

## 1: Constantinopolitan Creed

*The Greek text, however, in Labbe, and with it agree the version of Hervetus and the text of Hefele, reads: "the Eunomians or Anomaeans, the Arians or Eudoxians, the Semi-Arians or Pneumatomachi, the Sabellians, Marcellians, Photinians and Apollinarians."*

Please contact for permission for any commercial use. Nicholas of Myra is second from the right. It was written as a response to confusion about the doctrines of the Trinity and the dual nature of Christ as God and man. It draws heavily from Scripture. You can see a reflection of John chapter 1 in the second article about the dual nature of Christ. We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all that is, seen and unseen. For us and for our salvation he came down from heaven, was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary and became fully human. For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate; he suffered death and was buried. On the third day he rose again in accordance with the Scriptures; he ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead, and his kingdom will have no end. We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who in unity with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified, who has spoken through the prophets. We believe in one holy Christian and apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. English Language Liturgical Consultation , altered slightly. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, And was made man: And was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; He suffered and was buried: And the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures: And ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of the Father: And he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead; Whose kingdom shall have no end. And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church: I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins: And I look for the Resurrection of the dead: And the Life of the world to come. Although this is a confession of faith and a doctrinal statement, the Nicene Creed has been set to music. Here it is in Latin as a Gregorian Chant: Since the Reformation, it was the practice in Germany to sing the Creed in the form of a hymn.

## 2: Original Apostle's Creed

*It gives the text as now received in the Eastern Church. It is usually traced to the second ŀcumenical Council, which was convened by Theodosius in Constantinople, A.D. , against the Macedonians or Pneumatomachians (so called for denying the deity of the Holy Spirit), and consisted of bishops, all from the East.*

First of all, early on leaders noticed the difference and discrepancies that language brought. This was perhaps the first sign that there was division within the church. Several additional developments enhanced the linguistic and geographical separation. First, when Pepin made his donation of land in central Italy to the papacy in , he caused the pope to fix his attention more to the West and basically ignore the East. The pope was now the largest landholder in Italy, with an annual income of over one million dollars, and a recognized secular as well as religious leader. This act symbolized the division of East and West. A doctrinal development further intensified the obvious East-West division. This controversy is hence called the filioque controversy. The Eastern theologians strongly protested this addition. Another theological controversy separating East and West was the dating of Easter. During the first several centuries of the church, Eastern Christians celebrated Easter on Passover. The West always celebrated Easter on a Sunday. At the Council of Nicea, the Eastern practice was condemned, thereby marking another divergence. By the 4th century, Easter was being celebrated on different Sundays all over Christendom. During the 6th century, a monk named Dionysius Exiguus, worked out a formula for dating Easter and created the B. The West accepted his system; the East did not. For Western Christians, Easter is celebrated on the first Sunday after the first full moon occurring on or after 21 March vernal equinox. In the East, Easter is celebrated on the first Sunday following the full moon after vernal equinox, but also the Sunday following Passover. For that reason the East normally celebrates Easter about a week later. The final break came in in what is known as the Great Schism. This mutual excommunication marks the formal break between Eastern and Western Christianity. That break has never been healed. The hostility and split were intensified when, during the Crusade, the crusaders sacked and pillaged Constantinople on Good Friday. So horrific and inexcusable was this event that the break between Eastern and Western Christianity was final and complete. Islam also had a devastating effect on the Eastern Church. Major centers of the Eastern Church, Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria, fell into Muslim hands and after the 8th century theological development in these areas ceased. Today, in effect, there are thirteen self-governing and independent churches in Eastern Orthodoxy, each with its own head, a patriarch, archbishop or metropolitan.

*The Eastern Orthodox Church belief about Holy Scripture that is the Bible of the Old Testament and the New Testament we must be fully aware from within Holy Tradition. Tradition, is a life, a personal encounter with Christ our Lord in the Holy Spirit.*

Enter keyword s below to search this website. Peace Be Unto All! And To Thy Spirit! The Bible is the book of the Church. We therefore read Holy Scripture, not as isolated individuals, but as members of the Church. In order to keep Holy Scripture in the mind of the Church, we observe how Scripture is used in worship, and how it is interpreted by the Holy Fathers. Our approach then to the Bible is both Liturgical and Patristic. Tradition, is a life, a personal encounter with Christ our Lord in the Holy Spirit. Tradition then not only is kept by the Church - it lives in the Church, it is the life of the Holy Spirit in the Church. The meaning of Tradition in the early Christian Fathers refers to the Revelation made by God and delivered to His faithful people through the mouths of His prophets and apostles. Thus, it does not mean something "handed down" something delivered. The Greek word for Tradition, or its corresponding verb, is in a similar way used in the New Testament and applied in the same manner to the betrayal of Christ our Lord by Judas to the Jews delivered , and to the delivery paradosis of Christian teaching by St. Paul to his converts. The Tradition was called "Apostolic" because it was delivered by the Apostles to the Churches which they founded. It was later also called "ecclesiastic" because it was delivered again in each generation by the Church's teachers to their people. Its substance was considered to consist of the central facts and beliefs crystallized in the Creeds of the great orthodox bishoprics. In the early Christian literature, there are references to an "unwritten tradition" left by the Apostles. This, however, does not appear to refer to any body of information independent of Scripture but rather to the evidence of primitive Christian institutions and customs which confirm Biblical teachings. Then, by Holy Tradition with capital T the aggregate of truths of the faith is signified; these were originally orally transmitted by Christ and the Apostles to the members of the Church and, after that, taught in their entirety by the Church. These truths have been partially formulated and stated by the Ecumenical Councils, and by minor synods validated by the former; they have also been circulating in the common faith and conscience of the Church and have been included in later dogmatic and symbolic texts, in the writings of the Fathers and in the liturgical books of the Church. Holy Tradition also contains all ecclesiastical traditions with small t referring to worship, polity, and, generally, the customs connected with the life of the Church. These traditions deserve respect on the part of the congregation but should be distinguished from the dogmatic Tradition referring to the truths of the Orthodox Faith. Holy Tradition is considered to be a source of Christian faith of the same authority and standing as that of the Bible. It is related in the first three Gospels Matthew The vision of Christ transfigured was witnessed by Ss. Peter, James, and John, and is described by the evangelists with striking agreements as to its main outline. By tradition, the transfiguration took place on Mount Tabor, but many scholars prefer Mount Hermon, and some even the Mount of Olives. The event was interpreted as the attestation of the Jewish Law and Prophets to the Messiahship of Christ, since both Moses and Elijah appeared at the time of the Transfiguration right and left of Christ. The feast of the Transfiguration originated in the Eastern Church. It was first a local and unofficial feasts, but it became widely adopted before the year From there it was introduced to the West, but it did not become a general observance until the middle of the 15th century. Feast day, August 6. A Dictionary of Greek Orthodoxy, by Rev. Patriarcos, Hellenic Heritage Publications. Since the Eastern Orthodox Church therefore looks to Holy Scripture the Bible as the supreme expression of God's revelation to man, and it must not be regarded as something set up over the Church, but as something that lives and is understood within the Church that is why one should not separate Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition. It is from the Church that Holy Scripture ultimately derives its authority, for it was the Church, which originally decided which books form a part of Holy Scripture; and it is the Church alone which can interpret Holy Scripture with authority. This is the case being that from the many sayings in the Bible which by themselves are far from clear, and the individual reader, however sincere, is in danger of error if he trusts his own personal interpretations. Now we can say that the Orthodox Christian when reading Holy

Scripture, accept the guidance of the Church. Therefore who helps us in understanding Holy Scripture and who guides us? First the Holy Spirit and secondly above all we in the Orthodox Church turn to the Holy Fathers over the many centuries which have helped with the interpretations of the Bible or as the Eastern Orthodox Church like to express: The following questions can help in understanding more about Holy Scriptures in the Eastern Orthodox Church. Can you tell me which translation the Eastern Orthodox Church uses and why? Can you tell me how many books are there in the Orthodox Bible? Can you list the books of the Old Testament and the New Testament? Can you tell me how to read the Bible and why? Does the Orthodox Church have any prayers before reading Holy Scripture? Where can I obtain a full set of the Early Church Fathers? The name "father" was originally appended to bishops as the living witnesses to Christian tradition. However, from the end of the 4th century the name acquired a more specific sense referring to a rather clearly defined group of ecclesiastical authors of the past whose authority on matters of belief was widely and indisputably accepted. Basil the Great and St. Gregory of Nazianzus are among the first who attempted to prove the orthodoxy of their teaching by appealing to the concerted opinions of texts widely accepted at the time as Patristic. Later on during the Christological controversies of the 5th century, all parties claimed the authority of the Fathers behind their teachings. A noble example is the Council of Ephesus clearly referring to the Fathers and their canons. By the end of the 5th century the name was also applied to teachers and authors who were not bishops. As commonly accepted, the Fathers of the Church were distinguished by orthodoxy of belief, holiness of life, the approval of the Church, and antiquity. But as dogmatics was further developed together with the growth of the Church, the attribute of antiquity began to be extended in time. In the East, the period of the Fathers of the Church ends with St. Their authority was, and still is, immense within the entire Christian Church. But though their concerted opinions on belief and practice are taken to be of inviolable authority, individual positions of Fathers not in agreement with the universally taught Patristic opinion bear no restrictive authority on the thought and the practice of the Church. And though a Patristic consensus is greatly restrictive, if not obligatory, for the Church, there is no Orthodox teaching or rule by which the Fathers are considered to be infallible; nor has the name Father been applied to particular individuals by decree of Synod or other authority, rather, it has been accorded to certain ecclesiastical personalities of prominence by the conscience of the Church and only after their life and work proved to be worthy of such distinction. The title "Fathers" is given to important Christian writers and teachers who wrote between the end of the 1st century to about the close of the 8th century. This period is commonly termed the Patristic age. Patristic literature is closely connected with the history of the Church and the history of early doctrine. This literature is the chief evidence for the events as well as for the ideas of those times. The leading Fathers authored works vital to Christian thought and practice. They defended the Gospel against heresies and misunderstandings. They wrote extensive commentaries on the Bible, explanatory works on doctrine and ecclesiastical life, and innumerable sermons on the faith and life of the Church, and projected the Christian faith vis-a-vis the best thought of their times. And considering the fact that the genuine formulation of faith and order within Christianity took place during the times of the Seven Ecumenical Councils of the Church, the importance of the Greek Fathers is inestimable in evaluating the geniuses of the present day Christian belief and life. Some of the Holy Fathers of the Church are both from the East and in the West who were in total agreement with the Church, however we discover later onwards that a schism occurred in , and those in the West and in the East were no longer in communion with one another. After the year the Eastern Orthodox Church no longer agreed with the writings of the West, even although earlier the well know writers of the Church in the West began to stray from the teachings of the holy Fathers in the East. Here is an example of some of the Holy Fathers in the early Church, as well as well know saints who spoke or have written about the Holy Scriptures: Andrew of Crete, St. Anthony the Great, St. Alexander, Patriarch of Constantinople, St. Ambrose of Milan, St. Aphrahat of Persia, St. Athanasios the Great, Sts. Barsanuphis and John, St. Basil the Great, St. Clement of Rome, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. John of Damascus, St. John of Kronstadt, St. Justin the Martyr, St. Gregory the Theologian, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Mark the Ascetic, St. Maximos the Confessor, St. Nicodemus the Hagiorite, St. Photios the Great, St. Polycarp of Smyrna, St. Seraphim of Sarov, St. Symeon the New Theologian, St. Theodore the Studite, St. Theophan the Recluse, St.

Some recent 20th century writers on Holy Scripture are: To note more Holy Fathers of the Church and to learn what each one wrote read: Christianity in America is often characterized as a faith of the "Bible-thumpers."

4: Eastern Orthodoxy and the Ordination of Women by Michael A. Fahey from 'Women Priests'

*The council of Constantinople enacted four disciplinary canons: against the Arian heresy and its sects (can. 1), on limiting the power of bishops within fixed boundaries (can. 2), on ranking the see of Constantinople second to Rome in honour and dignity (can. 3), on the condemnation of Maximus and his followers (can. 4).*

Novum Instrumentum omne and Editio Regia Erasmus had been working for years on two projects: In , he began his work on the Latin New Testament. He collected all the Vulgate manuscripts he could find to create a critical edition. Then he polished the Latin, declaring, "It is only fair that Paul should address the Romans in somewhat better Latin. I have already almost finished emending him by collating a large number of ancient manuscripts, and this I am doing at enormous personal expense. Though some speculate that he intended on producing a critical Greek text or that he wanted to beat the Complutensian Polyglot into print, there is no evidence to support this. Rather his motivation may have been simpler: He wrote, "There remains the New Testament translated by me, with the Greek facing, and notes on it by me. In the second edition Erasmus used also Minuscule 3. Typographical errors attributed to the rush to complete the work abounded in the published text. Erasmus also lacked a complete copy of the book of Revelation and translated the last six verses back into Greek from the Latin Vulgate in order to finish his edition. Erasmus adjusted the text in many places to correspond with readings found in the Vulgate, or as quoted in the Church Fathers ; consequently, although the Textus Receptus is classified by scholars as a late Byzantine text, it differs in nearly two thousand readings from the standard form of that text-type, as represented by the " Majority Text " of Hodges and Farstad Wallace The edition was a sell-out commercial success and was reprinted in , with most "though not all" the typographical errors corrected. Consequently, most modern scholars consider his text to be of dubious quality. Many other publishers produced their own versions of the Greek New Testament over the next several centuries. Rather than doing their own critical work, most just relied on the well-known Erasmian text. Robert Estienne , known as Stephanus " , a printer from Paris, edited the Greek New Testament four times, in , , and , the last in Geneva. The first two are called O mirificam; the third edition is a masterpiece of typographical skill. It has critical apparatus in which quoted manuscripts referred to the text. Among these are included: Codex Bezae , Codex Regius , minuscules 4 , 5 , 6 , , 8 , 9. The first step towards modern Textual Criticism was made. The third edition is known as the Editio Regia. The edition of contains the Latin translation of Erasmus and the Vulgate. It is not nearly as fine as the other three and is exceedingly rare. It was in this edition that the division of the New Testament into verses was for the first time introduced. The third edition of Estienne was used by Theodore Beza " , who edited it nine times between and In the critical apparatus of the second edition he used the Codex Claromontanus and the Syriac New Testament published by Emmanuel Tremellius in The preface reads, Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum: In his Novum Testamentum Graecum, cum lectionibus variantibus MSS Oxford he reprinted the unchanged text of the Editio Regia, but in the index he enumerated 30, textual variants. He claimed that the autographs of the New Testament were identical to the Textus Receptus, and that the text had never been corrupted. Whitby claimed that every part of the New Testament should be defended against these variants. Bengel divided manuscripts into families and subfamilies. He favoured the principle of lectio difficilior potior "the more difficult reading is the stronger". He introduced the practice of indicating the ancient manuscripts by capital Roman letters and the later manuscripts by Arabic numerals. Griesbach " combined the principles of Bengel and Wettstein. He enlarged the Apparatus by considering more citations " from the Fathers , and various versions, such as the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Philoxenian. Griesbach distinguished a Western, an Alexandrian, and a Byzantine Recension. Karl Lachmann " was the first who broke with the Textus Receptus. His object was to restore the text to the form in which it had been read in the ancient Church about A. He used the oldest known Greek and Latin manuscripts.

## 5: Writings of the Church Fathers

*In one respect, the Eastern Orthodox Church's received text of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed differs from the earliest text, which is included in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon of The Eastern Orthodox Church uses the singular forms of verbs such as "I believe", in place of the plural form ("we believe") used by the council.*

But all is not what it appears. That the Textus Receptus TR resembles the majority text is no accident, since in compiling the TR Erasmus simply used about a half dozen late manuscripts that were available to him. As Hodges points out: The reason for this resemblance, despite the uncritical way in which the TR was compiled, is easy to explain. Thus, when our printed editions were made, the odds favored their early editors coming across manuscripts exhibiting this majority text. Precisely because advocates of the majority text can dissociate themselves from the TR in these places, their argumentation is more sophisticated—and more plausible—than that of TR advocates. In a previous article 3 the present writer interacted with the majority text theory as it has been displayed concretely in The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text. Not all majority text advocates share his approach, however. Three points in the current debate will be discussed: Preservation and the Majority Text For many advocates of the majority text view, a peculiar form of the doctrine of the preservation of Scripture undergirds the entire approach. Their premise is that the doctrine of the preservation of Scripture requires that the early manuscripts cannot point to the original text better than the later manuscripts can, because these early manuscripts are in the minority. Pickering also seems to embrace such a doctrine. For one thing Pickering has charged Hort with being prejudiced against the Byzantine texttype from the very beginning of his research: Rather, he deliberately set out to construct a theory that would vindicate his preconceived animosity for the Received Text. His particular view of preservation seems to have dictated for him that the majority text must be right. In one place he argues: Presumably the evidence is the same for both believer and unbeliever, but the interpretation of the facts depends upon the presuppositions used. Let the conservative Christian not be ashamed of his presuppositions—they are more reasonable than those of the unbeliever. God has preserved the text of the New Testament—the Traditional Text is in the fullest sense of the term, just that. Apparently to jettison the majority text would be a departure from orthodoxy for many of its advocates. Too many evangelicals have abandoned an aspect of the faith when the going got tough. That the majority text proponents have held tenaciously to this doctrinal position—in spite of an ever-increasing mass of evidence—speaks highly of their piety and conviction. But nowhere do they explain why this view of preservation is the biblical doctrine. His one clear statement about preservation is this: It could be in the majority of witnesses, or it could be in a small handful of witnesses. In fact theologically one may wish to argue against the majority: Third, again assuming that the majority text is the original and that it has been readily available to Christians for 1, years, then it must have been readily available to Christians in Egypt in the first four centuries. But this is demonstrably not true. Literally scores of studies in the last 80 years have demonstrated this point. In reality, to argue for the purity of the Byzantine stream, as opposed to the pollution introduced by the Alexandrian manuscripts, is to blow out of proportion what the differences between these two texts really are—both in quantity and quality. For over years, New Testament scholars have argued that no textual variant affects any doctrine. This is true for any textual tradition. The interpretation of individual passages may well be called in question; but never is a doctrine affected. Do they agree only 30 percent of the time? Do they agree perhaps as much as 50 percent of the time? This can be measured, in a general sort of way. There are approximately , textual variants among New Testament manuscripts. The Majority Text differs from the Textus Receptus in almost 2, places. So the agreement is better than 99 percent. But the Majority Text differs from the modern critical text in only about 6, places. In other words the two texts agree almost 98 percent of the time. Consequently the majority text and modern critical texts are very much alike, in both quality and quantity. David Hume, in his Essay on Miracles, argued against miracles on the basis of statistical probability. The majority of people Hume had ever known had never been raised from the dead. In fact none of them had. But belief in the resurrection of Christ is not based on statistical probability—there is evidence which, in this

case, overturns statistics. In historical investigation, presumption is only presumption. An ounce of evidence is worth a pound of presumption. In textual criticism there are three categories of external evidence: If the majority text view is right, then one would expect to find this text form often known as the Byzantine text in the earliest Greek manuscripts, in the earliest versions, and in the earliest church fathers. Not only would one expect to find it there, but also one would expect it to be in a majority of manuscripts, versions, and fathers. But that is not what is found. Among extant Greek manuscripts, what is today the majority text did not become a majority until the ninth century. In fact, as far as the extant witnesses reveal, the majority text did not exist in the first four centuries. Not only this, but for the letters of Paul, not even one majority text manuscript exists from before the ninth century. To embrace the majority text for the Pauline Epistles, then, requires an year leap of faith. When Westcott and Hort developed their theory of textual criticism, only one papyrus manuscript was known to them. Since that time almost have been discovered. More than fifty of these came from before the middle of the fourth century. Yet not one belongs to the majority text. The Westcott-Hort theory, with its many flaws which all textual critics today acknowledge, was apparently still right on its basic tenet: The evidence can be visualized as follows, with the width of the horizontal bars indicating the relative number of extant manuscripts from each century. Many hypotheses can be put forth as to why there are no early Byzantine manuscripts. But once again an ounce of evidence is worth a pound of presumption. In historical investigation one must start with the evidence and then make the hypothesis. This chart does not tell the whole story. The extant Greek manuscripts—the primary witnesses to the text of the New Testament—do not include the Byzantine text in the first four centuries. But what about the early versions and the church fathers? Do they attest to the Byzantine texttype in the early period? Many of the versions were translated from Greek at an early date. Most scholars believe that the New Testament was translated into Latin in the second century A. Almost one hundred extant Latin manuscripts represent this Old Latin translation—and they all attest to the Western texttype. In other words the Greek manuscripts they translated were not Byzantine. The Coptic version also goes back to an early date, probably the second century 34—and it was a translation of Alexandrian manuscripts, not Byzantine ones. The earliest forms of the Syriac are also either Western or Alexandrian. At the end of the fourth century. The significance of these early versions is twofold: This is not the case; the Coptic, Ethiopic, Latin, and Syriac versions came from all over the Mediterranean region. In none of these locales was the Byzantine text apparently used. This is strong evidence that the Byzantine text simply did not exist in the first three centuries—anywhere. But it would not prove that it was in the majority before the fourth century. Many of them lived much earlier than the date of any Greek manuscripts now extant for a particular book. Some lived in the first or early second century. If it could be determined what kind of text they used when they quoted from the New Testament, such information would naturally be highly valuable. But textual critics do not usually give much weight to the church fathers. There are several reasons for this, some of which are as follows. First, when a church father quotes from the New Testament, it is not always possible to tell if he is quoting from memory or if he has a manuscript in front of him. Second, he rarely tells which book he is quoting from. Almost all the copies of these early patristic writers come from the Middle Ages. In other words textual criticism must be done on the church fathers in order to see how they attest to the New Testament text. This last problem is significant because the Byzantine text was the majority text after the ninth century. And virtually all the copies of the fathers come from the ninth century or later. When a scribe was copying the New Testament text quoted by a church father, he would naturally conform that text to the one with which he was familiar. In , Frederic G. And it is precisely these older studies that the majority text advocates appeal to. Fee, who is recognized as one of the leading patristic authorities today, wrote: In all of this material I have found one invariable: The early fathers had a text that keeps looking more like modern critical editions and less like the majority text. It is not found in the extant Greek manuscripts, nor in the early versions, nor in the early church fathers.

6: The Majority Text and the Original Text: Are They Identical? | [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*The Orthodox Church, [aka Orthodox Catholic Church, Eastern Orthodox Church] is the world's second largest Christian communion with an estimated million members. It is also considered to be the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church established by Jesus Christ and his Apostles almost 2, years ago.*

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the Right Hand of the Father. And he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead. Whose kingdom shall have no end. And [we believe] in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver-of-Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And [we believe] in one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins, [and] we look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Found in Labbe, Concilia, Tom. We begin our letter to your Piety with thanks to God, who has established the empire of your Piety for the common peace of the Churches and for the support of the true Faith. And, after rendering due thanks unto God, as in duty bound we lay before your Piety the things which have been done in the Holy Synod. When, then, we had assembled in Constantinople, according to the letter of your Piety, we first of all renewed our unity of heart each with the other, and then we pronounced some concise definitions, ratifying the Faith of the Nicene Fathers, and anathematizing the heresies which have sprung up, contrary thereto. Besides these things, we also framed certain Canons for the better ordering of the Churches, all which we have subjoined to this our letter. Wherefore we beseech your Piety that the decree of the Synod may be ratified, to the end that, as you have honoured the Church by your letter of citation, so you should set your seal to the conclusion of what has been decreed. May the Lord establish your empire in peace and righteousness, and prolong it from generation to generation; and may he add unto your earthly power the fruition of the heavenly kingdom also. May God by the prayers of the Saints [euchais ton hagion] show favour to the world, that you may be strong and eminent in all good things as an Emperor most truly pious and beloved of God. And every heresy shall be anathematized, particularly that of the Eunomians or [Anomoeans, the Arians or] Eudoxians, and that of the Semi-Arians or Pneumatomachi, and that of the Sabellians, and that of the Marcellians, and that of the Photinians, and that of the Apollinarians. Ancient Epitome of Canon I: Let the Nicene faith stand firm. The Greek text, however, in Labbe, and with it agree the version of Hervetus and the text of Hefele, reads: I, however, have followed the other as being the more usual. And let not bishops go beyond their dioceses for ordination or any other ecclesiastical ministrations, unless they be invited. And the aforesaid canon concerning dioceses being observed, it is evident that the synod of every province will administer the affairs of that particular province as was decreed at Nice. But the Churches of God in heathen nations must be governed according to the custom which has prevailed from the times of the Fathers. Ancient Epitome of Canon II: No traveller shall introduce confusion into the Churches either by ordaining or by enthroning. Nevertheless in Churches which are among the heathen the tradition of the Fathers shall be preserved. Valesius This rule seems to have been made chiefly on account of Meletius. For Meletius leaving the Eastern diocese had come to Constantinople to ordain Gregory bishop there. And Gregory having abandoned the bishoprick of Sasima, which was in the Pontic diocese, had removed to Constantinople. For the purpose therefore of repressing these [disorders], the fathers of the Synod of Constantinople made this canon. Take notice from the present canon that formerly all the Metropolitans of provinces were themselves the heads of their own provinces, and were ordained by their own synods. But all this was changed by Canon XXVIII of the Synod of Chalcedon, which directs that the Metropolitans of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, and certain others which are mentioned in this Canon should be ordained by the Patriarch of Constantinople and

should be subject to him. But if you find other churches which are autocephalous as the Church of Bulgaria, of Cyprus, of Iberia [Georgia], you need not be astonished. For the Emperor Justinian gave this honour to the Archbishop of Bulgaria. The third Synod gave this honour to the Archbishop of Cyprus, and by the law of the same synod Canon viii. The bishop of Constantinople is to be honoured next after the bishop of Rome. In this place the Council takes action concerning Constantinople, to which it decrees the prerogative of honour, the priority, and the glory after the Bishop of Rome as being New Rome and the Queen of cities. Some indeed wish to understand the preposition meta ["after"] here of time and not of inferiority of grade. And they strive to confirm this interpretation by a consideration of the XXVIII canon of Chalcedon, urging that if Constantinople is to enjoy equal honours, the preposition "after" cannot signify subjection. But on the other hand the hundred and thirtieth novel of Justinian,<sup>1</sup> Book V of the Imperial Constitutions, title three, understands the canon otherwise. For, it says, "we decree that the most holy Pope of Old Rome, according to the decrees of the holy synods is the first of all priests, and that the most blessed bishop of Constantinople and of New Rome, should have the second place after the Apostolic Throne of the Elder Rome, and should be superior in honour to all others. And otherwise it would be impossible to guard this equality of honour in each see. For in reciting their names, or assigning them seats when they are to sit together, or arranging the order of their signatures to documents, one must come before the other. Whoever therefore shall explain this particle meta as only referring to time, and does not admit that it signifies an inferior grade of dignity, does violence to the passage and draws from it a meaning neither true nor good. Moreover in Canon xxxvj of the Council in Trullo, meta manifestly denotes subjection, assigning to Constantinople the second place after the throne of Old Rome; and then adds, after this Alexandria, then Antioch, and last of all shall be placed Jerusalem. This canon is of the number of those which the Apostolic See of Rome did not at first nor for long years afterwards receive. This is evident from Epistle LI. The same thing also is shewn by two letters of Leo IX. But still more clearly is this seen from the letter of Blessed Gregory [the Great or Dialogus] xxxj. Canon IV Concerning Maximus the Cynic and the disorder which has happened in Constantinople on his account, it is decreed that Maximus never was and is not now a Bishop; that those who have been ordained by him are in no order whatever of the clergy; since all which has been done concerning him or by him, is declared to be invalid. Ancient Epitome of Canon IV: Let Maximus the Cynic be cast out from among the bishops, and anyone who was inscribed by him on the clergy list shall be held as profane. Canon V Possibly adopted at a Council held in Constantinople the next year, Vide In regard to the tome of the Western [Bishops], we receive those in Antioch also who confess the unity of the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Ancient Epitome of Canon V: The Tome of the Westerns which recognizes the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as consubstantial is highly acceptable. Vide Forasmuch as many wishing to confuse and overturn ecclesiastical order, do contentiously and slanderously fabricate charges against the orthodox bishops who have the administration of the Churches, intending nothing else than to stain the reputation of the priests and raise up disturbances amongst the peaceful laity; therefore it seemed right to the Holy Synod of Bishops assembled together in Constantinople, not to admit accusers without examination; and neither to allow all persons whatsoever to bring accusations against the rulers of the Church, nor, on the other hand, to exclude all. If then, any one shall bring a private complaint against the Bishop, that is, one relating to his own affairs, as, for example, that he has been defrauded, or otherwise unjustly treated by him, in such accusations no examination shall be made, either of the person or of the religion of the accuser; for it is by all means necessary that the conscience of the Bishop should be free, and that he who says he has been wronged should meet with righteous judgment, of whatever religion he may be. But if the charge alleged against the Bishop be that of some ecclesiastical offence, then it is necessary to examine carefully the persons of the accusers, so that, in the first place, heretics may not be suffered to bring accusations touching ecclesiastical matters against orthodox bishops. And by heretics we mean both those who were aforesaid cast out and those whom we ourselves have since anathematized, and also those professing to hold the true faith who have separated from our canonical bishops, and set up conventicles in opposition [to them]. Moreover, if there be any who have been condemned for faults and cast out of the Church, or excommunicated, whether of the clergy or the laity, neither shall it be lawful for these to bring an accusation against the bishop, until they have cleared away the

charge against themselves. In like manner, persons who are under previous accusations are not to be permitted to bring charges against a bishop or any other clergyman, until they shall have proved their own innocence of the accusation brought against them. But if any, being neither heretics, nor excommunicate, nor condemned, nor under previous accusation for alleged faults, should declare that they have any ecclesiastical charge against the bishop, the Holy Synod bids them first lay their charges before all the Bishops of the Province, and before them prove the accusations, whatsoever they may be, which they have brought against the bishop. And if the comprovincials should be unable rightly to settle the charges brought against the bishop, then the parties must betake themselves to a greater synod of the bishops of that diocese called together for this purpose; and they shall not produce their allegations before they have promised in writing to undergo an equal penalty to be exacted from themselves, if, in the course of the examination, they shall be proved to have slandered the accused bishop. And if anyone, despising what has been decreed concerning these things, shall presume to annoy the ears of the Emperor, or the courts of temporal judges, or, to the dishonour of all the Bishops of his Province, shall trouble an Ecumenical Synod, such an one shall by no means be admitted as an accuser; forasmuch as he has cast contempt upon the Canons, and brought reproach upon the order of the Church. Ancient Epitome of Canon VI: Even one that is of ill repute, if he have suffered any injury, let him bring a charge against the bishop. If however it be a crime of ecclesiastical matters let him not speak. Nor shall another condemned before, speak. Let not one excommunicated, or cast forth, or charged with any crimes speak, until he is cleared of them. But those who should bring the charge are the orthodox, who are communicants, uncondemned, unaccused. Let the case be heard by the provincials. If however they are not able to decide the case, let them have recourse to a greater synod and let them not be heard, without a written declaration of liability to the same sufferings [i. By "those who were cast out of the Church" are to be understood those who were altogether cut off from the Church; but by those who were "excommunicated" the holy fathers intend all those, whether clerics or laymen, who are deprived of communion for a set time We call Adrianople, for example, or Philopopolis with the bishops of each a "Province," but the whole of Thrace or Macedonia we call a "Diocese. Canon VII Those who from heresy turn to orthodoxy, and to the portion of those who are being saved, we receive according to the following method and custom: Arians, and Macedonians, and Sabbatians, and Novatians, who call themselves Cathari or Aristori, and Quarto-decimans or Tetradites, and Apollinarians, we receive, upon their giving a written renunciation [of their errors] and anathematize every heresy which is not in accordance with the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of God. Thereupon, they are first sealed or anointed with the holy oil upon the forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth, and ears; and when we seal them, we say, "The Seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost. On the first day we make them Christians; on the second, catechumens; on the third, we exorcise them by breathing thrice in their face and ears; and thus we instruct them and oblige them to spend some time in the Church, and to hear the Scriptures; and then we baptize them. Eunomians baptized with one immersion, Sabellians, and Phrygians are to be received as heathen. Those giving up their books and execrating every heresy are received with only anointing with chrism of the eyes, the nostrils, the ears, the mouth, and the brow; and signing them with the words, "The Seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost. It is cited also by Photius in Nomocanon, Tit. But it is wanting in all the Latin versions of the Canons, in the ancient translations of Dionys. To recount all the sufferings inflicted on us by the power of the Arians, and to attempt to give information to your reverences, as though you were not already well acquainted with them, might seem superfluous. For we do not suppose your piety to hold what is befalling us as of such secondary importance as that you stand in any need of information on matters which cannot but evoke your sympathy. Nor indeed were the storms which beset us such as to escape notice from their insignificance. Our persecutions are but of yesterday. Others, worn away with various cruelties, still bear in their bodies the scars of their wounds and the marks of Christ. Who could tell the tale of fines, of disfranchisements, of individual confiscations, of intrigues, of outrages, of prisons? In truth all kinds of tribulation were wrought out beyond number in us, perhaps because we were paying the penalty of sins, perhaps because the merciful God was trying us by means of the multitude of our sufferings. For these all thanks to God, who by means of such afflictions trained his servants and, according to the multitude of his mercies, brought us again to refreshment. We indeed needed long leisure, time, and toil to restore the church

once more, that so, like physicians healing the body after long sickness and expelling its disease by gradual treatment, we might bring her back to her ancient health of true religion. It is true that on the whole we seem to have been delivered from the violence of our persecutions and to be just now recovering the churches which, have for a long time been the prey of the heretics. But wolves are troublesome to us who, though they have been driven from the fold, yet harry the flock up and down the glades, daring to hold rival assemblies, stirring seditious among the people, and shrinking from nothing which can do damage to the churches. So, as we have already said, we needs must labour all the longer. For who will give us wings as of a dove, and we will fly and be at rest? But this course seemed likely to leave the churches who were just recovering quite undefended, and the undertaking was to most of us impossible, for, in accordance with the letters sent a year ago from your holiness after the synod at Aquileia to the most pious emperor Theodosius, we had journeyed to Constantinople, equipped only for travelling so far as Constantinople, and bringing the consent of the bishops remaining in the provinces of this synod alone.

**7: CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA: The Rite of Constantinople (Byzantine Rite)**

*The 7th canon is an extract from a letter which the church of Constantinople sent to Martyrius of Antioch. The council ended on 9 July , and on 30 July of the same year, at the request of the council fathers, the emperor Theodosius ratified its decrees by edict.*

A Brief Overview Few Christian denominations can claim the antiquity of the Syriac Orthodox Church of Antioch, whose foundations can be traced back to the very dawn of Christianity. The Church justifiably prides itself as being one of the earliest established apostolic churches. According to ecclesiastical tradition, the Church of Antioch is the second established church in Christendom after Jerusalem, and the prominence of its Apostolic See is well documented. Peter the Apostle established a bishopric in Antioch and became its first bishop. He also tells us that St. Peter was succeeded by Evodius. In the mid of the 5th century, the Bishop of Antioch, and his counterparts in Alexandria, Byzantium and Rome, would be called patriarchs. The Syriac Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch used to be known by his own name; however, since the patriarchs of Antioch adopted the name Ignatius, after the Illuminator. The See of Antioch continues to flourish till our day, with His Holiness Patriarch Ignatius Zakka I, being the nd in the line of legitimate patriarchs. The patriarchate was forced to move from Antioch in ca. After another period of heinous violence during and after World War I, which took the lives of a quarter million Syriac Orthodox faithful, the patriarchate was transferred to Homs, Syria, in , and later to Damascus in The Syriac Orthodox Church is quite unique for many reasons. Firstly, it presents a form of Christianity, which is Semitic in nature, with a culture not far from the one Christ himself experienced. Secondly, it employs in its liturgy the Syriac language, an Aramaic dialect akin to the Aramaic spoken by Christ and the Apostles. Thirdly, its liturgy is one of the most ancient, and has been handed from one generation to another. Fourthly, and most importantly, it demonstrates the unity of the body of Christ by the multiethnic nature of its faithful: A visit to your local Syriac Orthodox Church in Europe or the Americas would demonstrate, for example, the blend of Near Eastern and Indian cultures in the motifs and vestments of clergy. The Syriac Orthodox faithful today live primarily in Middle Eastern countries and the Indian State of Kerala, with many communities in the diaspora. The Church takes part in ecumenical and theological dialogues with other churches. As a result of these dialogues, the Church has issued two joint declarations with the Roman Catholic Church and another with the Eastern Orthodox churches. History Throughout Syria and Mesopotamia, Aramaic, in its many dialectical forms, was the language of the land, and Syriac, originally the Aramaic dialect of Edessa in Northern Mesopotamia, must have been the most influential literary form of Aramaic. When we speak of Syriac Christianity, we refer to Christians whose native tongue was Syriac and those who employed Syriac as their liturgical language. Syriac Christianity was not centered just in Antioch, the Roman capital of Syria. In fact, Syriac Christianity can be traced further East in Mesopotamia. As local tradition tells us, Christianity was received in Edessa during the time of the Apostles. Abgar Ukomo, the toparch, to Jesus the good Savior who has appeared in the district of Jerusalem, greetings. I have heard concerning you and your cures, how they are accomplished by you without drugs and herbs And when I heard of all these things concerning you I decided that it is one of two things, either that you are God and came down from Heaven to do these things, or are the Son of God for doing these things. For this reason I write to beg you to hasten to me and to heal the suffering which I have The reply from Jesus to King Abgar, according to the same tradition, was carried by a certain Ananias and read: Blessed are you who believed in me, not having seen me Now concerning what you wrote to me, to come to you, I must first complete here all for which I was sent, and after thus completing it be taken up to Him who sent me; and when I have been taken up, I will send to you one of my disciples to heal your suffering and give life to you and those with you. The story continues to describe how one of the Seventy Disciples, named Adai, was sent to King Abgar to heal his disease. Historical literary sources tell us that by the second half of the second century there was an established church in Edessa, though probably most of the inhabitants remained pagan. The Chronicle of Edessa tells us that in the year , a disastrous flood destroyed the church of the Christians in the city. However, it took only about a century until most of the city was under the umbrella of Christianity. Edessa, home of the

Syriac form of Aramaic, indeed prides itself as the first kingdom that officially accepted the new faith. Syriac Christianity has had a long history in India. According to tradition, Christianity in India was established by St. Thomas who arrived in Malankara Kerala from Edessa in A. The close ties between the Church in Malankara and the Near East go back to at least the fourth century when a certain Joseph of Edessa traveled to India and met Christians there. The church in Malankara today is an integral part of the Syriac Orthodox Church with the Patriarch of Antioch as its supreme spiritual head. The local head of the church in Malankara is the Catholicos of the East, consecrated by and accountable to the Patriarch of Antioch. Syriac Christianity spread rapidly in the East. The Bible was translated into Syriac to serve as the main source of teaching as early as the second century. Till our day, the antiquity of the Syriac biblical versions is upheld with high esteem by modern scholars. In the words of Dr. Their scholarship in this domain has no equal in Church history. The Church of Antioch was thriving under the Byzantine Empire until the fifth century when Christological controversies split the Church. After the Council of Chalcedon in A. The former group professed that Christ is in two natures, human and divine, whilst the latter adopted the doctrine that Christ has one incarnate nature from two natures. It is worth noting that the drafts of the Council were according to the position of the Syriac and Coptic Churches. The final resolution, however, was according to the doctrine of the Western Churches and was rejected by the Syriac Church. This schism had sad consequences on the Syriac Church during the next few centuries. As the Emperor supported the Chalcedonian camp, the Syriac Church came under much persecution. Mor Severius died in exile in By the year , the Syriac Church was in an abysmal situation with only three bishops remaining. Theodora used her influence to get Jacob ordained as bishop in Later, Mor Yacqub would travel across the entire land reviving the Church. He managed to consecrate 27 bishops and hundreds of priests and deacons. For this, the Syriac Orthodox Church honors this saint on July 30 of every year, the day of his death in The Syriac Orthodox Church rejects this belittling label which wrongly suggests that the Church was founded by Mor Yacqub. Aside from their ecclesiastical role, Syriac Churchmen have contributed to world civilization. As early as the fourth century, academies and schools were set up in monasteries throughout Syria and Mesopotamia. Monks and scholars were busy studying the sciences of the Greeks, commenting on and adding to them. It is no surprise that when the Arabs, who conquered the Near East at the end of the seventh century, wanted to acquire Greek knowledge, they turned to Syriac scholars and churchmen. Arab caliphs commissioned Syriac scholars to translate the sciences of the Greeks into Arabic. Had it not been for the Syriac monks, we in Europe might never have had a renaissance. Neither intimidation nor oppression could suppress the faithful, but the Church diminished in size to a fraction of what it was. By the beginning of the 20th century, Syriac Orthodox Christianity was confined mostly to mountainous rural areas, such as Tur Abdin, and various towns in the Ottoman Empire. The worst of the persecutions was yet to come. It is estimated that a quarter of a million perished; villages were emptied; monasteries and Churches were destroyed. Some left the Middle East all-together, forming new communities in the Americas. As a result of further immigration that ensued, the Syriac Orthodox Church today has faithful not only in the Middle East and India, but in Europe, the Americas and Australia as well. It believes in the Trinity, that is one God, subsisting in three separate persons called the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Syriac Orthodox Church believes in the mystery of Incarnation. It further believes that at the time of Annunciation, when the Angel Gabriel was sent to the Virgin Mary, the Holy Spirit came upon her and cleansed her of all natural impurity, filling her with His grace. Then the Only Son of God came down and entered her immaculate womb, and took to Himself a body through her, thus becoming a perfect Man with a perfect Soul. After nine months, He was born of her and her virginity was maintained contrary to the laws of nature. This union is marked by being a natural union of persons, free of all separateness, intermixture, confusion, mingling, change and transformation. The Syriac Orthodox Church believes that the death of Christ was the separation of His soul from His body, but His deity did not at any time leave either His body or His soul. It further believes that by His death for us, He conferred upon us salvation from eternal death and reconciliation with His Heavenly Father. The Holy Spirit is equal with the Father and the Son. Holy Spirit is referred to with the feminine pronoun in almost all early Syriac writings, though later writings refer to it in the masculine. With regards to Sacraments, the Syriac Orthodox Church believes that the Holy Sacraments are tangible signs designated by

the Lord Christ to proclaim divine grace, which He gave for our sanctification. The Sacraments of the Church are: Holy Sacraments are offered by the Bishops and the Priests. Only believers can receive the Sacraments. All but four of the Sacraments are essential for salvation: Baptism, Confirmation, Repentance and Eucharist. Of the sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation and the Priesthood may be received only once. It rejects the Council of Chalcedon A. The ecclesiastical day begins in the evening at sunset. For example, Monday starts at sunset on Sunday evening. During prayers, the worshipper stands facing the East, holding his hands stretched out. For as the lightning comes from the east and shines as far as the west, so will be the coming of the Son of man - Matthew The sign of the cross is made with the right hand. The thumb, first finger and second finger are brought together and the first finger is extended further than the thumb and second finger, indicating that Christ is the One and Only Savior. The sign of the cross is drawn starting from the forehead, down to the breast and then from the left to the right shoulder.

## 8: The Nicene Creed – A Collection of Prayers

*The official version of the Creed, ratified at the council of Constantinople in A.D. , says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. Somewhere during that period of separation the Roman Catholics added filioque to that phrase, making it read " proceeds from the Father and the Son."*

The Pergamos Church became predominant during the fifth century. And you hold fast to My name, and did not deny My faith even in the days in which Antipas was My faithful martyr, who was killed among you, where Satan dwells. To him who overcomes I will give some of the hidden manna to eat. And I will give him a white stone, and on the stone a new name written which no one knows except him who receives it. Irenaeus said that they claimed to be descended from the deacon Nicolas in Acts 6: Book 1, Chapter 26, Verse 3. The last statement to the Church in Pergamos in Revelation The Pergamos Church appears to be a part of the church portrayed by the woman in the wilderness hidden for apparently years Revelation Spiritually, they seemed to have a problem with compromising with parts of the truth to save their lives. This is a major way they differed from the Smyrna Church. We find the identification of the true church, both by the name and doctrine, scattered from Palestine to Spain, and from the Piedmont valley of Italy to Scotland, Ireland and England. As has already been shown that the people honoring the true faith, and bearing the Scriptural name, were called by the world, Waldenses, Vaudois, Henricians, Catharists, Puritans, Bougres, Paulicans, Publicans, Lombardists, Albigenses, and also other names from leading preachers among them, and from countries from which they would be expelled; but they disowned these names, calling themselves the Church of God. A History of True Religion, 3rd ed. Jerusalem, Church of God, 7th Day. The origin of the name Paulician is obscure. Gibbon Decline and Fall, liv , says it means "Disciples of St. Their special veneration for the Apostle, and their habit of renaming their leaders after his disciples lend some colour to this view. On the other hand, the form Paulikianoi, not Paulianois is curious; and the name seems to have been used only by their opponents, who held that they were followers of Paul of Samosata Conybeare, op. Transcribed by Richard L. Nihil Obstat, February 1, Some of those labeled as Paulicians kept Church of God doctrines, while many with that name did not. Some believe that a leader of them, Constantine of Mananali, could have been in the Church of God. He was martyred in A. Short papers on Church history. Oxford University, , Digitized Aug 29, , p. Pergamos was the capital of the Roman province of Asia in Asia Minor. The old Radio Church of God published the following: In Pergamos the sun had been worshipped as a serpent! Plain Truth, February Some in Pergamos compromised. Despite some compromiser, those of Pergamos were not popular with the Roman Catholics because they considered them to represent forces that were anti-Christ. Actually, a Catholic source suggested that the Paulicians first came up with the papal-antichrist theory in the fourth to seventh century: Now, one of the first questions which it is natural to ask on entering upon the subject is, whereas the Pope is said to be Antichrist, sometimes from the fourth, sometimes from the seventh century, when was he first detected and denounced, and by whom? On this point, Todd supplies us with much information, from which it appears that the belief that the Pope was Antichrist was the conclusion gradually formed and matured out of the belief that the Church of Rome was Babylon, by The Protestant Idea of Antichrist. Why would that occur then? The trinity actually denies that Jesus came in the flesh that denial was what the Apostle John wrote was a doctrine of antichrist in II John 7 as it teaches that God really did not empty Himself of His divinity in contradiction to Philipians 2: In the late fourth century AD , after the Eastern emperor Theodosius established Greco-Roman Christianity as the official religion of the empire, the Western Emperor Gratian renounced the title of Pontifex Maximus he was the also last of the emperors to hold that title. Almost immediately afterwards, the bishops of Rome took the term and have used it ever since. Perhaps it should be noted that that idea of a Latin or Roman anti-Christ was apparently developed by Polycarp , and he seems to have learned this from the Apostle John. But it apparently was not until the late fourth century that the Bishops of Rome had enough influence and heresy to have such a resemblance to the final antichrist. Amazingly, The Catholic Encyclopedia notes this about the Paulicians: Leo V, though an Iconoclast, tried to refute the accusation that he was a Paulician by persecuting them furiously. A great number of them at this time rebelled

and fled to the Saracens. Sergius was killed in Theodora, regent for her son Michael III, continued the persecution We hear continually of wars against the Saracens, Armenians, and Paulicians This eliminated the sect as a military power. Meanwhile other Paulicians, heretics but not rebels, lived in groups throughout the empire Fortesque A. In other words, since the Paulicians and Emperor Leo V were against idols, Leo decided he had to persecute them because he was accused of being a bit like them in that area. The above quote also shows that there were Paulicians, who even though persecuted, would not fight back. This is because those truly in the Church of God were opposed to military participation please see article Military Service and the COGs. And while not all who claimed to have been Paulicians were in the true church, notice how brutal the persecution was: The empress, Theodora, instituted a new persecution, in which a hundred thousand Paulicians in Grecian Armenia are said to have lost their lives Paulicianism. Thus, the "Orthodox" Empress Theodora apparently killed ,! Furthermore, note this historical writing about the Paulicians in Armenia: From the earliest ages they have devoutly hated the error and idolatry of the Greeks. Like the primitive Christians, they have ever exhibited an unconquerable repugnance to the use or abuse of images, which, in the eighth and ninth centuries spread like a leprosy They are decidedly adverse Davis, Tamar. A General History of the Sabbatarian Churches. Thus the followers of the true church were persecuted for beliefs such as opposing idolatry. Furthermore, the Eastern Orthodox also oppressed the Bogomils. Notice this odd admission: The Orthodox, as have all religions, berated other confessions and denominations. But Orthodoxy was always benign - no "jihad", no bloodshed, no forced conversions and no mass expulsions - perhaps with the exception of the forcible treatment of the Bogomils. It was all about power and money, of course. Bishops and archbishops did not hesitate to co-opt the Ottoman administration against their adversaries Sam Vaknin Ph. Notice that the Orthodox claim to have not caused bloodshed, forced conversions, or mass expulsions of any group, except what they did to the Bogomils. I cannot comment on how they treated others, but obviously, they felt mistreating people that were associated with the true Church of God was acceptable which the "Orthodox" also did earlier than this--see article on Smyrna. This is sad, but consistent with what happened to true Christians in the Pergamos and Thyatira eras of the true Church. The historian Sozomen reported in the mid-5th Century, The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria Sozomen. Comprising a History of the Church, from a. Translated from the Greek. Revised by Chester D. The "people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere" is most likely referring to those in Asia Minor that is where Constantinople was , and perhaps northern areas of Europe and the Middle East. The historian, Fred C. Conybeare observed this about some affiliated with the Paulicians: They are accused by their Armenian opponents of setting at naught all the feasts and fasts of the Church, especially Sunday The Sabbath was perhaps kept Of the modern Christmas and of the Annunciation, and of the other feasts connected with the life of Jesus prior to his thirtieth year, this phase of the church knew nothing. The general impression which the study of it leaves on us is that in it we have before us a form of Church not very remote from the primitive Jewish Christianity of Palestine Conybeare F. The Key of Truth: A Manual of the Paulician Church of Armenia. Clarendon Press, Oxford, , pp. It would be logical that Paulicians would be opposed to Sunday and the other festivals of the Roman Church. A History of Christianity, Volume 1, Beginnings to Harper Collins, San Francisco, , p. And Sabbath-keeping has existed throughout history even Roberts and Donaldson refer to it in the s. Other Beliefs The Paulicians apparently had the entire Bible and often quoted from it: There is no rejection of the Epistles of Peter, nor is any disrespect shown to that apostle. It is merely affirmed, p. In the Election Service, p. The Paulicians, as part of their heresy held that all matter especially the human body is bad, that all external religious forms, sacraments, rites, especially material pictures and relics, should be abolished. To honour the Cross was especially reprehensible Fortescue A. Transcribed by Michael C. Nihil Obstat, June 1, Like the Romans, the Paulicians condemned Simon Magus: But Simon himself believed and was baptized and rose up against Philip in trickery and charlatanry, in order to obtain the power of the holy spirit by deceit Conybeare F. Clarendon Press, Oxford, , p. Then among the observances which we know to have been repudiated by them as neither apostolic or divine the mysterious prayers of genuflexion

**9: Tradition in the Orthodox Church - Theology - Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America**

*As a result of these dialogues, the Church has issued two joint declarations with the Roman Catholic Church and another with the Eastern Orthodox churches. In Syriac, the proper name of the Church is 'idto suryoyto treey s ath shub h o.*

And in the life of the world to come. We gather that it had already been introduced into Cyprus as a baptismal creed. On his return from exile in A. The election of Meletius of Antioch as the first president of the council carried with it the vindication of his old ally Cyril. Unfortunately the acts of the council have been lost, but they were quoted at the council of Chalcedon in A. One of the signatories of the Definition of Faith made at Chalcedon, in which both creeds were quoted in full, Kalemikus, bishop of Apamea in Bithynia, refers to the council of Constantinople as having been held at the ordination of the most pious Nektarius the bishop. Obviously there was some connexion in his mind between the creed and the ordination. The reasons which brought the revised creed into prominence at Chalcedon are still obscure. Kattenbusch supposes that Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, or his archdeacon Aetius, who read the creed at the 2nd session of the council, took up the idea that through its likeness to the Roman Creed it would be a useful weapon against Eutyches and others who were held to interpret the Nicene Creed in an Apollinarian sense. But Kunze thinks that it was not used as a base of operations against Eutyches because there is some evidence that Monophysites were willing to accept it. Certainly it won its way to general acceptance in the East as the creed of the church of the imperial city; regarded as an improved recension of the Nicene Faith. The history of the introduction of the creed into liturgies is still obscure. The theory of Probst that it had been used in Rome before this time has not been confirmed. Probably they were interpolated in the creed by mistake of copyists. When attention was called to the interpolation in the 9th century it became one cause of the schism between East and West. The interpolation really witnessed to a deep-lying difference between Eastern and Western theology. Western theologians approached the problem from another point of view. Hilary, starting from the thought of Divine self-consciousness as the explanation of the coinherence of the Father in the Son and the Son in the Father, says that the Spirit receives of both. Augustine teaches that the Father and the Son are the one principle of the Being of the Spirit. From this it is a short step to say with the Quicumque vult that the Spirit proceeds from the Son, while guarding the idea that the Father is the one fountain of Deity. Critics indeed agree on the main outline. Swainson, developed by J. Lumby, and adopted by Harnack. Swainson thought that the Quicumque was brought into its present shape in the 9th century. The so-called profession of Denebert, bishop-elect of Worcester, in A. He conjectured that they were brought together in the province of Rheims c. This theory, however, depended upon unverified assumptions, such as the supposed silence of theologians about the creed at the beginning of the 9th century; the suggestion that the completed creed would have been useful to them if they had known it as a weapon against the heresy of Adoptianism; the assertion that no MS. The two-portion theory was vigorously attacked by G. Ommanney, who was successful in the discovery of new documents, notably early commentaries, which contained the text of the creed embedded in them, and thus supplied independent testimony to the fact that the creed was becoming fairly widely known at the end of the 8th century. Burn and Dom Morin. This conclusion has never been seriously challenged. It has been greatly strengthened by the discovery of a MS. Delisle at once pointed out Notices et extraits des manuscrits, , this MS. The Quicumque occurs in a collection of materials forming an introduction to the psalter. The suggestion has been made that Leidrad intended to use the Quicumque in his campaign against the Adoptianists in But the phrases of the creed seem to have needed sharpening against the Nestorian tendency of the Adoptianists. It is more probable that Leidrad was interested in the growing use of the creed as a canticle, and was consulted in the preparation of the famous Golden Psalter, now at Vienna, which contains the same collection of documents as an introduction. The earliest known MS. There is a reference to the Quicumque in the first canon of the fourth council of Toledo of the year , which quotes part or the whole of clauses 4, , 28 f. The council also quoted phrases from the so-called Creed of Damasus, a document of the 4th century, which in some cases they preferred to the phrases of the Quicumque. Their quotations form a

connecting link in the chain of evidence by which the use of the creed may be traced back to the writings of Caesarius, bishop of Arles. Further, Caesarius was in the habit of putting some words of a distinguished writer at the head of his compositions, which would account for the fact that the name of Athanasius was subsequently attached to the creed. The use, however, of the Quicumque by Caesarius as a catechism may be explained by the suggestion that it had been taught him in his youth, so that his style had been moulded by it. He was not an original thinker. Moreover, the creed is quoted by his rival Avitus, bishop of Vienne, who quotes clause 22, as from the Rule of Catholic Faith, but was not likely to value a composition of Caesarius so highly. Morin does not deal fully with the arguments from internal evidence which point back to the beginning of the 5th century as the date of the creed. If the creed-phrases needed sharpening against the revived Nestorian error of the Adoptianists, it is scarcely likely to have been written during the generation following the condemnation of Nestorius in Burn suggests that it was written to meet the Sabellian and Apollinarian errors of the Spanish heretic Priscillian, possibly by Honoratus, bishop of Arles. This would explain the quotation of the two documents together by the council of Toledo, since the heresy lasted on for a long time in Spain. There are phrases in the writings of Vincentius of Lerins and of Faustus, bishop of Riez, which are parallel to the teaching of the creed, though they cannot with any confidence be called quotations. They tend in any case to prove that the Quicumque comes to us from the school of Lerins, of which Honoratus was the first abbot, and to which Caesarius also belonged. The earliest use of the Quicumque was in sermons, in which the clauses were quoted, as by the council of Toledo without reference to the creed as a whole. From the 8th century, if not from earlier times, commentaries were written on it. The writer of the Oratorian Commentary Theodulf of Orleans? Angilbert, abbot of St Riquier c. It passed into the office of Prime, apparently first at Fleury. In the Russian service books it appears at the beginning of the psalter. The controversy on its use in modern times has turned mainly on the interpretation of the warning clauses. No new translation can put an end to the difficulty. While it is true that the Church has never condemned individuals, and that the warnings refer only to those who have received the faith, and do not touch the question of the unbaptized, there is a growing feeling that they go beyond the teaching of Holy Scripture on the responsibility of intellect in matters of faith. Modern Confessions of Faith. The famous theses which Luther nailed to the door of the church at Wittenberg in cannot be called a confession, but they expressed a protest which could not rest there. Some reconstruction of popular beliefs was needed by many consciences. There is a striking contrast between the crudeness of much and widely accepted medieval theology and the decrees of the council of Trent. Even from the Roman Catholic standpoint such a need was felt. Luther himself had a gift of words which through his catechisms made the reformed theology popular in Germany. In it became necessary to define his position against both Romanists and Zwinglians. Some 21 of its articles dealt with doctrine, 7 with ecclesiastical abuses. It expounded Augsburg confession. The main difference between these, the first of a long series of articles of religion and the ancient creeds, lies in the fact that they are manifestoes embodying creeds and answering more than one purpose. This is the reason of their frequent failure to convey any sense of proportion in the expression of truth. The disciplinary question of clerical marriage is not of the same primary importance as the doctrinal questions involved in the restoration of the cup to the laity, or discussed in the subsequent article on the mass. As has been well said by a learned Baptist theologian, Dr Green: The failure of the latter was really inevitable. Moreover, fresh complications arose from the confusion in which the question of the duties and rights of the civil power was entangled. In an age when the foundations of the system on which society had rested for centuries were seriously shaken, such subjects as the right of the magistrate to interfere with the belief of the individual, and the limits of his authority over conscience, naturally assumed a prominence hitherto unknown. An elaborate Apology for the confession of Augsburg was drawn up by Melancthon in reply to Roman Catholic criticisms. Its thirty-five articles contain a moderate statement of Lutheran teaching. Zwinglian and Calvinistic Confessions. Bucer and was presented to Charles V. These cities were inclined to Zwinglian and Calvinist. It was sanctioned in Scotland and was well received in England. Such strict Calvinism was the strength also of the Westminster Confession see below, but was soon weakened in Germany. While Calvin began sternly with the question: English Articles of Religion. Thus the doctrine of the Real Presence is asserted, but no mention is made of Transubstantiation. Medieval ceremonies are

described as useful but without power to remit sins. Two years later, after negotiations with the Lutheran princes, a conference on theological matters was held at Lambeth with Lutheran envoys. Some of them were taken from the confession of Augsburg, but the sections on Baptism, the Eucharist and penance, show that the English theologians desired to lay more emphasis on the character of sacraments as channels of grace. With the accession of Edward VI. In they were revised by other bishops and were laid before the council and the royal chaplains. They were not devised as a complete scheme of doctrine, but only as a guide in dealing with current errors of i. The revision undertaken in by Archbishop Parker, aided by Edm. For the clause Art. The revision was passed by Convocation and again revised in , when the queen had been excommunicated by papal bull, and an act was passed ordering all clergy to subscribe to them. They have remained unchanged ever since, though the terms of subscription have been modified. An attempt was made to add nine articles of a strong Calvinistic tone, which were drawn up by Dr Whitaker, regius professor of divinity at Cambridge, and submitted to Archbishop Whitgift. The first Scottish confession dates from It is a memorial of the intellectual power and enthusiasm of John Knox.

V. 10. Venus flytrap What shall we have to eat? Postural diagnosis and treatment A defence of Catholic principles, in a letter to a Protestant minister Corrosion and corrosion control 4th edition revie Metal Treatments Against Wear, Corrosion, Fretting and Fatigue (Advances in Surface Treatments) Studies in the English Mystery Plays XIII Chapter Notes and Sources Garfield Jokes, Riddles, and Other Silly Stuff Hatcher, Robin Lee Introduction to time series forecasting Stealing the Mona Lisa Engineering mechanics timoshenko The hindu science and technology book Going big time : thinking about youth workers Roland barthes cy twombly works on paper Hard feelings : Samsom Occom contemplates his Christian mentors Joanna Brooks No more us for you The highest mountain Education training Immense amount of treasure Its division among the troops Rumors of a rising Trial of the Inca His executi Health Services in Britain (Reference Pamphlet) Greece under King George French literary laughter Outlines Highlights for Promised Land, Crusader State: The American Encounter with the World Since 1776 b Gelman hill multilevel modeling Sant valve price list 2017 The diversity council companion Timing really is everything Vastu shastra in civil engineering What is internet application Practical rabbit-keeping Birthday Surprise Vol. 10 Where was God? The World Trade Center Disaster as seen through a Chaplains Eyes A blackbird singing [words Francis Ledwidge ; [music Michael Head North American sun kings Principles of marketing 15th edition kotler Black angel cards Finance bodie merton Mayhem in miniature