

**Zeitschrift:** Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review  
**Band:** 7 (1899)  
**Heft:** 28  
  
**Artikel:** Eighteen centuries of the orthodox Greek Church  
**Autor:** Kiréeff, A.  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403457>

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

**Download PDF:** 01.04.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

# EIGHTEEN CENTURIES OF THE ORTHODOX GREEK CHURCH.

By R<sup>d</sup> A. H. HORE, M. A.

---

One of the most interesting works written in English about the Eastern Church is Rev. A. H. Hore's "Eighteen centuries of the orthodox Greek Church": It is much more than an "attempt to supply an acknowledged want, and to give, in a popular form, the history of the Orthodox Eastern Church", as the author calls it; it is a serious step in the direction of "mutual understanding".

The greatest misfortune that befell mankind, was, without doubt, the schism of Rome from the œcumenical Church,—the greatest blessing would be the reunion of East and West, the reconstitution of the great christian unity. Now, since the time when the Roman Legates pronounced the anathema against the East, 1054, we notice constant attempts, from the part of Rome, of reunion,—but in the sense of an unconditional submission to the Pope. Of course the East could never submit to such conditions. Since the Hussitic movement things got a new face, the reunion schemes framed by the representatives of the churches independent of Rome, received a new basis—namely "*equal conditions*", as reunion "*inter pares*", without any idea of supremacy of one church over the other, though strongly united in the *same dogmatical doctrine*, that being the condition "*sine qua—non*" for intercommunion. But, besides the differences in dogmas, there can be less important "*stumbling blocks*" for a mutual, a common religious life, viz.—old pre-

judices, clouds of mutual misconceptions, arising, partly from wilful misrepresentations, partly from ignorance; these blocks ought to be rolled away! Now, the best way for doing so—is certainly to get a mutual, just and clear insight in the past and present of the churches trying to be reunited, to mutually study the works relating to the history of both; works written *objectively*, with the only aim of discovering truth. Now, such exactly is the above mentioned work of Rev<sup>d</sup> Hore.

Far from being a work accessible only to professional scholars, Rev<sup>d</sup> Hore's work is a book for every cultivated reader, it can be studied with great profit and pleasure by every body taking interest in religious matters. The great merit of it—is its objectiveness; the author has scrupulously studied the sources, the historical documents. A greater amount of scepticism and caution in the choice of these sources would have been desirable; in one instance at least—most advisable: The author quotes Stepniak, the murderer of general Mesentzeff! It makes a strange and painful impression on a Russian reader to meet such a name in such a book! What would say the English reader of a Russian work about the Anglican Church in meeting quotations from some libel written by one of the murderers in Phoenix-Park?

The work of Rev<sup>d</sup> Hore is the fullest history of the Eastern Church written in English. It begins with the birth of Her founder Jesus Christ, and ends with the visit of the then Archbishop of Finland, Anthony, accompanied by a Russian general to the Queen's jubilee (1877), and the consecration of an Anglican church at Jerusalem, performed by the Bishop of Salisbury and attended by two orthodox Archbishop-delegates of the orthodox Patriarch and many representatives of other churches in 1889.

Rev. Hore's work is divided into XVIII chapters and an introduction, containing a general view of the orthodox Greek Church (p. 693).

I will give a brief account of their contents, and stop only at the most important points discussed by the author.

Rev. Hore concludes the Introduction p. 42 with the summary of the chief points of difference between the Roman Church and the Greek, which, says the author, "is now, as she was" at the beginning—*immutable in faith*. These differences,

according R. H., are: (1) Christ is the alone Head of the Church. (2) Œcumenical councils can alone determine the doctrine and discipline of the Church. (This statement is perfectly true; and according to it the Greek Church condemns absolutely the new dogma of papal infallibility). (3) The Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, through the Son. (We must make a reservation to this point: Our dogma is the exact quotation of the Saviours word: "Who proceeds from the Father"; nothing else. (Vid. the article of a "Russian theologian" about the Filioque in N. 24 of the „Revue internationale de Théologie). (4) The free and unrestrained use of the Bible. (5) The marriage of the clergy. (There, again, must be made a little amendment—our Bishops are not married, but may be widowers). (6) Communion on both kinds. (7) Leavened bread in the holy communion. (8) Services performed in the vulgar tongue. (9) The Greek Church does not allow instrumental music.

To these points of difference, I must add the following very important three. We reject the Immaculate conception of the Holy Virgin, the syllabus and the indulgencies.

## Chapter I.

### *The Conflict between the Fourth and Fifth Empires.*

It is the history of the struggle between Christendom (or the fifth Empire), and the Pagan world, or the forth (the three first being the Assyrian, the Persian and the Grecian), from the Saviours birth till Diocletian (284-305). Foundation of christianity and fulfilment of Prophecy. Misconception of the nature of Christ's Kingdom. Jews disappointed in their expectations of a powerful political, worldly Kingdom. S<sup>t</sup> James, cousin of the Lord, appointed first overseer (Bishop). Saul-Paul. Antioch the centre of Greek christianity. Council of Jerusalem, where the Apostles, and amongst them Peter, whose presence at the council is the last mention of him made in the Acts, assembled in a council held (A. D. 50) under S<sup>t</sup> James who summoned up the deliberations, Peter, Barnabas and Paul being the principal speakers. Apostolical Journeys. Foundation of the see of Alexandria. Death of the blessed Virgin, commemorated in the Greek Church as Her "falling asleep" (*κοίμησις*)<sup>1)</sup>

---

<sup>1)</sup> In russian too—(oospenye). K.

in the latin as “assumptio” (taken up in the Heaven). The forged Clementines; Origen—the great scholar.

## Chapter II.

### *Victory of Christs Kingdom.*

Tenth persecution by Diocletian. Constantine—Emperor. Battle of the Milevian Bridge. The Labarum, Constantine sole Emperor (324-337). Monasticism. General relaxation of church discipline; still much stronger in the East, than in the West.

## Chapter III.

### *First œcumenical Council of Nicea<sup>1)</sup>.*

The history of christianity and of the roman Empire begin to run in the same channel. Arius—the author of the great Trinitarian controversy; he denies the eternity and uncreatedness of the Son. The Council convoked not by the Emperor *and* the Pope Sylvester *together*, but by the Emperor *alone*. Constantine declining to take his seat until invited by the assembled Bishops to do so!<sup>2)</sup> The Homousion adopted as the watchword of the council. The creed. Athanasius the powerful antagonist of Arius. His life and his death was a witness to and a struggle for the Homousion. Rev<sup>d</sup> H. quotes D. Stanley saying that Athanasius was the father of orthodoxy. Vacillating mind of Constantine. The removing of the Empire from Rome to Byzantium was the foundation of the papal power and the first reason of the separation between East and West.

## Chapter IV.

### *The struggle for the Homousion.*

The Council of Nicea giving the creed to the Church; Constantine not only approving and even—suggesting (says R. H.) the Homousion. Soon after he goes over to the side of Arianism, and orders Athanasius to admit Arius to communion. Persecution of Athanasius. Death of the vacillating Emperor baptized, shortly before his death, by Eusebius Arian bishop

---

<sup>1)</sup> Or Nice, as R. H. calls it. K.

<sup>2)</sup> The same filial and submissive deference has been shown by the Russian Tsar Alexis at the Council of Moscow (1666-7). K.

of Nicomedia<sup>1</sup>). Forgery about Pope Sylvester baptizing Constantine, and further fiction about the “donation of Constantine”. Council of Sardica—only (says Rev<sup>d</sup> H.) a Western Council. The words of Hosius, proposing the canon, according to which a Bishop deposed by a provincial Synod can appeal to the Pope, were: “If it is your pleasure (*si placet*) let us honour the memory of the Apostle Peter... etc.) The reasonableness of the canon at that particular time was evident but it did not bind for ever the East. The Roman Church tacked the Sardican canons as an appendix to the Nicean. Pope Zosimus (417-432) was the first who claimed to inherit a divine authority equal to that of S<sup>t</sup> Peter. Constantius undisputed Emperor siding with the Arians. Persecutions of the orthodox continued. But —“Athanasius contra mundum”. Hosius of Cordova and Liberius of Rome give way, abandon the Nicean creed, and subscribe the Arian creed of Sirmium. Macedonius matures his heresy. Julian the Apostate. Athanasius recalled and banished several times. Jovian—the first (says R. H.) pronounced orthodox Emperor. Athanasius recalled and dying (373) in Alexandria, amongst his own people. His “mantle falling” on the three great Cappadocians: Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen. Definitive victory of the Homousion.

## Chapter V.

### *The second œcumenical Council.*

Theodosius summons the second œcumenic Council in Constantinople (381). The Council amplifies the Nicean creed, adding particularly the clauses respecting the Holy Ghost against the Pneumatomachi (Macedonians). Rev<sup>d</sup> Hore quotes Bishop Wordsworth drawing a distinction between the greek “ἐκπόρευσις” and the latin “processio” and showing how, in the restricted sense of the former word, the Holy Ghost only proceeds from the Father; in the wider sense attached to the latter, he may be said also to proceed from the Son. The first rank after the Bishop of Rome, given to the Bishop of Constantinople (as honorary precedence) and on the same ground; viz.—because

---

<sup>1</sup>) According to our (Russian) ideas about these events, the reason of the lenity of Constantine towards Arius, was that he (Const.) was deceived by ther latter, confirming by oath that he sided with the Nicean creed. K.

it was the Imperial City. The œcumenical character of the second council was objected by Rome, but all cavilling superseded by the fact that this character was recognised by the IV œcum. council (Chalcedon). Besides: after the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins (1204) when the Latin Patriarchate was established there, Innocent III acknowledged the patriarchal rank of Constantinople. S<sup>t</sup> Ambrose inflicting a penance to Emperor Theodosius. The great Emperor submits. Prohibition of pagan sacrifices (385). John Chrysostome strenuously opposing the corruption of the Church. Chrysostome persecuted. Sharp controversy going on as to the writings of Origen, probably (says R. H.) the most learned theologian in the early Church; Athanasius being a great admirer of his works. The controversies of the East, says R. H., were generally with regard to subtle matters of theological speculation, such as the relations of the Persons in the Trinity; whereas those of the West were of a more practical nature, predestination, free will, etc.<sup>1</sup>).

## Chapter VI.

### *The third and fourth œcumenical Councils.*

Nestorius denies the supernatural union of the two natures in Christ. Opposition of Cyril of Alexandria. As Athanasius, says R. H., was the most powerful champion of the Homousios, so was Cyril of the Theotokos. But for him (quotes R. H. from Wordsworth) the world would be astounded to find himself Nestorian. The Third Œcumenical Council of Ephesus (431) Cyril presiding. For the statement, says R. H., that he presided as plenipotentiary of the Pope there is not a shadow of foundation. Nestorius condemned. The latrocinium of Ephesus. Firmness of Pope Leo. Œcumenical council of Chalcedon summoned by Emperor Marcian (451) the Roman legates presiding, Anatolius of Constantinople holding the next place. The synodical of Cyril and the tome of Leo accepted as a Rule of Faith against the monophysite teaching of Eutyches. The council confirming the faith of Nicea-Constantinople. The Fathers "with one consent" teach (about the two natures of Christ)

---

<sup>1</sup>) No doubt that difference in theology had its origin in the difference of the Greek and Roman geniuses, the former being speculative, philosophical, the latter juridical. K.

men to confess... the Son truly man and truly God... to be recognised in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation... the property of each Nature being preserved. The Council declaring the creed of Nicea perfect, and adding that under pain of deposition and anathem, it was not lawful for any one to propose, compile, hold or teach any other faith. The decree has been recited word for word and reaffirmed with equal solemnity in the fifth and sixth œcumen. Councils... Most explicit on this head, says R. H., was the oath taken by the Popes themselves. They swore at their election to preserve unmutated the decrees of the first six œcumenical Councils. We look in vain for any papal Encyclical or any general council authorising the insertion (of the Filioque). We find for the first time an alteration made in the pontifical oath in the eleventh century. The 28<sup>th</sup> canon remained in force notwithstanding the opposition of Pope Leo. Gregory the great acknowledged the four œcumenical councils. This canon, however, says R. H., was the principal cause of the schism.

#### Chapter VII.

##### *The separate Churches of the East.*

Some of these Churches, says R<sup>d</sup> H., are separated from the orthodox Church through a misunderstanding (as for inst. the Armenian). It is possible, says he, to condemn their schism and yet to acquit them from heresy.

#### Chapter VIII.

##### *The fifth and the sixth œcumenical Councils.*

Justinian; end of the schism between Rome and Constantinople. Laws against Arians and other Heretics enforced. Fifth œcumenical Council summoned by Justinian (553). Pope Vigilius, says H., fell into heresy and repented several times; charity can scarcely find a good word for him. The Emperors claimed and exercised at that epoch the same power over the Popes of Rome and over the Patriarchs of Constantinople. Letters of Pope Gregory prove that, for instance, the Emperor's consent was necessary for tending the Pall, to a see which had not previously enjoyed the dignity. P. Boniface III succeeded in obtaining an edict from Emper. Phocas, that Rome was the head



*of all Churches*, and that the Pope should alone hold the title of œcumenical Patriarch. Emperor Heraclius's victory over Chosroes. Monothelism—is, says H., a corollary to Monophysitism. That heresy held by Sergius Patr. of Constantinople and by Honorius Pope of Rome. Honorius wrote two letters to Sergius (both of which were ordered to be burnt by the 6<sup>th</sup> œcum. Council) in which he, falling into dire heresy, approved of what Sergius had done. Emperor Constans Pagonatus summons the œcumenical Council of 680-681 (the first in Trullo). Anathema pronounced against Honorius and Sergius. Pope Leo II condemns Honorius in plainest terms... *nec non et Honorius qui... profunda prodicione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est.* Emper. Justinian II summons (691-692) a Council (in the same Trullo) which, as being a supplementary to the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Councils, is called the *quinisext Council*<sup>1</sup>).

#### Chapter IX.

##### *The Saracenic conquest.*

The Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem subjugated by the Mahometans.

#### Chapter X.

##### *The seventh œcumenical Council.*

The iconoclastic controversy. Owing to his iconoclastic measures Leo III the Isaurian losed a great part of Italy; yet, by the defeat of the Saracens (717), he stopped their progress for a long while. Leo soon began to turn his mind from military to ecclesiastical matters. A monophysit by birth, he was in contact with mahometans who taunted the christians with idolatry. Beginning of the persecutions (726). Riots. Massacres of the orthodox in Constantinople. Rebellion of the whole East. In Italy the edicts of Leo excited even a greater opposition. Equal to Pope Gregory, as an intrepid defender of the images was John Damascene. Iconoclastic Council of 754 condemning to severe punishments and anathemising those who used the images, including John Damascene. Second Council of Nicea (787) (seventh œcumenical). The iconoclastic Council condemned. Solemn confirmation of the decrees of the former six œcume-

---

<sup>1</sup>) The so called 85 apostolic canons accepted by the Council. K.

nical Councils. Decree enacting that the Images of our Lord, His Mother, the Angels and Saints should be set up in colours, mosaics or any other materials; respectful adoration<sup>1)</sup> should be paid to them (*προσκύνησις*) but not worship (*λατρεία*) which belongs exclusively to God.

R. Hore, though admitting that the decrees of the Council of 787 were accepted by the East, and “generally” by the West (Pope Hadrian) questions the œcumenicity of the Council. Why? True: Charlemagne, with regard to the Council, took up an intermediate position; true, the Councils of Francfort (794) and of Paris (824) condemned the *image-worship*; still, as R<sup>d</sup> Hore himself states, the tenets of Nicea were two centuries later recognised by the Frankish Church. It seems therefore, that there is no reason whatever to deny the œcumenicity of the second Council of Nicea. Has it not stood the definitive test of œcumenicity—its *universal* acceptance, not only by the clergy but as well by the laity? Most cartainly! As soon as a dogmatical decree of Council is accepted (though not at once, not without a struggle) by the universal Church, by East and West, it seems to me, that, though the practice of “respectful adoration” can lead to *exaggeration* (as can every thing) the true doctrine *must* be accepted by every body.

## Chapter XI.

### *The culminating schism of the Greek and Roman Churches.*

The Patriarchs Ignatius and Photius. Both applying to Pope Nicolas acting as highest judge; strengthening by their appeal the (false) Isidorian decretals. R<sup>d</sup> Hore describing, as usually, with the most careful objectiveness, the struggle between the two Patriarchs, does not convey any new fact, but gives a complete and interesting view of the question; he quotes the letter of Pope John's (VIII) strongly condemning those, who add the Filioque to the creed, “quasi Divini verbi transgressores, theologiæ Christi Domini eversores...”

Speaking of the conversion of the Slavonic and Teuton nations to christianity, R. H. states, that, even in the latter case its meed of praise must not be withheld from the Greek Church. Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths was a Greek Bishop

---

<sup>1)</sup> Dulia. K.

of Cappadocian descent, and exercised his Ministry in Dacia and Mœsia. Theophilus, Bishop of the Goths, who attended the I<sup>st</sup> Council of Nicea was as well orthodox. The Greeks converted too the Bulgarians, the Moravians, the Tshekhs, partly the Poles (by Mieczislav I) and finally the Russians (988). Soon afterwards Poland became latin, and that was the source of the death-struggle between the two sister-nations. About the question of the Filioque, says R. H., the two Churches agreed to differ; there were Greek Churches and monasteries in Rome and Latin Churches and monasteries in Constantinople. In a correspondance between Leo and Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, whilst the latter condemned the addition of the Filioque to the creed, and Leo declared that he was ready to die in defence of it, the Pope spoke of the faith of the Patriarch as sound and catholic. Mutual and definitive excommunications 1054.

## Chapter XII.

### *The Schism widened by the crusades.*

To the Greeks, says R. H., the crusades were an unmitigated calamity; they professed to be holy wars and *were* such in the beginning, but degenerated in a latinising movement. The fourth crusade. Dandolo. Constantinople taken. Never, says R. H., was victory more cruelly abused; murder, sacrilege and plunder prevailed everywhere; no mercy for religion, for age or sex was shown; the vessels of the altars turned into drinking cups for drunken orgies . . . . such were the tender mercies of the Latin crusaders to the Greek church, so long the bulwark of christendom against the Saracens. In the following contest which took place between the Latin Emperors of Constantinople and the Greek Emperors of Nicea the Latins allied themselves with the Mahometans . . . . the Popes, who considered Mohometans less dangerous to their supremacy than Greeks, made the contest between Greeks and Latins holy wars and granted Indulgencies to the latter in their attacks on the Greek heretics.<sup>1)</sup>

---

<sup>1)</sup> We find even now the same standing point in the Roman church, mitigated of course by civilisation; a French Bishop admitted that the Crimean war was undertaken not to prevent the dismemberment of Turkey, but for the humiliation of the Greek, or as he called her, of the Photian church. K.

### Chapter XIII.

#### *Intrigues of the Palæologi with Rome and fall of Constantinople.*

The closing years of the Eastern Empire were overclouded with internal dissensions, and the servile submission of the Emperors to the Popes, in which respect justly remarks R. H., they found themselves in opposition to the Greek church (and, it may be added, to the Greek people). Council of Lyons, the ephemeral union with (or rather the submission to) Rome; never being accepted by the Greek people. The union of Ferrara-Florence had the same result. It melted into air, says R. H. The only permanent results of these attempts of union were to intensify the hatred of the Greeks against the Latins; so that it was commonly said that the Greeks would prefer to see the crescent of the Turks, rather than the Tiara of the Pope, on the churches of Constantinople.

I may add, that, in a certain sense, it is quite comprehensible, for the very plain reason, that the Turks, as well as the Tartars (Moguls) during the epoch of their domination in Russia (1236—1480), though tyrannical and barbarous their sway might have been, did not interfere with religious matters. Turks kill sometimes the body, but leave alone the soul; unhappily such is not the Roman fashion; hard as it may be, we orthodox, prefer the Turkish system, less dangerous than the Roman.

### Chapter XIV.

#### *The making of Russia.*

This chapter contains the history of Russia and its church from the foundation of the Bishopric of Kief, till the end of the Rurik dynasty. I will note some interesting remarks of R. H. When, in the tenth century, the Roman church was, by the profligacy of the Popes, brought to the verge of ruin, it was the civil power and the German Emperors that saved it; when Russia was, first through the Appanages, and afterwards by the Moguls, brought to a similar State it was the Russian church that rose the Nation. Quite true: Since the very beginning of Russian history, the Popes offered their moral and material aid to various Russian princes, on the condition that Russia would become a fief of Rome. Crusades proclaimed by

the Popes against the Livonians. Establishment of the order of the Knights of the Sword (Ensiferi). Invasion of the Moguls and enslaving of Russia. The conquerors, says R. H., protected the Russian monasteries, forbade their own people to molest them, and exempted the clergy from taxation. During that time the Russian church was the teacher and the stronghold of the Russian nation and of the Russian state. St. Peter and St. Alexis (Metropolitans of Moscow) were the staunch supporters of the Dukes of Moscow. Grand Duke John III marries Sophia Palæologue and becomes the heir of the Byzantine Emperors. Lithuania emerging about the XIII<sup>th</sup> century from legend. Ghedymin, the real founder of the Lithuanian power (1315 at 1340). Lithuanians led by their warlike princes conquer a large part of Western Russia; but the victors soon began to be absorbed by the vanquished, in receiving faith, language and civilisation from the Russians. Prince Jaghello, marrying Princess Jadwiga, heiress of the crown of Poland, abandoned the orthodox faith and became a Roman catholic. That event turned the course of history, Lithuania was annexed to Poland.

By his marriage with Sophia Palæologue John III became the heir of the Eastern Emperors and Moscow the heiress of Constantinople, the "Third Rome" and virtually the capital of orthodoxy. The smart stroke of the Pope (the marriage of Sophia, educated in the principles of the council of Florence, was his work) had not the results expected by Rome.

The character of John IV the Terrible, says R. H., is a problem difficult to be explained. He assumes the title of Tsar. Joseph Patriarch of Constantinople sends him a letter with his blessing, as to the last scion of the ancient Imperial house, the letter being subscribed by thirty-six Metropolitans and Bishops of the Eastern Church. The second Rome, says R. H., thus recognising Moscow as the third Rome and her heiress. By the advice of Metrop. Macarius John IV summons the council of Moscow (1551) whose result was the publication of the Stoglav (the hundred chapters) regulating the religious life in Russia. In forming our estimate of the character of the Tsar, says R. H., we must not forget his contemporaries—Henry the VIII, Catharine Medici, the Inquisition and St. Bartholomew's day.

Chapter XV.

*The Three Romes.*

Job first Patriarch of Russia (1589). The third Rome, succeeding, in the eyes of the Eastern Church, to the Patriarchate vacated by old Rome (the first). Tubingen divines corresponding with Patriarch Jeremias of Constantinople. Important answer of the Patriarch, written with cordiality and benevolence, but proving the impossibility of the union. Rome, by the aid of Jesuits, progressing in Poland. Union with Rome, on the basis of the Florentine council, violently introduced in Western Russia and Lithuania. Persecutions. Aristocracy or flying to Russia—or converted to Latinism. Breach between the renegade Aristocracy and the masses of the people. The readers of the *Revue* are acquainted with the history of the struggle between Latinism and Orthodoxy in Western Russia and Lithuania; I won't stop, therefore, at the description of it given by the author. The deadly struggle culminates in the seizure of Moscow by the Poles and brings Russia to the very brim of ruin, but supported chiefly by her strong religious spirit Russia is saved from dissolution. Poland, thanks especially to the Jesuits, rapidly declines.

Orthodoxy in the East. Cyril Lucar. The author calls him the greatest Patriarch, which, since the taking of Constantinople, adorned the Greek Church. That is a questionable estimation. Cyril was a pure character and a martyr, crushed by the Jesuits, but his religious tenets were not always free from protestant influence, and here, the constant objectivity of the author is, I believe, betrayed. Of course a propensity in the direction of protestant free thought is far better than a bent towards Latinism (which was the fault with some of the fellow-Bishops of Cyril Lucaris), still his works, written with the intention to withstand the romanising influence then prevailing in Constantinople, bear a calvinistic spirit. The Doctrine of Peter Mohila; the champion of orthodoxy, says R. H., was to a certain extent tinged by calvinistic spirit.<sup>1)</sup>

Nikon, Patriarch of Russia, and the revision of the sacred service books. Fall of Nikon, but maintenance of the revised books.

---

<sup>1)</sup> The council of Jassy 1642 to whom the Profession of faith drawn up by Peter Mohila was presented found necessary to make in it several modifications. K.

The Patriarch Dositheus of Constantinople leaning to Latinism and the Bethlehem Council (1672).

## Chapter XVI.

### *The Holy governing Synod.*

Reforms of Peter the Great. The Patriarchate replaced by a Synod: 1721. Approval of this reform by the Eastern Patriarchs. The establishing of the Synod in no way whatever touching orthodoxy, was not, says R. H., of an Erastian character with which its Roman opponents charge it. No Russian, says he, of the orthodox church, no orthodox Greek believes that a temporal sovereign, except in *external* matters—is head of the Church. There is only one Head of the Church, under Christ, and that is an œcumenical council. R. H. is quite right in quoting the answer given by a Russian to M. Athelstane Riley: “if the Tsar were converted to Romanism the whole country would follow his example?” asked A. R. “On the contrary! It was very much more likely, that the Tsar would lose his throne.”

Schemes for the union between the Eastern and Anglican churches. The English Non-Jurors and the answer to them of the Patriarchs (1723).

The author relates the foundation of the so called “Edinoverie” (“one” or “same faith”) according to the plan of the Metropolitite Plato viz. the reunion of the Schismatics (Raskolniks) with the orthodox Russian Church, on the basis of a *complete identity in dogma* with differences in rites, formularies etc. . . . These “Edinoverizy” (equally believers), whose priests are ordained by the orthodox Bishops, keep the old ante-Niconian books and rites; they enjoy, of course, in every respect the same rights as the orthodox; the number of the schismatics (“Raskolniks”) is large, but their reunion with the orthodox Church is, I believe, only a question of time and enlightenment. To be noted are the last lines of this chapter. Speaking of the fall of Poland R. H. justly says: In the reign of Peter the Great the dependence of Poland on Russia, and its consequent decadence, which was accelerated by cruelty and oppression, commenced. The massacre (1724) of the Protestants at Thorn sent a thrill of horror throughtout christendom. Poland as an independant nation ceased to exist. Such was

the fate of religious bigotry; the result of the entrance of Jesuits into Poland. R. H. is quite right, but is the actual state of Poland its definitive fate? I hope not. Let it secede from the infallible Rome, return to the old faith of united Christendom— and Poland will recover!

## Chapter XVII.

### *Partial recovery of the Greek Church.*

Gradual decline of the Ottoman power since the wars of Catherine the Great. Treaty of Kutchuk-Kaynardjy. Emperor Nicholas I. Treaty of Andrinople. Greece independant. Synodical organisation of the Greek Church. The "Eastern war" 1854—1855. Mahometan Turkey saved by France, England and Piedmont. <sup>1)</sup> Treaty of Paris. Last war between Russia and Turkey. Bulgaria and Servia freed from the Turkish yoke, but Bosnia and Herzegovina given up to Austria and (I may add) to the Latin propaganda.

The (last) XVIII chapter.

### *The Greek Church in its present relation to Western Christendom.*

This chapter represents the Greek Church in its present relation to the Western Churches, and contains the ideas of the learned author about the reunion of the Churches, a question of the deepest interest for the present generation and strongly ventilated since the Vatican council.

Discussing the conditions of reunion R<sup>d</sup> Hore justly remarks, that the last year of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century opens on a Christendom more disunited as when, 1054, Cardinal Humbert left the papal writ of excommunication on the altar of St. Sophia in Constantinople;—owing to the system adopted by Rome, since the Schism, the Western Church became split into two parts—the Roman and the Anglican. <sup>2)</sup>

---

<sup>1)</sup> To a certain degree by Austria forcing Russia to keep on the Austrian frontier an army of about 100,000 men, and preventing it from going to Crimea. K.

<sup>2)</sup> R<sup>d</sup> H.'s idea is true, but, instead of "split into *two* parts", I would say into *three*: Roman, Anglican and *Protestant*. True, the Protestants have no regular orders; true, some of them, even the most learned and the most influential, as Harnack and Kaftan, are unitarians; still, generally speaking, it would be difficult not to consider them as forming a part of christianity, not to take them in account when discussing the question of the reunion of the christian churches. K.



Speaking of the reunion of the churches the author justly remarks, that the figment of papal supremacy is the barrier which stops the way to reunion. Quite true; when the Pope uses that word, he does not mean "reunion" on equal, liberal terms, but submission to Rome, *enslaving* to it. Still he never ceases to speak of the necessity of Union, of Reunion! He sends everywhere and to every body invitations to join *His* Church. Did not Pope Pius II write a letter even to Sultan Mahomet II (soon after the fall of Constantinople) promising him, that if he (the Sultan) would embrace Christianity, the Pope would, by his apostolical authority, confer on him the legitimate sovereignty of the lands which he had conquered! Nearly four hundred years later an other Pius (the IX) sent an encyclical (1848) to the "Eastern scattered sheep into pathless and rough ways" urging them to *return* (!) to the Roman faith . . . . The encyclical was full of gross mistakes, which the Eastern Patriarchs were not backward in sizing on. (Thus St. Ignatius was spoken of as Bishop of Alexandria, the œcumenical Council of Chalcedon was called council of Carthago, etc. . . .) In 1869 the same Pius invites the Patriarch Gregory of Constantinople, to the Vatican council. Recently (1894) Leo XIII issues an Encyclical on the necessity of Union, under his, the Christ's vicegerent's on earth, sway. Of course our church answered negatively to all those attempts to get hold of the East (including Russia). I may add, that our church will henceforth give exactly the same negative answer to all the enticements of the old Roman Siren.

After having explained the unsurmountable difficulties to come to an understanding between the East and Rome, the author turns to the relations between the Greek and the Anglican Churches. Recent events, says he, represent a spirit of love, between the two churches, which a fuller mutual understanding can only increase. The intercourse between the Eastern and the Anglican Churches, says R. H., becomes more and more friendly and is now a common topic of conversation in Russia. In 1863 was founded the "Eastern Church Association", with the object to give mutual information. In 1864 was appointed a committee in view "to ecclesiastical intercommunion with the orthodox East". At one meeting of this committee the Arch-Priests Popoff and Vassilieff attended and gave the most cordial assurance of cooperation. Friendly intercourse was

organised. The third Lambeth conference, of 1888, spoke hopefully of reunion with the East. In the Lambeth conference of 1897 two English Archbishops with the Bishop of London were requested to act as a committee to confer with the authorities of the Eastern Church, in view of obtaining clearer understanding and of establishing closer relations. These friendly feelings were appreciated by the Russian government and have been evidenced by the delegation to England of an eminent scholar and divine—Antonius Archbishop of Finland (now Metropolitan of Petersburg and Presiding member of the Holy Synod of Russia). The friendly relations which now exist between the two Churches, do not mean that they are in communion, nor even that their union is at present within the area of practical politics, but they do mean that the way has been smoothed, and that the two Churches understand each other better than they did sixty years ago.

In this last chapter we meet with the ideas of R<sup>d</sup> Hore about the reunion of the Churches and its conditions. The author examines some of them. In discussing the Filioque question he states that between the two Churches there is no difference on doctrine, the Anglican Church as well as the Greek disclaiming two principles, *ἀρχαί* or causes, *αἰτίαι* in the Holy Trinity, and, proceeds R. H., as there is no difference between the two Churches in point of doctrine its (the Filioque's) removal would *be as unadvisable as impossible*. I confess, that I could hardly side with the R<sup>d</sup> author in that respect. The maintainance of the Filioque in the creed would be a heavy stumbling block in the way of reunion. As a pious opinion of a private, personal character, as an attempt (hardly successful) to give an explanation of the Trinitarian mystery, the Filioque may be kept by those who find it necessary, (the more so, as the same opinion was held by some Fathers of the undivided Church); but to maintain it in the credo—is a quite different thing; its presence in the credo alters its meaning, transforms a private pious opinion into dogma, obligatory for every christian, necessary for salvation. R<sup>d</sup> Hore quotes the decisions of the Bonn conferences (attended by more than fifty members of the Anglican Communion, amongst them the Bishop of Gibraltar, canon Liddon, canon McCall etc.). But, as much as I can see, they must convey the idea that the Filioque ought to be removed

from the creed! Another point of disagreement between our Churches is the rejection, by the Anglican Church, of the dogmatical decision of the Nicean œcumenical Council relative to the Icons. I believe that this stumbling block can be easily removed, if only we examine the decree of the Council in itself, such as it is, as it stands in our doctrine. No doubt, the worship of icons can lead to abuses, and, in point of fact, sometimes *leads* to them, but the doctrine defined by the Fathers of the Council is by no means answerable for its misrepresentations. True, the Councils of Francfort and of Aix-la-Chapelle rejected the decisions of Nicea, but, if I am not greatly mistaken, two or two and a half centuries later the icons were worshipped in England, as well as everywhere else in the area of the Western Church. I repeat, if the canons of icon-worship were explained as they ought to be, strictly in accordance with their literal sense, their acceptance would, I hope, meet with no difficulties whatever, at least by Anglicans.

There is I believe a still greater difficulty for union between our two Churches; a difficulty, which can be removed by the Anglicans alone, I mean some discrepancies in the Anglican Church herself. I do not speak of the so called ritualistic movement of to day; I do not see the seriousness of the debate. Of course, as a foreigner, I can easily be mistaken, but I believe that more or less incense, more or less candles on the altar are questions that ought to be left to the piety of the parishioners, that they do not deserve to be considered as channels leading to "popery". (I fear there are some deeper streams leading to Rome in England!)

But there are some far more serious questions, which must be previously solved by the anglican theologians themselves. Can we hope to find amongst them a complete identity in the way they understand the sacramental character of priesthood? etc.

R<sup>d</sup> Hore, speaking of the future relations between the Greek and Anglican Churches, quotes the learned Guettée stating that: "to be completely in accord with the Greek Church, the Anglican should reconcile some contradictory statements in her official books, and declare more distinctly 1) that there exists a divine teaching transmitted orally by the Apostles, 2) that the oral teaching is preserved infallibly by the Church,

and 3) that it is to be ascertained by the constant testimony of the apostolical Churches, which have remained unchanged from the first ages.”

Without disagreeing with the learned D<sup>r</sup> Guettée, I believe that there is no want of looking for a new basis of agreement, new conditions for union besides those worked out at the Bonn conferences, and accepted by all the present theologians (including the Anglican). We have chosen for our motto the words of St. Vincentius of Lirinum: We must accept as religious truth “quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est”. Let us constantly keep that golden rule, and, I am convinced, we will come to an agreement.

To conclude my critic of R<sup>d</sup> Hore’s work, I willingly quote the last lines of his last chapter: The Tsar of Russia has inaugurated the last year of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century with a plan for the cessation in the armaments of Europe. Perhaps some good providence may inaugurate the commencement of the XX<sup>th</sup> century, with the spiritual disarmament of the conflicting Churches of Christendom. Friendly relations between the Anglican and the Russian, the principal member of the Greek Church, cannot but be of the first importance. Autocracy, Orthodoxy, Nationality, were the three watchwords of Nicolas I <sup>1)</sup>; with Russian people the last two are identical. Russians are at heart sincerely attached to the English nation; and the union of the Churches might be the means of composing differences, and effecting friendly relations between the civil governments of the two countries.

Pavlovsk, 13./25. August 1899.

A. KIRÉEFF.

---

<sup>1)</sup> There is a little mistake in the order: the watchword runs thus: Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality. It is too the watchword of the slavophiles. K.

---