THE GREEK CHURCH

PRICE 1/-

THE GREEK CHURCH.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

A Sketch.

BY THE AUTHOR OF

"PROPOSALS FOR CHRISTIAN UNION."

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

JAMES DARLING,

GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

1851.

LONDON:
Printed by G. Barclay, Castle St. Leicester Sq.

ADVERTISEMENT TO FIRST EDITION.

The Greek Church is a large subject. I have selected a few remarkable periods in her history; if I have failed in imparting to these the interest I wished to have done, it is my hope that the indulgent Reader will take the will for the deed. The materials of this Essay are chiefly drawn from the ecclesiastical histories of Neander, Döllinger, Doctor Townsend, and last, not least, of the Warden of Sackville College. References have been given where the text seemed to require them.

E. S. A.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER IV.

ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

CHAPTER V.

ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

CHAPTER VI.

COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

CHAPTER VII.

CYRIL LUCAR.

CHAPTER VIII.

CYRIL LUCAR.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

Foundation of Byzantium—Advantages of the Site—Tributary to the Persians—Treason of Pausanias—Byzantium in league with Athens—Besieged, taken, and ruined, by Severus—Constantinople built—Festival in Honour—Constantinople suffragan of Heraclea—Independent—Legend of St. Andrew—Patriarchs of Alexandria—Council of Constantinople—Patriarchal Encroachments—Council of Chalcedon—New Rome—Title Œcumenical—State Influence.

About six centuries and a half before the Christian era, Byzas, son of Neptune,—a parentage suggestive of hardihood and enterprise, which it would not be easy, if it were respectful, to trace higher,—founded Byzantium. The colonists whom he led came from Argos and Megara; the site did justice to his sagacity, one more advantageous could not have been chosen.* Washed on the south by the Propontis, or sea of Marmora; on the east, by the waves of the Thracian Bosphorus; on the north, by a deep and capacious harbour; on the west, or land side, protected by defences the best the age could contrive, and carefully improved as the science of war improved; Byzantium, at peace within herself, might have defied a world in arms. Free institutions—the government was modelled on that of Athens—developed the energy and resources of the citizens. The key to the continents of Europe and Asia, commanding the Euxine and Sea of Marmora, two great highways of commerce, the productions of the north and the south were exchanged in her markets.

* Gibbon's History, chap. 17.

The importance of Byzantium, as an almost impregnable fortress and emporium of trade, was not overlooked in those famed contests for empire and for liberty which immortalised the Grecian soil. The city first appears in history as a tributary of the Persian monarchs, garrisoned by foreign troops, but left in the unmolested enjoyment of municipal rights and privileges. During the Ionian war, B.C. 500, the Byzantines, in concert with the other Grecian settlements, asserted their independence. When the tide of war turned, and the revolted cities were devastated by fire and sword, the inhabitants of Byzantium avoided the storm by flying betimes with their most valuable effects, and planting the territory of Mesambria far within the Euxine Sea.* The resentment of the conquerors soon gave way to a more generous policy; the fugitives were encouraged to return by assurances of pardon and protection; their free institutions were restored; the presence of Persian troops and a moderate tribute were the only marks of subjection. As we advance in the annals of these memorable struggles, we find Byzantium the grave of a great reputation. In the hour of victory, Pausanias, the Spartan general, having, at the head of the allied forces, captured the city, here entered into a treasonable correspondence with the court of Persepolis. Becoming subsequently a member of the league of which Athens was the head, this city found the maintenance of freedom more costly than servitude. We hear of no complaints under the Persian rule. Under the dominion of Athens, about B.C. 358, the Byzantines, with three other states, addressed to the supreme Republic a significant remonstrance. "They were resolved," they declared, "henceforth to protect their own commerce with their own fleets, and wanting thus nothing from the Athenian navy, should, of course, pay no more towards its support."† However, the breach was soon repaired. When next we hear of Byzantium it is as the ally of Athens, besieged by Philip of Macedon and defended by the lips of Demosthenes.

Descending to a later period: in those intestine wars, which wasted the resources and prematurely hastened the decay of the Roman empire, Byzantium deserves honourable

* Mitford's Greece, vol. ii. p. 71. † Ibid. vol. vii. p. 402.

mention. Acknowledging Niger as emperor, the citizens closed their gates against his successful rival Severus. After a decisive battle, in the tumultuous retreat from which Niger had been overtaken and slain, the nearest friends and devoted followers of the fallen chief made their last stand in this friendly city. For three years they heroically defied the legions and fleets of Severus, and yielded at length to the pressure of hunger, not to the force of arms. A right-minded conqueror would have respected this signal fidelity, and by judicious clemency have converted determined foes into fast friends. Severus, abandoning himself to an infatuated vindictiveness, razed the fortifications to the ground, put the magistrates and soldiers to the sword, suppressed the privileges, ruined the trade and commerce of Byzantium, and reduced this noble city to the condition of a mere open village.* When, in the succeeding age, the Gothic fleet sailed through the undefended Bosphorus to the centre of the Mediterranean, the trembling successors of Severus cursed the remorseless hand that had destroyed the strongest bulwark against the assaults of the barbarians. Byzantium had descended to the lowest depth of abasement; an unlooked-for vicissitude, in almost fewer years than the city had lasted centuries, elevated it to the highest dignity and grandeur. We take leave of the ancient republic with a feeling of regret. The splendour which invests the metropolis of a mighty empire pales before the trophies of earlier and hardier days.

At the beginning of the fourth century, Rome, though it retained a titular precedence long after, ceased in effect to be the capital. Maximinian kept his court at Milan, Diocletian at Nicomedia. When Constantine assumed the purple, he strongly felt the necessity of a central position as the seat of government. With customary ill-fortune Byzantium had been again on the losing side. The fortifications had been repaired and strengthened by Licinius, who had thrown himself into the place as the last resource. The citizens, true to their old character, stood a siege bravely. When the contest was over, some hostile remembrance, perhaps, rankling in his mind, Constantine at first thought of erecting his new capital

* Gibbon, chap. 5.

on the plains of Troas; the ground had been measured, the foundations laid, some progress made, when a natural or supernatural intervention arrested the work. Between the Asiatic and European shores there was, in respect of convenience or utility, no comparison. Calm reflection and common sense might explain the change of purpose. Legendary history assigns a more palpable cause. "Constantine," writes Bishop Arculf, "was at first disposed to build a city in Cilicia, near the sea which separates Europe and Asia; but on a certain night all the iron tools were carried away, and when men were sent to seek them they were found on the European side, for there it was God's will that the city should be built."*

In 324 were laid the foundations of the new capital; ten years after, in 334, was celebrated, with the utmost pomp and magnificence, the Festival of the Dedication, to celebrate the completion of this immense work. At this festival an edict, engraven on a column of marble, bestowed the title of SECOND, or NEW ROME, on the city of Constantine.

As often as the birthday of the capital returned in times after, the statue of Constantine, framed, by his order, of gilt wood, and bearing in the right hand a small image of the genius of the place, was elevated on a triumphal car; the guards carrying white tapers, and clothed in their richest apparel, accompanied the solemn procession as it moved through the Hippodrome. When it came opposite to the throne of the reigning emperor, he rose from his seat and with grateful reverence adored the memory of his predecessor.†

The ancient city which Constantinople replaced had been, we recollect, by the vengeance of Severus reduced to an unwalled village; this overwhelming calamity fell upon it near the close of the second century. Whether from the fewness, the poverty, or lukewarmness, of its inhabitants, Byzantium was not thought worthy to have a bishop of its own; it formed a part of the diocese of Heraclea. Up to the erection of the new capital, we meet with the names of but three bishops who governed Byzantium as suffragans of

* Early Travels in Palestine, p. 11.—BOHN.
† Gibbon, chap. 17.

Heraclea.* With a remarkable humble-mindedness, for which their successors amply indemnified themselves, the Bishops of Constantinople for several years were content to remain under the Exarchs of Heraclea. Whether the metropolitan modestly withdrew his pretensions, or his magnificent suffragan ignored them, the dependence of the Church of Constantinople on that of Heraclea came to be spoken of as one of the things that had been.

The Church of Constantinople fed to the full, loaded with riches and honours as heart could desire, was not happy; there was something wanting: everything about her shone resplendent in the bright gloss of newness, but that was the very thing that distressed her; she was sick of newness—quite loathed it—pined to be old and venerable. Fortunate Church. It was but to ask and have. A tradition came at bidding, showing how St. Andrew visited Byzantium, where he instructed the inhabitants in the knowledge of the Christian religion, founded a church for divine worship, and ordained Stachys—whom St. Paul called his beloved Stachys—first bishop. Stachys was followed by a lineal succession of twenty prelates, all whose names are recorded in black and white on the authority of these respectable references—Dorotheus of Tyre, Nicephorus Callistus, and another Nicephorus, who, as the learned Cave justly observes, ought to know, as he himself, some hundred years after, was Patriarch of Constantinople.

When this city became the capital of the world, the Bishop of Alexandria claimed, as a right, to consecrate its bishop. He put forth this claim as the Primate of the East. The authority of this prelate in his own diocese was absolute. In Egypt, Thebais, and Libya, he ordained all the bishops, and, according to his pleasure, the priests of the different communities. In his diocese, therefore, there was no metropolitan, and the bishops of the chief cities had no more power than the patriarch was pleased to confer on them.† However, the claim in question was before long disallowed. By the second canon of the second Œcumenical Council, held at Constantinople in 381, it was decreed that

* Neale's Holy Eastern Church, vol. i. p. 26.

† Döllinger's History of the Church (Translation), vol. ii. p. 246.

the Bishops of Alexandria should confine themselves to their own province; that the Bishops of the East should govern the East, reserving its privileges to the Church of Antioch; and that the Bishops of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus, should alone regulate their respective dioceses. The same Council directed, by its third canon, that the Bishop of Constantinople should take rank next after the Roman Bishop, since Constantinople was New Rome. When this canon passed the Patriarch of Alexandria was not in his place, the Pope had no legates present. The former prelate confined himself to a simple protest; the latter, as on a question of Church principle, gave his decided opposition, and ever after the popes made a distinction between the creed promulgated and the canons passed in this Council of Constantinople.*

The questions of jurisdiction and consecration continued unsettled. Thus St. John Chrysostom was consecrated in 398 by Timotheus, bishop of Alexandria; and in the Council of the Oak, Theophilus of Alexandria deposed St. Chrysostom; while the Metropolitan of Heraclea, reappearing on the scene, presided at that synod. In the third General Council, held at Ephesus in 431, Cyril of Alexandria, nephew to Theophilus, presided and deposed Nestorius—not quite fairly, if it be true that he went to the vote without waiting a reasonable time for the bishops friendly to the accused, and filled all the avenues to the assembly, and intimidated the fathers, by a number of robust and daring fanatical monks, who acted as his soldiery.†

The pre-eminence conferred by the third canon of the Council of Constantinople the court gave out to be simply honorary; but the Bishops of Constantinople, with the imperial sanction, were bent on making it real and substantial. He of the golden mouth was as great a stickler for the rights of his see as any of his predecessors, if he did not rather set the example of encroachment. St. John Chrysostom exercised jurisdiction, not only in the diocese of Pontus and Thrace, but having been invited by certain Asiatic bishops, went also to Ephesus; where he held several synods, deposed six bishops who had been convicted of simony, and, together with their successors, ordained a bishop of Ephesus.

* Neale's Eastern Church, vol. i. p. 27. † Waddington, p. 182.

Theophilus, in his accusations, took care to produce this "illegal innovation."* Atticus, foiled in an attempt to wrest Eastern Illyricum from the Pope, obtained, in compensation for his disappointment, a rescript from the Emperor, which forbade any bishop to be ordained in Asia Minor and Thrace without the Patriarch's consent. Anatolius scarcely set bounds to his pretensions; he ventured to exercise an almost absolute jurisdiction, even in the patriarchate of Antioch. He divided Phœnicia into two metropolitan districts, threatened the Bishop of Tyre with excommunication and deposition, and consecrated a bishop of Antioch at Constantinople.

The Council of Chalcedon, in 451, gratified, one might have imagined, the utmost ambition of the imperial patriarchs, by a canon which decreed that New Rome, ennobled by the residence of the emperor and senate, and which had privileges equal to those of ancient Rome, should be equally exalted also in its ecclesiastical relations; and that the metropolitans of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, and the bishops of countries within those dioceses possessed by the barbarians, should be ordained by the Bishop of Constantinople. This was the last canon but one of this famous Council; and the way in which it was smuggled through—if the statement be correct—will serve to show how very much the tactics of one house of representatives resemble those of another. The sees of Alexandria and Ephesus were vacant; Maximus of Antioch was a nominee of the Patriarch Anatolius, our unscrupulous friend above mentioned; Thalassius of Cæsarea was also under obligations to him. It was plainly the fag-end of the session. The Bishop of Heraclea was gone; the Pope's legates, in unsuspicious confidence, had departed also; not a single Egyptian was present. There remained only a comfortable family-party of court bishops, by whom the proposition was voted *nem. con.*†

At the next sitting the legates attended, and protesting with natural vehemence against the exceptional canon, were assured by the imperial commissioners that they were en-

* Döllinger's Church History, vol. ii. p. 249.
† Ibid. p. 250.

tirely mistaken. "The supremacy over all," they said, "remains inviolate to the Bishop of Rome." In its address to the Pope, the Synod declared that they had never thought that their patriarch was independent of the Bishop of Rome, or that he could compare himself in all things with him. The Council, the Emperor Marcian, and Anatolius himself, confessed in their epistle to the Pope Leo, that the decree respecting the elevation of the Church of Constantinople required his confirmation; and Anatolius expressly declared, even after Leo had made known his disapprobation of the canon, that its whole force and validity depended on the consent of the Pontiff. However, the imperial patriarchs, with all their flattering and deferential words, took care that neither this canon, nor an earlier one, which allowed appeals from any diocese to the Bishop of Constantinople, should remain a dead letter.

In an evil hour for the peace of the Church, the title Œcumenical was adopted by the imperial court. The Council of Chalcedon had thus addressed Pope Leo I. Pope Hormisdas had also been similarly honoured. That it was considered at first as merely complimentary, may be gathered from the circumstance that it was used also in addressing Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria. Some Syrian monks began the practice of giving this honorary addition or prefix to the Patriarch of Constantinople, in the person of John II. The Emperor Justinian gave importance to the title, by using it in a rescript to Epiphanius, successor to John II., who, on the strength of it, disputed precedence with Pope John I. when he came to Constantinople. In a council holden there 536, the Patriarch Memnas, in virtue of the rescript above mentioned, openly claimed the title in question. When the patriarch John the Faster, in 582, convened a general council at Constantinople, to decide on the imputed heresy of Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, John, in his letter of convocation, styled himself œcumenical patriarch. Pope Pelagius II. then, for the first time—though the title had been in constant use upwards of fifty years—took the alarm, and denied that the Patriarch of Constantinople had any right to style himself Œcumenical, or, in fact, to convoke a general council at all. Gregory the Great, the successor to Pelagius, took the matter up very warmly—a great deal

too much so, Doctor Neander thinks, since he refused to listen to any explanation.* According to the construction which Gregory put upon the title, it was certainly a very arrogant assumption: it appeared to him to bear, or might be made to bear, the signification, that the Bishop of Constantinople was the universal, that is, the only true bishop in the Greek empire: and that all others were no more than his representatives, possessing only a power delegated by him. He, therefore, in this sense, declined the title when it was given to him by Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria. As usual, the ecclesiastical and civil authorities at Constantinople apologised and explained, and were profuse in expressions—which cost nothing, and meant nothing—of deference to the Apostolic See. It so happened, during the progress of the dispute, that a priest of Chalcedon appealed from the Patriarch to the Pope; the Patriarch gave way in the handsomest manner, and sent the acts of the process to Rome. Afterwards the Emperor Phocas, of whom the less that is said the better, gave Pope Boniface III. assurance that the title Œcumenical should be discontinued by the Patriarch. However, the title had been in constant use till this reign began, and was resumed immediately after its close, and is kept up to this day.†

I have traced an outline of the fortunes of the ancient republic of Byzantium, and of the rapid steps by which the Church of the metropolis, its proud successor, ascended from the lowest to the highest grade of splendour and dominion. The reader will call to mind, that before a single stone was laid of Constantinople, the Churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, were the chief members of the Christian republic, commanding the veneration of the faithful by the heroic conflicts for the faith of which they had been the scenes, for the scholars whom they sent forth from their seats of learning, in the dispensations of charity and mercy to the poor, the widow, and the orphan, of which they had been the never-failing sources, and he will judge for himself, whether the swift promotion which, in little more than fifty

* Neander's Church History, vol. v. p. 149.
† Döllinger, vol. ii. p. 253.

years, elevated the youngest member of the Episcopal college over the heads of three patriarchs, and in about fifty more placed him on a level with the fourth, in whom, by common consent, in all times before, a primacy was acknowledged to reside; whether this extraordinary rise was a legitimate developement of Church principle, or the arbitrary act of imperial despotism.

CHAPTER II.

ALIENATION OF EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCHES.

The Church a free Confederacy — Primacy of Bishop of Rome — Establishment of Christianity—Division of Empire—Disputes about Illyria —Patrimony of St. Peter — Claims to Bulgaria — Sham Patriarchs— Greek Italy—Sardica against Philipoppolis—Schism at Antioch—Acacius and the Henoticon — Synod in Trullo, or Quinisextum — Iconoclastic Controversy—Violent proceedings of Constantine Copronymus —Irene—Leo the Armenian—Theodora—Protestants against Images —Doctor Arnold approved use of Crucifix—The Holy Rood.

At the commencement of the fourth century, the Church presented the appearance of a vast organised body, spreading her branches far and wide over the Roman empire, and interlacing, with a network of her own, every order of the state, and every gradation of society. Of this great, free confederacy, the Bishop of Rome was the acknowledged head. From Rome the large portion of the West had received the Gospel, from Rome the common interests of Christianity through the whole extent of the Roman empire could best be advanced. The Roman bishops, heads of the wealthiest community, were early distinguished and known in the most distant lands for their liberal benefactions to the Christian brethren, and a common interest bound all the communities of the Roman empire to the Church of the great capital; in Rome was the *Ecclesia Apostolica*, to which the largest portion of the West could appeal as to their common mother. "It was, without doubt, not an accidental circumstance that the Apostle Peter, rather than any other of the Apostles, became the representative of unity for the religious consciousness of the Western Church; for on him had been bestowed, in virtue of his peculiar natural character, ennobled by the Holy Spirit, more particularly the *charisma* of Church government."*

* Neander, vol. i. p. 288.

At this epoch the Church, having the Bishop of Rome her virtual head, defender of the faith and guardian of her liberties, became united to the State; the Emperor, supreme in the latter, claiming the same authority in the former also. Had the imperial jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters been as clearly defined as is the royal prerogative in our Thirty-seventh Article, there had been little ground for dissatisfaction and alarm, but this was not the case. In that observation of Constantine the Great, said in a playful manner at a court banquet, "I am a bishop as well as yourselves,"* there was more meant than met the ear. From the first blissful moments of union the Popes' feelings towards the Emperors were those of distrust and jealousy; nor was it in the nature of things that the Emperors could entertain any very ardent attachment to the Popes, who were continually thwarting their designs, and doing all they could to keep alive that spirit of Christian liberty and independence which these enlightened statesmen would, of course, desire to see wholesomely extinguished.

In a brief review of the agencies at work in the separation of the Greek and Latin Churches, I will trace first the personal and political, and afterwards the ecclesiastical causes of estrangement. Among the personal causes of irritation, the canon of the Council of Constantinople, which gave the second place to, and the canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which conferred an equal first on, the Patriarch of Constantinople are foremost; we can lay our fingers on these two grievances: but the other personal grounds of alienation are so blended with the political, that we must take them as they come.

The partition of the Roman world between the sons of Constantine, on the death of that great prince, and the subsequent —with occasional intervals of reunion—continued separation into the Eastern and Western empires, almost unavoidably upon a state theory, broke up the visible unity of the Church; subjects entered into the quarrels of their sovereigns, national distinctions grew up, intercourse was often interrupted, old grudges were studiously preserved, aggravated, and embittered. Literature, singular to say, of two nations so highly

* Neander, vol. iii. p. 178.

polished, ceased to diffuse its humanising influences. The Latins, on principle, learnt no Greek; and the Greeks, on principle, learnt no Latin. In the communications between Rome and Constantinople, the services of an interpreter were constantly in requisition; and if, as it sometimes happened at the imperial court, the scholar intrusted with this delicate function omitted here and softened there, or with ready wit metamorphosed a rebuke into a compliment, rather than that any unwelcome sounds should grate on the sovereign's ear, those who are more conversant with the ethics of courts than I am must determine the quality of the offence and its extenuation.

When the Holy See and the Eastern Emperors had nothing else to quarrel about, there remained one inexhaustible bone of contention—the Illyrian provinces. These were part of the Western Empire, and included in the Roman Patriarchate till 379, when they were annexed by Gratian to the Eastern Empire.* It had been laid down by the State as a settled principle that ecclesiastical should follow civil divisions, in conformity with which the provinces in question should have been transferred to the Patriarch of Constantinople. But the Pope would not hear of a surrender; he asserted that State arrangements were not binding on the Church, and regularly appointed a vicar to watch over his interests and protect his rights. In the sixth century, in the reign of the Emperor Justinian, at his request Pope Vigilius divided Illyricum into two parts, eastern and western. In Eastern Illyricum the Greek was the vernacular language; in Western, the Latin.† In the heat of the Iconoclastic controversy, in the eighth century, the Emperor Leo the Isaurian wrested these provinces from the Roman Patriarchate, and subjected them to that of Constantinople. The Pope tried hard to get them back again, but with no success; nor was his disappointment much alleviated by the Greek explanation, — that the provinces in dispute had been given to the Bishop of Constantinople, because the Pope of ancient Rome had passed under the dominion of barbarous nations, the Lombards and Franks.

Since the time of Justinian and the ruin of the Gothic

* Townsend's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 467.
† Döllinger, vol. ii. p. 242.

kingdom, down to the middle of the eighth century, the Emperors of the East were in possession of a fragment of the Western Empire,—the exarchate of Ravenna, containing the modern Romagna, the marshes or valleys of Ferrara and Commachio, five maritime cities from Rimini to Ancona, and a second inland, Pentapolis, between the Adriatic coast and the hills of the Apennines.* This territory the Lombards conquered, and after a very brief possession yielded to the arms of Pepin, the father of Charlemagne. The Greek Emperor claimed restitution; the generous Frank in the meanwhile had, in the person of his ambassador, presented the keys and the hostages of the principal cities before the tomb of St. Peter. To the demand, or rather urgently pressed entreaty, of the Emperor, Pepin reverently replied, that no human considerations should tempt him to resume the gift which he had conferred on the Roman Pontiff for the remission of his sins and the salvation of his soul. The Pope, not to be outdone in generosity, still with a mature consideration that enhanced the value of the gift (for the event did not take place till upwards of a quarter of a century after the donation of the patrimony of St. Peter), in the year 800 placed on the head of the French monarch, the illustrious son of Pepin, the crown of the Western Empire, and transferred to him the allegiance hitherto paid to, and rights enjoyed by, his Eastern colleague. From the noble gift of the Exarchate the Popes date their admission into the brotherhood of European sovereigns, and from the coronation of Charlemagne commences their avowed independence on the Greek Emperors.

In the ninth century a question arose, To which patriarchate, of Rome or Constantinople, the recently-converted Bulgarians belonged?† Bulgaria had formerly constituted a part of the Greek empire, and the Bulgarians, when they took possession, found there not Latin but Greek priests: this was the Greek plea.‡ On the opposite side it was contended, that the jurisdiction of the Church was not confined by the political divisions of the empire, and ought not to vary with the variations of territorial boundaries; that Rome had

* Gibbon, chap. 45. † Neander, vi. 50.
‡ Döllinger, vol. iii. p. 97.

ordained, either immediately or by its vicars, the bishops in the two provinces of Epirus, in Thessaly, and Dardania (Bulgaria), until these provinces had been wrested from its jurisdiction by the violence of Leo the Isaurian; that the Bulgarians had of their own will subjected themselves to the Roman Church; that they had been converted by Roman missionaries, and that for three years they had been governed by bishops and priests, who had been sent to them from Rome. Bogor, the monarch of the newly-converted country, wavered; at one time he inclined to Rome, at another to Constantinople. Ultimately he made his choice in favour of the latter. Archbishop Silvester, the metropolitan appointed by Pope Adrian II., on his arrival in Bulgaria, was refused an audience, and commanded to withdraw; a Greek metropolitan, appointed by Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, was received and recognised. This coveted acquisition, however, was lost almost as soon as it was won: in the following century, about 925, the Bulgarian Archbishop, with the consent of the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus, declared his province independent of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.*

In an earlier stage of the question an incident occurred, which I mention just to show the license which the Byzantine court and patriarchs allowed themselves. Photius, of whom more presently, in 867 summoned a council, at which a few bishops only were present. But deficiency in numbers was compensated by the dignity of three of their body, who presented themselves as representatives of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. Nothing could be more imposing—which is quite true—than the appearance and deportment of these venerable men. There are persons in the world who will be busybodies; the proxies of the august princes of the Church were not exempted from the intrusion of a profane curiosity. It was discovered,—from regard to their simulated dignity, I hope not till after they were gone—that the three Oriental Patriarchs never sent, and knew nothing about them; it was elicited that they were not even Christians, but Saracen merchants, who had visited Constantinople on their lawful callings, and been induced to undertake their parts for a consideration.†

* Döllinger, vol. iii. p. 33. † Neander, vol. vi. p. 406.

After the Eastern Emperors had irretrievably lost the exarchate of Ravenna, they retained for some time longer Calabria and Apulia, also Sicily, Sardinia, and other islands in the Mediterranean. If their outlying possessions were less valuable in a political point of view than might have been expected, they were exceedingly convenient under an ecclesiastical aspect,—they were capital means of annoying the Pope. In accordance with which amiable intentions, the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas commanded that the episcopal see of Otranto should be raised to the dignity of an archbishopric by the Patriarch of Constantinople, who ordained the bishops of the surrounding countries: it was decreed also, that the Greek should supersede the Latin language in the Liturgies of Calabria and Apulia.*

The reader, from the details into which I have entered, and the facts recalled to his recollection, may form some idea how far considerations of the rights of their see, and personal motives, may have influenced the Popes in the part which they took in those controversies and collisions, which at no very distant intervals caused repeated suspensions of communion between the two Churches up to the period of their final and complete separation.

The earliest instance of suspended communion occurred during the Arian controversy. Athanasius, the deposed Patriarch of Alexandria, fled to Rome, and made his appeal to Pope Julius; this, on settled Church principles, he was perfectly justified in doing. The Pope, in 342, convened a Synod, intended to consist both of Eastern and Western bishops; however, the latter only obeyed the summons. This Synod reinstated Athanasius in his see, or, more correctly, asserted his lawful title to it. The Pope announced the decree in an encyclical letter, of which Neander says "that it was written with the feeling of superiority that springs from the consciousness of right in opposition to illegal arbitrary will." A few years after, through the influence of the Roman Church, the two emperors, Constantius and Constans, united in calling a General Council for the purpose of settling the matters in dispute; the place of meeting was Sardica in Illyria, the time in the year 347. There were about 300

* Döllinger, vol. iii. p. 104.

Western bishops present, and less than 100 Eastern. On the day appointed, the members took their seats together in the Hall of Assembly. One of the first motions put was, that Athanasius and his friends should be invited to take their seats in the council as lawful bishops; in other words, that the Roman Synod just spoken of should be pronounced valid and binding upon all. The proposition, it will be seen at a glance, included directly or by implication those most jealously contested points of plenary authority and jurisdiction. The motion may have been brought forward with the most pacific intentions; if so, never were purpose and result wider asunder. The Western bishops voted in the affirmative, the Eastern bishops did not vote at all; to a man they rose up, and quitted the assembly. They bent their steps to Philippopolis in Thrace, where they formed themselves into a synod. At their first sitting they renewed the sentence of deposition against Athanasius and his supporters, among whom Pope Julius was expressly named.* Having settled this matter to their minds, and thus calmed their ruffled tempers, they cheerfully set to work to compose a new symbol of faith. Symbols of faith were as frequent then as political constitutions now, and as long lived. During the heats of the Arian controversy, communion was often suspended, not so much between church and church as between members of the same church, Catholic and Arian. The calamity of a general disunion caused the evils of a particular separation to be less considered.

The next partially interrupted communion was occasioned by a disputed succession to the Patriarchal See of Antioch.† The Arians, in 330, deposed Eustathius, the lawful bishop, and in his room elevated, as time went on, a succession of men of their own way of thinking. In 360, Eudoxius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, was translated to Constantinople; and after a hard contest Meletius, bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, elected to the vacancy. What fitful dream of ambition —the noblest, we will suppose, the ambition of doing good— could have excited this simple-minded, amiable man, to travel from remote Armenia to put his claims forward? and to what strange accident did he owe success? His flock, expert

* Neander, vol. iv. p. 66. † Ibid. p. 93.

casuists every one of them, who could split hairs to a nicety, came in crowds to hear their new bishop, expecting profound disquisitions, eloquent denunciations, clever, subtle arguments; a style rich in imagery, sparkling, epigrammatic, sarcastic. The sermons of Meletius were not even controversial; they inculcated Christian moderation, taught nothing but pure Gospel truth. If Meletius overstepped the limits caution prescribed, it was to rebuke "the speculative pride which affected to know and determine too much concerning these incomprehensible things. He reminded them of the Apostle's words,—that human knowledge was but in part, and that perfect knowledge was to be expected only in the life to come." It is almost superfluous to add, that the see of Antioch was declared vacant again in less than a month by the deposition and banishment of Meletius. An out-and-out Arian succeeded him. In the meanwhile the Catholics had chosen Paulinus instead of Eustathius, deceased; so that there were at the same time three parties and three bishops at Antioch—Meletius, Paulinus, and the Arian. The Western Catholics and the Patriarch of Alexandria communicated with Paulinus, the Eastern Catholics with Meletius, and the Arians with their own bishop. Meletius died in 381; Flavian the priest was elected to succeed him. Paulinus died in 388; Evagrius, his successor, occupied the see four years, dying in 392. Flavian had sufficient influence to prevent the old Catholic party from proceeding to a fresh election; and six years afterwards, by the good offices of St. John Chrysostom and Theophilus of Alexandria, he obtained the recognition of the Holy See; and so at length, after a continuance of sixty-eight years, the schism ended.*

I do not undertake to chronicle every difference and disagreement between the Greek and Latin Churches, my pages would fail me if I did; but only the most important and eventful. Next in order comes the affair of Acacius. After the Council of Chalcedon, held in 451, those Oriental Christians who received Monophysite tenets left the Church. This much-to-be-regretted separation entailed disturbance to civil order, as well as religious peace. The Emperor Zeno, at the instance, as supposed, of Acacius, patriarch of Con-

* Döllinger, vol. ii. chap. 3, sect. iii.

stantinople, in 482 published the Henoticon, or Deed of Union; in which, proclaiming himself master and legislator in matters of faith, he decreed that no symbol other than that of Nice, with the additions of the Council of 381, should be received; he condemned Nestorianism and Eutychianism, but made very slight mention of the Council of Chalcedon. The Emperor and his advisers imagined that, without prejudice to their dogmatical differences, the Catholics and Monophysites might, by this edict, be induced to renew communion with each other. The Emperor Zeno died in his bed. There is some satisfaction in knowing this. In strict right, he had no business to put forth the Henoticon in that autocratic fashion at all: still the edict was good. Zeno was not torn to pieces, the Henoticon was. The instant it appeared, the high Catholic world fell upon it tooth and nail. Those halcyon times of peace, the day-dream of the imperial counsellors, vanished before the abhorrent spectacle of confusion worse confounded. In 484 Pope Felix, in a synod of seventy bishops, to give a practical refutation to the legislatorial pretensions of the Emperor in questions of faith, passed sentence of deposition on Acacius, at whose door, whether justly or not, the merit or demerit of the Henoticon was laid. Some monks of the monastery of Acomete affixed the sentence to the mantle of the Patriarch — an act of boldness which cost them their lives. However, the whole East — as whatever the matter might be, if the Pope were concerned in it, was almost sure to be the case — took part and communicated with Acacius. A separation between the two Churches followed, which continued thirty-five years. Acacius, it is but fair to add, was much beloved, and after his death his memory was held in great veneration. On the accession of Justin — a soldier of fortune, who had attained to nearly threescore years and ten; just the Dacian peasant he was born, he could neither read nor write — the face of things changed. Justin reigned in name, but his nephew and adopted heir, Justinian, was really sovereign. For political, not to speak of other reasons, a reconciliation was very desirable. It was effected thus:—A week after the enthroning of Justin, on a Sunday, as the Patriarch John was officiating in the church of St. Sophia, which happened to be very much crowded, he was interrupted by loud cries—

which no one took any pains to suppress — demanding a declaration of his adherence to the Council of Chalcedon. *Vox populi, vox Dei.* The Patriarch complied; in less than twenty-four hours a synod of eighty bishops unanimously confirmed the act, and immediately afterwards an imperial edict was published, obliging all the bishops of the empire to acknowledge the Canons of Chalcedon. The Pope, against whom for thirty-five years the Henoticon had reared its head, a stout rebel, had all he asked granted. The name of Acacius was instantly erased from the diptychs, nor did the imperial purple preserve those of Zeno and Anastasius; even the respected Patriarchs, Euphemius and Macedonius, who refused to condemn Acacius, suffered this posthumous indignity. On Maunday Thursday of the year 518, the five Papal Legates and the Patriarch John mutually gave and received the kiss of peace. They then partook together of the Body of our Lord, and thus the long-desired union of the divided Churches was accomplished.*

As time wore on, the suppressed but unextinguished hostility broke out in indirect forms.† Take the canons of the Synod of the Trullo, so called from the chamber of the imperial palace at Constantinople in which it was convened. This Synod met in the year 691, during the reign of Justinian II. Their decrees — several of them, at least — ostensibly framed for the edification of the whole Church, were really pointed at the Latins, and in very unmistakeable terms. Thus the first canon revived the — one would have thought — extinct fires of the ancient dispute with St. Cyprian, that had been forgotten time out of mind, by confirming the African Synods, which had declared invalid the baptism of heretics and schismatics. In the thirteenth canon they reprehended the celibacy of the Western clergy. In the fifty-fifth canon they condemned the fast of Saturday practised in the Roman Church. The publication of the decrees of this synod was quickly followed by an encyclical letter from the Pope, vetoing the offensive canons.

The traces of this last irritation were still fresh when the Iconoclastic war broke out. This unhappy schism began in

* Döllinger, vol. ii. p. 175.
† Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 198. Döllinger, vol. iii. p. 83.

726, with an edict from the Emperor Leo the Isaurian, prohibiting the veneration of sacred images, and was not brought to a close till the Council of Constantinople in 842,—an interval of 116 years. Throughout this painfully protracted interval, the Popes supported the veneration of the images, while the reigning sovereigns of the East, with the exception of the Empress Irene, and her two immediate successors, were image breakers. Within the boundaries of the Eastern rule the imperial edicts were implicitly obeyed; but the sweeping conquests of the Arabs had seriously narrowed those boundaries: and of the Greek clergy under the Saracen sceptre, George of Cyprus and John of Damascus have honourable mention for a manly independence. The spiritual and temporal heads of the Church came now into violent collision. Gregory III. fulminated a sentence of excommunication against the enemies of sacred images. Leo manned a fleet to subdue by force of arms the refractory pontiff. The fleet was lost in the Adriatic, and the Emperor reconciled himself to the misfortune by confiscating the patrimonies of the Roman Church in Calabria and Sicily, and by separating the Illyrian provinces from the Western Patriarchate. Constantine V. trod in the steps of his father; and in this as in other things, giving the rein to his passions, carried his hostility to the most savage and brutal pitch. He convened a Council in 754, at which 338 bishops of Asia Minor, Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece, were present. It was as much as their lives were worth to have staid away. The fruit of their deliberations was a decree, in which the obligation to destroy images was largely set forth and the piety of the Emperor glowingly eulogised. The decree contained a passage which, when the reader has perused, I think that he will not ask for any more:—"That the disgraceful and blasphemous art of painters had destroyed the work of our redemption, and had perverted all the decrees of the six general councils." The consequence was, that every kind of figure and representation on the altars and walls, on the vessels and ornaments of the church, were destroyed. The Pope condemned the decree, and the three Patriarchs of the East, whose sees, we remember, were in possession of the Mahometans, joined in its rejection.

In reading the doings of Constantine Copronymus, we

almost feel transported to comparatively modern times. The religious houses, with their rich libraries, were either burnt or converted into barracks; the monks were compelled to lay aside their habits and marry, or fly to foreign lands; his own patriarch, who had hitherto obeyed his every will, was deposed and soon after executed; the fury of the populace was permitted and encouraged to wreak itself, not only on the representations but even on the relics of the saints, which were either burnt or cast into the sea.* Nothing was allowed to be set up but the cross only. From 726 to 784 there was a suspension of communion between the Greek and Latin Churches, and between those dioceses of the Eastern Church under the Greek and those under the Saracen dominion. The Empress Irene, if Gibbon be correct in the character he gives her, in other respects not a very amiable personage, did good service by the restoration of unity. The use of images, rationally explained, was sanctioned. The difficulty being removed, Pope Adrian received the Patriarch of Constantinople into communion, and at a council held in 787 peace was restored.

Quiet lasted twenty-nine years. In 816, Leo the Armenian, by an imperial decree prohibited, as contrary to the law of God, all honour paid to images. A renewal of the former tumults and excesses ensued: the sacred images were again broken in pieces and burnt, the vessels of the church on which any figure had been formed were destroyed. All who refused to submit were scourged—many suffered the loss of their tongues—banishment and confiscation of property were considered the mildest chastisements. Bishops and monks suffered torture unto death, or were frequently tied in sacks and cast into the sea. The mere possession of a religious picture or of a book defending the use of images, the reception of an exile or an act of mercy exercised towards a prisoner, brought with it the heaviest punishment. Spies were hired to discover offenders.† This state of suffering and oppression, with brief intervals of relief, continued till 842, when, under the auspices of Theodora, widow of Theophilus, and Empress Regent, a Council was called at Constantinople; which confirmed the decrees of

* Döllinger, vol. iii. p. 49. † Ibid. p. 53.

the second Council of Nice, authorising veneration to sacred images, and anathematized the Iconoclasts. Theophilus had been as cruel a persecutor as any of the Greek emperors, but the affectionate intercession of Theodora prevailed, and upon her declaration that on his death-bed he had given signs of repentance, he was absolved from excommunication.

There exists in the minds of most Protestants a strong repugnance to the devotional use of pictures and carved representations. This repugnance springs from a most virtuous and holy source, an impression that to put material objects to such a use is a violation of the second commandment; yet a distinguished Protestant of our own days, a man remarkable for clearness and vigour of mind, thought very differently. "The second commandment," writes the late lamented Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, "is in the letter utterly done away with by the fact of the Incarnation. To refuse then the benefit which we might derive from the frequent use of the crucifix, under the pretence of the second commandment, is a folly, because God has sanctioned one conceivable similitude of himself when he declared himself in the person of Christ."* The ignorance of the very elementary truths of the gospel existing in our population is notorious; could this have been so great had the Sacred Rood remained, as it ought to have done, in our churches? That most touching scene in the Saviour's passion, when from the Cross he spake to the mother who bare him, and the beloved disciple weeping at his feet, "Woman, behold thy son!"—"Behold thy mother!" In how many instances would not that moving history, that had riveted the eyes of the child, been remembered by the man? A heavenly vision passing and repassing before him: soother in the hour of sorrow, quickener to the affectionate performance of filial and parental duties, inspirer of a hope that maketh not ashamed, and a faith that faileth not, by the vivid evidence of human sympathy united to divine power.

* Dr. Arnold's Life, vol. i.

CHAPTER III.

ALIENATION OF EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCHES.

Ignatius—Cæsar Bardas—Bishops shamefully treated—Photius—Papal Legates corrupted—Correspondence of Pope Nicholas and the Emperor Michael—Charges of Photius against the Roman Church—Introduction of "*Filioque*" into the Creed—Ignatius restored—Photius condemned—Sham Patriarchs again—The matter explained—Negotiation with Pope John XIX. for Independence of the Churches—Michael Cerularius makes a frightful discovery—Final Separation of the Churches—Behaviour of Roman Bishops—Church in East and West compared—Doctor Newman's Lectures—Conviction of ultimate Re-union and its happy effects.

SCARCELY had the Iconoclastic breach closed before another was opened.* Ignatius was fourteen years of age, when, by one of those revolutions common to the Eastern empire, his father Michael, who had worn the purple little more than a year, was dethroned by Leo the Armenian. He retired with his family to the isle called the Isle of Princesses, where they all took the vows of religion. Ignatius had his trials. The persecution of an Iconoclastic Abbot pierced his soul; but he endured patiently, and so won the affections of the community, that on the death of this Abbot he was chosen to succeed him. He governed the house well and wisely; his exemplary life and conversation gained him universal love and veneration. He founded three new monasteries in these little islands. While thus diligently pursuing the duties of his office, in 846 Ignatius was unexpectedly summoned to Constantinople, to ascend that perilous height the patriarchal throne. He carried thither the virtues proper to the monastic state—mortification, humility, and charity; and one beside, most rare in that voluptuous court and corrupted capital, fearless courage. An occasion that called this virtue

* Neander, vol. vi. p. 383; and Döllinger, vol. iii. p. 85, &c.

into action soon presented itself. The reigning emperor, Michael III., was a youth, under the guardianship of his uncle, the Cæsar Bardas. We can judge how well he fulfilled his trust by the pastimes which he encouraged. The most solemn offices of the Church were openly parodied and burlesqued. A professional jester assumed the robes, and mimicked the tone and manner of the saintly patriarch. A sacrilegious audacity spared not the most holy things. When these scandals reached his ears, Ignatius remonstrated respectfully but firmly; his remonstrances were received with insult and indignity. The person of the Emperor may have been held sacred, his youth might have pleaded in extenuation, but no such excuse protected his profligate adviser Bardas, living at the time in open adultery. After repeated warnings to no purpose, Ignatius excommunicated the exalted offender. Within awhile an attempt was made to compel Theodora, the Empress Mother, to retire to a monastery and take the veil. Ignatius opposed the violence with all his might. To silence his opposition an accusation was got up, the materials for which are always at hand in despotic governments. Ignatius was deposed, and banished to the isle of Terebinthus in 858. He had scarcely reached his place of exile before a deputation of bishops and patricians arrived, to persuade him to resign the patriarchal dignity. He had not sought the honour, but had been wrongfully deposed, and he stood to his right, notwithstanding very harsh and contumelious treatment followed his continued refusal.

In the meanwhile a curious scene was enacting at Constantinople. The deposition of a patriarch was no very extraordinary event. The audience-chamber of the Cæsar Bardas was thronged with a crowd of expectant bishops, each of whom felt his own claim to the vacant dignity indisputable. The Cæsar had fixed on his man, but, unfortunately, he was not among the venerable prelates who bent before him. To get out of this difficulty Bardas hit on an ingenious expedient. He took each of the candidates aside and told him that he was the person fixed on, but begged him when the dignity was offered, just for form's sake, to seem to decline it. Accordingly the Patriarchate went a-begging, a unanimous "*Nolo Episcopari*" was returned. For about twenty-four hours —they were not kept in suspense longer—each bishop

anxiously counted the moments for the arrival of the royal messenger, whose urgent solicitation was to overcome his coy reluctance. He never came. Constantinople was electrified by the announcement that Photius, a layman, a Minister of State, but the first scholar of his day, was chosen to fill the patriarchal chair. Imagine how London would receive the news that Lord Palmerston was gazetted Archbishop of Canterbury, and you will have a fair notion of the sensation produced.

Photius was extremely desirous to have the Pope on his side. An embassy of bishops, with an uncle of the Emperor at its head, went to Rome with rich presents; they carried also a letter from the new Patriarch, in which he protested that the appointment had been forced upon him; that the Emperor had insisted on his accepting it, so that he could not refuse. The Pope contented himself with expressing his disapproval of the selection of a layman to fill so high an ecclesiastical dignity, adding, that he would send his legates for more perfect information. The legates came, were entertained with the utmost magnificence, and lodged in the imperial palace, which they were never permitted to leave unattended. All communication with the friends of Ignatius was vigilantly prevented. The legates were unremittingly plied with presents and promises, nor were arguments of a more substantial kind omitted. The papal ambassadors were men. Who could resist royal solicitations so handsomely backed? They studied the merits of the case through the golden medium interposed, and, subject to the approval of their master, confirmed the deposition of Ignatius and elevation of Photius. This synod took place in 861. The legates returned; but tidings of their delinquencies travelled fast after them. They were stripped of their preferments and excommunicated, while the Pope, instead of confirming their acts, convened a synod in 863, which passed sentence of deposition on Photius himself and on the bishops who assisted at his consecration. All those who had been ordained by Photius were commanded to return to the rank of laics.

A sharp correspondence commenced between the Emperor and the Pope. The former wrote that the Bishop of Rome ought to consider it an honour that he had been consulted at all—that he was not to set himself up for a judge—Photius

should be Patriarch, with or without his consent. His imperial majesty descended to personalities. He called the Latins Barbarians, Scythians; Rome, an antiquated city. Nicholas, the reigning pontiff, replied with dignity. To an assertion of the Emperor that he had commanded the Pope to send delegates to Rome, he rejoined that such was not the tone in which it became him to write to a Pope. As the Latin language worshipped the true God, it was clear, he said, that it could not be called a barbarian language; if he called it so because he did not understand it, he should consider how ridiculous it was for a man to style himself *Imperator Romanorum* and yet know nothing of the language of the people. The Pope's letter concluded with this declaration, "That unless the Emperor would command that letter to be burned, he would excommunicate all those who had counselled him to send it, as well as those who had composed it, and that he himself would burn it in a synod." The Emperor had required certain monks who had fled to Rome to be given up to him; the Pope indignantly refused. They should not, if he could help it, become the victims of imperial vengeance. "He speaks here," writes the sagacious and candid historian, whose account I am abridging, "as ever, in the consciousness of the high destination of the new Christian capital of the world, where thousands daily congregated from all nations, seeking protection and quiet for the last days of life."*

In 867, in a synod convened at Constantinople, the same in which the pretended Patriarchs spoken of in a former page were present, Photius retorted on the Pope sentence of deposition. Communion between the churches was again suspended. Shortly after Photius addressed a circular letter to the bishops of the East, in which he objected to the Roman clergy in the debateable land of Bulgaria, and through them to the whole Western Church, that they fasted on Saturday, that they abridged the time of Lent by a week, and that during the fast they took milk food; that they despised those priests who lived in virtuous matrimony, and rejected the anointing (confirmation) administered by priests. The gravest charge was, that they falsified the confessions of faith,

* Neander, vol. vi. p. 395.

which had been sanctioned by the General Councils, by adding to them, and taught that the Holy Ghost proceeds not from the Father only, but from the Son also.

The word "*Filioque*" was first introduced by the Spanish Church, in its profession of faith, about the beginning of the fifth century: it is to be found in the first symbol of the first Council of Toledo, held against the Priscillianists in the year 400. In the symbol of Nice, as enlarged at Constantinople, it was found at the time of the conversion of the West Goths to the Catholic Church. It had been introduced at the Synod of Toledo in 589, and was ordered to be sung in the Mass. From Spain the word passed into France and Germany during the eighth century, and in the Synod of Friuli, 794, and in that of Frankfort in the same year, was adopted in the confession of faith. Here, it must be acknowledged, we have a remarkable instance of a late developement on a most awful subject.*

Nicholas seems to have been more disturbed by these attacks than he need have been. Not trusting to his own powers of ratiocination, he wrote to Hincmar of Rheims, and begged him to help him to refute them, more particularly as the following serious allegations had been since added:—That the Latins offered on the altar at Easter a lamb, together with the Body of our Lord; that the priests did not permit their beards to grow; that they consecrated deacons bishops without having first ordained them priests; and that they prepared the chrism from river water.

In 867 the Emperor Michael was assassinated, and Basilius, with whom he divided the cares of state, became sole emperor. He was a supporter of Ignatius, whom he reinstated in the patriarchal throne, after an exile of nine years. Public feeling, however, was so equally divided between the late and present Patriarch as to render the assembly of a General Council necessary to decide the question. This synod, eighth in order of the General Councils, met at Constantinople, October 869. The pontifical legates presided, and below them sat Ignatius and the representatives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. To reconcile the statements undermentioned,

* Döllinger, vol. iii. p. 91.

we will suppose the opening of the council, at which it is natural to imagine there would have been a full attendance, to have been merely a form, no business to have been gone into then. At the first session for the transaction of business only eighteen members were present; to these the legates propounded a formula of union, which every bishop was required to sign before he could take part in the council. The formula bound the subscribers to an approval of everything that had been said and done on the Roman side, and a disapproval of all counter-demonstrations on the Greek side. In the first and second session the formula was signed as demanded. It must be remarked, that on both these occasions the attendance of bishops, deducting the patriarch, legates, and other official members, was extremely scanty; there were not above ten or a dozen independent prelates at the most. In the third session, more numerously attended, several bishops refused to sign the formula of union, complaining that the Byzantine Church was made the bondwoman of the Church of Rome. In the fifth session, the deposed patriarch, Photius, was compelled to appear; whatever he might have been in the height of power, there was nothing that misbecame him in his low estate. He bore himself with composure and dignity. To most questions he gave no reply; to a few he made answer in the words of Christ, taken from the Scriptures. In the seventh session, at which the Emperor assisted in person, an address was read, in his name, by the Imperial Secretary, to the recusant bishops, exhorting them to yield to the decision of the present synod, which was celebrated—This passage was read with great emphasis—with the co-operation of the united patriarchal sees. Photius, and Gregory of Syracuse, a prelate who had assisted at his consecration, declared that they would give the reasons for their conduct only to the Emperor, and not to the legates of the Pope. They were then excommunicated, with all their adherents. To one who objected to the anathema pronounced on Photius, because he was no false teacher, but an orthodox man, Elias and Thomas, the representatives of the patriarchs, replied, that no false doctrine could be worse than the actions of Photius. This strong expression of feeling from lips so weighty settled that point at once. The Council was suspended for three months, and then resumed its sittings.

The Roman influence was plainly in the ascendant, as, among other decrees, there was this,—That whoever, either by words or by writings, should attack the see of Peter, should be condemned, as were Photius and Dioscorus. The Emperor signed the decrees of the council after the delegates of the patriarchal churches. The Roman legates added to their subscription the clause with reservation of the revision of the Pope, which all the Greeks, as was very natural, took in high dudgeon.

The Emperor Basilius was a very able and sagacious prince. Gibbon compares him to Augustus, saying that he found the empire ruined and left it flourishing. The remarkable deference which he showed to the Roman Pontiff may be taken as a fair measure of the augmented power and influence to which the Popes, as sovereign princes in Italy and Patriarchs of the Western Church, had attained. So far as words went, which were the current coin at Constantinople, Basilius studied to conciliate the Roman bishop. Communion was formally restored, nor afterwards interrupted; for on the death of Ignatius, Photius quietly succeeded him, and made his peace with the Pope. To the honour of these rival patriarchs it should be stated, that, notwithstanding they were so opposed to each other in public, in private they were excellent friends. Photius showed great sympathy for Ignatius in his last illness; Ignatius, when dying, commended Photius to the favour of his surviving friends.

The reader may remember the trick played at the Council in 867, by palming off certain Saracen merchants as the veritable representatives of the Oriental patriarchs; he is hardly prepared to hear that a similar deception was practised in the Council of 869, in which Photius was deposed and excommunicated. Photius made the discovery — the sagacity of men out of office is astonishing. In one of his letters he declared that an unheard-of and unprecedented thing had happened; in so saying he evidenced a short memory, a no uncommon infirmity in public men, for the counterpart happened to himself two years before. That Elias and Thomas, who laid down the law so forcibly on the misdoings of Photius, were very respectable persons, I am not going to deny, but their proper business at Constanti-

nople, to which masquerading in patriarchal costume served as an episode, was to negotiate, as agents from the Saracens of Alexandria and Antioch, for the redemption of captives.* The explanation is this; Constantinople was to the East the capital of the Christian world, the proper place where general councils should assemble: now a general council with the patriarchal seats vacant would show a sad falling off. Since the conquest of Syria and Egypt by the Arabs, the Oriental Patriarchs often could not, and just as often would not, come. When the real is not to be had, the next best thing is a well-got-up sham; and whatever may be thought of the morality of the proceeding, these Moorish gentlemen looked their parts to admiration.

In 1024, during the reign of Basilius II., a proposition was made to Pope John XIX.† to consent that the Patriarch of Constantinople be considered on a level with himself; and that, as head over the Greek Church, following her own laws, he should be so far considered a universal bishop. It surprises one to be told that a proposal like this, touching Rome in the tenderest point, was ever made; nor is that astonishment lessened by the knowledge of the fact that it was favourably received and seriously entertained. The envoys of the Emperor were, it is believed, empowered to offer weightier arguments than could be expressed in words. The negotiation, meant to have been kept a profound secret, by some accident got wind. All Italy rang with indignation. William of Dijon, a zealous abbot, whose mission was to set the popes right when they were going wrong, read this unfaithful steward a most trimming lecture for daring to think of surrendering one iota of the power conferred on St. Peter by Christ himself, and which extended over the whole Church. John gave way, and the project fell to the ground. It must, in any case, have come to nothing eventually, as the first act of a new pope would have recalled and annulled a cession so injurious to the prerogatives of the Holy See. John XIX. was of the family of the Counts of Tusculum, who in those turbulent times were masters of Rome, and dictated the election of her pontiff. Regardless as this unprincipled man was of the rights and duties of his exalted station,

* Neander, vi. p. 407. † Ibid. p. 412.

public opinion, by the lips of the intrepid and plain-spoken Abbot of Dijon, shamed him into a better mind. In the Church's history, evil is ever balanced by some compensating good. While the Counts of Tusculum made Rome a bye-word, the monk Hildebrand, in the calm cells of distant Clugny, was pondering in his heart those noble conceptions which have made the pontificate of Gregory VII. glorious, and shed a redeeming splendour over so dark an age.

The irritation between the two churches, by the natural operation of time, had gradually calmed down. There was little intercourse between them, still they were in ostensible communion: the zeal, no less passionate than bigoted, of Michael Cerularius* revived the old feuds, and exasperated both parties to a pitch utterly beyond hope of reconciliation. There were in the Latin Church Greek monasteries, and in the Greek Church Latin monasteries, using their own language and ritual respectively. They formed a bond of union, contributing to the maintenance and increase of a good understanding. The Greek had a house of prayer, and therefore a home in the Western Patriarchate; nor did the native of Italy, France, Spain, or the remote Britain, feel himself a stranger in the far East. This last connecting link Michael Cerularius burst asunder. In 1053 he caused all churches in which worship was conducted according to the rites of the Church of Rome to be closed, and the abbots who would not conform to the Greek ritual to be confined to their cloisters. These were very stringent measures; but there had dawned on the mind of Michael a light that had not been vouchsafed to his predecessors: he had made the appalling discovery that the whole Latin Church was sunk thousand fathoms deep in a soul-destroying heresy. They actually, without the least sense of the heinousness of the sin—just as if they were judicially hardened—used unleavened bread in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist! Here were the plain marks of the beast! Rank Judaism! Who could deny this? They fasted on the Sabbath in Lent! that was proof positive. Besides, they wrung the neck of ducks and chickens, and ate them afterwards, reckless of the prohibition in Scripture of "things strangled." Michael said this, and a great deal more,

* Neander, vol. vi. p. 413, &c. Döllinger, vol. iii. p. 104, &c.

in a letter written to John, bishop of Trani in Apulia. A copy of this letter came into the hands of Cardinal Humbert, a celebrated polemic of the day, who laid it before Pope Leo IX. The Pope published an answer, in which he contrasted what he styled the indisputable and decisive authority of the Church of the Apostle Peter, who must, beyond all doubt, have committed to her the tradition of the truth on all important points, with the Church of Constantinople, always troubled by false doctrines and schisms. Upon the wanton and unjustifiable act of closing the churches he remarked, "There are, both within and without Rome, a great many Greek monasteries or churches; none of these have been yet disturbed, nor prohibited from observing the customs of their forefathers. On the contrary, they have been advised and admonished to keep to them. It is known that diverse uses, according to time and locality, are no hurt to the salvation of believers, since it is one faith, working by love all the good it can, which recommends us to one God."

It was neither the interest nor the inclination of the Emperor Constantine Monomachus to quarrel with the Pope. At the instance of the former negotiations were opened, in which the Patriarch took a part—a reluctant, and probably not very gracious one. Leo IX., shortly before his death, sent, in 1054, three legates to Constantinople. These were Cardinal Frederick, archdeacon of Rome, Cardinal Humbert, and the Archbishop of Amalfi. The legates took high ground, and spoke in a lofty tone. Michael would not give way an inch; the negotiations were broken off; the last public act of the legates was performed in the Church of St. Sophia, where they solemnly excommunicated the Patriarch Michael and all his adherents. Having laid the Deed of Anathema on the grand altar, and shaken off the dust from their feet, they departed. They had hardly reached the first post on their journey home, before messengers from the Patriarch overtook them, requesting their return. They cheerfully complied, prepared to withdraw the excommunication should any concessions from the Patriarch enable them to do so. At a friendly warning from the Emperor they hastily recommenced their journey. The anathema had not been suffered to remain long on the high altar of St. Sophia; it was soon in the hands of Michael,

and interpolated by him, or with his privity, involved the whole Eastern Church in excommunication. The excitement of the people knew no bounds. Had the legates lingered in hopes of an accommodation, as, judging by their readiness to return, they might, and it was evidently intended they should have done, they would to a certainty have fallen victims to popular fury. They escaped to carry home no very favourable impressions of the just dealing, whatever they might have thought of the polemical skill, of the redoubtable Michael.

They were scarcely gone before he assembled a synod, and pronounced anathema against the legates. In order to induce the Patriarchs to break with the see of Rome, he wrote a letter to the Patriarch of Antioch, in which he enumerated other scandals in the Western Church. It was allowed, he said, in that Church, to two brothers to espouse two sisters. He stated also, that the bishops wore rings, and engaged in warfare; that in the Mass one ecclesiastic embraced another; that baptism was administered by a single immersion; and that salt was placed in the mouth of the child baptized; that the images and relics of the saints were not honoured, and that Gregory the Theologian, Basil, and John Chrysostom, were not numbered among the saints.

In the East, public opinion supported Michael. He wielded a political scarcely inferior to his religious influence. The Emperor, who had interfered to save the legates, felt the weight of his displeasure. Michael denounced him as an enemy to the true faith and concealed Papist; an insurrection broke out, Michael absolved the people from their allegiance. The Emperor Michael Stratioticus was dethroned in 1057.* The purple at the disposal of this haughty and turbulent prelate was bestowed on Isaac Comnenus. Monarchs are rarely grateful to the authors of their elevation. Upon a charge, whether true or no, consonant with the Patriarch's ambitious character, that he had assumed the emblems of majesty, and declared that between the sacerdotal and imperial rank the distinction was small, he was banished to

* Constantine X. died in 1054; Theodora, his successor, in 1056, to whom Michael succeeded.

Proconesus, where he ended his days, 1059. State exigencies, on several occasions afterwards, constrained the Greek emperors to attempt the restoration of unity, but these superficial reconciliations were hollow and vain. It will be unnecessary for me to take up the reader's time in discussing them.

In a gradual separation going on through many centuries, in which so many different causes concurred, and such a variety of actors appeared and disappeared on the scene, it is scarcely possible to determine the effect due to a distinct cause, or the share of blame justly attributable to each individual. But a succession of persons stand out from the rest, commanding our undivided attention; to judge them fairly we must place ourselves in their position, and see with their eyes. The theory by which the conduct of the Popes was regulated was this,—That they were the divinely-appointed heads of the Church Catholic, the chartered guardians of her rights and liberties. What a single bishop was to his own diocese, such they deemed themselves to be to the whole Christian world. They laid to their own hearts and consciences those awful words, "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, Who shall judge the quick and the dead, at His appearing and His kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine."* I am no pledged advocate; I do not take upon myself to say that the Sovereign Pontiffs never interposed unnecessarily, that the spiritual arms which they wielded were never rashly nor unjustifiably employed, but I cannot help feeling persuaded that the reader who will examine dispassionately the line of conduct which the Popes pursued in the unhappy divisions and dissensions which so often distracted the Church, will find that they generally acted with firmness and moderation; that they rarely resorted to extreme measures till there was no choice left them; that the sentence of condemnation, so far from being irrevocable, was almost always mitigated, and often revoked, on the repentance and submission of the offender.

In the ten centuries and more during which the two

* 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2.

Churches held together, the Western Empire had been dissolved and reconstructed out of new elements. The Eastern Empire had been stripped of the fairest provinces, and reduced to the dimensions of a second or third-rate kingdom. In the East, where the Church was subordinate to the State, she preserved—and that was much—the shadow of her former greatness. In the West, where she exerted her own independent authority, she conquered the conquerors, and on the thoughtful, earnest, practical character of the European race impressed convictions that have never been utterly effaced. None laboured more in the extirpation of the good seed in later years than did the Church of Rome herself, by her manifold abuses and corruptions. Still, so often as she has started from her lethargy, shaken off her guilty dreams, girded herself with strength to run the race set before her, it is scarcely credible in how short a time she has recovered the ground that had been lost. Witness the progress of the Jesuits in Germany in the sixteenth century.* Witness the revival of Catholicism this century in sceptical, revolutionized France. Witness—I write with sorrow, knowing whence chiefly converts are drawn—the success at the present hour, in our own country, of the Oratorians and other regular and secular missionaries of the Roman Church.

Doctor Newman, in his able and interesting Lectures on the "Difficulties felt by Anglicans in submitting to the Catholic Church," which, by the way, have removed none of my difficulties,† or rather in the preface to the Lectures, speaks of "the instinctive feeling of curiosity, interest, anxiety, and awe," excited by the appearance of a Roman Catholic missionary. He describes this "as a specific feeling, which no other religion tends to excite." In his present

* Rankes' Popes, vol. i. p. 410.

† I think of the words of two great teachers, one belonging to the seventeenth, the other to the nineteenth century:—

"My answer was, that somewhat dwelt within me that would not suffer that, till Rome were other than it is."—*Diary of Archbishop Laud*, p. 143. Parker, Oxford, 1839.

"I will mention a personal consideration, which ought to be considered not a slight argument for a Christian's continuing where Providence originally placed him, in spite of the scandals which surround him. It is this: in various parts of our Church various persons, who do not know

position he naturally defines this to be "an involuntary homage to the notes of the Church—a spontaneous recognition of her royal descent and her imperial claim." There was a time, not many years ago, when he ascribed these feelings to a different cause. He is truer and juster now. Yet the gifted man who could see in that majestic form, those almost divine lineaments, the habitation of an unclean spirit*—the abode of a fiend seven-fold in wickedness—will surely pardon those on whose memories is still freshly and vividly impressed Rome as she appeared to their ancestors,—that brow serene knit with pride, anger, and covetousness—those tender, affectionate eyes scowling with hate, or fierce with unbridled lust —those hands that minister to the poor and afflicted, eagerly stretched forth to grasp the polluting bribe — those feet that hasten with the message of peace, swift only to shed blood. The Church of Rome, with all her priceless gifts, has something else to think of when she treads English ground beside her royal descent and imperial claims. She should advance to meet us—she should show in her deportment and actions a sorrowing consciousness that she too has had her share in the work of separation. Ah! in the way of peace and reconciliation stand many obstacles, prejudices to be overcome, misconceptions to be removed, both by Roman Catholics and Protestants. Yet who, reflecting on the changes that have taken place and are taking place around and in us, can doubt that, distant as it may seem to be, that day will come and not tarry? Blessed day! when the now pent-up or diverted streams of Christian sympathy shall flow on together as a mighty river; when a crowd of petty distinctions and differences shall be swept away. In a true Socialism we shall have all things in common—common joys, common griefs, common faith, common hope, and, greatest of all, common charity. Believe me, there is not a single form which the religion of

each other, and who gained their religious views in various ways, men and women, have, in consequence of the miserable confusions of the time, been tempted to look out for the true Church elsewhere. They have been tempted to do so; but yet, when they proceeded on, and came towards, or upon, or over the border, they have one by one, though separate from each other, felt as it were a nameless feeling within them forbidding and stopping them."—NEWMAN'S *Sermons on the Subjects of the Day*, p. 383.

* Romanism and Popular Protestantism, p. 103.

Jesus Christ assumes among us from which there goes not forth a crystal thread of light, leading on to, and ending in, Catholic Unity. When the rent shall have been closed, and the breach filled up, a future generation will marvel that they should have been kept so long apart. Casting a backward glance on the scenes of trouble, rebuke, and blasphemy which sadden our days, they will feel as men feel who, years after, traverse a battle-field, when the earth that had been broken by the horses' hoofs, stained with gore, blasted and desolate, has become a flowery sward, refreshed with the dews of heaven and the tender rains; and they will think of those who contend in the heady strife as these think of gallant foes sleeping side by side in their bed of glory.

CHAPTER IV.

ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

Persecutions of Christians—Humanity of Heathen Magistrates—Galerius' Edict of Toleration—Cautious Policy of Constantine—His Prayer on the Defeat of Licinius—Gratitude of Christians—Duties of Bishops in the Fourth Century—Theodoret of Cyros—Liberality of Aurelius—Noble Remark of St. Augustin—Privileges of the Clergy—Observance of the Lord's Day—Soldier's Form of Prayer—Constantine Pontifex Maximus—His Relation to the Church—Adoration of Divinity of Emperors—Doctor Waddington's Summary—Action of Greek Church—Alexander and Arius—Progress of the Controversy—Synods and Counter-Synods—Popularity of Arius—Letter of Emperor Constantine—Outrages of Arians—Excitement of the People—Council of Nice—Imperial Persuasives—Church in Bonds.

THE Protestant reader may have perused the preceding chapters with dissatisfaction; he may expect at my hands some less exceptionable evidence of the action of the Greek Church than the attitude, offensive or defensive, assumed towards one whom he would designate as a foreign bishop, offers to him. I will endeavour to meet his wishes, and I hope that he will forgive me if I seem to retrace my steps and go over ground trodden already.

Dark and threatening were the signs of the times as the third century passed away. An order of the Cæsar Galerius had just come out, commanding all soldiers to join in the Pagan sacrificial rites; many, in consequence, gave in their commissions; soldiers of all ranks, from the highest to the lowest, preferred to quit the service rather than forsake or compromise their faith. The worst forebodings were realised when, in 303, the persecuting arm of Diocletian spread terror and desolation. Nicomedia, where Diocletian kept his court, contained a magnificent church, erected and adorned by the pious munificence of Christians of rank and influence in the imperial household. The hallowed services of prayer and praise had been accustomed to prevent the night-watches.

On the 22d of February,* at the first dawn of day, the church was surrounded by troops; the doors, which had been hastily barricaded, were broken down; the copies of the Bible found were burnt, and the whole edifice abandoned to plunder and destruction. The next day an edict was published to the following effect: "All assemblies of Christians for religious worship are forbidden; Christian churches are to be demolished to their foundations; all sacred writings are to be burnt; those who hold places of honour or profit must either renounce their faith or be degraded. In judicial proceedings the torture may be used to Christians of whatever rank. Plebeians are to be deprived of their municipal privileges as citizens and free men, Christian slaves are incapable of receiving their freedom." This edict was so timed as to aggravate its severity. It became known in many provinces near the Easter festival, and in several instances on Easter Day. Numbers yielded and gave up copies of the Scriptures. These were afterwards termed in reproach, *traditores*, whence traitors. Numbers more resisted at the cost of their property, and often their lives; and for the honour of human nature it may be added, that not a few were saved either alternative by the consideration and humanity of the heathen magistrates.†

Take an instance or two. Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, removed all manuscripts of the Bible from the church to his own house, leaving behind only the writings of heretics. The search-officers came and carried these off, asking no questions. Certain senators of Carthage told the proconsul of the matter, but the edict said, "sacred writings," without specifying which, orthodox or heterodox; and since the edict had been executed the proconsul declined to interfere. When Secundus, a Numidian bishop, refused to surrender the Scriptures, the officers of police asked him to give them some useless fragments,—anything he pleased. So the question of the Prætorian prefect to Felix, an African bishop, "Why do you not surrender your sacred writings—or perhaps you have none?" In 304 an edict still more rigorous was published. Proclamation was made in the streets of the cities and towns, that men, women, and children should all

* Neander, vol. i. p. 201. † Ibid. p. 205.

repair to the temples. Every one was summoned by name from lists previously made out, and the recusants condemned at once. At Alexandria, and the instance was not singular, Pagan citizens concealed the persecuted Christians in their houses, and protected them at the hazard of their own lives. These barbarous proceedings, while they inflicted most serious injury on the best interests of the empire, effected nothing towards the end designed, the extinction of Christianity. In 308 there was a lull, Christians condemned to work in the mines were better treated; within less than a year another desperate effort was made. An order was addressed to all civil and military functionaries, commanding that the heathen temples which had fallen into ruins should be rebuilt; that all free men and women, all slaves, and even little children, should sacrifice and partake of what was offered on heathen altars. By a refinement of cruelty, all provisions in the market were to be sprinkled with the water or the wine which had been used in these sacrifices.

The efficacy of this and similar edicts may be judged by the remarkable counter-declaration issued by Galerius in 311. "As the majority of the Christians, in spite of every prohibition, persevere in their opinions, and it has now become evident that they cannot worship their own Deity, and at the same time pay due homage to the gods; the Emperors have resolved to extend to them their wonted clemency. They may once more be Christians, and will be allowed to hold their assemblies, provided only they do nothing contrary to the good order of the Roman State." *

The space between toleration and ascendancy was soon spanned. The movement now was under the direction of Constantine. The guiding hand of this sagacious prince guarded against the mischiefs which might else have arisen from over-confident zeal and rash precipitation. His earlier proclamations placed all religious sects on a level, to stand or fall by their own merits; every person was permitted to be of what religion he pleased. A leaning towards the Christians was only observable in a clause which expressly by name specified Christianity as one of the religions which all persons might freely profess. Shortly after the churches,

* Neander, vol. i. p. 213.

landed estates, and other endowments, confiscated by Diocletian, were ordered to be restored; nor was the decree marred by injustice, since it contained a provision for equitable compensation to those who had bought the forfeited estates, or to whom they had been granted. As Constantine, thus cautiously feeling his way, saw no appearance of any concerted or dangerous opposition from the adherents of the old religion, "the obsolete superstition," as he scornfully termed it, his intentions were more fully disclosed, and edicts and laws in favour of the Christians multiplied.

The hypothesis, that ascribes the establishment of Christianity by Constantine to worldly policy, to the considerations which might reasonably be supposed to influence a cool-headed sagacious statesman, by no means excludes the existence of religious convictions; we may believe him quite earnest in that prayer of thanksgiving after the defeat and death of Licinius, wherein he says, "Everywhere preceded by thy sign, have I led on a victorious army. For this reason I have consecrated to thee my soul, deeply imbued with love and with fear; for I sincerely love thy name, I venerate thy power, which thou hast revealed to me by so many proofs, and by which thou hast confirmed my faith."* The assured deliverance of so many sufferers for conscience sake from torture and contumely; the lasting reunion of so many families in the restoration, as alive from the dead, of their exiled or enslaved members; the permanent reinstation in posts of honour or emolument, or in their professions and callings, of so many talented, industrious, and virtuous men; the relief from anxiety and suspense that had weighed heavily on every Christian subject and citizen; the joy which lightened every heart and was diffused over every countenance, centered in Constantine, the great instrument in the hand of God for the delivery and exaltation of the Church of the Redeemer. A comparative view of the laws which Constantine enacted for the benefit of the Church, and of the prerogatives which he reserved to himself, may help the reader to determine whether the first Christian Emperor merited all the praise which the Catholic Church, in the transports of her emancipation, heaped upon him.

* Neander, vol. iii. p. 28.

Upon the bishops of that period the care of all the churches in their respective dioceses really laid: they were expected to sustain the sacred fabrics, the services and ministers of religion; to supply the Christian poor with the means of subsistence; to provide houses of charity for strangers, almshouses, hospitals, orphan asylums, schools. To meet these and other contingent expenses a large and constant revenue was required. The annual subscriptions and donations of the faithful provided the necessary funds. Hitherto they could not receive legacies, the privilege to do which was only granted to corporations by the license of the State. Constantine made the Christian churches, or rather bishops, an exception, assigning as a reason "the inviolable sacredness of the last will."* To show how bishops spent their incomes then, and how much, with prudence and foresight, may be done with a little, Theodoret, bishop of Cyros—an inconsiderable town—saved enough to enable him, over and above the ordinary expenses of his see, to erect porticoes for the use of the city, build two large bridges, construct a canal from the Euphrates to the town, which had suffered before from want of water, and repair and improve the public baths. The episcopal revenues well and wisely spent were not wrongfully acquired. A citizen of Carthage, having no children, nor expecting any, made over his property to the church of that city, reserving a life interest in a part for his support. Afterwards he had a family, on which Aurelius, the bishop, cancelled the deed of gift, and restored the whole. "According to the civil law," writes St. Augustin, "he might have retained it; but not according to the law of heaven." This high-minded man says, in another place, "He who would disinherit his son to make the Church his legatee, might look for some other one to receive the inheritance besides Augustin; nay, he hoped and prayed that he might look in vain for any one."†

Bishops had had for a long time their courts to decide causes between Christians, but no person, in the eye of the law, was bound to submit to their arbitration. Constantine enacted, that the decisions of the bishops in their consistories should stand good, and that no secular judge should have

* Neander, vol. iii. p. 181. † Ibid. p. 182.

any power to reverse them. This episcopal jurisdiction, however, was confined to civil causes, criminal were reserved for the lay tribunals. By the canons of the Church, bishops could not be concerned in blood. A humane custom imposed upon them the duty of interceding for criminals. Constantine recognized and sanctioned the practice. The clergy were exempted from all civil personal offices—the privilege descended even to the door-keepers. They were also, by a rescript of Constantine addressed to the Proconsul of Africa, exempted from all civil and municipal offices. "Our pleasure is, that all those in your province who minister in the Catholic Church, be exempted from all public offices whatsoever, that they may not be let or hindered in the performance of divine service by any sacrilegious distractions." Afterwards laymen, having procured titular orders, and pleaded them as an exemption from the burdens of the State, the above-named laws were amended by clauses, enacting that no rich plebeian, qualified by his estate to bear civil offices in any city, should become an ecclesiastic; or if he did, he should be liable from the time the amendments were made to be fetched back, and returned *in curiam* to bear the offices of his country as a layman.* The manumission of slaves, hitherto performed in heathen temples, Constantine allowed to take place in Christian churches. In 315 he abolished the punishment of crucifixion in veneration of Him who had been crucified for mankind. In 321 he published a decree for the observance of the Lord's day,† under the title of Sunday—a clever compromise; the name heathen, the use Christian. The courts of law were to be closed, and all labour, excepting agricultural, was prohibited. The manumission of slaves was permitted in the spirit of the Saviour's words applied to the Sabbath—"I will have mercy and not sacrifice." The soldiers, if Christians, were required to attend the services of the Church; if not Christians they were to march out into the fields, and at the word of command repeat the following prayer:—"Thee alone we acknowledge as the true God, thee we acknowledge as ruler, thee we invoke for help; from thee have we received the victory, through thee have we conquered our enemies, to thee are we

* Döllinger, vol. ii. p. 209. † Townsend, vol. i. p. 251.

indebted for our present blessing; from thee also we hope for future favours, to thee we all direct our prayer. We beseech thee that thou wouldst preserve our Emperor Constantine and his pious sons in health and prosperity through the longest life."* To meet the prevailing disposition towards an ascetical life, the Emperor repealed the Poppæan law, which had inflicted fines and disabilities on the unmarried.

From the concessions, privileges, and immunities granted to the Church, let us turn to the prerogatives reserved to the Head of the State. In 312, a year before the famous edict of toleration, published first at Rome, and afterwards in bolder language at Milan, Constantine had assumed the supreme direction of the state religion, under the customary title borne by the emperors, of Pontifex Maximus. By the act of union, Constantine considered himself to stand in a similar relation to the Christian Church—to be, in fact, her Chief Pontiff. This was his meaning when he styled himself a bishop. The courtly pen of his friend and biographer, Eusebius, confirms and explains the title. "God," he writes, "had entrusted the general oversight of the whole Church to the emperor, just as the oversight of their particular dioceses belonged to the bishops;" a sort of universal episcopate, in relation to the several individual bishoprics.† Under Paganism, policy or adulation, or both, regarded the reigning Emperor as elevated above the common rank of humanity; to his divinity altars were raised, and adoration paid. On the change of the established religion, this notion, diametrically opposed to the first principles of Christianity, was studiously maintained. The royal palace was still *Diva domus;* the Emperor's missives, *Literæ sacræ;* his edicts *Constitutiones divinæ;* his decrees, *Oraculum cœleste.*‡ In 404, the Emperor Arcadius proclaimed, "All shall be deprived of their rank who shall sacrilegiously dare to oppose the authority of our divinity."§ The emperors, from Constantine downwards, though the title Pontifex Maximus was dropped at the death of Gratian, continued to exercise power in accordance with these supernatural pretensions. Constantine, however, proposed only to regulate the external affairs of the Church; bishop though he

* Neander, vol. iii. p. 35. † Ibid. vol. iii. p. 178.
‡ Bingham's Christian Antiquities, vol. ii. p. 79.
§ Townsend, vol. i. p. 393.

styled himself, he did not ostensibly intrude into the priest's office; he did not take upon himself the administration of the word and sacraments. His functions, as described by Dr. Waddington, who tells us much in a little compass, embraced "everything relating to the outward state and discipline of the Church, and was understood to include a certain degree of superintendence over such contests and debates as might arise among the ministers, of whatsoever rank, concerning their possessions, their reputation, their rights and privileges, as well as their political or other offences against the laws of the empire. Even the final decision of religious controversies was subjected to the discretion of judges appointed by the emperor. The same terminated any differences which might arise between the bishops and people, fixed the limits of the ecclesiastical provinces, took cognizance of the civil causes subsisting between ministers, and lent his power to the execution of the punishment due to their criminal offences. And though the right of convoking local and provincial synods remained with the Church, that of assembling a General Council was exercised only by the prince."* By this summary of the imperial prerogatives there does not seem to have been a very large margin left for the liberties of the Church.

Two points have been insisted upon, as exhibiting an exemplary self-denial in a despotic ruler: one, the free election of bishops according to custom; the other, liberty of speech and vote in the general councils. A sketch of a constitution, ecclesiastical or civil, tells us what is intended to be, and what should be, done, but sometimes leaves us in the dark on the most essential point—what actually has been done. To form anything like a tolerably correct idea of the combined action of Church and State in this age, which has been assumed to be the proper model for succeeding ages, we must see this complicated machinery at work. In the Eastern empire, the relations between the Church and the State, from first to last, never materially varied; no revolutions interposed, there was no organic change, as in the Empire of the West. It becomes, therefore, comparatively unimportant what period we select. In the choice of a controversy, of which Con-

* Waddington's History of the Church, p. 83.

stantine witnessed the beginning, but of which neither his sons nor his sons' sons saw the close, I have been influenced by the interest which attaches to the subject, and the instruction to be derived from watching the imperial theorist himself carrying out his ideas of Church government.*

At the commencement of the fourth century the Alexandrian Church numbered among her members two presbyters, of great piety and virtue; remarkable in an age when discipline had not yet become relaxed, nor were good examples wanting, for the exemplary discharge of their sacred duties. Their names were Alexander and Arius. Upon a vacancy, these two, with others, were competitors for the patriarchal dignity: the choice fell on Alexander. Arius continued in the ministry of the church of Baucalis, the oldest parochial cure in the city, to which he had been appointed by the deceased bishop Achillas. Alexandria, you will recollect, possessed a famous school of theological science. In seats of learning preachers occasionally discuss very deep and mysterious subjects. It chanced, in one of these erudite disquisitions, that Alexander made use of an expression which had an heterodox sound, very much like Sabellianism. Arius, whose powers of observation would seem to have been uncommonly sharpened by his recent disappointment, took the matter up, and, as it is difficult to keep to the strict line of right in these sublime heights, soon argued himself into an error immeasurably worse. Baucalis was not only the oldest parish, but also in the best part of the city, where the principal merchants of Alexandria resided. Arius was very popular with his people; they saw him much in earnest in the views he had adopted, and his wealthy and influential parishioners stood up for the opinions of Arius, without greatly considering their tendency, because they liked the man. It is but justice to Arius to say, that he really believed the particular tenets he was at so much pains to spread, to be true Catholic doctrine, and did not, at the time he promulgated them, anticipate the result. When he was enabled to judge better, he had advanced too far—become too much heated in the pursuit—to retrace his steps. The respect and

* Neander, vol. iv. p. 32, &c. Döllinger, vol. ii. p. 102, &c. Neale's Church of Alexandria, vol. i. book i. sect. xv. &c.

esteem in which he was held induced several of his brother clergy to side with him. The ladies of Alexandria, also (most powerful auxiliaries), warmly espoused the cause of Arius.

The bishop Alexander, in expectation that the excitement would die away, shut his eyes and closed his ears as long as he could. His first step was marked by forbearance and good sense; he called his clergy together, to discuss the question in a friendly spirit. The discussion brought out the opinions of Arius in a clearer light, showing them to be decidedly opposed to the Scriptural teaching of the Church on the Divinity of our Lord. Two meetings were held, at the second of which it is supposed that Arius presented a confession of faith, or explanation of his sentiments,—catholic in form, uncatholic in substance. This document was not accepted. Conferences having ended in nothing, at a synod of the priests of Alexandria and the neighbouring province of Mareotis, sentence of excommunication was passed on Arius; thirty-six priests and forty-four deacons voting for, and five priests and five deacons against, the penalty. The relative numbers tend to show that the more the tenets of Arius were known the less they were liked. The condemned presbyter, —a man of popular manners, commanding talents, exquisite tact, and admirable address,—very soon, excommunicated though he was, gathered a strong party round him. He was a native of Libya, and the Libyan bishops upheld their countryman. The merchants, who sadly missed his eloquent discourses, spoke of his virtues and his wrongs to all their acquaintance and correspondents. The convents rang with his praises; for Arius—a high recommendation to the cloister —was an ascetic. In fact, it grew to be a settled thing everywhere, with everybody, that Arius was a most ill-used man. Alexander convened another synod; this time, a general council of the whole province. One hundred bishops were present, who, by a unanimous vote, confirmed the previous excommunication, and delivered Arius and his followers over to anathema, till such time as they should repent and recant. Shortly after, Arius left Alexandria and went into Palestine. However, before he did so he wrote to his chief friend and confidant, Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia: Eusebius replied. The letters, extant in part, appear to be just such as a man

who thought himself aggrieved would write and a sympathising friend answer.

Arius agitated successfully in the Holy Land. Alexander the while was not inactive; he wrote letters to all provinces of the Church, entreating the various prelates to refuse communion to Arius. The encyclical letter which reached Palestine drove Arius to seek an asylum at Nicomedia. Eusebius wrote again and again to Alexander in his behalf. That prelate replied by a circular letter, in which he maintained his ground with spirit and Christian boldness; excepting one or two personal reflections on Eusebius, which he might just as well have run his pen through, the address was in keeping with the man and the occasion. Arius was not a person to leave a stone unturned. He got himself introduced to Constantia, widow of Licinius and sister of the Emperor, and made a complete convert of her. In order to neutralise the censure of Alexander, Eusebius of Nicomedia assembled a provincial council of Bithynia, at which Arius was formally restored to communion, and letters were despatched in every direction to notify the event.

Job, seeking solace in his affliction, exclaimed, "O that mine enemy would write a book!" Arius gratified his antagonists, he wrote a book—an adaptation to serious subjects of the style and metre of a popular but licentious poet of the day. The character of Arius is, or should be, a guarantee that he took from Sotades nothing but his captivating manner. The book is defunct, and the best that can be said of it is, that it was well meant; and the worst, that it was conceived in exceedingly bad taste.

After the Synod of Bithynia, Arius returned to Palestine, where, by the permission of three bishops, of whom the historian Eusebius of Cæsarea was one, he was allowed to celebrate the divine offices, as he had done when parish priest at Alexandria. At this time he was so ill-advised as to alter the Doxology into "Glory be to the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Ghost." Alexander's next step was the publication of a confession of faith, or Tome, as it was called, which he sent round to all quarters, and requested the signatures of the various bishops: 250 signatures were attached. Alexander sent the Tome to his namesake, the Bishop of Byzantium, accompanied by a letter, in which he gave a dismal

account of the state of things at Alexandria. Arius was the all-engrossing subject. The ladies—the young ladies especially—were indefatigable in his behalf. The stir at length reached the ears of Constantine. Eusebius of Nicomedia, the sworn friend of Arius, was the informant; and the colouring which he gave was, of course, favourable to the accused. Eusebius made light of the whole matter, and threw the blame on Alexander, the diocesan of Arius.

Constantine, under the erroneous impression given him, wrote a letter to the parties; which failed, as might have been anticipated by any better informed, of the effect intended, but was a sensible composition notwithstanding. "On investigation" (so it ran) "I must say, that the reasons for this eagerness on both sides appear to me insignificant and worthless. . . . . As I understand the matter, it seems that you, Alexander, were asking the separate opinions of your clergy on some passage of Scripture, or rather, were inquiring about some unedifying question, when you, Arius, inconsiderately committed yourself to statements, which should either never have come into your mind or have been at once repressed. On this a difference ensued, Christian intercourse was suspended, the sacred flock was divided into two, and the harmonious order of the Church broken. . . . . My advice to you is, neither to ask nor answer questions which, instead of being Scriptural, are the mere sport of idleness, or an exercise of ability; at best keep them to yourselves, and do not publish them. . . . . You agree in fundamentals; neither of you is introducing any novel mode of worship; so that it is in your power to unite in one communion. Even the philosophers of one sect can agree together, though differing in particulars. . . . . Is it right for brothers to oppose brothers for the sake of trifles? Such conduct might be expected from the multitude, or from the intemperance of youth, but little befits your sacred order and experience of the world." The conclusion is really pathetic:—"Give me back my days of calm, my nights of security, that I may experience henceforth the comfort of the clear light, and the cheerfulness of tranquillity; otherwise, I shall sigh and be dissolved in tears. . . . . So great is my grief, that I put off my journey to the East on the news of your dissension. . . . . Open for me that path towards you which your contentions have closed up.

Let me see you and all other cities in happiness, that I may offer due thanksgiving to God above for the unanimity and free intercourse which is seen among you."

One of the most distinguished theologians of the day, a Spanish bishop—(the Church of Spain, fallen on evil and degenerate days, has still one modern name to glory in — her Balmez)—the venerable Hosius, was the bearer of the letter. On the arrival of this great prelate, a council was held at Alexandria, the question was thoroughly gone into, the definition "consubstantial" approved, and Arius excommunicated afresh. So soon as the decision of the council was known the Arians were quite furious. The gentle sex — to express myself with that delicacy which is fitting — became most ungentle; the Alexandrian fair displayed the opposite to the virtue indicated by their name. It was running a most alarming risk for a Catholic to be seen in the streets of Baucalis. Whatever article — the heavier the better — could be got to, descended from the windows, upon heads burdened enough already. The royal person was happily safe from violence; but no indignity to the statues of the sovereign was spared. The whole world, the work-a-day world, farm-labourers, mechanics, artisans, attendants at baths, waiters at taverns, were seized with a monomania. Let the necessity have been ever so urgent, the solicitous and perplexed applicant could get nothing he wanted till he had, with good or bad grace, submitted to be victimized by a polemical harangue, of which, with grotesque confusion of terms, and reasoning not often heard in the schools, Arius was the hero and the idol. To Constantine, as Head of the Church, the deposed presbyter appealed, asking redress for his unjust excommunication. The Emperor condescended a reply, in which it is to be regretted that the royal penman compromised his dignity by infelicitous and clumsy attempts at sarcasm. However, if he passed sorry jokes on the name and person of Arius, it was blow for blow — a rhetorical retaliation for the actual bespattering of the effigies of the sovereign.

As the inhabitants of the distracted provinces were beginning to arm themselves, to act on the offensive or defensive, for attack or protection, and there was every probability of some serious outbreak, of which the disaffected might take advantage; under those pressing circumstances, Constantine

convoked a General Council, to meet at Nicæa, June 325—the first public exercise of authority since the union of Church and State. Three hundred and eighteen bishops obeyed the summons, for whom means of conveyance, other incidental travelling expenses, and maintenance during the session of the council, were provided at the Emperor's charge. Constantine opened the proceedings, in that conciliatory and deferential spirit which usually characterised his deportment to the bishops. He came down from his palace, to the great church in which the assembly was held, without guards, attended only by a few distinguished prelates; the robes he wore on the occasion were more than ordinarily magnificent. On his appearance the bishops rose up; he passed through the hall to the throne prepared for him at the upper end, but remained standing till the members present requested him to be seated. A bishop—it is uncertain who—spoke a complimentary address, to which Constantine replied in a short speech, expressing his joy at meeting so large an assembly, and his hope that their deliberations might lead to unanimity. He delivered himself in Latin, and an interpreter translated his words into Greek, the native language of the greater number present. The real business then commenced. In the council there were three parties, who represented the divided suffrages of the Christian community—the Catholic, the Arian, and the Semi-Arian, or *via media* party. Of avowed Arians there were very few. The Semi-Arians agreed in disapproval of the opinions impugned, but differed with the Catholic party as to the wording of the symbol, or profession of faith, by which pure Gospel truth should be preserved for the instruction of the faithful. Eusebius of Cæsarea, one of the leaders of the moderate side, proposed a confession of faith, containing the doctrine which, as he said, had been held from the first by the bishops in his Church,—the confession which he had received in his earliest religious instruction and at his baptism, and which, as a presbyter and a bishop, he had constantly preached. This symbol was perfectly Catholic in terms, but open, by perverse ingenuity, to an Arian construction. It was received with rather an angry chorus of "No, no!"

A committee to draw up a symbol of faith was appointed, of which Hosius acted as chairman. The strong cord which

bound together the other articles of the creed, and defied the utmost efforts to loosen, was the word "consubstantial," adopted from the last council at Alexandria. Constantine, we are informed, occasionally assisted at the sittings of the committee, took great interest in the question, and himself spoke, explaining how the word Homoousion ought to be understood: were there not reasons for thinking he was crammed for the occasion, the imperial exposition would have been worth having. The fruit of the deliberations of the select members was the symbol, named after the place of assembly, the Nicene Creed; which, with the judicious and charitable omission of the concluding anathema, and the addition of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, has been read in the Catholic churches ever since: an evidence of the general agreement of Christians, at that period, in a fundamental article of faith, and a clear and beautiful exposition of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity; a mystery it were presumptuous to attempt to fathom, but which brings peace and joy in believing. Of the 318 bishops present at the council, 301 *ex animo* adopted the creed. The dissentients were 17. It is asserted that the General Councils assembled by the Emperors were free. What constitutes freedom in a deliberative body? Certainly nothing short of the assurance that, vote which way members will, they shall take no hurt, incur no loss of property, position, or personal security. Tried by this test the First Nicene was not a free council; the symbol came forth from the committee with an imperial authorization; whoever refused to subscribe it disobeyed (so the crown lawyers argued) the commands of the sovereign, and exposed themselves to the pains and penalties of contumacy, which in this case were deposition and exile.

Perplexed in part by this new reading of the oath of allegiance, in part intimidated by penal terrors, twelve of the opposition went over to the majority at once. Three more, one of whom was Eusebius of Nicomedia, after a little hesitation, followed their example. Two remained firm; Secundus, bishop of Ptolemais, and Theonas, a Libyan bishop. Eusebius, however, declared that he subscribed the creed and not the anathema, and both he and his celebrated namesake, the Bishop of Cæsarea, avowed that they yielded

for the sake of peace, after having expressed their views as to the way in which the creed ought to be understood. Secundus and Theonas were deprived of their sees, and together with Arius himself banished, by the decree of the Emperor, into Illyria. The two prelates, regarding their deposition as an unjust sentence, inflicted by an incompetent authority, appear to have continued in the exercise of their episcopal functions; though Pope Julius, in an instance named, disallowed ordination conferred by Secundus as invalid.

Ecclesiastical historians dwell with rapture on the great Council of Nice. They single out from that venerable assembly the scarred and mutilated bodies of intrepid confessors, who endured grief—suffering wrongfully. In glowing language they contrast their present with their past condition: then houseless fugitives, now the honoured of the princes of the earth. The Council is to these writers the fulfilment of prophecy descriptive of the glories of the Church, when kings shall be her nursing fathers and queens her nursing mothers. The essayist must bear the reproach of singularity, but for his life he can discern, in this famous assembly convened by the temporal head of the Church, only a splendid illusion—real subjection thinly veiled under the semblance of freedom—royal flatteries designed to enslave whom they enchant—the same cautious, shrewd, forecasting, undermining policy, that had destroyed civil, directed with renewed energy to the extinction of spiritual liberty.

CHAPTER V.

ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

Athanasius—The Arian Presbyter—Arius received into Communion by the Emperor—Athanasius before Constantine—Council of Tyre—Apparition of Arsenius—Athanasius appeals—Banished to Treves—Alexander of Constantinople's Prayer—Death of Arius—His Character—Constantius—Athanasius restored—Council of Antioch—Athanasius deposed—Gregory of Cappadocia—Laws against Heretics—Athanasius restored—Arian artifices—Athanasius in danger—Emperor Julian's Edict of Toleration—Council at Alexandria—Greek Church Missions—English Government not after the Pattern of the Byzantine—Convocation—Let Right be done, and Charity abound.

At this eventful epoch, when imperial prerogative was advanced to crush the independence of the Church, there arose one singularly qualified to defend and preserve it. In the vigour of early manhood, rich in divine and human learning, courageous, cool, determined, always master of himself, seeing the path of duty before him, and resolved in simplicity and singleness of mind to keep that path, come what may—such was Athanasius, the sagacious counsellor and faithful friend of the aged Alexander, who, with his dying breath, recommended him as his successor to the suffrages of the clergy and people. At the time of the Patriarch's decease, Athanasius was absent on duty in a distant part of the diocese. There is a rumour of a hurried, irregular election by the Arians, of one Theonas. However, the great body of the clergy, in whom the choice lay, were unanimous in favour of Athanasius: nor were their deliberations permitted to be of long continuance; the shouts of the multitude who crowded the avenues broke in on the conclave,—"Give us Athanasius! the true Christian, the ascetic, the true bishop! We will have none but Athanasius! The prelates shall not depart till they have elected Athanasius." *

* Neale's Church of Alexandria, vol. i. p. 153.

Popular favour is proverbially capricious, and often bestowed on the undeserving—in the instance of Athanasius it was lasting and merited: easy of access, kind and courteous to all comers, skilled to temper indulgence with firmness and reproof with gentleness, the tender and munificent patron of the suffering poor, fearless to control the oppressive rich; by a most just and equal return, he occupied that place in the hearts of others which he freely gave them in his own. Athanasius was about thirty years of age, when, in 326, he ascended the stormy throne of the Alexandrian Patriarchate, which he nobly filled for almost half a century.

The decision of the Council of Nice on the vital doctrine impugned, cordially acquiesced in by 301 out of 318 bishops, ought to have set the question at rest. The minds of the faithful should never from that time have been harassed with a doubt. Had the Church been unfettered in her action, such would have been the result. The power which ruled her destinies was open to disturbing influences, against which the mind of a judge ought to have been steeled. It may be remembered that Arius had been introduced to Constantia, the Emperor's sister, at Nicomedia. This princess had in her household a priest attached to the person and opinions of Arius. On her deathbed she recommended her chaplain to the protection of her brother,—a kind and thoughtful act, as the penalties enforced against those who held these opinions were very severe. Constantine fulfilled a wish so tenderly and touchingly expressed. The priest permitted to approach the imperial presence availed himself of the opportunity to intercede for Arius. Constantine, softened by recent recollections, listened patiently, and replied consistently, that Arius should be restored upon his subscribing the Creed of the Council of Nice. Arius, looking on this answer as equivalent to a safe-conduct, ventured himself in Constantinople. Received to an audience of the Emperor, he presented his confession of faith, which did not agree with the Nicene Creed, inasmuch as the key-word Homoousion was omitted. This confession Constantine accepted, and sent Arius back to Alexandria (this happened between the years 328 and 329) By so doing, Constantine glaringly violated the constitution

of the Church, substituting for her proper synodal action his own single, and in the present case most inconsistent, judgment. We may extenuate the fault of the man; the image of his beloved sister was before him—he yielded to emotions, natural if not excusable: but we may justly complain of that union of Church and State which rendered the teaching and authority of the former entirely dependent on the personal feelings of the sovereign. Nor can we regard the founder of such a system, however lofty a place he may hold in the ranks of statesmen, deserving of thanks and benedictions at the hands of Churchmen.

When Arius arrived in Alexandria he produced an imperial order, in virtue of which he claimed to be admitted to communion. Athanasius declined to receive him. Petitions, got up much in the same way in which petitions have been got up since, remonstrances couched in mild, and threats in harsh language, produced no effect on this faithful steward of the deposit of faith. At last the Emperor commanded Athanasius to admit Arius, and all his friends who were willing to rejoin his Church, and unless he did so declared that he should be deposed from his office and sent into exile. Athanasius respectfully but firmly replied, that his duty as a pastor did not permit him to receive the teachers of false doctrines into the fellowship of the Church. Constantine, esteeming the courage and honesty of Athanasius, pressed the matter no further. The friends and supporters of Arius who surrounded Constantine knew when to time their misrepresentations. They fabricated a plot to assassinate the Emperor, and made the chief conspirator an Egyptian, whom they pretended Athanasius had supplied with money for the purpose. In obedience to an imperial summons the Patriarch, in 332, presented himself at Psammathia, a suburb of Nicomedia, where Constantine was residing at that time. In the consciousness of truth and loyalty, Athanasius calmly met the searching glance of one quick to detect guilty embarrassment. There was a cheek that blushed, there were eyes that sought the ground, not of Athanasius. Constantine acknowledged the accusation to be groundless, and in his letter to the Church of Alexandria styles the Bishop a man of God. In this letter he lamented the existing divisions, and recommended unity and concord.

It being quite clear to the Arian party that nothing was to be gained from Athanasius, they saw their only chance lay in getting him deposed. The Patriarchs of Alexandria were almost, if not quite, absolute in their diocese, and exercised, it is supposed—we have no positive information—considerable civil jurisdiction also. As a conscientious bishop would, Athanasius made frequent tours of visitation, attended by both clergy and laity. In the places which he thus visited were many opposed to him. The escort of Athanasius and the partisans of Arius did not very well assimilate—from words they came to blows, scandal and outrage followed. In the exercise of his patriarchal authority, Athanasius dispossessed of their preferments several Arian incumbents by main force, if they would not go without. All these things put together, formed the groundwork of the charges against Athanasius of oppressive and tyrannical conduct. Among other grave imputations, he was directly accused of the murder—the judicial murder, we suppose—of Arsenius, a bishop; and in proof both of the act itself, and of the cruel dismemberment that accompanied it, an embalmed human hand was asserted to be that of the dead Arsenius. At the Council of Tyre, held in 335, by the express authority of Constantine, to reinstate Arius, Athanasius met his accusers face to face, After other charges had been gone into, with no very satisfactory result to the promoters of the impeachment, the matter of Arsenius was brought forward, and expatiated on with much affecting declamation. To make assurance sure, the ghastly and mutilated hand was held up in the air, to the conviction and horror of the assembly. An untoward interruption cut the oration short. At a sign from Athanasius, a muffled figure, which stood beside him, unrobed, and presented the familiar countenance of Arsenius himself, alive and well.

The Synod of Tyre appointed a committee to investigate the allegations in Egypt, but would not, as in common fairness they should have done, allow any friendly to the accused Patriarch to be on the committee. The result, as might have been anticipated, was adverse. Athanasius appealed to the Emperor, and, to enforce his appeal in person, immediately set out for Constantinople. On arriving at the city, hearing that Constantine was on horseback in the

suburbs, without a moment's interval for rest or refreshment, with a few attendants he rode on to seek his sovereign. As the travel-stained company advanced at a rapid pace, Constantine, expecting a courier with important despatches, spurred on his horse to meet them. A glance undeceived him. He had never flinched in the battle-field, but he turned hastily away this time. After considerable hesitation, and with great reluctance, an interview was granted. Athanasius pleaded his cause energetically, out of an honest and good heart; he might have triumphed—perhaps in reality he did triumph. A courtier interposed. "Athanasius has said that he can stop the corn coming from Alexandria," on half-yearly supplies of which the court depended. Whether the charge was credited, or in kindness to Athanasius advantage taken of it to remove him out of danger's way, Constantine pronounced on the Patriarch sentence of banishment to Treves. He was received by Constantine the younger with great honour and reverence, and in a letter of this prince, written after his father's death, he says expressly that Athanasius was sent into Gaul to be beyond the reach of those who had designs on his life, and that Constantine the Great had fully resolved to restore him in a short time. That is, we may infer, so soon as Arius was firmly seated in his old parish of Baucalis.

In 336 Arius, at the Synod of Jerusalem, was solemnly received back into the communion of the Church. He then returned to Alexandria. If he anticipated an enthusiastic reception he must have been woefully disappointed. The consistent, manly, uncompromising behaviour of Athanasius, had won all hearts. The appearance of Arius was the signal for tumults and disorders, to allay which Constantine the same year ordered him back to Constantinople. It was determined that his reconciliation to the Church, since it could not be safely performed at Alexandria, should be publicly celebrated in the capital. The day was fixed; all the bishops present at Constantinople were commanded to assist; Constantine with the whole court was to be present. In the meanwhile neither entreaties nor remonstrances were spared to save the Church and government so heavy a reproach. On the night previous some of the party of Arius thus insolently addressed the Bishop Alexander at the con-

clusion of the holy office:—"As against your consent we procured him to be called to court, so to-morrow, in this very church, he shall join and assemble with us, whether you will or no."* So saying, the throng, flushed with their approaching victory, swept away, and left the good bishop with a single attendant, named Macarius, alone in the church. He closed the doors, and, kneeling down before the high altar, prayed after this manner:—"If, Lord, thou permittest Arius to communicate to-morrow, suffer me thy servant to depart, and destroy not the righteous with the wicked. But if thou sparest thy Church, as I know thou wilt, have respect to the threatenings of the Eusebians, and give not over thine heritage to ruin and reproach. Take Arius out of the way, lest, entering into the church, heresy enter with him, and hereafter piety and impiety be accounted alike."

The day dawned; few had slept, the streets were crowded, the troops were under arms. Time wore on—noon came. As each man's mind was set, some augured the best others the worst from the delay. Many a heart sank within itself when news spread that Arius was on his way to the church of St. Sophia; but another report came quick after, so strange, so startling, that at first no one credited it—it was true. Arius, the observed of all observers, was advancing slowly, preceded and followed by a train of friends and admirers in long and stately procession, when, just as he entered the Great Square, in which stood the porphyry pillar crowned with the statue of Constantine, death struck him—it might have been a quarter of an hour, and Arius was no more. "Death is the common lot of all men. We should never triumph over the death of any man, even though he be our enemy, since no one can know but that before evening the same lot may be his own." These are the words of Athanasius in reference to the event—let us make them ours. Arius died in 336.

The character of this remarkable man has come down to us delineated by no friendly hands; considerations of justice, no less than charity, induce us to throw his faults into the shade, and give prominence to his good qualities. Through life the moral conduct of Arius was irreproachable; he

* Cave's Lives of the Fathers, vol. ii. p. 220.

reached a high standard of Christian excellence, as excellence was then accounted; he was rigid in the observance of prayer, fasting, watching, and those bodily austerities which were the religious characteristics of the day. As a parish priest he was, till this unhappy schism, beloved by the people committed to his charge. As a preacher, he enjoyed great fame and popularity. These became a snare to him. Popularity often brings power, but not so often the wisdom and discretion to use that power well and wisely. Upon very insufficient grounds Arius placed himself in open opposition to his canonical superior, whose language he misconstrued, and in turn had the misfortune to be misconstrued himself. Treated as he considered unfairly, his high spirit, impatient of contradiction, drove him into errors, and would not suffer him to acknowledge and recall them. I cheerfully subscribe to the opinion of a distinguished Church writer, just lost to the world,* that Arius, in the first instance, never intended to put forth any tenet contrary to Catholic doctrine. He claimed a latitude commensurate with the language of the Scriptures, and refused to be tied closer than the Bible bound him. In person, Arius was very tall and thin, of a pale and pensive countenance; in his dress there was a studied negligence, common to the ascetics of his time, and he wore his hair long and matted. His voice was shrill and sharp. Notwithstanding his ungainly appearance, his manners were very pleasing and attractive; and his conversation, when he had a point to gain, most fascinating. Happy would it have been for the Christian Church had his opinions been buried and forgotten in the grave that closed over his earthly remains; but it was ordained otherwise.

The year following that in which Arius died, Constantine, a catechumen till his last illness, during which he received the Sacrament of Regeneration, departed this mortal life. Constantius succeeded to his eastern dominions. The sceptre in the hands of this vain and weak prince became a crosier; the crown, a mitre. His mind was absorbed in theological disputations: he acted as if he had ascended a throne for no other purpose than to survey from this elevation the whole field of controversy and dictate infallible decisions.

* Dr. Neander.

The Arian presbyter, recommended to Constantine by his deceased sister, had ever since continued about the person of the Emperor; to his custody was committed the will of Constantine, and he it was who placed the precious document in the hands of Constantius. This man soon acquired great influence in the new court, made a convert of the first chamberlain, or prime minister; having accomplished which, he with no great difficulty brought over to his opinions the other imperial functionaries. The Empress was persuaded next, and, last of all, Constantius, who affected to take no one's word for anything, made the discovery for himself that Arianism was the true religion.

I am anticipating: this process of persuasion took time. Constantius, on his accession, was not unfavourably disposed towards Athanasius; his brother, Constantine the younger, counting on his acquiescence, sent Athanasius from Treves back to Alexandria. The Patriarch on his way back had two interviews with his sovereign; one at Viminiacum, a city of Mœsia, where he was supported by the presence of his friend and patron Constantine the younger; the other, at Cæsarea. On his entrance into Alexandria, in 338, he was welcomed by the inhabitants with the strongest marks of affection and reverence. The Emperor himself had never been treated with greater honour; nor, indeed, having respect to the heartfelt sympathy expressed, with half so much.

The Council of Tyre had deposed Athanasius—their decrees had not since been reversed: the council aforesaid was a packed assembly, questionless; still there was a colourable pretext supplied to those of the Arian party, and they were all of one mind on this point, who refused to acknowledge Athanasius as rightful bishop. The malecontents met at Antioch, and elected Pistus, an excommunicated priest, to the (as they asserted) vacant see. Constantine the Great, during the banishment of Athanasius, had been repeatedly urged to appoint in the room of the deposed Patriarch, but had constantly refused. Pistus was consecrated by Secundus, bishop of Ptolemais. There his greatness ended, for he never, it appears, set foot in Alexandria. In the year 340 Athanasius lost his friend Constantine, who fell in battle. In the year 341, at the dedication of a magnificent church founded by Constantine the Great, a synod was held at Antioch,

attended by a hundred Eastern bishops; this synod produced five creeds, drawn up on a principle of accommodation, none of them Arian, and yet none of them Catholic. The Western Church did not receive them, preferring to hold to the Nicene Creed, which had never been revoked, only ignored. The twenty-five canons of the Council of Antioch have been received by the Catholic Church. Two, the fourth and twelfth canons, unobjectionable in themselves, were pointed at Athanasius. The former provided, that if a bishop deposed by a council, or a priest or deacon deprived by his bishop, presumed to exercise his office, he should not be capable of restoration, even in another council. The twelfth canon ordered, that if a bishop or priest under the like circumstances should appeal to the Emperor his punishment should be the same. These canons Constantius, nothing loath, put in force against Athanasius; his former deposition was confirmed, and Gregory the Cappadocian chosen in his room. For argument's sake, assuming the deposition of Athanasius as valid, we observe, in filling up the vacant see, freedom of election totally disregarded. A stranger is sent from a distance by a Syrian council, and all the clergy and people of Alexandria have to do is to obey the imperial edict which appoints him.

Any man thus nominated in place of Athanasius had had need of very prepossessing manners and great powers of conciliation. Gregory was just the reverse; he did everything to exasperate the minds of the people, while opposition to him was reputed as disloyalty to the Emperor, whose sign manual he bore, and punished accordingly. The mixed multitude, composed of all the idle, the dishonest, and the dissolute, who speedily flock together on any occasion in large cities, were edged on to attack the Catholic churches, wound the monks, insult the religious women, and even kill some of the worshippers. In the midst of these outrages an attempt was made by some daring spirits to awaken sympathy with the ancient religion, and heathen sacrifices were actually offered on the altar of the Church of Quirinus.

Gregory, under severe penalties, forbad the private as well as public assemblies of the Catholics, and subjected the persons of bishops, equally with those of priests, to the most shameful and barbarous indignities. Did he in these cruel proceed-

ings act on his own responsibility—carry out alone the dictates of a violent and arbitrary disposition? He acted strictly according to law. The statutes of the empire subjected heretics to fine, imprisonment, exile, or death, premising that all were heretics who differed from the minutest point of the Catholic faith, whether doctrine or discipline. Heretics were to be declared infamous; branded with names of reproach; have no benefit of the public law, nor common privileges, laws, and customs, as citizens; be regarded as entire strangers; could hold no civil nor military office, could make no will—the less important, since the next passage tells us that they had nothing to leave, their goods being confiscated to the state. The sovereign himself could not remit this penalty. Heretics could make no gifts nor receive any, neither buy, nor sell, nor contract. They were proscribed, banished, and transported, having been first sometimes scourged. In their places of exile they were forbidden to come within a certain distance of a city or church. The last prohibition was not always enforced. Every heresiarch, with his favourers and followers, was to be beaten with mallets and assured of the Divine displeasure.* Now, had a voice from heaven pronounced what was and what was not heresy, Churchmen would have had some rule to go by—they might have had an assurance of safety or otherwise, according to circumstances; but, unhappily, the lips which determined these momentous questions were of the earth, earthy. The favourite bedchamber-woman of the Empress or chamberlain of the Emperor could often turn this destructive machinery which way they would, since an edict of an Emperor was the law of the Church. Through the greater part of the reign of Constantius, and frequently afterwards, the Catholics were heretics in the sight of the law, and suffered accordingly.

Athanasius appears at first to have intended to maintain his rights against the intruder Gregory, he awaited his coming; but, warned by the tumults which ensued, he sought concealment under a friendly roof, beyond the gates of the city. Here he composed his encyclic Epistle to all Catholic bishops throughout the world, in which he set forth the outrages perpetrated by Gregory; and as no one was safe from a similar

* Townsend, vol. i. p. 397.

invasion of his rights, appealed to the fears if not the conviction of those who shared a common danger. He then, in 341, sailed to Rome, whither, as we have touched on that part of his history before, we will not follow him. In 347, the Council of Sardica acquitted Athanasius and his friends, and excommunicated the Arian or Eusebian party, as it was called, from its indefatigable supporter, Eusebius of Nicomedia. The members who voted in this council were all Western bishops. The Eastern bishops, who met at Philippopolis, were engaged in the same congenial task, though with opposite results, as they, with Stephen, patriarch of Antioch, at their head, excommunicated Pope Julius, Hosius, Athanasius, Paul of Constantinople, and all their adherents. As years went on, things at Alexandria fell from bad to worse. Agreeably to the laws against heretics, public notice was given, that if Athanasius or his companions returned, it should be lawful for any one to bring them to condign punishment—that is, they might kill them as they would some wild beast. In 349 Gregory was put to death by the people, worn out by his oppressions and exactions.

Constantius had been repeatedly solicited before by his brother Constans to restore Athanasius, but had resisted hitherto; the vacancy of the see left him at liberty to comply with the request of his brother, without doing violence to his own ideas of right. The Emperor wrote to Athanasius a very handsome letter of recall, and when the two met at Antioch on the Patriarch's return, Constantius gave him personal assurances of the sincere interest and esteem he felt for him. The Emperor took the opportunity to make a request, which would have proved extremely embarrassing to a man of less ready wit—Athanasius parried it with admirable dexterity: the request was, that he would allow the Arians the use of a church at Alexandria. "Certainly," he replied, "if you will allow the Eustathians" (the Catholics of Antioch) "a church in return." The subject was dropped.

Athanasius was, if possible, more heartily welcomed on his second return from exile than he was on his first; the people had reason, after the experience of a Gregory. He received very gratifying proofs of the effect wrought by his fearless upright consistency; many separatists joined the Catholic Church; many of his personal enemies openly retracted their

hostility: in the words of St. Gregory Nazianzen, "There was great joy in that city." The Arians did not relax their exertions, persuaded that, whatever constraint policy might lead him to put on his inclination, Constantius continued an Arian at heart.

All persons are more or less sensitive of a slight or affront; the more exalted the rank or station, the keener the susceptibility. One day an officer of the imperial household presented himself before Athanasius, and informed him that, agreeable to his wishes, all the necessary preparations were made, and that he had by command of the Emperor been appointed to conduct him to the vessel which was to convey him to Constantinople. Athanasius, surprised, asked what he meant. "The Emperor," he replied, "has received your letter, everything is arranged." Athanasius had neither written nor dictated a line; a letter had been forged in his name to Constantius, asking permission to wait upon him in Italy, in order to confer on ecclesiastical affairs. Athanasius, considering that his presence was more necessary at Alexandria, wrote an explanation to the Emperor. However, his enemies insisted on the genuineness of the first letter, and made the conduct of Athanasius appear in the light of a studied insult to his sovereign.

Constans having followed his brother to the grave, by a like violent end, Constantius acquired increased power and influence in the Western empire. He summoned a council at Milan; the Prince being Arian, it is scarcely necessary to add that the decrees of the Council held under the shadow of the court were Arian also. Athanasius was condemned, persecution broke out everywhere; the aged Hosius even was not spared; the Catholic bishops in many places were insulted or exiled. Athanasius saw the storm approaching, but did not quit his post. Troops poured into Alexandria; the people flew to arms: to avert bloodshed, a compromise was made, and Athanasius left in quiet possession of his church till the Emperor's wishes were definitively known. The intrepid Patriarch lost no time in circulating an address to his suffragans, exhorting them to constancy in the orthodox faith: he powerfully contrasted the varying creeds of Arianism with the one Nicene Creed, and made an affecting appeal to their hearts and consciences by the recollection of the suffer-

ings undergone by holy bishops, living and dead, for Catholic truth.

On Thursday night, Feb. 8, 356, the Holy Office was being said in the church of St. Theonas, the Patriarch seated on his throne, when a noise was heard outside the church of the trampling of feet and clanking of armour. Athanasius betrayed no alarm, remaining in his seat; he ordered a deacon to read Psalm cxxxvi., and the congregation to respond, "His mercy endureth for ever," and then retire: there was not time; before the psalm was gone through, soldiers burst into the church, drawing their swords on the unarmed and defenceless people: many lost their lives by violence, or in the press to escape. Athanasius sat still; the soldiers reached the choir; at that moment, the clergy and monks crowded round the Patriarch, and carried him away by main force. The principle of the court in the selection of bishops for Alexandria seems to have been to put in the worst men they could find. Gregory was an atrocious tyrant, but George considerably surpassed him. Athanasius retired to the desert; a strict search was made, in vain; the desert was peopled by monks, not a man of whom but would cheerfully have died for Athanasius. The course being left clear, the Arians gained ascendancy everywhere; successive councils declared in their favour; the Council of Constantinople, which, in 360, adopted the creed of Rimini, drew from St. Jerome in after years the oft-quoted words—"That the whole earth mourned, wondering that it had become Arian."

The death of Constantius, succeeded by Julian, was a severe blow; the Imperial philosopher published, almost immediately, a declaration of tolerance; in consequence of which, after the death of George, slain in a sedition, Athanasius returned to his see. In 362, the Council of Alexandria was held under the presidency of Athanasius; that was a free council, and the spirit in which its discussions were conducted is a model to all similar assemblies. The objects constantly kept in view were, first, to bring about a substantial agreement, so that the strife about words should cease; and, secondly, to deal tenderly and considerately with the weak and erring, as it is written—"Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be

tempted."* At the opening of the Council there was apparently great difference of opinion, and propositions were advanced by parties respectively, which at first sight were flat contradictions. But Athanasius, entering on the work of conciliation with all his heart, soon brought the disputants to feel that their differences were only verbal, and reaped the just reward of his benevolent exertions in witnessing them all sign, *ex animo*, the Nicene Creed. Those who in the preceding government had through weakness communicated with the Arians, were, on their recantation, at once acknowledged and received as members of the Catholic Church, and retained their sees and benefices. The Arian leaders might be received as members of the Catholic Church, on condition that they went into lay communion. "This ecclesiastical body," writes Dr. Neander,† "expressed its views in a noble spirit of Christian charity: 'we wish all who still stand aloof from us, and who seem to have united with the Arians, would give up their delusions, so that all in every place might say, 'One Lord, one faith;' for what is so glorious and lovely as that, in the words of the sweet singer, brethren should dwell together in unity? (Psalm cxxxiii. 1.) for so we believe the Lord also will dwell with us, according to his promise, 'I will dwell in them, and walk in them.'"

The Arian interest revived under the Emperor Valens, nor was the controversy finally set at rest until the Council of Constantinople in 381, under the Emperor Theodosius. I have given what appeared to me the most interesting portion, and preferred to close with the proceedings of a council of which a bishop rather than an emperor was the presiding genius. I should be doing great injustice to truth and to our holy religion if I omitted that, bent on diving into secret things, as the Greeks almost by nature were; in other ways, under the action of their church system, impeded often, but not entirely arrested by these divisions, there was a great deal of good done to the souls and bodies of men. Many faithful, in a little as in much, adorned, instructed, and improved their age. Works of charity and mercy abounded; missionaries went forth to preach, in hostile and barbarous lands, the unsearchable riches of Christ. In the graphic

* Galat. vi. 1. † Neander, vol. iv. p. 92, &c.

language of the author of the "Holy Eastern Church," she extended herself "from the sea of Okhotsk to the palaces of Venice; from the ice-fields that grind against the Solevetsky monastery to the burning jungles of Malabar; embracing a thousand languages, and nations, and tongues, but binding them together in the golden link of the same faith; offering the Tremendous Sacrifice in a hundred Liturgies, but offering it to the same God, and with the same rites."* In selecting the ungenial subject of controversy, my reason was, that conflict brings out the action of the state element. It is not without use at the present day to know, in some measure, what that action really was. Is the Church in the age of Constantine put forth as a model of what an established church should be?—an attentive examination may lead the unprejudiced reader to a different conclusion. Is the English government in its relations to the Church represented as the exact counterpart of the Byzantine?—a very slight comparison will satisfy a candid mind how little there is in common between them. On the Byzantine Church we see laid the iron grasp of a crushing despotism; to the English Church there is stretched out the protecting arm of constitutional liberty.

The Church of England has grievances, we well know; but for the existence, or rather continuance, of these, she has no one but herself to blame. While other bodies have been up and stirring in defence of their rights and interests, she has contentedly slept over hers. It is thus far satisfactory, that her principal grievances are so plain and palpable that no impartial person can reflect on and not desire to have them redressed. To instance one—the suppression of her Synods. To say nothing of other strong reasons, the Church of Scotland, established by law, has her General Assembly; how unequal, then, to debar the Church of England hers! The contrary arguments are drawn from expediency, and apply with much greater force to the House of Commons than to the House of Convocation. This is not a question of expediency, but of right; and I trust that her Majesty's Ministers will ere long be authorised to return answer to the petitions of her loyal subjects, "Let right be done!"

When the Church of England shall have her own, soon

* Neale's Holy Eastern Church, vol. i. p. 2.

may that day arrive! Whether the assembly be Convocation or Synod, there will be many an Athanasius there, in profound learning, in glowing piety, in pure disinterestedness, in high-principled consistency of purpose. May they also be like-minded with him in a wise moderation, in a charitable construction of the words and actions of their brethren; may they, with that illustrious confessor, study to bring about peace and reconciliation. Then will their labours indeed be blessed; then will the unbelievers and unlearned be convinced that God is in them of a truth; and that dear Mother, whose loving sons they are, relieved from a weight of care and sorrow, will go on her way rejoicing.

CHAPTER VI.

COUNCIL OF FLORENCE.

Depression of Constantinople—Emperor Manuel—His Sentiments on a Reunion—John Palæologus sends Embassy to the Council of Basle—Pope Eugenius makes advances to the Eastern Emperor—Council of Ferrara—Leaders, Greek and Latin—Preliminaries of Council—Questions discussed—Council removed to Florence—Defection extraordinary—Conditions of Reunion—Prince Demetrius and Mark of Ephesus dissentient—Ceremony of Reunion—Relief to Papal Exchequer—Reception of Greek Bishops on their return—Isidore of Kieff—Last Patriarchs before the Fall of Constantinople—Attempt at Reunion—Popular Demonstrations—City taken by Assault—Cardinal Isidore's Letter—Mahomet II. appoints Gennadius Patriarch—Patriarch Jeremias—Letters between him and the Lutheran Reformers.

In the early part of the fifteenth century the Eastern Empire, tottering to its fall, had within a little shrunk to the bounds of a single city, nor even thus an independent power, but—last stage of degradation to the once queen of half the Christian world—doing homage and paying tribute to the Infidel, who, in the instance of Turkish slaves flying thither for refuge and protection, exercised a summary jurisdiction even within the walls of Constantinople.* The Eastern Church sharing in part the ruin of the temporal power on which she leaned, in part enfeebled and distressed by the divisions and defections of her members, in the midst of these trying reverses preserved still the elements of Catholic strength and Christian greatness in the learning and piety of her children. In a former Chapter I forbore to trespass on the reader with any detailed account of the later attempts at reunion between the Greek and Latin Church. †The visit of the Emperor

* Early Palestine, p. 341.

† Gibbon, chap. 66. Waddington, p. 621, &c. Neale's Church of Alexandria, vol. ii. p. 335.

John Palæologus II. to Europe, on a mission of reconciliation, is deserving of notice as an exception.

His father Manuel, who had associated him in the purple, left at his decease six sons, among whom, after he had remembered the poor, his friends, and dependants, he divided his inheritance. The four younger shared the Peloponnesus or Morea, a recently recovered and precarious domain; the second received the principality of Thessalonica; the eldest, John, succeeded to the unenviable possession of corroding cares and anxieties attendant on a barren sceptre and shadowy crown. On previous occasions the distressed Greek princes had sought to awaken sympathy and procure succours from their Christian brethren in the West, by pleading their necessities in person. The Emperor Manuel, threatened by the victorious arms of Bajazet, had thus made the circuit of Europe with no diminution of dignity, for respect and reverence everywhere waited on the heir of the Cæsars; but with little accession of strength, as neither money nor troops followed him home. Manuel had depended on political without laying much stress on religious motives. He took quite a worldly view of the reconciliation of the Churches—looked at the project with the eye of a statesman. "Our last resource," he said, in a reported conversation with his son and successor, "against the Turks is their fear of our union with the Latins—of the warlike nations of the West, who may arm for our relief and their destruction. As often as you are threatened by the miscreants, present this danger before their eyes. Propose a council, consult on the means; but ever delay and avoid the convocation of an assembly which cannot tend either to our spiritual or temporal emolument. The Latins are proud, the Greeks are obstinate; neither party will recede or retract, and the attempt at a perfect union will confirm the schism, alienate the Churches, and leave us, without hope or defence, at the mercy of the barbarians." The royal youth listened, and withdrew in respectful silence. His heart, that yearned for a true and lasting reconciliation, turned with aversion from this calculating policy.

On the death of his father, which left him in undivided possession of the government, John Palæologus made his wishes and intentions known. The Council of Basle, which promised so much and effected so little towards Church reform,

opened in 1431. At one of its sessions (which, it is not mentioned) the assembled Fathers were gratified beyond measure by the recognition of their authority, implied by the appearance of an Imperial embassy from the temporal head of the Eastern Church, to treat on the reconciliation of the divided members of the Body of Christ. Much discussion followed, and a good deal of time was taken up in correspondence upon the subject of the place of meeting, which at last was agreed should be Basle. As this negotiation prospered, Pope Eugenius, who was at open war with the Council of Basle, took the alarm. He had hitherto looked very coldly on the project of reconciliation; but now, all of a sudden, professed to take the deepest interest in it. Most flattering letters, under the seal of the Fisherman, reached Constantinople in rapid succession. The Byzantine monarch was invited to heal by his presence the schism of the Latin as well as of the Eastern Church. As dissuasives to closing with the rival applicants, the distance to the place selected by the Council and dangers of the way were exaggerated. The Greeks, who had little relish for the journey at the best, were given to understand that if they ever got to their destination, which was a great chance, there was not the least likelihood of their ever getting back again. Both Council and Pope undertook to provide the travelling expenses and maintenance of the Emperor and Court on the most liberal scale; both Pope and Council sent vessels to Constantinople for the reception of their expected guests. As the Pope had the advantage of the Council in the long run, so he distanced them in this short heat; his galleys were ordered last, and first ready. The papal commander was charged to make the best of his way, and furnished with instructions, not the most pacific, in case he encountered the opposite squadron, to burn, sink, or destroy. The little fleet had anchored before Constantinople, taken the Emperor, prelates, and retinue aboard, and were on their voyage back, before the tardy mariners of the Council had found their labour lost.

Premising that the Emperor was received in the different states which he traversed with the respect due to his exalted station and personal merits, I shall attend the steps of the Patriarch and prelates who accompanied him, and worthily sustained the honour and dignity of the Eastern Church.

The most distinguished of these were, the Patriarch Joseph; Bessarion, archbishop of Nice; Dionysius of Sardis; Isidore of Kieff, metropolitan of Russia, who represented the Patriarch of Antioch; Antony of Heraclea, representative of the Alexandrian patriarch; and Mark of Ephesus, who, conjointly with another prelate less known to fame, upheld the dignity of the patriarchate of the Holy City and Palestine. In order that the services of the Greek ritual should lack nothing of their accustomed splendour in the eyes of the fastidious Latins, the altar-fittings, church plate, and most costly vestments, were carefully removed from the cathedral of St. Sophia and carried on board. When this august company arrived at Ferrara, the footing on which the Pope and Patriarch should meet became a subject of most serious consideration to the punctilious and sensitive strangers. The good sense of the Roman Pontiff removed the difficulty: he saluted his brother with a kiss of union and charity, and took no notice of the conscientious scruples of the Greek prelates, which obliged them to omit the usual ceremony of kissing the feet of the Western Primate.

Questions of precedency and etiquette were as earnestly discussed before the Council met, as were subjects of an immeasurably higher character afterwards. To avoid the possibility of unpleasant collisions, the Greeks and Latins were ranged on opposite sides of the church in which the Council was held. The chair of St. Peter stood at an elevation at the head of the Latin ranks; the throne of the Emperor and seat of the Patriarch occupied the same relative position on the Greek side, only each rose one step less. These preliminaries arranged, the Council opened. The attendance on the Latin side was rather scanty. Five archbishops, eighteen bishops, and ten abbots, did not bespeak a very widely-spread interest in the momentous subject under consideration. After the first public sitting, merely of a formal nature, a select committee, composed of the most distinguished members of the two Churches, was appointed to the arduous task of settling, if practicable, articles of union. The points debated were, first, the Procession of the Holy Ghost; secondly, the use of Unleavened Bread in the holy Eucharist; thirdly, Purgatory; fourthly, the Pope's Supremacy. Of the Latins, the chief speakers were Julian Cæsarini, cardinal of St. Angelo; An-

dreas, bishop of Rhodes; and a Spanish doctor, John, provincial of the Dominicans: of the Greeks, Bessarion of Nice, Mark of Ephesus, and Dionysius of Sardis.

The first point, the Double Procession, engaged for fifteen sessions the undivided attention of the venerable fathers; the Council was then, on account of the appearance of a fatal epidemic, removed to Florence. Seven sessions more were spent in discussion of the first point of difference, without bringing the matter disputed any nearer to a conclusion, when a defection, which no one in fact had even dreamt of, broke the Greek phalanx, and threw the opposing doctors into consternation and dismay. Evoked by the astute Dominican, those burning and shining lights of the Eastern Church, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and a number of other great names, crossed over to the Latin ranks. Ancient manuscripts were produced, in cogent proof that these standard authorities had asserted and taught the Double Procession. Bessarion of Nice was convinced, or pretended to be convinced; the other bishops hesitated. They were reassured by an explanation from the lips of the Emperor himself, which gave an orthodox complexion to the Latin opinion, without compromising the Greek. The Pope on his part did all he could to make the reconciliation easy, by contenting himself with a general acknowledgment of the doctrine of the Double Procession, without insisting upon any change or addition in the national creed and liturgies. This great point settled, the remaining differences received a quicker solution. It was agreed that leavened or unleavened bread might be used at the Eucharist indifferently; that there was an intermediate state between death and judgment, leaving the conditions of existence in that interval undetermined. The Supremacy of the Pope was admitted in general terms, saving the imperial prerogative and rights of the Greek Church; as, for instance, that the Pope should call no councils in the Emperor's dominions without his approbation and that of the Patriarchs; nor would he permit appeals from the Patriarchal Courts to be carried to Rome. He maintained that the Pope should send his legates and decide them on the spot; and that the election of a successor in room of the deceased Patriarch Joseph, who had died at Florence, should take place in Constantinople.

This spiritual concordat was followed by a political league

and covenant, under which the Holy Father bound himself to support the Greeks home; to maintain a standing military and naval force for the defence of Constantinople; to furnish the Emperor on demand with twenty galleys, for six months, or ten for a year; and to use his influence with the Western princes to send reinforcements, if wanted, to the imperial army. What the Emperor was to do in return is not mentioned: in the miserable state of his affairs, it could have been little or nothing. I have appended the State Convention to the Church Union. From the latter there were two conspicuous dissentients; the Prince Demetrius, the Emperor's brother, who withdrew to Venice, rather than be a witness of what he considered the vassalage of his Church; and the independent-minded and eloquent Mark of Ephesus.

The Patriarch Joseph, as has been said, worn out by age, anxiety, and fatigue, expired at Florence, before the Council closed. In the vacancy of the see of Constantinople, Antony of Heraclea subscribed first, on the Greek side, as representative of the Patriarch of Alexandria; the other names followed in their order. On the 6th of July, 1439, the Union was celebrated with the utmost solemnity in the cathedral of Florence. On one side arose aloft the chair of the Chief Pontiff; on the opposite side, at a slightly less elevation, the throne of the Emperor. Cardinal Julian, and Bessarion, archbishop of Nice, ascended the pulpit together, and, having read the Act of Union in Latin and Greek, mutually embraced, in the name of the reconciled Churches. High mass was then performed according to the Roman liturgy, and the Creed chanted, with the addition "*Filioque.*"

This great task accomplished, the Emperor, court, and clergy embarked at Venice, and returned by the same route they came. They departed with the best wishes and to the unspeakable relief of their generous host, and now acknowledged canonical head. The Greeks had been nearly two years in Italy, during the whole of which time there was a continuous call on the papal exchequer to the following amount per month: the Emperor, thirty florins; the Patriarch, twenty-five florins; Prince Demetrius, twenty florins; and so on, in lessening gradation, down to three florins for the servants: this, be it remembered, at a time when the Pope was engaged in an arduous conflict with the Council of Basle, and his own

revenues fluctuating and precarious. At first the Apostolical donation was paid with tolerable regularity; latterly it was allowed to run into arrear. Perhaps—I do not speak with any certainty, I only say, perhaps—the extraordinary prolixity of the earlier sessions of the Council, and the expedition with which the momentous business in hand was despatched at last, may have some reference to the above-named facts. All returned home but Bessarion. Wafting his adieus to his beloved archiepiscopal see of Nice, he settled down in Rome, where he was admitted to the College of Cardinals, and, if Gibbon be correct in the story he retails, was once, for a moment, Pope elect.

But to follow the voyagers, crowding all sail to reach in safety their loved homes. The Byzantine prelates might have fondly hoped for a kind and gentle reception on returning after so long an absence: they were painfully undeceived. Scarcely had they set foot on land before they were assailed with a storm of insults and execrations. The churches were deserted the instant any of them were seen to enter; every one avoided and shrank from them as from the leprous or plague-stricken. This was much too severe a trial for their constancy. Yielding to fear, without conviction, they had signed the Act of Union; conviction coming now, in aid of fear, produced a recantation, speedy and unreserved. Mark of Ephesus was the hero of the day, the idol of Church and people. When dying, the accents of forgiveness were not on his lips: he made a last request that no friend to Rome might be present at his funeral, nor assist in the services for the repose of his soul. The Emperor, the while, with a firm hand and a stout heart, encountered the tempest without flinching. He filled the see of Constantinople, vacated on the death of Joseph, by the appointment, in 1440, of Metrophanes of Cyzicus, a stanch Unionist. The public dissatisfaction was evinced by the emptiness of the church of St. Sŏphia on the day of the Patriarch's consecration. Even the cross-bearers laid down their office and refused to assist. Metrophanes found his diocese in the greatest confusion;—no discipline, no subordination. His suffragan bishops regarded him as a heretic, and refused communion with him. Philotheus of Alexandria, who had by proxy taken part in the Council of Florence, and, on the reunion being notified to

him, had addressed to Pope Eugenius a letter stuffed with fulsome adulation,—this prelate, having turned with the tide, in conjunction with his brother turncoats of Antioch and Jerusalem, in April 1441, sent off a fiery epistle to Constantinople, in which Metrophanes was branded as a matricide, who had aimed a deadly blow at the heart of his Eastern mother; his conduct in the administration of his diocese pronounced insupportable; and all bishops and priests consecrated and ordained by him declared suspended from the exercise of their function till a full and free inquiry could be had. Shortly afterwards, the same three bishops wrote to the Emperor, in a not very respectful tone, protesting that they had never received the Council further than as it was agreeable to the œcumenical synods and to ancient traditions and discipline.

About this time, news arrived at Constantinople not less discouraging. Isidore of Kieff, metropolitan of Russia, raised to the cardinalate and appointed papal legate by Eugenius, had returned to his charge at the termination of the proceedings at Florence, assumed the functions with which the Pope had invested him, and had the Latin instead of the Greek cross ostentatiously borne before him. The Russian bishops, monks from Mount Athos, trained in the strictest principles and prejudices of Greek theology, beheld the innovation with pious horror. At a full synod Isidore was condemned, and imprisoned in a monastery, from which he made good his escape with the utmost difficulty.

The Patriarch Metrophanes resigned his charge in 1443, and died shortly after; it is said, of a broken heart. Pope Eugenius kept his word. That same year, 1443, the fleets of Burgundy, Venice, and Genoa, sailed to the Hellespont; Ladislaus, king of Poland and Hungary, passed the Danube. This chivalrous prince, seconded by his companion in arms, John Huniades, defeated the Turks in several pitched battles. Peace was asked, and granted on condition that Servia should be restored, the prisoners ransomed, and that the Turks should evacuate the Hungarian frontier. All that had been thus gained was lost, not to the saving even of honour, in the battle of Varna in 1444, fought in open violation of the treaty, under the baneful influence of the Pope's legate, Cardinal Julian. Admirable in his own proper place, as a scholar and

controversialist, but wholly unfitted for the camp, his mischievous casuistry—that no faith need be kept with infidels—and wretched counsels, not only ruined the Christian cause, but covered it with merited disgrace. Metrophanes was succeeded in the Patriarchate by Gregory Protosyncellus, a Uhionist: at the expiration of a year and six months he was deposed, by the influence of the Anti-Unionists. The names which follow, down to the fatal year 1453, are, Athanasius, deposed; John; Athanasius again; Nyphon; Isaias. In 1451, Gregory Protosyncellus, who appears to have remained at Constantinople since his deposition, in hopes of being reinstated, finding he had no chance, went into voluntary exile, choosing Rome as his place of residence. He was received with honour and respect, and treated as Patriarch of Constantinople, *in partibus infidelium*, to the day of his death.*

When the Sultan Mahomet had concentrated his forces on the devoted city, and the siege was on the point of being begun, the Emperor Constantine, as a last resource, endeavoured to interest the Western nations in his behalf. To pressing entreaties for temporal succour he added the assurance of spiritual obedience, and requested the Pope to send a legate. Nicholas V., the reigning pontiff (and a most excellent one he made), complied, and sent his representative. The choice was not the most acceptable; but then, the mission was hopeless from the beginning. The personage who arrived was Cardinal Isidore, a Latinized Greek, one of the chief promoters of the Act of Union at Florence, and ex-metropolitan of Russia. His hairbreadth escape from that inhospitable region and the hands of his undutiful suffragans has been already mentioned. The Emperor embraced the Cardinal as an old friend, attended his sermons, held private conferences, owned his arguments to be incontrovertible, and himself, with as many of the clergy and laity as could be prevailed upon to join, subscribed the Act of Union. On the 12th of December, 1452, the two nations, in the church of St. Sophia, joined in the communion of sacrifice and praise; and the names of the two pontiffs, Nicholas V. and the exile Gregory, were solemnly commemorated. The motives of prudence and policy—(it was industriously circulated that these

* Dupin, Histoire Ecclésiastique, vol. iv. p. 542.

were the only motives)—which determined the court and higher classes, had no influence on the people. They had hated the union all along, and they now hated it more than ever. Again, and for the last time, the city was placed under a popular interdict. No sooner had the church of St. Sophia been polluted by the Latin sacrifice, than it was deserted, as a Jewish synagogue or an heathen temple, by the clergy and people, and a vast and gloomy silence prevailed in that venerable dome, which had so often smoked with a cloud of incense, blazed with innumerable lights, and resounded with the voice of prayer and thanksgiving.* Of every member of the clergy was exacted this most unreasonable and unchristian promise—that he would never be reconciled to the Church of Rome. Whoever refused was deemed to have forfeited the grace of ordination. Even in danger of sudden death, none might ask of such prayers or absolution.

On the 29th of May, 1453, Constantinople was taken by storm; and the Greek empire, after a term of power that had lasted nearly twelve centuries, was finally extinguished. So soon as it became known—which, from the extent of the city, was not immediately—that the Turks were masters of the place, the till now deserted cathedral and churches were thronged. Thither hurried high and low, rich and poor, priest and people. Vain confidence! Those venerable walls, dedicated to the name and honour of the Wisdom of God, could not defend the generation who, by their unhallowed and implacable resentments, their remorseless bigotry, outraged that heavenly wisdom, which "is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." In a few hours were seen issuing from every sacred threshold, long and mournful processions of captive men and women—every distinction of rank and station swallowed up in one common calamity. The Cardinal-Legate, Isidore, exposed a second time to imminent danger, effected his escape in disguise. There is extant a letter written by him, shortly after, in which he describes the scenes of poignant distress and appalling profanation of which he was an eye-witness. I will copy a few lines:—"The accursed Infidel commanded to be driven out of the city, as a herd of brute

* Gibbon, chap. 68.

beasts, numbers bound in iron chains and fetters, with ropes round their necks. Nobles, burghers, monks, nuns, men and women, the most elevated in station and distinguished for virtue, were assailed with the coarsest and vilest abuse, loaded with insults and injuries. Youths of both sexes were separated from their parents, and sold before their eyes. Infants, as little lambs, were slain in their mothers' sight. The nearest and dearest relations and closest friends, torn from each other's arms, were led away captive to distant lands. O what bitter tears, sighs how deep, what loud convulsive sobs from loving hearts, what cries of misery, were uttered in the midst of that carnage and slavery, those expulsions and contumelies!"* The Patriarch Isaias perished with the mixed multitude who fell on the fatal morning of the general assault.

For a while the dissolution of the State appeared to involve the Church; there was no Patriarch—it was feared and hoped by Christians and Mahometans that there never would be again. However, having satiated his vengeance, policy dictated to the conqueror a mild and conciliatory course. The dispersed population, who by timely flight had saved their lives and liberties, returned in crowds on receiving an assurance of the free exercise of their religion. The churches left standing were equally divided between the victors and the vanquished. This fair and liberal arrangement continued for sixty years.† A new Patriarch was elected, George Scholarius, who, as the Monk Gennadius, figured on the popular side as a prophet and agitator, not to say incendiary, during the last abortive attempt at a reunion. The installation of the Patriarch was performed according to the old forms revived of the Byzantine court; the Sultan delivered into the hands of Gennadius the crosier or pastoral staff, conducted him to the gate of the seraglio, presented him with a horse richly caparisoned, and directed the viziers and bashaws to lead him to the palace that had been allotted for his residence. Gennadius found—it could hardly have been otherwise—the affairs of his diocese in the greatest disorder; the parochial clergy scattered, the monks in division. He exerted his utmost efforts to correct these disorders and

* Clarke's Travels, vol. vi. Appendix, No. 2.
† Gibbon, chap. 68.

put things into a healthful train. On the patriarchal palace being appropriated by the Turks to other uses, he retired to the abandoned monastery of the Apostles. Three or four times, so precarious was his position, he was forced to leave Constantinople; at last he definitively resigned his charge, and took up his abode in the monastery of St. John the Baptist, where he is supposed to have died about 1460.

From the death of Gennadius in 1460, to 1710, when my authority leaves me, upwards of sixty patriarchs in succession governed the Constantinopolitan Church, nearly all of whom expired in exile or by violence. A mere string of names would weary. From the list of those who attained the patriarchal dignity I select two, as deserving especial mention, on account of the interest that attaches to the individuals themselves, and that they are connected with continental Protestantism. Jeremias of Larissa succeeded Metrophanes, deposed in 1527. Ten years after Jeremias was removed, and Metrophanes reinstated. The latter died in nine months, and Jeremias was restored; he went on quietly for a time, till Pacomius of Lesbos drove him out with violence, and procured his exile to Rhodes. Not long after Pacomius was deposed by a synod. Theoleptis of Philoppolis then carried the patriarchate by main force. He was soon expelled, and Jeremias a third time reinstated. He ruled the Church with prudence and sagacity during many years, and died in peace, 1594. This brief summary illustrates the chequered fortunes of the Byzantine Patriarchs under the Sultans, while the lengthened periods, first of ten years, and then for a longer space, that Jeremias sustained himself in his most difficult and delicate position, prove him to have been endowed with those rare qualities which, while they command the affectionate attachment of friends, conciliate the respect of enemies.*

A communication between the Greeks and Lutherans opened thus:—In 1559, Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, sent Demetrius, deacon of his church, to Wittemberg, to learn the state of the Reformed Churches in Germany. On his leaving Wittemberg, Melancthon presented him with a copy of the Confession of Augsburg translated into Greek, with

* Dupin, Hist. Ecclés. vol. iv. p. 558, &c.

a letter in the same language, to give the Greeks a correct idea of the sentiments of the Lutherans. No reply came. Subsequently Crusius, Professor of Humanity in the University of Tubingen, wrote a complimentary letter to the then Patriarch Jeremias, and at the same time sent extracts from the sermons and other writings of James André, minister of the Church of Tubingen, and Chancellor of the University, to whom he gave the title of bishop. Jeremias having acknowledged the letter in graceful terms, Crusius was encouraged to send him another copy in Greek of the Confession of Augsburg, accompanied by a letter signed by James André and himself, requesting him to examine the Confession, and compare it with the doctrines of the Greek Church, and, having done so, to favour them with his opinion thereon. The letter is dated 15th September, 1574. Jeremias duly answered their letter, saying as many civil things as he could, but nothing to the purpose. Crusius and André wrote again, stating that the Bishop of Rome accused them of innovations, because, being instructed in the truth by Luther, they had rejected dogmas and traditions contrary to the Holy Scriptures. They concluded by earnestly soliciting an immediate reply to the application contained in their former letter—they particularly desired his judgment on the subject.

Jeremias showed great reluctance to enter on the subject; at last he wrote his sentiments on the Confession in explicit terms. The reader would scarcely understand the letter without the Confession on which it comments, and as I have no space to spare I must content myself with transcribing the leading observations of Jeremias. He begins with an exposition of the Nicene Creed, and, speaking of the Virgin Mary, insists on her perpetual virginity as a certain fact. He maintains the doctrine of original sin and the necessity of baptism; finds fault with the Latins for using only one immersion, and vindicates the anointing at baptism and administration, at the same time, of the holy Eucharist. To the faith which justifies sinners he adds good works, confession, and penitence, as necessary to justification. Speaking of the Church, he says that it contains good and bad, and that priests do not lose the grace of ordination so as to be unable to administer the sacraments on the commission of sin. He recognises seven sacraments, declares infant baptism

to be necessary, and that in the Eucharist there is a real change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ; he maintains the necessity of confession, that prayers, sacrifices, and alms are profitable to the dead; he approves of the worship of saints as interceders, especially that of the Blessed Virgin; he acknowledges the need of the grace of the Holy Spirit, at the same time lays stress on human liberty, that a man is master of his own choice, be it good or evil, and to persevere therein; he disapproves of the passages in the Confession of Augsburg directed against fasts, church ceremonies, and the monastic life; he agrees with the Lutherans, that the Eucharist ought to be administered in both kinds, and sanctions the marriage of the clergy before priest's ordination. This date is May 5, 1576, at Constantinople. The German theologians replied, and to this letter the name of Osiander is subscribed, in addition to those of Crusius and André. The Patriarch replied, defending the single, as the Lutherans maintained the double procession, of the Holy Ghost. The rest of his answer, as given by Doctor Dupin, is nothing but a repetition of the former one. He finishes by conjuring his correspondents to embrace the sentiments of the Fathers and great Church writers, and so reform the errors in which they were plunged. This is dated May, 1579. The Protestant theologians, not disheartened, wrote again. Their letter bore the signature of eight doctors. Jeremias answered them briefly; he begged that they would not give themselves the trouble of writing again, or sending any more of their books. "Take your own course," he says, "as it pleases you, but do not write to me any further about dogmas; let us only exchange letters of courtesy." This letter, dated June 10, 1581, was the last which Jeremias wrote. The chief value of the correspondence is the light which it throws on the received doctrines of the Greek Church; for the rest, nothing came of the negotiation. During the patriarchate of Jeremias, Russia was separated from the see of Constantinople, on which it had been before dependent, and erected into a fifth patriarchate, of which the ancient capital, Moscow, was appropriately chosen to be the seat. Job, archbishop of Rostof, was the first elevated to the office.*

* Mouravieff, p. 132.

CHAPTER VII.

CYRIL LUCAR.

His Birth — Early Education — Travels — Intercourse with Protestants — Ordination — Advancement — Visits Constantinople — Sent to represent Patriarch of Alexandria at Polish Synod — Constantine, palatine of Kieff — Union of Polish to Roman Church on easy conditions — Sigismund III. sends Cyril to Alexandria — Cyril returns — Cyril at Constantinople — M. Von Haga — Cyril patriarch of Alexandria — English traveller Sandys visits Cyril — His Letter to M. Uytenbogaert — Cyril fails at Constantinople — Disposal of Church Dignities in Turkey — Patriarch of Constantinople persecutes Cyril — Cyril in Wallachia — His second Letter to M. Uytenbogaert — Cyril at Mount Athos — Metrophanes Critopulus — Cyril's Letter to the Archbishop of Spalatro — Plague at Cairo — Cyril patriarch of Constantinople — Declares War against the Jesuits — Deposed — Archbishop Abbot — Metrophanes Critopulus — "Sparkles of Benevolence" — Cyril restored — Turkish Exactions — Remarkable Instructions — An illustrious Stranger — The Jesuits active — Judgment on Sunday Dinner-parties — The Jesuits expelled.

WHILE the German Reformers were engaged in well-meant but ineffectual efforts to enlist the sympathies of the œcumenical Patriarch of the Eastern Church, and make common cause against, as they harshly deemed, the foe of both, there entered on the stage of life one who seemed designed to realise the most sanguine expectations of the leaders of the Protestant movement. Cyril Lucar,* patriarch of Constantinople, was born at Candia, in the Isle of Crete, 1572. His parents — no disparagement to him or them — were in an humble class of life. Crete belonged to the Greek Church, but the Venetians, who held it, favoured the introduction of the Latin clergy, and there were at this period ten bishops at least under the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Candia. Beneath the mild and tolerant sway of the merchant republic

* Dupin, Hist. Ecclés. vol. iv. p. 469; Neale's Alex. Church, vol. ii. p. 356, &c.; Leo Allatius, lib. iii. chap. 11; Smith's Greek Church.

the emulation of the members of the rival churches was turned to mental cultivation; the Latin clergy, then as now, were learned and accomplished, and the Greek clergy, put on their mettle, tried hard to keep pace with them. Youths destined for the ecclesiastical profession sought the schools of Venice and Padua, and, with the learning and refinement of Italy, not unfrequently returned with a dangerous leaning to the teaching of that Church which fostered and protected the liberal arts.

The youth of Cyril was watchfully guarded against Roman influences; by a happy chance, a kinsman and fellow-townsman rose to eminence in the Alexandrian Church. Cyril was hardly ten years of age when his parents, remembering the adage, "Out of sight out of mind," shipped him off to Alexandria, on a visit to his fortunate relative, Meletius Piga, a stanch Anti-Roman. On his return Cyril was sent to school at Venice, and thence proceeded to the University of Padua, where he became a pupil of Maximus, after bishop of Cerigo, whom Dupin calls a great enemy to the Latin Church. On the completion of his education he, with the natural curiosity of an intelligent and inquiring mind, resolved to see the world before he settled down to a profession. The countries to which Cyril directed his steps were those in which he had peculiar interest, as the scenes of those religious revolutions of which he had heard, and probably read so much. Accordingly he travelled through Germany and Switzerland, visited Holland, and it is said also England, associated with Protestants, studied their writings, and returned imbued with their spirit and doctrine. He had hardly reached home before he received a summons from his early patron Meletius, now Patriarch of Alexandria. Cyril's ordination to the priesthood in 1595 was speedily followed by his advancement to the office of Archimandrite. On the occurrence of a vacancy in the see of Constantinople, which under the Turks was by no means rare, it was customary for the Patriarch of Alexandria to administer the affairs of the metropolitan Church *ad interim;* Meletius came to Constantinople as administrator, and brought Cyril with him.

About this time very important changes affecting the interests of the Greek Church were going on in Poland. Sigismund III., king of Poland and Hungary, a Roman

Catholic (the first of his line who was so), devoted his energies to the conversion of his subjects to the same faith. Among other methods, he resorted to measures of exclusion, and declared the Greek bishops of Lithuania and Black Russia incapable of sitting in the Diet until they embraced the conditions of union proposed. A majority of the bishops gave in, and sent two of their order to Clement VIII., requesting that the Slavonic Churches might be admitted into the Roman communion. Against these concessions a powerful minority strongly protested. Constantine, duke of Ostrog, and palatine of Kieff, led the opposition. The longevity of the natives of northern Europe is remarkable; Constantine was a hundred years old, his natural force unabated. The first translation of the Bible into the Slavonic language was the fruit of his exertions and munificence; he had also established several flourishing schools in Ostrog and Kieff. To support the Greek side Matthew, the newly-elected Patriarch of Constantinople, despatched as his legate Nicephorus, and Meletius as his, Cyril Lucar. They arrived in time to be present at a synod convened by Sigismund, in which a scene was enacted not much unlike that which was presented at Sardica in the fourth century. On the ground that Nicephorus, legate for Constantinople, was not recognised by the Roman party, the Greeks held their sittings separately in a private house, because they could not get the use of a church, Sigismund the king carrying matters with so high a hand; there they anathematised the Metropolitan, who had joined the court party, and all his adherents. The Uniates and the Roman Catholics, on the other hand, having sealed their agreement of union by the joint celebration of the liturgy in the same church, retaliated on their opponents a like sentence of excommunication. It is but fair to add, that the terms of union were exceedingly liberal,—nothing was required except submission to the Pope; in all other points the Greeks who united themselves to the Church of Rome preserved their own doctrines and discipline.

During his stay in Poland, Cyril Lucar resided at Wilna, supporting himself by giving instruction in the Greek language. King Sigismund, very desirous of bringing so distinguished a member of the Greek hierarchy as Meletius to concur in his scheme of comprehension, sent Cyril to Alexan-

dria, the bearer of a letter exhorting the Patriarch to revere the Primacy of St. Peter, and to acknowledge Clement VIII. as his successor and œcumenical bishop. Meletius returned a courteous but firm refusal. On reaching Wilna, Cyril found persecution raging hot against the orthodox Greeks; his colleague, Nicephorus, who had taken the lead against the court measures, had been strangled just before Cyril arrived. Under existing circumstances, considering discretion the better part of valour, Cyril kept the letters of Meletius — one of which was addressed to the Protestant divines — in his pocket; and, like a wise man, looked on and said nothing. This is one version of his conduct; another is, that worked upon by the threats and promises of the Polish Government, and terrified by the fate of his colleague, he left behind him (perhaps on this condition only he may have been allowed to depart) a letter, addressed to the Archbishop of Löwenberg, professing his adhesion to the Roman Catholic Church. As Cyril Lucar, throughout his history, does not give proof of the possession of any large share of physical or moral courage, this last statement is not so very improbable. However, Mr. Neale positively affirms the letter in question to be a forgery. Cyril returned to Alexandria, with a high reputation for learning, and for qualifications more convertible in ordinary life — diplomatic skill and tact. Allatius says, that he brought back with him five hundred pieces of gold; if he did, it was an evidence of great cleverness.

Poor Cyril seems never to have been allowed a moment's peace and quietness; no sooner had he landed at Alexandria than he was ordered to Crete, to collect contributions for the Patriarchate. During his absence on this occasion he visited Constantinople, where he formed an intimacy with M. Von Haga, a Dutch gentleman of fortune, travelling in the Levant. From his talented Dutch friend, who was bent on a union between the Genevese and the Constantinopolitan Church, Cyril is supposed to have imbibed Calvinistic sentiments. On his return to Egypt, Cyril found his benefactor, Meletius, on his death-bed, and had the melancholy satisfaction to close his eyes. Cyril now became a candidate for the vacant Patriarchate; he had one competitor, named Gerasimus, but was chosen by a large majority of the clergy. His

election took place in 1602. We hear nothing of him till 1611, when the English traveller, Sandys, who visited Egypt in that year, speaks of him thus:—"The name of the Greek Patriarch now being is Cyril Lucar, a man of approved virtue and learning, a friend to the reformed religion, and opposing the contrary; saying that the difference between us and the Greeks be but shells, but that those are kernels between them and the others."* In 1612 Cyril revisited Constantinople, to procure permission to rebuild some churches at Alexandria which had fallen into decay; and being there, was called upon to act as Administrator of the metropolitan see, then just vacant by the deposition and exile of Neophytus. Encouraged by the presence and countenance of the Dutch ambassador, his old friend M. Von Haga, Cyril opposed with energy and effect, the Roman Catholic missionaries — the Jesuits especially, who had a few years before established a college at Constantinople.

At this time, on the suggestion of M. Von Haga, Cyril wrote to an eminent divine at the Hague, M. Uytenbogaert. The letter runs in a very unassuming strain: "I write to you," the Patriarch proceeds, "as a minister to a minister, and a pastor to a pastor — for we both sustain these titles, you in your Church, I in mine." Speaking of his own Church, he declares,—"To her, innovations are novel signs, and prodigies to be dreaded rather than followed. She is contented with that simple faith which she has learned from the apostles and our forefathers. In it she perseveres even unto blood. She never takes away — never adds — never changes; she always remains the same — always keeps and preserves untainted orthodoxy." After having adduced the persecutions endured by the Greek Church as a proof that she bears in her body the marks of the Lord Jesus Christ, he concludes: — "Wherefore, then, do I mention these things to you? That your good sense may teach you that in these parts it is a difficult thing to admit any novelty in the Church or in faith. Nor shall we ever consent to those things which, although they have a semblance of advantage and usefulness, yet are proved by experience to occasion great scandal to all Christendom. And I could wish that

* Sandys, ed. 5, p. 89.

your Church would with us follow the same rule, for in that case there would not be those objections to it which the writers of these times everywhere bring forward."* The tone of this communication was, it must be confessed, very like throwing cold water on the scheme which M. Von Haga had so much at heart — the Greek and Geneva Union.

At the next election for the Patriarchate of Constantinople, Cyril presented himself as a candidate, but was not chosen; the reason given is, that he would not pay the stipulated price. My impression is, that he was ready to pay, but not enough; that, in fact, he was outbid. As to the question of payment, Cyril says himself, in a letter to which I shall shortly refer:—"The Patriarchs, when they are elected, deposit a certain sum with the Turkish officials of the province to obtain possession." The Turks, knowing nothing of the religion of the Greeks, decided by rather a rude standard, though one not quite obsolete, on the fitness of a candidate, that he had most in his head who could produce most from his pocket. But the Greek clergy were extremely poor; from whence was the money to come? The accumulations of thrift and industry, the fees and collections received by each as he ascended in the scale of Church dignity, from those who were beneath him; and last, though not least, the liberal sums contributed by powers, Catholic and Protestant, who at that period were very desirous to gain an ascendancy in the Oriental Churches for their respective tenets; these were the chief sources whence the necessary funds were derived. Timothy of Patras was elected Patriarch in 1612, and cherished afterwards — which a man who has succeeded in his object rarely does — a vindictive feeling towards his disappointed competitor.

Cyril, in danger at Constantinople, went into Wallachia, to settle some disputes, and collect alms for the distressed Church of Alexandria. Here he received an answer from the Dutch clergyman, to whom he replied at great length. Cyril evidently desired to conciliate his correspondent; and accordingly words his statements of doctrine in an ambiguous, and, if any like to take them so, Protestant sense. Thus he speaks of the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, as if

* Alex. Church, vol. ii. p. 367.

there were none other than these two; while, as a member of the Greek Church, he professed his belief in seven sacraments. However, of the Eucharist he says,—"It is certain that by it we become partakers of the Divine nature;" of Baptism,—"By it we are born again, without which new birth and communion it would be difficult for us to be justified." Cyril gives the Dutch minister a good deal of information on the constitution and government of his Church, laying stress, with a philosophic after-thought not uncommon, on the superior advantages enjoyed by the Patriarch of Alexandria over his brother at Constantinople. He touches on the principle of election to the latter see. Had he exhibited at the last election the Spartan virtue his admirers ascribe to him, I think that we should have heard something of it. He has just been telling his correspondent what an admirable person the Patriarch of Alexandria is, and what inducements he has to keep so. "But it is not so," he continues, "with him of Constantinople; because, for the most part, Turkish oppression, without any foregoing election, confirms him who gives most." He intimates to his friend, that as Patriarch of Alexandria he carried all before him; that his most reverend brothers of Antioch and Jerusalem would not have been where they were but for him; that even Timothy of Patras owed his election to him—for which, by the way, he showed very little gratitude—as he (Cyril Lucar) it was who had caused the deposition of his predecessor. The offence of the unfortunate Neophytus was this: "He introduced some vagabond Romans as preachers in our churches, teaching many errors, and seducing simple folk. He was admonished by me," Cyril adds, "more than once; but he would not put any cheek upon himself: for which reason I was compelled to surmount every other difficulty, to set at nought private loss, and to do my utmost to get him deposed, which was done." Afterwards he says expressly that the Patriarchs, excepting, as he asserts, the Patriarch of Alexandria, "deposit a certain sum with the Turkish officials to obtain possession."

On his return from Wallachia, in 1616, he was so ill received at Constantinople as to find it prudent to retire to the monastery at Mount Athos, whither followed an order from the Turkish Government for his arrest and execution. He escaped in disguise, under the care and protection of the

kind-hearted, hospitable monks. Cyril then returned to his beloved patriarchate. On arriving at Cairo, the first thing he did was to summon a council of his clergy, and anathematize the Roman Catholic missionaries.

Somewhere about this time, on an opening being made, Cyril sent a young Greek priest, Metrophanes Critopulus, into England, to be advanced in his education. He bore a commendatory letter to Archbishop Abbot, in which Cyril writes, — "Here is a Greek, by rank a presbyter, possessing a good knowledge of Greek literature; a child of our Alexandrian Church, of noble birth and talents, prepared to receive deeper learning." In alluding to the reigning sovereign, James I., he writes: — "We would ask him, that of his innate, and I had almost said, immense goodness, he would allow some sparkle of his benevolence to shine on our Metrophanes." I should have said, that Cyril's letter to the Dutch minister finished with a request for books, — commentaries on Scriptures, modern controversial writers, on philosophy, other arts, and even mathematics, — to be sent the first opportunity. In these studies Cyril beguiled the time not claimed by the care of all the churches. The result of his recent and earlier meditations is shown in a letter addressed, in 1618, to the celebrated Marc Antony de Dominis, archbishop of Spalatro, on occasion of his secession to the Church of England. Cyril acknowledges therein an early leaning to the Church of Rome, which had been happily corrected by a three years' study of the Reformed writers, whose doctrines he had compared with those of the Roman and Greek Churches; avows his reception of something equivalent to the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith; declares that the faithful alone receive the Lord's Body and Blood in the Eucharist; condemns image-worship, on account of the abuse, admitting that in his private prayers he has sometimes observed the crucifix to have been an assistance to his mind. He also condemns the invocation of saints, though he says, with great candour, that he had himself written two works in defence of the practice. The same year Cyril made acquaintance with another Dutch traveller, M. David de Wilhelm, who helped him nothing loath, and calling for more books on the Reformed road.

Early in the spring of 1619 the plague broke out at

Cairo, where the Patriarch resided. During this awful visitation, Cyril would seem to have proposed to himself as a pattern the conduct, under similar circumstances, of his favourite author, Calvin, at Geneva, rather than that of St. Charles Boromeo. "They reckon," he says, "up to this day, that four hundred thousand have died, and yet the corners — I might almost say the whole streets — of this vast city, are yet full, and it does not seem as if one were wanting. I remained shut up, with great danger, in my house; and let down from my windows the answers I had to make to my Christians respecting the dead; and, by the grace of God, I am safe up to this time."

In 1621, Timothy, patriarch of Constantinople, died, and Cyril was, without opposition, chosen to succeed him, November 5th, 1621. He owed his elevation to the exertions and influence of the representatives of the Protestant powers, and throughout the whole of his patriarchate he fought their battle, and vigorously opposed the encroachments of the Roman missionaries. He was scarcely in his seat before he declared war against the Jesuits in a pastoral mandate, by which all the faithful were required to withdraw from the communion of all members of the Latin Church. The French ambassador took up the quarrel of the order; by his influence an Anti-Patriarch was elected, one Gregory; him Cyril solemnly excommunicated after a sermon, in which he pointedly alluded to the proceedings of "certain incendiaries." The Turkish Government interposed in its own prompt, decisive way; Gregory was banished, and put to death on the road. This happened in February 1622. The April following the Jesuits reported to the Vizier that Cyril was negotiating with the Florentines, to put them in possession of one of the islands of the Archipelago. An accompanying present of twenty thousand dollars made good the accusation, and Cyril was sent prisoner to Rhodes. Not six months Patriarch, and deposed! He had better have remained constant to his first love, his dear Alexandria.

While Cyril is in exile, we will return to our young friend Metrophanes Critopulus. He had been now nearly six years in England, which time he had spent at Oxford, under the patronage of the good Archbishop Abbot, who gave him, on his return, a letter of introduction to Sir Thomas Rowe,

English ambassador at the Porte. This encomiastic epistle was speedily followed by another, much less satisfactory. The Archbishop, as an aggrieved man, recounts the cost he had been at, in board, education, and other incidental expenses, for Metrophanes, amounting to full 300*l.*; that is, 50*l.* a year for six years,—a considerable sum in those days, for an abstemious, hard-reading student. The Archbishop says, that he had provided a passage for him in a very good ship, when somebody suggested that he ought to go to the court at Newmarket and see the king before he left. His Majesty took rather marked notice of him; the "sparkles" of royal benevolence, to use Cyril Lucar's brilliant metaphor, shone on "our Metrophanes." The Greek, with mother-wit, set about instantly to turn the sparkles into hard cash. "First he should have a knight made for his sake, and then, after that, a baronet; wherein a projector should have shared with him. After that, the king was to be moved to give the advowson of a benefice, which a false simoniacal person did promise to buy of him." The pretext for raising the money was to purchase books to carry home to Cyril. The Archbishop very liberally bought for Metrophanes "many of the best Greek authors, and among them Chrysostom's eight Tomes; also other books of worth, in Latin and in English; so that" (he wrote to Sir Thomas Rowe) "I may boldly say it was a present fit for me to send to the Patriarch of Constantinople." The books were not exactly what the Greek wanted, nor did he set much store by the free passage in the very good ship: he would see the world, he said, "and better his experience that way." "I found that he meant to turn rogue and beggar, and more—I cannot tell what," writes the indignant Archbishop, who goes on to tell his correspondent that he sent Metrophanes 10*l.* and washed his hands of him. Sir T. Rowe communicated the Archbishop's letter to Cyril Lucar, and, in answer to his Grace, says,—"At the first he seemed somewhat astonished, but his affection towards him prevailed to make his excuse. He hath given orders to write to Holland, France, and divers other parts, to recall this stray sheep, to whom he bears an entire love, and if he come hither, intends to make him a kind of coadjutor in judging of causes, and to confer upon him all the dignity he can." The reader may perhaps like to be informed what became of Metrophanes.

He turned out much better than his antecedents promised. In process of time, ascending the steps of the hierarchy, he was chosen Archbishop of Memphis, and ultimately Patriarch of Alexandria. He died in the chair of St. Mark, and left behind him the reputation of a good and pious man and learned and orthodox divine.

To return to Cyril. His exile was a triumph to the Roman Catholic interest. Pope Urban VIII. wrote to the French ambassador, to congratulate him on the services he had thus rendered to the Catholic faith. On the other part, roused to exertion by this reverse, King James wrote to Sir Thomas Rowe, desiring him to procure, at any cost, the recall of Cyril. The Porte was not inexorable; still, the restoration of a prelate banished on suspicion of treasonable practices was running a great risk. Sixty thousand dollars quieted these patriotic scruples, and Cyril was again Patriarch of Constantinople: the war was renewed. The restoration took place late in the autumn of 1622: early in 1623 it is said that a Greek monk was sent by the Propaganda to Constantinople, with the offer of 20,000 dollars to the government if Cyril were displaced. This seems to have reached Cyril in the shape of an intimation that, if he expected to keep his seat, he must present at least half as much as the sum named to the authorities; which we are told that he did, with considerable cost to the wretchedly impoverished Greek Church. With great respect to my learned authority, I question whether the Greeks paid a farthing towards it. My impression is, that the sum, whatever it was, figured in Sir Thomas Rowe's accounts under the head of "secret-service money." In the spring of 1624 there was another mare's nest,—Cyril was conspiring with the Cossacks.

Shortly after that there reached Constantinople a remarkable document, purporting to be "Instructions" from the Vatican, in reply to overtures of reconciliation made by Cyril Lucar, not in writing, but by word of mouth, through a messenger. The "Instructions" begin with an assertion which I should be glad to see confirmed, that "the Church of Rome has always desired peace and union with all Churches;" "especially," they continue, "with the Eastern Church, which has deserved so well of the Catholic Church at other times. With regard," they go on to say, "to the particular business of the present

Patriarch, our Lord (the Pope) would most willingly spend any sum of money whatever to reunite so noble a member to the Church, and to aid that see in particular on which the rest of the East depends. But supposing the accounts to be true which have come and are continually coming from Constantinople, concerning the Patriarch, he does not see how that can be done. We are informed concerning him that he denies the invocation of saints, the worship and veneration of images and relics of saints, the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the freedom of the will, the authority of the holy councils, traditions, the authority of the holy Fathers, the necessity of auricular confession, and the declaration in it of sins of the mind; and that, instead of it, he has introduced a kind of confession made to God publicly, in general terms: that he sends young men to study in the University of England, where they are taught this doctrine, in order by means of them to disseminate it through the Levant. That for this end he has caused to be printed, and does himself distribute to the bishops, a kind of catechism, full of these and similar errors, condemned many years since, not only by the Apostolic See and the Council of Trent, but even by his own predecessor. That on the representation of the Huguenot ambassadors, with whom he freely communicates, he has taken away the Synodicon, and has left off paying any reverence to the most holy Eucharist." The "Instructions" proceed to express the satisfaction it would give to find the reports calumnies, "in order that the Pope might be able, with a good grace and conscience, to help him." Cyril is to be informed that he may place entire confidence in the ambassadors of France and of the Emperor; and that a reconciliation may be effected on the conditions agreed upon at the Council of Florence. The "Instructions" are set down as a weak invention of the enemy; upon insufficient grounds, in my humble opinion. It is not at all improbable but that Cyril, finding himself hard pressed by the Jesuits, may have opened a negotiation at Rome, in some such cautious, indirect way as this. He had plenty of precedents. Patriarchs and emperors had done the same before him, and, for the most part, with equal sincerity.

The Turks regarded their Church patronage simply as a source of revenue. The greater interest a patriarch excited,

—the harder he was fought about, the better he would be paid for. There was a talk, about this time, of the suffragan bishops proceeding to a new election to choose another Patriarch. The affair went so far that Cyril left the city. His friends had an audience of the Vizir, to whom they tendered explanations, and 10,000 ducats,—the latter part of the argument was deemed satisfactory, and Cyril returned. This happened in 1624.

In 1627 a stranger was brought to Constantinople, who excited a great sensation,—a very formidable personage; despotic rulers and jobbing administrations tremble still at his very name—the Press. Nicodemus Metaxa, a Greek monk, brought from England a fount of Greek types, a printing-press, and knowledge enough of the craft to enable him to set up as a printer. Cyril was delighted; but he really was so very busy that he could not do the honours himself, so he recommended Metaxa to his very good friend Sir Thomas Rowe, and no less a personage than the Metropolitan of Corinth was the bearer of the recommendation. The English ambassador's joy was quite equal to that of the Patriarch's; but, unfortunately, his engagements, too, were so pressing. However, at the urgent entreaty of the Metropolitan, a consultation was held at the Embassy; present, the English and Dutch ambassadors, Cyril Lucar, and Gerasimus, patriarch of Alexandria: poor Metaxa the while, with his Greek types, stood in the street, or sat upon thorns. The issue of the deliberation was that permission should be publicly asked the Vizir to unpack and use the types. Beyond expectation (and possibly desire), permission was given. Cyril then asked Sir Thomas Rowe to suffer the press to be set up in his own house. This he would not do, but hired a house at his own expense, established Metaxa as printer, and took him under his ambassadorial protection.

Happy Metaxa! to have thus weathered the storm and found himself in so good a haven. Alas! the printer's house, only a street's length from the English, was but half a street's length from the French Embassy. As the poor printer sat cheerily over his work, the Jesuit fathers invaded his humble domicile: they told him terrible things; not all at once, by degrees. They made him out first a heretic, by the clearest logic. He had learned printing in an heretical country, there-

fore he must be a heretic himself. The types were all contaminated—full of dangerous contagion. There was no help for him but to put himself under their salutary protection. Metaxa did not fly to their arms. The Jesuits then, according to rule, began to call hard names—Lutheran, Infidel, and so forth. Metaxa stood fire bravely. At length he was told, since he would not listen to godly admonition, that he must prepare for death. Almost frightened into a mortal sickness, the trembling monk, with tears in his eyes, begged of Sir Thomas Rowe a sleeping-room at the embassy, whence and whither, night and morning, he was duly guarded by his friends and workmen. The press was not suffered to remain inactive. There were two works in hand, judiciously selected, the one to cover the other; first, a treatise of Meletius, late Patriarch of Alexandria, against the Papal supremacy; and, secondly, Cyril Lucar's own Confession of Faith. This is better known than any other later production of Greek divinity. I can only say of it here, that on most of those points in which Protestants differ from the Roman and Oriental Churches, Cyril sides with the former against the latter. One day the English ambassador had a dinner-party; Cyril was invited, and went to it: the day was Sunday. I do not like to call anything a judgment; but certainly there did happen on that day enough to show how very wrong it is for ambassadors to give dinners on Sundays, and Patriarchs to attend them. About the second course, there was heard a dreadful uproar: 150 janizaries had broken into the printing-house, and seized types, paper, machines, tools, and furniture of all kinds. Metaxa, who fortunately was not on the premises at the time, reached his chamber at the Embassy in safety. A dinner is much too grave a business to give place to anything short of a revolution. That at the Embassy—this ill-omened interruption notwithstanding—proceeded as though nothing had happened. The book in hand when the press was seized was Cyril's Confession; but the book complained of was an earlier tract; written, so said the Jesuits, against the Mahomedans, to incite the Cossacks to revolt. On the Monday following, the Vizir summoned the Mollahs, who gave it as their opinion that the book contained nothing fixing a capital offence either on the author or the printer. Cyril, who had staid all night at the Embassy, on hearing

this took courage, came boldly before the Vizir, and protested his innocence. He was placed in honourable custody. The Mufti was next consulted; he gave his judgment as thus:—"Dogmas contrary to the precepts of Mahomet are not, on that account, necessarily blasphemous or criminal. Since Christians are permitted by the Sultan to profess their doctrines, there can be no more harm in writing than in preaching in their defence. It is not simple belief, but an overt act, which renders men amenable to the laws." I wonder whether the Mufti, so mild, tolerant, and gentlemanlike, had had his palm touched with English gold. As the government lowered their tone, the ambassador raised his; he insisted on the restoration of Metaxa's goods and the punishment of his enemies. Fortune inclined to Cyril; he gained a signal victory, and for the last time. In conjunction with Sir Thomas Rowe, he made a great and successful effort for the expulsion of the Jesuits. The Fathers retired to the palace of the French ambassador; but on their return to their convent, at the end of a fortnight, they were arrested, thrown into prison, and would have been put to death but for the generous intercession of the Patriarch and his friends. As it was, all the Jesuit settlements, at Chios, Smyrna, and Aleppo, were broken up; the Jesuits themselves put on board a Christian vessel, and landed in Italy. Two remained as chaplains at the French Embassy.

CHAPTER VIII.

CYRIL LUCAR.

Cyril's Confession published at Geneva—M. Von Haga's Proposals to Patriarch of Alexandria—His Reply—Cyril forms an Intimacy with M. Leger—Cyril's Interview with the French Ambassador—Attempts against Cyril—His Deposition—His Letters in Exile—Cyril Contari—Plot to carry Cyril off—Neophytus of Heraclea—Cyril restored—His Address to Senators of Geneva—His last Letter—Particulars of his Death—Council at Constantinople—Council at Bethlehem—Summary of Confession—Declaration of Council—Cyril's Character—Judicial Murder of Greek Patriarch in 1821—Prospects of the Greek Church—Anglican Union with her—Conclusion.

In consequence of the seizure of the press, the "Confession" by Cyril could not be—I have a shrewd suspicion that it was never meant to be—published at Constantinople. The work appeared in Latin at Geneva, 1630. It created a sensation throughout Europe, but to the honour of the Greek Church was generally pronounced a forgery. To remove this erroneous impression, Cyril reprinted it in Greek, with an Appendix: the enlarged edition was published at Geneva also, in 1633.*

Shortly before the first publication of the "Confession," M. Von Haga, naturally encouraged by his success with Cyril, wrote, in the joint names of himself and M. Leger, pastor of the Dutch congregation at Pera, a letter to Gerasimus, patriarch of Alexandria, proposing, at the expense of the States-General, to erect colleges, and to establish printing-presses in Egypt, on condition that the Calvinistic bodies were received to the communion of the Alexandrian Church. Gerasimus replied. "Unity," he observes, "is that at which all Christians ought to aim, but it is necessary to be careful

* Alex. Church, vol. ii. p. 433.

that it is a true—not a false unity. We can only give peace on the same terms on which Christ gave it. A suspected peace is more dangerous than open warfare. Colleges would indeed be a boon to Alexandria, but not on the terms proposed. The recent attempts to make the Scriptures more clear than Christ left them are by no means to be approved. The obscurity of Scripture has always been confessed. The Apocalypse may more truly be called an obvelation than a revelation. There are for those that need them, the Catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. John Studites, S. Gregory Nyssen." Cold comfort this, it must be owned; however, I shall leave the Bible Society to settle that knotty point with the shade of Gerasimus. Cyril had asked Gerasimus to send his Confession of Faith, the latter refers generally to the seven Œcumenical Councils. The letter is dated July 1629.

Cyril now lost a staunch friend in the recall of Sir Thomas Rowe, who was succeeded as English ambassador by Sir Peter Wych. After the death of King James I. in 1625, and accession of Charles I., Anglican theology took a more Catholic direction. Doctor Laud, whose high-Church principles were gaining the royal ear, was not a likely person to promote Cyril Lucar's plans of innovation: the English representative was civil to the Patriarch, and that was all. The consequence was, that to keep his ground, Cyril threw himself more than ever into the arms of the Dutch Calvinists. M. Leger became his sworn friend and constant correspondent. Several letters of Cyril are preserved at Geneva, and given to the public, for the first time, by Mr. Neale, in his invaluable history of the "Patriarchate of Alexandria."

It is interesting to read about the "Confession." "Here, in Constantinople," he writes in one letter, "many copies of this my Confession have been written, and many friends have requested me to authenticate it with my own hand, which I did not refuse them." He then goes on to give an account of a visit of ceremony which he paid to the French ambassador, newly arrived, Count Marchville. "His excellency," he says, "after having conversed with me, and finished the usual compliments, brought out to me my Confession, and showed it to me, inquiring whether it was mine: when I had recognised it, I replied, that it was my Confession and Pro-

fession." It appears that the Pope sent the Confession to the ambassador to show to Cyril, and inquire whether it were his, and whether he intended to persist in it. "I then," Cyril continues, "replied without fear, that it was mine, and that I had written it because I so hold, believe, and confess; and that if any error were found in it, and he would point it out to me, I would answer him like a Christian in good faith." There is another account of this interview in a letter of M. Von Haga, dated January 17, 1632, which states that Cyril, after carefully examining the copy of the "Confession" put into his hands, said, that he was the author; adding, "that if there were errors in it, he should be most happy to be convinced of them from Holy Scripture. That, however, the Pope had no right to interfere in the matter; that if his views were heretical, it was the duty of the hundred Greek metropolitans and bishops, over whom he presided, canonically assembled in Synod, to expose and condemn them."

Shortly after this, two whom Mr. Neale calls "schismatical Greek Prelates,"—the metropolitans of Sardica and Bulgaria —came to Constantinople, and were received at the French embassy. They spoke openly against Cyril, calling him Heretic, Infidel, and Lutheran. Joined with three other metropolitans, they very nearly effected their object to depose Cyril. A timely present of 10,000 dollars to the Porte averted the stroke. In October 1633, a new adversary took the field against Cyril—the worst there can be—a disappointed man. Contari, metropolitan of Berœa, was too late in his application for the see of Thessalonica. Cyril had promised the dignity to somebody else. Contari sent to Muscovy to collect alms for the Church of Constantinople, converted the collection to his own use, and bid the Porte 50,000 dollars for the Patriarchate; the sum was considered insufficient; Contari and his agent were banished to Tenedos for offering so little. Cyril's position was now evidently precarious, so much so that the Patriarchate was considered to be in the market. Anastasius, a fellow-countryman of Cyril's, bid 60,000 dollars: his offer was accepted. Cyril was deposed and sent into exile to Tenedos.

Anastasius must have fleeced his flock amazingly to get anything like a return this time, as he was deposed at the end of a month. Cyril had the refusal of the vacant see at

70,000 dollars; with great difficulty he scraped the money together, and was reinstated June 1634. In the spring of the following year Contari made a second and successful attempt to obtain the Patriarchate: his 50,000 dollars were accepted, and he was enthroned March 1635. Cyril was banished to Chios, from whence he wrote a letter to M. Leger, in which he distinctly denies the intercession of saints and angels, and speaks of the Real Presence in the Eucharist in language we may hope of now obsolete profanity.

The Patriarch Contari may have been, as times went, a well-intentioned, but he was certainly not a very prudent nor amiable man; he openly declared his submission to the see of Rome, and said he would send Cyril a prisoner to the Pope. This was not mere talk; a plan had been formed to carry him off from Chios, which might easily have been done, as the corsairs, who then scoured the seas, were ready to serve any who would pay them. On Cyril's representation of the danger to which he was exposed, he was transferred to Rhodes. He continued at Rhodes a year; there is nothing very striking in his correspondence in the intervals; he speaks with that full assurance of the correctness of his own new opinions, and utter contempt for those who stood in the old paths, which was the characteristic tone of the popular theology of the day. The Patriarch Contari having no more money, became at length unbearable; he was deposed by a Synod. As no one paid the Porte better than Cyril Lucar, or was generally so much liked by the clergy, he was nominated successor; but his funds were for the present exhausted. The appointment did not fall into hostile hands. Neophytus of Heraclea, a former pupil of Cyril, was chosen upon a sort of understanding that he should resign as soon as Cyril was enabled to reclaim the patriarchal chair. It is not every one who would have consented to hold office on this condition, but Neophytus was a gentle, amiable being, whose highest ambition was to gratify his old and revered master; to the subscription in aid of whose reinstatement he is said to have given all he could command. In August 1636, Cyril was permitted to return to Constantinople; he took up his residence under the friendly roof of the Dutch ambassador. An affectionate contest followed between Cyril and Neophytus which should resign in favour of the other; the latter persisted

in his resolution to abdicate, and Cyril for the last time was Patriarch of Constantinople.

About the period of his re-election, M. Leger was on the point of returning to Geneva; by him Cyril addressed a letter to the Senate of the Republic, in which he says a great deal in favour of Calvin, styling him "a most holy and wise doctor, who rejoices in heaven, and has his portion with the saints, who are most dear to their Redeemer." Of his own position he speaks with a confidence which past experience hardly justifies: "I, who have been pointed at as a heretic, am here present, and no one dares to speak a word. Not only so, but they are all coming submissively to beg my pardon, except two or three of the ringleaders, whom I have not yet admitted to my presence, although some intercede for them." The next sentence is not conceived in a very Christian spirit, though perhaps, of all deadly weapons, the particular one selected is the most merciful, inasmuch as it invites to profound and painless sleep: "I am reserving myself for the first congregation to which I shall have to preach, that I may treat them according to their deserts, which will be death to them." He assures the senators of Geneva that he embraces their doctrines, "which are orthodox and Catholic," and abhors the doctrine of their adversaries, "the false and corrupt Roman doctrine." "I know," he continues, "that the mountains rise and conspire against me in consequence of this my Confession, but I will always say, The Lord is my light and my salvation, whom then shall I fear? the Lord is the protector of my life, of whom shall I be afraid? And encircled with this hope, I will fight, in this time of my age, against the adversaries, until the blessed Lord shall call me, and by your prayers vouchsafe to me the kingdom of heaven, where we shall see ourselves with you, sirs, most illustrious and most reverend, gifted with white robes, with palms in our hands, in the sight of our Lord Jesus Christ, for whose glory we all fight, and shall embrace each other in everlasting glory and eternal felicity."

In another short note, he promises to send M. Leger some manuscripts relating to the Council of Florence. The last letter he is supposed to have written to M. Leger, in reply to some remarks on his Confession: he says therein, "That Scripture, by reason of its brevity, does not contain

all things necessary to salvation;" the original runs: "*ob brevitatem scimus non omnia saluti necessaria in Sancta Scriptura contineri.*" That Scripture cannot, in strictness, be said to be its own interpreter, as that would destroy the office of prophecy. On baptism he cites John, iii. 5, "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," but adds, "If death prematurely overtake an unbaptized child, we do not exclude such a one from the lot of the blessed, since, these are the children of believers;" an opinion founded on 1 Cor. vii. 14, "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." He says that he made no mention in his Confession of angels, saints, and images, because he was writing a Confession not a Refutation, and there was the less occasion to say anything on this subject, since Christ being represented as the only Mediator, every other was necessarily excluded. He approves of pictures as ornaments on the walls for instruction in history; for any use but this, he thinks that they do not edify in the Church, and that the reverence paid to them is superstitious and savours of idolatry.

Cyril, in the harassing discharge of the duties of his high station, had encountered and passed through many difficulties and dangers: his hour was now come, the power of darkness must prevail. The Sultan Amurath was on his march to Bagdad when news came that Azof had been seized by the Cossacks. "This is Cyril's work," said his enemies; "what folly to leave Constantinople at the mercy of a man like him!" Instantly, without further reflection, Amurath signed Cyril's death-warrant and forwarded it to Constantinople. The courier, who was the bearer of the fatal instrument, arrived at the city on June 27, 1638. The same evening, by the command of Musa Pasha, governor of the city, janizaries presented themselves at the patriarchal palace, stating that they were sent to carry Cyril on board ship, it being the Sultan's pleasure that he should be sent into exile. The intimation was sudden and abrupt, but under the Turkish government there was nothing unusual in this. Having made some slight preparation, Cyril went that night on board a boat, expecting to be conveyed to St. Stefano, a small town

near Constantinople, where a vessel was said to be waiting for him.

The boat had not got far on its way over the dark waters before the countenances of the men, in hitherto apparently respectful attendance on the Patriarch, changed. Cyril saw at a glance that he was in the hands of his executioners; begging a few moments for preparation, he fell on his knees and prayed earnestly and fervently; he then resigned himself into their hands, and, after the example of the Captain of his salvation, Who was made perfect through suffering, having patiently endured contumely and buffeting, received the stroke of death. The corpse, as of an ordinary criminal, was stripped and cast into the sea; brought to shore by fishermen and thrown on the beach, for awhile none ventured to perform the common offices of humanity in sprinkling on it a little earth: at length, a few who knew and loved him overcame their fears, and gave the body Christian burial,—a pious act, which elicited a fresh proof of the implacable hatred to which he fell a victim. The torn and mutilated body was, by the officers of justice, dragged from its resting-place, and again cast ignominiously into the sea: carried to land, affection rescued it once more. In one of the little secluded isles of the Bay of Nicodemia, at nightfall, unmolested, they dug the Patriarch's grave, and tenderly laid him down to sleep, where "the wicked cease from troubling and the weary be at rest."

About a year before his death Cyril sent an Arabic Pentateuch, as a "sign of brotherly love"—so the inscription runs—to Archbishop Laud. The book is in the Bodleian Library, and this is also written in it: "The gift of Cyril, patriarch of Constantinople, a little before he unworthily perished, at the age of eighty,* by the hands of the Turks." The Archbishop, with a presentiment of his own calamity, was very solicitous to learn the minute details of Cyril Lucar's death. These the celebrated Oriental traveller, Doctor Pocock, communicated in a letter, which was unfortunately lost in the civil wars.

A Council was held at Constantinople, September 1638, three months after Cyril's death. Cyril Contari, the late

* He was not so old by fourteen years.

Patriarch's determined enemy, who was now for the third time chosen head of the Eastern Church, presided. The name and opinions of Cyril Lucar were anathematised with a passionate severity, which showed the source of their inspiration. Three Patriarchs and twenty-four Archbishops and Bishops subscribed the anathemas. Of the Patriarchs, I am sorry to see Cyril Lucar's early favourite, for whose education he took such care, and for whom he did all he could, to have been one. I should hardly have thought that Metrophanes Critopulus would have lost ground in public estimation, had he, yielding to a sentiment of delicacy, not to say gratitude, declined to set his hand to an instrument which consigned to obloquy and reproach the memory of one who, whatever may have been his faults, was to Metrophanes the earliest and most indulgent benefactor and friend.

In 1672 another council was held, called the Council of Bethlehem. Cyril Lucar's case came up again, the occasion of which was, a report current in the West that the Eastern Church fraternised with the Calvinists, in proof of which Cyril's Confession was alleged. M. Claude, the distinguished Huguenot minister of Charenton, was most active on the Calvinist side in claiming the support of the deceased Patriarch. The acts of the Council of Bethlehem were published with a preface, containing some remarkable statements, previously to copying which, this appears the proper place to introduce a summary of Cyril's famous "Confession."* It commences thus:—"Cyril, patriarch of Constantinople, to those who are asking and inquiring concerning the faith and worship of the Greeks, that is, the Eastern Church, what its sentiments are concerning the orthodox faith, publishes, in the name of all Christians, this brief Confession, for a testimony before God and man, with a pure conscience, without any deceit." The first article is on the Holy Trinity; he affirms that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son. The second is on Holy Scripture; in which he affirms, "Wherefore the authority of Holy Writ is far greater than that of the Church, for it is a different thing being taught by the Holy Ghost and being taught by man." The third, on Election and Reprobation: We believe that God, before the

* Neale's Alex. Church, vol. ii. p. 424.

foundation of the world, predestinated his elect to glory, without respect to their works. In like manner, that before the foundation of the world he reprobated whom he would reprobate." The fourth article, on the Origin of Evil; the fifth, on Providence; the sixth, on Original Sin; and the seventh, on the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, contain nothing contrary to the received dogmas of his Church.

The eighth is on the Mediation of Christ: "We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ, sitting on the right hand of the Father, is there our Mediator, and pleadeth for us; that he alone does the work of a true and proper High Priest and Mediator, whence also he only takes care of his own Church, adorning and enriching it with various blessings and ornaments." The ninth article is on Faith: "We believe that none can be saved without faith. By faith we mean that which justifieth in Jesus Christ, which the life and death of our Lord Jesus Christ produceth for us, and which the Gospel preaches, and without which it is impossible to please God." The tenth article is on the Church: "We believe that the Church which is called Catholic contains all the faithful in Christ, both those who, having fallen asleep, have removed into their country, and those who are yet strangers in the way; of which Church, because a mortal man can in no sense be head, our Lord Jesus Christ is head alone." The eleventh article is on the Saints: "We believe that the members of the Catholic Church are the saints predestinated to eternal life, from the lot of, and participation with whom, heretics are excluded, although we discover and behold in particular Churches the chaff mingled with the wheat."

The twelfth is on the Infallibility of the Church: "We believe that the Church Militant is sanctified and instructed by the Holy Ghost, for he is the true Paraclete, whom Christ sendeth from the Father to teach the truth and to scatter darkness from the minds of the faithful. But it is true and certain that the Church Militant may err, and choose falsehood instead of truth; and from this error and deceit the teaching and light of the Most Holy Spirit alone, not of man, frees us. Although this may be done by the ministry of those who faithfully serve in his Church." The thirteenth is on Justification: "We believe that man is justified by faith, not by works. But when we speak of faith we mean

the correlative of faith, which is the righteousness of Christ, on which faith takes hold. Works are not to be neglected as necessary means to the testifying our faith and the confirmation of our vocation, as the truth itself teaches. But that they are sufficient of themselves to save a man, so as to give him salvation *ex condigno*, is proved by human frailty to be false. But the righteousness of Christ applied to the penitent alone justifies and saves the faithful." The fourteenth is on Free Will. In the fifteenth he limits the number of the sacraments to two, and affirms them to be signs of the promises and to confer grace. The sixteenth is on Baptism: "Wherefore, whoever is baptized, as it is commanded in the Gospel, we do not doubt that his sins, actual as well as original, are remitted; so that they that are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, are regenerated, purified, and justified." The seventeenth is on the Holy Eucharist: "In its administration we confess a true, Real Presence of Christ our Lord; but such a presence as faith gives, not such a one as the rashly-devised doctrine of transubstantiation affirms. But we believe that the faithful eat the Body of Christ in the Lord's Supper; but by receiving it with the sense of the soul." He condemns the denial of the cup to the laity. The eighteenth article is on the State of the Departed. In this he asserts that they are in blessedness or condemnation. He expressly condemns the doctrine of purgatory, but says nothing of the intermediate state.

To this abstract of the "Confession" may be fitly appended the declarations made in the preface to the Acts of the Council of Bethlehem.* It is there distinctly asserted that this Confession was not Cyril's, but a forgery, for which five reasons are assigned. "First, the Eastern Church never knew Cyril to be such a person as the adversaries say, nor was acquainted with the articles as his composition. Secondly, if it be granted that they are his, he must have published them secretly, without the knowledge of any of the Easterns, much less of the Catholic Church. Thirdly, Cyril's Confession is not the Confession of the Eastern Church. Fourthly, one of two things is impossible,—either that the Easterns were acquainted with this Confession, or that, if

* Neale's Alex. Church, vol. ii. p. 467.

they knew it, they could be Christians. Fifthly, that the Easterns have always had such an aversion to these articles, that Cyril has been often known to teach with an oath, and in the Church contrary to them; and only because he would not write against them he was anathematised and excommunicated in two very crowded synods; that Cyril was never known in the Eastern Church as a Calvinist is evident to every one who has no evil intention, for, having been Pope of Alexandria after Meletius, and having been translated to the throne of Constantinople (at a time when he was sojourning there), by the joint consent of the clergy of Constantinople, neither in synod, nor in church, nor in the house of any orthodox person, and, in short, neither in public nor private, did he say or teach any one of those things which his adversaries say he favoured. These people who never knew him vehemently affirm that he was a partaker of their heresy, whilst those who ministered to him in the business of many years, and knew everything relating to him, assert that he was nothing of the sort. There appears no unsuspected writing of his, nor any written with his own hand confessing any such things as these heterodox people testify. We have not only ten thousand witnesses who attest the well-known piety of Cyril, and that they never heard anything heretical from him, but also a book of the largest size, written with Cyril's own hand, in which appear his sermons delivered at Constantinople on each Sunday and festival, exhibiting quite the contrary to these forged articles." The Fathers of Bethlehem then contend that Cyril was not anathematised as the author of the Confession, but because he did not suppress and anathematise it. Had the Council seen Cyril Lucar's letters to his Dutch friends they would have been saved the trouble of this ably-reasoned but fruitless vindication.

It is impossible to doubt but that Cyril was a Protestant at heart, in the common acceptation of the word; his youthful travels in Germany and Switzerland, which brought him into intercourse with the Reformers, his study of their writings, the friendships which he formed in advancing life, the generous support which he received on critical occasions, the experience that, when others failed him or played him false, he could always depend upon the steadfastness of these, endeared to his mind first the men, and then the principles they pro-

fessed. But Cyril was a prey to ambition; even when he held the second place he aspired to the pre-eminence, and in a letter cited at an earlier page, in a vainglorious tone and spirit boasted of himself as the virtual ruler of the Eastern Church, setting up and pulling down whom he would. Thus it was that his religious convictions were subordinated to his worldly interests. Cyril's Protestantism was no great mastering principle that bore him onward in spite of himself, he kept it always under control; docile, conformable, and well-mannered, it never appeared at a wrong time or in a wrong place. He transacted business, assisted in the services of his Church, preached eloquent and, sometimes we suspect, stinging sermons, without a single trace of it escaping him. To M. Von Haga, the Dutch ambassador, and M. Leger, the Calvinistic divine, he was quite a different person from what he was to the ten thousand witnesses of his own flock, who were prepared to give undeniable testimony to the orthodoxy of his life and opinions. Could Cyril have effected any change in the Eastern Church? The chances were very much against him, but he never put the matter to the proof. To solicitations for this end he replied, "If I could reform my Church I would do it willingly; but God knows it is talking of impossibilities!"

Cyril possessed one great recommendation in the eyes of the Greek community, his determined opposition to the Roman Catholic Missionaries. Meletius Piga, and the instructors of his youth, had carefully instilled this feeling into his mind; though for a time, it appears, by his own account, that he had wavered. The Greeks knew little or nothing about the Confession; so far from its being extensively circulated at Constantinople, not more than one copy, sent by the Pope to the French ambassador, seems to have reached it. I except, of course, those in the hands of his Protestant friends. To the vast majority of his co-religionists, Cyril was known as the uncompromising champion of the rights and liberties of the Church against Papal pretensions; and it was for this they believed that he was persecuted, oppressed, and hunted to his grave.

Viewing him apart from the excitement and turmoil in which his life was for the most part spent, Cyril seems to have been an affable, unassuming, kind-hearted man, entering

with hearty goodwill into the benevolent schemes and harmless pleasures of those whom he loved. In fine, I cannot finish this slight sketch better than in the words of a great scholar, to whom I am under many obligations for the instruction I have derived from his writings:*—"Considering what he did, and what he suffered, the strength of his enemies, the weakness of his friends, the power of his early associations, the bitterness of his persecutors, his own meekness, and patience, and great humility; and using towards him that charity of judgment which we should ourselves desire; we are justified in believing that, notwithstanding his many errors,

'After life's fitful fever he sleeps well.'"

From the early part of the eighteenth century, when Dupin's list of the Patriarchs of Constantinople ends, to the present time, I have been unable to meet with any detailed account of the Greek Church. That incidental notices, which, put together, might carry the history on, may be found in Oriental histories and travels, is likely; and I shall feel much obliged to any of my readers who will direct me to the sources of information. The despotism of the Turkish Government uniform, the tenor of one century becomes an accurate guide to the course of the next. How many patriarchs came to a violent end, I know not; the last instance occurred at the commencement of the Greek Revolution in 1821. Mr. Burgess, in his interesting work, "Greece and the Levant," speaking of the Patriarchal Church of St. George, writes:—"In entering the court through a very common doorway, I could not but shudder as I passed under the beam to which the aged Gregory was suspended, in his pontifical robes, on the Easter Sunday of 1821. The Jews took his body, and with much mocking, and cruel insults, threw it into the canal, mutilated and bleeding; but perhaps Greece owes her freedom, in a great measure, to the thrilling effect produced throughout Christendom by that horrid deed."† In the last few years the power of the Turks has declined rapidly, and, with decaying fortunes, their pride and

* Alex. Church, vol. ii. p. 455.

† Burgess's Greece and the Levant, vol. ii. p. 195.

intolerance have sensibly abated. Christians, no longer treated as the brutes that perish, aspire to an equality with their Moslem fellow-citizens. There is a belief prevalent among the people themselves, and for that reason likely to lead to its accomplishment, that the destined period of Turkish supremacy is almost filled up — the days of her empire are numbered. Byzantium, that has witnessed so many vicissitudes, may, perhaps, an exception to the rule that there is no resurrection for nations, behold another, see herself once more metropolis of a Christian empire, seat of a no longer titular but real œcumenical patriarchate. Independent of the rights of conquest, in the present royal family of Russia, as representatives of the race of Palæologus,* are continued the claims to the Imperial inheritance. The throne of the Sultan, resting on no firmer basis than certain fine-spun theories of the balance of power, is guarded by the jealousy of other nations rather than by the strength of his own. To turn from political speculations to a subject more appropriate to these pages. Among the various projects of Christian re-union, that of the English and Greek Churches has been mooted. It is certainly true that we have more tenets in common with the Greek Church than we have with her Roman sister; as, for instance, communion in both kinds, the marriage of the clergy, denial of the papal supremacy. Though evil days have laid her prostrate under Turkish oppression, the Greek Church preserves in theory that union of Church and State which is happily—as many think—in action among us. It is in that particular that the danger lies. In the event of such a re-union, sovereigns would be the temporal heads of the respective Churches. So long as those sovereigns were at peace, the united Churches might prosper. But assuming the Czar of Russia to be the head of the Greek Church—which he is already virtually admitted to be: supposing the courts of St. James and Petersburg had a difference, the united National Churches would feel it. Supposing the difference to issue in a downright quarrel, suspension of communion between the Churches would inevi-

* Sophia, daughter of Thomas and niece of Constantine Palæologus, last Greek emperor, married John the Great of Russia, who, considering himself heir to Constantine, assumed, in right of his marriage, the title of "Czar."

tably follow; and to a certainty they would, *pro tem.*, cut the connexion. There is another consideration, if there are any who have a salutary horror of the Pope—there is no love lost between the Emperor of all the Russias and ourselves. As citizens of a free country, we cannot have—it is not in the nature of things—much liking for a despotic ruler. We wish no ill to his Imperial Majesty, on the contrary, we desire all possible good both to himself and his subjects, only we would keep from him, as we would he should from us—a respectful distance. Turning to another quarter. The English Government helped to put King Otho of Greece on his throne, and keep him there; for which, of course, he is very much obliged to us: still there are certain unpacific recollections of the name of one Don Pacifico, that might lead the royal mind to contemplate with a shade of distrust any closer intercourse. It is remarkable, that of all religious societies, there is scarcely one with which we have so few points of contact as with the Greek Church. There are no old associations, no popular traditions, no hidden fountains of love and sympathy, that at a touch will gush out. The Greek Church is a great phenomenon, full of interest to the English statesman, scholar, theologian, and the educated classes, but not possessing the least hold on the mass of the English people, to whom its very existence is unknown. It is not so with that Christian body which I have ever had in my thoughts throughout this Series, towards which we see accumulating around us fresh proofs of returning interest and deepening affection.

We live in times of excitement, when men feel strongly, speak boldly, and sometimes roughly. There are to the sensitive many provocations; but there is one, for the sake of which we may well forgive all the rest—the provoking to love and to good works. This remarkable characteristic of English life at the present day has struck a distinguished writer, a foreigner and a Frenchman. Foreigners are not prone to flatter us, and Frenchmen less than any. M. Lamartine speaks with admiration of the "extreme mildness of men's minds and hearts, the temperance of ideas, the moderation of what is desired, the tenderness evinced towards a conciliation of all classes, the justice which all classes of the English population render to each other, the readiness of all

to co-operate, each according to his means and disposition, in advancing the general good, the employment, comfort, instruction, and morality of the people." It is on these generous and noble dispositions of my countrymen that I rest my hopes. United in mutual love and duty, they will desire more and more earnestly to have the social union hallowed by the bonds of a common religion. The aged may be gathered to their fathers, youths become aged men before that day come; nevertheless, come it will; when past wrongs forgiven, exasperated differences reconciled, the rights of nature vindicated, the last words of Christ observed, to each member assured a just measure of Christian liberty, all with loving concord and cheerful obedience shall seek the law at the lips of her once, by the almost unanimous consent of Christendom, the scarcely intermitted voice of tradition, recognised and owned Head and Mistress of the Churches; who, in her darkest and most degenerate days, whatever else she lacked, preserved in unimpaired strength and radiant beauty the noblest attribute earth can show — Protectress of the people, the poor man's Friend.

POSTSCRIPT.

In closing a series on the subject of Christian Union at this time, I trust that I shall stand excused if I express my full and deliberate conviction, that the Reformed Church of England, as represented by her Archbishops and Bishops, constitutes a true and lawful Episcopate; and that no act of the Sovereign-Pontiff—from whom, not through our own fault, but by the misgovernment of his predecessors, and the present unscriptural conditions of communion, we are unhappily separated—can invalidate and annul it. Looking at the recent alterations as designed for the spiritual advantage of the members of the Roman Catholic Church living in this country, I rejoice, as I should rejoice at anything that tended to promote the welfare and happiness of so loyal a body of Her Majesty's subjects, such good citizens, persons so exemplary in all the social relations of life, as are our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. But regarding the Official Document lately put forth as the assertion of right to spiritual sovereignty within this realm of England, I absolutely and unreservedly ignore it. The Bull of His Holiness Pius IX. is to me, under that last character, as though it had never been at all.

E. S. A.

November 7, 1850.

London:—Printed by G. Barclay, Castle St. Leicester Sq.