoprics) in the one direction, and among the inhabitants of Syria and adjacent countries in the other.

To this great division of Christendom we commonly apply the name of the "Greek Church;" probably from its coincidence in territory and professing population with the eastern, so often called the Greek empire, and its being for the greater part of the first ten centuries after Christ, to so great an extent, the Church of the populations of Hellenic blood and speech. But she assumes for herself the title of "the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church of the Orthodox," to which, in her ecclesiastical utterances, and in publications made under the sanction of the Church, the significant prefix is added which makes it "The One, Holy," etc. In ordinary language, however, she is commonly styled by her own people distinctively and simply the Anatolic Church. This title, as more correct and descriptive than the one common among us, of the "Greek Church," will be used generally in the present article.

The Great Schism of the "Catholic" Body.—The removal of the imperial capital, on the part of Constantine the Great, in the early part of the 4th century, which turned Byzantium into the splendid city that still bears his name, laid the first stone that paved the way for the great ecclesiastical separation which was afterwards to take place. The division, of what

had been the "world" of Roman conquest and dominion, by the Emperor Theodosius, at his death, between his two sons, and constituting from A. D. 395 the empires of the east and west, still more decidedly prepared the way for it. The rivalry between the ambitious and dominating sees of Rome and Constantinople began to exhibit itself, during the 7th century, in angry disputes, which, while they were mostly about doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters, few of them of any moment were really the products of a feeling lying back of them. The result as every reader knows, was the great Church schism of the ninth century, which, aside from the real causes just referred to, had scarcely a pretext, except in the war of words about the question of the "procession of the Holy Ghost."

That separation, almost strictly coincident with the two imperial divisions of the political world, has remained to the present day with almost the same boundaries which each of the ecclesiastical parties had at the time it took place. In fact it is worthy of notice, and seems to show that ecclesiastical are stronger than civil ties, that while the eastern and western empires of the political world have so long since gone to pieces, and the parts of each have been so frequently and variously remoulded, the great spiritual empires of eastern and western Christendom have to a great extent stood as they were in their component parts, when ten centuries ago they were resolved into the two.

And any one at all acquainted with the case can see that the separation is irreconcilable. With the lapse of ages, the points of divergency have multiplied and become sharper. The parties do not even recognise each other as having any proper ecclesiastical existence. The Church of Rome, and the Oriental Catholic Church, each claims to be, exclusively, the lineal and proper descendant and representative of the primitive, Apostolic Church. It is *the* Church—the one and only Church of God on earth. This, as regards the latter of the two, in its aspects toward Protestantism will be more fully shown in the course of this article. But the Anatolic Church is not only independent of, but antagonistic to, the other great non-Protestant sect. Hatred to the papacy, as a bastard and usurping pretension to

the true apostolic descent, animates her utterances as a Church and the spirit of the people of her wide-spread communion, everywhere. In some cases where the power was possessed, each of these proud claimants of apostolicity has actually persecuted the adherents of the other; and to the good High Church people of England and this country, who, though it may be with some affliction to themselves, are yet called Protestants, but seek to suck the breasts of some old mother that is held to be of the true apostolic lineage, and who pay their regards alternately to both these aforesaid ones, it may afford some good nuts to crack that either of the two scorns to acknowledge the other, and each claims to be the only true mother and mistress of the house; while each, as we shall see presently to be true of the one as of the other, repudiates the "Protestant sects," no matter of how high pretension, as one and all, nothing but the merest bastards. If the term be not dignified, it is not too bad for them to use of us.

The Anatolic Church and the Oriental Sects.—In its great outlines, the history of that great division of nominal Christendom, which we are now treating of, is pretty well known by common readers of Church history. But a brief review, giving the history in its connection, will probably be of some interest to those who read this article, while it will afford the opportunity of correcting some errors and supplying some deficiencies in the common accounts. From the Council of Chalcedon, which in the 5th century nullified the doings of the Council of Ephesus and separated Eutyches and his Monophysite followers from what was called the "orthodox" body, oriental Christendom has been divided, according to Mosheim, mainly into three parts, in some regions, however, coincident, in part, as to the territory that they cover; the "Orthodox" (Greek) Church, or that body "which is in communion with the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople"—the sects, Monophysite and Nestorian, which dissent from the Latin and Greek Churches—and those eastern Christians who acknowledge the Pope. A late English writer (Dean Stanley) makes the three-

fold division also, but his classification is made out by putting the various branches of the Monophysites as the second, and the Nestorians as the third of the parts. The Christians of the "one nature" doctrine prevail in Syria, Egypt, Ethiopia, etc.; those of the "double person" dogma are found farther eastward. But these last (the Nestorians) have dwindled to a mere fragment; and even the former of these two divisions is of insignificant dimensions and importance by the side of the great Greek and Latin communions.

Government and Doctrine of the Headship.—As the ambition and rivalry of the two ecclesiastical monarchies of Rome and Constantinople precipitated the great schism of the 9th century, it hardly needs to be stated that the eastern Catholic body or "Greek Church" repudiates the Pope, in respect to all his claims as such. And while she has her patriarchs in most of the countries where the Church exists, to whom belongs the presidency of the Church in those countries, and among these the Patriarch of Constantinople holds somewhat of a conceded primacy, yet even he is not an œcumenical bishop, and she does not regard him or any living person as the vicergerent of Christ; but professes to hold Christ himself as the only true head of the Church.

The government of the Anatolic Church, even where the patriarchal form exists (and we shall see presently that it does not everywhere in this communion) may be said to be in a great measure synodal. Each of the patriarchs has a council ("synod") composed of the higher prelates of his jurisdiction. All councils, representing one or more patriarchates, have authority to the extent of the jurisdiction of the prelates sitting in them. But the "power of the keys," according to the "orthodox" faith, resides supremely in the œcumenical councils; those that this Church recognises as having been legitimately held in the past, and any that may in the future be convoked, if that should ever be. No council regarded as œcumenical has been held since the separation from Rome.

Four patriarchates are in existence—those of Antioch, Jerusa-

lem, and Alexandria, beside the Constantinopolitan. They are all, perhaps, by the creed of the Church, equal in rank; but in fact the last named interposes its dictation in the appointment of the incumbents of the others, under the form of nomination or a signature of confirmation, or both. The patriarchs are all of them nominally elected by the vote of certain prelates in each jurisdiction to whom the suffrage belongs. But the head of that grand see which has its seat at the Turkish capital, though he is thus, in form, chosen by the voice of the Church, holds his office very much at the pleasure of an outside overshadowing power—that of the Sultan. His spiritual jurisdiction extends over all “the Orthodox” populations of Europe east of Russia, including Moldavia, Wallachia, Bulgaria, and all of Turkey in Europe; but leaving out independent Greece; and reaches on the other side of the Hellespont as far as Cilicia in Asia Minor. This takes in the six or eight millions of Greeks (of the ancient Macedonia, etc.) who form the plurality of the population of European, and two or three millions more of Asiatic Turkey. Under the peculiar system by which the Turkish Government has for ages in a great measure governed its Christian subjects—beginning now to be somewhat modified—that of making the head of each religious denomination or “community” in the empire, to some extent responsible for the raising of the taxes paid by its people, etc., and giving, on the other hand, to that ecclesiastical representative, some investment of secular power—the Constantinopolitan arch-prelate, despite the creed of his Church in regard to the pure headship of Christ’s body, has exercised, as a matter of fact, the power very much of a pope, through most of the ages past. In our own day he has assumed at times a power almost equivalent, against Protestant missions. The other and more eastern patriarchates are, comparatively, of small consideration. While that of Constantinople counts up one hundred and thirty-five metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops; the patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria number, respectively, but sixteen, twelve, and four. But all included in these last numbers are ranked as metropolitans.

Some are merely nominal or titular, as those of Montenegro and Mt. Sinai.

The Church in Russia.—It was in the 10th century—the one just following the great religious schism of the east and west—that the Anatolic Church gained, by the conversion of her people, the important accession of Russia to her communion. But this was not owing to any evangelistic zeal on her part, for it was mainly brought about by the conversion of the Princess Olga, resulting from a visit which she made to Constantinople in 955, and the conversion after her death, but through her instrumentality, of her grand-son Vladimir. The Church in that country was attached to the See of Constantinople till, under the instigation of the Grand-Duke Theodore, and the influence of motives brought to bear upon Jeremiah, second patriarch of Constantinople, a Russian patriarchate was established in the year 1593, having some connection with and subordination to the Constantinopolitan primacy; which conditions however were abolished during the next century. The Anatolic Church was inclined to regard this Russian patriarchate which made up the number of five as taking the place which the Roman, as the former Church considers, left vacant by defection. The fact just now mentioned, of the acquisition of Russia to the domain of the Anatolic ecclesiastical power, in connection with the manner of its taking place, suggests an important observation, namely, that the Greek Church (so called) has for ages past, as to the matter of extension, remained not only to a great extent stationary, with the above exception, but almost entirely inert. In regard to any propagandism, the fact or spirit of it, she has shown since the 9th century about as little as her neighbor religion, the Mohammedan, has done in its more recent history; and it is curious to observe how the two have stood for ages side by side; the one hating the other with a hatred supreme, but making scarce the shadow of an effort toward proselyting each other or any other of the religious divisions of the world.

The Russian patriarchate continued for a little over a century, and was then swallowed up by the despotism of the secular power; for the great Peter I., liberal though he was, and enlightened in many of his ideas, yet, thinking this hierarchical power too much of an *imperium in imperio*, abolished the office, established that of "Exarch," with prerogatives limited within the consent of other bishops and the reference of very grave matters to the crown; and then in 1720 abolished this and set up the "Holy, Legislative Synod," composed of persons chosen by the Czar himself from the higher clergy, to exercise supreme spiritual jurisdiction in the Church of the Russias. Over this, too, in behalf of the imperial master, who claims to be at least the secular head of the ecclesiastical establishment of his empire, a lay representative of the Czar—a sort of "lord high commissioner," but one clothed with real and substantial powers, in the way of supervision and control, presides.

The Church in the Kingdom of Greece.—The same constitution of things, in the feature of the primacy, has been followed in the Church establishment of the Kingdom of Greece. When, after the sanguinary and desolating war of the Greeks from 1821 to 1828 had been terminated by the intervention of the three European allied powers and the battle of Navarino, these powers (France, Russia, and Great Britain) set up this kingdom, with a territory extending from the Southern borders of the ancient Thessaly and Epirus, and including, though it be so small a domain, (not fifteen thousand square miles), yet all of the territory of the famous ancient Greek republics, from Phocis and Locris to Lacedemon. Most of the islands were attached; but the Sultan still retains Scio and the islands along the Asia Minor shore of the Archipelago, with Rhodes and the grand isle of Crete. The Ionian islands, lying west and southwest of Greece, inhabited by a Greek population, and forming for a time the Septinsular Republic, latterly under the so-called "protectorate" of Great Britain, have been added, by cession, to the nationality. The Greeks that achieved their independence, numbering only one million, (now one and a half,) out of

the many millions of their race this side the Hellespont, had not much idea of having, as their ecclesiastical primate, one who is officially so much a creature of the Sultan. They, therefore, after the example of Russia, established a national Church of the Anatolic communion, the supreme authority of which resides in what is called the "Holy Synod" of the kingdom. This body is composed of five regular members appointed by the king, one of them as president; and the royal power* appoints at pleasure extraordinary or supernumerary members; the first named or regular members, from the higher ranks of the clergy; the latter class from the ordinary secular clergy and the monastic body which exists yet in Greece, but in very limited numbers. Beside these, there is a royal commissioner ("epitropos"), and a secretary, both appointed by the king and actively representing the government in the deliberations and doings of the Synod.

We have now disposed of the main parts of this vast religious community, as respects the matters organism and locality. There is unity among these different parts in the recognition of common synodal authority; of the same ancient councils and sources of tradition, and doctrines and canons proceeding from them; and of the same forms of worship and ceremonies. The Georgians and Mingrelians inhabiting the ancient Iberia and Colchis are in the outskirts of the extension of the Anatolic Church. They have an independent primacy, filled by what they call a "Catholic;" and their religion is in a very debased condition, as they themselves are, especially the latter race.

DOCTRINAL AND SPIRITUAL STATE.

We come now to the branch of our subject which is far the most important, namely—the internal state of this great Church, as respects her doctrines, worship, spiritual state, and dispositions toward the Protestant churches. This is a question in itself of the greatest historic interest, especially to a Christian mind. But it has now become one of vast practical moment. The

*Such was the original mode of the constitution of the body, and is believed to be still.

greatest movement of our age is the awakening of the Christian body—the true Church of Christ, in its different evangelical branches—to the work of gospel propagation. In her outlook of that great undertaking, next after the papal regions, and right in her path to the vast unevangelised Orient of Mohammedanism and Paganism, she finds this great nominal Christian body extending its dominion over some of the fairest lands and most interesting races of our globe. Are the populations of her communion evangelised? If not, will she do it for them? And will she, in our world-work of evangelisation, be a friend and ally, or turn her power against us? Shall she be a dispenser, or must she be herself a recipient of a saving evangel?

Variant Opinions among Protestants.—Strange and wide has been the diversity on this question among Protestants. This has been owing in a measure no doubt to the want of accurate information about the Anatolic Christians, induced by their geographical remoteness and want of intercourse with them. And some circumstances have tended to mislead public opinion in the Protestant western world—such as the degree of liberty in the circulation and reading of the Scriptures, existing in many parts of this communion, not always owing to the liberal disposition of the Church itself, but defended by members of the communion in Greece, on the ground of its being according to the fathers; as also the decline of monasticism, and the absence amongst a large part of the membership of this body, of the extreme bigotry and persecuting spirit which so much prevail in the papal body. And it is surprising to see how much of error and misinformation exist, even to the present time, in regard to matters of fact of such importance, and, as it would seem, so ascertainable. We sometimes, even now, in respectable periodicals of this country and Great Britain, find the “Greek Church” spoken of as something like a semi-evangelical body, and quite removed from the category in which the Roman Church stands. Such a sentiment recently appeared in print, “on both sides the water,” from an eminent dignitary of the English Church.

VOL. XXIII., NO. 3.—6.

On several notable occasions in our own day—the history of which cannot be given in the present article, but which is so entertaining and instructive that it might well merit being given to the public at another time—the Episcopal Church, of England and of this country, has made friendly and deferential approaches to the Anatolic Church, as represented in the persons of those who occupy its high places, seeking to convey the tribute of recognition from the first named parties, but, we may believe, much more humbly and eagerly craving to be recognised. It does not come within our present province to describe, amusing as it might be, the polite but cool manner in which these advances were received. The facts are now referred to, as showing the sentiment held by a respectable portion of the Protestant body in regard to the Greek Catholic Church.

And though the far larger part of the evangelical and pious men, who have gone as missionaries to the Mediterranean countries where this form of Christianity is found, have soon come to the conclusion that it is non-evangelical and anti-evangelical, nearly as much so on most points as the Roman Catholic; yet there have been some, among those who have gone in a missionary capacity, from Protestant churches, who have acted on the principle of recognising and reverencing the Greek Church, at least as if it were a true, holy and venerable Church of Christ, from which separation is not to be encouraged; but whose members are rather to be cultured in religion within her own fold, while continuing and encouraged to discharge most scrupulously all her most anti-Protestant forms. On this principle the mission—mainly an educational one, (and really a handsome and valuable one, considered as a mere educational establishment,)—of the American Episcopal Church, at Athens, Greece, has been conducted for forty years, by their representative (the Rev. J. H. Hill), and is still, unless his resignation has changed the course of things. The unexampled management displayed in this case, how a good face could be kept to the venerable “Orthodox Church,” on the one hand, and on the other to the Low-Church and more evangelical of the Church at home that sent him out, might be one of the curious studies of history: but there is not

time to dwell upon it, our present purpose is more important, and the Rev. Dr. Andrews of the Episcopal Church itself, much to his honor, has fully exposed the matter. One of the missionaries of the "American and Foreign Christian Union," too, a native Greek, educated in this country, has actually and recently made this a point of dissent from his colleague, Dr. Kalopothakes, of the mission at Athens; and both of them feel it, and justly, to be a radical difference—the first maintaining that the introduction of evangelical religion among people of the Anatolic Church, is to take place in and through this Church itself.* Dr. K. holds the contrary view, and is acting upon it, in the interesting undertaking, which is even now, while these lines are traced, going through its initiative, and perhaps a crisis of peril, in the organisation, as an evangelical Church, of a little band of Bible-taught believers, and the establishment of a pure Christian worship in a church edifice recently built by the aid of friends in this country and England, at Athens—the first ever erected for evangelical worship, as conducted by Greeks† and in their own beautiful tongue, in modern times, on the soil of Greece. Dr. K., it will be remembered, is a member of one of the Presbyteries of our Southern Church.

The question referred to is, therefore, a very practical one; and it is high time, in its relation to the great work of the Church, aside from its historic interest, that it should be settled, and settled aright. And true it is, we may say, in the outset, that all the errors of the Roman Catholic Church are not held in the Greek—one important one at least, is not—that of the papal supremacy. And some are held in mitigated form, or not carried out in such gross abuses in the Anatolic body, *e. g.* in its practice of praying for the dead, with not quite so much of a professed purgatory, and the less gross idolatry of "the host," in connection with transubstantiation. But what if the poison-

*Happily for all parties, he has now resigned his connection with the union.

†The excellent Dr. Jonas King for many years kept up a weekly preaching service for Greeks, but it was on his own premises, and there was no organised body, then, of converted Greeks.

ous plant or venomous reptile be not in one case so fully grown and so dangerously active; the deadly juice, the fatal fang are there; and poison is poison, and not good to give people; and a snake is a snake, a scorpion a scorpion, everywhere.

The people too of the "Greek communion, generally, and many of the clergy, especially of those belonging to the lower ranks, who are often too ignorant to know or care much about differences, or see the drift of missionary efforts, show less bigotry than the Papists. But we must separate, in such a case, between the dispositions of the people, and even of individuals among the clergy, and that which is the ordained and established doctrine of the Church incorporated into its very being. It is the former, as evinced to travellers, and even to missionaries, in first intercourse, that have tended to promote the illusions which have prevailed. These illusions, in the case of all missionaries who do not go under some peculiar bias, are soon dispelled. And these apparent good dispositions are very apt to disappear the nearer truth approaches and the more fully it reveals itself. Especially is this true of the clergy; but most of all, in general, of the more intelligent of them, who are but the more sagacious to perceive the irreconcilable difference between their system and ours. Men who are attached to a false system "love the darkness rather than the light," and the more clearly the light is revealed, the more they hate it. But it is the latter, the expressed creed, the prescribed worship and observances of a Church, that properly determine what that Church is.

Capability of being Vitalised.—And when we come to investigate, what do we find, in the actual facts of the case, to justify the hope that the Anatolic Church will go with us hand in hand, in the work of instructing her people, or any other of the earth's populations, in a true gospel? Glad as we might be to find it so, the proof is all to the contrary; and the writer of this, having had something of an unusual occasion and opportunity of making the investigation, well remembers the irresistible conviction forcing itself upon his mind, and the painful impression accompanying it, as at one time he pursued this inquiry; that impres-

sion becoming deeper and more painful as he turned over successive pages of the numerous and ponderous tomes that embody the creed and worship of the great "Orthodox" body, so called.

But before we proceed to look at the proofs on the question, there is a remark to be made, namely—that, if the body now spoken of be a true Church, even one of the parts of the true body of Christ, we might expect to find something of a gospel influence emanating from it upon the non-Christian races—at least those in immediate contact with it. But where has the "Greek" Church done the least particle of such work for ages upon ages past? What good and saving influence has she thrown out upon Mohammedanism? Except the most few and sporadic cases of conversion, occurring through the influence merely of outside circumstances, and counterbalanced by the equally numerous, or rather un-numerous cases, produced by like causes, of conversion the other way, she has expended her zeal on the question in teaching her children to hate all the Turks and Mussulmen with a perfect hatred.

And then, if this body be one that is possessed of enough of God's truth and the character of a true Church to cooperate with us in promoting the gospel, her bosom ought to have at least enough of vital warmth to keep alive some degree of piety amongst her numerous children. But, if any one, with proper opportunities, and without prejudice, will pursue investigation on this point, he will come to the conclusion that, if there be cases of true piety among the members of this communion, they too are merely sporadic, and that they exist, not properly as an effect of the general teachings and influence of their Church, but rather in spite of her errors, and against her predominant influence leading almost all around them in a false way;—these few spoken of, finding some of the gold amid the heaps of dross—all the rest discerning nothing but the rubbish that is piled over it. But where one comes into contact with the people of this faith, in the thorough way that a missionary does, how sad, generally, the results of his observation—how full of disappointment in some cases! Better, it is true; any form of Christianity than none. Twilight is not an entire remove from day; and

even under a total eclipse of the sun, some of his light gets to us; and it is not the darkness of midnight. There is so much of heavenly power in the gospel, that its most faint and oblique rays make, anywhere, less of a polar winter. But as to vital, spiritual religion among the people of this great communion, there is a sad and terrible eclipse. The words are on the lips; the technology of piety is volubly used;—certainly so among the Greeks, and said to be so everywhere else in the communion;—you would think at first that you were talking with some of the most pious people in the world; and this has misled even missionaries at first. But alas! you soon find that, under this outward show, there is an utter want of true spiritual perception and understanding,—the shell without the kernel;—that every body is a Christian from baptism, and that repentance and faith, in their vocabulary, or rather, in their minds and hearts, have a meaning that falls far short, practically, of the true and saving one. Dr. Andrews, (to whom reference has already been made,) after a residence of half a year in the Levant, in which he “made constant inquiries of missionaries and pious foreign residents,” while he justly says that we are not to assume that there are no cases of saving piety in the bosom of the Anatolic Church,—none where the person has groped the way to sufficient light and savingly apprehended Christ, despite the errors he was taught,—yet states, as the testimony of the persons above referred to, when asked “whether they had ever met with any,” (Dr. A. means of those who had not been brought under influences from outside their Church,) “who would be regarded as being, in the Protestant sense of the term, converted persons,” the reply, in every case was, “not one.”

And it must be remembered that, in our present investigation, the question is not whether individuals, in this or any other nominal Christian Church may be saved, in spite of its errors and mal-teachings; but what the Church itself is, and whether it is a Church of such character as to fit it for accomplishing the evangelistic agency for which Christ's Church was established; which means the diffusion and promotion of truth and saving influences among men. Such a Church ought not only to be, in

the main, evangelical, but, in its spirit, to be in sympathy with the truth it teaches. And can any man "in his senses," that is at all acquainted with the facts of the case, be so wild as to affirm that these predicates are true of the great Church of the East?

But, if they are not true, then truth and spiritual vitality have to be infused into her through some agency operating from without. Let us now look into that question.

Impracticability of reform within itself.—Even if it be a supposable case that the Eastern Catholic Church, in distinction from its great rival, the Roman Catholic, can be reformed, how would one go about so huge and monstrous an undertaking? First, the clergy, teachers and leaders of the Church would have to be converted to evangelic faith;—certainly a commanding majority of them, else no reform of the Church could be effected; for the prevalence of right sentiment among the people, not having their clergy with them, could only result in secession. And, even if the clergy and the people were together, in the main, so disposed, how would the vast process of purgation and reform be elaborated? To bring about this preparatory change of general sentiment might itself require years upon years, if indeed it could ever be accomplished as regards the clergy; for the ministers of a false creed and all who have a material interest in supporting it are generally the last to be converted, very commonly oppose "to the bitter end," and are not converted at all. How long would gospel propagation have had to linger, if the conversion of the chief-priests and scribes and members of the Sanhedrim had been waited for? And then, suppose them disposed to act in the case, how would they go about it, and how long would the work take? How many councils would have to be called? How many sessions would they sit, and how many years? Pope Pius IX's late council sat an incubation of months upon the one single doctrine of Infallibility; the Council of Trent, which only did tinkering and mending and strengthening of the old points, consumed eighteen years and twenty-five sessions about it. And our own General Assembly has spent some half-dozen years in the revision simply of its Book of Discipline,

and the Church has groaned and labored and, as some brethren, at least, prophecy to us, been almost convulsed, even over this not vital matter. How would the elements have to work and heave in the tremendous process of this vast Anatolic reform, and when would the end come? If our little book, or piece of a book, costs us such time and trouble, what will learned doctors do when they come to expurgate and amend and substitute and define, all through the piles of huge volumes that contain the canons, creeds, and liturgies of the Anatolic Church; the latter themselves (the liturgies) being so extended and multitudinous as to require on the part of the priest a strain of speed which has become an art and is most marvellous, to one unaccustomed to it, in order to accomplish even the reading of them, in the space of the two hundred and fifty fast and festival days which this Church keeps, in a year! The idea of a reform in and of either the Latin or the Greek Church is, in every point of view, preposterous; and the truth is, those Protestants who have ever talked or written favorably about it in regard to the latter, have had nothing but the most vague and crude ideas on the subject.

And if there were no other objection in the case, what can be the advantage in operating upon the populations now within the pale of this Church, or any other, through old, complicated and cumbrous forms, rather than by the establishment, *de novo*, of churches with simple, evangelic forms, as well as faith? What an absurdity in fact to take, for a given work, an old machine, merely because it is old, that is no longer upon the simple, original and effective plan, but found to have a vast accumulation of parts and appendages added on from time to time, till now it has become monstrously clumsy and cumbrous; while there stands by us, or can at once be constructed, a simple but beautiful and perfect machine, after the true, original, and unimprovable pattern;—more especially if the old one, though it makes a great rattling and noise, to the senseless admiration of many, yet in the actual experiment turns out, and has for generations turned out, nothing of any value!

But the old machine is worse than useless. Nominal and corrupted Christianity is worse than valueless. The Papacy, in

Western Europe and Southern America, actually stands in the way of the evangelisation of those parts of our globe. It has always, in fact, been the strongest and worst foe of a true gospel. And so it is in regard to the other grand and false form of Christianity, that calls itself the only true and Catholic Church of Christ, as to its influence over the peoples who own their spiritual allegiance to it. It stands in the way; it is, in fact, if not in so strongly manifested degree as in the case of the former, an enemy, not a friend.

The more any true Protestant explores the doctrines, worship, usages, and spiritual state of the great Church of which we are now speaking, the more he will find the proof that it is utterly incapable of being reformed by any process short of entire demolition and reconstruction. And the Greek Church would itself heartily consent to the challenge of all or nothing.

We need not take much time for the evidence. Dr. Andrews has given it, to his Episcopal brethren of this country, in a few pages of his pamphlet entitled, "Historic Notes of Protestant Missions to the Oriental Churches,"—drawn forth by the discussions in that Church in regard to their missions in Greece. In some of our present quotations, his extracts, for convenience, will be used, as being ready to hand.

Tradition—Doctrine, Authority, Sources.—We may affirm, in the general, what is certainly true, that, with the single exception of the doctrine of Papacy, *i. e.* of the human headship, as held by the Roman Catholic Church, there is not one of the important non-Protestant and anti-evangelical doctrines of this last named Church which is not essentially held by the Greek Catholic, and held as an irreversible part of her creed. First of all, and fundamental to all, she acknowledges tradition as the authoritative and infallible exponent of the word and will of God; and even places it, as we shall presently see, quite on a level as to authority, with Scripture itself. She pronounces the first seven œcumenical councils—those which she regards as such, (though distinctively from the Roman Catholic Church as to the validity of some of them,) to be, along with those whom she

•

honors as "Fathers" of the Church, and who utter their coincident sentiment, the true and unerring standards of faith, to all orthodox believers and all the world. And it will throw light on our general subject to see, while we give the list, what some of these councils determined, on questions aside from tradition itself for all the believing. After those of Nice, in 325, and Constantinople, in 381, and those of Ephesus and Chalcedon, in the years 431 and 451, we find, in her accredited list, that of the year 553, at Constantinople, then comes what was sometimes styled the Penthect, as being somewhat supplementary to the fifth, but generally regarded in the Anatolic Church as the sixth held at Constantinople, in 691; and the second of Nice in 783, makes the seventh and last.* Going back as far even as the Council of Ephesus, we find Nestorius condemned, in part, for deprecating the dangerous if not blasphemous term, "Theotokos;" and the very church in which the council held its sessions was a building styled, as Greek writers tell us, "the church of 'Mary Theotokos.'" That of Chalcedon made itself an unenviable reputation by condemning such a man as John Chrysostom. The fifth, while it condemned the errors of Origen, laid the foundations of the present Greek ritual, especially in points where it differs from the Latin, but embodying many of the corruptions of creed and worship which, as Protestants, we most repudiate. The Constantinopolitan (Trullan) Council, reckoned by the Anatolic Church as the sixth, sanctioned, directly or indirectly, many such superstitions. But the second Nicene, numbered by this Church as the seventh œcumenical, put on the cap-stone of traditional authority and of all the superstitions now, for so many ages, forming structural parts of the Anatolic faith and forms.†

*This is the list given in the "Pedalion," a collection of the canons of the Synods, published under the sanction of the heads of the Anatolic Church. It omits the one of Constantinople in 680; probably not acknowledged, in the Eastern Church, because of the part taken by the Roman pontiff in getting it up.

†No really universal council has been held, as before remarked in this article, since the separation from Rome. But some of the Anatolic Church

Looking over the utterances of some of these latter synods, one is struck with the fact that, instead of founding their dogmas and decrees on the Word of God, they refer to previous councils as the final authority. But looking at them all, especially the latter ones, we have to say to every Protestant, as he studies what came from them, behold the fountains of sacred, immaculate, infallible tradition! Bow down thyself at them!

Tradition.—But our present concern is specifically with the doctrine of Tradition. On this subject the Synod of Constantinople decreed as follows: “We believe the Scriptures without doubting; *not otherwise, however, than as the Catholic Church has interpreted it. . . . The testimony of the Catholic Church we believe not inferior to what is contained in Scripture.*”

A noted correspondence too, was conducted, in 1723, between the archbishops of the English Church and the Patriarch of Constantinople, having along with him the other three patriarchs of the Anatolic Church—those of Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria—the matter initiated by the former of the parties. It drew forth on this great point, from the latter, the following: “That the Scriptures are the word of God; but tradition and the acts of the first eight œcumenical councils, *being of the same origin as the Scriptures are to be of equal authority with them.*” The specious argument contained in this quotation will be noticed. It shows the more strongly what a deep foundation the Tradition doctrine has, in the minds of those who receive it.

But the Greek Catholic Church is fully committed to the doctrine, as much so as the Roman. And it is the great, ultimate, fundamental heresy of all heresies held by professed Christians—the great point of divergence from evangelic truth, and from all that we cherish of our faith as Protestants. You can do nothing with the man of the Roman or Greek communion, in

writers of late ages,—among them Plato, archbishop of Moscow,—refer to “eight” œcumenical councils. They probably include that held at Jerusalem, after so great an interval, in 1672. So too the Patriarchs of the Anatolic Church, in their letter above mentioned, to the primates of the English Church, reckon the number.

converting him from his errors, however palpable, till this foundation is knocked from under him; for of what avail will it be to put before his eyes the language of the decalogue, as plain as human words could ever be made, about certain of his practices of worship, while he can tell you, the Church teaches us how to understand the first and second commandments, and her authority is as high as any; it is final. How can you drive a man, by Scripture itself, into the acknowledgment of the doctrine of a free justification, available through simple faith, while he can produce the authority of the Church, which he believes is its unerring expounder and constituted oracle, to inform him and you that works concur with faith, in justification. Every one that, as a missionary or otherwise, has had practically to come in contact with the differences between ourselves and the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, has been made to feel the tremendous, overshadowing power of this arch-heresy, and to realise, as never otherwise, the impressive import of those words of our Saviour, "Ye have made the word of God of none effect by your traditions." In fact we may say that this doctrine has been Satan's prime and masterly device for corrupting the faith of the Church and for entrenching and defending error, through the ages past, of the Church's brooding desolation. On the ground of this question it was, mainly, that the great battle of the Reformation had to be fought, and was won; for win here, and the field is our's for truth. And any Church that holds to tradition, and in the most gross and pernicious statement of it, as the Anatomic Church does, is radically degenerate, and even apostate. This is shown by the language currently used by its writers; for, while they speak of the Scripture writers as "θεόπνευστοι" ("theopneustoi,") they constantly do honor to the councils and fathers as "θεοφόροι" ("theophoroi.") And it is notorious that, as a matter of fact, in this great communion, it is the Church, (in its traditional authorities) more by far than the word of God, that is referred to in determining religious questions.

But does this Church hold, in the detail, the false doctrines and corrupt, and even idolatrous practices, which as Protestants we repudiate and abhor in the Roman Catholic faith and

worship?—every one of them, with the only one important exception heretofore specified, of the Papal primacy. She may not, practically, carry out some of them in such extremes of their exhibition as her sister in apostacy. But they are there; and the sentiment, the worship, the piety, (such as it is,) of the whole Church is thoroughly imbued with them. They form a part and parcel of their religion, theoretically and practically.

Method of Justification.—As to the vital doctrine of Justification, Luther's "*articulus stantis*," etc., the same Council of Constantinople above quoted, (Article XIII.) holds this language: "We believe that *not by faith only* is a man justified, but by faith which works by love; that is to say, by faith and works; and we hold it a *doctrine of utter impiety* to say that simple faith, performing the function of a hand, can apprehend the righteousness (of Christ.) We believe the contrary to this; that it is *not faith, by the imputation of any thing*, but the faith that is *in us*, which, through our works, justifies us before Christ. We judge that works are not mere indications of what is in us, but are fruits to be *independently considered*, by means of which faith obtains what is practicable, (*i. e.* may be earned,) and are *in themselves meritorious*, through the divine promise to enable each of the faithful to receive the things done in the body."

The Council of Trent could not have framed, did not frame anything more anti-Protestant and anti-scriptural on the subject. Indeed its language in regard to it devised to combat a developed Protestantism, bears a striking resemblance to this. Instead of being on this point rather orthodox and evangelical, as some writers have seemed to think she is, the Greek Church is as radically unsound as the Latin. And the whole tenor of Greek theological teaching is in conformity to this. The "*Katechesis*," or book of religious instruction, by Darbares, makes justification to depend on works as well as faith; and this book has the imprimatur of the "*Holy Synod of Greece*," and is the manual of religious instruction used by authority in the public schools of the kingdom. It may be of some interest, in connection with this and others of its doctrines, to know that it is the

one which for so many years Dr. Hill allowed to be taught the scholars of his ("missionary") schools at Athens, under the superintendence of a Greek priest.

Saint and Image Worship.—But are the teachings of the Oriental any less objectionable and pernicious than those of the great, corrupt occidental "Catholic" Church, on the question of things which we, as Protestants, believe to be essentially and really idolatrous, and in express violation of the two first precepts of the decalogue? Not a whit. The proof is so strong that even Bishop Whittingham, though one of the American Episcopal bishops that sustained the notorious Mr. Southgate (ordained bishop, if we mistake not, for the enterprise,) in his romantic, but farcically unsuccessful, knight-errant mission of reverence and courted recognition to "*the* great Church of the East,"—even Bishop W. is compelled to say that, in it, image-worship and the intercession of the saints are even more rife than among the Romanists."

The very object of the second Nicene Council, acknowledged and revered by this Church as one of the grand œcumenical synods, was to establish saint and image worship. Leo and other "eikonoklast" emperors had made, through fifty years, one of the last struggles against this invasion of idolatry. But the Empress Irene, well styled by historians "the infamous," triumphed, in the calling of this council, which decreed every thing that she wanted. And, though the murderess of her husband, she is adored in the Greek Church as a saint, and her name constantly crowned with praises. Many of their churches, among them an important one at Athens, are named in honor of her.

But the contest being renewed in the following century, the idolatrous doctrine prevailed, under another woman, the Empress Theodora, in a council held at Constantinople; and was finally and for all time installed, in the corrupt creeds of the Church, by the Constantinopolitan Council of 879, mentioned before as the last of the œcumenical. The learned Dr. Covell, in his work, (published Cambridge, England, 1722, fol.) gives at large the

decrees of the Council of Jerusalem, heretofore mentioned as having been held in 1672, and acknowledged by the Greek Church as authoritative, if not œcumenical. The articles of faith, (as mentioned by Dr. Andrews,) "submitted by the Synod of Constantinople," (probably a synod of recent times held by the Constantinopolitan patriarch,) quoting largely from this Synod of Jerusalem, and republished in Athens, in 1844, with "the benediction" of the Synod of Greece, thus sets forth the doctrine of the Church on the subject: "We honor those who are truly saints, and declared mediators by the Church, as the friends of God, and as supplicating him on our behalf. We honor them in a twofold manner: one in the mode which we call *hyperdouleia*, the mother of the divine word; for if the parent of God be confessedly the servant, *yet is she also the mother of the only God*, as having brought forth in the flesh *one person of the Trinity*; for which reason she is lauded, etc. In the second mode, in paying honor to angels, etc., we offer the worship termed *douleia*. We also worship and honor the wood of the precious and life-giving cross; the stall at Bethlehem, the life-giving sepulchre, etc. We worship, honor and salute the pictures of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the *super-holy Mother of God*, and those of all the saints and the holy angels." And one grand division of the festivals of the Anatolic Church is the "Theometric," in honor of the Virgin.

In the Catechesis of Darbares, already cited from, and the most mild, guarded and apologetic of all the published statements of Anatolic faith ever published, unless we except that of Bishop Plato, we find, in the exposition of the first commandment, even where he is defining the violation of it, such language as this: "That person sins inexcusably and greatly against this commandment who offers to the ministers of God almost the same honor that he offers to God himself; who *prays more and oftener to them* than to God; who celebrates their memory or their [festival] days with *more reverence* than that of the Lord; who honors their pictures *more* than that of our Saviour," etc. The indirect intimations of this language are sadly significant. And, bad, in these things, as are her symbols of doctrine, the

prescribed worship of the Anatolic Church is even worse. It is a dreadful fact that the larger part of the forms of worship found in the numerous collections of her church services, are addressed to the Virgin and the canonized saints. And a large part of this vast accumulation may, without exaggeration, be called a compound of puerility with what a properly enlightened mind feels to be not only creature-worship, but even blasphemy and sacrilege of the most revolting kind—so much so, that an unprejudiced person like Dr. John Glenn King, Chaplain to the British Factory at St. Petersburg, after a learned and thorough investigation of the subject, gives it, in his work, (London, 1772; 4to.) as his opinion, “Their worship has degenerated into absolute idolatry.”

Let the reader take a sample or two. He will be satisfied with very few. Passing by the honors paid to the Virgin-Mother in connection with her reputed supernatural birth and assumption to heaven, and opening the *Euchologium*,—an authorised collection of prayers for various extraordinary occasions,—we find a liturgy of “the Paraclitic canon, to the super-holy (uperagia) Theotokos,” beginning, “To the Theotokos, we who are sinful and base shall urgently run and fall down unto her; in penitence crying out, from the depths of our souls, Mistress, give thy help, showing us compassion; hasten, for we perish, by reason of the multitude of our offences; turn not they servants away empty; *for we have gained thee as our only hope!*” Except for the use of our own hands and eyes upon the volume, it might have staggered us to believe that anything so monstrous could be found in a volume of the prayers of a so-called Christian Church. But in this strain, with the interludes of “Glory, both now, etc.,” the invocation goes on and concludes,—one of its sentences containing a shocking apostrophe of the “Bride of God”! (“*theonymphe.*”) And turning to another part of the *Euchology*, we find, in the form of profession to be used by any Jew converted to the faith, the following, “And I believe in (and so declare) the Holy Virgin Mary as having begotten him, (Christ), but afterwards remaining a virgin, eminently and truly the Theotokos, truly Mother of God incarnate, and by reason of

this, *become lady and mistress of all the creation.*" Thousands more of like citations might be made; but they would only shock pious minds.

And, as if to commit herself, in the utmost degree, to this impiety, the Anatomic Church has appointed a solemn annual celebration in honor of the restoration of saint and image-worship, under Irene and Theodosia; and on this day, honored as the peculiar "Day of Orthodoxy," while she pays her homage to these and such persons, as saints, she pronounces her solemn "anathema" upon those who do not thus acknowledge and adore these demi-gods of her ecclesiastical heavens.

No sensible Protestant will pay the least respect to the miserable subterfuge of an apology made by the Greek and Roman ecclesiastics, and others of the more shrewd defenders of saint-invocation and the use of images, that the one is a mere calling for intercessory help, and the other a mere suggestive aid to devotion, through the senses. The Brahmin and the intelligent Buddhist will make just the same kind of apology for his pagan worship. "The deity resides in the stocks and stones; we adore it in and through them." But, in the case of both the so called heathen and the so-called Christian worship, it is with the great masses a real, matter-of-fact idolatry; as any one can clearly see who goes amongst either of the parties. The highest benediction, usually, in the mouth of one of the common people, male or female, of the Greek communion, is one invoked from the Virgin; "the All-holy," (in the feminine form of the adjective,) "bless you!"

Nor does it need to be said how preposterous is the distinction drawn by the Eastern Catholic Church in justification of her religious use of painted images, as against such use of sculptured and cast ones; as if images projected in relief could be worse to worship than those made on a plane surface; and as if the awful command of Jehovah did not say, "*any likeness, of any thing,*" etc. And it is a fact to be noticed, that the worshippers in the churches of the Anatomic communion do literally and often "bow down" to these painted "likenesses," and the reader will have marked, in one of the quotations which have

been given, the use of the very words which express the idea of "serving them," ("douleia," etc.)

Auricular Confession.—Though the doctrine and practice of confession to the priest are not made so prominent, and have not been carried out into such abuses as in the Roman Catholic Church, yet the thing as certainly exists in the Greek. It is a well-known matter of requisition, on the part of the latter, that her members attend on confession, at least at certain designated times, before coming to communion. Where they refer to Scripture at all for a sanction, they quote James v. 16. In fact, as we shall see presently, the Church gives such dignity to this observance as to number it, as a sacrament, among the chief ordinances of Christ's house.

A future Purgatorial state.—Dr. J. G. King (before quoted) says that, "while the Greek Church admits prayers and services for the dead, and even prays for the remission of their sins, it does by no means allow the doctrine of purgatory." And this has been even to our own day the almost unchallenged supposition. Even, if in her creeds, there was nothing expressed in reference to the condition of those for whom such prayers are to be offered, the very offering of them infers something; for what would be the use of prayers for the departed, if these, as means, delivered them from nothing, or there was nothing to be delivered from? And if there is something, it matters little whether it be torments of any particular description.

But Dr. Andrews quotes the eighteenth article of the Synod of Constantinople, as follows: "We believe that the souls of the deceased go immediately into a state of joy or of woe; that the souls of those who have been defiled by mortal sin, who have not died in despair, who repented while yet alive, but did not exhibit the fruits of repentance, such as the shedding of tears, kneeling with watchings, prayers, afflictions, and relieving the poor, go to hades and endure punishment for the sins which they have committed; but are in expectation of deliverance from that place, and they are liberated through the prayers of the priests, and

the pious offerings which the relatives of each make for the departed; the unbloody sacrifice [of the mass] being of the greatest efficacy, which each of the relations in particular offers for the departed, and which the Catholic and Apostolic Church daily offers in common for all." Is not this purgatorial doctrine fully forged? And the reader will notice how transubstantiation shows its cloven foot.

Transubstantiation.—Whether the doctrine of the awful transmutation, as gradually introduced, and at last, in the 13th century, fully installed in the Roman Church, is a clearly developed doctrine of the Eastern Church, is a question about which there have been the most variant statements, even on the part of very respectable authors. It seems surprising that it should have been doubted. The only question now to be raised is, when it was introduced; and this of little practical importance. As far back certainly as two hundred years ago, it was formally adopted and proclaimed by the Anatolic Church. The following is an extract from the 17th decree of the Council of Jerusalem, (held, as before stated, in 1672, and acknowledged in the Greek Church,) as found in the work of Dr. Covell: "When the priest consecrates the elements, *the very substance of the bread and wine is transformed into the substance of the true body and blood of Christ.*" And Dr. C. remarks, in regard to the whole article, "it is as full as if Bellarmine and all the Tridentine fathers had been present at the making of it." The Synod of Constantinople, laying down the doctrine in the most circumstantial and explicit manner, concludes thus: "Farther, *the body and blood of our Lord, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, ought to be honored and worshipped with the very highest act of adoration,*" etc. And the doctrine is everywhere incorporated in the Anatolic creed and liturgies; as any one can see who will refer to such manuals and compilations, prepared by the Church itself, or under its sanction, as the "Synopsis," the "Euchologium," and the various catechisms. Turning once more to the second of these, we find, in the "profession for a converted Jew," the following: "And I am persuaded and

confess and believe them" [the bread and wine of the Eucharist, which he declares himself to adore,] "to be in truth the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, changed [into it] by his divine power, after a manner above our comprehension and known only to him." In fact, no communicant of the Anatolic Church ever partakes of the Lord's Supper without the priest's pronouncing the words, along with the person's name, "The servant of God partakes of the precious body and blood of our Lord God and Saviour," etc.*

Farther proof need not be cited. But it may be added that the doctrine is most distinctly taught to, and even enjoined upon, all the children and members of the Anatolic communion, in Darbares' book and all the other catechisms and manuals used for religious instruction, including Archbishop Plato's book. And if there is not in the Greek Church so much of gross demonstration and excess in the worship of "the host," they certainly do adore it, as really and professedly, as the Roman.

Multiplied Sacraments.—The Anatolic Church, along with her hating and hated sister, the Roman Catholic, did not find enough of august and imposing ordinances of the first class. Hence she has her "Seven Mysteries"—baptism, chrism, the eucharist, confession, ordination, marriage, and unction of the sick.

How will this suit Protestants? Especially if we find, as we do in looking over the forms of administration, a great deal of error and superstition connected with each and all of them. It would hardly be worth while to produce citations even if we had space.

Regeneration.—But there is one of them that, as held by this Church, contains a deadly heresy not yet mentioned. In the offices of baptism, and the accompanying chrism, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is brought out in the fullest and grossest form that language could give it. In the prefatory prayer, the priest asks that "Christ may be formed in him" (the

*The Greek Church administers in "both kinds."

subject) that is about to be regenerated through my [the priest's] mercifulness." In the prayer following the administration, the words of Ps. xxxii., "Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered," being first pronounced, the priest gives thanks to God for "having granted the happy purification in the holy water and the divine sanctification in the life-giving chrism," [the anointing of the child with the "holy oil;"] and for having been *pleased to regenerate his servant*, the neophotist, by water and the Holy Spirit, and having bestowed on him the remission of his sins, voluntary and involuntary."

If anything were needed to fill up the dreadful list of—no life-giving, but (as the Greeks would express it) "death-bringing" errors—to put a cap-stone on the structure of corruption and apostacy, our present quotation would give it.

Doctrine of the "Procession."—And, beside the other and more essential differences that have now been set forth, how could any Protestant Church affiliate with the Anatolic body, while the latter makes so much of the doctrine of the "Procession." You may judge it unessential, whether we say "from the Father," or "from the Father and the Son," but she will not allow this. Having split with Rome upon the "filioque," she will hold herself in antagonism to you, till you pronounce the creed with the "Patre" only.

And just such a difficulty would all Protestants find in regard to the Apocryphal books, some of which she receives; if indeed we did not find some also in her reception of the Septuagint as the proper and authorised version of the Old Testament. This recognition the Anatolic Church has renewed, in declarations made by the Church in Greece and elsewhere, within recent years.

But, as to the grand errors which we have been reviewing, even Bishop Whittingham, comparing the two great degenerate bodies of Rome, and the Levant, is obliged to say, "For centuries the east and west have been diverging from primitive truth and order, by widely different ways; the point of departure lies almost equally remote from both." Dr. Andrews expresses him-

self even more unfavorably in respect to the eastern Catholic body. There certainly does seem to be reason for believing that, for ages past, there have been fewer instances of vital piety, existing in spite of its errors, in this than in the Roman Catholic Church. And, as to the chimera of change and reform, from within and by her own action, the Anatolic Church has herself completely foreclosed this, if any Church could do it. Behold how she has entrenched some of the very worst of her corruptions by the institution of the "Day of Orthodoxy," with its Mounts Gerizim and Ebal of benedictions and anathemas; and every Protestant and evangelical person in the world lies under the latter, most solemnly pronounced, as a heretic and apostate, in not receiving and honoring as the Church prescribes "the holy images," etc. She has, moreover, been fully tested, both as to her doctrinal views and her dispositions toward evangelical Christian bodies, in approaches made to her, not in recent years only, but at various periods since the Reformation. Every reader of Church history will remember the efforts made, in the latter half of the 16th century, by Melancthon, Crusius, and the "divines of Tubingen," through the transmission, to the Constantinopolitan patriarch, of the Augsburg Confession, and the correspondence which they instituted; which terminated so abruptly when they began to discuss matters, and refer to Scripture as authority.

And, whatever dispositions an individual of her communion here and there may have shown, *the Greek Church, as such, has every where and always* manifested but one feeling toward evangelical doctrine and the propagators of it. Protestant missionaries, so soon as they were understood, have always met with her frown—in some cases, as that of Dr. Jonas King, have been struck by the iron hand of her persecuting power.

We might have hoped for somewhat better things in free Greece. But it was here that Dr. K. suffered imprisonment—the very Greek constitution of 1843, which liberalised their government, recognises the Anatolic as the national Church of the kingdom and inhibits proselytism—and in the governmental act constituting the "Holy Synod," thus defines some of its duties:

“The Synod is to watch for the preservation of the purity of the articles of faith received and acknowledged by the Oriental Church, and especially of the books treating on religious subjects, intended for the clergy or young persons,” (aimed, no doubt, at the missionaries,) and as soon as it ascertains that any one attempts to make innovations on the Church of the kingdom, either by new doctrines, proselytism, or in any other manner, it is bound to require the aid of the temporal authorities to repress evil.”

Final Evidence of its Dispositions.—But the truth is, the question, whether of fraternal recognition and coöperation or of reformation in that Church, was as completely and finally wound up, just one hundred and fifty years ago, by the Anatolic Church itself, as it could possibly be, by the most formal and solemn declarations that human language could frame: As the issue of the correspondence, already referred to as having been instituted by the primates of the English Church with those of the Anatolic body, in the year 1723, the English archbishops received a final and elaborate communication, on the part of “Jeremiah, the most all-holy (panagiotatos) patriarch of Constantinople, New Rome; Athanasius, most benignant patriarch of Antioch; Chrysanthus, most blessed patriarch of Jerusalem; and the most sacred Metropolitan archbishops; with the whole body of the Oriental orthodox clergy;” in which, after mentioning a second letter received by them from the English ecclesiastics, they use this marked language: “Having carefully read it and understood its import, we have only to repeat what we have already said, that the doctrines of our Church have been a long time ago examined and defined by the holy and œcumenical Synods; and it is not lawful to add to or diminish aught from these, and that whosoever wishes to be of the same mind with us must wholly submit with a sincere obedience, without further investigation or inquisitiveness, to the doctrines which have been definitely declared by the fathers and by the holy Synods from the time of the apostles and the fathers of our Church, in regular succession, to this day.”

And then, after stating that they had sent their correspondents a copy of "the exposition of the orthodox faith of our eastern Church, as drawn up by the Synod of Jerusalem, in the year 1672," (the very one that capped the climax of apostacy in this Church, by declaring its adoption of the transubstantiation dogma,) these grand and worshipful dignitaries thus turn the tables and announce conditions: "*If you will agree with these our doctrines, you shall be altogether one with us, and there shall be no more differences between us.*"

This notable communication too is the very one which was republished, with its "blessing," by the Synod of Greece in 1844, and speaks the universal sentiment of the Anatolic Church at this day.

These citations clinch the argument of these pages. But if a stronger finale could be demanded, to the question of internal reform, and assimilation to evangelical bodies, let us ask, was not this very experiment once made, and most notably in history? Was not all the imperial influence, of a number of successive emperors, during the 8th and 9th centuries, brought to bear, to this end? The result was disastrous defeat, even to them. And was it not tried, on a more ample scale, as to its object, by the noble, enlightened, ill-fated Cyril Lucaris, himself patriarch of the great See of Constantinople, and one who had been in contact with Protestantism and was in sympathy with it. The result, of even his declarations of sentiment, was his own martyrdom—being strangled, in 1638, by order of the Sultan, at the instigation of the Jesuits and his own ecclesiastics.

Conclusion.—We have now given as the results of many years of research and observation, conducted under some peculiar advantages, what we think a more complete and accurate exhibition of the history, condition, and relations of the body called the Eastern Catholic Church, than any that, to our knowledge, has yet appeared. The writer of this is obliged to say, and he can safely do it, that he has never met with any thing in print, from any Protestant quarter, which gives a fully accurate and satisfactory account of this body, which forms so grand and impor-

tant a part of nominal Christendom, with the single exception of Dr. Andrews' pamphlet; which, however, is taken up in great part with the discussion of matters in detail, relating to Dr. Hill and the Athens Episcopal mission. It is high time that the evangelical Christian world should be properly informed as to its character and condition, and relations to Protestantism.

If there were time and space, we might ask, where are the instances, in the history of the Church, of reformation in and on the part of a corrupt religious body itself? Most, if not all, of the facts are just the other way, beginning with the Jewish Church. If it was purged, under the Old Testament, it was only by the most extraordinary processes, such as the captivity and the very ruin of the nation. But, under the New Testament, Christ came with the "winnowing-shovel"—nay, with the very "axe," to fell. Jerusalem and the very temple were swept away; the Church of God never ceased to be; but the apostate Jewish Church was cast out, and from its ruins rose a new and evangelic one. And yet we do not hesitate to say, that the Jewish Church, in our Saviour's day, was, so far as we know, far more pure in its doctrine and worship than either the Greek or the Roman is now found to be.

And did not Luther and his fellow-reformers earnestly and fully try the experiment of reform in and from within? And so, in like instances, almost if not quite without exception, hath it ever been, and shall it ever be. So must it be where a body is vitally corrupt. If the old house is decayed in every important timber, how shall it be made new? Or, to use our Saviour's own figure, "if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" And if, to improve it, you have to take, and do take the warp or the woof out of every yard of a piece of cloth, where will be the cloth? As to whatever of truth is still held by the Greek and Roman Catholic Churches, how much is it worth, when it is so adulterated? Pernicious drugs, mingled in, may make the most valuable liquid or medicine deadly. What can be more wholesome and pure, than water? And yet such an admixture may turn even water into a poison. The great "man of sin" and "anti-Christ" apostacy, covers more than

the papal development. It has been far more extensive and tremendous than even that.

And, as the passion for the antique and venerable is with some, whose ecclesiasticism leads them to shut their eyes on her hideous errors, the wonderful attraction toward the great Church of the East, we beg leave to say, before we close this discussion, that there could scarcely be a greater humbug. If simple, absolute antiquity of existence is meant, the religion of the Buddhist, or the unbelieving Jew, may boast something far higher up the line of ages. If a true Christian antiquity, then, we say, strange as the affirmation may sound to some, neither the Greek nor the Romish Church has it at all. Their "apostolicity" is a spurious apostolicity. It is a bastard coin, of post-apostolic ages. Our brother Kalopothakes, gathering a little handful of scriptural believers, and restoring true doctrine and pure worship, within the walls of the neat evangelical chapel which now stands in sight of "Mars' Hill," restores the true apostolicity. Forming it on the true, primitive model, he bridges the chasm of the ages that have rolled between him and that greatest, noblest of missionaries who, eighteen centuries ago, proclaimed, on the Areios Pagos, the gospel of a true God and Saviour, to the ancestors of Kalopothakes and his little Christian fraternity, civilised as they were, and proud of their superiority to the remaining, and, as they so styled them, barbarian nations of the earth, yet, in his regard, as might almost as well be said of most of their descendants, though under a Christian name, very "deisidaimones." The broken link is bound again, and Dr. K. and his associates have "the true succession," as any and every evangelical Church has all over the world.

But, aside from its being better in its influence than outright heathenism, we owe something to the Auatolic Church—its very superstition, in using an ancient tongue, being so overruled—for its aid in the preservation of the Scriptures; for it is an interesting fact, never, that we know of, adverted to by any body, that, aside from the Septuagint, always used by them, the New Testament Scriptures have been read, in her church services, in every generation, without a single break, from the very ages in

which they were written; some of them thus preserved and read on the very spots where they were first delivered.

And we must discriminate between a corrupted religion and those who profess it; and pray that the light and life of a pure Christianity may be restored to the regions and populations of this vast communion, embracing one of the grand leading empires of Europe and the world, and most of the great Slavonian family, along with that renowned and still most interesting race of people, whose name has passed over, in common usage to the Church itself—the still preserved Hellenes, who are falsifying Byron's oft-quoted saying, (written when they were slaves,) and with a pure gospel would emphatically show the world that Greece is "living Greece" once more.