THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN STUDENT CONFERENCE AT WHITELANDS, 1932.

SPRING, 1932.] [VOL. XIII. No. 1.

The Christian East

EDITORIAL NOTE.

THIS issue of *The Christian East* is occupied by some of the papers which were read at the Anglo-Russian Student Conference of April, 1932. That Conference was the sixth and latest in a series to which reference has frequently been made in these pages. They may now fairly be held to have struck root, and seem likely to be of great importance and to do good service in the furtherance of mutual understanding and appreciation between the Anglican and Orthodox Communions.

The papers here printed are preceded by an article by Mr. Paul B. Anderson, who writes of the series of Conferences as a whole, and also of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius which has been founded in connection with them. Mr. Anderson is a close student of Russian affairs, as readers of *The Christian East* already know, and has penetrated deeply into the spirit of Orthodoxy. He is in touch with the re-union movement over a wide field both in Europe and in America, and his extensive knowledge, wise judgment and sympathetic insight (to say nothing of his fluent command of the Russian language) have played no small part in ensuring the usefulness of the six Anglo-Russian Student Conferences at all of which he has been present.

The papers read on these occasions are frequently of a standard and authority which make it highly desirable that they should reach a wider circle than the hundred or so persons who listen to them at the time, or even than those who read them afterwards in the excellent Journal of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. It is well that they should be given permanent form in print and become available for reference by others who desire to learn from the contrasting and complementary points of view of East and West in dealing with the same title.

In our next issue we shall print at least one more of the papers which were read at Whitelands College last April, *i.e.*, a paper on the Work of the Holy Spirit in Revelation, by Professor G. Florovsky, of the Russian Academy in Paris. In that issue also the other features in the normal make-up of *The Christian East* will make their reappearance.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF ST. ALBAN AND ST. SERGIUS.

By Paul B. Anderson.

IT was the search for a truly Œcumenic attitude that gave birth to the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. Like other significant movements in the history of the church, the Fellowship struck its roots and still feeds in the soil of student and university life. This has proved to be both fertile and strengthening ground, for while, on the one hand, student life is stimulating to fresh endeavours in seeking for truth, on the other, the exuberance which youth finds in the experience of worshipping in common with Christians of another communion is steadied by the sobering realization that real unity, true Œcumenism, can only be achieved through scholarly, intellectual as well as prayerful, spiritual exercise.

For about thirty years students of various confessions had been meeting at international conferences, but it was not until a strong and thoroughly self-conscious Eastern Orthodox student movement had grown up in the Russian emigration that the need for a new Œcumenic attitude came to be felt. The general committee of the World's Student Christian Federation, meeting in 1926, saw in this situation not only a problem but an opportunity, and made suggestions which led to the calling of the first conference of Anglican and Russian Orthodox students.

Previously, students of various denominations had united on the basis of such ground of faith and worship as they had in common; now the opportunity was given for an inter-confessional union in which each group could both hold to its own faith and practice and recognize the verity of the Christian faith and experience of the other, even endeavouring to share with each other in worship although the broken unity of the Church still prohibits sharing in common the sacrament of the Eucharist.

Since the holding of the first of these conferences, in January, 1927, five others have been assembled. At the close of the second, held like the first at St. Albans, the desire to formulate and perpetuate the rich experience of East and West united in thought and prayer, led to the establishing of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, with membership open to all who had or might in future attend these Anglo-Russian Conferences. A special prayer card was prepared, and St. Sergius Day (July 18) set aside as the annual day of prayer for the work of the Fellowship in the cause of Church Unity. A quarterly journal was begun, supplementing the annual conference by providing a channel for

continuing throughout the year the exchange of thought and experience peculiar to the problem of Anglo-Orthodox relationships. About 250 persons, of whom about one sixth are women, have become members. The Bishop of Truro is President; in fact he is much more, for at each conference he is a most helpful and stimulating member. The Committee, for practical reasons consisting of persons resident near London, is now made up of the following: the Rev. O. F. Clark, the Rev. Frank Bishop, the Rev. John Ramsbotham, Mr. Nicholas Zernov, with the Rev. Eric Fenn and Miss Xenia Braikenitch as secretaries, and Mr. Eric Mascal as Chairman. There is also a Russian Committee of the Fellowship in Paris, with Professor G. Florovsky as Chairman.

Thanks to the generous financial and executive support provided by the Student Christian Movement, the conferences have been prepared and conducted with very little burden on the members of the Fellowship. At the same time, the growing self-consciousness of this body led, at the Conference in April, 1932, to the expression of hope that the Fellowship might take more responsibility upon itself, relieving in part while yet depending upon the Student Christian Movement, whose help is needed not only for finances but for the invaluable aid its position in the student world enables it to render in securing a continual stream of new recruits for conferences and the Fellowship.

This growing feeling of responsibility on the part of Fellowship members applies even more particularly to the task of advancing relations between the two communions. Those who attended earlier conferences as students have now, as ordained clergy in parish work and on the mission field, experienced how division hinders the full acceptance of God's love outpoured for all men, and they are eager to work for the unity of the Church. Furthermore, the Conferences have been attended or addressed by some who have led in the Lambeth and subsequent negotiations between Anglican and Orthodox, and their words have thrilled younger members to a desire to share in the burdens and the joys of this important work.

The Archbishop of Canterbury visited and blessed the Conference of 1930, perceiving the usefulness of this new movement toward unity. Some words which he spoke on the occasion may indeed be taken as the keynote, the basis and the hope of the Fellowship. "Plainly what is uppermost in our minds is the growing and deepening friendship between the Orthodox and the Anglican Church. For long years in history these Churches have been in friendly relations. How could it be otherwise? We are naturally drawn together. We have the same creed, which lies at the basis both of our faith and of our ritual. We have the same scripture to which we look with reverence as the guide of our thoughts. We

have the same sacraments, which we reverence, I trust, with the same constancy of devotion. We have the same orders preserved by us and you throughout the centuries. We have the same conviction that we stand together for a conception of the unity of the Body of Christ illimitably deeper and more beautiful than that which is associated with the great Roman Catholic Church. I think that for all these reasons we have very much the same duty to fulfil in Christendom, to be the means, in our several places of influence and ministry, of opening out to a new world all the treasures that have been committed to us from the ancient and the near past . . . . While you may teach us something of the witness of humility in trials, we also may be able to teach you something of that liberation from the old, how it may find fruit in the new, that at least is my hope for your gathering."

At the last Conference, April, 1932, a day was devoted to the work of the Joint Doctrinal Commission, with particular reference to its session at Lambeth in October, 1931. Papers were read by Canon H. L. Goudge and Canon J. A. Douglas, both of whom are members of the Commission. The importance of theological discussion for the achievement of unity, the clarifications accomplished, and the difficulties inherent in these conversations, claimed only part of these papers; for the rest they emphasized the need for other methods and other groups. These papers were particularly helpful in making clear some of the stages that need be passed, each requiring frankness, intelligence, patient work and love, along the road, probably a long road, to inter-communion and unity.

The Fellowship promises to hear another and conjoint method, and a gathering together of other groups and individuals, to share in the work of *rapprochement*. Its unofficial character and the fact that it embraces rather more younger than older members give it a peculiarly favourable status. It believes thoroughly that real unity depends on the concurrent advance of large numbers of the faithful in both communions in harmony with the work of commission; in fact that without such a broad advance, the work of "delegates" cannot bear fruit. Youth, and especially student youth, can be best engaged in spreading the cause of unity: let acquaintance precede prejudice, knowledge precede argument, friendship precede fear, and let the sweet experience of unity in worship create a hunger for the full unity of sharing at the common table of our Lord.

At conferences the whole body attends the daily cycle of Russian Orthodox or of Anglican services, repeated on alternate days. The strangeness which would sit heavily on older Anglicans attending long liturgy conducted in Slavonic, or on older Russians striving prayerfully to unite in simple evensong, dissipates more

readily in student youth. Almost invariably the last day of conference sees little of the reserve and stiffness of the first and, if one is sensitive to such things, he can feel that the voice of prayer is one, for each has heard the other in confession, supplication, and praise, and has felt the outpouring of love on all without distinction.

Such brotherhood in spirit is fostered by the provision of ample time for informal walks and talks in the conference grounds. All "live in," have meals in common, and readily find interpreters when language difficulties arise. Such informal intercourse provides a naturalness of setting that makes work for unity seem an everyday task. The importance of this cannot be exaggerated. Students, much esteemed scholars, priests of both confessions, and already a considerable number of "senior" friends, mingle discussing matters of minor as well as of great importance. Mostly, however, conversation centres on points raised in the two papers of the morning, one by an Orthodox and the other by an Anglican, dealing with a common subject. One gets an impression of the discussion potentialities of these conferences by reviewing the subjects of some of the papers: "Authority and Freedom in the Church," "The Church and State," "The Call toward Holiness extended to every Member of the Church," "Asceticism and Holiness—Saintliness in Daily Life," "The Social Aspects of the Liturgy," "The Eucharistic Sacrifice," "The Nature of the Kingdom of God," "Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures," "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

From the beginning conference papers have been given by men of authority on the respective subjects, with the result that discussions have been highly informing as well as spiritually stimulating. The Anglican and the Orthodox viewpoints have been stated with clearness and conviction; the unofficial character of the conferences has permitted those holding important Church positions to speak with great frankness in drawing distinctions as well as in explaining agreements between the theological and practical positions of the two confessions. The reasoned statements of papers read have been sharpened by the dialectic of discussion. No one present at St. Albans in 1922 and 1928 will forget the search for mutual understanding of the nature of the Kingdom of God, with Bishop Gore (of blessed memory) maintaining that the Kingdom of God "is in your midst" and that Christianity was a life to be lived before it was a doctrine to be taught, while the Rev. Sergius Bulgakov presented the Eastern emphasis on the sudden coming and the mystical nature of the Kingdom. So also on the interpretation of the Scriptures—the intellectual comprehension represented by the Anglicans finding a complement in the "meta-historical" view put forward by the Russians. In 1931, Professor A. Kartashev, who was Russian Minister of Cults in

1917, and now at the Russian Orthodox Theological Academy in Paris, dealt with Church and State in a paper reflecting practical experience, erudition and prophecy. Both Dr. Kenneth Kirk, in 1931, and Canon H. L. Goudge, in 1932, held up the Anglican view that moral uprightness is an essential condition for receiving the Guidance of the Holy Spirit. Though controversy could well have been anticipated on the question of Scripture and Tradition, Professor Florovsky's paper on Authority in 1931, and Canon Douglas's remarks on the work of the Joint Doctrinal Commission both made it clear that such controversy, or agreement, could quite as likely take place within the respective communions as between them.

To be sure, the conferences have not resulted in agreement between members on all points. Indeed, so long as general unity is not achieved, there will be differences within the Fellowship, for the basic idea is that Anglicans may fully profess and practise their faith, as Orthodox theirs. But the eirenic spirit of the Fellowship and the readiness to sacrifice which accompanies the enthusiasm of youth seem propitious for the undertaking.

The present limitations of the Fellowship are keenly felt, and first of all the relatively restricted representation of both communions. The conferences have consisted in the main of Anglo-Catholics and Russian Orthodox, but a certain number of Anglicans of other tendencies and non-Anglicans have been present as guests, and several have become members of the Fellowship. The non-Anglicans have contributed by raising questions which brought forth greater clarity of exposition of theological views, and their presence has kept before all the realization that eventual unity must include all Christians. A few Orthodox other than Russians have also attended the conferences, and the process of securing their further inclusion is a matter claiming early attention.

Quite naturally, those came first together who had the greatest interest and desire for unity: if, therefore, Anglo-Catholics have predominated in number, it has been because they have felt themselves nearer to the Eastern Church. The evangelical tendency has been represented both in the papers and in the general membership, as in 1928 and in 1932 by the Principal of Wycliffe Hall, the Rev. G. F. Graham Brown, now Anglican Bishop-Elect of Jerusalem, and by several of his students. More serious are the limitations of the Russian delegation, due to the virtual incarceration of the Church in Russia and in part to differences within the Church in the emigration. Yet the Conferences have been attended and the work actively shared by representatives of all groups, in the persons of such distinguished guests as the Metropolitan Evlogie, the Archbishop Seraphim, and Professor

Nicholas Bedaiev. We should indeed pray that the grace of the Holy Spirit may, both within the Fellowship and in the whole Church, descend upon or rather raise up our human consciences, that these differences within the churches may no longer hinder the sacred cause of unity in Him Who loveth all men.

Herein indeed lies one of the realities deeply felt by the Fellowship, that we are yet unworthy of the joy of unity. Discipline, work, prayer, and self-effacing love are incumbent on every member. In so far as these elements are operative and are made contagious in the theological colleges, the parishes, and the councils of the Church, we may have confidence in the future.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN NATURE, HUMAN LIFE AND CULTURE

By Professor G. Fedotov.

IT is very difficult to distinguish between the actions of Father, Son or Holy Ghost in the world, or indeed to consider the invisible and mysterious power of God by these separate names at all. In the history of the Church, humanity's redemptive organ, the holy names become partially clear for us. And this is the work of Christian theology. But, even in theology, even in the economy of the Church, the Holy Spirit remains the same mysterious hypostasis. Theologians are in agreement that the nature and the actions of the Holy Spirit remain for us hidden and scarcely named. What, then, can be said as to Nature and Culture, which are generally outside the theologians' sphere? Here, only guesses and presentiments are possible. As one must guess, may I be forgiven, not being a theologian, for offering my unpretentious thoughts?

First of all, we can, and must, state that the Holy Spirit acts in the world outside the limits of the Church. If His Acts manifest themselves more clearly and powerfully in the mysterious life of the Church, and in the spiritual life of the Saints, there is not and cannot be any place strange to His breath. "Whither shall I go from Thy Presence or whither shall I flee from Thy Presence? If I ascend up into Heaven Thou art there, if I make my bed in Sheol behold Thou art there." It is not by accident that the hymn of the Divine Omnipresence begins with the word "spirit." And we all know and repeat, "The wind bloweth where it listeth," and "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty," denying with the Church the possibility of the normative, lawful and canonical limitations of His Power, though in the ecclesiastical economy of His gifts, norm, law and canon are acting. To some extent we think of the activities of the Holy Spirit in the world as more diffuse than those of the Son as Redeemer, though not as Divine Logos.

Salvation outside the Church is impossible according to ecclesiastical dogma, but it is admitted by us in the freedom of pneumatology. The Holy Spirit speaks by the word of the pagan prophet Balaam, and even through his ass. Outside the Church the activities of the Holy Spirit manifest themselves in nature and culture. Where and how are they manifested pre-eminently as compared with the power of the Father, and the wisdom of the Son? In these rather dangerous researches we commence from only two trusted dogmatic symbols. The Church reveals to us the Holy Spirit as "the Giver of Life" and as "Who spake by the prophets." This is

in accord with all the revelations of the Holy Spirit in the scriptures, and so we shall direct our enquiries towards the Spirit as the source of life and of inspiration.

In the created world according to these symbols, the Holy Spirit manifests Himself primarily in living nature with its limited freedom. This freedom is shown in the primitive spontaneity of movement. Law reigns in the inorganic world; in the astral spaces, and in a crystal one sees the order of the rational Logos, the mathematically ideal basis of the world, but in the organic world there is place for the unforeseen and interrupted, which has been called *élan vital*. What lies behind the *élan vital* of Bergson in the divine world? "All souls live by the Holy Spirit" is sung in one of the hymns of the Eastern Church.

In the light of the general symbolism of the Holy Spirit (the image of the dove) it would not be too bold to see the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit not only in human, but also in animal, and even vegetable nature, and perhaps in the cosmic soul of the world at large.

For even inanimate nature seems alive from the religious and artistic standpoints. In it, order and organization have not finally imprisoned liberty. There are elements pre-eminently free, and in their freedom menacing to man. It is noticeable that the manifestations of the Holy Spirit are often connected with the tempestuous actions of these very elements, wind and fire. "And suddenly there came a sound from Heaven as of a mighty rushing wind . . . and there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire." The name itself of "spirit" in different languages signifies first of all breathing, air and wind, πνεῦμα, Spiritus.

Fire is so very symbolic of the Holy Spirit that Christ's own baptism is the baptism of the Holy Spirit and of fire. In this elemental form the angels are like the Holy Spirit; "Who maketh His Angels spirits (i.e., winds) and His ministers a flaming fire." In fire the tempest is revealed to Man not only as the power of a wrathful divinity but also the inspiring power of God filling him with awe and enthusiasm. The Israelites trembled before Sinai engirdled by lightnings and the Prophets heard the voice of God in fire and thunder. Elijah, taken up in the fiery chariot, in the imagination of the Russian people is still a thunderer. It seems that even water more than earth is connected with the power of the Holy Spirit. Does not the Bible begin with these words, "And the Spirit moved upon the face of the waters"? Water seems contrary to fire in its cold and moisture but in its tempestuous power the ocean is similar to thunder and wind, as all are free of form. The fire of the Holy Spirit descends in the water of Baptism.

Earth alone, inert and immovable, subject to Man, seems farthest removed from the theophanies of the Holy Spirit. She is the

motherly bosom, the beloved mother earth, so called by almost all nations. Human life is possible only on the earth and only by its gifts. The other elements are mortal to Man. Why, then, should the Holy Spirit manifest Itself in them? Here is opened a limitless field of speculation. Our troubles increase when we see that Nature is hostile to the principle of personality, that chaos threatens to dissolve and drown personality in formlessness. Christianity is a religion of personality. In it, personality is delivered from the dark powers of the passions by asceticism, sacrifice and personal love.

What is the significance of the symbol of the dove in which the Holy Spirit descended on the Son of God? Students of comparative religion point out that the dove was the sacred bird of Astarte and Aphrodite, and with the Jews the Spirit—Ruach—is feminine. Our confusion increases. Sex is the principle of natural organic life. So the symbol of the dove added to the symbols of wind and fire increases for us the menacing mystery of the various manifestations of the Holy Spirit.

In the world of nature and in the most menacing element of sex, mortal danger for personality lies hidden. But in it lies the source of organic life. Personality is tied to the flesh and cannot exist without it. That antinomy expresses the absence of unity in worldly life, introduced by the Fall. Through sin death entered into life, and affected its very roots. Where the tension of life is strongest there death is nearest: in storm, in fire, and in love. The dissolution of personality into elements is its spiritual death. The fact that death is preceded by the stormy tension of energy, enthusiasm and a feeling of liberation, indicates that divine power of life which retains traces of its divinity even in its dissolution. The elements mortal to Man remain as beautiful garments of divinity.

Not in the earth, harmless and even beneficial and submissive to Man, but in the destructive and beautiful forces of fire and wind does the Holy Spirit speak to Man. Wind and fire, air and heat, when calm and tempered, are the sources of life and the fertility of the earth herself. However, Man's greatest danger consists in his giving in to the natural powers, even though spiritualized. From the source of life and inspiration he drinks the cup of sin and death. The Old Testament protected Israel from that danger, surrounding her with a defence against the threatening beauty of the world. Concluding with God's Chosen People, a personal covenant, it gave to Israel in the law a disciplining school of personality. But in paganism, everywhere humanity serves the elements, uniting itself with them as the Divine source of life. The captivity and slavery of personality becomes the price of this dangerous road to the knowledge of God.

We can quietly recognize, however, that paganism had its knowledge of God, and not only of demons, because the fathers of the

Church introduced these heathen premonitions into Christian doctrine. Hellenism and not Israel, built up culture and foresaw its religious sense. Can we acknowledge the fundamental truth of the Greek myth about the sacred origin of culture? I think we can if we take seriously the words of Christ, "Apart from Me ye can do nothing." Nothing, that is to say, of value. It excludes the possibility of the demonic origin of things of beauty, and modifies the belief in the exclusively human character of culture. Yes, culture is pre-eminently Man's work—Man who stands between God and Cosmos—but is inspired by God to create.

In culture there are two eternal principles; labour and inspiration. Culture in the Latin sense of the word is double: *cultura agri* and *cultura Dei*. As labour, culture is related to the earth. As labour, it is inconceivable without tools, or rational knowledge, and pursuing this line of thought we reach the realms of science and its Divine origin, the Logos. As Inspiration, culture originates in primitive art (χορεία), that is to say, in singing and in dancing, indissolubly related to prayer and culture. The ancients were filled with the conviction of the Divine character of artistic inspiration. Poetry —sacred madness (μάνία). Poet—prophet. "*Vates*" means both. Even Aristotle calls the poet ἔν-θεος, possessed of God. The ancients were not mistaken in this.

Philosophizing about Greek culture, Nietzsche designated its two opposite and yet related principles by the names of Apollo and Dionysus. Refusing to acknowledge the demonic inspiration either of the "Apollonic" Socrates or the "Dionysian" Æschylus, we Christians, according to the Apostle Paul, can give two names to the Divine Power acting in pre-Christian culture. These names are the Logos and the Spirit. The one indicates order, congruity and harmony, and the other inspiration, enthusiasm and creative energy. Both principles are inevitably present in every work of culture. Handicraft and agriculture are alike impossible without a certain creative joy. Scientific knowledge is impossible without intuition and creative contemplation. And the creation of a poet or musician presupposes hard work, moulding inspiration into the severe form of art. But the principle of Spirit prevails in artistic creation, as the principle of Logos in scientific knowledge. Muse is the pseudonym by which the ancient poets call the inspiring grace of the Holy Spirit (*Ruach*), unknown to them. Poets (*Vates*), as perhaps the sibyls of Apollo, received prophecies. So Balaam received inspiration from the Spirit who spake by the prophets.

It is not from Beelzebub that Virgil prophesied the birth of the Divine child.

But all the dangers that are hidden in the natural powers rise up with particular strength in the enthusiastic and inspired sphere of culture. Even the union with the world of nature is here deeper

and more indissoluble than in the cold and stern realm of the Logos. The turbulence of the natural elements and especially the turbulence of sex in man inspires the artist. He is the most defenceless of all the world's children from the pressure of the natural powers. In relation to them he is all tension and energy. The fetters of duty and law are powerless over him. That is why the songs of poets often become songs of sin and their spiritual careers tragedies. To be lacerated by the passioned powers is the fate of many poets.

But in the passionate sphere of the soul impersonal currents do not operate: demons rush in and taint the sacred source of inspiration. Art often becomes demonic, but that does not exclude its divine origin. The devil is an actor aspiring to imitate God. Deprived of creative power he assumes a creative mask. Thus with greater facility he insinuates himself into the true divine creative work, and by his muddy admixtures he renders the clear waters turbid. The Holy Spirit appears as the muse but the harpies pollute and defile the divine nourishment.

Plato is in despair over the self-will of poets whom he himself recognizes as divine, yet he dreamed of throwing them out of his republic. How many Christians in the depths of their souls would not imitate him? But culture without poets, like the Church without prophets and mystics, would be a sterile desert. With the drying up of creative contemplation the green tree of science will wither. Without the revelation of a national idea in beauty a country would narrow down to a state, and social life into a series of juridical norms and the heavy yoke of labour. Family life would evaporate without love. Life would cease without the life-giving spirit. The hearth grows cold with the extinguishing of the fire. The danger of coldness and death threatens all soulless culture. One feels it with particular acuteness when a powerless Christian scholasticism meets a godless paganism. But in Christianity inexhaustible sources of the Holy Spirit are given to us, and with it the possibility of conserving their purity. Obviously slavery to the elements is inevitable for paganism. For it, acquiring the Spirit, in accordance with the laws of a fallen world, becomes orgiastic. The efforts of the Orpheans and Plato to restore to Dionysus and Eros their pure divine life were doomed to failure. But behind the orgy of pagan spirituality and Christian spirituality there is the Cross. Upon that Cross is crucified human nature in its Divine prototype. The wounds of Our Lord, for those who contemplate them, make a passive and sensuous descent into natural life impossible. The Cross cuts through the stream of natural existence. Its nails pierce our souls and bodies, killing their sinful motions. But the crucified Lord sent a Comforter to His followers. He Himself sent Him to them as if from the Cross, and drawing His Fire and Breath through the Cross. The Apostles crucified together with Christ were able at once to become drunk

with the enthusiasm of the descending Spirit. To onlookers they seemed drunk with joy and mad with glossolalia. The outward signs of the Holy Ghost are, as in the pagan world, ecstatic and of the natural order. But the elements of that world are already dead for those who "bear branded on their bodies the marks of Jesus," and Peter shows that way to the gifts of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. "Repent and be baptized . . . and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Baptism is the symbol of death to the world of nature and resurrection to Christ. And with it, baptism is the entering into the Church, the divine organism built by the power and energy of the Holy Spirit Who acts in it. *Criterium Crucis* and *Criterium Ecclesiæ* are given to us in order that we shall recognize the Holy Spirit and preserve the purity of His gifts. Others here have spoken about the actions of the Holy Spirit in the Church and in sanctified life. I must pursue the problem of the Holy Spirit in culture already Christian.

Is culture abolished in the New Testament? That is a question which in our times is answered very hesitatingly. In the fullness of the Kingdom of God there is no place for culture. Pure life exists in the Holy Spirit: there can be no culture where one of its two component parts, labour, which is the curse of the Fall, vanishes. But if labour and striving remain on the road of holiness, culture is inevitably on the road to life. If the Kingdom of God were already here—in everyone and in everything—Nature itself would be abolished as a realm of law. Inasmuch as Nature exists, culture must be built, otherwise the angelic purity of saints would immediately encounter the bestiality of sinners. The Church having as a problem the salvation of humanity sanctifies culture for herself.

The structure of Christian culture does not formally differ from pagan culture. Sociology makes no difference between the baptized and the unbaptized. With them also the law-givers make laws, poets write poetry, and, just as before, they address themselves to "the Muse" in which they no longer believe. In Christianity, are the same zones of culture (*e.g.*, art, creative intuition) which remain pre-eminently the vehicles of divine inspiration, although no sphere of life or culture can be entirely deprived of it. As in paganism, poets yield to the passionate powers, unable to discern the voice of the Holy Spirit from the voices of other spirits, and often seek in the sensual tempests of the flesh for sources of inspiration. Everything is—as it was. Sometimes it seems even worse. Can one be astonished at this phenomenon in culture when even in spiritual life itself inspiration can be led astray? Throughout church history there pass sects which deliver themselves from law in the name of the Holy Spirit and are attracted by the pull of the lower elements; "the Brethren of the Free Spirit" in the West, and "the Spiritual Christian" in Russia. The pagan orgy ever reappears in Christen-

dom. The old Adam is never altogether overcome in us. We can only for a short time be crucified together with Christ and our Church life becomes shortened and sporadic. *Criterium crucis*, as well as *criterium ecclesiæ*, becomes obscure for us. However, the Cross and the Life of Grace in the Church act in the world uninterruptedly transforming its nature.

The possibility of variety in the manifestations of the Holy Spirit arises from its freedom. " Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty." Law does exist for the sanctifying spirit. All the energy of the struggle of Paul the Apostle against law is completely understandable in the Church which is filled with the thunderous revelations of the Spirit. " Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." He speaks with tongues, He speaks by prophecies ; tempestuously, and sometimes darkly. The Apostles desire to define the gifts of the Holy Spirit systematically. " For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom ; and to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit ; to another faith, in the same Spirit ; and to another gifts of healing in the one Spirit ; and to another workings of miracles ; and to another prophecy ; and to another discernings of spirits ; to another divers kinds of tongues ; and to another the interpretation of tongues." But teaching is more valuable than speaking the tongues. Proceeding along this road scholastic theology develops the doctrine of the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit already mentioned by the Prophet Isaiah. " The Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Might, the Spirit of Knowledge and of the fear of the Lord." Here is a distinct tendency to moderate and rationalize the manifestations of the Holy Spirit ; there are neither prophecies of tongues, nor mystical union with God if they are not carefully hidden in the " Spirit of Power " and " the Spirit of the Lord." In the Ancient Church the manifestations of the Holy Spirit are tempestuous and fiery. And not only in the Apostolic Age, but in all ages of the Church pressing towards the coming revelation of the Kingdom, the ancient prophecy is alive. " And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh : and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams."

The cessation of powerful personal charismata is in a certain measure balanced by the developing of the complicated economy of grace imparted through the Sacraments. Here the gifts of the Holy Spirit are offered to everyone including the sinful. Here, in penitence and prayer, is worked out the purifying of the heart for the receiving of these gifts. But already the heroes of the spiritual life are going to the wilderness to " acquire " the Holy Spirit by a painful struggle. Their terrible asceticism in the religious sense is the crucifying of body and soul. And through the Cross the terrible and wonderful

gifts of the Holy Spirit are given to them. Asceticism, that is, self-crucifixion, is the unfailing way to the pure heights of Christian mysticism. False mysticism and false spirituality are nearly always connected with the need of ascetic purification. But asceticism is essentially crucifixion and not the keeping of the law. Law has no dominion over the spirit, it is judged not by law but by the Cross.

Let us adapt the *criterium crucis* to the peripheral spheres of culture. One cannot judge the revelation of the artist, thinker, or poet by the law of the moral and social norm. Everything creatively new, everything prophetic, breaks the norm : different and higher norms will grow up from the new revelations. But every departure from the norm is not spiritual. The criterion of the Cross demands that the passions must be crucified on it. " The Hosanna of life " and its eternal source, and the last " yes " to the world carries in it every great art and every wise revelation about life. But it is so easy to approve evil ; pantheistically to dissolve God in the world, and human personality in passions. Here it is indispensable to ask oneself, is the artist or creator wounded by the evil of the world, its sinfulness, its suffering ? Does he see death and corruption face to face ? Is he crucified together with Christ in the person of the smallest of His brethren and the lowest of the earthly creatures ? If " yes," if his " Hosanna " rises through terror and compassion, his vision of the world will be Christian, his muse—of the Holy Spirit. From that point of view, not Dante but Reiner Maria Rilke becomes the greatest amongst the Christian poets.

Criterium ecclesiæ is adapted in judging culture in a much more limited sense. And this for two reasons. First, the circle of Christian inspiration is always larger, if not larger than the mystical church, yet larger than church institutions. In our epoch of secularization the most significant and creative work is done beyond the limits of the church. It is not seldom done by enemies of the Church and Christendom. As all our Culture and life have grown from Christian mediæval origins, and remaining faithful to the Church continue to nourish themselves at her sources, that is why her grace is partaken of in different measure by her rebellious sons also. A modern man often does not guess from where the breath of the Holy Spirit comes to him, refreshing him and reviving him in the wilderness. Admitting the action of the Holy Spirit in paganism, one cannot determine limits for Him in the half-pagan, half-Christian world in which we live.

Secondly, the *criterium ecclesiæ* in its direct approach to the phenomena of culture can easily degenerate into *criterium canonis* The ecclesiastical consciousness in conflict with the false spiritualism and the natural life of the world, likes to enclose itself within the walls of law. Even saints and mystics have often become victims of the

legalistic spirit of some members of the Church. The creation of new forms, inevitably bound up with the overstepping of the law, meets with opposition from the conservatism of the upholders of the law. That is why in practice the *criterium ecclesiæ* in the life of culture threatens to become a struggle against the spirit. However, it keeps its significance if we attribute to the Church its true and mystical significance ; not a society of church members, but the living Body of Christ. Through the experience of sacrament, prayer and spiritual life are offered the gifts of the discerning of spirits, and even forces for direct cultural work. On the other hand, perpetual secularization renders very difficult this mystical-cultural infiltration. Not only do men of culture not understand saints but saints also do not understand culture.

Let us take a mental journey through the centuries to the world of unspoiled religion when one could seriously (though always with limitation) speak of the unity of Christian culture : in the Middle Ages, in the Ancient Byzantine Empire, and in Ancient Russia. Their culture was created directly from the source of the grace-bearing life of the Church. Philosophy expresses in its conceptions the experiences of mystics, poets make prayers, painters through their ikons and statues depict their vision of the heavenly world. Here the free creative breath of the Holy Spirit comes from the centre of the life of the Church, from the altar, and from the victim of Golgotha eternally offered on it. *Crux* and *ecclesia* are the same. However, in those times, also, the secular world remained not foreign to Christ but distant from Him, hoping for its own future consecration. It had to undergo the creative transfiguration. Its sufferings and its beauty inspire the Christian poet. As in paganism the Christian poet sings about feminine beauty and the high deeds of heroes. However, his sight being quickened, he sees something else beyond the beauty and force of the world ; the image of the crucified Christ. And insofar as he realizes Him he brings His own experience into the elements of the world : he creates Parsifal. But insofar as his Christianity remains external and unrealized he creates works of pagan inspiration, " the Song of Roland." The world of culture is always the world of internal oppositions. It is only little by little that the Crucifix penetrates the consciousness of the world. The Christian katharsis of inspiration is seldom complete. But at every stage of inspiration it is always inspired by Spirit and Fire.

From what has already been said one can establish the following stages of the divine inspiration of human creative work. At the apex is the immediate " acquiring of the Holy Spirit." Here the work of humanity is directed towards the Holy Spirit Himself, and the material receiving His impression is the human spirit. This process is beyond culture, if one does not count the ascetic purification of personality as culture. It is the work of the saints. The next

stage is creative inspiration in the life of the Church : here creation is directed towards the human-divine world of revelation and holiness. It is objectified not in the human spirit but in the realm of things : in forms, in colour, sound, ideas and words. This creative spirit is not incompatible with personal sinfulness : but it presupposes the partaking of the church life and its purifying process. The creative process is sacred, though not necessarily the creative agent. Descending lower, we come to Christian creative work which is directed towards the world and the human soul. It is always complicated and mixed, pure and sinful, not sacred, but consecrated from without. At every moment it has the possibility of a fall, of falsification and disfigurement. Is it necessary to add once more that this possibility is not excluded in the higher stages of creation also ? Still lower down and we enter the secularized work, divorced from the Church, which is distinguished from Christian work by the absence of any recognized criterion. And it can be both sinful and pure, both ruinous and creative of life—often both at the same time, in the same work. It, too, must be judged by the Cross. And finally, there is the work of pagans, not knowing but not betraying Christ, yet partaking of divine inspiration. It is difficult to say whether it is on the lowest step, or whether it is higher and more innocent, more holy than the sinful inspiration of an apostate Christian world. It is true that paganism never fell so low in its inspiration as our soulless and godless age. However, in the uttermost depths of the Fall, in the abominations of Sodom, the renegades are wounded by the Cross, which wound sinners cannot escape. Out of the deep the road which passes by Golgotha is opened up. Along the road from Sodom to Golgotha passes pre-eminently the modern godless soul unable to wash from itself the mark of forgotten baptism.

Nowhere at any single stage of human working is it abandoned by the Holy Spirit. " If I make my bed in Sheol, behold Thou art there." But that does not mean that there are no qualitative distinctions amongst the gifts of the Holy Spirit or that Macarius of Egypt is in the same sense (only in greater measure) participant in the Holy Ghost as Anacreon. These distinctions are deep and are often felt as pitfalls. One of them lies between holiness reached in personal spiritual life and the consecration of culture : between the saint and the artist. Another, less evident, between Christian and non-Christian work, understanding by it the personal participation of the author in the grace-bearing life of the Church. The possibility of impersonal and unconscious participation in the sacrificial experiences (*criterium crucis*) makes this second qualitative distinction difficult of comprehension in practice. But it keeps its religious significance in the destinies of the creative personality itself.

The qualitative distinction of the gifts of the Holy Spirit make

antagonisms possible in the world of values created by them: for instance, the ascetic denial of culture and the struggle between separate religious and cultural spheres. This struggle can be justified in life on the road to perfection. But Christian thoughts must strive to surmount contradictions. Not to deny, but to gather together the divine wealth scattered about the world. To build the Temple of the Church upon a true universal foundation, capable of holding all the spiritual creative work of Man. Man's inspiration must be judged, sifted and separated by the Cross and sacrificial experience. But in this, one must not forget the fundamental independence of law of the manifestations of the Spirit. It is terrible to follow deceptive calls and to give oneself up into the captivity of the demons and of nature. It is still more terrible to quench the Spirit. Many things must be left to the last, non-human Judgment, only then will be made plain to us the incomprehensible image of the Holy Spirit which even in the New Covenant is manifested in impersonal symbols: Wind, Fire and Dove.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN NATURE, HUMAN LIFE AND CULTURE.

By Canon Spencer Ellis.

WE have already dealt with the experience of the Holy Spirit in the Church—in those specific activities which are manifested in the corporate life of the Christian Ecclesia. With all this as a background, we turn to the consideration of our belief in His activities in the sphere of nature and human nature. As an English Churchman I must try to outline such a belief—as is definitely grounded in the Sacred Scriptures as interpreted by the "ancient authors" as distinct from "the Schoolmen"—and acceptable by human reason, enlightened by "such studies as help to the knowledge of the same." Thus, as I see it, there are four points in time, at which we must test our interpretation of our belief in the relation between the Spirit and Nature: the Scriptures, the Fathers, the 16th century, and to-day.

"I believe in one God—maker of heaven and *earth*, and of all things visible and invisible—and in one Lord, Jesus Christ—by whom all things were made—and I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver."

But it is desperately difficult to do so especially, perhaps, if you live in the slums of a Northern Industrial Town, and among people whose lot in life is a daily challenge to any belief at all in a good God. Here one is up against nature and human nature in its crudest form:—How does "nature" appear to common man who is a town-dweller? This is really important, in view of the fact that so vast a proportion of our population lives in towns—and an even greater proportion must win its daily bread by the sweat of its face—if so fortunate as to have a job to do. Those whom I have known best, perhaps, are not the most fortunately-placed for seeing the whole truth about nature—yet unless this first article of the Christian Creed can be preached to them with saving power, the Christian Creed is not Catholic. The coalminer may attach an unusual and very limited meaning to the "invisible" aspect of creation yet his experience of "nature" is as valid as any man's and to live in a mining community is to share an atmosphere of daily and hourly fear. The life of a pit village is quite truly overshadowed by a cloud of fear. It dogs the footsteps of man and woman almost from cradle to grave. Experience drives it home, that however careful man may be this life which aims at wresting from the earth the coal which is the life-blood of

our modern industrialism is a mortal combat with the forces of nature.

By way of contrast visualize the life of the sailor of to-day. Is the Psalmist quite right when he cries, "These men see the goodness of the Lord; and His wonders in the great deep"? In spite of all advances in ship-building, and of the protection given by wireless telegraphy and other devices, I venture to doubt whether the impression that his experience of nature makes on the average sailor, is that it is the handiwork of one who is revealed as a Father. Some years ago the Titanic struck an iceberg in the mouth of the St. Lawrence and sank. He would be a strange man who should go to the crowd of relatives of those on board which thronged the offices of the White Star Line awaiting the names of the saved—and speak of One who is the maker of all things—including ice and fog.

Or, again, think of the farmer. He, of all men I suppose, might be considered to be the one who sees nature at her best in his daily work. To him, does nature give certain sign of a holy, good and life-giving Spirit indwelling it? I wonder! What I am sure of is that I have more often heard the praise of nature sung by those whose acquaintance with the land is very slight and casual, than by sons of the soil. As a class farmers are, proverbially, grumblers.

But to turn from nature to human nature. What kind of impression is conveyed to the mind of the ordinary man by his experience of human nature? Is the society of which he is a member indwelt and directed by a spirit who is recognizably good?

"Life to-day," I quote from Mr. Lippmann's preface to *Morals*, "is not a social order at all, as Greek city states or the feudal society was a social order. It is rather a field for careers, an arena of talent, an ordeal by trial and error and a risky speculation. No man has an established position in the modern world."

A century of unrestricted competition has resulted in a social order which is a flat denial of all spiritual values. Man, so far from being master of his fate, is a cog in a machine which he can neither understand nor control.

In business he is merely a unit, a "hand" and not a "soul," and his tenure of the means of livelihood, whether he be director or office cleaner, is almost equally dependent upon impersonal forces before which he must either bend—or find himself among the multitude of unwanted men for whom there is no room in the business world. The average man, I suspect, if he is clear-sighted recognizes Mammon as the real god of the world; if he cannot be a pure materialist, then he will put a mascot on the bonnet of his motor-car, or in his button-hole, and invoke the god whose name is "Good Luck."

Gilbert Murray, in "Five Stages of Greek Religion," says, "It

is worth remembering that the best seed ground for superstition is a society in which the fortunes of men seem to bear practically no relation to their merits and efforts." That is our state, and we are reaping a plentiful harvest.

It is with this kind of a background that we in England have to try to present the Christian tradition—and we have to remind ourselves frequently that it is by an act of faith—not of intellect or mind—that we appropriate the Christian Faith—and that our task in making men see the Father as Creator is not more difficult than was that of the Apostles, who proclaimed the shameful death of a Galilean peasant as the most significant act of the Living God. When we come to the consideration of our Lord's recorded teaching on the subject of nature—it seems to be of the very first importance to clear our minds with regard to a great deal of rather one-sided loose thinking and writing which is very common to-day. The sort of writing which I suspect can be illustrated from a paragraph on p. 387 of the recently-published book by Dr. Charles Raven—*Jesus and the Gospel of Love*. He says, "Jesus accepted the world as His Father's and appealed to the awful impartiality of sunshine and rain as proof of the Father's perfect love. This is no casual utterance. Throughout His teaching He is far more fond of flowers and birds, of the growth of green things, of children and the simple works of men, than of angels and demons, and all the paraphernalia of ecclesiastics. If the Marcan account is correct, at the first crisis of His ministry when all Galilee was agog with excitement to discover the policy and proposals of the new prophet. He bewildered His disciples, and probably disappointed His audience, by telling a simple story of the sowing of a field. . . . The hackneyed words expressed His open vision. His poetry . . . was full of the beauty and goodness of the world."

But suppose it wasn't just a simple story of the sowing of a field! Suppose that the concluding words of the story, "Who hath ears to hear let him hear"—really are of the utmost significance, and that Christ, like every true educationalist, realises that knowledge can not be poured into a mind, like water into a bowl, but must be assimilated, like food into the system. Suppose further that He had come to a people already prepared by prophet, psalmist and lawgiver—and that the purpose of His coming was that they might have Life—and life *is* the knowledge of God. If all this be true, then surely the whole point of "this simple story" is the identification of Jesus with the Living God, who in the O.T. is the heavenly sower.

Even if the story is to be treated just as a simple story of the sowing of a field, Dr. Raven and his fellows are in no better case —for the plain teaching of the story is, not that nature is good and beautiful, but that it is wantonly destructive of 3/4 of the good seed which is sown in it!

Or again, take the *locus classicus* of our nature-loving poets. "Jesus saw more beauty in the lily than in all the services of the Temple." Maybe He did. But there are no grounds in the record of His sayings which justify the statement. He certainly used the lily to illustrate a point—but the point had absolutely no reference to the beauty of the lily *per se*. The point was the absurdity of anxiety in the minds of those who believe in a Heavenly Father, whose care is so all-embracing that it clothes even the grass of the field which to-day is—and to-morrow is cast into the oven.

In the same context Jesus illustrates the same point of the absurdity of anxiety, by the impossibility of our adding one cubit to our stature. On an exactly parallel line of exegesis to that which presses the reference to the lily into an argument for the love of flowers, one could arrive at the solemn conclusion that His audience was composed of men and women short in stature—for none else would desire to be taller. If this argument is idiotic—so also, and for the same reason, is the other.

Surely the truth is, that Jesus came to give a revelation of the Father, and thereby to redeem the world at the point of its ultimate need and destitution : and it is as fond and foolish a thing to seek in the record of His teaching for irrelevant knowledge about His attitude to birds and lilies as to interpret His reference to sunrise and sunset as a revelation in the realm of astronomy.

But to reject a method of exegesis which appears to project into our Lord's teaching the predilections of our own minds, lays upon us the more laborious task of trying to elucidate his teaching on "the Spirit and nature and human nature" from His recorded sayings.

It would seem that the best starting point for this consideration is the account of The Temptation in the Wilderness—for which we are indebted to the common source of Matthew and Luke. The ultimate authority for the account must have been our Lord Himself—for no eye witness shared that long retreat in which He laid the plans of His public ministry. The significant temptation is that which Matthew gives as the third and Luke as second.

It would seem that our Lord contemplated all the excellence that is to be found in human society as it organizes itself in the world. Never for a moment does He seek to minimize its worth. Apart from the conscious recognition of God man has done great things. In the ancient civilizations there was a vast amount that stirs the heart and fires the imagination by its exhibition of true greatness. The philosophy of Greece, and the ordered government of Rome, may represent an unconscious human endeavour to prepare a road by which the King of Glory should visit His people. The human virtues, justice and fortitude, love of home and children, strife for truth in word and action, self-

denial and high endeavour after lofty ends; these He sees in the world around Him—and the suggestion comes, can He not take the world at its best, and by this momentary condescension, seize hold of the glory that is in the world and by gradual education lift it to the heights? He answers, "No." He looks right into the heart of all the world's greatness—a greatness which itself is due to the presence and power of the Spirit of God—and declares that on this He cannot build his Kingdom. The whole foundation must be changed and altered. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God; and Him only shalt thou serve." This cannot mean less than a complete alteration of motive and purpose in the life of society, and in its constituent members. It is a proclamation that law, order and justice are not embryos from which spring love, reverence and purity, but are man's poverty-stricken copies of God's primal laws; that what the world needs is not just a teacher who shall make it a little wiser, nor a reformer who shall make it a little better, but a redeemer who shall fashion it anew in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. I suggest that here—in this parable of Temptation—we have the key to all our Lord's teaching with regard to human nature. On the one hand there is the recognition of all the goodness and splendour, which are the result of the Spirit's action on the life of man; on the other hand the jealousy of perfect Love who cannot be content with less than a perfection "even as your Father in Heaven is perfect" and wills to re-create man in the image of God.

The aged Rabbi Nicodemus, who comes by night to see Him, may perhaps represent the earnest seeker after truth, who yet could not be reckoned among the disciples. Clearly our Lord recognizes his moral earnestness, his lifetime's devotion to the Law. Yet His insistence is overwhelming on the necessity even for him, the teacher of Israel, of a new birth into the life which comes through a "lifting up" of the Son of Man.

Zebedee's wife is the revelation of a mother's love which craves the best for her two sons. She represents something which is perhaps as beautiful as anything the world can show—the self-forgetting, and self-effacing devotion, which, in its natural symbol, the pelican, early Christian Art did not shrink from using as a type of Christ himself; she makes her request, and the heart of Jesus yearns to grant it; but the condition must be that mother-love itself must share His baptism, and drink deep of His chalice. Even the home itself must be re-created by redeeming love, "Woman, behold thy son," "Behold thy mother."

It seems to be universally true that as each case of human virtue comes to Jesus—whether young and adventurous, or old and burdened—He sees in it something which he can admire, some result of the Spirit's working, but never that which is sufficient

in itself on which to build; human nature always and ever is in need of nothing less than re-creation. In a word, He finds that to which he can appeal, but nothing upon which he can build for eternity.

When we turn to our Lord's teaching with regard to this material universe, it is difficult to avoid a negative form of speech. When He came on earth there were, roughly speaking, in the heathen world two interpretations of the relation between spirit and matter. The East was steeped in dualism, the West in crude materialism. Both had gained some slight entrance into contemporary Jewish thought. There is nothing in Christ's teaching which gives the slightest countenance to either. He views nature as sacramental, i.e., as being capable of being used as the vehicle of spirit. This is seen not only in the Incarnation itself, but in His use of matter in His "signs." Clay anointing the eyes of the blind, the touch of the hem of His garment were made the vehicles of healing. On the other hand, it is at least arguable that He realizes that matter may also be used by the Evil Spirit as his instrument. His acts of restoration to health of mind or body are a warfare in the flesh against physical ills in a sense which it is hard to think of as only figurative. Unless we are prepared to accept a literary criticism of the N.T. based largely on our own mental outlook, the gospels record a mastery over nature which can only be called miraculous, "Even the winds and the sea obey Him." Or to bring the whole matter to a point. The characteristic teaching of Christ, that puzzled the disciples and perplexed the multitude, is the ἀναστασις νεκρών—which in its plain grammatical meaning is nothing less than "a resurrection of *corpses*." It is quite true that νεκρός is sometimes used in the N.T. in the figurative sense—"my son was dead and is alive"—"let the dead bury their dead"—but its original meaning (e.g. Mark, ch. 9, v. 9) of a living again of corpses is never completely lost sight of: and the two meanings find their synthesis in the Resurrection of Jesus.

Dare we say that in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus we find the revelation of the truth concerning the spirit and human nature and nature? That in history we see what is the will of the Spirit?

Here the Spirit had a perfect instrument for His revelation, in the perfect human nature, which, spotless and without any taint of sin, Christ took of His Virgin Mother—and at every moment of life He exhibited in an ordinary human society the will of the Spirit. And under such conditions this holy will led human nature along the way of sorrows to Calvary—and thence to an open tomb from which this nature rose *in a new form*. No longer subject to the laws of nature, it is manifested as the perfect instrument, perfectly expressing every movement of the spirit.

Further, at the supreme moment which Jesus chose to give expression to the significance of His death—He took the elements of the natural world, bread and wine, and associated them with Himself in the act of redemption—consecrating them to the purpose for which they were created, which was to be a means for the manifestation of God's glory.

I suggest that our Lord's teaching can be briefly summarized as follows:—

The only principle of evil is an evil will, i.e., a will in rebellion against the will of God. All men are tainted with this to a greater or lesser degree, but in so far as they will co-operate with Him, the Spirit will manifest Himself in them, at the varying levels of their moral earnestness. Nature itself is capable of manifesting God's glory, but like everything sacramental, it may be used unworthily, and so may manifest not the Spirit of God, but of evil. Through the Cross Christ makes the way by which the work of the Spirit both in nature and human nature may be perfected.

Alone among the writers of the N.T., St. Paul deals with this subject particularly in his Epistle to the Romans. His standpoint is in agreement with the above interpretation of Christ's teaching. If his description of the heathen world in the 1st chapter seems to be one of unrelieved gloom, it is because those of whom he writes have denied and frustrated the striving of the Spirit with them; they have refused the light that was offered; they have wilfully shut their eyes to the truths which natural religion would have revealed through the ordering of nature; they have changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man. On the other hand St. Paul teaches that in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, those who are without the covenant but who lived uprightly will be in better care than the circumcised hearer of the Law whose works belie his profession. Yet both, Jew and Gentile, are all under sin, and need "the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God set forth to be a propitiation through His blood."

Though there may be much that is obscure in the passage in the 8th chapter (18-25), it clearly indicates St. Paul's belief that "creation" lies within the love of God; and that the eternal purpose to sum up all things in Christ is not fulfilled until earth as well as heaven is filled with His glory. The sufferings of this present time unite the whole creation which is groaning and travailing in pain with the redeemed, who groan within themselves, waiting for their adoption, and the pain is interpreted by the Spirit Himself who makes intercession with groanings too deep for words. But the creation is subjected to corruption and futility by a power outside itself, and its release is dependent upon the revealing of the Sons of God, who have the first fruits of the Spirit. This

revealing of the Sons of God, their adoption, is the redemption of their *body*, and when it is accomplished creation itself shall be delivered from corruption into the liberty of the glory of the Sons of God.

The meaning of St. Paul's words here and elsewhere echoes the words of Jesus—No created thing is evil in itself. "All things are lawful unto me." But evil lies in the will alienated from the Holy Will of God. In Christ all are redeemed to God—and as in creation God calls man to be a fellow worker with Himself, so too, in Redemption, man, by becoming confirmed to Christ's sufferings, shares in the task of restoring all things.

In the briefest possible manner let us try to trace the outline of the history of this Christian doctrine from St. Paul's days until to-day.

In the first centuries the Church had to proclaim its faith in opposition to gnosticism, which declared matter to be essentially evil, and regarded the Supreme God as distinct from the Creator. I suggest that we see in her Eucharistic worship the Church's most compelling witness. In every early Liturgy, the Church declared her belief. After the prayers of the faithful comes the offertory the presentation of bread, wine and water. The Sursum Corda leads on to the great Eucharistic prayer, which starts with a Commemoration of God's Eternal Being and Work in Creation, which leads to the triumphal Hymn of Sanctus. Thus week by week the faithful are reminded of the *goodness* of creation, but in such a way that their thought leads on immediately to the redemption wrought by Christ, and thence to the Spirit's work in sanctifying the creatures of Bread and Wine—the first fruits of creation (and the body of the Church). Here is the whole cycle of thought that we have discovered in the N.T. In her *lex orandi* the Church declares her *lex credendi,* not only in word but in action; not only to the mind, but in the daily experience of the ordinary man.

Somewhere about the middle of the 4th century the Roman "Canon" of the Mass—in something like its present form—became the sole form of Eucharistic prayer at Rome—and generally throughout the West. From our point of view the significant fact about it is that all real reference to God's work as Creator is omitted. Henceforth in the West in the Church's supreme act of worship, Creation and Redemption are no longer held together—and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the creatures of earth is so altered that it is hardly recognizably the same in intention, as in the earlier liturgies.

Weakened in its witness by this change in its form of worship the Church had to combat Pelagianism; which denied the essential necessity for the redemption of human nature, and in fact asserted man's practical independence of God. Gratitude to St. Augustine

for the overthrow of this menace to true religion cannot blind our eyes to the fact that his great authority has infected the Church with a conception of human nature, which, to say the least of it, is sub-Christian. In reaction from the errors of Pelagianism he tends to deny the possibility of any purely natural goodness; free will in man is so circumscribed that it is almost meaningless; the "fall," to him, represents a total ruin of creation, of human nature, and, by implication, of nature. It seems impossible to deny that Augustine's was the most predominant influence in the thought of the Western Church from his own day, until, at any rate, the period of the Reformation. Of course, there were splendid protests. The love of nature, and human nature, could never be more joyously expressed than it was by S. Francis of Assisi, and he was by no means alone.

In fact the Scotist theology was largely a protest against an Augustinianism as interpreted by Thomas Aquinas—from the point of view of its poor estimate of human nature.

The witness of the English Reformation may be gathered round two points. First, the alterations made in the Canon of the Mass. No return was made to the custom of the primitive liturgies in making thanksgiving for Creation—and even the "*Supplices Te,*" which is sometimes regarded as the alternative to the Invocation of the Spirit upon the bread and wine, is omitted. I believe it to be true that the omission was due to quite other considerations than those with which we are now concerned—but the fact remains. In the whole of our official Prayer Book the thought of Creation is singularly obscured. The only reference occurs in the General Thanksgiving, which was accepted by Convocation at the Restoration, and was the work of Bishop Reynolds. In this we thank God for Creation and all the blessings of this life—as distinct from the blessings of redemption and sanctification. The other point for examination lies in the 39 Articles. At first sight it seems as though they come heavily on the side of Augustine—and assert that the works of the natural man have the nature of sin. Further consideration relieves one of this intolerable situation.

For the Articles in question are dealing with that portion of mankind only. who are consciously either accepting or rejecting the Gospel of Christ and have no reference to heathens as such. The Articles do not assert that man "is of his own nature inclined only to evil," but only that man is "very far gone from original righteousness." The Articles leave room for the recognition of the exhibitions of natural goodness of which the world is full.

When we come to the life of to-day, we must touch on a number of distinct details.

1. When our Convocations in 1927 and 1928 revised the Prayer Book, they suggested the supplementing of our present Canon of

the Mass by the introduction of an Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the Bread and Wine. So would our Liturgy have been brought into line with those of our sister Churches in Scotland and South Africa; and it would have been a daily reminder of the return of nature to its obedience to its Creator through the Sacrifice of Christ, and the prayer and labour of his Church. In this popular religion seems to be in advance of its official expression. The almost universal "Harvest Thanksgiving," may be despised by the superior, but it is certainly loved by the common folk. It gives an outlet to the conviction that nature has its good things—and that all good things around us are the creation of God which we must receive with thanksgiving. It is surely a grand opportunity to press home the truth, that even these good things need for their perfecting, redemption and sanctification. But the most significant fact about our day is the result of the revolution in thought which may be said to have commenced some 80 years ago with the appearance of the Origin of Species. It can hardly be doubted that no period in the world's history has witnessed so vast a change in habits of thought, as has the last century. The change from a static to a dynamic view of life has revolutionized practically every department of human thought. The difference is nowhere more apparent than in our conception of nature. The patient investigation of scientists has enlarged the horizon of our knowledge beyond all calculation. We realize to-day that creation must be regarded not as a static fact of the past, but a process which is unfolding itself before our very eyes. The knowledge of the history of the past enables us to make some forecast of its future development. If experience has wrecked the belief of the last generation in an automatic progress, hope still paints a fascinating picture of what may be in store for us when man has learnt more completely how to harness the forces of nature to the supply of his needs. But two dangerous tendencies emerge. On the one hand, there are not a few who find in the goodness and progress of nature a satisfying substitute for God. Conscious of the power that knowledge gives, and encouraged by the hope of the future, it seems that man is self-sufficient. He has no need of God or for redemption.

On the other hand, it is impossible not to recognize a tendency among some who name the Name of Christ and who find in their knowledge of the natural world a real revelation of the love and purpose of God—a tendency to identify God with his creation, in such sense that God is a meaningless word apart from the created universe.

The spread of an elementary knowledge of scientific truth among the multitude has created an atmosphere—in which the seed, sown by the experience of the cruelty of modern conditions, produces a

harvest of difficulties for the Christian Teacher. Wisdom seems to dictate that we should do our best to make it clear, that modern science has not touched—and cannot touch—the religious problem. Science tells us nothing about the purpose of creation—it can only speak about its methods. It leaves completely unsolved the greatest riddle of all—*why*, if God is good, does he create by this method which science discloses—a method of suffering, sorrow and tears? The Church has her answer. She tells us that behind all the observed facts, lies the mystery of sin—the rebellion against the Holy Will of God—and suggests that we can only think of creation aright when we do not separate it from the thought of redemption and sanctification.

In a group the day before yesterday somebody used the symbol of incense as the sign of sacrifice. May it not be that the function of the Church is to be the censer into which the Holy Spirit gathers all that is good in nature and human nature, that, kindled at the flame of redeeming love, the world itself goes up as a sacrifice to the Eternal Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier?

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN WORSHIP

By Fr. SERGIUS BULGAKOV.

THE Old Testament did not discriminate very clearly between the Spirit of God and the Holy Spirit. It recognized varied gifts of the Spirit bestowed on certain persons according to their vocation or special service: for the art of workmanship in the decoration of the Tabernacle (Exod. 31), for a skilful governing of the people (Num. 11), for success in battle, for kingship, especially in the consecration of Aaron and his sons for the priesthood, and finally for prophesy. The effusion (pouring out) of the Holy Spirit was generally a very concrete almost visible act; this is true also of the Primitive Church. The Spirit was given in the Old Testament only to chosen people in exceptional cases. In a prophetic vision Joel was promised that the Holy Spirit should be poured out on all flesh and this prophesy was fulfilled at Pentecost (as is shown by Peter's speech). The gift of the Holy Spirit is bestowed on every Christian in the Sacrament of Chrismation when the soul receives a special gift and is sealed by Him. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." The entire Church as well as each one of its members, is sanctified by the Holy Spirit—"they shall prophesy." But this common inspiration no longer has a visible concreteness in the life of the Church. In addition to this direct and mysterious inspiration there exists in the Church a continuous flow of institutional life. The Church is the treasury of Grace which is regularly distributed to its individual members as well as to the entire community, and this is the work of the Holy Spirit in worship and sacraments.

The Holy Spirit pours out new life into the Church, infuses it with a power, which is mysteriously full of Grace. This power can be only felt spiritually but in itself it is no less real and undoubtable than the impressions of our everyday life. It can and must be even more efficacious. This mysterious, heavenly reality in the first instance applies to time, which contains the rays of eternity and is embraced by it. Our time is full of different events and impressions of this life, but in addition to this it has another fullness of a spiritual, church kind. *There exist holy times and seasons* in the Church, which occupy their place in the Ecclesiastical Year. The reality and holiness of these seasons are likewise the work of the Holy Spirit. They are the principal Feastdays—Christmas, Easter and so on. These feasts are not merely commemorations of different events in the earthly life of Our Saviour, they become real

and actually present for us. We become witnesses of these events, similar to His contemporaries who beheld them with their bodily eyes. This mysterious reality of the holy life of Our Saviour in the holy seasons becomes self-evident for us during these most solemn moments of the Church Year, such as Christmas, Easter or Pentecost. The presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church is then felt in our own hearts, and our souls are filled with joy and exultation of a particular character, according to the particular feast commemorated. I should like to remind you here only of the mystery of Passion Week, with its real symphony of varied and changing sentiments which run as a mystical torrent, until the piercing sorrow of the Passion is suddenly transfigured into the heavenly triumph of the Easter night. And not only these exceptional days, but every day of the week or of the month in the ecclesiastical year is dedicated to one or another event, or to a saint or patron. This significance is realized in the day's worship. Because of this the Church lives in two worlds and as it were in two "times" simultaneously, and the reality of this other holy time through the Holy Spirit reveals to us the presence of Jesus Christ in our lives. This feeling gives us a link with *the times of the Incarnation*. It immerses us in the mystery of Redemption which belongs to eternity and to our own time as well.

The work of the Holy Spirit provides us not only with holy times and seasons, but with holy places. God is omnipresent, "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit, or whither I flee from Thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold Thou are there" (Ps. 139: 7-8). One cannot understand this omnipresence to mean that God occupies every place *(ubiquitas)* and then in this sense actually belongs to the place itself. No, He is beyond any limitation in space. He cannot be tied down to any place, for all space is transparent to Him. "Will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee" (I Kings, 8:27). But man has to dwell in a certain place, and for his sake God provides a particular place for meeting Him. Through His condescension to man God is present in a holy place, which is His *temple*, in a special sense. As we put it in human language—He lives there. But such a place must be set apart from other places and dedicated to God, and this dedication is the work of the Holy Spirit. Such a temple no longer belongs to the sinful earth, it is, as it were, transfigured by Him. The Orthodox Church has a very solemn and impressive rite for the dedication of a temple. It resembles the Baptism and Chrismation of a man. Such a place becomes full of Grace to serve for common prayer and the celebration of sacraments. In a similar way certain objects are especially sanctified by the Holy Spirit for a certain sacred use.

They are taken out of the world and especially consecrated for the needs of divine service and the sacraments. It is obvious to our feelings that a layman or even a priest should not approach a holy place or touch sanctified objects—especially those for sacramental use—without being in a sense isolated from the world by his vestments. This isolation is mainly achieved through a special consecration of the various implements used in Divine worship. Special blessings are asked for various other everyday objects; this symbolism implies that not only holy places and objects need sanctification for purpose of ritual, but that the whole of life needs and awaits sanctification. In the Apocalypse we read of the new heavenly Jerusalem descending from heaven: "I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it" (Ap. 21:22). We are seeking for the whole of our life to be sanctified by the work of the Holy Spirit. This our desire for and our presentiment of the future transfiguration of the whole of our life and of all nature is symbolized by and has actually been begun by the Holy Spirit, Who moved upon the face of the waters already at creation. The same significance is attached to the blessing of different kinds of food (eggs and cheese at Easter, fruit and grapes on the Day of Transfiguration, palms on Palm Sunday, branches of trees and flowers at Pentecost) and particularly of the blessing of the waters at Epiphany with an invocation to the Holy Spirit, "come down now, also, through the descent of the Holy Spirit and sanctify this water!", and a prayer, "that these waters may become sanctified by the power and effectual operation and descent of the Holy Ghost." This consecration of water at Epiphany forms the basis for the sanctification of all objects, because generally these are sanctified by sprinkling with holy water. In a word one can say that the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit applies to all the elements and things of this visible world, to everything that has any connection with human life.

There exists yet another kind of consecration of objects, which is of pre-eminent importance in the life of the Church. I refer to the consecration of ikons, which cover the wall separating the main body of the Church from the altar—the so-called ikonostas (image screen) and the actual walls of the Orthodox Church. The ikons, at their best, are works of religious art. As such they are results of the artist's inspiration. The actual creative power revealed in them by the artist is not to be comprehended as directly God-inspired. Nevertheless all true art, as a revelation of beauty, belongs to the actual domain of the activity of the Holy Spirit. But in ikons we see something much more than only art, because the consecration of an ikon bestows on it a supernatural Grace. The significance of our veneration of ikons lies in the fact that they

are not only images of Christ, or the Blessed Virgin or of the saints, not only works of art, but that they are actually places of a gracious Presence of those represented on them. We meet them in a certain way when we pray before the ikons. The canon dealing with the veneration of ikons, according to the definitions of the VIIth Œcumenical Council, deals not only with the permission for making them and exposing them in churches, but also institutes a kind of worship before them. This veneration of course cannot be compared with the worship and veneration of God (*or of His saints*). It is only relative—σχετικη—it is a rendering of honour τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις. The ikon is neither an idol nor God, it is only a place of the presence of God for the receiving of prayers by Him (only in and this *special* sense it *is* God).

The ikon can be compared to a sacrament of prayer, if we draw an analogy with the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Lord. It is, of course, merely an analogy and not an identification. But the ikon is not only an image, it is a kind of Divine Reality as well. The Divine presence for the sake of receiving prayer is not secured as a result of creative activity of art, it is the direct work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification of the ikon. This power in the ikon is even quite independent of its actual artistic significance and worth; the ikon in question may even be a bad picture, but after consecration it becomes sacred. The ikon is blessed by sprinkling of holy water with the words of the priest: "this ikon is sanctified by this sprinkling of the Grace of the Holy Spirit in the Name of the Holy Trinity." One may also add that if we regard the holy altar as a kind of sanctuary in the temple, the holy ikons can be regarded in the same way. The church is a holy place for the presence of God, for the offering up prayer to Him, and the holy ikons, too, are particular places for such a presence of God. The difference between them is that the church is immobile, whereas the ikons can be moved and transferred from place to place. They are found present in every house, and the corner of the room where they are placed is called the holy corner. The presence of the ikons turns every house into a domestic church.

Not ikons alone, as works of art, are sealed with artistic inspiration, other things in the church, its architecture, its decoration, its ornaments and pictures, etc., belong to sacred art. The Temple of God must be arrayed in beauty, it is like the ointment which was poured on the feet of Christ by the woman, and it is said about her by Our Saviour: "She hath wrought a good work upon Me." The walls of a temple must not remain bare. This would be false asceticism, or a triumph of prose, as was the case with Protestant chapels and halls of prayer after the Reformation. The dwelling place of the Lord must be a palace of beauty, where the breath of the Holy Spirit is felt

Further, the inspiration of the church includes not only descriptive forms of art, but the art of the Word, or sacred poetry also. The origin of sacred poetry is already laid in the Old Testament. It is sufficient to mention the Psalms, together with other hymns and songs of the Pentateuch or of the Books of the Prophets and —last, but not least—of the Song of Songs. To these solemn hymns and prayers the music of plainsong would correspond. The construction of the Temple and the order of God's services were objects of the greatest attention and care both of King David and others. Only in the local houses of prayer—the synagogues—the rite of service was simplified and deprived of its artistic character so that it reminds one of the simplicity of Protestant services and chapels.

The Orthodox Church inherited the liturgical and artistic riches of the Jewish Church and added to this from the precious treasures of antiquity. This heritage is best observed in all kinds of art, but particularly in its hymnology, its sacred poetry, which has its strong and its weak sides. This sacred poetry grew very rapidly in the first eight centuries, after which it was put in order and worked up in the form of a ritual. The Book of the Order of Services, the so-called Typicon, is a very large one. It was compiled in the monastries of St. Savva and St. Studion and contains a very complicated set of rules which refer to the singing and reading in Church, and deal with the services, the lessons, the hymns and the prayers. It is very difficult to study and use.

The actual books of services are still more extensive. They constitute a whole library, comprising large volumes of varying content and purpose. The liturgical riches of Orthodoxy, even in comparison with these of the Roman Church, are renowned. They cannot in any way be compared to the concise and strictly necessary content of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. Of course every single type of liturgy according to its very properties has certain advantages and weaknesses. Orthodox services are—according to a strict observance of the rule—very long and complex. They are written in the Slavonic language which is very beautiful but often difficult to understand. Most of this liturgical material is religious poetry of great antiquity and, of course, not of equal literary worth. Amongst it are to be found specimens of religious poetry of the highest value which can be compared with the best psalms or songs of the prophets, at times even perhaps they exceed these because they are Christian. Among these one can rank the services of Passion Week and Easter, or some of the great Feastdays (Christmas, Pentecost the Assumption of the Holy Virgin and others), the rites of burial and wedding, the rites of the liturgies, which are not to be surpassed. They resemble the highest attainments of classical works of

antiquity and take their origin from the spirit of hellenism and true art. Sometimes, unfortunately, they also possess peculiar properties of rhetoric, characteristic of an epoch of ancient decadence, which is over-refined in its Eastern loquaciousness. It is owing to this that texts of a secondary importance are generally shortened (this is much more so in the practice of the Balkan Churches than in that of the Russian Church). Most of this material is intended for singing like the psalms of David, and words have grown together with special melodies and tunes (they are different in the East and in Russia, which has brought in her own musical gift). Instrumental accompaniment is not used in the Orthodox Church. This is due to a very high esteem of the human voice, for this mingles in a special way with the Word and cannot be separated from it. All these forms of Church poetry are of course a work of poetical inspiration, which at its height already belongs to the domain of natural grace, as a gift from the Holy Spirit. But they possess much more. They are looked on by the Church as a kind of God-inspiration, in a sense they are God's inspired books, in some ways akin to the Holy Scriptures. It is not easy to find an explicit formula for this likeness, it must not be identified with the books of Holy Scripture, but the texts of the services also have an edifying and dogmatic significance. *Lex orandi est lex credendi*—this principle is acknowledged in Orthodoxy and in Roman Catholicism and, I presume, in Anglicanism, too. I shall not exaggerate if I say that out of various forms of tradition liturgical texts have the most authority, as compared with other sources. Liturgical texts also give authority to the use of certain narratives from the apocrypha in the Church, though these are not recognized in their entirety. In patristic writings private and even erroneous opinions may occur, which are not authorized by the Church, and sometimes are actually rejected. Such a state of things impossible in liturgies. Of course there exist in them passages of different importance, sometimes of an occasional or temporary nature. For instance many of these arose in connection with the political order of things—in conection with monarchy, as for example the various prayers for the Czar. These are now excluded by life itself owing to the failure of monarchist institutions. But in questions of dogmatic significance liturgical tradition sometimes supplements an absence of direct reference in the Holy Scriptures. Such liturgical witness has, as a matter of fact, a binding authority, no less than the direct indications in Holy Scriptures (for instance most of our knowledge about the life of the Blessed Virgin, her Nativity, her Entrance into the Temple, her Assumption, Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven). This teaching of dogmatic significance is acquired by the Church through Holy Tradition, which is sometimes of a comparatively later date, is authorized and

incorporated in the liturgical texts of Divine worship on those feastdays. The infallibility of the Church is manifested in its life of prayer, in Divine worship, sometimes with a greater authority than merely through dogmatic definitions of œcumenical councils. These definitions in fact are very limited in number and context as compared to the universal character of liturgical texts. An as inspiration of prayer and art Divine Worship represents a dogmatic source of the first rank.

Further, the work of the Holy Spirit within the Church does not only result in holy seasons, places and objects of art and prayers, but also of sacred (consecrated) persons who are able to perform the sacred actions, namely—the hierarchy of the apostolic succession, handing down the Grace of the Holy Spirit. In the hierarchy the Church has an organ of regular mediation between the Holy Spirit and the body of believers; as it were, the hierarchy represents the hands of the apostles, who were the personal bearers of the authority and power of sanctification. These are the rays of Pentecost which are not extinguished in the world, but are continually transmitted through the laying on of hands of the bishop at ordination. Of course, the significance of the hierarchy must not be exaggerated, as is always done in the Roman Catholic Church and sometimes to a certain degree in the Eastern Orthodox, perhaps also in the Episcopalian Protestant Churches as well. To be more precise the hierarchy possesses indisputable power for the celebration of the sacraments and for the life of worship—it is an instrument for this. A special privilege of teaching and government in the Church is also appropriated to the hierarchy, but in this case it is rather a derivative of the sacramental power, which comprises the very essence of the hierarchy. And it is only this power for celebration of the sacraments that is the work of the Holy Spirit, its charismatic gift to the hierarchy. All its other powers of government, jurisdiction, teaching are only prerogatives of authority, but are not charismatic. The contrary doctrine is expounded in the Roman Church and very often in Orthodoxy as well. A gift of infallibility of teaching and government is not a privilege of episcopacy. It might be quite possible for a layman or for an ordinary priest to have a better understanding of doctrine and to find more penetrating words for its expression than it is for a bishop, although a layman is never allowed to celebrate a sacrament. The hierarchy is given to the Church for organizing a regular life of Grace, though of course its influence permeates the whole of Church life. The hierarchy exists *in* the Church and *for* the Church, but not *over* the Church. The Church is a living organism and not a state, and the exaggeration of this principle in modern church life is rather a malady of the modern ecclesiastical conscience. Episcopacy exists as the fullness of sacramental gifts

(or as the organized possibility of sacraments), but not as a form of sacramental government and teaching. The Church can live without a pope or patriarch—both these are products of history and cannot be regarded as unchangeable or in any way absolute. The Primitive Church did not know of such institutions. The Church needs episcopacy for Sacraments not for centralization. The Church has already undergone periods of centralization, of Roman papacy and the great patriarchates, with their tedious and seducing quarrels over jurisdiction. Unfortunately this has not yet finished. Nevertheless the future belongs to a type of ecclesiastical federation and to freedom, not the absolute monarchy of Rome, and even less to the retarded and powerless parodies of it in the East or West.

In this sense we must clearly discriminate between the work of the Holy Spirit in the *sacramental* gift to the hierarchy, and the human, institutional, historical gift of hierarchical government. Of course, this important work in the Church cannot be achieved without the help of the Holy Spirit. But we recognize the direct action of the Holy Spirit, His breath and His benediction, only in the sacraments performed by the hierarchy, not in its government, with its possible failures and not even in its teaching, with possible fallacies. It is not infallible. At this point we stand in direct opposition to the doctrine of the Vatican Council, which recognized the charisma of infallible judgment and of papal government, treating it as a direct action of the Holy Spirit in the Church. A similar principle—of course timidly and not consistently—has been appropriated, consciously or even unconsciously, by other episcopal churches until now. We feel called upon to fight against these different forms of papacy for the sake of the freedom and welfare of the Church. We are seeking for the realization of the principle of "sobornost," which lies at the very root of the Orthodox doctrine of the Church; which is—freedom in unity and unity in freedom.

Now all these varied gifts of the Holy Spirit organize the sacramental life of the Church and are its means. The sacraments are a true continuation of Pentecost in the Church. They represent a fulfilment of the words of the Saviour, spoken on the last day of the feast of tabernacles: "If any man thirst, let him come to Me and drink" (John VII: 37)—"but this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive" (38) —and it was received at Pentecost. The Church is the Body of Christ. It becomes this for us through the Holy Spirit. Owing to this the Sacraments given to us by Christ are performed by the Holy Spirit: "He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine and shall declare it unto you" (John XVI:14). The gracious waters of Pentecost which abide in the Church, are distributed into

the separate channels of the different sacraments, and their use becomes regulated according to the needs of man, without in any way impairing their fullness as a whole. The sacraments as a whole completely satisfy the claims of human life as a whole and of every individual in all his particular needs. They are divine in their origin and human in their aim. The usual catechetic definition of a sacrament is that it is an invisible gift given in a visible sign. Therefore a sacrament is a *symbolical* action. The divine action or presence is joined to or merged with an object or an action of our world, and this essential symbolism is not merely a sign but a real interpenetration of the Divine presence into our world. As opposed to this sacramental reality of symbols we have the Protestant idea of symbolism which denies the work of the Holy Spirit and the presence of God Himself in the Sacraments. The efficacy of the sacraments is here limited only to a subjective feeling of remembrance and of a personal inspiration and ecstasy. Roman theology distinguishes between *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis* which is useful for this purpose. *Ex opere operato* means that the sacrament has a real, objective character, it is given by God Himself through man. It is celebrated not by man alone, as is thought in the doctrine of *ex opere operantis*. This divine effectiveness of the sacrament cannot be attained to by human efforts, though man, as a receiver of Grace, uses it differently, according to his personal freedom and disposition.

The objectivity of a sacrament depends on the pronouncing of definite words or prayers and the performing of certain actions. This form of sacrament is instituted by the Church and springs from its tradition, which of course follows the will of Our Lord Jesus Christ. This will has not been always directly expressed in the New Testament, though this is thought by Roman Catholics and sometimes by Orthodox theologians. We find in the New Testament not ready-made sacramental formula, but a direct command (as is the case of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist), or more or less indefinite indications of a general nature, which are generalized in the last promise of Our Saviour about the Comforter: "the Comforter, *which* is the Holy Ghost. . . . He shall teach you all things" (John XIV:26). It is because of this that there exists the possibility of variation in the performing of sacraments, as we see in different communities, without losing their efficacy. Of course, these differences relate only to the non-essential, to ritual or detail, though at times such details grow into theological divergencies, for instance, in the question of *epiclesis*.

One serious doubt in connection with the sacramental principle has arisen from the Protestant side, namely, as to whether we have not here a kind of magic. This prejudice is founded on a misunderstanding. Magic presupposes the power of somebody who possesses a certain formula, word or action. Such a power belongs to this world, is personal, and has no spiritual character or aim. Sacramental power is given to the Church as a whole, though it is realized only through the mediation of the hierarchy, but perforce in contact with the whole of the Church. Further, this gift is a supernatural, spiritual one, which is received according to the personal disposition, *ex opere operantis*. The magical conception of a sacrament is atheistic—for such a conception there exists no work of the Holy Spirit in mankind. Such a conception limits human life merely to this world and its forces and excludes the access of any divine, supernatural influence to the human soul.

Another repudiation of the sacramental principle as of a really symbolic and objective action comes from the side of an exaggerated, one-sided spiritualism. Some of the Reformed Churches do acknowledge the possibility of an inner direct action of the Holy Spirit on the human soul, but without any mediation through any matter of this world. The sacramental action in this case means only a subjective sign, deprived of any real significance. For instance in the Holy Eucharist they cannot admit of a real change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, they are shocked by the possibility of such a transformation of an earthly material thing into the heavenly glorified Body of Christ, and still more by such a connection between the spiritual and the material (and this is the idea of the symbolical character of a sacrament). The answer to such a conception is that man is not a spiritual being only, but an embodied spirit, who lives in this unseverable connection. The Word was made flesh Himself, and the Holy Spirit descended on Him at His Baptism and on the whole of humanity and creation at Pentecost. It is proper for the Holy Spirit to penetrate not only the spirit, but also the material body. An object may become spiritual, and the spirit may be given through such an object. All this is a result of the Incarnation of Our Lord and of the descent of the Holy Spirit into the world. The sacramental idea does not represent a materialistic superstition, which is unable to distinguish between a material and spiritual substance. It is a logical conclusion from the fact of an indissoluble connection existing between spirit and matter. If the human body of Our Lord is worthy of sitting in Heaven on the right hand of the Father, then it is already impossible to separate or even to put the spirit and the body in opposition to one another, though the close connection is not equivalent to identification. The purpose of my paper is merely to give a general outline of the principles involved without going into any details as regards the various sacraments, their number, etc. I would only like to add to this that each Sacrament contains its own particular gift. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit" (I Cor. 12:4).

The Protestant would recognize only two sacramental gifts—of Baptism and the Eucharist. The Eastern and the Western Church recognise seven sacramental gifts, but the sacramental work of the Holy Spirit in the Church is not exhausted and limited even by these seven sacraments. We have not only sacraments, but also what is termed in the Latin Church—*sacramentalia*. Very often it is difficult to draw the distinction between them; for example, for a long time the clothing of a monk and burial were regarded like real sacraments. The true dogma about Sacraments cannot limit sacraments to a certain number, as is done in Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. The Council of Trent proclaimed that the number of sacraments was seven, no more and no less, and Eastern theology was also influenced by this dogmatic prejudice. But in the real life of the Church no such limitation exists. This usual number of sacraments accounts only for the most important sacramental actions, but in itself does not exhaust the sacramental power. The two so-called Evangelical Sacraments—of Holy Baptism and the Supper of Our Lord—of a new birth and a new life in the Body of Christ—remain the central facts of Sacramental Life. But the gifts of the Holy Spirit cannot be compared in importance in the various sacraments, because in spite of the differences the same Holy Spirit is given in all.

The effectiveness of a sacrament is not a mechanical one. The gift of the Holy Spirit is in every case received or not received at all by every individual Christian soul, according to its own choice or its personal disposition, and in this sense it is *ex opere operantis*. It is, however, true that a sacrament as a power is always *ex opere operato*, and can never be destroyed or become nul. It acts unto salvation or unto judgment and condemnation. But this holy gift may be differently used, though its influence and significance within every single soul will always remain a mystery. But we are called on to concentrate ourselves to collect all our power of faith and love for the worthy reception of the sacrament. There exists an exception to this principle—that the sacrament presupposes a personal kind of receiving—in the baptism of little children, a practice which is equally shared by the Orthodox, Roman, Anglican Churches and even by Protestantism. The Orthodox Church also admits children to chrismation and Holy Communion. Is this not a contradiction of the principle of *ex opere operantis?* The only satisfactory answer to this question can be found in the idea that the power of the sacrament penetrates deeper than the conscious, that it reaches the *super*-conscious. Such is the new birth in Baptism, the sealing of the gift of the Holy Spirit in chrismation, or the Holy Communion of children—as a kind of aid to their growth, as a kind of pledge given. On the other hand it must also not be forgotten that the sacraments are achieved not only individually, but *in corpore*, by the unity of the Church. It conserves the gifts for the children and helps them to use them. Such a participation of the Church is symbolized in Baptism by the presence of the God-parents. In such cases also we do not have magic but the "sobornost" of the Church.

Each Sacrament has its own particular character and imparts a special gift of Grace, and all the sacraments in their entirety give us spiritual strength and support. They are like a seed, or like leaven or like spiritual food. A fullness of Christian life is impossible without a participation in sacraments. It is the most important way of communion with Christ through the Holy Spirit. But the action of sacraments on man is not a magical or mechanical one. Grace never violates even in sacraments, and the manner of receiving them *(ex opere operantis)* is in any case different, depending on personal devotion and individual characteristics as well. Grace leaves the freedom of man unbroken and individual creative effort is necessary. Sacramental grace can be likened to the talents of the parable which are to be made use of and multiplied by individual effort. The same talents may remain useless buried in the earth, when they ought to be made use of, ought to bear fruit. The effectiveness of a sacrament is not the same in any two souls. It is related about St. Seraphim how he received the Sacrament; his face became enlightened and like that of an angel, after partaking of it he fell into a kind of spiritual ecstasy. It is also related about Fr. John of Kronstadt that after Holy Communion he became mystically aflame and full of joy. A true fruit of sacramental life is shown in personal sanctification, the overcoming of sin and a purity of heart, which is seeing God. A strenuous effort in this direction makes man into a vessel of Grace, into a citizen of the heavenly world. St. Seraphim often repeated in his sayings: "The aim of the Christian soul is to acquire the Holy Spirit." The holy man who is filled and inspired by the Holy Spirit becomes really His temple. This deification is the ultimate and true aim of the sacraments which strengthen man on his way. This aim and task is expressed by the exclamation of the priest before communion: "Holy things unto the holy!"—the sacrament of holiness and sanctification. But this relation between the sacrament and sanctification is neither mechanical nor legal. Exceptions are possible, but these only reaffirm the common rule. In the life of hermits we find examples of their non-partaking of sacraments during many years, because of their life in solitude and in the wilderness. But this temporary abstinence for the sake of an ascetic life does not mean that they denied its necessity. It is related of such hermits that they received the sacraments through angels, by mysterious unknown ways. But such an example has

nothing common with a denial of visible sacraments, as with the Friends or other mystical sectarians. Such a negation would mean for the ascetics an empty pride and self-delusion. The highest steps of the spiritual ladder do not exclude the lowest ones.

Besides these fruits of the sacraments in individual lives there exists an influence of sacramental grace on the common life of society, because the work of Grace is not exhausted by purely individual holiness but extends to social life. Man is not only an individual but likewise a social being. Neither must the individual life be limited in itself, and sacramental sanctification includes forces which influence the whole of society, like leaven. The Holy Liturgy—a common work in the temple—must be widened and brought outside the temple, into the whole of human life, into the world. It is accomplished not individually, but socially, by a kind of accumulation of power and holiness, step by step in the history of Christian humanity, which is the history of the Church at the same time. On this sacramental field the world-harvest is ripening—there are wheat and tares, and the wheat will be gathered into a barn of Our Lord—not only the separate grains of personal effort and gift and inspiration, but all these grains together. The world must be ready for its transfiguration, must be prepared for the words of Our Saviour: "Behold, I make all things new."

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN WORSHIP

By The Rev. Kenneth Mackenzie.

THE subject assigned to me is "The Work of the Holy Spirit in Worship, the Sacraments and the Sanctified Life." That is to say, our concern is entirely, or almost entirely, with the Spirit as Pentecostal: not with the Spirit as an eternal Person in the Godhead. We speak of the promised Comforter, of whom it was said, "[The] Spirit was not yet [given], because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

Consider first the revelation given by our Lord.

In St. Luke we are taught that He is given in answer to prayer. He is called the Promise of the Father: Power from on high.

So in the Acts we read that the result of Baptism with the Holy Ghost is that the recipients will receive power.

But by far the greater part of our Lord's revelation as to His sanctifying activity is to be found on the pages of St. John. To be born of the Spirit is a pre-requisite of entering into the Kingdom of Heaven. He is a perennial spring of living water. He is the quickening power in the Holy Eucharist. It is His office to carry from within the παράκλησις of Christ, and so to be to the disciples what Christ was. He will renew and extend the teaching of Christ. His coming depends on the exaltation of Christ. He will make all clear, sin, righteousness and judgment, acting as the medium of communication from the Father and from Christ. Finally, according to St. John, the climax of our Lord's life on earth is the bestowal of the Spirit for the remission of sins.

Some of this teaching seems to lead to the idea of the Holy Spirit as the Substitute for, or Vicar of, Christ: but other parts rather suggest that He is the perpetual guarantee of the presence of Christ. This is saved from being a contradiction only if we hold fast to that Catholic doctrine of the Trinity called περιχώρησις: that while each Person of the Trinity has His distinctive way of acting, no One can act in separation from the Others. An act of a Person of the Trinity is an act of God. Thus it was the Son alone who became Man, the Holy Ghost alone who became the Inspiring Spirit of the Church: yet each of these events was an act of God. The Holy Spirit's distinctive way of acting is inspiration; but to be inspired by the Spirit necessarily involves a new relation to the Father and the Son: we become children of the Father and members of the Son. The three relationships involve each other. Yet it is not because God is the Word that He penetrates the human soul but because He is the Spirit. Christ apart from the Spirit would be external to the soul.

So much theological introduction seems to be necessary. Now for the application.

First: apply it to prayer. Christian prayer depends on the presence of the Holy Spirit. It implies both that we should be " in the Spirit " and that the Spirit should dwell in us. The Holy Spirit is, as it were, an atmosphere of Christ. Prayer is the breathing of that atmosphere: " the Christian's vital breath." Like breathing, it is a semi-conscious activity, which can at will be made fully conscious. (The " method of prayer " recommended by St. Ignatius, in which prayers are timed by actual physical respiration, seems to rest upon a certain natural affinity between the two activities.) Thus it is in the power of the Holy Spirit, the " Breath of God," that we can " pray without ceasing." Prayer is an act of God, though it requires the co-operation of the human will. In mental prayer this Divine activity may often outstrip human understanding. The " groaning " of the Spirit is literally unutterable. The human mind can find no words in which to express it. But that does not matter. God understands. " He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit." But the same truth applies to every kind of prayer, vocal as well as mental. It is only by the inspiration of God that we can offer fitting praise or thanks or petition or intercession or even contrition. Deep calls to deep. Prayer is the Spirit within crying out to God.

Apply it to the Sacraments. The especial relevance of the doctrine of the Spirit to sacramental rites lies in the fact that interpenetration is the function and characteristic activity of the Spirit.

Baptism and Confirmation. The question of the relation between the two is aroused by the Western practice of separating the administration of them by an interval of several years. So for Westerners it is a practical difficulty. It is acknowledged by all that by an act of the Holy Spirit in Baptism the soul is forgiven, regenerated and united to the Body of Christ. The question is whether it is also actually indwelt by the Holy Spirit. If so, what is the gift of Confirmation? Most Anglicans would answer: A closer union and new gifts. Roman Catholics would say: Growth and stability. In this they would rely on the authority of St. Thomas and the Catechism of the Council of Trent. But it seems to be the case that St. Thomas himself was misled by a passage in the Forged Decretals and was even mistaken as to the true translation of this passage. But some Anglicans following Fr. Puller and the late Dr. Mason, with strong patristic support, affirm that in Baptism the gift is an external action of the Holy Spirit, and that the interior relation between the Spirit and the soul is reserved for Confirmation. The scriptural evidence seems indeterminate. The Fathers on the whole seem to support the view of Fr. Puller and Dr. Mason, using the word Baptism to include the whole complex rite of Christian

initiation; yet there are passages in Origen, St. Jerome, St. Athanasius and St. Cyril of Jerusalem which seem to imply that Baptism by itself confers the interior gift of the Spirit. The Anglican Book of Common Prayer certainly speaks of *giving* the Holy Spirit to the candidate, that he may be born again. The question is certainly a puzzling one. But in theology, which is the attempt to translate the things of God into human language, antinomies are seldom such as to defy solution. Very often it is not so much a question of the actual facts as of the best way of stating those facts. Can we then say that this idea of being in the Body of Christ but not in the Holy Spirit is ultimately a tolerable way of describing the position of those who have been baptized but not yet confirmed? Dr. Bright said, " It is hard to see how the recipient of Baptism as such could be in Christ, yet not in the Holy Spirit: could be incorporated into the Body Mystical, yet not really inhabited by the Giver of Life, who is the very informing and vitalizing principle of that Body." We cannot help asking whether such an idea is really consistent with the general theology of the Holy Spirit, whose characteristic activity is to interpenetrate the human spirit with Himself.

It is sometimes suggested that the true distinction is that Baptism provides the negative and Confirmation the positive element in the Sacrament of Initiation. This does not seem very satisfactory. For it would remove regeneration and membership in Christ from the sphere of Baptism to that of Confirmation, and Baptism would become nothing more than an absolution from sin preparatory to the reception of spiritual life in Confirmation.[1]

Perhaps it is difficult to be more definite than to say that Confirmation completes Baptism by conferring additional spiritual power and gifts as a consequence of the interior operation of the Holy Ghost. To this must, however, be added the idea of a kind of rudimentary ordination, a notion which is very frequent in the Fathers. This idea is specially connected with the symbolism of Chrismation, a ceremony the restoration of which in the Anglican Communion is greatly to be desired.

Some prominent Anglicans, among whom are Dr. Darwell Stone and Fr. Puller, desire to get rid of the separation between Baptism and Confirmation by restoring the Confirmation of infants. Dr. Mason, however, was strongly opposed to this, and stated that, if they were to be combined, he would prefer that this should be brought about by the abandonment of infant Baptism.

Anyhow the normal status of a Christian is to have received both Baptism and Confirmation. Indeed, it is this reception which, on the objective side, makes a man a Christian, and in virtue of which

[1] It was pointed out to me in this connection by Fr. Alexis that in a hot country water has a far more positive symbolism than in a temperate one. It suggests not the mere removal of defilement but also invigoration and life.

he can claim to have been " washed and sanctified." Baptism chiefly concerns purging and life and Confirmation the consecration of that which has been purged and vivified: but it seems that both must be the work of the Holy Spirit from within. The significance of both is that one cannot grow from the natural to the spiritual man by merely natural means. It is God's work in its inception and in its continuance.

Penance (as regards the primary use of it) deals with the man who has lost the sanctifying grace of his Baptism by mortal sin. In this case the work of the Holy Spirit is needed before ever the Sacrament comes into action at all. The sinner has lost the state of sanctifying grace; but the actual grace of God is needed for conviction of sin. We cannot feel sin for ourselves as it should be felt. The Spirit of the Crucified must take the things of Christ (in this case His Cross and Passion) and show them unto us. Then by confession in the presence of the Church (as represented by the priest) we can straighten out the crooked and paralysed will, and Absolution is the pledge of the restoration of spiritual life—in other words the presence of the Holy Ghost. The restoration of spiritual life is a far more fruitful way of looking at the gift of Absolution than either the remission of a debt or a sentence of acquittal.

So also it is surely the same Holy Spirit who has taught the Church the true conditions of penitence, by the gradual conforming of ecclesiastical demands more closely to the spirit of the Gospel: making her view of what constitutes mortal sin more stern, but her conditions of forgiveness far more lenient.

The Holy Eucharist. It is easy to exaggerate the difference between the " Western " and " Eastern " views of what is necessary for Consecration. It is in truth more a difference of method than of doctrine. Clearly there is no power but that of the Holy Spirit which could invest the material with a spiritual status.

Our Blessed Lord, being Himself full of the Holy Spirit, seems to have consecrated the first Eucharist by " giving thanks." That is in a sense the central feature in any liturgy. So, in early times, it is the Gifts " over which thanks have been given " which are the Body and Blood of the Lord. Yet the Church has always, so far as we know, conceived of two other things as necessary to a due Consecration: (*a*) the recitation of the authoritative words; (*b*) a prayer that it may be unto us according to these words. The ultimate meaning of the former requirement is that the Church acts in the person of Christ, of the latter that she invokes the intervention of the Holy Spirit. When the thanksgiving has been made, and both these latter requirements have been fulfilled, the Consecration is indubitably complete. Therefore if the question is insisted on *at what moment* the Consecration takes place, the only answer is:

When the three liturgical acts are complete: thanksgiving, words of Institution, Invocation. (It does not seem to be necessary to *mention* the Holy Spirit: our earliest actual document, the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, does so, but not Serapion, nor the Roman rite, nor the English.) If, then, the question is pressed the answer must be that the actual and final effective words are whichever of the three comes last: i.e., in practice, *either* the Invocation, *or* the words of Institution, according to what rite is being used. No doubt a Roman Catholic theologian will say that if any priest were (almost *per impossibile*) to recite the words of Institution and nothing else, intending to consecrate, the Consecration would be valid: but the point is little more than academic, for such a proceeding would be an almost incredible act of sacrilege. There is no rite accepted by the Church which does not include all the three elements we have mentioned.

The Holy Spirit has also a very definite relation to the act of reception of the most holy Sacrament. It is the Spirit within us who makes us capable of receiving the Sacrament as a gift from without. The sacred Gifts descend from heaven into hearts already illuminated by a beam proceeding from the same Source—as the Grail descends among the worshipping knights in the last Act of *Parsifal*. Hence the necessity of Baptism and the congruity of Confirmation before Communion.

Holy Order. The stress on the necessity of valid Ordination has a threefold meaning: (*a*) that ministerial acts can only be performed by the power of the Holy Spirit; (*b*) that such enabling power is not a private gift, but one mediated through the Church; (*c*) (and this is the reason for insisting on Episcopacy and a due succession) that the reservation to particular persons of authority to bestow the Holy Spirit for this purpose is part of the original constitution of the Church. The Apostolate was not evolved out of the Church but anterior to her Pentecostal rebirth.

Marriage. None but the Holy Spirit can so perfectly interpenetrate personalities as to fuse them into one. This is the potential result of the marriage rite.

Unction. This, too, is the work of the Divine Spirit, who so invigorates the human spirit as to make it capable of triumphing over bodily infirmity.

Finally, the Holy Spirit is the centre of the consecrated life.

1. As Fire He consecrates it for sacrifice. The sacrificial life is the life which is used up in the service of God. The Holy Spirit is the cleansing and transforming power which brings this about. That which is given up for God's sake is not the sacrifice. It may be the cost of the sacrifice: but the actual sacrifice is that which is neither kept nor thrown aside, but used.

2. As Light, He illuminates the mind with the knowledge of God, giving wisdom and understanding, knowledge, counsel and the fear of the Lord.

3. As Wind, He wafts the soul Godward with invisible power, giving freedom, blowing where He lists, that the regenerate soul may do likewise, free as the wind to choose and execute its own true highest will. Thus the Church is the true home of freedom, the freedom of the slaves of God, *quem nosse vivere, cui servire regnare est.*

SUMMER, 1932.] [VOL. XIII No 2.

The Christian East

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN REVELATION.

By PROF. G. FLOROVSKY.

" Jesus Christ the same yesterday and to-day and for ever "
(*Heb.* 13 : 8.)

IT is always the first definitions which are the most difficult. Here we have nothing to which we can refer, nothing from which we can draw deductions. We must not prove, but show; we must look and see.

And just now I am very keenly conscious of the difficulty of speaking of initial principles.

Revelation is a primordial fact, the initial gift of Christianity, of Christian life and faith. "But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. . . . The things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God" (I Cor. 2:10-11). And again: " No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost" (I Cor. 12:3).

In our usual conception of Revelation there is a certain heterogeneity, even a certain ambiguity. And the first thing we have to do is to find out in what this heterogeneity consists, and how we are to set it aside. In a certain sense the whole world is the Revelation of God. The creation of the world is a revelation, "a manifestation of God," in "conceivable images." The whole world testifies of God, of His Wisdom, Mercy and Love. This is generally named: "Revelation through Nature." This is Revelation in *matter*, so-to-say, the Revelation which is immanent in the very nature and essence of things; which is inscribed and implanted there. Above all, it exists in the nature of man himself; man, who was created and made in God's image and likeness. This is the "Law of God" "Written in the hearts of men" (Rom. 2:15).

But strictly speaking this is not Revelation in the direct meaning of the word. It is better to speak here not of *Revelation*, but of God's *manifestation*. In Nature, visible and invisible, God is manifested, not revealed. In Nature and in the human soul we find only "certain traces of God," *"vestigia Dei naturalia."* But,

so far, this is no theophany. This is only a testimony (Testimonium) *of God;* and from it the human mind may *conclude* or presuppose God's existence; may become conscious of God; may divine God in His works. This gives birth to "seeking after God," to religious longing, to religious needs, still unclear and wavering: "That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us" (Acts, 17:27). But so far this is not yet knowledge of God, it is not seeing or knowing. Strictly speaking Revelation is not the fundamental essence of every religious life. Even more, we have a right to say that Revelation is, in general, not religion, but it is greater than religion. It is something different, something *apart from religion*. It is not the manifestation of God in His creation, in the beings created by Him, but a direct *vision* of God granted to man. God is manifested in all and always. Here we stand before a certain continuity, the continuity of Divine Omnipresence of Him "who is omipotent and omnipresent."

But not everywhere and not to all is this *vision* of God granted. There is no continuity in theophanies. Here we are in a realm of rupture and interruptions, of interruptions in the continuous stream of the world's natural order, though this too is established by Divine command and by Divine Providence, by the Providence of the Omnipotent Creator. This is the realm of the supernatural, and only the "supernatural" is the Revelation of God in the real meaning of the word. In the "Religion of Nature" man recognizes and divines God; seeks after Him and reaches out for Him, for "He be not far from every one of us." But this is only *the path of man towards God*. Revelation is the *path of God towards man*. This is above nature, supernatural, this is something new and different, something greater than that force of movement and life which has been implanted in every created being by the pre-eternal and creative "Fiat."

Or, in other words, in Nature God is manifested as the Creator of vitality, the Giver of existence and of life. But in the supernatural, in what is above nature, God in His transcendence appears and is revealed as He who spake; "Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son" (Heb. 1:1-2). God is revealed in the *Word,* and only God's word is Revelation in its direct and exact meaning. Revelation is the Divine Voice, the Voice of God, speaking to man. Man hears this Voice, listens to it, accepts it, and understands the Divine Word. For God speaks so that man should hear Him. God created man in His image and likeness that man should listen for His Voice and Word, should hear it, and, even more, that he should treasure it, remember it, and keep it. When we speak of

Revelation, we have in mind just the Word of God that has been *heard* by us. Some heard it direct, without any intermediary; these were the great initiated and prophets. Others heard of it through the mediation of those who were commanded by God and by the power and aid of the Holy Ghost to repeat what they had heard and seen themselves. The Holy Scriptures are the written record of the Revelation they heard, and it was God who gave them the strength, through the outpouring of His Holy Ghost, to hear and write down His words. The sacred mystery of Divine inspiration cannot be completely fathomed by us. We cannot fully understand in what manner "God's holy men" heard the Word of their God and how they repeated it in the words of their own tongue. But even in their transmission it was the Voice of God, the Voice of the Holy Ghost, that was heard, and the feeble human voice, the voice of flesh and blood, had no part in it. Therein lies the miracle and mystery of the Bible that it is the Word of God, the Word of the Spirit, who "spake by the prophets," and yet it is the Word of the Spirit *in a human tongue*. And whatever the manner in which we understand the Divine inspiration of Scripture, one thing is important. The scriptures transmit and preserve for us the Divine Voice in the tongue of man. The scriptures transmit and preserve for us the Divine Word such as it had been heard, such as it sounded in the receptive soul of man. The mystery of Divine inspiration is not only that God spoke to man, but also that man was listening to God and heard Him. God descends to man, shows His Face to man; speaks to him. And man sees God, is lost in the vision of God, and describes what he has seen and heard, bearing witness to what has been revealed to him. Therein lies the significance of the Old Testament Divine visions, of the Old Testament Revelations. In them there is a certain essential anthropomorphism, and this not so much because of the weakness of human understanding, or from a sense of "adaptability," but as a foretaste of the coming incarnation. It is already in the Old Testament that the Divine Word becomes human, is incarnated in the human tongue. And there is another point of great importance. If we want the Divine Word to ring clear, the human tongue must not lose its natural qualities. It must not leave off being human. What is human is not suppressed or swept away by Divine inspiration; it is only transfigured. The supernatural does not go counter to what is natural.

Therefore, it is that God chooses to speak in the human tongue, that through Divine inspiration, through the Breath of the Spirit of Omniscience and Wisdom, human nature should be completed, fulfilled. The human tongue does not weaken or belittle the absoluteness of Revelation; it does not limit the power of God's Word. The Word of God may be exactly and strictly expressed

in the language of man, who is created in the image and likeness of God; in the image of God's Word, as was taught by some of the Fathers of the Church. The Word of God does not grow dim because it sounds and is pronounced in the tongue of man. On the contrary, the human word becomes transfigured, transubstantiated, because God deigned to speak in the human tongue. The Divine Spirit breathes in the organism of human speech, in the substance of human words. And therefore the tongue of man acquires force and firmness. It becomes possible for the word of man to speak of God. Theology becomes possible.

Strictly speaking theology grows possible only through Revelation. It is the answering speech of man to God, as man's witness of God who had spoken to him; whose voice he had heard and remembered, and whose words he had kept and was repeating. So-called "natural theology" is no theology in the true sense of the word. It is rather a philosophy, a word about the "Unknown God," towards whom the restless human soul reaches out but has not yet found; frequently it loses its way in its search. This is the "Word about a God who has not yet revealed Himself; about whom man can so far say nothing, unless it be that his soul panteth for Him and longeth for Him as the hart panteth for the spring of water." And it is only through Revelation that true theology becomes possible. For the first time in answer to Revelation true prayer is poured out in words of testimony, words of adoration, of thanksgiving and of petition. Again it is an answer to the Word of God.

In Sacred Scripture we are, first of all, struck by the intimate relation of God to man and of man to God. In Scripture we see not only God, but man as well. It is the Revelation of God, but it is also a revelation concerning man. God reveals Himself to man, *appears* before him, becomes visible to him, speaks with him, so as to reveal to man the hidden meaning of his existence, to show him the path and meaning of human life. In Scripture we see God coming to reveal Himself to man, and we see man meeting God and not only listening to His Words, but answering them. In Scripture we not only hear the Voice of God, but also the voice of man answering Him—in words of prayer, thanksgiving, adoration, sorrow, and contrition. God wants, and expects, and demands this answer. It is for this that He speaks with man. He expects man to answer Him. He is waiting for man to talk with Him. And He draws up His covenant with man.

Revelation is the history of this covenant. Recorded Revelation —Sacred Scripture—is, first of all, history. Law and prophets, psalms and prophecies are included and woven into the living historical web.

Scripture is history, the history of the world created by God,

and the history of man who is called to be the priest, the prophet, and the king of this world. Scripture begins with the creation of the world and is brought up to the eve of the new creation: "Behold I make all things new" (Rev. 21:5). Between these two extreme points, that of the first creative, "Let there be," and that of the latest prophecy, the living web of Sacred Scripture dynamically unfolds itself. Revelation is not only a system of Divine *words*, but, above all, the system of Divine *works*. This is the reason of the extension of time in Sacred Scripture. We might say that Revelation was the path of God in history. And the culminating point is reached when God enters history for all time; when the Word is incarnated, when God-Man is revealed.

Revelation is also the book of human fate. First of all, it is the book which narrates the fall and the salvation of man. It speaks of the first created paradise, of Adam's expulsion from it as a consequence of his sin; of the first promise of salvation, the so-called "First Gospel" (Gen. 3:15). It speaks of the path fallen man had to tread upon earth, of the new promises, and, at last, of the chosen "Father of all the faithful," Abraham, and of the covenant made with him. It is from here that the actual Old Testament begins. The Old Testament is the sacred history of Israel, the history of that unique people, the people chosen by God, with whom God concluded His covenant. Here the most important thing is the fact of election; the separation of Israel, the setting Israel apart from all other peoples. Israel is the grace-given, sacred oasis in the history of fallen mankind. Only with one people on earth did God conclude a covenant and give it His own law, Divinely inscribed on tables of stone. God establishes in the midst of this people a true priesthood, even though only a temporal and prophetic one. He raises from among it the prophets, who speak words inspired by the Spirit of God. Before Christ it was in Israel alone that there existed a true priesthood and not only an idolatrous one. Therefore it was only there that true Divine service was performed. Here alone was sacrifice, pleasing in God's eyes, offered. Here alone was there a true temple of God, the only temple of the sort in all the world. It was a sacred centre for all the world—an oasis granted by the Grace of God, in the midst of a sinful, unredeemed world. It is from here that sanctification begins. "The cloud filled the House of the Lord" (I Kings, 8:10). This election and separation of Israel is easily understood and explained from an historical standpoint, from the historical mission of Israel. Israel is the first-fruit of mankind. Its historical mission leads to the birth in its midst of the world's Saviour. In it was to be accomplished the last limit of the final Revelation of God, the incarnation of the Word. It was because of this that the legislation of Mount Sinai was

granted to this people; because of this the prophets spoke. The Sacred meaning of the Old Testament is that it is the history of the ancestors of our Saviour, and therefore it is by mentioning them that the Gospels begin their narrative: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham" (Math. 1:1). "For salvation is of the Jews" (John 4:22). The Old Testament is the period of the Messianic expectation, the time of covenants and prophecies. It is not only the prophets that prophesy. Events also become prophecies. The Old Testament history, as a whole, is a kind of foregiven image, an historical symbol, a looking forward towards approaching events. St. Augustine said: "The New Testament is contained within the Old and the Old is revealed in the New. In *Vetere Testamento Novum latet, in Novo Testamento Vetus patet;* and the Messianic tense expectation culminates in the appearance of the God-Man: "But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman" (Gal. 4:4). The time of expectation is passed; the promise has been accomplished; the Lord has come. He has come to abide and remain with those who believe in Him: "Alway, even unto the end of the world" (Math. 28:20). The Old Testament history is finishing—the history of flesh and blood. The history of the Spirit is beginning—the Kingdom of Truth and Grace is opened (John 1:17). And yet the law is not destroyed, but fulfilled (Math. 5:17), and the prophecies have been accomplished and did not prove vain. The Old Testament was fulfilled, revealed, and completed in the New, *in Novo patet.* And therefore the books of the Hebrews are still sacred for Christians. Not only, because *once,* in olden times, God spoke to Israel, but also because *now, too,* the Word of God is to be heard in the Bible, and *now* through this eternal, eternally living book, God's Revelation *continues* coming down to us. It is therein that the mystery of the Bible consists; this is the mystery of the inspired, transfigured, transubstantiated word. This does not mean that the Bible is used in the Church as *a book of parables,* as a book of historical examples and cases, a collection of texts or theological instances *(Loci theologici).* No, the Bible remains a history, and it is just as a book of *sacred history* that it preserves all its power. The law is already set aside and is replaced by something higher. The temple exists no more in Jerusalem and the House of Israel is empty (Luke, 13:35). Prophecy has been accomplished.

However, in *sacred history* events not only take place and pass away, but they are *accomplished* and *fulfilled,* they are completed. The past does not mean *"passed"* or *"was,"* but, above all, has been *fulfilled.* Fulfilment is the fundamental essence of Revelation. That which has become sacred remains holy for always and without change. It has the seal, the sign, and the blessing of the

Holy Ghost. For even to the present moment the Spirit breathes in the words once inspired by it. The Old Testament is, above all, *a book* for us. The New Testament is more than a book. In the Old Testament we see most clearly the meaning of the Revelation as *of a Word.* Therefore we witness to the Spirit "that spake in times past unto the Fathers by the Prophets" (Heb. 1:2). In the New Testament God hath spoken to us by His Son, and we are bound not only to hear, but to see, too.

We admit that the Old Testament is a difficult book. And, as time runs on, it grows no easier. Perhaps, on the contrary, it is more difficult for us to read it than it was for our ancestors. This is not the time or place to ask and discuss the question concerning the "historical authenticity" of the Old Testament. There is no time here to unravel the complex and difficult problem of the so-called "Higher Criticism." It would involve us in giving too much time to it in this paper. But all these critical investigations do not touch upon the fundamental principle of Revelation; do not deflect from its Divine inspiration. Scientific criticism cannot prove the sacred value of the Bible; cannot refute it. Divine inspiration is not a category of autonomous science. The reason of man, left to itself, cannot feel inspiration. Divine inspiration presupposes a certain *rupture* in the natural order. We need a special method of seeing to be able to recognize it. This in no wise means that faith and reason cannot be united, and that reason knows no religious truths and postulates; that religious truth, the truth of Revelation, is not obligatory or convincing for reason. On the contrary! But to achieve this, reason itself must be transfigured. Out of a world of two dimensions we must pass over into one of three; we must *feel depth.* Herein lies the nucleus of the *theological* question of Higher Criticism. To be able to feel the breath of the Spirit in Sacred Scripture, we must "strive after the Spirit," we must possess spiritual intuition and insight. We must learn to discern *profanum et sacrum;* we must know and feel *what* is *profanum* and *what* is *sacrum;* we must admit and know that there *is* a *sacrum,* quite apart from *profanum.* And this transfiguration of our consciousness can be accomplished only in the Church, in its spiritual charismatic completeness. Revelation has been granted to the Church not to individuals. In the Old Testament also "God's Words" were entrusted not to individuals, but to God's *people* (Rom. 3:2). Revelation has been given only to the Church, and only in the Church is it accessible to us; i.e., it can be accessible only in the *fullness* of spiritual life. Outside the Church, for outsiders, it becomes unclear, unconvincing. This unclearness is the nether side of our inattention, of our absence of intuition.

The apex of Revelation is in the Gospels. For the fullness of

Revelation—is Christ. The New Testament is also, first of all, history—the Gospel history of the incarnated Word and of the beginning of the history of the Church, which is now expecting its apocalyptic fulfilment. The basis of the New Testament is facts, events, realities; not only commandments, teaching, and words. Here the basis is Christ and the Church, His Body. "The fulness of Him that filleth all in all" (Eph. 1:23). The Gospel is history. *Historical events* are the subject and source of Christian faith and Christian hope. From the beginning, from the very day of Pentecost, when the Apostle Peter as an *eye-witness,* ("Whereof we are all witnesses," Acts 2:32), *witnessed* to the fulfilment of salvation, apostolic preaching had an historical character. But again it is a *sacred history*. The Apostles always speak of concrete historical facts and events. They bring vividly before the consciousness of their hearers the *image of Christ,* they make it live anew, and they show who He was. The uniqueness, the marvel of this historical Figure consists in the fact that He who became visible, whom we saw, was the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. Therefore it is that human limits, belonging to a world of two dimensions, cannot encompass this Image. It transcends them; and within historical boundaries we see what is super-historical, what is above the earth. But the boundaries are not obliterated, not wiped away, not dimmed; in the sacred Image historical features are still visible. Therein lies the meaning and importance of apostolic preaching that it is a *narrative,* a narrative of what the Apostles themselves heard and saw, of what was fulfilled and accomplished, *hic et nunc*. "Which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled" (I. John, 1:1). But what happened was unheard of: "The Word was made flesh" (John 1:14). Therefore this narrative is more than merely a narrative; it relates not only something that took place, but something that was realized and completed. Through historical vision we catch sight of what is visible only to the eyes of faith, what only the few saw and recognized during the lifetime of the Saviour; what even the Apostles saw and recognized fully only later, after His resurrection, when He had opened their understanding that they might understand "The mysteries of the Kingdom" (Luke, 24:45). The Gospel is a narrative and an image, but it is the narrative about God-Man. And just because it is a narrative and an historical witness there is a certain reserve in it. The scope of faith is more than reminiscence. Faith grows living in creative recognition of what it has seen and heard in communion with Christ. The Gospels give us a unique, integral image, an image both Divine and human—the image of God become man. For those whose capacity of perception is not fine

enough this image often appears as two separate images, just as it did to those who saw Him in the flesh, as long as their hearts had not been enlightened by faith. The Evangelists and the Apostles were no chroniclers. It was not their mission to relate all that had been done by Jesus, day by day, year by year. They described His image and related His works, so as to give us His image; an historical, yet a Divine image. The Gospels may be called *"An historical ikon,"* an ikon in words not in lines and colours, yet a picture of His face. Or, to be more exact, the Gospels are not one, but four ikons, a four-fold ikon of God-Man. And this ikon has been delineated by the power of the Spirit. The gospels are the records of the apostolic "good tidings," and the preaching of the Apostles was contained not "in the doubtful words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power" (I Cor. 2:4), in the numerous separate reminiscences the figure of Jesus grows living and the sensitive heart recognizes in Jesus of Nazareth, crucified and risen, the Saviour of the world and the God-Man. The earthly plan of the Gospel is always mysteriously transparent, and through the historical evidence we see the glimmering of Divine reality. It is true that not all see this, just as not all saw it then; and not "flesh and blood," but the Father which is in Heaven hath revealed that He was the Son of the living God (Math. 16:16-17). In the mysterious blending of the double features the Face of God-Man has been drawn, seen, and recognized. For thus it was described by the Evangelists. The whole of the New Testament throbs with historical fulfilment of what has been and is accomplished. But this is no historically isolated earthly stream of events, of "natural events." The narrative of what took place is a realistic narrative. It was, it happened, this meeting of the sky and the earth, of God and man. The meeting and the union: *"And the Word was made flesh"* (John 1:14). "And yet no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost" (I Cor. 17:3). It means that revelation becomes clearly heard by us in all its fullness only in spiritual experience. Therefore the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, has been sent down to us that He "Will guide you into all truth" (John 16:13), that He should "bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you" (John 14:26). And to the present day, "The same anointing teacheth you all things" (I John 2:27). The Gospels are written within the Church. They are the records of the apostolic "good tidings," of the apostolic preaching, and the strength of this preaching built up the Church: "Go ye, therefore, and teach." The Gospels are the records of Church experience and faith, records of what is visible in the experience of the Church. It is the living Image of Christ which the Church has contemplated from the beginning;

and it is only within the Church that this Image is fully and wholly accessible. St. Athanasius the Great says: "It is the direct and living meeting with Christ, into whom all the faithful are clothed in the sacrament of Holy Baptism; we are satisfied by the Spirit; we drink Christ."

Divine Revelation is preserved in the Church. It is protected and strengthened by the words of Scripture; it is protected, but not exhausted. The words of Scripture do not exhaust the whole fullness of Revelation; do not exhaust the whole fullness of Christian experience and of the charismatic reminiscence of the Church. The experience of the Church is wider than its direct testimony. Therefore those who abide in the Church know infinitely more and quite otherwise than "outsiders." For those who abide within the Church, the testimony of the Spirit makes the Scriptures a clearer, a fuller thing; this testimony once more lives in their own personal experience. And this is why we must not speak of the "self-sufficing quality" of Scripture. For Scripture is not only preserved by the power of human memory; it is also protected by the power of Grace in the charismatic life of the Church. In the Church, Revelation becomes an inner spiritual experience. The Church in itself is already a Revelation. From the Day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost *entered* the world to *abide* in it, Revelation has become an uninterrupted continuity. The fiery baptism of the created world was accomplished. It was represented by the twelve Apostles and those that were with them, as the chosen first-fruit (Math. 3:2). At any rate the Scriptures demand that they should be expounded and explained. And a true explanation will be one that proceeds from the realities described in the Scriptures. It must be no outward, but an inward explanation, growing out of the depth of spiritual experience. And here we do not so much speak of the personal spiritual intuition of every separate expounder, as, above all, of the living of the fullness of the spiritual experience of the Church itself. For in this experience the Scriptures become vivified by the same Spirit who had once inspired them. When the Church expounds Scripture it bears witness to *that* of which the Scriptures testify. But frequently new words are used. Revelation is received in the silence of faith, the silence of contemplation—such is the first silently receptive moment of theology. And in this receptive silence of contemplation the whole fullness of Truth is contained and given. But *Truth must still be expressed and pronounced.* Because man is called not only to receive Truth attentively, but also to witness of it. *Silencium mysticum* does not exhaust the complete calling of man. He is called to creative activity, above all, to the building up of his own self. God's Word must become evident in the reality of human thought; God's Word must give

birth to human thought. This is the creative or positive moment of the knowledge of God. Divine reality revealed in the experience of the Church may be described in manifold ways. *Either* in images and symbols, in religious poetry and religious art—such was the language of the Old Testament prophets; thus frequently spoke the Evangelists, thus preached the Apostles, and thus the Church is still preaching in the songs and hymns of its Divine service, in the symbolic meaning of its rites. This is the tongue of preaching or witnessing; it is the tongue of charismatic theology. *Or,* Divine reality may be described in the conceptions of the mind, in research. This is the language of dogma, of dogmatic theology. "Preaching" and "Dogma" are the two ways in which the Church bears witness to Truth, to that inner Revelation which is still continuing in the Church by the power of the Spirit abiding in it (cp. St. Basil the Great concerning the Holy Ghost). This Revelation, this deepening and growing into "The Knowledge of Truth," is the life of the Church: "Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13).

Dogma is *thought witnessing* to Revelation, to what it has seen, to what was revealed to it, to the visible and the contemplated in the Catholic experience of the Church. And this witness is expressed in definitions and conceptions. Dogma is the sentence of experience, the *mental vision,* true contemplation. We may name it the "logical image," the "logical ikon of Divine reality. And, at the same time, dogma is a *definition.* Therefore it is that both the logical form of dogma, that "inner word" which is fixed and made definite in outward expression, and the outward choice of words, are so important in dogma.

Dogma is no new Revelation; dogma *is only a witness,* a witness of the mind, such as is worthy of the experienced and recognized Divine Revelation, a Revelation granted and revealed in the charismatic experience of faith, of the mysteries of life eternal, such as has been shown by the Holy Ghost. All dogma is revealed by experience, in true contact with "things not seen" (Heb. 11:1).

This is the source of dogmatic decisive authority and of the unchangeableness of Truth, revealed and preserved from the beginning. Dogmas are not developed or changed. They are inviolable, even in their outward choice of words. Perhaps it may sound paradoxical, but it is still true to say that dogmas can arise, can be established and expressed, but they cannot be developed. A dogma once established is an eternal inviolable "rule of faith" and the measure of it. Of course this does not mean that something new, some "new truth" is being revealed; but it does mean that such a truth is being *expressed* and *pronounced.* In its dogmatic

witness the Church is *expressing* and *pronouncing* the truths preserved within its fold. And its aim is to find and establish the *exact* words, which should truly express the experience of the Church. These words must be able to transmit the "vision of the mind," which is being revealed to the faithful spirit in experience and contemplation. There is a pre-dogmatic period of Church consciousness; then the language chosen is one of images and symbols. But after this comes the time for bearing dogmatic witness. For truth of faith is truth of reason as well, and thought must enter "into the knowledge of truth." In doing this it becomes creatively transfigured, the very realm of thought becomes transfigured, sanctified, and renewed. When Divine Truth is pronounced and expressed in the human tongue, the very words are transfigured, and the fact that the Truths of Revelation are imparted in logical images and conceptions witnesses to the transfiguration of word and thought, *words become sacred.* The words of dogmatic definitions, frequently taken from the habitual philosophic vocabulary, are no more simple, casual words, which might have been and still may be replaced by some others. No, they have grown to be *eternal, irreplaceable* words. This signifies that in the adequate expression of a Divine Truth certain words, i.e., definite *conceptions* and *ideas,* or a *definite train of thought* have been eternalized and stabilized. This means that eternal and absolute ideas are being sought; therefore the Truth of Revelation may be and is adequately expressed in them. This Truth of Revelation has been positively granted, and not only postulated. Not something to be sought, but something given. However incommensurable our present knowledge "in part" is to the promised knowledge that is to be "face to face," still, now as alway, it is full and perfect. Truth is being revealed in Catholic experience and is being expressed in dogmatic definitions. The dogmas of the Fathers *repeat* in categories of thought the unchangeable contents of "apostolic preaching," they express "in words of reason dogmas which once were narrated in simple words by fishermen, who had received wisdom thereto by the power of the Spirit."

By the power of the Spirit. In the dogmatic definitions of the Church we again feel the life-giving power of the Spirit of Truth, the Spirit of Wisdom. Dogmas are pronounced not by the arbitrary desire of man, but by the inspiration of the Spirit. Usually this was done during the Œcumenical Councils, but sometimes also through the silent reception of *"ecclesiæ sparsæ."*

And again; dogmas do not exhaust the experience of the Church; just as Revelation is not exhausted in the words or the "letter" of Scripture. In dogmatic definitions the Truth of experience is only determined and protected, but not exhausted.

The experience and faith of the Church are fuller and wider than its dogmatic word. There is much to which the Church witnesses even to the present day in images, symbols, and similes, in symbolic theology. Probably this will exist to the end of time, i.e., to the last passing over from here to the beyond (see St. Gregory the Theologian). From the very beginning the Church was given the fullness of Truth. But it is only gradually and "in part" that this fullness is being expressed. In general all our knowledge here, is always a knowledge "in part." The exhaustive fullness will be revealed *only in the beyond,* in the Second Advent, in the "meeting with Our Lord." From here proceeds the dogmatic incompleteness of the Church's witness; this is also caused by the Church being "in a state of pilgrimage," *"in via";* that it is still being "completed and maketh increase (Eph. 4:16). The human spirit and reason are still "increasing." The historical aims of the knowledge of God, of understanding Revelation, are still facing us. There is much that is still to be accomplished. However the incompleteness and the inexhaustibleness of our knowledge here does not weaken its truth, its finality, the impossibility of replacing it; does not deprive it of the finality which has been attained. Within the limits of Church experience there are many mysteries for us to contemplate, mysteries for which no dogmatic words have been found so far. Here there is scope for "theological opinions" and research. There can also exist freedom in the understanding of established dogmas. Of course there is no room here for subjective arbitrary mental choice. Theology must always remain vital, *intuitive;* it must be nourished by the *experience of faith,* and must not be split up into autonomous isolated dialectic conceptions. Once more we want to remind you that the dogmas of faith are the truths of experience and of life—therefore they can be unfolded through no logical synthesis and analysis, but only through *spiritual life,* through actual participation in the fullness of Church experience. A lawful "theological opinion" can be attained not through any logical deduction, but only through direct vision, and this again can only be attained through strenuous prayerful effort, through a striving after the Spirit, through personal spiritual growth, through living communion with the constant Catholic experience of the Church.

Theology can be realized only through a *Catholic transfiguration* of those who are striving to attain knowledge. Catholicity is a victory over all manner of separatism. Catholicity strives against all kinds of individual isolation, against the self-assertion of exclusiveness and isolation. Catholicity is a certain attitude of conciousness, the measure and limit of spiritual growth. In this Catholic transfiguration, personality grows complete and receives the faculty and strength of feeling and expressing the consciousness and life of the

whole. And those, who, in striving to attain Catholic development, have gained this power, accept it as a gift of the Spirit. We name those who express the experience and consciousness of the Church, "Fathers and Teachers of the Church"; because from them we hear not only their own personal professions, but also the witness of the Church. It is out of Catholic fullness that they speak. In their words we feel the breath of the Spirit. The fullness of Revelation is assimilated by the Church in the measure of its spiritual growth. And this gradualness in the profession of faith is connected with the dynamic growth of Church existence, with the process of vital salvation, sanctification, and transfiguration. Perhaps it is not by chance that it is just those dogmatic definitions which treat of the building up of the "new creation" and of the final fate of the Church, which have not yet been expressed. Because this has not yet been fulfilled in time, because we are still seeing its fulfilment: and therefore we know not all about it, and can speak of it only in prophecies and symbols. In those dogmas which have already been established, that which pertains to the future is but partially visible. We possess no categorical definitions concerning the abiding of the Holy Spirit in the world, the action of the Holy Spirit in it; not of the life of the saints and sinners beyond the tomb, nor of much else that is awaiting its accomplishment. Here the Church often limits itself to dogmatic negation, i.e., it witnesses in an authoritative manner to what we are not allowed and must not think. And this witness proceeds from the depth of that experience which has not yet been and cannot be expressed. But the Church does not hasten to establish in dogmatic formulæ positive theological opinions of the future. And this not because it does not know, but because the time has not yet come for it to pronounce itself. The Church witnesses in a categorical manner to that which is ever present, to that which does not belong to time (as for instance the dogma of the Holy Trinity); or to that which has already been revealed, seen, and accomplished (the dogma of the Person of Our Savour). And in the dogma of Christ the first things defined were those which pertained to the past, in so far as they belonged to time (Incarnation, reality of the sufferings and death on the cross, Resurrection, Ascension); or again it witnesses to that which was revealed direct by Our Saviour Himself (the Second Advent, universal resurrection, the Day of Judgment). Of all else the Church prefers to bear testimony in symbols and similes, not dogmatically, but liturgically; as when it establishes the solemn festivals of Ascension and Transfiguration; or that of the Life-giving Cross. Here the Church testifies to much that has not yet found its final dogmatic expression; to much that is bound up with the sanctification, i.e., the perfection of the world; a sanctification that is being, but has not yet been, accomplished.

The mystery of the Ascension of Our Lord can be fully revealed only at the Second Advent "When He shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen Him go into heaven" (Acts, 1:11). For only then, and in the resurrection of all, will the created body be fully re-established and become incorruptible. The mystery of the Lord's Transfiguration is also closely connected with this. We catch but a glimpse of it in the witness of the Light of Mount Tabor, given by the Byzantine Councils of the XIV century. There is no doubt that much has been given us only as foreknowledge. However, this does not mean that we have the right to form whatever opinion we like concerning the truths that have not been expressed; or that here there is nothing obligatory for us. The realm of foreknowledge is no "doubtful realm" *(Dubitum)* in which unlimited "freedom" is permitted us *(In dubiis libertas)*. The absence of "dogmatic" definitions does not indicate *absence of knowledge*, and does not authorize complete *reserve* from *all* judgment. For that which has not been given in dogma has been given us in an experience, which is the source of the dogmatic definitions of the Church. It has also often been given in written recorded Revelation, which is not exhausted in dogmatic expressions, and which is full of mystery and prophecies. Not all that is known and revealed is proclaimed dogmatically by the Church, but *all is given* in the dialectic experience of the Church, which indissolubly abides with its head, Jesus Christ, and is unchangeably enlightened and inspired by the Life-giving Spirit.

Father Sergius Bulgakov expressed himself very adequately when he said: "He who has once met Christ, His Saviour, on his own personal path, and has felt His Divinity, has, in that very moment, accepted all fundamental Christian dogmas—Virgin Birth, Incarnation, Second Glorious Advent, the Coming of the Comforter, the Holy Trinity." (S. Bulgakov: "The Undying Light." 1917, p. 57). To this I want to add: "Or else he has not yet met Christ, or, at any rate, has not recognized Him." "The Spirit abideth with us now, and, in the striving after the Spirit, the path towards the fullness of the knowledge of God is opened to us." (St. Gregory the Theologian).

God speaks to man through His Spirit; and only in the measure in which man abides in the Spirit does he hear and understand this voice: "The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8). There are no isolated paths of spiritual life. Since the Day of Pentecost the Spirit abideth in the Church, where God hath ordained "the action of the Spirit" (*"Omnem operationem Spiritus,"* as St. Ireneus of Lyons said). Here, by the power of the Spirit, is every soul quickened. Here the Word of God rings

and is heard—all the words pronounced since the beginning. Here is the fullness and the path of knowledge. The striving after the Spirit, the prayer for the granting of the Spirit, is the path in which we can glorify God. Through the Breath of the Spirit God's Revelation will be eternally vivified and will be built up into the living organism of the one and undivided Truth.

The Church teaches us to pray:

"Our Heavenly King, Comforter, Spirit of Truth, Omnipresent and All-fulfilling, Treasure of all Good, and Giver of Life, come and abide in us, cleanse us from all evil, and save, O All-merciful, our souls."

PROTESTANTISM VERSUS HISTORY

By Hoffman Nickerson

A FEW months ago the Bishop of New York set forth in a sermon the doctrine of the ministry, and especially of the Episcopate, held not only by Anglicans but also by Rome and by the Eastern Churches: namely, that from the beginning there have been in the Church of God the three Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. This sermon was attacked not only by various Protestants but also by certain Protestant-minded Anglicans, one hostile commentator remarking that it "showed no evidence of scholarship."

I propose now to examine the Protestant case against the apostolic succession of our Bishops, not in the light of any detailed study of Christian origins (to which I lay no claim) but solely through that general knowledge of the subject easily obtainable by any educated man. To this general knowledge I can add familiarity with the handling of historical evidence and considerable reading on certain phases of mediæval and modern history.

Protestants used to deny altogether the Orthodox-Catholic doctrine of the ministry, saying in particular that the Early Church had no bishops. The advance of historical science has now so completely disproved this earlier and sweeping denial that probably no one at all acquainted with the subject would make it to-day. Accordingly the Protestant thesis is now more modestly put. It is admitted that the Catholic and Apostolic ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons existed in the Early Church but it is argued that it did not exist alone, that beside it there were forms of Church government of a sort which we should call to-day Presbyterian (that is, government by synods of Priests or Presbyters, the Greek word for an Elder, *Presbuteros*, having developed into our word Priest), perhaps also Congregationalist.

This theory of diversity is put forward on an historical basis and must therefore be judged as history. History is not a "science," that is not an exact science. Its conclusions are never based upon mathematically perfect proof because there is always the chance, however slight, that the witnesses on whom it must rely may have been either mistaken or liars. Accordingly its certainties are matters of converging probability, and the estimate of probability is always a matter of judgment.

Historical evidence is either that of documents contemporary with the events described or that of tradition fixed in documents written long after the events.

Litera scripta manet, the written letter remains. Full record compels belief. But that means contemporary documents substantially in agreement and so numerous as to make it unthinkable that their authors were unanimously liars or mistaken—still less forgers. When record is doubtful or scanty then judgment as to probability comes in.

For a particular event, documents should outweigh tradition. Thus there is a strong tradition in the United States that, on April 18th, 1775, the first shots were fired at Lexington, which tradition Dean Murdock has disproved in his book, *The Nineteenth of April 1775*. Since the contemporary pictures and other contemporary evidence show the Lexington militia fleeing from the British and not resisting them, and since it is most improbable that a handful of raw troops would commit suicide by standing against an overwhelming number of regulars, we may be reasonably certain that they ran without returning the British fire. The Massachusetts men, including the Lexington company, fought well that day but the fighting began at Concord and not at Lexington, and the national pride amply explains the Lexington tradition.

On the other hand, tradition has value. Did space permit, this could be conclusively proved in great detail, and the job would be worth doing because the anti-traditional mania of a lifetime ago, although dying at the hands of advancing scholarship and especially archæology, is not yet quite dead. But since all the world knows to-day that one can hardly stick a shovel into any old mound from Italy through Greece and Asia Minor to Palestine without digging up evidence favouring some sacred or classical tradition, the point need not be laboured here. When not a particular event but a widespread institution, visible to many witnesses, is in question, then the evidence of tradition is particularly valuable.

Further, the nature of the Early Church gives its tradition far higher value than that of tradition in general. When the Early Church appears in the light of fairly full record soon after the year 200 A.D., it is a body insistent upon unity not only in basic doctrine but also in organization. It claims to invent nothing but to have received all things from its Founder. It decides its differences by asking "which of two opinions best agrees with the Faith once delivered?" In grave matters it holds that its decisions are incontrovertible thanks to an indwelling Holy Spirit promised to it by the Founder. In other words it is a body ideally designed for continuity.

Further, its tradition as to the universality and importance of Bishops is unanimous. Every part of the organized Christian world is presided over by them. When later the Œcumenical Councils are summoned, the testimony of Bishops as to the traditions of their sees is sought as a natural thing and the decision of the assembled

Bishops—when tacitly ratified by the consent of the mass of believers—is final and incontrovertible.

The Christian writers of the late second and early third centuries, St. Hippolytus at Rome, Origen (*c.* 185–254) in Alexandria, Tertullian (*c.* 155–*c.* 222) and St. Cyprian (*c.* 200–258) in North Africa all take Bishops for granted. They have no memory of a time when every local Church was not episcopally governed. Although they know that heretics such as the Ebionites had denied Our Lord's divinity and the Gnostics his humanity, they nowhere record a suggestion that in every city a single chief priest called a Bishop and in succession to the Apostles had not existed from the beginning. Not the faintest echo of debate concerning the office of a Bishop has come down to us.

Consider now the time factor in terms of human life. A slightly older contemporary of St. Cyprian, that is, a man born in 190 and twenty years old in 210, was only one long lifetime removed from the survivors of the apostolic generation. The old men of 210 had in their youth known a generation of old men who in their turn had known men who could well remember contemporaries of the Apostles. This point, well made by Belloc in his *Europe and the Faith*, demolishes the unhistorical idea that in so short a time there might have been a gradual and imperceptible development. Such a thing presupposes a conspiracy of silence, historically unthinkable in such an institution as the Early Church.

Further, we well know that the first and second centuries were unfavourable to the growth of distorted errors in such a matter. They were highly cultured times of frequent travel. The Empire had a single government, no internal frontiers like those of Christendom to-day and consequently no tendency to undue localism. It abounded in highly-cultured men possessed of leisure and concerned over the ultimate problems of human life. All told, therefore, the time was inhospitable to errors of ignorance, vagueness and provincialism.

Accordingly, did no documents from the first two Christian centuries exist, then the strong and unanimous tradition as to monarchical Bishops would be decisive. Even if positive documentary evidence to the contrary existed, that evidence would have to be abundant and capable of meeting severe investigation before any careful historian could set so formidable a tradition aside.

Turning now to the documents themselves, we find the New Testament and certain other documents surviving from the apostolic generation or shortly after. Then until near the end of the second century there is a gap from which only a few fragments survive.

None of these early documents contains a treatise on Orders and Church government—evidently their writers took these things for granted. Almost all their references to them are fragmentary and

incidental. Thus even if the implications fairly to be drawn from these fragments seemed to agree against the primitive character of Church government by a single Bishop in each city, there would remain the difficulty of trusting to their slight evidence as against the vast and solid tradition arising so soon afterwards. The fact is that among the very few documents approaching systematic treatment of the subject we have a clear and most positive statement of the monarchical Episcopate by St. Ignatius of Antioch who gives the threefold Orders Bishop (*Episcopos*), Priests (*Presbuteroi*), and Deacons in each diocese. Now St. Ignatius was born about 50 A.D. and therefore stood to the Crucifixion as men in their early fifties stand to-day to the end of the American Civil War. Because St. Ignatius had an intense nature and wrote under the shadow of martyrdom, certain modern writers have psycho-analysed him unfavourably ; they themselves would be at least equally fit subjects for like treatment.

By contrast, most of the documentary fragments quoted in favour of the diversity theory are altogether inconclusive. Because the opening verses of Acts xiii say that certain " prophets and teachers " in the Church of Antioch " sent forth " St. Paul on his first missionary journey, therefore we are solemnly told that these were then the chief officers of the Antiochean Church. Unfortunately for this argument, since St. Paul was already an Apostle, the highest dignity in the infant Church, it is hard to see how any Antiochean Church officer would have had hierarchical authority to send him anywhere. Accordingly it seems more probable that these prophets and teachers either persuaded St. Paul by the exercise of spiritual gifts independent of Church order or raised money to help meet the expenses of the journey.

To illustrate the grotesque results achieved by arguing from the fragmentary implications of documents irrespective of tradition, suppose I write to a friend that I yesterday met so and so wearing a silk hat. That statement in itself, isolated from the traditions of our society, will not rule out the possibility that the wearer of the silk hat may have been otherwise completely naked. Indeed that is said to be the practice of certain savages who own silk hats. It is solely through our knowledge of the traditions of our own society that we are safe in assuming that the man in question was clothed. Indeed our traditional knowledge will take us further ; it will tell us that he was probably wearing either full evening dress or a suit with a cutaway coat. It will justify belief in shoes, socks, a shirt, collar and necktie as well.

But it may be argued that although the support given to the theory of diversity by the implication of each documentary fragment is small, nevertheless their consensus has some weight. Other things being equal, those documents most prized by the early Church would

be most often copied and therefore most likely to survive. Therefore, the fact that a given fragment has survived is evidence in its favour.

Let us examine the historical evidence as to the survival of documents. In classical literature the argument for the survival of the best and most significant writers breaks down before the virtually complete loss of Sappho's poems, reckoned by ancient critics the greatest Greek lyrics. If we say that not only literary excellence but also suitability for use in education make for survival, that Sappho was obscene and hence unsuitable for a text-book, how then can we account for the survival of authors like Petronius and Martial —at least as obscene as anything that Sappho could have written and far below her in literary merit ? There seems absolutely nothing to show that the lost books of Livy were inferior either as history or literature to his surviving work. If popularity be the test, we must face the fact that to-day many talented men write for audiences reckoned in hundreds while trashy popular novels sell by hundreds of thousands.

Clearly, although there is some force in the idea that the most significant fragments of ancient literature will survive, to press it too far is to fall into an unwarranted Victorian optimism. The theory would work perfectly were we dealing with an infinite number of chances but in fact the number is strictly limited and we must therefore allow very generously for the freaks of what seems mere blind chance. Thus, if anyone were disposed to play roulette through most of their waking hours and for months at a time, and if the wheel were accurate, black and red would doubtless come nearly even. But over shorter periods it is the universal experience of mankind that the wheels of fortune are most uneven. So delightful a poet as Catullus survived in only three manuscripts. A slight illness would have prevented the copying of the first, fire or a careless librarian might well have caused the destruction of the second, and a brush with bandits while the third was in transit might have caused its loss, too. All of which chances would have had no more to do with Catullus's literary excellence than the man in the moon. When the fourteenth-century scholar Boccaccio visited the great monastic library of Monte Cassino he found the monks allowing priceless ancient manuscripts to rot under the weather—in which case the best chance of survival would be to those which merely happened to be in the middle of each pile. Precisely the same luck preserved the letter which, after a hundred and fifty years, identified Washington's chief spy in New York through the last phase of the Revolution ; it was thrown into a stove to be burnt, but happening to be in the middle of a tight packet or wad of other letters it did not catch fire and was afterwards rescued intact.

Once admit the large part of what seems blind chance in such

matters and we must conclude that surviving fragments may or may not be significant.

A perfect and amusing example of the grotesque results possible, to one who would argue strongly from fragmentary record, can be drawn from the American Revolution. We know from full record that one of its chief results was to destroy hereditary monarchy in the Thirteen Colonies. If, however, we assume the future destruction of most Revolutionary records together with the survival of certain unquestionably genuine documents, then two thousand years from now a scholar contemptuous of tradition, going solely by those documents, and arguing as Protestants still sometimes argue against Bishops, would be well able to claim that the Revolution was not against hereditary monarchy but on the contrary balanced between hereditary and elective government.

Let us assume a knowledge of the Revolution parallel to our present knowledge of the Early Church. Let our future scholar know that pre-revolutionary England and America were alike familiar with the idea of elections. Just so we know that the ancient Roman World was familiar with the institution of monarchy; it had the Emperors whose powers were continually increasing at the expense of the Senate, it had provincial governors who were deputy-monarchs, and in Jewish religious affairs it had the " Masters " of Synagogues. Let our future scholar know that the United States of the early twentieth century was governed solely by elected persons and that a strong tradition existed that such had been the case from the beginning of the Republic. Just so we know the Universal Church of about 200 A.D. to have been everywhere governed by Bishops, everywhere to have believed the Bishops' office primitive, and retained no trace of disagreement as to its primitiveness. Let the learned of 4000 A.D. possess fragmentary record of the institutions set up by the Revolution and of the political opinions current among the American patriots of the time. Some of these fragments would strongly support the tradition as to elective government—exactly as the passages in Acts describing St. James as monarchical Bishop in Jerusalem, together with St. Ignatius' testimony to the three Orders, support the third-century tradition as to Bishops.

But let us assume also that certain other and apparently contrary fragments had survived, seeming to tell against the primitiveness of the elective principle throughout the United States precisely as certain early Christian documents seem to tell against the universality of monarchical Bishops in the early Church. We here approach the hub of the argument. Let us assume our future scholar possessed of the diary of Captain John Montresor of the Royal Engineers, stationed in New York City during the Stamp Act troubles of the seventeen-sixties. He would find Montresor writing " if we may judge of the loyalty of most people here, they acknowledge the King

but not the power of Parliament." Let him know the early Revolutionary fashion of referring to the British troops in America not as " Royal " but as " Ministerial " troops, especially let him have Washington's letter of May 31st, 1775, from Philadelphia to George William Fairfax, speaking of " . . . the Ministerial troops (for we do not, nor can we yet prevail upon ourselves to call them the King's troops)." Let him have several of the high compliments paid by Americans to Louis XVI, showing American feeling most friendly to an hereditary allied monarch. Let him know in some detail the seventeen eighty-two attempt of certain army officers to make Washington King of America, also that Washington had no children —which deficiency could have been assigned as a reason for not accepting.

From the period immediately following the Revolution let us suppose that our scholar of A.D. 4000 had Madison's letter of seventeen eighty-seven, written just after the democratic riots in New England and saying " the late turbulent scenes in Massachusetts and Rhode Island have done inexpressible injury to the Republican character in that part of the United States, and a propensity toward Monarchy is said to have been produced . . . in some leading minds." Finally, let him know Franklin as an extreme Democrat and let him have *Madison's Journal* for June 2nd, 1787, making Franklin say " there is a natural inclination in mankind to kingly government. It sometimes relieves them from aristocratic domination. They had rather have one tyrant than five hundred. It gives more the appearance of equality among citizens and that they like."

To-day abundant record permits us to put the foregoing documents in their place. If, on the other hand, our future scholars were disposed to argue on Protestant principles (which, in the interest of sound learning, may God forbid), is there any doubt what he would say? It would be something like this: The unquestionably genuine documents surviving from the Revolutionary era in the United States " . . . form a solid basis—and the only solid basis—on which to build a history of the primitive "—American State. (The words in quotation marks are taken bodily from a recent exponent of the pro-Protestant theory of diversity speaking of the surviving apostolic documents.) Arguing thus, our learned man of A.D. 4000 would solemnly conclude the United States long balanced between hereditary and elective governments. If by any chance he discovered that Rhode Island in the year 1802 was governed by a certain governor Fenner and in the year 1829 by a second Fenner, who was the legitimate son of the first, then he would be quite certain and would write " the happy results of recent research in Rhode Island have sufficed to establish the existence of hereditary government in post-revolutionary America. In view of the well-known

statements of Montresor, of Washington himself, of Madison and of Franklin, the long-believed tradition of universal elective government in the early United States, long doubted by the Higher Critics, has now received its death blow. The objection of certain hide-bound and reactionary men to the effect that the traditional list of Rhode Island governors gives several names intervening between the two Fenners is hardly worthy of attention. It will be evident that the intervening names, if genuine at all, are morally certain to have been those of regents acting in the name of the younger Fenner until his maturity!"

If the reader is amused, let him none the less note that our imaginary pedant is repeating almost word for word the Protestant argument against Bishops.

What, then, can history really tell us of the early Church in general and of her Bishops in particular? Whether the Faith be true or no, history cannot say. In the strict sense neither the books of the New Testament nor the other earliest Christian writings can be called historical documents because they are full of marvels and are unsupported by other contemporary documents from outside what was at first the small and obscure Christian society. Except Josephus, no contemporary non-Christian document so much as mentions Our Lord. It is true that Josephus's testimony has recently been strengthened by the discovery of a Slavic manuscript apparently translated from the lost Aramaic version which we know Josephus first made—this Slavic manuscript contains the reference to Our Lord in a form more ample than in the long-known Greek version. But this reference, although it strengthens the historical case for Our Lord's existence, is not altogether conclusive because it stands alone. It is true that history finds it equally impossible to deny the genuineness of the early documents; the historical characters appearing in them such as Pilate and the Herods are used correctly, which might not be the case in spurious writings especially if later in time. But for history the early Christian documents would be inconclusive if unsupported and unconfirmed by tradition.

Accordingly the history of the infant Church is based first of all not upon the New Testament and other primitive documents but upon the Catholic—that is Universal—tradition of the early third century. The early third century Church is an historical fact, solid and definite. We know her belief in the combined Divinity and Humanity of her Founder, her Eucharistic worship. We know her passion for pure tradition and for unity, also her insistence upon regular organization for maintaining both. We know the world in which she grew up. We have her word and her word alone for the genuineness of the early Christian writings. If we find her mistaken as to her Orders we are at liberty to doubt the earthly existence of Our Lord Himself, for both rest on the same traditional basis. But

that the first Christians, whether rightly or wrongly, believed as the third-century Christians believed is so overwhelmingly probable that we are intellectually compelled to accept it as historical fact.

Were we compelled to account for the documentary fragments quoted by Protestants against the institution of Bishops, many reasonable suppositions might be made. For instance, it is conceivable that the earliest Bishops were known as Apostles, and that as this term passed out of use there may have been some local and temporary confusion between the terms *Episcopos* and *Presbuteros*. In a body expanding so rapidly as the Early Church, and so full of spiritual gifts existing independently of Church Order, some slight symptoms of such confusion would be natural. Further, a persecuted body cannot organize as regularly as if legally established. Incidentally, the persecutions make it difficult to explain the institutions of regular clergy and of Bishops on the ground of worldly ambition among the early Christian leaders—to be known as a Christian leader merely increased one's chances of being tortured to death in the next persecution. In any event we as historians need press none of the various guesses which would explain the various documentary fragments quoted by Protestants. It is enough for us to insist kindly and fraternally that the historical difficulties are theirs, not ours.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH AND THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.

By the VARTOPED SHAVARSH KOUYOUJIAN.

IT is common even for people of scholarship to go astray on a dogmatic point about the Armenian Orthodox Apostolic Catholic Church.

In spite of the facts that she derives her apostolic origin from two actual disciples of our Lord—SS. Thaddeus and Bartholomew—that she was the first Christian Church in the world to be recognized by the state as national, and that after all, she possesses, as her name suggests, the threefold criterion of the Church of our Lord, a heretical feature, namely Monophysitism, is ascribed to her. The most recent occasion on which she was so stigmatized was in an article in *The Times* (Feb. 20, 1932).

In order to be able to discuss that misleading statement we have to know what is the connotation of the term applied.

Monophysitism is the belief which recognizes only one nature μόνη φύσις, the Divine, in Christ, and rejects His Manhood.

In this connection we have to remember the fact that this heresy originated in reaction from Nestorianism, which was refuted at the Council of Ephesus in the formula: μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ σεσαρκωμένη.

Though this clear-cut formula can bear only one interpretation, yet we judge it as well to state this: (in the first stage) The word The Logos was "Light of Light, Very God of Very God . . . . (in the second stage) 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 . . . ."

Owing to his zeal against Nestorius, Eutyches found himself driven to the opposite extreme. He held a confused union of the divine and human natures: an amalgamation of the two. The matter was discussed at the Council of Chalcedon (451) where while the orthodox insisted upon the formula μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ σεσαρκωμένη (one incarnate Person having two natures), Eutyches took it up and altered it to μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ σεσαρκωμένου (one nature in the Incarnate), as the result of an absorption of the human nature into the divine. This was duly condemned, and a *perfect, unconfused* union of the two natures was proclaimed: one ὑπόστασις, one πρόσωπον, two natures, without confusion, without change, without rending, without separation.

Now this is the very confession of the Armenian Church,

according to which she says: ". . . and the perfect God became a perfect man in soul, mind and body; one person one figure, and *united one nature* . . . without change, without alteration . . ."

Thus it is obvious from this comment on the formula μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ σεσαρκωμένη (as the grammatical construction of the phrase not to one nature of the Incarnate Word φύσις is applied to the One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Word (σεσαρκωμένη), not to one nature of the Incarnate Word (σεσαρκωμένου). In other words, φύσις is taken for πρόσωπον or ὑπόστασις. Therefore our Lord is confessed ἕν προσωπον, δυο φύσεις μετὰ τὴν σαρκωσιν.

Here is a quotation from St. Gregory of Nareg (10th cent.) the greatest monk and mystic poet of the Armenian Church: "Taking truly the very structure of the human body, the great God united in Himself without confusion . . . ."

In conclusion, the Armenian Church has been always loyal to the Orthodox Confession of *the Church*.

Here arises the question of the attitude of the Armenian Church towards that Council—a paradox for some people and a stumbling-block for many. She could not take any part in that Council for these reasons: 1, In the year 451, while doctrinal discussions were going on at Chalcedon the Armenian Church, the corner stones of which were formed by the Three Œcumenical Councils, was fighting the Persian Empire in order to secure her faith against Zoroastrianism. It is needless to mention the overwhelming power of the Persian religion which, as a vigorous rival, menaced not only a National Church, but Christianity itself.

As an immediate result of that war the bishops were either imprisoned or exiled, the princes scattered, the fighting power crushed, and the people panic-stricken.[1] Under these conditions

[1] Gibbon wrote (*Decline and Fall*: II, 322). "Since the age of Constantine the Armenians had signalized their attachment to the religion . . . . of the Christians." "The disorders of their country and their ignorance of the Greek tongue prevented their clergy from assisting at the Synod of Chalcedon."

For "since the age of Constantine" in the above passage, truth would substitute "since the age of the Apostles." The Armenians proclaimed their Church as National in 301, before Constantine's proclamation of Christianity as the State religion.

Gibbon's "disorders" were a vital religious struggle against Zoroastrianism: and as for the Greek tongue, the version of the Bible made from the Septuagint by the Armenians and characterized by European scholars as a Queen of translations, is witness that some at least of the Armenian clergy were masters of it.

Gibbon continues: "They floated eighty-four years in a state of indifference or suspense, till their vacant faith was finally occupied by the missionaries of Julian of Halicarnassus." "The Armenians alone are the pure disciples of Eutyches . . . . they alone persevere in the opinion that the manhood of Christ was created, or existed without creation, of a divine and incorruptible substance" . . . . In contrast with this, the truth is that the Armenians always remained firm in the teaching of the Church, till their full faith finally urged them to face Zoroastrianism and to anathematize the missionaries of Julian Halicarnassus. The Armenians alone are the loyal followers of the Three Œcumenical Councils. They persevere, with the Church, in the Faith that the Logos was truly incarnate in a perfect unconfused union of the Two Natures.

could she think about taking part in the Council? What she really and naturally wanted to be given was some christianlike assistance in her fatal struggle, and this was denied. Marcian, the emperor, who patronized the Council, rejected the petition of the Armenian delegation.

2.—The doctrines of the Armenian Church already contained the Chalcedonian Definition, but never accepted the Council itself, since the points of Christian dogma, of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation and Redemption, were already stated in the Creed of the First Three Councils. The business of a general council must be to transfer the dogmas to the faithful as revealed by God as compulsory for belief, leaving the doctrines to be discussed by the doctors of the church. Dogma is a matter of belief, doctrine is a matter of study. The Council of Chalcedon, strangely enough, mixed up these two distinct features, and taking up a dogmatic point—our Lord's perfect divinity and true manhood (already settled in the previous councils)—began to discuss the way in which they were united. It is true that Eutyches denied our Lord's manhood, but what next? All the Apostolic Churches were firm on their common creed; Eutyches, therefore, had to be counted as a rebel for not submitting himself to the faith of the Church, an heresiarch, and consequently he should have been simply excommunicated. To illustrate what we are insisting upon, let us take the case of people of diverse and false opinions. Nobody cares to hold general councils to refute them; there is the Creed; it concerns them to submit themselves to it or to keep away from the Church.

Let us now consider some historial data, in justification of the attitude of the Armenian Church towards the Chalcedonian Council. One of the aims—if not the only one—of that Council was to exalt the See of Constantinople, and this was done; but it aroused the opposition of Rome. Thus she refused to accept —as we shall see later—a decision which was not in her favour. Moreover, the subtle distinction between "two persons" (heresy) and "two natures" (orthodoxy) was not fully apprehended by the majority of people. Thus the Chalcedonian Definition, suspected of Nestorianism, was suspended. It will be remembered that after their defeat, the Nestorians took refuge in Persia which encouraged them for political reasons. After the Council of Chalcedon they became active. A council took place in Antioch (476), which considered the Chalcedonian Definition as suspicious. Similarly various emperors issued edicts rejecting it and confining themselves to the Ephesean clear-cut Definition. It is mainly from this point of view, of suspicion, that the Armenian Church kept herself clear of it. She would have had nothing to do with all these, had the Nestorian Assyrians not prevailed—in setting forth, as did

Nestorius himself, the Chalcedonian Definition—over the Orthodox Assyrians who solicited her. Finally, in a National Council held in 506, she proclaimed the confession of the Council of Ephesus, and repudiated not only Nestorianism, but also anything suspected of Nestorianism, including the Council of Chalcedon, and Monophysitism or Eutychianism.

3.—The third reason why the Armenian Church could not be interested in the Council of Chalcedon; is the fact, that under the guise of a Doctrinal Discussion, it was a question of precedence and influence among the distinguished Sees. During the first three centuries there were three patriarchates: that of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch. But at the Council of 381, Constantinople was also raised to that dignity, the patriarchs basing their claims on the ground that it had been proclaimed capital of the whole empire, and that an Œcumenical Council had been held there. The See of Alexandria could not endure this. It recalled the fact that two of the holders of that See were dethroned as heresiarchs, Macedonius and Nestorius: while its own patriarchs, Alexander, Athanasius, Theophilus and Cyril were the champions of the Church. Likewise Rome could not tolerate a claim of that kind. That is why it refused, as we stated above, to acknowledge the decision of Chalcedon which ranked the See of Constantinople next to it; because it feared that one day the See of Constantinople might—as it had risen from the fifth position to the second—claim to be first.

We should like to repeat our statement that the council dealt with was not regarded, even by the Roman and Greek churches themselves, as general, until, in the process of time, their differences with regard to temporal authority were settled. The Armenian Church always refused to acknowledge a council which was held in the interests of parts of the Church and not of the whole.

In this connection I cannot help mentioning the Georgian Church. As long as she was loyal to the Armenian Church, she kept her identity and enjoyed all her privileges. But the moment she accepted the Council of Chalcedon she resigned her independence; because there came a period when the Russian Church, as a kindred body, interfered with her affairs. The result is that the ceremonies and the language, even the head-bishop and the bishops are Russian. Long before the Russian interference she was obliged to withdraw from the Holy Land, bequeathing her post to her sister, the Greek.

Of course it would be different for the Armenian Church had she not been wise enough to reject the Chalcedonian Council; but she would have risked being considered a part of the Greek Church, just as there are now people who do not realize that she is not monophysite.

4.— At the present moment the Council of Chalcedon has no significance for the Armenian Church. She has always been able to manage for herself while accepting only the Three General Councils. This is a strong position which has its sound justification. The universal character attached to a council is based on the number of churches taking part in it, and implies that they are in perfect harmony on the matters which were settled. Now that kind of harmony was realized from 325 to 431, at the Three General Councils, when the Church as a coherent whole, faced and overcame all the difficulties. After that period certain churches held private councils, passed laws, and even rose against one another. Thus mundane ambitions culminated in the Council of Chalcedon, which was denied the title of "General" for fifty years. What a contrast to the first Three General Councils!

For a moment let us suppose that the Armenian Church were to acknowledge the Council in question. What next? Would she not be obliged automatically to accept three others peculiar to the Greek and Roman Churches? Then what about the thirteen others, besides the seven peculiar to the Roman Church?

Thus the attitude of the Armenian Church is entirely justified. She will never condescend to any form other than her own. It is the others who must themselves go back to the most cherished apostolic simplicity, where they meet the Armenian Church.

If the longed-for unselfish union of the churches, dominated by Christian love is what is really wanted, then they must all go back to the point from which they all derived their Common Creed.

But before that blessed day dawns, to get rid of ignorance or injustice, the writer of this article asks all who are interested in this matter not to attach the stigma of Monophysitism to the Armenian Orthodox Apostolic Catholic Church.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN

By Leicester C. Lewis, Ph.D.

IN view of the steadily increasing friendship between the Eastern and Anglican Churches, I am glad to put on record the account of a serious attempt at intercommunion, made in America now nearly thirty years ago, which in the mysterious providence of God miscarried.

It will be recalled that at the famous consecration of Dr. Weller as Bishop Coadjutor of Fond du Lac (Wisconsin) in 1900, both Bishop Koslovski of the Polish Old Catholics and Bishop Tikhon, later Patriarch of the Russian Church, were present, in the chancel vested. The photograph taken of the bishops at this consecration popularized the significance of the service, and well it deserved to do so. Every one of the vestments contested during previous fifty years in the Anglican Communion was used at this solemnity, under the authority of the bishops commissioned to consecrate by the Presiding Bishop of the American Church. The three episcopal ministers of the altar wore the full eucharistic vestments, besides cope and mitre, and the Assisting Bishops were also in cope and mitre. Incense and processional lights were used, and the Blessed Sacrament was reserved on a side altar. Therefore practically every point of consequence which had been in litigation during the Ceremonial Revival was employed here under the highest possible authority. Moreover when criticism of the service was made in certain quarters, Bishop MacLaren of Chicago, himself one of the assisting bishops, and recognized as the foremost canonist in the House of Bishops, publicly invited anyone who could do so to test formally the legality of the service. None dared to do this, and hence the Fond du Lac consecration closed an epoch in the story of the revival of Church ways in America.

The ceremonial importance of this beautiful service has long been known and appreciated, but it had a little known sequel, which I wish to chronicle here.

The Russian Bishop Tikhon, as I have said, was present vested, and it had been the intention of Bishop Grafton, the Chief Consecrator, to have him join with the American prelates in the actual laying on of hands. Owing, however, to the strong opposition of one of the assisting Bishops, this did not happen, and the Russian bishop was "merely present." Bishop Tikhon, however, remained on terms of close intimacy with Bishop Grafton,

and indeed through the latter's influence was made an honorary doctor of theology of Nashotah Seminary.

Not long after this, Bishop Tikhon, with his seat in New York, found it necessary to consecrate a bishop for the Orthodox Church in Brooklyn. The candidate was Archimandrite Raphael, whose jurisdiction was to be among the Syrians. At that time there were only two Orthodox prelates in America, Tikhon of New York and Innocent of Alaska. Now it was that Bishop Tikhon, remembering the great service at Fond du Lac, and in view of all he had heard of things Anglican from Bishop Grafton, *invited the latter to join in the consecration of Bishop Raphael, thus making up the canonical third consecrator.*

The implications of such an act were of course obvious, and Bishop Grafton accepted the invitation with apostolic eagerness. His Chaplain in the East at that time was the Reverend Sigourney Fay, then still in Deacon's Orders, later Archdeacon of Fond du Lac and Professor of Dogmatics at New York. I, then a school boy, had known Fr. Fay at Holy Cross Monastery, and as a consequence he asked another friend, Clement Hoffmann, and myself, to come to the service as acolytes.

The chaplain and the acolytes arrived at the Russian Church on Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn, in good time for the service, only to find that Bishop Grafton was unable to be present. He had been taken seriously ill over the week-end, and the physician had positively forbidden his leaving his bed. With Bishop Grafton's unstinted and lifelong devotion to Catholic ideals, we can be certain that this was no diplomatic illness.

So all that happened was that the Anglican chaplain and acolytes were present in the sanctuary without their bishop. The two Russian bishops conducted the ceremony, and consecrated without a third. We, however, were given places of honour behind the ikonostas, were separately censed, and received the unconsecrated elements of the Agapé at the end of the service. The Gospel was sung in several languages, including the original Aramaic words used by Our Lord.

As, in the years since, Fr. Fay became a Roman Catholic and later died, and as I understand that my acolyte companion of whom I lost track soon after the service has also died, it seems only fitting that the attempt at genuine Catholic fellowship between two great bishops and confessors, Grafton of Fond du Lac and Tikhon of Moscow, should be placed on record by the sole Anglican survivor of the attempt.

His Holiness Mgr. Khoren,
Supreme Catholicos of the Armenian Church.

Autumn and Winter, 1932.] [Vol. XIII. Nos. 3 and 4.

The Christian East

EDITORIAL.

THIS double number of *The Christian East* represents its Autumn and Christmas issues for 1932.

If every subscriber to *The Christian East* declared that the dilatoriness in its appearance was past pardon and abruptly terminated his subscription to it, we could not be surprised.

But the Game is more than the Players of the Game.

If by our remissness, we Editors have failed the Cause and risked the support which is necessary for the keeping in being of *The Christian East*, the devoted adherents of the Anglican and Eastern Church Association will not suffer our defalcations to shipwreck it.

On the contrary, we are very sure that they will do the thing which everyone else would expect them not to do—and will not only renew their own subscriptions to it but will canvas others to subscribe to it. For *The Christian East* is unique in this. Amongst periodicals it stands alone as an organ of *liaison* between the Orthodox Communion and the Anglican. Since its first appearance in 1920, it has been the vehicle for the publication of many and singular documents which are of permanent and historic importance in the Orthodox-Anglican Movement and which otherwise would not have been published. It has served as the organ alike for the chronicling of major happenings during the past twelve years of its existence in the history of Eastern Christendom and for their interpretation by men who have played a leading part in them. And it has not only placed in ordered record the capital events which—as the present Œcumenical Patriarch describes them—have marked the transformation of Orthodox and Anglican relations from the comity and amity of friendly Communions into the intimacies of sister churches, but in some measure has been of service in that transformation.

To close our eyes to the shortcomings of *The Christian East* and to our editorial defects other than unpunctuality, would be blind self-complacency.

None the less, the quotations from and references to *The Christian East* which are to be found in practically every recent documented book on Reunion in general or on the mutual approximation of the Orthodox and Anglican Communions in particular, make us bold

to claim that as its twelve volumes provide material which is indispensable for those who would write the history of those movements, so they have been not altogether negligible in the making of the history which is chronicled in them.

Of the interest of *The Christian East* as a periodical, it is for our readers and not for us to write.

Savoir tout, c'est pardonner tout.

The past six months have been a troubled time in A. and E.C.A. We might put forward considerations which would induce the friends of *The Christian East* to mitigate somewhat the severity of their just judgment upon its editors for the delay in its appearance. But we do not urge extenuating circumstances.

We are confident that at this critical moment this strong devotion for the cause of Anglican and Orthodox friendship will make the friends of *The Christian East* rally to its support.

As we judge, this belated double number contains matter of varied interest and of no small importance.

Space has compelled us to hold over for our Spring issue, which should be printed by the end of April, contributions of equal interest and importance, for example a sketch of Bishop Gore's activities in relation to Eastern churches as well as articles upon the vacancy in the Jerusalem Patriarchate, upon the election of the new Jacobite Patriarch, and upon the abortive efforts made by Mar Shimun to win consideration at the last moment for the betrayed Assyrians from the League of Nations, and his desperate appeal that the Persian Shah may provide them with a national home.

HIS HOLINESS THE NEW CATHOLICOS OF THE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

By The Vardapet Shavarsh.

THE 9th of May, 1930, shocked the whole Armenian nation by very suddenly depriving it of its beloved Catholicos in Etchmiadzin, for the grave made in Jerusalem for the Patriarch Tourian was still new.

The two deaths (one following immediately after the other) were equally awful, equally heart-breaking. Both graves were made on or near two historic mountains, Ararat and Zion, which have stood for centuries as the centres of the hierarchy and the spiritual life, tradition, culture and glory of the Armenian nation. Obviously, these two graves required nothing more nor less than just the two heads of the nation to signify the burial of their cherished hopes. They stood then, indeed, for two fatal wounds inflicted on the very heart of an ever-struggling nation.

But Divine Providence, whose working is not understood by finite beings, had compassion upon Zion and gave the throne a new occupant who inherited the mantle and was endowed with the spirit of his predecessor.

Under the British mandate it was possible to elect and enthrone a new Patriarch in Palestine, but the election of a Catholicos in Armenia itself was a real problem, and a source of much anxiety, Armenia being under the Soviet *régime*. The pessimists were quite prepared to give up all hope, for the death of the Primate meant for them the quenching of their religious spirit. Further, they thought it quite clear that the Soviet authorities would avail themselves of this sad occasion and, by refusing to allow the electoral delegates, both from the homeland, and indeed from all over the world, to gather together in Etchmiadzin to elect a new Catholicos (which has been the law from the very beginning of the hierarchy), they would extinguish once and for all the source of faith and light.

But, happily, events proved the contrary.

When the Armenian Government had granted permission for the election of a Catholicos, the Holy Synod in Etchmiadzin appointed the 10th of November, 1932, for the purpose, and despatched notices to the effect to all Armenian dioceses in the world.

The procedure of the election was to have taken place according to the Regulations so wisely laid down by the late Catholicos himself in consequence of the political situation. That document contained in itself the very spirit of the national law, viz., an election made

under conditions corresponding to the will of the delegates representing the national church.

The ultimate principle of the Regulations gave every group numbering from ten thousand (minimum) to twenty-five thousand (maximum) people the right to have a delegate of their own. That is why some twelve small colonies (England, Belgium, Germany, Italy and so forth) formed a minimum whole and had a delegate in common, while others (*e.g.*, America) exceeding the maximum number, had delegates in proportion. The only countries officially hindered in the fulfilment of their sacred duty were Turkey and Syria.

However, behold November the 10th. The scene of the election is crowded with physicians, lawyers, intellectuals, statesmen and clergymen: they are the delegates. The Cathedral of Etchmiadzin is as of old re-living one of her historical days. Beneath the dome of the Sanctuary the spirits of the departed saintly Catholici reign in a mystic atmosphere. The Holy Synod and the seventy-two delegates are gathered around the election table. One can read on their solemn countenances their consciousness of the sacred character of the function.

The conclave lasts for seven hours, the first voting giving the following result:—

Archbishop Khoren (the *locum-tenens*)	51 votes.
Archbishop Mesrop (of India and Southern Persia)	12 ,,
Archbishop Mattheos (of Georgia)	10 ,,
Archbishop Bagarat (of Azebeijan)	2 ,,
Archbishop Garegin (now a member of the Synod)	2 ,,
Patriarch Thorgom of Jerusalem	1 vote.

In the second and decisive voting Archbishop Khoren wins 60 votes, against 19 votes of Archbishop Mattheos, and is declared Catholicos.

On the declaration of this result the bells of the cathedral are rung, followed by the cheers and national songs of the eager, faithful thousands crowded outside.

On the next morning, a Sunday, the faithful hasten to the cathedral to witness and enjoy the ceremony of the unction of the Catholicos-elect.

Amidst fervent devotion and the offering of the liturgy, twelve bishops in cope and mitre pour the blessed oil on the head of their Supreme Head, beseeching the Holy Spirit to fill him with grace and guide him in his great and solemn responsibilities.

Born in 1873 in Tiflis, His Holiness the Catholicos received his secondary education at the local Armenian Academy, and for several years attended university courses in Switzerland. In 1901 as a

vardapet (celibate priest authorized to teach and preach) he taught in schools in his native country. Two years later, when the Tsar's Government ordered the confiscation of all the wealth and riches of its subject-Armenians, the Catholicos, then in charge of Nor-Beyazit, suffered exile in Russia. After gaining his freedom, he was elected in 1910 Diocesan of Erivan, the capital of the Armenian Republic, and on Sept. 19th of the same year was consecrated Bishop, with, among others,[1] the present coadjutor Catholicos Babken of Cilicia (now settled in Syria), His Beatitude Thorgom, the present Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Mgr. Zaven, the ex-Patriarch of Constantinople.

In 1920 the late Catholicos George V appointed him pontifical delegate for Armenians in America, where he managed diocesan affairs. On his return he was appointed *locum-tenens* of the Catholicate, at the same time retaining his title and office as Diocesan of Erivan.

Owing to the death of the Catholicos, and as *locum-tenens* of the See and president of the Holy Synod, he had *ipso facto* conducted the affairs of the Catholicate.

The National-Ecclesiastical General Assembly summoned in Etchmiadzin on the 10th of November, 1932, elected him on November the 12th as Catholicos, and the unction took place on the following day, as related above.

* * * * *

Another function performed by the Electoral General Assembly was the formation of a new Synod. Thus, though formerly the occupants of the hierarchical throne at Etchmiadzin had been indicated by the Armenian nation, yet the system which gave the Tsar the privilege of choosing one out of two candidates presented to him by the nation meant a conventional procedure belittling the significance and value of freedom. Whereas now, we rejoice heartily that regarding the election of the Catholicos, for the first time for many years and in regard to the election of the Synod, for the first time in the history of the Armenian Church, both have been singled out and authorized by the people themselves.

Moreover, the joy of the nation is intensified by the fact that the Primate is elected and entitled to his rights, and is not obliged to take an oath of allegiance to a despot, but functions under the auspices of our Government, the Armenian Republic, which has been established for the first time for almost six centuries.

It is true that both the diaspora and our ecclesiastical dignitaries

[1] The existence of two Catholici in the Armenian Church who held spiritual jurisdiction over Armenia Magna (proper) and Armenia Minor (Cilicia) once ruled by a Tsar and a Sultan respectively, is quite intelligible. In ecclesiastical affairs, however, the two hierarchies constitute a coherent whole, and the relation of the Catholicos of Cilicia to that of "all the Armenians" corresponds to the relation between the Archbishops of York and Canterbury.

in the homeland with their kindly spirit paved the way towards this result, yet it is also true that the authorities in Armenia realized and appreciated their feelings and desires to the full. The question of a reform of some kind which originally formed part of the agenda was postponed not only for lack of will on the part of the diaspora, but also on account of the fact that the Armenian Government rejected it lest the impression should be given that it had exerted official pressure of any kind.

Evidence that this chivalrous attitude of the Armenian Government has aroused in return a wide enthusiasm among all classes of Armenians is given by the delegate from Paris. "A lady, aged 82 years, had undertaken a four days' journey by train from Rostov, in order to see the Catholicos, for whom and for the 120 officials there present she had prepared cakes. She was so tired, owing to her journey and the long services, that she fainted for a moment in the church."

I could not resist the temptation of narrating the above incident, as it gives me the opportunity not only of expressing my admiration for her, but at the same time of referring to her as a typical example of her compatriots. As a matter of fact it has been, and still is, their racial characteristic to undertake pilgrimages to their sacred institutions and dignitaries, to overcome obstacles, and, having witnessed the glory of the House of God, to present it with their very best.

THE ORTHODOX AND ANGLICAN CONJOINT DOCTRINAL COMMISSION.

Report to the Holy Synod of Constantinople of the Church of Alexandria upon the First Session.

THE Joint Doctrinal Commission of Anglican and Orthodox representatives, which met in London, in October, 1931, "to prepare a joint report on the theological points on which there is difference and agreement between these churches," proposed for discussion the thirteen terms which Anglican theologians had submitted formerly to the Œcumenical Patriarch as a basis for Sacramental Communion between the two Churches. The said Commission did not occupy itself with the three last of these terms, inasmuch as they had been sufficiently discussed during the meeting of the representatives of the two Churches in London in 1930, and the others were comprised into six subjects.

Before the discussion of these subjects, that of Sacramental Communion between the Churches was put forward. This question is regarded as most important in the Anglican Church and it also concerns us very closely, because many Orthodox live in Europe and America and elsewhere in places where there is neither an Orthodox Church nor priest and where formidable propaganda is carried on by Latin and Protestant heresies.

There the Orthodox are either deprived of the means of satisfying their religious needs, or they neglect them or they fall victims to the propagandists or they have recourse to the Anglicans, in order that the latter may meet their needs.

In the last case the Anglicans are asking for leave to do so, recognizing the same right to the Orthodox Church for the Anglicans who find themselves in similar circumstances.

The Orthodox representatives stated that "Full Sacramental Intercommunion must follow as the last step of the process when complete dogmatic agreement has been established and unity has taken place."

This question certainly requires solution by a unanimous reply from the Orthodox Church and the covering Pro-Synod ought to take it in hand. The Church of Alexandria, however, has already come to a decision as regards baptisms and marriages of Orthodox by Anglicans, which must be supported in the Pro-Synod at Mount Athos.

DISCUSSION OF "THE SUGGESTED TERMS."

Term I.—In Regard to Christian Revelation.

The conception of the Anglicans is that the principal source of the Faith is Holy Scripture, but Oral Tradition is not put parallel and on an equal level. Or more explicitly, they accept the Faith "as it has been handed down to us in the Creed of Nikæa and expounded by the Œcumenical Councils and as accepted by the Undivided Church," but they do not agree that the Faith is a unity which has been defined in part only by the Church, but at the same time is taught in its integrity by her, or that there are still matters of Faith which have not been formulated and defined in a Council.

Term II.—Scripture and Tradition.

The discussion about Faith was continued long and perseveringly on the second question. The Anglicans finally accepted a wider formula approaching the Orthodox point of view. They do not confess verbally that there are two sources of the Christian Faith, Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition, but insist that "Holy Scripture containeth everything necessary to Salvation." They added, however, "as it is completed, explained, interpreted and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Church." This agreement is certainly not ideal, but it is, however, a satisfactory and important step in advance towards the Orthodox point of view. We doubt, however, whether it will be unanimously accepted by the Anglican Churches. It was not defined exactly, however, as to what Tradition is and what are its contents. The truth is that even in the Fathers of the Church a varying conception is to be found. See passages from Athanasias the Great and Jerome, on the one hand, and Basil the Great on the other. (Report, pp. 11, 13.)

In this question that of the Canonical Books was also included. Agreement was reached as to the number of the Books of the Old Testament and their titles, the term "apocryphal" being deleted as ill-sounding and the term "deutero-canonical" being accepted.

Term III.—The Creed of the Church.

It is gratifying that the Anglican members accepted the Creed of Nikæa-Constantinople, and the statement of the Council of Chalcedon upon it without the addition of the Filioque, as being the principal and outstanding Symbol [Creed] of the Church. It acknowledged that "it is unlawful for any church to put forth any other Creed as the teaching of the Catholic Church or to add or to take anything away from the Creed." This being thus determined, the Orthodox members agreed that the use of other creeds, such as the

so-called Apostles' and the Athanasian Creed, in teaching and in the services of the Church, is not unlawful, because they are in agreement with Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition.

This agreement is not wholly satisfactory for the Orthodox Church, which from the first General Council onwards has used one Creed only, but the teaching of the two said Creeds which were in use in the ancient undivided Church is not contrary to the Orthodox Faith. So these may be characterized as a tradition prevailing in the West, but in the East only the Creed of Nikæa will continue to prevail and be in use.

Term IV.—The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

In the agreement reached every proposal and every form of expression suggesting the existence of two principles or two causes in the Holy Trinity was condemned and the teaching of John Damascene was received that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. With this meaning some of the Anglicans were of opinion that the Filioque can be retained in the Creed of Nikæa, as its excision would disturb the consciences of the faithful.

The Orthodox Communion rightly characterized the teaching of St. John Damascene as a theological opinion and not as a dogma of faith and insisted on the excision of the Filioque. We are of opinion that on this point no concession is possible, because in the Creed of Nikæa it is the Eternal Procession of the Spirit from the Father alone which is taught and confessed, and not the Temporal Mission which comes through the Son, and it is this second case only of which Our Lord Jesus Christ is speaking when He says in the Gospel, "Another Paraclete I will send unto you," and "I will send the Paraclete to you."

Term V.—Variety of Customs and Usages in the Church.

This statement is correct and acceptable. But for greater clearness there should be added to the second part, with regard to "the customs which have a local character only, which each Church is free to receive or not," that such do not relate to Dogma or the Faith and are not opposed to what has been handed down by the Catholic Church. We think this is necessary, because St. Augustine, under customs, includes Sacraments, such as Baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity, Communion in the Body and Blood of the Lord, the decisions of General Councils.

The Anglican President made clear in the discussions that local customs only are contemplated which do not possess the authority of Holy Scripture or a General Council. But this is not made sufficiently clear in the Report.

Term VI.—The Sacraments.

The Orthodox insisted on fixing the number of Sacraments at seven. They allowed that the number has not been fixed either by an Œcumenical or a General Council, but that it has existed in the consciousness of the Church, and that the two, namely Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, stand out pre-eminently. But they maintain that the other five are of Apostolic Tradition, are met with more or less clearly in the Gospel and are necessary for the spiritual life and well-being of a Christian. The Anglicans accept as Sacraments —actually of Divine Institution—the two first, but they recognize that in the other rites there is an outward and visible sign, and an inward spiritual grace, and in this sense they can be regarded as having the character of a Sacrament and are commonly called Sacraments. We observe that the Anglicans carefully avoid specifying seven as the number of the Sacraments, and through their indefiniteness about Sacraments, they both recognize the other five as Sacraments in a sense and are able also to include, under the same term, other sacred rites as Sacraments.

In regard to the formulated statement of this term a real progress is required, *i.e.*, even if it be accepted by the Anglican Church, and the 39 Articles are not in agreement with it on this point. In particular the statement must be completed by laying down that Confirmation (Chrism) and Penance are obligatory and necessary for every Christian. As regards the manner of celebrating the Sacraments, a "variety in customs and rites" was accepted, provided that the essential elements of the Sacrament were retained.

The questions of the Holy Eucharist and of Holy Orders specially occupied the Joint Anglican and Orthodox Discussions in 1930. That which took place there was considered at our Autumn Synod. (See the Minutes in *Contact Between Anglicans and Orthodox in London*.)

The Joint Commission arrived at two conclusions :—The first was to the effect that certain fundamental questions had been sufficiently explored, but that others remain for another and to-be-hoped-for meeting.

Besides the differences which had been registered, there had also been registered much agreement between the two Churches.

Sacramental Communion must be based on unity in the Faith, the measure of which and the degree of difference permissible must be defined by the competent Synods.

The Joint Commission did not proceed to any decision, not having authority to do so, but submitted the reports and the results of the discussions to the competent authorities of the two Communions.

Finally the representatives of the Anglican Communion submitted a Report and the decisions of the Conference of Old Catholic and

Anglican Churches, which the Orthodox representatives promised to submit to the judgment of the Synod of the Orthodox Eastern Church.

Of these three decisions the first recognizes mutually the catholicity and independence of both of the two Churches and the preservation of this independence. If anyone should be doubtful as to the use of the term "catholicity," none the less for the peace of the Church for advancing unity in the Faith, we can accept this term for the two said Churches.

The two other decisions dealt with relate to Sacramental Intercommunion, concerning which all that is necessary has already been said above.

Briefly speaking, the discussions with the Anglicans have marked progress in the relations between the two Churches and in the movement towards unity, and if the labours are continued the results will be gratifying, though not to be expected speedily.

✠ Nicholas of Hermopolis,
Reporter of the Committee.

March 5th, 1932.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ORTHODOX AND OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES.

Proceedings of the Conferences between the Old Catholic and Orthodox Churches, held at Bonn, on October 27th and 28th, 1931.

[*Editors' Note.—We print this unfortunate document with satisfaction. Its translation is authorized by Archbishop Germanos of Thyatira.*]

FIRST AND SECOND CONFERENCES HELD ON THE 27TH OF OCTOBER, AT 10 A.M. AND 5 P.M., AT THE HOTEL KONIGSHOF, AT BONN, BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ORTHODOX AND OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES.

THE Archbishop of Utrecht, Dr. Kenninck, opened the Conference with prayer in Greek. Bishop Moog, as Bishop of the place where the Conference was being held, welcomed the members and dwelt on the importance of the Conferences on Re-union which had met there in the years 1874 and 1875 under the leadership of Döllinger, the continuation of these negotiations through the Rotterdam Committee, on the one hand, and the Petersburg Committee—Kiréeff-Janyshev—on the other, and finally through the Œcumenical

Conference and its representative, the Vice-President, Metropolitan Germanos.[1]

He concluded with Döllinger's words. (*Conference on Re-Union*, 1874, p. 23.) The Metropolitan Germanos returned thanks for the welcome and proposed Archbishop Kenninck as President, inasmuch as the Old Catholic Church was entertaining them. Archbishop Kenninck in return proposed the Metropolitan Germanos, because the initiative for the present Conference came from the Orthodox Church.

This initiative is due to the great interest which the Orthodox Church has shown from the beginning in the Old Catholic movement.

The names of the representatives were then verified.

(1) *Old Catholic Church.*—(1) F. Kenninck, Archbishop of Utrecht, (2) Prof. A. Kury, Bishop of the Christian Catholic Church in Berne, (3) Dr. G. Moog, Bishop of the Old Catholic Church in Germany, at Bonn, (4) Dr. Muhlhaupt, parish priest at Bonn, (5) C. Wijker, President and Professor at the Seminary at Amersfort.

(2) *Orthodox Church.*—(1) Dr. Germanos, Metropolitan and Exarch of Western and Northern Europe, as representing the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria and Jerusalem, (2) Theodosius, Metropolitan of Tyre and Sidon, representing the Patriarchate of Antioch, (3) Dr. Nectarios, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Bukowina, representing the Patriarchate of Roumania, (4) Leontius, Metropolitan of Paphos, representing the Church of Cyprus, (5) Polycarp, Metropolitan of Trikka and Stagon, representing the Church of Greece, (6) Dr. Nicholas Arseniev, representing the Orthodox Church in Poland, (7) Dr. Theologos Paraskevaides, Archimandrite of the Greek Church in Leipzig, Secretary of the Orthodox Committee, and (8) Irenay, Bishop of Novi-Sad, representing the Church of Yugo-Slavia (arrived on Wednesday).

The Metropolitan Germanos, who had been elected President, laying emphasis on the difficulties on account of which the Russian Church could not send any representatives (as was the case also at Athos in 1930 and Lambeth, 1930–1931), added that this was the more grievous because the Russian Church, both clergy and laity, had from the first shown their sympathy for the Old Catholic Church and nearness to her and he hoped that these difficulties would be removed in the future.

While Archbishop Kenninck declared that the present Western Delegation had full authority to accept the decisions of the present Conference in the name of its churches, the Metropolitan Germanos said that he must decline such plenipotentiary powers on behalf of the Orthodox Church, since the present discussions would serve only as preparations or proposals for the local Churches and from

[1] The German text reads :—" And finally thro' conversations on the occasion of the Œcumenical Conferences." It also gives the full text of Döllinger's words.

these would be passed on through the Œcumenical Patriarchate to the Eastern Pro-Synod, which would meet in June, and to which the confirmation of to-day's decisions would be reserved. Professor Dr. Muhlhaupt was called by Archbishop Kenninck to fill the place of the absent Bishop Paschek of Czecho-Slovakia, as member and secretary. The three secretaries would compare their notes at each session and prepare a joint statement.

The first session lasted from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m., and the second session from 5 to 7 p.m.

Basing himself upon the preparatory correspondence which had passed between the Metropolitan Germanos and Archbishop Kenninck, the President put this question to the Old Catholic Committee: What are the fundamental documents for Old Catholic teaching? In reply the Conference was referred to the Declaration of Utrecht, put out by the Old Catholic Bishops on September 24th, 1889, to the Old Catholic Catechisms and to their liturgical books, which were laid before the members present to form the basis of the discussions. This discussion started from the first article of the Declaration of Utrecht. The conclusion was that all the seven Councils are to be accepted. Because, however, sometimes only the first four Œcumenical Councils are regarded as important—while the others are regarded as secondary on account of the lesser importance of the subjects treated at them—the Old Catholics accordingly added in the first article the No. 7 to the phrase " Œcumenical Councils." Similarly the decisions of Local Councils are recognized as of equal force by the Old Catholics if their decisions subsequently obtained the confirmation of Œcumenical Councils. In the discussion on Creeds it was acknowledged unanimously that the official Creed is that of Nikæa-Constantinople (without the addition), but that besides this there is—as a baptismal Creed—the so-called Apostles' Creed, which is in use in the West. The Metropolitan Germanos brought forward the question of the Filioque. Archbishop Kenninck stated that in the Old Catholic Church of Holland it had been deleted, and Bishop Moog said the same for the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland. In Germany and Austria the liturgical books still retain the Filioque in brackets, but, according to the statement of Bishop Moog, it will be deleted in the new edition of these books also. This agreement was greeted with joy by the Orthodox Committee and Archbishop Kenninck is contemplating the publication of an Encyclical on this subject to all the Old Catholic Churches. The Metropolitan of Thyatira brought forward the question of " Holy Tradition." The following reply was given on behalf of the Old Catholics. Tradition is the explanation and completion of Holy Scripture, through the unanimous and written tradition of the Ancient Church. (See *Old Catholic Catechism*, q. 39; also *Inter. Kirch. Zeitschrift*, No. 3, July–September, 1931, p. 156.)

Question about the Canon of Holy Scripture.

Both the proto-canonical and the deutero-canonical books—the latter in particular as edifying books, profitable for reading—are recognized as forming part of Holy Scripture; the latter consequently are not regarded as apocryphal.

Question about the Canons.

Does the Old Catholic Church recognize the Canons of the Seven Œcumenical Councils?

The Archbishop Kenninck replied, "Certainly, so long as they are not interpreted according to the letter, but in the spirit of the Ancient Church." The Metropolitan Germanos emphasized the fact that each autokephalous Church can add new regulations which have the force of law to these canons, so long as they are not in opposition to the canons. A new codification would be made in accordance with the Pro-Synod on Mt. Athos, but the old canons would remain in force so far as they bear on the present-day life of the Church. The Archbishop of Trikka pointed out further, "These canons have become inapplicable, not because they are opposed to Holy Scripture and tradition, but on account of human weakness (for instance, the question of attendance at church)." To the question of the Archbishop of the Bukowina, whether the canons of the Roman Church are held binding, a negative answer was given. So it was shown that there was agreement, too, as to the recognition of the ancient canons.

Question about the Marriage of the Clergy.

After a long discussion the views of the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches were defined as follows: "The Orthodox Church permits marriage only before ordination. Bishops must be unmarried and are therefore chosen from the unmarried or widowed clergy or from the monks. The Old Catholic Church permits marriage both after ordination and not only to priests but also to bishops. The whole question is regarded as a matter of indifference. Archbishop Kenninck called attention further to the Roman Catholic decree of the Council of Trent, which makes marriage for the clergy entirely impossible. Archbishop Germanos stated that the widowed clergy in Serbia who had married a second time were excluded from the clerical office.

Question: What do the Old Catholic and Orthodox Churches think about the so-called "customs and usages"?

Answer: The local church can use customs of its own, if these are not opposed to catholic ecclesiastical decrees or injurious to them (for instance, in Confirmation, laying on of hands is the practice in the Old Catholic Church and anointing with chrism in the Orthodox Church).

Question: On the meaning of the word "Church"?

Reply: The Church as guardian of faith and morals has authority over the faithful. "The Church, therefore, is to be interpreted as being above Scripture and not Scripture above the Church."

Archbishop Kenninck emphasized especially, "As God is our Father, so the Church is our Mother," and recalled the words of St. Augustine, "I should not have believed if the Church had not taught me the Gospel." But the Church must teach on the basis of Scripture and tradition, "what has been believed always, everywhere and by all." The Œcumenical Councils decide authoritatively concerning the teaching of the Church, but the Church is not justified in declaring new doctrines, not based on Scripture and tradition.

So on this point also full agreement was shown between the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches. On the question as to whether a local council was justified in altering customs settled by an Œcumenical Council, or whether only an Œcumenical Council could attempt this change or sanction it subsequently, no decision was reached. The Orthodox Church declared in the negative.

There was agreement as to the second and third Articles of the Declaration of Utrecht and in general as to Articles 4 and 5, the historical importance of which was explained by Archbishop Kenninck.

No other Council is recognized as Œcumenical beyond the seven Œcumenical Councils. The really catholic dogmas of the Synod of Trent are of force in the Old Catholic Church also, so far as they are in agreement with the ancient teaching of the Church.

The afternoon session was closed with prayer.

THIRD SESSION, OCTOBER 28TH, 1931, 9.30 A.M.

The session opened again with prayer. The Bishop Irenay of Novi-Sad—representing the Church of Yugo-Slavia—also arrived.

The Acts of the two previous sessions were read and confirmed, after three alterations in the drafting. They will be published when Archbishops Germanos and Kenninck consent and will be signed by them and the Secretaries. The discussions were continued.

First Question.

How does the Old Catholic Church understand the term "Sacrament"?

Agreement was reached between the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches on the basis of the Catechisms. The No. 7 was recognized as the number of the Sacraments without any disagreement, special stress being laid on Baptism as effecting entrance into the Church and the Holy Eucharist as the centre and the means of grace which unites all Christians. Holy Order is not only appointment to an

office, but the imparting of a divine charisma, such as is imparted also by the other sacraments (mysteries).

(1) *Baptism.*—There is a difference here as to form.

In the Orthodox Church there is triple immersion, in the Old Catholic Church, affusion, which is also used in the Orthodox Church in case of necessity. As to the rest there is agreement.

(2) *Confirmation.*—In the Orthodox Church this follows immediately after Baptism, being conferred by the priest with chrism which has been consecrated by bishops. The Orthodox Church holds it necessary for chrism to follow Baptism, as being indispensable for the inner growth of the Christian life. The Old Catholic Church administers it after previous teaching and she regards chrism (Confirmation) as desirable. In any case as necessary before ordination, but not for the reception of Holy Communion. (The German text adds here : " because it is often received after Communion.")

(3) *The Eucharist.*—The President, Archbishop Germanos, read the 6th Article of the Declaration of Utrecht (the German text gives the Article in full) and emphasized with satisfaction that everything in it was set forth very clearly. Both Churches were agreed as to the change of the bread and wine, only in the Old Catholic Churches the epiclesis precedes the words of institution of the Sacrament and in the Orthodox Church it follows them, since in the view of the Orthodox Church the whole liturgy is a representation of the life of Christ. The Eucharist is offered as a sacrifice on behalf of the living and the dead.[1] Bishop Kury also said that in Switzerland, Old Catholic clergy give the Holy Eucharist in cases of necessity to members of the Orthodox Church if they express a desire for it. He therefore proposed that at the coming Synod at Mt. Athos permission for this should be officially given. Archbishop Germanos said that he would convey this desire.

Administration in the West is under one kind, but under both kinds if desired. In the Old Catholic Church it is with unleavened bread ; in the Orthodox Church, with leavened bread.

Question about Confession.—In the Old Catholic Church compulsory private confession is abolished, but every opportunity is given for voluntary confession. In the Orthodox Church confession is necessary before the reception of the Holy Eucharist. The so-called penances in the Orthodox Church are means for the improvement of sinners, which the priest imposes on those who come to confession.

Prayer Oil (*Unction*).—There was complete agreement here.

Eschatology.—The teaching about purgatorial fire is also rejected by the Old Catholic Church. We pray, invoking the mercy of God on behalf of the dead ; everything else is a mystery.

Veneration.—The teaching about the " intercession of the Saints " is accepted and their veneration is recognized, especially the honour

[1] In the German text the sentence about Communion in one kind follows here.

due to the Mother of God, which is particularly emphasized in the Liturgy. The abuses in honouring the saints which are found in the Roman Church are rejected. In regard to the " holy ikons and relics," both the Churches recognize the honour due to them, so far as this, however, refers not to the material, but to the person represented thereon, as Basil the Great and the 7th Œcumenical Council insist. The form of paying honour varies. In the Old Catholic Church there are statues of saints, but not in the Orthodox. Likewise the offering of lighted candles in their honour is permitted, and at the consecration of churches holy relics are deposited.

The morning session was concluded at 1 p.m. with prayer ; the next session began at 3 p.m.

FINAL SESSION, OCTOBER 28TH, 1931, 3 P.M.

Archbishop Germanos asked if anybody had anything further to say.

The Metropolitan Theodosius asked what the Old Catholic Church thought about fasting ? Archbishop Kenninck : Fridays and the Great Lent are fasting days in the Old Catholic Church.

How is the fast kept ? There is a difference made in food according to the season and circumstances. Sermons are preached in the Church on the Passion of Christ. There is no fixed rule, but naturally the great week is observed with special solemnity.

The Bishop of Novi-Sad, Irenay : How does the Old Catholic Church regard the Apostolic Succession ? Archbishop Kenninck : All Old Catholic Church doctrine maintains the Apostolic Succession.

The Archbishop of Trikka : How is the bishop ordained ? Always with three bishops ?

Archbishop Kenninck : The Chapter (that is, the clergy of the Cathedral who constitute the electoral assembly) asked for three bishops from the Pope, but without success. Finally Bishop Varlet alone was found willing to consecrate. It was a case of necessity.

Archbishop Kenninck, in conclusion, put the question : What is the attitude of the Easterns towards the Old Catholic Church, so that further conferences may have a clear idea about this ? The present representatives of the Orthodox Church said that they had not plenipotentiary powers. But the Old Catholic Church would like to know what the Orthodox Church thinks about the Old Catholic Church ? Is it possible for an Œcumenical Council to meet and not merely one of local autokephalous Churches ?

The Metropolitan Germanos replied : Each of the present representatives of the Orthodox Church must communicate the Acts of these conferences to his own Church and they will be submitted in common to the Pro-Synod for decision. Such a common decision has been impossible up till now, because till the preceding year no

such Synod has been able to meet. However the question is asked: What are our relations towards the Western Church ?[1] The speaker himself will introduce this question at the Pro-Synod. It is especially desirable that the Union of the Old Catholic and Orthodox Churches should be realized in sacramental communion as the Fathers desired.

Archbishop Kenninck expressed his thanks for these statements.

Professor Arseniev stated officially as representative of the Church of Poland his desire, not only to submit the Acts, but to express his own opinion (to lay his own opinion before his Church—German text). This opinion was full personal agreement (for intercommunion—German text). He would submit the Acts as material for the Pro-Synod and would exercise his influence and zeal that he might see sacramental communion realized as quickly as possible.

The Metropolitan Nectarios desired Sacramental Communion because there are no dogmatic hindrances. He would propose this to his Synod and recommend its acceptance.

Bishop Dr. Moog then concluded as follows: He expressed his joy that the conferences had gone so smoothly and had reached such a gratifying conclusion. He referred to the saying of Our Lord, "that they all may be one," which is often not understood rightly. He explained it as meaning unity in the truth, in freedom and in love, as God the Father and Christ are one. Unity, however, does not mean uniformity in the letter, but unity in freedom, with due regard to peoples, places, customs, but at the same time (it means) unchangeable Catholic truth. "Such a unity Döllinger desired; therefore let us dedicate our last thoughts to him." (All present rose from their seats.)

The Conference closed with prayer.

(Signed) GERMANOS, *Metropolitan of Thyatira.*
FRANCISCUS KENNINCK, *Archbishop of Utrecht.*

[1] The German text differs slightly in this sentence.

THE ORTHODOX PRINCIPLE OF ECONOMY, AND ITS EXERCISE

I. The Term Economy.

THE usage of the term Economy by Orthodox writers is not confined to relaxations of the canons and common laws of the Orthodox Church in its dealings, corporately or individually, with the non-Orthodox.

That usage is only secondary, and when so applied, the term is in no way separable from its primary usage in Orthodox theology.

In the widest sense, mankind is the *oikos,* the family, of God, of which His Will and Purpose are the *nomos,* the creative, sustaining, regulative principle.

In general, therefore, the operation of God in relation to mankind is to be termed *oikonomia*—His dealing with His family according to the law of His Will and Purpose.

In particular, however, the term is applied to God's dealings with men as mediated in and through the Church.

To men those dealings are in apparent antimony.

The Law of God's Justice is absolute and admits of no exception. To contravene His Will is to be cut off from Him. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. But the Law of God's Love has another logic.

Accordingly, while, Christ being the *oikonomos,* by whom the Law of God's Will is mediated in the *oikos* of the Christian Church, *oikonomia* covers every aspect of the Christian dispensation, it always connotes the condescension—*sunkatabasis*—towards human infirmity by which divine Love reconciles divine Justice.

By the strictness—*akribeia*—of God's Justice the universality of sin had made mankind incapable of being His family. But in His tender Love for mankind—*philanthropia*—God sent His Son into the world to redeem the world.

In the Redemption wrought by Christ, both the Justice and the Love of God are satisfied, and it is described, therefore, by many Orthodox writers *kat' exochen,* as the *Oikonomia,* the supreme operation of the Law of God's Will in which that Justice and Love are in perfect unity.

II. The Principle of Economy in the Orthodox Church.

(In reading this and the following sections, it should be remembered that Orthodox theology has not been systematized and formulated as Latin theology has been, and that in this matter Orthodox writers of authority at times diverge from each other in

their premises, their treatment and conclusions. What appears below may be taken, I think, as a sufficiently accurate representation of the matter.)

It is in and through the whole body of the Church individually and collectively that in general Christ, the *oikonomos,* exercises His *oikonomia.* But it is through the organs of the Church, the Sacred Ministry, and, above all, the Apostolic Episcopate, that He exercises it in particular.

The Church is, therefore, fully *tamiouchos,* possessed of stewardship in her own household, and in her exercise of *oikonomia, philanthropia* must relax *akribeia* for the good of human souls and for her own cause, whenever need demands and the condescension is possible.

For our present purpose, Economy may thus be defined as an exercise of her stewardship by the Church whereby that which by the strict letter of her law is forbidden, is permitted.

Thus Theophylact of Bulgaria (*Comment. Epist. Gal.* v.) writes: "He who does anything by Economy, does not do it as being good in itself, but as being needful for the occasion."

III. The Exercise of Economy.

I venture to be doubtful as to whether the theory of Economy among the Orthodox is in any way comparable to the theory of Dispensation among the Latins.

At any rate, it has nothing juridical about it. Neither can its exercise be codified.

Of the necessity of the case, even if it does not postulate a supersession of law, any and every exercise of Economy transcends law; for the active principle in Economy is not Justice, but Love. Just as Christ's Redemption, the divine *philanthropia,* transcended the *akribeia* of divine Justice, and in virtue of His "condescension"—*sunkatabasis*—was not inconsistent with it but was complementary to it, so in every case in which special circumstances touching either the mystic life of the Orthodox Church itself or its contacts, individual or collective, with those who do not belong to its *Communio in sacris,* bring *akribeia* into seeming conflict with *philanthropia,* then, so long as it does not negate that which is revealed, the Law of Love is free to govern the decision. But as soon as the particular occasion for any Economy has passed, *akribeia* re-enters into complete possession.

Every exercise of Economy stands by itself.

Precedents or their absence will have weight in the decision of those who are called on to decide whether or not to exercise it. But no precedents can bind that decision. Indeed, strictly speaking, there can be no real precedents for any Economy. That *akribeia* has been relaxed in the case of an individual or a group in a particular matter, emboldens *philanthropia* to relax it in the same matter in another case. But for *philanthropia* the need for Economy may be decided according to its judgment on the one hand of the need of the individual, and on the other hand of the well-being of the Church.

An Economy exercised in a particular case may thus be refused in another in which the circumstances appear closely analogous. And an Economy, the exercise of which habitually has been authorized for individuals or groups of individuals, may be ceased at any time.

In brief, *philanthropia* is constrained to exercise any and every Economy which it judges to be for the salvation of an individual soul or for the welfare of the Church and of the Kingdom of Christ.

But it is constrained to refuse any and every Economy which it judges would be injurious to the welfare of the Church.

IV. The Limits of Economy.

Of necessity, the Church can only exercise Economy in regard to the laws and customs which, having herself prescribed, she can change. She cannot exercise it in regard to that which Christ Himself has revealed and ordained.

That is to say, no exercise whatever of Economy is possible in the dogmatic sphere.

Accordingly, a paramount requirement for every exercise of Economy is that it shall in no wise compromise or appear to compromise the dogmatic tradition of the Church.

V. The Mode of the Exercise of Economy.

From what has been said above, it will be plain that the immediate decision as to whether a particular Economy is to be exercised in a particular case rests with the person who exercises it.

But if *akribeia* is to be relaxed by *philanthropia,* its relaxation must not be the arbitrary action of an individual.

Thus, while in pressing emergency a layman, a priest or a bishop must employ his own discretion, in doing so he must not forget that he acts as the *okonomos* of the Church, and he must not exercise Economy in a manner which he has reason to think would not be authorized by those to whom he is subordinate.

Thus, except by the authority of an Œcumenical Council, or at least of the unanimous consent of the Synods of all the autokephalous Churches, Economy cannot rightly be exercised even by a Patriarch in Synod or the Synod of a single Church, in regard to the Canons of the Œcumenical Councils and the traditional common law and customs of the whole Orthodox Church.

Again, no individual bishop, and probably not even a Patriarch,

would be right to exercise Economy in a manner which was disapproved by the Synod of his particular Church. Nor would a priest or layman be right to do so in a manner which their bishop would disapprove.

Philanthropia can justify Economy only so long as it does not produce *anomia*.

VI. The Exercise of Economy in regard to those not in the Communion of the Orthodox Church.

By the 10th of the so-called Canons of the Apostles, which the 2nd Canon of the Sixth Œcumenical Council invests with Apostolic authority, the members of the Church are forbidden even to pray with anyone who is *akoinotos*—out of its Communion.

According to *akribeia*, therefore, no spiritual intimacy is permissible between a member of the Orthodox Church and anyone not of its Communion.

That that Canon is based on disciplinary and not on dogmatic grounds is plain from particular relaxations made by the Œcumenical Councils. And it is taken for granted to-day that, unless prohibited by competent authority, the Orthodox laity no less than the clergy are free at discretion to exercise Economy in the matter.

Thus it is frequent and normal for them to attend the Eucharist of non-Orthodox Churches alike as an act of worship and as a ceremonial act of comity and amity.

It must be noted, however, that when the conditions which justify the exercise of Economy cease, *akribeia* re-enters.

Accordingly, if the appropriate authority prohibited the relaxation of the Canon in question, that prohibition would restore its stringency.

VII. Economy in Regard to Sacraments Administered Outside the Orthodox Church.

For the understanding of the Orthodox view of sacraments administered outside the Orthodox Church, which identifies itself exclusively with the one Catholic Apostolic Church, it should be noted that St. Augustine's influence in the East, where in comparison with St. Basil he is a secondary authority, has always been, and remains, small.

Those Orthodox writers who incline to hold that the charisma of Baptism, Confirmation and Orders is indelible cannot maintain that those sacraments must be recognized as valid *per se* when administered outside the Church.

On the contrary, St. Basil laid it down that "those who are [illegible] from the Church, having become laymen, have no power

to baptize or ordain, and cannot confer that Grace of the Holy Spirit from which they have fallen away" (*Migne* xxxii, 669).

The 46th and 47th of the Apostolic Canons, which order Baptism and Orders when administered outside the Church to be repeated, govern the position, and from the time of St. Cyprian instances of such repetition are abundant.

If, on the other hand, instances such as that provided by the Third Œcumenical Council are equally abundant of the reception during the first eight centuries of heretics and schismatics in their Baptism and Orders, their reception was an exercise of Economy, and the declaration of the Seventh Œcumenical Council that clergy who renounce their heresy are to be received as clergy is also shown to be such by the qualification "provided there be no other hindrance."

But Economy cannot override dogma. It cannot pronounce that to be a sacrament which dogma denies to be a sacrament nor deny that to be a sacrament which dogma pronounces to be a sacrament.

Accordingly, *akribeia* does not prescribe the repetition of Baptism, Confirmation and Orders administered outside the Church because they can be pronounced dogmatically to be no sacraments. It prescribes it because, according to the measure of heresy and the guilt of schism, the administration of sacraments outside the Church becomes deficient, and for that reason the Church cannot regard them as valid *per se*.

Dogmatically, that deficiency is supplied on the reception of individual heretics and schismatics into Communion by the Church in the exercise of her power as *tamiouchos*. Otherwise, the Third and Seventh Councils could not have relaxed the Canons of the Apostles and the Fathers must have maintained its *akribeia*.

And it is thus that the Orthodox Church holds itself to be following the tradition of the Fathers in exercising Economy and accepting those who accede to her Communion in their Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, or in requiring them to be baptized, confirmed and ordained at her discretion.

Speaking generally, her decision in the matter is determined (1) by the degree of the heresy and the hostility to herself of the Communion from which they come to her and (2) by the measure in which the canonical requirements of the sacraments have been preserved in that Communion.

Where there is a close affinity to Orthodox dogmatic teaching in regard to the sacrament in question, where the essentials of the external canonical acts are observed, and where there is a will to draw near to the bosom of Orthodoxy, Economy can be safely exercised and therefore is to be exercised.

But since, in the last extreme, deficiency might come near to rendering a sacrament void and valueless, it would be perilous and indefensible to exercise Economy in cases where the dogmatic

teaching of the Church in regard to the particular sacrament in question is wholly rejected and where its external and canonical requisites are completely absent, even though heresy and schism would not be reinforced by the *sunkatabasis*.

In expressing the opinion that as *tamiouchos* the Church *could* accept the priesthood and sacraments of heretics and schismatics among whom they are not accomplished canonically or the Apostolic Succession has been broken (*Ta Hepta Mysteria,* pp. 162-163), Professor Dyovouniotes goes very far, and would appear to advance the opinion that theoretically or dogmatically there is no bar to the acceptance by Economy of the Orders of non-episcopal Churches.

An Œcumenical Council is the only authority that in regard to the sacraments can prescribe a relaxation of *akribeia* which would be obligatory upon the whole Orthodox Church. But of the nature of the case, the synodical authority of an autokephalous Church is competent to prescribe obligatory regulations in its jurisdiction for the exercise or non-exercise of such Economies in regard to the sacraments as are warranted by established precedents or by the decree of the Seventh Œcumenical Council quoted above.

An exercise of Economy in regard to them which was not so warranted—even by a Patriarch—would be regarded as temerarious and approaching *anomia*.

In regard to non-Orthodox Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, the history of the exercise of Economy in the Orthodox Church is as follows:

After the Great Schism the general rule was to receive schismatics in their Baptism and Orders by chrismation. The attempted Latinization of the East during the period of the Crusades having led to frequent reassertions of *akribeia,* the topical Synod of Constantinople in 1261 prescribed that converts should be chrismated and not rebaptized. That prescription, which was repeated by a similar Synod in 1481 and was interpreted as covering Holy Orders, remained uniformly in force throughout the whole Orthodox Church in regard to converts from the Latin, Monophysite and Nestorian Churches until 1629, but was not held to apply to converts from Protestantism.

In 1629, on account of Uniate aggression, the Russian Patriarch in Synod forbade the exercise of the Economy within his jurisdiction, but in 1669 the same authority ordered it to be exercised again.

In 1718, with the assent of the Œcumenical Patriarch, the Russian Patriarch in Synod ordered all Trinitarian Baptism to be accepted by Economy.

In 1756, however, the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem issued a decree forbidding the continuance

of the Economy in regard to all Western converts and ordering their rebaptism.

That decree has not been revoked. So that strictly the position is that, while the acceptance by Economy of all Trinitarian Baptism is prescribed by authority in Russia, such a relaxation of *akribeia* is forbidden in the four Patriarchates. In fact, however, the four Patriarchs' decree is very generally regarded as lapsed.

VIII. The Permissibility of Economic Intercommunion.

In the previous section I have dealt only with the treatment of converts received by Economy in their Baptism, Confirmation and Orders by the Orthodox Church, but have not touched upon what is known as *Economic Intercommunion*—viz. (1) the resort of members of the Orthodox Church to sacraments administered outside her Communion, and (2) the admission of those not of her Communion to her sacramental administrations.

The treatment of this matter must also be governed (1) by the dogmatic fact that all sacraments outside the Church—*sc.*, the Orthodox Church—are deficient, and are not to be regarded as valid *per se,* and (2) by the canonical fact that the Apostolic Canons order their reiteration. As *tamiouchos,* however, the Church is free to reject them or to accept them in the exercise of Economy, and if she accepts them, *ipso facto* she supplies their deficiency and pronounces them valid *per se*.

Plainly, the above two classes of Economic Intercommunion must be examined separately and neither must in any way be confused with that of the reception of converts in their Baptism and Orders.

(*a*) *The Resort of the Orthodox to non-Orthodox Sacraments.*

The case for Economy in this matter may be set out thus:

Dogmatically, the Orthodox Church must regard all sacraments administered outside herself as deficient, and cannot recognize them as valid *per se*.

Accordingly, it might be reasoned that Economics could not rightly be exercised whereby (1) Orthodox parents brought their children to receive a Baptism and Confirmation which were deficient and not valid *per se,* and (2) to say nothing of Marriage Blessing and Unction, the members of the Orthodox Church communicated in the Lord's Body and Blood, and received Absolution, through sacraments which were deficient and not valid *per se*.

So far as I am aware, the dogmatic permissibility of this Economy has not been investigated by any Orthodox writer, and it would seem probable that theoretically as *tamiouchos* the Orthodox Church could exercise the Economy authorizing her members to

resort to sacramental ministrations, which, being outside her, must be regarded as deficient and not valid *per se*.

It is at least a sustainable position, however, that—since she is *tamiouchos*—if she exercised that Economy, *ipso facto* she would supply the deficiency of the sacramental ministration to which she authorized her members to resort—*i.e.*, not generally, nor for anyone except for her own members, but for them alone and for them only *pro hac vice*.

In that case, her authorization for their reception would carry with it a pronouncement that the sacraments as received by her members were valid *per se*. Moreover, in fact, their reception would not constitute a *communio in sacris* with the Church through whose ministers they were received, but by Economy would be within the *communio in sacris* of the Orthodox Church itself.

(*b*) *The Admission of the Members of another Church to Orthodox Sacramental Administrations.*

This Economy clearly presents far greater difficulty than the former, under which, though the Baptism and the other sacraments ministered to the Orthodox and their children may be deficient, their deficiency either is supplied or can be supplied.

Dogmatically, neither Baptism nor any other sacrament administered by the Orthodox Church can be deficient.

That by Economy the Orthodox Church can act vicariously for another Church and minister a sacrament which is in deficiency and which she does not pronounce valid *per se* is out of the question.

Accordingly, in ministering Baptism to a child who is not to belong to her *communio in sacris*, she would be ministering it without deficiency but on the condition that by *akribeia* she must thereafter regard it as not valid *per se*. And further, in ministering the Eucharist and other sacraments to those not of her *communio in sacris*, she would pronounce that dogmatically they are capable of receiving her sacramental ministrations. That is to say, she would admit them to her *communio in sacris* for, but only for, the particular occasion.

None the less, if, as is at least very widely held nowadays, no dogmatic obstacle forbids, these Economies are theoretically possible, and given the necessary conditions *philanthropia* would require their exercise.

There is something like a consensus of opinion among the Fathers for the reception of converts in their Baptism and Orders, and instances of the exercise of that Economy are abundant in their practice. Moreover, the Seventh Œcumenical Council expressly relaxed the *akribeia* of the Apostolic Canon in regard to heretic and schismatic Baptism.

No such tradition exists for Economical Intercommunion.

It is, therefore, held widely among the Orthodox that both because of the principle of Œcumenical unity of action and because the Economies involved relate to the sacraments in general and the Eucharist in particular, practical, if not theoretical, considerations dictate the necessity of an Œcumenical authorization of either form of Economic Intercommunion by the consensus of all the Orthodox autokephalous Churches before it is authorized by a single Church as permissible.

On the other hand, in the Report of the Œcumenical Patriarchate's Commission on Anglican Ordinations drawn up by Professor Komnenos in 1922 (see *The Christian East*, 1922, pp. 107-121) it is contended that of the nature of the case a particular Orthodox Church has discretion to authorize both forms of Economic Intercommunion.

So far as I am aware historically there are no precedents for the authorization of the Orthodox to resort to alien sacraments or for the Orthodox ministration of Baptism and Confirmation to those not of the Orthodox Communion.

But in regard to Orthodox ministration of the Eucharist to those outside the Orthodox Communion, Professor Komnenos held the widespread disapproval of the holding to *akribeia* in the case of Latin captives among the Turks, recorded by Demetrios Chomatenos in 1203, to cover that Economy.

Though authorization of Economic Intercommunion would appear, therefore, to be a permissible exercise of its power as *tamiouchos* by the Orthodox Church, the conditions for its exercise would appear to require—

(i.) That the Church with which it was authorized approximated very closely in its dogmatic teaching, and particularly in its dogmatic teaching as to the sacraments, to that of the Orthodox Church.

(ii.) That real urgency obtained, such as inability to receive the sacraments ministered under it, or some great profit for individual souls or the common good.

(iii.) That the general relations to the Orthodox Church of the Church with which it was authorized were such that even if it was not approaching union with it, no confusion could be created which would injure Orthodoxy.

I have not been able to verify the statements, but as far back as thirty years ago I was informed by the Œcumenical Patriarch Joachim III. that the admission by the Orthodox of individual Nestorians and of Armenian Monophysites in isolation to Holy Communion had been occasional for centuries and remained occasional.

Since the Great War, with the cognizance or by the direction of their ecclesiastical superiors, the Orthodox authorities in Corcyra,

Khartoum and elsewhere have admitted large bodies of Armenian refugees which otherwise would have been in spiritual destitution to Orthodox ministrations, including Holy Communion, and the same Economy has been recently extended to a large colony of Nestorians, 5,000 strong, by the Patriarchate of Antioch.

Before the Great War, in the U.S.A., where the Field Officer for the Foreign Born of the Anglican Episcopal Church states that there are now 1½ million Orthodox immigrants, who may be considered as in permanent isolation from Orthodox sacramental ministrations, in Canada, South Africa and other overseas British Dominions, the resort of the Orthodox to the Anglican clergy for the Marriage Blessing, for the Baptism of their children, for Absolution and for Holy Communion, with or without the authorization of the Bishops representing their particular national autokephalous Churches in those lands, had become frequent.

In the period of the Great War, and subsequently, that resort has been greatly increased and authorization of it by the various local Orthodox authorities has frequently been explicit.

That increased authorization has been due in part to the fact that in 1922, after twenty years' investigation, the Œcumenical Patriarchate declared Anglican Orders capable of acceptance by Economy.

Although the Church of Jerusalem and Cyprus at once concurred in that declaration, the other Orthodox autokephalous Churches postponed their decision until the matter could be examined by the corporate action of all the Orthodox autokephalous Churches.

None of them, however, has protested against the declaration of the Œcumenical Patriarchate.

No large dispersions of Anglicans existing in Orthodox countries, need for the resort of Anglicans to Orthodox sacramental ministrations is necessarily rare.

I know of no case in which Anglicans have asked for the Baptism of their children by Orthodox clergy.

On the other hand, during and since the War many Anglicans in isolation and necessity have been admitted to Communion by the instruction of Orthodox diocesan Bishops.

During and since the War there have been cases of Anglicans who were in no necessity being invited to receive the Eucharist by Orthodox Bishops. Thus Canon Garland received Communion in 1920 on the personal invitation of the Patriarch of Antioch and although an Anglican chaplain was due in Belgrade on the succeeding Sunday, though without the consent of his Synod the Serb Patriarch himself administered the Eucharist to six Anglicans on Christmas Day, 1927.

Further, with the consent of his Synod the Patriarch of Roumania periodically administers Holy Communion to Queen Marie of Roumania, although she is an Anglican.

Although theoretically permissible, the admission to Communion of members of another Church, unless they are in real isolation or emergency, is generally viewed with anxiety throughout the Orthodox Church.

At the instance of the Patriarch of Roumania, the Orthodox Delegation to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 formulated the questions which Orthodox writers had indicated as necessary for the final removal of all doubts as to the capability of Anglican Orders and the Anglican Eucharist being accepted by Economy by the Orthodox Church with a view to submitting the answers to the Pro-Synod in which it is expected that representatives of all the Orthodox autokephalous Churches will meet on June 19, 1932.

That Delegation was not plenipotentiary but included synodically appointed representatives of all the Orthodox Churches, and was presided over by the Patriarch of Alexandria.

Having been satisfied with the answers given, the Delegation proceeded to discuss the question of Economic Intercommunion between the two Churches, and as a temporary provision pending a decision by the forthcoming Pro-Synod authorized the resort of those Orthodox who are in lasting isolation to Anglican sacramental ministrations.

It made no pronouncements, however, in regard to the admission of Anglicans to Orthodox sacramental ministrations.

IX. Conclusion.

The above sections were written to elucidate the principle of Economy as exercised in the Orthodox Church, in view of the present economical relations between the Orthodox Communion and the Anglican Communion and of the discussions now taking place in regard to the Relations of the Anglican Communion with other Churches.

John A. Douglas.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH IN JERUSALEM.

By Canon C. T. Bridgeman.

AMONG the prized possessions of the Armenian Church in Jerusalem is a long amber wand, tipped with gold, which was the royal sceptre of one of the Armenian kings of the middle ages in Cilicia. The kingdom over which he ruled has disappeared, as did the former kingdom in the Caucasus four hundred years before him, but the people over whom his sovereignty lay still remain. Scattered throughout a dozen countries of the Near and Far East, Turkey, Persia, Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Greece, India, to name but a few, the Armenian people still have a national life, still speak their ancient Indo-European tongue in the midst of peoples where Arabic, Greek, Russian, Persian and Hindustani are the common languages, and still cherish the memory of their long witness to the Christian faith. How are we to explain this strange phenomenon? It is because when the territorial kingdom fell before foreign invaders and the people were dispersed, there yet remained a bond of national unity stronger than any political tie, or even geographical contiguity: the possession of a common faith finding itself expressed in the liturgy and life of the Armenian Church. It is most significant that the sceptre of the long dead kingship is to-day preserved in the treasury of the Church, for the hegemony has found renewed life among the ecclesiastical leaders of the people. Patriarchs and bishops, not kings and princes, nurture the people, guide their thoughts, provide education, express moral and patriotic ideals, and provide the nucleus of communal organization. But above all they exercise their peculiar function of keeping alive the faith in the Incarnate Christ which has been at once the glory of the Armenian people, and the cause of their unending national trials.

There are a number of centres whence this moral and spiritual guidance proceeds: Etchmiadzin, Constantinople, Beirut, Cairo, but the most vigorous and unhampered centre is found in Jerusalem. Etchmiadzin in the centre of the Armenian Soviet Republic in the Caucasus has been the seat of the spiritual head of the Church since the fourth century, but with the swamping of old Armenia by the Bolshevist flood the Church there has been sadly hampered and to a large extent kept out of touch with the Armenians elsewhere. Before the War, when Turkey ruled the great majority of Armenians, they found Constantinople a natural place of leadership, there where a patriarch of wide influence lived and the Armenian National

Assembly met; but since the War the Kemalist Turks have not allowed the Armenian remnant to develop. The Catholicos of Sis, spiritual leader of the people in the days of the Cilician kingdom, has fled with his people across the Turkish frontier to French Syria, where a new life is being slowly built. The people are poor, their ancient churches are lost, their homes of centuries are abandoned, and their internal organization is weakened. The new centre of life at Antilyas, near Beirut, where the Catholicos has been given a *pied à terre* in buildings lent by the Near East Relief, and a theological school and a Press have been started, gives promise for the future, but as yet it is struggling with small beginnings. Egypt has a large Armenian colony, but it has no long tradition behind it.

In contrast with all these, Jerusalem, though it is the home of but a small Armenian community, occupies an outstanding position. The pre-eminent place of the Holy City in the Christian world, the association of Armenians with it since the fourth century at least, the existence of a monastic community of ancient foundation in buildings which have weathered the political storms of centuries, the freedom made possible under the British mandate, and above all the presence in Jerusalem of far-seeing, statesmanlike and spiritual prelates have made post-War Jerusalem the natural focus of Armenian national life.

To witness the regeneration of a people, the upbuilding of their life, and the moulding of their destiny, is ever a marvellous sight. The harried remnants of the Armenian people after the War appeared before the world as the very embodiment of misery, helplessness and social disintegration. To-day everywhere in the Near East the Armenians have captured by hard work a secure economic place in the sun, and reassembled their scattered peoples. And the Armenian community of Jerusalem is regarded as one of the best-organized, progressive and stable religious groups in the Near East.

The story of the last eight years, during which I have been privileged to live and work with the Armenian Church in Jerusalem, shows how it has been accomplished. A little over eight years ago the Brotherhood of St. James, which is the monastic community long established in the Holy City, wishing to repair the damage of the War and make a contribution to the rebuilding of their people, called to the vacant patriarchal chair a former patriarch of Constantinople named Elisee Turian, poet, preacher, scholar and saint. To join him there came also the former Archbishop of Angora in Turkey, Papken Gulessarian, at that time living in the United States. The great task before the patriarch was the intellectual and spiritual regeneration of his people.

The first step was the revival of the old theological school on Mount Zion, which in its day had produced many able men, but had been destroyed when its students were drafted into the labour

battalions of the Turkish Army, and found unknown graves on the line of the railroad which the Turks built across the desert to meet the British forces advancing from Egypt. Though the patriarch was educated largely with a French background, he felt that the English language and English theological literature were a better help to the new school, especially since the British ruled the Holy Land and so many of the Armenians in dispersion. This was why the Episcopal Church, long on friendly terms with the Armenians, and sharing the fine reputation of the Church of England in its generous help of the Assyrian Nestorians, was invited to send a priest to help in the school. When I came to Jerusalem the work had already begun. The outstanding feature of the school was the manner in which the Patriarch himself, and Archbishop Papken, gave of their time to the education of the young men. As the years went by the work began to bear fruit. To-day fifteen young priests have received their training in the school, two classes of deacons are in preparation (three ordained this last summer shortly after four men had been advanced to the priesthood), and four classes, totalling some thirty youths, are in training in the lower school. Two priests have been sent to England for advanced training, and have returned to us, one, the Rev. Diran Vartabed Nersoyan, now being head of the Theological School, and the Rev. Norair Vartabed Bogharian, instructor in Holy Scripture. In the meantime two more men are being trained for special work at King's College, London. Practically all the teachers in the seminary, and the teachers of religion in the lay school of 450 children, are products of our work, as well as the young men who carry on the manifold work of the community, taking services in various churches, and preaching to the people.

A school for the lay community was also of importance. The Armenians have built one of the best-equipped new school buildings in Jerusalem, and have a school of 450 boys and girls which is beginning to rival the foreign schools to which Armenians, like other Easterners, are wont to send their children.

Books are of prime importance. One of the early projects of the patriarch was to put the Press on a good foundation. To-day it has a long list of worthy publications to its credit.

A serious theological journal was needed. Under the name of *Zion* there is now a monthly magazine which occupies an outstanding place in Armenian life. It has become the mouthpiece for the most progressive and enlightened comment on national and religious life, and is preparing the way for needed ecclesiastical reforms.

Finally as an arsenal of the spiritual and intellectual life of the people, a library of unusual value has been gathered together. On October 24th, 1932, the new building erected by the friends of the late Patriarch (for Elisee Turian entered into rest two years ago), in memory of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, was dedicated. On the shelves were to be seen 25,000 volumes of printed books, besides the unequalled collection of three thousand manuscripts (many finely illuminated) which are housed elsewhere. The books are not only in Armenian, but include thousands of French, Latin, German, Greek and other works, as well as a large and solid collection of English theological and historical works, chiefly the gift of the Church Periodical Club to the theological seminary. The librarian is to be the Rev. Cyril Vartabed Israelian, well known from his association with the educational work of the patriarchate for many years, and as interpreter of Armenian life to English-speaking visitors.

The Patriarch Turian laid the foundations of this far-sighted work. Eighteen months ago he entered into rest. In his stead a former pupil of his, and his successor as the head of the famous theological school at Armash in Turkey before the War, and late Archbishop in Cairo, was chosen to succeed him: His Beatitude Torkhom Koushagian. Under his wise leadership the work continues. A certain reorganization of the curriculum of the schools, suggested by the experience of the last years, has been effected, and the Armenian Church in Jerusalem enters upon the next phase of its service to the nation and the Gospel.

In the meantime a new source of national inspiration has been added by the opening of the theological school and Press at Antilyas, Syria. There Archbishop Papken, who is now Coadjutor to the Catholicos of Sis, has brought his evangelical enthusiasm; and there Bishop Shahe Kasparian, a graduate of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass., and long pastor of the Armenian Church in Boston, is the dean of the new seminary.

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE

(Contributed or Collected by the Editors.)

THE establishment of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, by the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York, is, of necessity, noteworthy and may well prove to be of far-reaching importance. Actual negotiations with foreign churches are expressly excluded from its purview. Nor does its scope include foreign churches within the jurisdiction of the overseas provinces of the Anglican Communion.

It is to be divided into four Committees, the purview of which respectively will be concerned with (1) the Roman Catholic Communion, (2) the Orthodox Communion, (3) the Assyrian, Coptic, Jacobite and Armenian Churches, and (4) the Continental Protestant Evangelical Churches.

Its President is the Archbishop of Canterbury, its Vice-President the Archbishop of York, its Chairman the Bishop of Gloucester, its General Secretary Canon Douglas and its assistant secretaries the Rev. Philip Usher and the Rev. C. B. Moss.

Its establishment was due to a request made by the Church Assembly to Archbishop Lord Davidson in 1928, and repeated to Dr. Lang in 1931.

Bishop Hicks of Lincoln

The translation of Dr. Hicks from the See of Gibraltar to the See of Lincoln has given us most hearty pleasure.

It is not for us to estimate the debt which the Anglican Diocese of Gibraltar owes Dr. Hicks for his assiduous and vitalizing pastoral work. Our business is to express grateful appreciation for his rare services in the drawing together of the Orthodox and Anglican Communions.

In effect, each and all of his episcopal journeys in the Near East were embassies to the Orthodox Churches. No matter how heavy the demands of the local Anglican colonies upon his prayers, his time and his care, he never visited an Orthodox centre without establishing or developing intimacy with its Orthodox authorities. Possessed as he is with singular faculty for friendship, a theologian of mark—his book on the Eucharist is peculiarly acceptable to Orthodox theologians—dignified but simple and easy in contacts, he impressed the many leading Orthodox personalities with whom he came in contact [illegible]. Their appreciation of him was typified by the conferment last November upon him of the Star and Riband of the famous Serb Order of St. Sava.

To overestimate the value of his ambassadorship in the Near East would be impossible. Nonetheless, even if the great strain of incessant travel upon his physical strength had not rendered his acceptance of the See of Lincoln obligatory, we should not have desired him to decline it. For, in fact, whatever our movement loses by his ceasing to be Bishop of Gibraltar, will be more than compensated by the having him at the centre here in England, where in the counsels of our Diocesans and in many another way he will have even larger opportunity of promoting our cause.

Accordingly, in congratulating Lincoln on its fortune in acquiring him as its Diocesan—and it is doubly fortunate because of his good lady—we congratulate ourselves on the certainty that his work for Anglican and Orthodox Re-union has passed into an even richer and more fruitful chapter.

Bishop Bury. R.I.P.

The death of Dr. Bury leaves a gap in more than one circle which it will be difficult to fill. He was wise, generous, strong and loyal, and those qualities made him a multitude of friends. At the funeral service, which took place on January 19th, at St. Stephen's, Rochester Row, the Bishop of London referred to the splendid work done by Dr. Bury as a parish priest at St. Paul's, Avenue Road, "at the time the best-run parish in London," said the Bishop. Dr. Bury went to St. Paul's in 1896, and there are many who remember his work there and are prepared to echo the Diocesan's praise. This was not Dr. Bury's first experience of work in London. Indeed, one of the marks of his life was the variety of experience it afforded. His career at Oxford was interrupted by two years of cattle-farming in the Argentine, where he went for the benefit of his health. He came home again and was ordained in 1878, serving his first curacy at Prestwich. From 1885 to 1888 he was Vicar of St. Peter's, Stockport. Then he came to London as Assistant at St. James's, Piccadilly. In 1891 he went back to the country for five years as Rector of Newchurch in Rossendale, till he accepted St. Paul's, Avenue Road. Here he remained until he was consecrated Bishop in 1908, working devotedly and successfully among his people and in close touch with the Bishop whose honorary chaplain he was from 1905. Dr. Bury was Bishop of British Honduras for three years and has left a record of some of his experiences during that time; but most of us think of him as Bishop of Northern and Central Europe, to which charge the Bishop of London called him in 1911. Always a great and eager traveller he now covered as much as 28,000 miles in a year within his vast jurisdiction. I first met him some twenty

years ago at Montreux, which he had made his headquarters for a few months. I remember the impression he made upon me at a meeting of the English colony, though I have quite forgotten what he said and what the meeting was about. It was evident that he had the people's hearts as he spoke to them with simple charm and told them of the importance to his work of their home as " London by the Lake." It was the same everywhere, people loved him wherever he went. His was arduous work and as the years went by he had need of all his intrepid courage to face it. He did the work and did it thoroughly for fifteen years. Two aspects perhaps stand out. One is the immense difficulty of his task during the war and the courage, tireless energy and tact with which he faced it. He even succeeded in gaining permission to visit the British prisoners in several camps, including Ruhleben. The other aspect is the peculiar interest he had in Russia and the Russian Orthodox Church. He travelled over European Russia and Siberia, ministering to Anglicans and making friends among the Orthodox. He viewed Russian life with a sympathetic eye and has recorded his impressions in such books as *Russia from Within* and *Russian Life To-day*. For the Russian Orthodox Church he had a deep love and veneration, and he retained his profound belief in its future even when the devastative persecution of the Soviet threatened its very existence. Again his personality opened up a path for him where it would seem almost impossible for him to go, and he visited the Patriarch Tikhon in Moscow, in 1923, and took part with him in the celebration of the Liturgy in the Uspensky Cathedral. Dr. Bury resigned the Bishopric of Northern and Central Europe in 1926 and became Assistant Bishop of London. He continued to occupy the benefice of St. Anne and St. Agnes, Gresham Street, which he had held since 1920. During the last six years of his life he was at pains to keep in touch as far as possible with men who had worked under him as chaplains on the Continent, and they are among the very many who regarded him with real affection as a friend and father in God. His love for the Russian Church continued to find an outlet in speeches and sermons on its behalf all over the country. He was a member of the Committee of the Russian Church Aid Fund which to a large extent supports the Academy for training Russian Ordinands in Paris. The Bishop loved to visit that little bit of Russia set down in a western land, and that is not the only cause which will miss his wise counsels and ever-open purse, for he was one of the most generous of men. Dr. Bury was a firm believer and staunch supporter of the movement towards closer relations between the Anglican and Orthodox Communion and was a Vice-President of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. *The Christian East* owes much to his interest and support and valued contributions from his pen. It was with a deep sense of loss but with thanksgiving for a vigorous and inspiring

life that many of his friends and fellow-workers attended the Solemn Requiem at St. Matthew's, Westminster, and the Pannykhide at the Russian Church in London, on January 31st. R.I.P.

R.M.F.

Bishop Rennie MacInnes. R.I.P.

The death of Bishop Rennie MacInnes occurred on December 24th, 1931. Nonetheless, it cannot be too late to write in *The Christian East* both of the profound sense of his loss and of the great value for him felt by all who are engaged in the Orthodox-Anglican Movement. Certainly, Dr. MacInnes was an Evangelical and remained staunch to his principles to the end. Nonetheless, his was no sectional outlook. It could not have been : for as a young man almost fresh from Harrow and Oxford, he devoted himself far back in the 'eighties to missionary work in Egypt. Living the life among the Egyptian Arabs as he lived it, he acquired an outlook which dismissed prejudice against and filled him with sympathy for the historic Churches of the East. Fanaticism makes missionary work among Moslems hard enough to-day. In the 'eighties and 'nineties it was almost impossible in Egypt, wherein ran the Shariat, the Sacred Law of Islam, which punished with death the apostate and his seducer. Lord Cromer, and after him Lord Kitchener, frowned on the Christian missionary, and when he tried to evangelize the Moslem even deported him from Egypt. The result was that most of the missionaries of the C.M.S. and other Protestant societies turned to make proselytes from the Orthodox, the Copts and other ancient national Christians. It was the same in Palestine where, under the Turks, the conversion of Moslems was even more dangerous. Evangelical though he was, MacInnes revolted against that. He knew the price which the Christians of the Islamic lands had paid and were still paying for their faithfulness to the Christian Name. The duty of Christian Europe, as he came to see it, was to befriend and neither to criticize nor attack them. What would the Church of England be like, he used to ask, if it had endured the like conditions which the Orthodox, the Copts, the Jacobites have endured all these centuries ?

When Archbishop Davidson was called on to nominate a successor to Bishop Blyth in 1914, he knew well what he was doing in turning to MacInnes. Archbishop Benson had appointed Bishop Blyth because, as a High Churchman, he would have sympathy with the Eastern Churches and because he would not allow Protestant propaganda against them. As history had happened, the endowments of the Jerusalem bishopric were vested in Evangelical trustees who had threatened to withdraw them. Those threats were renewed on Bishop Blyth's death. In appointing MacInnes, Archbishop Davidson appointed one who was not only acceptable to Evangelical

opinion, but was the most outstanding of Evangelical missionaries in the Near East. But in appointing him, he knew that he was also appointing one who would cultivate close and brotherly relations with the Orthodox and other Eastern Churches and, above all, one who would resolutely forbid proselytization from them.

This is not the place to speak of Dr. MacInnes' work among Anglicans. While to the last he remained an Evangelical, as Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem he was never sectional. He wore cope and mitre, established a Sung Eucharist in his Cathedral, permitted the use of Vestments and in general made it a home for all Anglicans. Except only the Assyrians, all the Eastern Churches are represented in Jerusalem and have rights in the Holy Sepulchre. The Armenian Patriarchate is now the cultural centre of the Armenian world-wide dispersion. The Copts and the Jacobite Syrians—the late Mar Ignatios Elias spent a considerable fraction of the last ten years there—have Bishops of Jerusalem, and the Abyssinian Convent outside the Holy City plays no small part in the life of the Abyssinian Church, the people of which have the pilgrim habit more than all nations except the Russian. Above all the Orthodox Patriarchate, with its Monastic Confraternity of the Holy Sepulchre, is a major institution not only of the Orthodox Communion but of historic Christendom. In it is vested the freehold of the Church of the Anastasis, the Roman Catholic and other Churches only having rights of user. Also the numerous and important Russian Orthodox convents in Palestine are ruled by the saintly, mystic Archbishop Anastasy, formerly of Bessarabia, whom we know well in London. With one and all of the hierarchs of different churches and nations in the Holy Land, Bishop MacInnes was at terms of close friendship. All gave him their confidence and loved him.

Bishop MacInnes' last public utterance was made at the Annual Meeting of his Diocesan Association, in the Caxton Hall, on October 20th, 1931, when not only the Archbishop of Canterbury, but the Archbishop of Thyatira, the Serb Bishop Irenay of Novi Sad and other Orthodox members of the Conjoint Doctrinal Commission which was then in session, were present and spoke. It is noteworthy that, in the peroration of his own speech, he declared not only the value and love which he had for the historic Christian East, but his deep-rooted and ever-growing conviction that the Orthodox, the Armenians, the Jacobites and the Copts were the appointed instruments for the conversion of Islam : for they are of one blood with the Arab.

If Bishop MacInnes took but small part in the theological discussions which are leading the Orthodox to take a favourable view of Anglican history and doctrine, his contribution to the progress of our Movement was great in this. He convinced the Orthodox, as

also the other Easterns, that the Anglican Evangelical can be as sympathetic to them as the Anglo-Catholic. The Evangelicalism which he presented to them never repelled but always attracted them. Being an Evangelical, he was able to give them an objective example of what the whole Anglican Communion is.

Well may we of A. & E.C.A. praise God for the life and work of Rennie MacInnes. R.I.P.

Nothing is as it should be in these days of economic crisis. But, thanks to the indefatigable work and organizing ability of the Rev. E. M. Bickersteth, the Secretary of the Jerusalem Diocesan Fund, the finance of the Bishopric is in good order.

The Jerusalem Bishopric

Though less known to the public, the death of Bishop MacInnes appears to have presented Archbishop Lang with a problem hardly less difficult than that with which the death of Bishop Blyth presented Archbishop Davidson twenty years ago. Unless we are misinformed, the Evangelical trustees, who had possession of the funds, are said to have had the temerity to claim that the Anglican Bishopric in Jerusalem is an Evangelical peculiar and actually went so far not only as to hint broadly that if So-and-So were appointed the income would be withheld, but even as to nominate a candidate for the vacancy. If our information is correct, Dr. Lang replied abruptly that no Anglican Bishopric could be earmarked as the perquisite of a party in the Anglican Communion and that the Anglican Bishopric in Jerusalem could not be bought up surreptiously by Evangelicals. If the trustees abused their power and withheld the funds vested in them, they must do so. With the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London, whose duty it is to advise him, he intended to make an independent appointment. The trustees were brought to reason by His Grace's firm attitude and the £30,000 which was in their hands is said to have been transferred to the appropriate officials of the Church Assembly. If this be true, all Anglicans, the extremely sectional Evangelicals alone excepted, will be heartily thankful. The Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem is the representative of the whole Anglican Communion and his selection must be independent of sectional considerations.

Bishop Graham Brown

Though Dr. Graham Brown, on whom the choice of the Archbishop fell, is a distinct and thorough Evangelical, many of us thought of him as Bishop MacInnes' successor as soon as the vacancy occurred. As Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, which is the *ne plus ultra* of Evangelical seminaries and the focus of that Group Movement which is reviving and transfiguring Anglican Evangelicalism, he had acquired a great reputation both as an academic and as a spiritual force. He was known as kindly and tolerant, with a wide outlook and a great use for those from whom he differs and of no sectional narrowmindedness. He had played an important part as a member of the Anglican and Old Catholic Commission which had met in July, 1931, at Bonn, and had agreed the terms of Intercommunion between the Old Catholic and Anglican Churches. He had fought for the implementation of that agreement by the English Convocations against the more extreme Evangelicals. He had taken parties of his students from Wycliffe Hall twice on Pilgrimage to the Holy Land and was known to have a great affection for the Orthodox Church, to desire the Intercommunion of the Anglican Church with the Orthodox and to be altogether opposed to proselytization from the Orthodox or any other of the historic Eastern Churches. Anglo-Catholics love a true Evangelical dearly and to them as to the Orthodox he had made himself a *persona gratissima*. On the one hand they were confident that he would carry on Bishop MacInnes' tradition. On the other hand, they felt that if Evangelical dictation ought to be rebutted, Evangelical sentiment ought to be studied. Moreover, they judged it to be very desirable that the Anglican Communion should be represented to the Orthodox in the person of an Evangelical Bishop in Jerusalem: for thereby the Orthodox would gain firsthand knowledge of what, when it is not sectional, Anglican Evangelicism can be and would learn that the legend that its Evangelical element forbids dogmatic agreement with Orthodoxy is mythical. Doubtless our Archbishop was glad when his choice of Dr. Graham Brown was hailed with universal acclamation. But unless we are altogether at sea, His Grace had fixed upon him of his own initiative from the first and, if all the world had gainsaid, would have pressed him to accept the call.

That Dr. Graham Brown will be faithful in Jerusalem to his principles as an Evangelical is not to be doubted. We could not wish otherwise. But that he will also be a true representative of the whole Anglican Communion, we are also sure; and we are certain that he will both discountenance proselytization and will labour to further the approach of the Orthodox and Anglican Churches towards Intercommunion.

An Old Catholic and Anglican Interconsecration

The ceremony of Dr. Graham Brown's consecration on St. John Baptist's Day, 1932, in St. Paul's Cathedral, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, was very memorable. His co-consecrate was Dr. Simpson as suffragan Bishop of Kensington in the Diocese of London. Among the great congregation present were the Earl of Athlone, Her Majesty the Queen's brother, the Chancellor of the University of London and many senior statesmen of the British Commonwealth, Sir John Chancellor, the recent High Commissioner of Palestine, the Archbishop of Thyatira, the Russian Bishop in London (Mgr. Nicholai), the other Orthodox clergy and the Armenian clergy of London. But the most significant feature was that the Old Catholic Bishop of Haarlem took part in the consecration of both consecrates, not as did the Bishop of London and the dozen or so Anglican bishops who joined with His Grace in the laying-on of hands, but as a principal co-consecrator.

Ultramontane Roman Catholic canonists of to-day propound the theory that the Validity of an episcopal consecration depends upon the principal consecrator alone. Accordingly, if the Bishop of Haarlem had done no more than conjoin in the consecration with the Anglican assistant bishops by merely laying one of his hands on the consecrator heads, Roman Catholic controversialists would have been free to dispute the validity of Dr. Graham Brown's episcopal orders on the ground that they were conferred only by our Archbishop, and therefore have been pronounced invalid by Pope Leo XIII.'s Bull.

To say that *pace* Leo XIII., no Anglican doubts the validity of Anglican Orders, or that if it had entered the mind of our Archbishop that by inviting the Bishop of Haarlem he might be construed as having such doubt, would be ridiculously otiose. Plainly, in making that invitation, His Grace was only implementing the Bonn agreement with the Old Catholics, which included Interconsecration.

Nonetheless, since so it happened, we are glad that the Bishop of Haarlem interpreted the invitation which was extended him by His Grace as meaning that he should lay both hands on the heads of the consecrates and in doing so should recite the Old Catholic formula of episcopal consecration, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, with the intention to confer the episcopal character and office as they are understood by the Old Catholics. We are also glad if, as we understand, the Bishop of Haarlem has been at pains to record his action as a principal consecrator of both bishops in the form of a protocol. In that case, in the face of facts, Cardinal Bourne himself must agree that Dr. Graham Brown and Dr. Simpson possess episcopal orders which are as valid as his own; nor can Bishop d'Herbigny and the *Instituto Pontificale Orientale* dispute that those whom those two Bishops

conjoin to consecrate, or whom they ordain, will be true bishops and priests.

Ourselves we have not the minutest doubt as to the Validity of Anglican Ordinations and we rejoice that every Orthodox theologian who has investigated them of late years is in agreement with Archbishop Chrysostom of Athens in regarding the Bull in which Pope Leo XIII. was induced to reject them as a fantastic and polemical piece of prejudice. But, though no loyal Anglican could have desired the Bishop of Haarlem to have conjoined in the consecration of June 24th for that end, if it results that at long last that lamentable Bull goes into the Vatican's wastepaper basket, and that the most hostile and severe Roman Catholic theologian is compelled to recognize the Validity of Anglican Orders, all Christendom will rejoice that a needless and thorny obstacle to Re-union has been removed.

By all accounts, the Enthronement of Dr. Graham Brown in St. George's Cathedral, Jerusalem, on Michaelmas Day, 1932, was a notable and symbolic ceremony. Of course, General Wauchope, the High Commissioner of Palestine, was present, the Grand Mufti and the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem were officially represented at it. But Mgr. Keladion, the Topoteretes of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem, and the hierarchs of the " Jacobite " Syrian, of the Coptic, of the Armenian and of the Abyssinian Churches who assisted in it, were there in the intimate capacity of brother bishops. After his enthronization Dr. Graham Brown paid a series of ceremonial visits to them all. He also visited Mgr. Barlesina, the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, from whom he received a friendly welcome.

Since then he has made a tour in Syria, Cyprus and Iraq, which has given him opportunity both to establish personal relations with the authorities of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria and the Archbishopric of Cyprus, and to obtain at first hand some acquaintance with those of the Assyrian and Jacobite Churches.

Dr. Graham Brown's visit to Iraq was made because, for practical reasons, the care of Anglicans resident in Iraq was transferred last year from the Anglican Bishop in Persia to the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem, an arrangement which makes the latter the Anglican Bishop in whose area are the authorities of the Assyrian and Jacobite Churches, and from our point of view is very desirable.

The Archbishop of Canterbury established a precedent last December, by addressing fraternal letters of New Year's greeting both to the Orthodox Patriarchs and other presiding bishops of the Orthodox autokephalous churches and to the Patriarchs of the other historic Eastern Churches. His Grace's action was much appreciated and all his letters were published in the official magazines of the churches concerned.

The Gibraltar Diocese

Other than their experiences in the Holy Places, few things have left a more vivid impression upon members of bygone Anglo-Catholic pilgrimages than the assembly of Eastern hierarchs at the garden parties given them by Bishop MacInnes. On his pretty lawn, with St. George's Cathedral in the background, each in the distinctive walking apparel which their clergy have evolved in the centuries, were the Orthodox Patriarch with familiar *kalimavkhi* and gown, the Armenian Patriarch in his cowl-like head-dress, the Syrian Jacobite Bishop in his Spanish onion-shaped little cap, the Coptic Bishop and the Abyssinian Abbot with their distinctive robes. Such a scene was a living picture illustrative of Eastern Christendom.

Jerusalem being the metropolis of Christian Mysticism in general, and of Eastern Christian Mysticism in particular, every Eastern Church—except, alas ! the long-tried Assyrian—is represented permanently in it by ecclesiastics of great distinction. Thus no other Anglican Bishop has opportunity of intimate and of continuous contact with influential Eastern hierarchs of the first distinction comparable with that of the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem. On the other hand, although the Orthodox Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem and the Churches of Cyprus are in the area of the Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem, it is the Bishop of Gibraltar and the Bishop of Fulham who are the natural ambassadors of the Anglican Communion to the Orthodox Church. In the area of the former are the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and the national Churches of Greece, Rumania, Serbia and Bulgaria. In the area of the latter are the Russian Patriarchate and the Churches of Poland, Finland and the other Baltic Succession States.

Bishop Buxton

Accordingly, it was with profound thankfulness that every Anglican lover of the Orthodox Church learnt that the Archbishop of Canterbury had called on Archdeacon Harold Buxton to succeed Dr. Hicks as Bishop of Gibraltar. In choosing him, our Archbishop was certainly not unmindful of the needs of those Anglican communities in the west of Europe which must always be a prime concern of the Bishop of Gibraltar, and we are very confident that as their chief pastor Bishop Buxton will justify himself. He has the true parish priest's love of individual souls, and with all his humility and unselfish zeal, his is the firmness and the perspective needful for a bishop. But from our point of view, His Grace's choice is ideal.

In brief, this is Bishop Buxton's career. Ordained deacon in 1904

and priested in 1906, after working in a colliery district of Durham, he spent three years in Burma. From 1911–1914 he was at Thaxted, in Essex, with Father Conrad Noel, that Bayard of English priests whom you may criticize but whom you must respect and whom all who know him admire and love. Then after being the parish priest of Horley, in Oxfordshire, he gave up his happy life in that parish to become domestic chaplain to Bishop Gore. In the later years of the war he undertook the secretaryship of the Lord Mayor's Armenian Relief Fund. Some day an Armenian will write the tragic tale of his martyred Church and nation from 1915–1923. The name of Bishop Buxton will be written in every page of that history. Wherever there are Armenians, he is honoured for his quiet, self-effacing but unremitting and inestimable advocacy of their national cause and labours for the relief of the victims of their wholesale deportations. All Armenians reckon that he belongs to them. Whenever he appears among them, they cluster round him. In the years following immediately after the great catastrophe, which was consummated by the holocaust of Smyrna and Mustapha Kemal's extirpation of Christianity from Asiatic Turkey, he rendered similar service to the million and more Greek Orthodox exiles who, escaping from the white or the red death, were welcomed by their kinsmen in the Republic of Greece. In 1923 he volunteered to be Bishop Gore's valet and courier when, notwithstanding his years, in order to equip himself to be Chairman of Archbishop Davidson's Eastern Churches Committee, that eager, saintly theologian made the tour of the Balkans. To be of service in the fulfilment of humble, self-imposed duty is Bishop Buxton's norm. Between 1921 and 1926, you might have met him anywhere at any time in the Near East doing his quiet relief work. In its intervals he took up some Martha-like job, such as a curacy at Christ Church, Westminster, the centre of the Industrial Christian Fellowship. In 1926, after much hesitation, he accepted the invitation of his cousin, Bishop MacInnes, and became Archdeacon of Cyprus and—tens of thousands of the Armenian and other refugees for whom he was caring were in that land—of Syria. In the autumn of 1930, sorely against his will, he yielded to pressure and agreed to take up the then vacant Anglican chaplaincy at Athens. In fact, he was loath to give up his unobtrusive but intensely constructive work in Cyprus, where *inter alia* he was busy building a church in Nicosia. But the agreement reached by the Lambeth Conference and the representative Orthodox Delegation which attended it, demanded an experienced and acceptable representative of the Anglican Communion in Athens. By mischance, the chaplaincy was filled before he was free to undertake it and after having resigned his Archdeaconry in Cyprus and Syria, in order to do the liaison work to which he had been bidden, he found himself *pondu dans l'air*. *More suo*, however, he made no complaint and was

waiting a new opening when Dr. Lang turned to him as the obvious man to succeed Dr. Hicks.

To write of one who has just buckled on his armour for the Great Adventure and of one who, after achieving valiant deeds is putting it off, are very different things.

None the less, we are confident that the Episcopate of Bishop Buxton will be fruitful beyond measure, not only for the life of the Anglican communities in the area of his ministry but for the cause of Re-union.

The Old Catholic Bishop of Deventer, Dr. Berends, took part as a principal consecrator in Bishop Buxton's consecration in St. Paul's Cathedral, on St. Matthias Day, February 24th. Accordingly, the most severe and unwilling Papalist with whom he may come in contact on his Episcopal tours, cannot but recognize him to be possessed of authentic and wholly valid apostolic Orders. Apart, however, from that, and in itself, his Consecration was very noteworthy. At its conclusion he was entertained to lunch by our own Anglican and Eastern Churches Association, his connection with the inner councils of which has been long, intimate and decisive.

During that ceremony he was presented by its members with a pastoral staff. On its morrow, he started on a three months' tour of the western portion of his Diocese and—Mr. Athelstan Riley was there—was duly enthroned in his Cathedral of Gibraltar on March 8th.

Bishop Nicholai. R.I.P.

All who knew him grieve for the death of Bishop Nicholai, the priest of that part of the Russian Parish of London which holds by the Metropolitan Antony and the Karlovic Synod of Russian Bishops in Exile. His was a sunny personality. Always eager, always enjoying life, always smiling, always loving and asking for love, even—and at times such moods swept over him in indignation —when in excited, combative anger, he was typical of Russian monasticism in its most engaging appeal. Quite unworldly, childlike in many things, a mystic altogether, he was one of those folk to whom as it has been said, the world owes a supreme debt just because they are so manifestly happy. I can never forget his preaching to my Mothers' Clubs in Peckham. They adored him, and he loved them.

The landmarks of his career were these. Born in Siberia in 1891, he did well in the Siberian Theological School of Kurgan from 1907-13 and on being passed on to the Theological School of Moscow, took the monastic habit and was ordained deacon in 1913. Ordained priest in 1916, and having graduated with distinction in 1917, became

Professor of Latin in the College and parish priest. Then came the Octobrist Revolution. The Bolsheviks closed his College. Archbishop Agathangel appointed him his private secretary. But he never took up office. For a time he was in danger, sought by the Tcheka. War found him with the Metropolitan Antony and the White Army in 1919. On the failure of that gallant adventure, he made his way to Serbia, where in 1920 the Serb Church employed him as a teacher in one of its Theological Colleges, the Professional Board of which elected him its Inspector, or as we might say Dean. In 1923 the Karlovic Synod of Russian Bishops conferred the rank of Archimandrite upon him. In 1926, when the disastrous agreement between the Metropolitans Evlogie and Antony produced open division, he came to London as the representative of the latter, and in June, 1929, was consecrated bishop in St. Philip's, Buckingham Palace Road by the Metropolitan Antony, Bishop Tikhon of Berlin and Bishop Seraphim. The Bishop of Fulham with myself as his chaplain attended to represent the Archbishop of Canterbury at that very beautiful and noteworthy ceremony.

No Orthodox Bishop had previously been consecrated in England.

Bishop Nicholai, who left England in July last year to take part in the annual session of the Karlowicz Synod, was obliged suddenly in October to undergo an appendicitis operation, which proved fatal. —R.I.P.

J.A.D.

Bishop Nicholai's successor, Father Boris Molchanov, who before the Revolution was an officer of the Tsar, did not arrive in London until March. Father Solodovnikov, who took charge during the vacancy, was chaplain to the saintly Bishop Benjamin of Petrograd, and was with that martyred confessor during the mock trial which preceded his murder by the Bolsheviks in 1917. Father Solodovnikov spent many months in rigorous confinement, and finally made an adventurous escape over the Finnish frontier.

Father Molchanov is a monk, and will carry on the monastic house in St. Dunstan's Road, W. Ealing, founded by Bishop Nicholai.

Bishop Russell Wakefield. R.I.P.

Henry Russell Wakefield, Bishop, R.I.P., passed away, as he would have wished to pass, in his sleep. The end was sudden. On the Wednesday he presided at a meeting of the Reform Club, the next morning he was seized with a paralytic stroke upon which pneumonia intervened, on Monday afternoon he died, never having recovered consciousness.

R.W., as he was known to many of his friends, was a very exceptional prelate. In fact, I have never met anyone like him. He was supremely natural without the faintest semblance of time-serving, original without pretence, dignified without attempt, and supremely lovable without effort. I will not insult his memory by calling him "broad-minded," for that popular term is so often misused, rather would I say that by his wisdom, gentleness, and courage allied to a broad and flexible outlook, R.W. made for himself a unique position in the affections of all with whom he came into contact in London, Norwich, Birmingham and finally in Brighton, where he was affectionately known as the third Bishop of Sussex, a title he fully earned for his voluntary work in the diocese of Chichester. He had that fine genius for friendship which gives more than it receives. He was the first Bishop in the Western Church to show practical sympathy with the persecuted Church of Russia. At once he gave his name, his interest and his influence (while Bishop of Birmingham) to the "Appeal for the Russian Clergy," founded in 1922 by friends of the Russian Church in London, becoming its first president and never relaxing his support or his effort on behalf of the cause to the end.

In 1925 he led the second Anglo-Catholic Pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and this experience was a great joy to him. Always interested in the Orthodox Church of the East, he had often expressed a desire to come into closer contact with Eastern Christians and their leaders, and above all to visit the holy places. I could write much about that Pilgrimage did space permit, but will only mention a few incidents which impressed themselves on my mind. It was my privilege to serve him at Mass in the Chapel of Abraham, adjoining the site of Calvary in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. He was greatly impressed, and afterwards said his thanksgiving at the Holy Tomb. We returned silently, but on reaching the hotel he said, "Never shall I forget this experience." He was delightfully at home with Prelates and Clergy: the aged Patriarchs Damianos of Jerusalem, and Photios of Alexandria, both remarking on the "charming smile of your Bishop," but, unless my memory fails me, it was the saintly Metropolitan Kleopas of Nazareth (God rest his loving soul!) who most attracted R.W., and gave him a clear insight of the best type of Orthodox prelate.

On the return journey a company of French soldiers were on the ship, and as we passed the heroes' graves on the heights of Gallipoli, they all stood at attention while the pilgrims sang *de profundis* and hymns for the fallen. This greatly impressed R.W. and the following day, with the captain's permission, he addressed the men in fluent French and handed to each of them a packet of cigarettes. The soldiers were as pleased as they were surprised, obviously a new experience to them.

Thanks to the generosity of Sir Henry Lunn we had arranged to give a banquet at a hotel in Athens and invited His Beatitude Archbishop Chrysostom and some leading members of the Athens University. On our arrival we were told that His Grace would not be able to dine with us, but had tendered the pilgrims an invitation to tea. We were determined to induce the Archbishop to change his mind, but tact was necessary. Consequently, I managed to place R.W. next Mgr. Chrysostom at tea, " I will do my best," he said: and later on a slip of paper was put in my hands with just these words, " It's all right " ; and, needless to add, the banquet was a great success.

One last memory. At Malta we arrived in the early hours of Ascension Day. The Provost of the Cathedral had told us to do " just what we liked," I quote his words. High Mass was sung at 6 a.m., our Bishop pontificating, and then he confirmed two young and very shy " middies." It was an ideal confirmation with one short and very homely talk. I am sure those two lads were deeply impressed: there was a delightful look of joy and gratitude in their faces when the Bishop bade them farewell. . . .

At a memorial service held in Birmingham Cathedral, Bishop Hamilton Baynes, the Provost, said: " Above and beyond all his activities, the picture that dwelt in their hearts was his large-hearted, kindly, genial humanity: he was the friend of everyone: his genial, smiling face was ever before them." He was indeed the beloved Bishop. . . . Under the gently swaying pine trees, in glorious sunshine, we laid him to rest in the beautiful cemetery at Bournemouth. We are all the better for having known him, and we shall not easily forget him. And so, farewell! Rest eternal grant unto him, O Lord, and let light perpetual shine upon him.

G.N.W.

A RUSSIAN ORDINATION IN PARIS

The distinguished Professor of Patriotics in the Russian Orthodox Seminary at Paris, G. Florovsky, was ordained priest in the Chapel of the Seminary in April last. His fellow-professors and all the students were present. The Metropolitan Evlogie performed the Ordination and in his sermon spoke of the difficulties confronting the Orthodox Church, and expressed the great joy he felt at seeing so distinguished and helpful a man enrolled in the ranks of the clergy.

(Ap. Barnabas, September 30/32, p. 303, etc.)