## THE

## PRINCETON REVIEW.

## JANUARY, 1867.

No. I.

- ART. I.— The Early Scottish Church; The Ecclesiastical History of Scotland from the First to the Twelfth century. By the Rev. THOMAS MCLAUCHLAN, M. A., F. S. A. S. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1865.
- Iona. By the Rev. W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D. D., F. S. S. A. Edinburgh.

LATE researches throw increased light upon the distinction between Celtic and Latin Christianity. They were separated by a boundary of facts, more enduring than the stone wall completed by Severus between the Solway and the Tyne, and warding off from Scotland both prelacy and papacy for more than a thousand years. There is reason to think that before the close of the second Christian century there were "Scots believing in Christ," and that for the gospel they were not indebted to missionaries from Rome. These Scots dwelt in Ireland as well as in Scotland, and there are historic intimations that they received their first Christian teachers from lands where the Greek language prevailed. It was perhaps three hundred years after Christianity dawned upon Scotland, when Ninian was commissioned by Rome as the primus Episcopus, "the first bishop to the Picts," and Palladius as "the first VOL. XXXIX .- NO. I. 1

ART. V.— Voices from the East. Documents on the present state and working of the Oriental Church. Translated from the original Russ, Slavonic, and French, with notes. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M. A. London. 1859.

THE middle of the seventeenth century presents one of those great junctures in history, by which the progress of the church is divided into periods of different characteristics. By the year 1648, A. D., Protestant nations had successfully asserted their independence, defined their ecclesiastical position, and adopted their authoritative symbols. Rome, in reactionary conflict had declared herself through the canons and catechism of the Council of Trent, followed up by the profession of Pius IV., and further developed in the controversy now instituted with the Jansenists. Oriental catholics, though not constrained by any revolution in their history, produced also, about the same time, that confession whereby the doctrinal standing of their church was stated in opposition to encroachments from the west.

Attempts at union of the churches had failed on all hands. The gulf between the Greek and the Latin churches, after many efforts to bridge it over, remained as constituted in the eleventh century. In 1638, the honest labours of Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, to promote a good understanding between the Greek and the Protestant, cost him his life. Six years earlier, Jesuit success in Abyssinia was brought to an end by a rising of the people, in which the order was expelled from the country, and the sultan, who had favoured it, was constrained to execute the popular will. The issue of the Thirty Years War had demonstrated that to hold Romanist and Protestant under one ecclesiastical jurisdiction was no longer practicable. More distinctly than ever had it been determined that the current of Church History was to flow in separate channels.

By the Peace of Westphalia, the strife in Germany between Protestants and Romanists was settled on the principle of an equal balance of power, the separate existence of Holland as a Protestant country was recognized, and the reformation in the

VOL. XXXIX.—NO. I. 12

Scandinavian kingdoms assumed as authoritative, Sweden being one of the high contracting parties. Lutheran and Reformed were alike comprehended in that treaty. In the settlement of religious questions, the conditions were based upon the religious peace of Augsburg; and the possessions of all parties were decided by the state of affairs as it had stood on the first of January, 1624. "Where a free exercise of religion was publicly tolerated in that year, it was to be continued; and where that was not the case, liberty of domestic worship was ' to be permitted." The legal relations of the two Protestant parties were also to continue as they had existed in that year.

The treaty of Westphalia also determined fundamental political maxims for all Europe, to which even parties then apparently unconcerned in it, or reluctating against it, were in course of time constrained to conform. Against the old ambition of universal empire systematic opposition was organized, and permanent barriers arrayed. No longer was either pope or emperor to be supreme. Important principles, upon which the balance of all power in Europe was to be preserved, were then determined and accepted.

In countries where Romanism subsequently prevailed, the religious conditions of the peace were neglected or set at nought, and Jesuitical machination succeeded in imposing, by political measures, many unjust restrictions upon the Protestant church. In Bohemia it was exterminated; and in the Austrian hereditary estates remained under increasing oppression until the reign of Joseph II. In Silesia and Hungary, where the Protestants formed a large part of the population, they were plundered of their property, and under the severities to which they were subjected, seriously diminished in number. In France the Edict of Nantes was still law, but ill complied with on the part of the government, then in the hands of Cardinal Mazarine, as regent during the minority of Louis XIV.

The Jansenist controversy was beginning to enlist attention in France and the southern Netherlands; but the principal doctrines, brought thereby into discussion, were already sufficiently defined. Elsewhere Jesuits were the ruling spirits, and had succeeded in reaching the last extremity of the anti-reform reaction. The peace of Westphalia was a severe blow to their hopes, and a strong check upon their measures; but was disregarded by them wherever they were able to set it aside.

In Holland and Geneva, the Reformed churches had reached the full day of prosperity. In England the Puritans had defeated the king, and were setting up a commonwealth in the interest of a progressive reformation.

The Assembly of Divines at Westminster had completed their work, and the last lingering delegates remained only to execute, in a few cases, what had been already enacted. Their Confession, Catechisms, Form of Government, and Directory for Public Worship, had been accepted in Scotland, in the Presbyterian church of Ireland, and in all but the Form of Government in New England, and thereby the definitive statement of Reformed doctrine settled for the orthodox Englishspeaking people, outside of the Anglican establishment. A similar service had been, at an earlier day, executed for the Reformed churches on the continent, and as a whole, by the Synod of Dort. Lutheran doctrine remained as determined by its two great founders, and as harmonized in the Form of Concord. And in the Greek church the Orthodox Confession had been approved by the Synods of Kieff and of Jassy in 1643.

Alike in the Greek, Roman, and Protestant connections, the middle of the seventcenth century formed a momentous crisis in the history of doctrine. The period of religious wars and of doctrinal organization, which had extended from the dawn of the Reformation, then came to an end. The union of church and state remained in force; but their relations were now different in different countries, by the introduction of new elements. And although oppression was often subsequently exercised by the stronger party, yet the right of each nation to follow the confession of its choice had been distinctly vindicated.

The position claimed by the Greek church is that of strict conformity to the ancient, maintained by unvarying hereditary practice, without change or alteration, or addition of any essential particular in either doctrine or practice, since the last true œcumenical council, when the bishops of both East and West met freely and on equal terms. The Greek presents itself as t he unchanged orthodox catholic church of antiquity, the only true church. And the two heretical churches of the East are no less conservative of the precise ground of their ancient theology.

Rome cannot deny that changes have taken place within her communion; but claims, notwithstanding, to be the only true church, as having an infallible guide to all truth, over and above the Scriptures, and a process of apostolical and spiritual development within herself, so that all the changes she may introduce are as binding as revelation.

Protestantism denies that Roman doctrine, together with all the innovations defended by it, refuses to accept the decisions of all œcumenical councils, and returns to the simplicity of Scripture. It respects the practice of apostolic and immediately post-apostolic times, the theological definitions of the first four general councils and the writings of the classical fathers; but tests all by conformity with Scripture alone.

All three, within their own respective bounds, contain minor divisions and dissenting sects. But the Protestant alone recognizes the fact, and accepts it as the legitimate condition of the church. The other two deny the right of dissent, war against it, and seek to extinguish it, and yet are constrained under various pleas and disguises, to legalize or submit to it.

In adhering to an absolute conservatism, the Eastern churches have produced little for the historian to record; the actively aggressive spirit of Rome presents more and more that is interesting; but it is under the intense activity and freedom of the Protestant churches that the richest historical treasures have been accumulated. The oriental have their relations most intimate with the ancient; the Romish with mediæval, and the Protestant with modern times. Since the council of Chalcedon in the middle of the fifth century, the oriental church has been divided into three great branches; namely the Greek, or Orthodox Catholic church, and the churches of Nestorian and Monophysite connection. The jurisdiction of these sections is not everywhere geographically distinct; but, in the main, the orthodox occupies the eastern countries of Europe, and the extreme west of Asia; the Monophysites, the next adjoining portions of Asia together with Egypt and Ethiopia, and the Nestorians are scattered in the

further east. In Syria and Mesopotamia they interramify with each other, having in many cases their churches side by side. And patriarchs of both orthodox and monophysite persuasion, in some places, exercise their jurisdiction over the same district, but in relation to separate pastoral charges. They are all and long have been in a state of great depression, diminished from what they once were and under bondage of alien powers.

The Nestorians are the ecclesiastical descendants of the one time great Syrian church, which holding its connection with Antioch, extended far into the centre and south of Asia. When Nestorius, one of the Syrian clergy, of the theological school of Antioch, was deposed from his place as Patriarch of Constantinople, on account of his views touching the relations of the divine and human in Christ, and for withholding a blasphemous honour from the virgin Mary, and subsequently banished to the desert under excommunication, a large portion of the Syrian church sympathized with him. But being thereby also laid under ban, they took refuge in the protection of Persia; and all the Syrian churches from the Tigris eastward were separated from the Catholic church.

Of the five and twenty metropolitan sees of which that communion anciently consisted, only fragments now remain. The most important of these is a population of about one hundred and fifty thousand, who live on the great plain of Oroomiah, in the northwest of Persia, and among the adjoining mountains of Koordistan. Some communities of them are also found in the southwest of India, on the Malabar coast and in Travancore, where they bear the name of Syrian or St. Thomas Christians.

When the Portuguese first arrived in India by way of the Cape of Good Hope, they found a Christian prince in the neighbourhood where they landed, and several communities of that profession; but who knew nothing of the Pope, nor of a great many observances and dogmas held as Christian in Rome. Missionaries were soon at work to constrain them into compliance with the religion of the invaders. An obstinate resistance was made by those Indian Christians. But vain was defence by argument, and in vain did they plead the antiquity

of their establishment, that the regular order and discipline of their church had existed for a period of thirteen hundred years, from the second century of the Christian era, and that they enjoyed a succession of bishops appointed by the Patriarch of Antioch. "We," said they, "are of the true faith, whatever you from the west may be. For we came from the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians." The fires of the Inquisition and Portuguese arms were the final answer to every plea. The Syrian bishop, Mar Joseph, was seized and carried a prisoner to Lisbon, and a synod of his clergy forcibly convened at Diamper near Cochin, in which the Romish archbishop Menezes presided. "At that compulsory synod one hundred and fifty of the Syrian clergy appeared." They were charged with having married wives, with recognizing but two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's supper, with neither invoking the saints, nor worshipping images, nor believing in purgatory, and with having no other orders, or names of dignity in the church, than bishop, priest, and deacon. All which they were called upon to abjure, or be deposed from office. Their church books were also condemned to the flames, "in order," said the inquisitors, "that no pretended apostolical monuments may remain."

Thus constrained, the churches on the sea coast acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, and accepted the changes of their liturgy made by Menezes; but retained the Syriac language in their worship. Subsequently they received the name of Syro-Roman Christians.

Further inland, where the force of Portuguese arms could not be so well applied, the churches under the protection of native princes successfully resisted Romish intrusion, and retained their ancient faith, although in a state of great depression, until the establishment of the English rule in India.

In 1806, the Rev. Claudius Buchanan visited them, and by the representations which he made of them, enlisted on their behalf the enterprise of English Christians. The cause was taken up by the Church Missionary Society, and a mission established at Travancore, under very favourable auspices. Without intending to interfere with existing forms and order, the mission aimed at the reformation of the Syrian churches, by improving the education of the clergy, by teaching youth to read, and by putting the Scriptures into their hands, and promoting the publication of evangelical principles. For many years the work proceeded with encouraging success.

Between 1832 and 1836 that method was abandoned, and, by decision of the metropolitan bishop of the English church in India, the Syrian Christians were to be treated in the same way as the heathen, all connection with them as a church was to be declined, and all of them who desired to have ecclesiastical relations to the mission were to become members of the Church of England. Subsequent missionary success has accordingly gone to diminish the numbers and importance of the Syrian Christians of India.

• Of those two bodies now mentioned, as descended from the once great and widely diffused church of the further east, one has submitted to a connection with Rome, and the other still adheres to their ancient forms and order. The population of the former was, a few years ago, estimated at nearly one hundred and fifty thousand, and the latter at about fifty thousand.

The other remnant of that ancient church still residing on the plains of ancient Media and Mesopotamia and among the mountains of Assyria, is also divided. Their patriarch in the best days of their history resided at Seleucia. When the Abbasside Caliphs established their throne at Bagdad, the Christian authority also centred there. Subsequently the patriarch removed his seat to Elkoosh, about thirty miles north of Mosul, and at the foot of the Koordish mountains. About the year 1590, a quarrel between two candidates for the office of patriarch led to division of the church. One, bearing the official title Mar Elias, retained his residence in Elkoosh, and the other, with the title Mar Shimon, planted his throne among the mountains, near the Koordish stronghold of Julamerk.

Romish missionarics came among them. And in 1681 A. D. a patriarch was appointed from Rome, with the title of "Mar Joseph, Patriarch of the Chaldean Christians," to preside over those who submitted to the Pope. Until about 1790, his seat was at Diarbekir. In that year another defection occurred. The patriarch of Elkoosh, Mar Elias, passed over to Romanism, in which connection his successors have remained, while their city has become a popish seminary.

Mar Shimon was thus left their only patriarch who remained faithful to the ancient church. This people live partly among the mountains of Koordistan, and partly upon a large and beautiful plain, which lies immediately to the east, and between the mountains and the lake of Oroomiah, which name it also bears. The mountain district belongs to the extreme east of Turkey, and the plain to the extreme west of Persia, being a part of ancient Media, as the mountains were of ancient Assyria.

Little was known of that people by Protestant nations until about thirty-five years ago, when they were visited by Messrs. Smith and Dwight, in the course of a missionary exploring tour. Their report decided the American Board to establish a mission there immediately. It was undertaken by the Rev. Justin Perkins, who was followed in 1835 by Dr. Grant, and in the course of the next year operations were commenced on the plain of Oroomiah. Much favour was shown to the enterprise by the native clergy, who in general regarded it in the light of a desirable assistance in their labour, and some of them gladly accepted instruction from the missionaries. Especially do they mention with gratitude the aid and encouragement which they received from an eminently pious bishop, Mar Elias, of Geog Tapa, who continued to coöperate with them for nearly thirty years, even to the end of his days.

As in the similar and earlier enterprise in India, so here it was not the design of the missionaries to make any change in the Nestorian order, form of worship, or ancient creed, but simply to labour for a revival of true practical piety by the diffusion of scriptural knowledge and evangelical influences—to purify and awaken the old Christian church of that denomination.<sup>\*</sup> At first the patriarch, Mar Shimon, was friendly; but in the complication of disasters which befell the mountaineers of his charge, from incursions of the Koords, and of the Turkish forces, his temper changed, and in his later years he threw obstacles in the way of the reformation.

When Dr. Grant, in 1839, for the first time, carried missionary enterprise into the glens of the Zab, in the heart of the Koordistan mountains, the Nestorians of that region were still independent, under the rule of their own local chiefs, and the patriarch, in whom was vested the highest authority of both church and state. Frequently harassed by the predatory incursions of their Koordish neighbours, they successfully defended themselves in their mountain fastnesses. In 1843, the Koords and Turks united, marched their forces into that portion of the Nestorian country, and laid it waste with great bloodshed, and circumstances of aggravated cruelty. In the end, both Koords and Nestorians were annexed to the subjects of Turkey. The patriarch, driven from his house, took refuge in Mosul; and thence, after the lapse of a few months, escaping to Oroomiah, put himself under the protection of Persia. While there, he proved a serious obstacle to the work of the missionaries. But with the restoration of peace in 1848, he returned to his residence among the mountains, and so little had his opposition effected, that in the course of 1851, missionary work was resumed in that quarter. Upon his death, the patriarchal office came into the hands of a youth, who, from his earliest years of observation, had been cognizant of the labours of the Americans, and of their deep interest in the welfare of his people. Although but imperfectly prepared for his high office, as it could not be otherwise from his immature age, he forthwith evinced his approval of the effort and a high sense of its value. But subsequently, owing, it was thought, to the influence of some of his kindred, he became less frank, and covertly discouraged the native helpers of the missionaries within the district where his power was greatest, although still maintaining the profession and appearance of friendship upon the whole.

In some places among the mountains, but more upon the plain of Oroomiah, the missionary work has made encouraging progress; and repeated revivals have added to the membership of the reformed congregations, to the number of native helpers, and the evangelical influence, in all of which some of the Nestorian clergy have cordially taken an active part.

Of the Monophysites there are still three grand divisions, the heads of which are Egypt, Syria, and Armenia. With the first are connected Nubia and Abyssinia, which acknowledge 13

VOL. XXXIX.-NO. I.

the primacy of the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, who now makes his residence at Cairo. In addition to his own city, there were in 1687, eleven bishoprics in Egypt subject to the jurisdiction of that prelate. In 1844, they had increased to thirteen, including Nubia as one.

The diocese of Syria, as belonging to the same connection, is governed by the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, who resides in Diarbekir, at Amida, or at the monastery of St. Ananias, near Mardin, and whose rule also extends over his co-religionists in Mesopotamia, and the adjoining desert. His power is shared by the Maphrian of Mosul, who, formerly vicar of the patriarch over the churches beyond the Tigris, is still sometimes called primate of the East; but is now only nominally superior to a metropolitan.

The third division of the Monophysites consists of the Armenian churches. Chief of their ecclesiastical connection is a patriarch catholicus whose capital is Echmiadzin, in the northern part of Armenia, and now within the Russian dominions. Two other patriarchs of more limited jurisdiction reside respectively at Ciz in Cilicia, and at Aghtamar, in Lake Van. Other prelates also, dignified by the title of patriarch, in different places protect the interests of their people scattered throughout the catholic dioceses of Constantinople and Jerusalem; besides vicariates and archbishoprics in Persia and Russia.\*

As among the Nestorians, so among the Monophysites, there are converts to the Latin church, and organizations under Romish authority, the fruit of modern Romish missions. Under the name of Maronite, there still survives in Syria a remnant of the ancient Monothelite party. Since the time of the Crusades they have been divided, the larger number having, in 1182, A. D., submitted to the dominion of Rome. They have, however, reserved some practices peculiar to themselves. They read their liturgy not in Latin, but in the ancient Syriac tongue, and retain their own ecclesiastical order. Their patriarch, who lives in the monastery of St. Mary at Karnobin, not far from Tripoli, takes, in common with the Greek catholic and Monophysite patriarchs, the title of Antioch. But the people over

\* For further information touching this sect see Princeton Review for October, 1866. whom his authority extends are to be found principally in Mount Lebanon, and cities of that neighbourhood. He is elected by his own communion, but receives the pallium and confirmation in office from the Pope.

A Maronite college, established at Rome, has been distinguished by the Assemani and others, to whom we are largely indebted for valuable information touching the eastern churches.

Another, but smaller number, have persistently rejected the connection with Rome and still adhere to their ancient ecclesiastical independence, and peculiar doctrine of the two natures with one will in Christ.

Of all parts of the eastern church jurisdiction, the most divided by the presence of conflicting parties are the Sees of Antioch and Jerusalem. No less than four prelates bear the title Patriarch of Antioch, namely, the Greek catholic, who resides at Damascus; the Roman Catholic, at Aleppo; the Monophysite in Diarbekir, and the Maronite near Tripoli.

In the orthodox or Greek catholic church, the ancient titles and distribution of primacy are retained. The patriarchate of Constantinople still enjoys the honour of precedency, and the number of people belonging to it, though sadly diminished, is not inconsiderable. But those of Antioch, of Jerusalem, and of Alexandria, are hardly skeletons of their former substance. The bishop of Rome is held to be entitled to the rank of Patriarch of the West, as in ancient times; but his assumption of universal primacy is condemned as utterly unwarranted. And, moreover, he and western Christendom, in general, are regarded as guilty of heresy and schism, in corrupting the creed, and separating from the communion of the only orthodox catholic church. According to that view, the other four patriarchs are, with equal right, primates of the regions assigned them respectively by ancient councils. The higher honour admitted to Rome and Constantinople is referred to the rank of those cities as capitals of the Roman empire. Apostolic foundation is not accepted as a reason for any special distinction; because Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria are on the same footing in that respect; and in the true and higher sense, all the churches were founded by apostles. The equal independence of all the patriarchs is constantly maintained, and the rank of œcumenical is not allowed to any except in that sense in which it is proper to all. Constantinople is higher in honour, not different in rank. And even the metropolitans of Cyprus, of Austria, and of Montenegro, and the archbishop of Mount Sinai, still retain their ancient independence, and take their places, in virtue of it, by the side of the patriarchs, in a synod of the whole. In the seventeenth century, the number of the patriarchates was, as determined by ancient councils, five, Russia having been admitted to the place left vacant by the schism of Rome.

Church government of the whole Greek catholic church is synodal, and the monarchical system of Rome is censured as unscriptural, the power of the keys having been committed not to Peter alone, but to all the apostles. And while the union of church and state is defended, they are each held to be sovereign within their own jurisdiction; the state being under duty to protect the church, while the church sustains the order and authority of the state. In Mohammedan countries these relations have long been in a state of great derangement. At the present time they are most consistently observed in Russia and independent Greece. Both are governed by synods, and in the latter there is no ecclesiastical superior to the bishops.

Each patriarch is elected by the church over which he is to preside; that is by the synod of the diocese; and approved by the chief magistrate of the state. In Mohammedan countries the latter condition is subject to great abuse, not unfrequently leading to simony, and on the part of the civil ruler to oppression, and sometimes to murder.

The principle of unity in the Greek church consists in recognition of the same doctrines and canons of ancient councils, the common synodal authority, and the same forms of worship and ceremonies. Since the defection of Rome no synod has been regarded as general, but only as authoritative for the jurisdiction of the prelates assembled in them. At the same time it is held that the Greek church alone is the truly catholic and orthodox.

In the middle of the seventeenth century Mohammedanism prevailed in all those countries, which had belonged to the ancient jurisdiction of the oriental churches; and Christians, only a sprinkling where once they constituted the mass of the population, were barely tolerated under great oppression. In the north, a more recent conquest yielded the Greek church a freedom and a power which she enjoyed nowhere else. To that quarter—the great empire of Russia—the principal interest of her subsequent history belongs. Of the patriarchs, the Con-

her subsequent history belongs. Of the patriarchs, the Constantinopolitan is at the head of one hundred and thirty-five metropolitans, archbishops and bishops. The patriarch of Jerusalem presides over twelve. Those of Alexandria and of Antioch are held to be chiefs respectively of four and of sixteen, who all rank as metropolitans; but in reality there is at present no catholic bishop in Egypt except the patriarch.

The metropolitan of Montenegro, and the archbishop of Mount Sinai, are merely titular, having no subordinate bishops. The metropolitan of Cyprus presides over three suffragans, and of Austria over ten.

The population over which these authorities extend may be estimated at somewhat more than sixty-six millions, of which at least fifty millions belong to Russia; and of the remainder by far the larger part to the see of Constantinople.

The several languages retained in the liturgies and other offices of the oriental churches are such, in all cases, as are not now spoken by the people. Among the Greeks, and their immediate connection, it is the ancient Greek; among the Georgians, the old Georgian; in Russia, Moldavia, Wallachia, Servia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Slavonia proper, Dalmatia, and Bulgaria, although various dialects are spoken, it is the old Sclavonic which alone is used in the church service. Monophysites retain, in Egypt, the Coptic; in Ethiopia the old Ethiopic, while it is the Amharic which is spoken; in the patriarchate of Antioch, the old Syriac, although both there and in Egypt the common idiom is the Arabic, and in Armenia, the old and otherwise obsolete Armenian. The Nestorians alike of Turkey, Persia, and India, whatever the language they speak, use in their worship only the ancient Syriac of their religious books; and the Maronites still continue to read their prayers in that same language, which they no longer understand.

1867.]

In this view we also observe the preponderance of the Slavic race among the Christians of the East. Even there the more recent European element prevails. Of the sixty-six millions, or thereby, connected with the orthodox church, at least fiftyeight millions accept the Sclavonic as the language of their devotions.

In every instance, it is the old language in which the Scriptures and liturgies were first established among the people which is held as sacred; the idea of sanctity attaching to it as it became obsolete and obscure to the common understanding. Such, in like manner, is Hebrew to the Jew, old Arabic to the Mohammedan, Sanscrit to the Hindu, the learned system of the Mandarins to the Chinese, and Latin to the Romanist. Protestants alone, and those who follow their example, employ the vernacular in the service of the sanctuary, preferring an intelligent worship to a blind veneration.

The little volume which has given occasion to these statements of ecclesiastical relationships, is one of those which the learned author of the "History of the Holy Eastern Church" throws out, from time to time, as incidental to the prosecution of his larger work. It consists of eight brief treatises, six of which are from the pen of Mouravieff, the illustrious church historian of Russia. Catholic orthodoxy, as compared with Roman catholicism, forms the topic of the first, which is also the longest and most valuable. It is followed by a paper, biographical and critical, on the great men of the Russian church; and that by an account of the recently formed mission to the heathen of the Altais. The Romish dogma of the immaculate conception, considered from an orthodox point of view, is the subject of the fourth. Two letters, one from Palestine, and one to a Roman neophyte, by Mouravieff; a copy of the prayers in honour of the passion of our Lord, and an account of the confessions of faith employed by the eastern church complete the list. Prefixed is a tabular view of the present catholic church of the east.

Much as the Christian world owes to Mr. Neale, for the light he has already thrown upon a region of church history, which previously to his labours was almost unknown to scholars of the west, it is with the deepest interest that we receive from his 1867.]

hand every additional fragment, and with impatience that we wait for a new instalment of his great work in the history of the Patriarchates yet to be recorded.

We shall close this article in the words with which Mr. Neale takes leave of his reader, making free to accept them in their best meaning, according to our views, and as really comprehensive of all branches of the church of God.

"And now I pray God to accept this volume as a mite thrown into the treasure-house of preparation for union. The union of the three churches, that second, and even more glorious pentecost, we cannot hope to see; but in the meantime, amidst all the obloquy and disputes, and suspicions and hard words of this generation, it is a blessed and consoling dream which some day will most assuredly become a reality. But a real and true union must not be, like that of Lyons or Florence, the triumph of one party, and the surrender of the other; but an equal assembly, where the problem of orthodoxy on the one side, and catholicity on the other, may be happily and enduringly solved. May God hasten that most glorious day."

## ART. VI.—Malthusianism.\*

THE most general form of this theory is, that the constant relation between the natural increase of population and that of food, is such that the earth's productions necessarily tend to become less and less adequate to the support of its inhabitants. The moral consequences of this view, advocated as it is by a certain school of political economists, and exerting its influence at the present time among a large class of intelligent people, may serve to justify us in submitting it to a critical examination in the pages of a religious periodical. In doing this we shall attempt to show that the theory rests upon speculation and

\* The greater part of the materials of this article may be found in Principles of Social Science, by H. C. Carey, 1858; and in A Manual of Political Economy, by E. Peshine Smith, 1860.