

# ECNL

A publication of the  
Anglican and Eastern  
Churches Association

New Series No 2  
Spring 1976  
50p to non-members

# The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association

founded in 1864

## Orthodox Patron:

The Oecumenical Patriarch

## Anglican Patron:

The Archbishop of Canterbury

## Anglican President:

The Bishop of St. Alban's

## Orthodox President:

Archbishop Athenagoras of  
Thyateira and Great Britain

## Chairman of Committee:

The Rev. H. R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

## General Secretary:

The Rev. A. T. J. SALTER, A.K.C.  
137, Liverpool Road, London, N.1.

## Treasurer:

SIMON BREARLEY, ESQ.,  
9, Emperor's Gate, London, S.W.7.

## Editor of ECNL:

B. S. BENEDIKZ, M.A.

The Main Library,  
University of Birmingham,  
P.O. Box 363,  
Birmingham B15 2TT.

## Eastern Churches News Letter

### Contents

Editorial	1
General Secretary's Notes	3
Assistant Secretary's Notes	5
A House Divided	8
The Church of the Old Believers	19
The Enemy Within	22
Eastern Saints and Kings in the ancestry of	
H.M. Queen Elizabeth II	30
Youth and the Gospel	33
News Items	38
Reviews	39
Correction	44

No responsibility can be accepted either by the General Committee or by the Editor for the views expressed by the contributors.

The year 1975 is about to blow out as I write these lines. It leaves behind a peculiar tension within the Christian body politic, not yet new, but rather unpleasantly familiar throughout the shape of the Church's history, right back to the squabbles of Our Lord's disciples and the acrobatics of the Pauline and Apollonian parties in Corinth.



## Eastern Churches News Letter

### EDITORIAL

Inflation, that scourge of us all, has been biting severely at our Association of late. The generosity of the bequest left us by our late, long-standing member, Miss Loddiges, has however provided a financial stabiliser which will enable us to bear the mounting costs of producing *ECNL*, even on the new, more limited scale, for a considerable while. To this has been added a generous gift from another benefactor towards our growing postal expenses, and the sting of the bite has thus been much lessened—for a while. In the last resort, however, it is you, our ordinary members, who decide whether we survive as an Association and do such work as we are able to do to make Christians aware that we *are* all members one of another. Please take our General Secretary's remarks to heart, therefore, and be punctual with your subscriptions.

In 1973, when I took on the Editorship of *ECNL*, I was told that this was a three-year stint with no question of re-election. Accordingly, I began to lay bait for a possible successor in the last issue, but to my surprise this has resulted in my being told that the Association prefers the devil it knows to any unknown goblin: hence I shall be continuing to serve until it indicates that it has had enough of me. So, if someone was about to take up the offer made in the editorial of the last issue, I am very sorry, but for the moment it has been withdrawn.

The year 1975 is about to bow out as I write these lines. It leaves behind a peculiar tension within the Christian body politic, one not new, but rather unpleasantly familiar throughout the whole of the Church's history, right back to the squabbles of Our Lord's disciples and the snappings of the Pauline and Apollonian parties in Corinth, and it has one most depressing result. Over the last five years the patient spadework of those who have laboured so hard and faithfully at the unspectacular but necessary task of making their own traditions and beliefs understood by those who see the same things differently has been largely destroyed by a horde of ecclesiastical brawlers, drunk with self-importance, who, because they hold a paper post in some paper organization, think they can aggrandize themselves by daubing all others with vile accusations dreamed up in their over-

heated imagination. It is as well to remind them that Christ saw the spiritual forebears of these smug gentry parading the streets of Jerusalem, swathed in their self-awarded virtue, and His judgment is as valid today on the party bosses of the WCC and Liberia as it was on the Pharisees of nineteen hundred years ago: "Amen I say to you, they have their reward". However distressing it is for a moment to witness these ecclesiastical Chinovniks giving Christianity a bad name, in the cold winds that blow from the far North their puffs of hot air are reduced to their proper insignificance. The Christian church will continue to follow her Lord's commandments long after such camp-followers have departed from her after finding that she has no more profitable pickings for them, and Christians will continue to serve as Christ bade them, mindful that it is not by screaming from the house-tops or by wild attempts to cadge publicity at any cost that the Christian is recognised, but by his willingness to follow his Lord who, in the words of John Henry Newman

... in the Garden secretly

And on the Cross on high

Did teach His brethren and inspire

To suffer and to die.

To die for our faith is a grace given only to an elect few, but to suffer, whether physically or mentally, is the common lot of the Christian—even to suffer from the vile abuse of those who pretend to share his faith. God grant us all patience to endure until these turbulences of the moment are forgotten, buried beyond recall in the sands of time, and His healing Grace has renewed in us health of mind and spirit; may those who need it most, but are least conscious of their need, prove more humble than the Pharisees of Christ's Palestine, and repent before they receive the rewards of their present words and actions.

I am writing in the winter dark of Christmastide, when the flame of the Child of Bethlehem, the Lord Incarnate, blazes through to lighten our darkness of spirit, to warm our coldness of heart, and reinvigorate our tired minds. When you read these words it will be Eastertide, the time when we celebrate the fulfilment of the Christian faith, even as the earth is rejoicing in God's gift of the new growths of another Spring, and cry, in the words of the Eastern rite

Christ is arisen!

He is arisen indeed!

May He grant us the blessings of spiritual renewal, of new love, and courage to face a torn and hostile world, in the power of His rising.

B. S. Benediktz

#### GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES

The members of the committee of the Association received the sad news of the death of an old member, Miss Loddiges. She has left £2,000 to the Association and a part of the residue of her estate, which has still to be settled. This is going to be a great help to the Association. As mentioned before we are also fortunate in that an anonymous Greek member of the Association has offered to pay the cost of the postage of the News Letter for 1976. However, I would urge all those whose subscriptions now fall due to send me their cheques as soon as possible. I am afraid that the cost of postage makes it impossible for me to send a receipt unless one is particularly asked for.

In October I attended the ceremony of the laying up of the Garter banner of late His Imperial Majesty the Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia in St. George's Chapel, Windsor. It was good to see such a huge crowd there for this last tribute to a great Christian Sovereign. One or two members of the Association were present; I was able to make contact with a young Ethiopian nun who is studying with the Sisters of the Love of God at the Convent of the Incarnation, Fairacres, Oxford. Also, I spoke to the new priest-in-charge of the Ethiopian congregation using a Methodist Church in Notting Hill, Abba Gabriel Aragawi Wolde.

The Archbishop of Thyateira asked me to address the Synod of the Greek Clergy of the Archdiocese in November on the work of the Association. A dozen priests joined the Association after the meeting.

Just before Christmas I attended Princess Helena Moutafian's supper party in aid of the restoration appeal for St. Jude's, Hampstead Garden Suburb, which needs £40,000 for a new roof. Canon W. Masters, a member of the Council and formerly Anglican chaplain in Helsinki and Moscow, was once vicar of St. Jude's. The evening was a truly ecumenical one. It was nice to see our good friend Archbishop Bessak Toumayan there and to hear him joining in most of the English carols. He remarked how much he had enjoyed the concise article by a fellow Pre-Chalcedonian, Father Marcos Askety of the Coptic Church, which appeared in the Spring News Letter.

Exactly twenty years ago when I was a soldier I went to visit the late Canon J. A. Douglas in a nursing home for the clergy in Worthing. After tea he asked me to deliver a book to a certain retired Brigadier at Lambeth Palace Library. The book was Francis Dvornik's "The Photian Schism". It was with deep regret that one



learned of Dvornik's passing in November. I came across my copy of his great work on Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who for a thousand years had been denounced by the Latin Church as an arch-heretic and arch-schismatic, while at the same time venerated in the East as a saintly Oecumenical Patriarch and a great scholar. Father Dvornik rehabilitated Photius in the eyes of the West. The book was given me by that delightful Serbo-Irish lady, Annie Christich, a near neighbour of mine when I was at St. Alban's, Holborn. In it she had written a note on the author:—

"I have known Dr. Dvornik ever since the early days—a great many years ago when he first came to London to read at the British Museum. He usually stayed at St. George's Cathedral House, Southwark. The last time I saw him in London was at the SS. Cyril & Methodius festival at Farm Street in the fifties. He had come from Rome and he told me he had been received by Pope John, and then—hesitatingly and fiercely blushing, he added:—

'Le Saint Père m'embrassait  
(What a reward after all the strictures and criticisms he had endured when he first published his findings on Photius!)"

Yes, indeed! It was on the foundations laid by such men as Francis Dvornik that other men now build, for he was among that handful of men of vision who prepared themselves to battle for peace and unity when the oecumenical trumpets gave an uncertain sound if they sounded at all across the Tiber, the Thames or the Bosphorus, but when we saw Pope Paul saluting the Oecumenical Patriarch's representative, Metropolitan Meliton, with a kiss—a kiss on the foot—we give thanks for men like Dvornik.

From the Phanar I hear from Metropolitan Gabriel of Colonna that he is much better and thanks us for our prayers during his recent painful illness.

May I take this opportunity of wishing all members of the Association every blessing for 1976 on behalf of the chairman and members of the committee.

John Salter

#### THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY'S NOTES

The Nikaeen Club last year celebrated its Golden Jubilee. We greet and extend to the Nikaeen Club our warmest congratulations praying that it will serve the Church in the future years in the course of Inter-Church Relations. 1925 was the year which we celebrated the First Council of Nicaea in Westminster Abbey which was arranged by our Association. Father French in his article on the history of the Association for our Centenary Year wrote these words. "The outstanding memory, however, of the life of the A. and E. C. A. between the wars is the commemoration in 1925 of the first Council of Nicaea. The Association had appointed an ad hoc sub-committee at an early stage. But it soon became clear that the idea had caught the imagination of the English Church as a whole and very shortly the A. and E. C. A. sub-committee became the nucleus of something very much larger. Invitations were sent by the Bishop of London to the Heads of the Orthodox Churches and were accepted by practically all of them. The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem attended in person. The Oecumenical Throne was vacant at the time and was represented by that staunch friend of our Church the Metropolitan Germanos of Thyateira. The Dean and Chapter of Westminster welcomed the delegates to a great service in Westminster Abbey at which the Archbishop of Canterbury preached. It was followed by a state luncheon at Lambeth Palace. Our visitors stayed for about a month and carried through a varied and sometimes crowded programme of events in different parts of the country. The importance of this visit lies not only in the scale of its events, the high dignity of the personages involved, and the doctrinal significance of the occasion, but also in the fact that the Orthodox were well aware that they were dealing with the Church of England as a whole and not merely with a particular section of it. It gave great pleasure at the time to hear some of them state explicitly that their experience of the sixteenth century of Nicaea in England cleared away or at least greatly modified any doubts they may have had about the Church of England before." Father French goes on to say: "A footnote of minor interest may be added. It does not seem to be generally known that the Epitaphion from the Church of Nicaea, with its romantic story, which was carried in procession at the Abbey on this occasion has since been kept in the north wall of the Lady Chapel in Canterbury Cathedral". It was indeed a very great joy to have at the lecture at Lambeth Palace on 7 October on the Council of Nicaea Bishop Harold Buxton who in 1925 at the great Liturgy in Westminster Abbey was one of those who carried the Epitaphion. We have in him a link with the long history of the relations between the Anglican Church and the Holy Orthodox Church, a life devoted to the union of our two Churches. We pray that God will give him health and joy for the future.



Another important event has been the 25th Anniversary of the consecration of the Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain Athenagoras II, Apokrisarios of His All Holiness The Oecumenical Patriarch to His Grace The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Orthodox President of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. We greet His Eminence Archbishop Athenagoras praying that he will have many years of happiness to serve the Great Church of Christ the Oecumenical Patriarchate. We extend our warmest congratulations to His Eminence, who celebrated his Jubilee in Constantinople, when the Archbishop of Canterbury's Pastoral Letter was sent by His Grace to the Archbishop of Thyateira. His Eminence in thanking His Grace said it would be read in the Churches of the Archdiocese on Sunday, 2 November, and be published in the periodical *Orthodox Herald* in Greek. The Archbishop characterised the Pastoral Letter as soul-searching and a product of piety, pastoral concern and Christian conviction. This is another important link in the Inter-Church Relations between the Anglican Church and the Holy Orthodox Church, pointing to the importance of there being a great exchange of information between our two Churches at the local level.

On 12 October 1975, Metropolitan Anthony of Sourzh celebrated the 25th anniversary of his appointment as Vicar of the Russian Orthodox parish in London. It was a day of deep thankfulness not only for the Russian Patriarchal parish in London but for a great number of fellow Christians throughout the country who have been greatly helped by Metropolitan Anthony's books and by his spoken word on television and radio. He has expressed the Spiritual life of the Holy Orthodox Church to many that have never met him but have found what he has said a great help in their own spiritual lives. To our great profit, he has been a member of the General Committee of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association for a great number of years, and is now a Vice-President. We extend to Metropolitan Anthony our warmest greetings and congratulations for many years of good health and happiness in which to serve the Church of Christ. A Pontifical Liturgy was sung in the Church of the Assumption and All Saints, Ennismore Gardens on Sunday, 12 October, when it was a great honour for me to have been able to share in the worship of our Orthodox brethren again and to join with them in thanksgiving to Almighty God for the work and witness of the Metropolitan. His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury marked the occasion by giving to His Eminence the Lambeth Cross for all that he has done to help forward the relationship of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Anglican Church.

The next important event has been the call of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to the nation. This is most important for it is a

call from God through His Church to the people of this land to return to God, it is a call to prayer which must be at the foundation of all that we seek to do. Our Lord interceded for the disciples that they who still are to remain for a while in the world may be kept from evil, and may be so united in love both with the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit that they may be one with Christ our Lord. It is through prayer that we will have a right relationship with God and with all mankind. If we are to bring men into the way of Divine Truth then we must first be persons of prayer; the Church must be a praying Church. At the time that these notes are being written, we hear much about the meeting of the WCC at Nairobi. It has been giving less and less thought to the incarnational faith, that God became man that man might become God (St. Athanasius) the incarnational and condescension of God the Word coming into the world that through the incarnation all creation becomes divine through the Church (kenosis and theosis). This is theology which Christians should know about, and indeed live the life of the incarnate Lord in their own lives. The Church must teach her children these divine truths. The WCC has been giving a secularism and defined as an exaggerated "horizontalism" involving social and political concern at the expense of the transcendent gift of New Life through the incarnational condescension of the incarnate Logos dwelling among us in the here and now. The Orthodox Church has given very careful thoughts to the theme of this Assembly of the WCC, and will once again be making a statement about these trends within the WCC over these last number of years. The WCC has little understanding of our parish life and there is unhappiness within our parishes about these trends within the WCC. It is our prayer and hope that the Anglican delegates will give full support to their Orthodox brethren in the statements which they will make at this Assembly. It is right that the Church should serve the needs of the whole man, but this must be upon sound theological grounds, we must serve our brethren for love of Christ, we must see Christ in our brethren, they are made in the image and likeness of Christ. "We honour Christ in our brethren," so says St. Benedict in his chapter on receiving guests, "we honour Christ in their person". St. Chrysostom spoke those words of love when he said "that it is vain to come to the altar in the Eucharist unless we go out to find the altar which is identical with the poor brother; this altar thou mayest see everywhere lying both in the lanes and market-places, and thou mayest sacrifice upon it every hour. When thou seest a poor brother reflect that thou beholdest an altar". St. Chrysostom knew the very rich and the very poor within his own city.

During the last few months I have spoken at Nottingham University on Orthodoxy. I have visited the Orthodox House at Ampleforth which is in the care of the Serbian Orthodox Church, where young



people get training with a view to their becoming priests. It is on the lines of the House which the Association had at Oxford between the wars for young people from the Serbian Orthodox Church, where they were also given help with their education with a view to their becoming priests. During my stay at Ampleforth I was invited to supper at the Abbey which is a Benedictine House. I have been co-opted onto the committee of Social Responsibility of the Burnham Deanery Synod. May I ask the support of all your prayers in this important duty which we have within our Church. We hope in the near future to arrange some talks on Orthodoxy at the Dorney Centre. This centre has the support of Eton College and the Diocese of Oxford. The Rural Dean of Burnham welcomes very much this step, for it is most important that our people come to know about the Holy Orthodox Church. May we ask the prayers of all for this undertaking.

Cuthbert Fearon, O.S.B.

#### A HOUSE DIVIDED

##### —the Russian Church in the late 17th century—

For a Westerner, perhaps one of the most striking features of Orthodoxy is the importance of tradition in the life of the Church. It might be convenient, at a time when we are being urged from many quarters to look primarily to the needs of the world in any situation where these conflict with the traditions of the Church, to attribute the Schism in the Russian Church in the Seventeenth Century to an unnecessary insistence on the status of tradition. But this would be to give a false impression: for the blame for the Schism must chiefly lie upon two personalities and their reactions one upon the other, for their inability to distinguish between the weightier and the lighter matters of religion. Yet it was over the relative value of varying traditions that battle was joined and to do justice to the protagonists there must first be an investigation of the histories of the traditions to which they made their appeal; this, typically, involves some mention of the beginnings of Christianity in Russia.

The earliest evidence of any organised Christianity in Russia dates from the first years of the tenth century when there seems to have been a church in Kiev. This may have had its origins in a period of German missionary activity but this had little lasting effect on the people, for the Latin script was impracticable to express the Slavonic dialects and the Roman forms held little attraction for the Russian temperament. At this time, of course, the division of East and West was not final but it had recently been encouraged by the so-called Photian schism and it was to receive further impetus after the

council of Florence in the fifteenth century. But in the ninth century, the Slav Princes of the Balkans were still wavering between Rome and Constantinople; in the event it was the refusal of the Papacy to grant them a sufficient degree of autonomy that induced them to throw in their lot with the Patriarchate. The Patriarch did not miss his opportunity and two brothers, Cyril and Methodios, were commissioned to evangelise the Slavs of the Balkans and those further north. Through the work of these two, the Russian people were fortunate in hearing the written and the preached word in an intelligible language at the outset, and this was a feature which they incorporated in their own missionary endeavour. The success of their work ensured that when the Russians did embrace Christianity it was couched in the forms and traditions of the Eastern Empire at that time. This national conversion is traditionally dated in the last decade of the tenth century with the baptism of Vladimir of Kiev; after this the ties with Byzantium were drawn tighter by the marriage of Vladimir and the Byzantine princess Anna and they were further strengthened by various trading agreements, so that by the eleventh century Russia had inherited the Byzantine tradition virtually piecemeal—architecture, the monastic system, the emphasis on patristic spirituality, these all are legacies of Byzantium, which in a real sense was the quarry from which the Russian Church was hewn and to which later generations were to be encouraged to look for direction.

In the course of the following centuries the centre of the emergent Russian nation shifted from Kiev through Novgorod to Moscow, keeping pace with the centre of resistance against the Tartars, and the eventual expulsion of the Tartars together with the eclipse of Constantinople led to the awakening of what has been called a Messianic consciousness in the Russian people. This has often been seen as programmed by Philotheus of Pskov in the fifteenth century: "Two Romes have fallen, a third stands and a fourth there shall never be."<sup>1</sup> To lend reality to this claim, the Prince of Moscow took the imperial title, Tsar or Caesar.

This messianic ideal continued to grow in the following centuries, and there are two factors connected with its growth which are of great relevance to the causes at issue in the Schism of the seventeenth century. In the first place, the Russians saw the value and purity of the Constantinopolitan tradition dwindling away after the fall of the eastern empire at a time when they were beginning to realise their own potential as a Christian nation. They came in many cases to regard themselves as the true guardians of that tradition, and the example of Cyril Lukaris was as much a cautionary tale for the Russians as for the West; in the same way, Latin and Protestant influence in the education of the clergy became abhorrent to the conservative elements in the Russian Church. The second relevant factor is this: that with the shift from the far west to Moscow the



western lands were thrown into close contact, both military and social, with the Uniate West and Protestant Germany and, especially in the case of Kiev and the turbulent Ukraine, could not avoid assimilating some forms and ideas from these groups.

By the late fifteenth century, then, the Orthodox Church in Russia had come in many parts to have a deep suspicion of both Kiev and Little Russia in the west, and of the sullied Byzantine Church itself then at the whim—sometimes benevolent, sometimes rather less so—of its Muslim overlord. The blueprint for this attitude—though by that time it was more an expression of an already existing outlook than a new ideology—was the Stoglav Council, the Council of a Hundred Chapters, in the mid-sixteenth century which declared the supremacy of the Russian usage in matters of ritual; the Greeks were contaminated and even had to pass an examination before being granted communion. So Russia's cultural and religious isolation was not merely over against the west—which is too often emphasised—but, paradoxically, against those very centres to which she owed so much of her own culture and religion, Little Russia and Byzantium.

So much is necessary by way of broad introduction to the controversies with which we are mainly concerned.

In the sixteenth century there was some attempt at reform in the Church; this was instigated by Joseph of Volokhalamsk, and in the controversy of the "Possessors" and the "Non-Possessors" Joseph found himself opposed by the man he had appointed to initiate the reforms, Maximus the Greek, over the question of the relationship of Church and State. The controversy ousted the proposed reforms from the attention of the Church and these had to be shelved for the present. Soon, too, came the period known as "The Time of Troubles", when the whole nation became weakened by internal and external fighting and intrigue, and it was only in 1613 with the establishment of the Romanov dynasty that it became possible to restore any stability to the country; this was achieved by Michael, the first of the dynasty, in the curious situation, so relevant to the Schism to come, where his own father, Philaret, stood beside him as the Metropolitan of Moscow.

Michael was succeeded by Alexei, "That most gentle and most religious Tsar". It is often proposed that the work of "Westernisation" in Russia must be credited—or blamed—to Peter the Great, but there is more than a little evidence of this tendency in the reign of Alexei: Rtishchev, a Little Russian, conducted educational reforms based on his contact with the West; Slavinskii founded a theological academy where the teaching was based on Latin and Greek thought. Polotskii, another Little Russian, was the tutor of the Tsar's children. Such men were supported by "an army of popes" from the Ukraine and Little Russia who were by no means reticent in their criticisms of Muscovite usage.

There are few good witnesses to the state of Russian religion at this time, and those there are are not entirely impartial, but they show both the extreme outward piety and the obvious ignorance of the majority of Russian Christians in the mid-seventeenth century. "Their ignorance is, in fact, the mother of their piety", observed a French sea-captain.<sup>2</sup> The English ambassador, Sir Giles Fletcher, was scandalised by the frequency with which the Russians made the sign of the Cross, "In a crosse and vain manner?"<sup>3</sup>, and even allowing something for a "reformed" outlook in this matter his observations are valuable as concurring in many places with the criticisms of the Little Russian clergy.

So—to sum up the position immediately before the accession of Nikon as Patriarch: Hagia Sophia was in the hands of the infidels and the true orthodox tradition had passed, so many Russians thought, to the Uspenskii Sobor in Moscow for safe-keeping. Since the previous century the need for reform in the Russian Church had been realised, but there were two factions who made claims to be the agents of reform, the "conservative" reformers who wanted to resuscitate the ideals of the Josephite reforms, and the more radical reformers from the west of Russia who were suspected of unorthodoxy by the conservative party.

For the majority of the Russian clergy regarded the Kievians as little better than Roman Catholics, though they were themselves not averse to reform in many cases. Indeed, there was a reforming party headed by Vonifatiev, Neronov, and Nikon which was resuming the shelved Josephite reforms. It is most important to appreciate the basic tenets of the reform group, for it was composed of men who were to find themselves in bitter opposition with each other in the coming controversies, and the identity of aim of the two factions in the matters which brought about the schism points to the irony of their opposition.

When the emissaries of Vladimir had gone to Constantinople in the tenth century they had reported that when they witnessed the divine Liturgy they thought they were in heaven itself. The Russian people had easily assimilated the dramatic element of the liturgy, its quality as a service of movement, and accordingly had always laid great emphasis on those outward forms which contribute to the dramatic effect and which had so scandalised the English Ambassador. At the same time they had inherited the theological traditions, Patristic and Conciliar, which formed the original milieu of that liturgy. The Liturgy was, so to speak, sanctioned by the traditions, so that much of what appears to be resistance to mere ritual change may in fact represent attempts to safeguard the theological traditions. That is to say that the outward forms represented theological belief; so that the question of whether two fingers should be used instead of three in making the sign of the Cross might be seen as involving the belief in the Trinity. Given this standpoint, it must be



admitted that there was widespread inability to distinguish between essentials and non-essentials in religion, but in saying that Christianity had been split over one iota in the Homoousion controversy one would allow that the issue had not been a mere verbal quibble but had involved the reality of the humanity and divinity of Christ. For the Russians, the same iota's difference between the spelling *Isus* and *Iesus* of the name of Jesus was not a mere quibble over an iota again but embodied convictions which, though they were less fundamental than those of the Homoousion, nevertheless represented the extremes of orthodoxy and heterodoxy.

A *casus belli* over this matter was soon to be provided by the policies of Nikon who was consecrated Patriarch in 1652. He was primarily a scholar, one of the reforming party, who was genuinely impressed by the quality of Little Russian scholarship especially when it was seen beside the low standard of learning amongst the Greater Russian clergy, and despite the evidence of his opponents he was not totally devoid of spiritual gifts; ascetic in the extreme, as Archimandrite of one of the Moscow monasteries he had become greatly loved for his pastoral work in the city. His personality is almost invariably represented as being overbearing and masterful, directed towards establishing the supremacy of the Patriarch over the Tsar. But, while the methods he employed with his opponents were certainly extremely overbearing and cruel, it is difficult to avoid judging his character in the light of more modern and humane outlooks, and in these respects he was but a child of his age. Indeed the austerities he imposed on others were not unknown to himself, and his methods of enforcing his will would even appear humane beside those his opponents would have used, had they been in the position to do so. More will be said about this later, but before embarking on an account of the events of the Schism in detail, I would want to offer two further points in mitigation of the usual verdict on Nikon, points which seem generally to be overlooked. One is the example set to him by the Tsar Michael and his father, the Patriarch Philaret. With them, the civil and ecclesiastical powers had worked together in harmony and on an equal footing, and looking at them Nikon must have felt that the possibility of establishing a truly Christian state depended on the equality and harmony of the two offices. But what he overlooked is that this state of affairs was based on a close personal relationship which, even if Nikon did once share such a thing with the Tsar Alexei, he was quick to destroy by his actions. The other point in his defence is this: the Eastern Church was almost everywhere except in Russia under Muslim rule, and if Russia were to preserve in freedom a tradition which was to be palatable to the whole of eastern Christendom, she must enlarge her outlook in matters of ritual to include some of the traditions of those Christians for whom Russia might seem the only hope of religious survival. These points are offered as a defence of

his position; they can offer no excuse for the implementation of his ideas.

Nikon's plan had two aspects—one was the building up of the office of Patriarch, the other was reform in the Church. It would be wrong to suppose that having once obtained power he then allowed it to go to his head, for his unwillingness to accept the patriarchate is witnessed both by his opponents and by himself. Avvakum, who was to become the centre of the resistance to Nikon's reforms, explained his reluctance thus: "He knew that he was going to be Patriarch, and feared lest some obstacle should arise, . . . but once he had been appointed he soon spewed forth all his poison."<sup>4</sup> Nikon himself explained at the time that he had been warned in a dream of the tribulations that were to follow his appointment, and this, owing nothing to the subsequent course of events, must surely be the most acceptable explanation.

Avvakum himself had been a fellow-reformer of Nikon; the two had come from the same background and even the same town, and Avvakum shared Nikon's asceticism though in a far greater degree. He was a fanatic in the same sense that the Old Testament Prophets were, with great power of prayer, a visionary and a healer, and firm to his beliefs under the most unimaginable persecutions. And he, too, was a beloved parish priest with enormous and widespread influence, especially in court circles in Moscow.

Avvakum and Nikon's first victim, Neronov, had been trying to implement reforms in preaching, with an emphasis on the value of confession and the removal of some of the abuses indicated earlier, but the first dose of Nikon's poison showed that he had come to see reform in a different light; in his first pastoral address in 1653 it was imitation of Greek practice rather than the removal of abuses that was seen to be the motive behind his reforms: "According to the tradition of the Holy Fathers it is not fitting to make genuflections—it is enough to bow from the waist; and the sign of the Cross must be made with three fingers."<sup>5</sup> During the next few years Nikon organized the revision of the Service Books, at the same time drawing up a *Skrizhal*, or List, of Greek authorities for the revisions, "Fort changées dans le passage du grec au slave," as the French scholar, Pascal, observes;<sup>6</sup> the traditional blessing of the waters after the Epiphany was abolished in order to bring Russian practice into line with contemporary Athonite usage: the Cross, to accord with the new regulations about the disposition of the fingers in making the sign of the Cross, was to be depicted as made from two and not three pieces of wood, while many traditional iconographic forms were forbidden and the ideals of the Stoglav Council, typified in the work of Rublev, were abandoned in favour of more modern forms. These and a number of other reforms embodied the ideals of Nikon, but to draw out their real significance it seems best to describe the reactions to them.



Neronov and Avvakum lost little time in making known their objections. The revision of the service-books, they claimed, had been entrusted to Arsenius, a Greek educated in Italy and assisted by Kievian and Little Russian monks who were anathema to the "Russophiles" among the clergy. The new ikons caused particular scandal; of ikons of Christ Avvakum observes, "They are monstrous German representations—all he needs is a sabre at his side." Of ikons of the Virgin Mary: "They make her all gross in the Annunciation like the impious Francs . . . whose inspiration is carnal."<sup>7</sup> In 1658 the monks of the Solovki monastery rebelled; "The faith of Russia has been murdered by the enemies of Christ." An illiterate parish priest, Silas Bogdanov, suffered exile for this outburst: "The Cathedral is in the hands of heretics and the Metropolitan is accused, he and his father the Patriarch . . . They have adopted . . . the Papal heresy. False prophets! Why have you forbidden us to sign ourselves as did Metropolitan Baarlam and our fathers? Why have you suppressed the Epiphany Benedictions? Why have you transformed the Orthodox Cross of Oblations into the Latin Cross, altered the books and found new rites from polluted sources? No! You are not pastors but ravening wolves."<sup>8</sup>

These objections were obviously aimed at the innovations themselves, but many more were aimed at the persons and methods of the reformers; this was the typical view, expressed by Avvakum, of those who were moving towards Schism: "To live it up and have a rubicund face, to deny oneself nothing—these are the characteristics of the Nikonians." And of his sometime friend, Hilarion, who had condoned the reforms, Avvakum complains: "Once he led the life of a true apostle, praying and fasting, and now he sits back sampling the Rhine wines.<sup>9</sup> How far these criticisms are reliable is, of course, open to question, but certainly all the Vicars of Bray were attracted to the Nikonian Party for it soon became clear that the Patriarch was not prepared to be lenient with dissenters—the choice came to be between acceptance of the new decrees and persecution.

The terrible nature of this persecution is made very clear in the pages of the *Autobiography* of Avvakum. Reading these one feels that he might certainly have taught Sir Giles Fletcher a thing or two about the true meaning of the Cross. It is impossible in this space to go in detail into all the sufferings of the Protopop as they are recorded in his *Autobiography* which, incidentally is regarded by many as the first modern literary work in Russian, written not in the rather stilted classical forms but in a readable colloquial style. He was hounded round Siberia for his noisy denunciations of the Patriarch; with his wife and children, he suffered incredible hardships at the hands of the marauding adventurers who were at that time opening up the east and who had traditionally been provided with dissenters, apparently to compensate for their hardships by acting as scapegoats for all failures. Characteristically Avvakum

shows much more sympathy with those who had had dealings with the pagan Shamans of Siberia than with his own clergy who had been in league with the Greeks and the Romans, and this attitude is best brought out by recounting a few incidents in his life.

Before leaving for his place of exile Avvakum had waved an accusatory finger at one of his persecutors who had seized the opportunity to bite off the finger; Avvakum's reaction on this occasion is not recorded but he would undoubtedly have rejoiced at this sign that the third finger was superfluous for the sign of the Cross and for blessing. There is a similar account of the punishment of one Lazarus who had held out against Nikon; he had his hand cut off and Avvakum describes how when the severed hand fell to the ground it lay there with its fingers in the old position for the blessing—"The lifeless condemning the living," as he observes. And if from this it seems that the charge of cruelty must lie solely with the Nikonians, then there is an account of the methods of Avvakum himself: a prostitute came to him to confess, and as a penance he kept her in an underground cell in the depth of winter. But when her howlings began to disturb his meditations he released her and having compelled her to make continuous abeiances to the ikons for three hours he then had a sexton whip her while the long-suffering Avvakum wept for her soul. After all this the Protopop complains: "And yet, when I let her go, this vessel of Satan sinned more than ever."<sup>10</sup> Avvakum himself spent most of the years between 1658 and 1664 in transit between Siberia or his other prisons and Moscow, recalled or banished according to the standing of Nikon with the Tsar. In Moscow he had the ear of many of the Boyars, the nobility, who were jealous of the Nikonian ascendancy and of the influence which the Patriarch at first had with the Tsar; but reticence was not his strong point and Avvakum found himself on each occasion returning to exile.

There is really another story running alongside the present one—that of the relationship of the Tsar and the Patriarch which ended in the suppression by Peter the Great of the Patriarchate in the early years of the next century. William Palmer wrote six volumes on the subject, so it is clear that it deserves much more attention than it can be given here.<sup>11</sup> Nikon's fears and ambitions have been hinted at earlier; there seems to be a curious parallel between his position and that of Becket in England—at first, reluctance to accept the ecclesiastical supremacy and then an apparently incontrovertible constraint to uphold the dignity of the office of Patriarch. Before his consecration he enjoyed great favour with the Tsar who referred to him as "That great shining sun, the most holy Nikon." At his enthronement Nikon extracted an oath from the Tsar and the Boyars, along the lines of the oath at the enthronement of the Byzantine Patriarch, "To keep the commandments of Christ's holy Gospels and the canons of the holy Apostles and the holy Fathers



and the laws of the religious (Byzantine) emperors unchangeably and to obey us as your chief pastor and supreme father in all things which I shall announce to you out of the divine commandments and laws."<sup>12</sup> What this undertaking involved for Nikon may perhaps be judged from the remark of Olearius who visited Russia two years later in 1654; he says, "The Patriarch's authority is so great that he in a way divides the sovereignty with the Grand Duke; . . . in things relating to the political government he reforms those things which he considers to be prejudicial to Christian simplicity and good manners without giving the Grand Duke any account of it."<sup>13</sup> A few years later, when Alexei had to leave Russia to attend to the war with Sweden Nikon was left in charge of the government; by this time he had been given the title of *Velikii Gosudar* which only the Patriarch Philaret before him had shared with the Tsar in the rather unusual circumstances mentioned above and which Nikon had always been careful to disclaim when it was used without the qualifying adjective, *Duchovni*, or Spiritual Grand Duke. But despite his having disclaimed the title he remained a thorn in the flesh of the nobles; one of the Boyars, Streshnev, a relative of the Tsar, had taught his pet dog to which he had given the name The Patriarch Nikon to sit on its hind legs and extend one paw in a gesture of blessing. This man accused Nikon, who had laid a solemn curse on him for this misplaced humour, of having taken the very title of Grand Duke which he had so assiduously qualified by adding the adjective, Spiritual.

Nikon's unpopularity with the Boyars could not but affect his standing with the Tsar who was rebuked for his self-abasement before the Patriarch for whom his admiration and friendship was strong enough to endure until Nikon's death despite the embarrassment of the other's denunciations. What it was that finally decided the Tsar to take action is not clear, but Nikon was not among those invited to several important functions in the summer of 1658 and the Tsar was not present at the Liturgy in the Patriarch's Cathedral for the important feast of Our Lady of Kazan. In reply to Nikon's protests a Boyar returned with this message: "You sign yourself *Veliki Gosudar* and we have but one Grand Duke, the Tsar. The Tsar's highness bids us say you are not to sign yourself so in future."<sup>14</sup> Nikon's reaction to the Tsar's displeasure at this point is significant for the understanding of his motives in pursuing the course he had done; had he merely been ambitious for the office which he held he would surely remained firm at this point for he, like Avvakum, was no compromiser. In fact he wrote to Paisius Ligorides, an eastern ecclesiastic of dubious orthodoxy who was in Russia at that time, saying, "The Tsar sent to us his own dissent with false and abusive words. And when we heard his accusations and groundless ravings, we decided to give way to his wrath." To the Tsar he wrote: "I depart because of your wrath; for the Scripture says, Give way to wrath."<sup>15</sup> And so, shaking the dust off his feet as

a witness against his accusers, which the soldiers hastened to sweep up, he retired to the monastery of the Resurrection.

In his account of Nikon's departure Palmer quotes him as saying: "From this day on I am no longer your Patriarch."<sup>16</sup> This remark has been the cause of much controversy; Nikon himself later denied that he had abdicated but the fact remains that he stayed in voluntary exile until his trial. Several attempts were made to bring him to trial, but his supporters defended him behind a barricade of canon law. Paisius Ligorides, the gentleman of the elastic convictions, was by now driving the anti-Nikon bandwagon and he drafted twenty five questions to the eastern Patriarchs about a hypothetical problem which at every point resembled the present one. The replies he received urged the Russians to obey the Tsar, to disregard the barricade of canon law and to allow the Bishops to judge Nikon, but Ligorides must have suffered considerable embarrassment when the genuine replies arrived several weeks later. These were conciliatory, begging the Tsar not to introduce schism into the Russian Church, "That ark of Noah", but to try to reconcile the two factions, and above all to beware Ligorides! Nikon from his place of banishment had been liberally dispensing anathemas—"I know I am a great sinner," complains the Tsar, "but what have my wife and children done to be cursed?" Nikon occasionally marched in triumph to the Uspenskii Cathedral—which confirms the view that he had not meant his abdication to be final—and he generally made so much trouble that the Tsar eventually was forced to call a council in 1666 at which all the eastern Patriarchs were represented, and at this council Nikon's deposition received oecumenical authority.

At the same time Avvakum was finally confined to prison, and from this date the anti-Nikonian party became schismatics officially—the Raskolniki, the Old Believers, or the Old Ritualists. By calling this council, of which the outcome was so paradoxical, condemning the Person of Nikon while upholding his reforms, the Tsar had—however unwillingly—taken the first step towards the subjugation of the Patriarchate which Tsar Peter I made final in 1723 by replacing it with the Holy Governing Synod. The Church was split internally and the divorce of civil and ecclesiastical power had become a reality. So there is little wonder that the Raskolniki, who were always given to apocalyptic speculations, should have settled on this as the year of the appearance of Antichrist; by way of confirmation they took the millenium and added to it the sign of the beast, which in the Apocalypse of St. John, is 666, and arrived at the year 1666.<sup>17</sup>

In the early stages of the controversy the Schismatics had believed that the Tsar was being misled by Nikon whom they honoured accordingly with the title of Antichrist; they continually encouraged the Tsar, whose support they did not doubt, to open his eyes to Nikon's deception, but there came a time when they realised that the Tsar was not going to reinstate them. Avvakum writes bitterly



from his prison: "Who gave the Tsar the right to govern the Church and by what authority does he presume to alter her dogmas?"<sup>18</sup> Gradually, with Nikon out of the way, the Raskolniki came to see the figure of Antichrist in the Tsar and it is from this trend that those groups among the schismatics originate who practise civil disobedience.

Nikon died in his monastery; Avvakum in his exile was tireless and a huge literary output dates from this period of his life, much of it directed at Tsar Alexei, who continually pleaded for reconciliation with him and with Nikon. But Tsar Feodor, who had succeeded Tsar Alexei in 1676 had none of the love for Avvakum that Alexei had, and after a particularly violent outburst Avvakum was burnt at the stake in 1682. Avvakum's Old Testament namesake, Habbakuk, provides what might well have been the last word of the Protopop himself on the Patriarch: "Woe to him who gets evil gain for his house that he may set his nest on high . . . You have brought shame upon your house by cutting off many people . . . Woe to him that builds a house with blood."<sup>19</sup> For his own part Avvakum's unflinching faith under the most extreme suffering can hardly atone for the blow which his human obstinacy struck at the Russian Church.

It is, however, very easy to criticise from the enlightened standpoint of a later day and a different environment those who were involved in the disputes for their inability to distinguish essentials from non-essentials, but the chief protagonists on either sides were not devoid of spiritual gifts—far from it, in fact. If it is necessary to apportion the blame, this much might tentatively be said of the Raskolniki, that they held the responsibility for millions of uneducated Russians, and these they cut off from the Church by their own personal convictions over matters which did not greatly affect the salvation of the individual members of the Church. Of Nikon it might be said that it was his high-handed persecution in trying to impose reforms too hastily conceived upon an extremely conservative people which turned a mere disagreement into open schism and lent such strength to such unreasonable obstinacy over non-essentials, and which—it must be admitted—encouraged the exaggeration of those non-essentials. The respective futures of the official Church and the Schismatic Church are another story; both were weakened by the Schism, but neither was without a strong spiritual tradition or practical evidence of its spirituality. It is too often assumed that the official Church became too secularised after these events and those of the following century, but this is certainly not true when the best that it could produce is the yardstick for making such a judgement. But this much is true—that ultimately the official Church was incapable of providing what was needed during the period of secularisation and industrialisation in the nineteenth century, and it is still paying the price for that failure. For this, much of the blame

must lie with people whom we have been studying, who weakened the Church by splitting it internally and by rendering it an easy prey to the designs of Peter the Great.

The note that should be struck here, then, is one of warning; not only a warning of what was to come in Russia but more than that, a universal warning for Christians, especially now when there is so much movement towards a reinterpretation of Christianity for the secularised civilisation of this century—that concentration on the means whereby people are to worship should not obscure the end of that worship.

J. P. Stubbs

- 1) see N. Zernov: *The Russians and their church*, London, 1945, 151.
- 2) Jacques Margaret: *Etat de l'Empire de Russie*, Paris, 1607; cited by S. Howe: *The Christian East*, VII, 132.
- 3) G. Fletcher: *Of the Rasc Commonwealthe*, ed. A. J. Schmidt. Ithaca, 1966, 138–39.
- 4) Avvakum: *Life*, trsl. J. Harrison and H. Mirrlees. London, 1924, 52–53.
- 5) *Ibid.*, 53.
- 6) On the Skrizhal see R. Pascal: *Avvakum et le debut du raskol*. Paris, 1938, 286–88.
- 7) *Ibid.*
- 8) *Ibid.*, 289.
- 9) *Ibid.*, 352.
- 10) *Ibid.*, 238, and refs there.
- 11) W. Palmer: *The Patriarch and the Tsar*, 6 vols. London, 1871–76.
- 12) Zernov: *op. cit.*, 97.
- 13) A. Olearius: *Travels . . .*, ed. S. H. Baron. Stanford, Cal., 1967, 265.
- 14) Pascal: *op. cit.*, 298.
- 15) Palmer: *op. cit.*, III, 53.
- 16) *Ibid.*, III, 41; see also Pascal: *op. cit.*, 298.
- 17) *Rev.*, 13, 18.
- 18) Pascal: *op. cit.*, 510–11 and refs there.
- 19) *Habbakuk*, 3, 9–11.

#### THE CHURCH OF THE OLD BELIEVERS

The Church of the Old Believers is called by the Russian Orthodox the *Raskolniki* or Schismatics, and by the Old Believers themselves the *Starovery* or Old Ritualists. The Church came into being in the seventeenth century at about the same time when Christians in England like Christians in Russia were arguing over minor points of ceremonial and ritual. The schism of the Old Believers was a schism concerning questions of ceremonial and ritual observance, but whereas the Puritans in England were the innovators who objected to the old ceremonies which Anglicans had retained from the pre-Reformation *Ecclesia Anglicana*, in Russia it was the Established Church which was the innovator and the schismatics who preserved the older rites and ceremonies of Holy Russia.

The schism was due to two factors: to the Westernizing tendencies of the Russian intelligentsia, which came to fruition with Tsar Peter the Great's "Window to the West". The West represented all that was novel and therefore heretical or anti-Russian and which had to be resisted at all costs by devout Slavophiles. But the immediate cause of the schism was the reforms inaugurated by the Patriarch



Nikon in the 1660's. Nikon decided that the liturgical books of the Russian Orthodox Church had several inaccuracies in translation from the original Greek. The minor errors were corrected, but at the same time certain alterations in the rubrics and ceremonial were made in order to bring the liturgy into closer conformity with the Mother Church of Constantinople. The reforms included such apparent trivialities as the number of syllables in the name of Jesus. Should there be two or three syllables? was a vital question. But English Christians cannot scoff for in England similar arguments had been raging over whether or not one should bow at the name of Jesus. Other questions concerned the number of *Alleluias* which should be sung; the number of fingers to be used in making the sign of the Cross; whether processions should go around the church in the same way as the sun or in the opposite direction. When the Reformers began to process in a different direction the Old Ritualists complained that this would undo all the processions which had ever been made. The Old Believers put up a tremendous resistance to the Tsar and the Patriarch and gained thousands of supporters among the peasants in the outpost of the Empire, Siberia. The famous, coarse, but holy Archpriest Avvakum was martyred for the Old Ritualists' cause and in his writings he has left a very vivid account of the struggle for liturgical and cultural conservatism in seventeenth century Russia.<sup>1</sup>

The famous monastery of Solovky in the ice fields of North Eastern Russia resisted the siege of the Established Church for over ten years. For many, many years the Starovery managed to survive without Bishops, which as ultra-traditionalists they were bound to have in order to continue the Apostolic Succession if they were to remain an Orthodox Church. Eventually in 1846 the deposed Orthodox Metropolitan of Bosnia was found in Byelo-Krinitza in Bukovina, from whom the Old Believers were able to renew the Apostolic Succession. In the two hundred years between the schism from the Established Church and the recovery of the Succession some congregations had managed to exist as a Church with the help of priests from the Orthodox Church who joined them, others performed the rather curious ceremony of standing with their mouths open every Maundy Thursday waiting for the Blessed Sacrament to come down from heaven!

The major part of the Old Believers who now have the Apostolic Succession are known as the Church of the Byelo-Krinitza Concord. The Old Believer Archbishop of Moscow has his throne in the Rogozsky Monastic Church in the suburbs of Moscow, from where he presides over his three and a half million followers. The Archbishopal Church contains some superb Rublev icons and manuscripts. The music manuscripts are still without bar lines as these were a post-Nikon innovation and therefore anathema. Here the visitor can hear the "correct" number of *Alleluias* sung during the Liturgy,

the Holy Name of Jesus pronounced in the "correct" way using the "correct" number of syllables; and accompanied by the signings of the Cross made with the "correct" number of fingers.

Schisms from the main body of the Old Believers are numerous. The *Bezpopovtsy* or Priest-less believers are the largest group after the Episcopal Old Believers, and rather undiplomatically they have a chapel in the grounds of the Rogozsky Monastery immediately behind the Old Believers' Cathedral. They have managed to survive without priests from the middle of the seventeenth century, although in theory they still believe in the desirability of the hierarchy. Another sect which has become familiar outside of Russia is the sect which settled in Canada and is known as the *Doukhobors*. They are a great embarrassment to the Canadian Government as they are anarchists who try to get their own way by wandering around stark naked at the least attempt to make them conform to any rules, such as sending their children to school.

The sects which survive in the depths of Siberia and the remote forests of the Soviet Union include the Holy Jumpers or the *Priguny* who expend a considerable amount of physical energy in trying to jump higher than each other; the *Stanniky* or *Wanderers* and the *Khlysty* or *Flagellants* and other fanatical sects. It is unlikely that the extreme factions have survived today.

The Soviet Government has liquidated most of the smaller sects, but there must be many still operating underground. The main body of the Old Believers is still a force to be reckoned with in Russia and Old Believers have survived the persecution of the Tsars and of the Communists. They remain, like the Quakers in England, respected members of the business community as they have always had a reputation as honest merchants and business men. Today they number probably 3,500,000 although some would put their numbers at less than one million. There are said to be 50,000 Old Believers of the Byelo-Krinitza Concord in Moscow. They have about a dozen Bishops. Their late Archbishop, Flavian, was a well-known figure at the State sponsored Peace Conferences in the Soviet Union.

The importance of the Old Believers today lies in the fact that they have preserved a form of religious life and Orthodox tradition which is pre-Nikon, i.e. before 1666. Moussorgskii based his opera *Khovanchina* on the struggle of the Old Believers with the Orthodox. To enter an Old Believer's Church and to attend their liturgy is like going back into the Russia which existed before Peter the Great, even the vestments remain unchanged and the beards and the hair untrimmed.

The downfall of the Imperial House of Romanov and the subsequent spread of Communism throughout the world could be traced back to a member of the Old Believers' Church, Rasputin. Many Old Believers believed he was the reincarnation of the Staretz Laron Dokoukin, the man who had withstood the Wester-



nizing movement of Peter the Great and who had prophesied the end of the Romanov dynasty should there ever be another Tsarevitch with the name Alexis.

The few Old Believers who have found their way to England tend to worship at the Patriarchal Cathedral in Ennismore Gardens, Knightsbridge, rather than with the Russians of the Karlovitzii Synod, who are associated in the minds of the Old Believers with the Royalist Movement in exile, which aims at the restoration of the monarchy in Russia, to the Old Believers the monarchy represented excessive legislation and the persecution of their Church.

The Byelorussian Catholic Chapel, Marian House, in North Finchley, which is a centre of the Uniate Byelorussian in England, celebrates the Liturgy in a manner nearer to the Liturgy of the Old Believers than is the Liturgy in either of the Russian Orthodox Cathedrals in London.

A few Old Believers have become Uniates and whilst retaining their ancient rites and ceremonies have placed themselves under the Pope; others have made their peace with the Moscow Patriarch and again are allowed to continue their old ritual.<sup>2</sup>

John Salter

1) G. P. Fedotov (ed): *A treasury of Russian spirituality*. London, 1950, 134-181.

2) MAIN WORKS OF REFERENCE.

F. Pascal: *Avvakum et le début du rascol*, Paris 1938.

W. Palmer: *The Patriarch and the Tsar*, 6 vols. London 1871-76.

N. Zernov: *Eastern Christendom*, London, 1961.

G. Woodcock: *The Doukhobors*, London, 1970.

#### THE ENEMY WITHIN

A reply to the letter of Alexander Solzhenitsyn to the Council of the Russian Church Outside Russia.

Dear Alexander Isaievitch,

A very old and very great Russian lady now living in Rome said once that if ever she met you she would first touch the ground—as we do in sign of respect and reverence—and then embrace you with all her warmth. But first she would touch the ground. I remembered her remark because I had thought the same thing myself. And now, unable to perform what we both had thought and I alone will say, it is with exactly those feelings that I ask you to share some reflections on your moving, your deeply appreciated letter to the Council of the Russian Church Outside Russia, which contains so much for us all to ponder upon.

Surely it is a common-place of Russian history that much of the best in the Church of Nikon was brutally and pointlessly forced into separation to form subsequently the various sects known collectively

as the Old Believers. Not only that, but when the balance is finally struck, how much in Orthodoxy itself will not be found, humanly speaking at least, to have been preserved through the purity and faithfulness of the Old Believers? They formed a four-square block, impermeable to the obtuse and cruel reforms of Peter and Catherine, designed to beat the ploughshare of the ancient Church into a bright new sword of modern state-craft, sharpened on the flint of scientific humanism and polished with the grease of sentimental piety, according to the models of the protestant *aggiornamento* of the 18th Century. In the close darkness of Enlightenment they made of themselves a unique torch of witness to the truth and continuity of Holy Russia, a torch often enough formed literally by their own massed bodies. Later on it was explicitly they who all but saved both the principles and the practice of the Icon, when the official Church was inundated by the post-Renaissance art of the flesh (examples of which still confuse and weaken our churches), and the ascetic principles, at least, of church music when (as today, in many of our large churches) the ancient forms were exchanged for the productions of fashionable composers, as spiritually equivocal as they were culturally restless and luxurious. And in the future who can say what greater debt may yet be owing to them, as the same enemy musters again and again the same old forces, altering only the cut of the disguise, especially if the grievous obstacles that still divide us can be truly and *effectively* suppressed at last.

And yet, as Metropolitan Philaret suggests in his reply to your letter, however they began, the Old Believers certainly *ended* as real sectarians, clinging to points of difference, defining unilateral theses, like the doctors of the divisions of western and eastern Christianity. As such they did not enter into the astonishing gardens of manifest sanctity that flourished behind the smartly refurbished facades of the state Church throughout the two centuries past, and therein lies the mystery of the Old Believers and their relations with the Church, a mystery as subtle and elusive as the logic of Christianity itself, and one that has never been noticed, at least by western observers, so far as I know. On the one hand there is the progressive historian who wonders conventionally what all the fuss was about; why all the trouble and pain over a few insignificant details of form? On the other, the integral conservatives, as faithfully reflecting the univocal western mind, proclaim them quite simply as Martyrs of Tradition. The first, of course, shows no understanding of the structure of religious truth, which is by nature *objectively symbolic*: outward forms not only reflect but participate in spiritual realities. This connection has always been a primary characteristic of the Orthodox mind, which delights, for instance, in demonstrating the consequences of doctrinal differences in the farthest aspects of outward behaviour. The converse, therefore, must also be true, and any change in outward form will conceal or oblige a corresponding



change in belief or spiritual attitude. Such is the explanation for the intransigence shown on both sides of the dispute between the Old Believers and their opponents. On the other hand, it is not true that form is simply identical with the inner essence, the image with its prototype. There are even cases, as St. Paul reminds us, in which the letter and the spirit stand in fatal opposition. Perfect formal observance has never constituted an independent "way" in Christianity; compressed, comprehensive faith that it is, the strands of knowledge, love, and formal observance, which hang separate in other religions, are here tied up in a single knot. But in the case of any falling apart, one holds tight with both hands to the first two and lets the third go free. The knot, however, is lost, and without all the strands it cannot be tied again. Something like this describes the situation at the second stage in the paradoxical relations between the Old Believers and the Church, with the Old Believers formally perfect but inwardly dry and doctrinally fragmented, while the Spirit moved with the official Church in spite of its outward disfigurements.

Who can say what might have happened if the initial sin had not been committed by the Nikonian Church and the Old Believers were still with us? Certainly the habits of comfortable compromise would have been, to say the least, harshly contradicted. It is legitimate to believe that we might have been spared the contamination of secular arts (abominated equally by Avvakum and Nikon) and careless rites, not to mention to open contempt for sacred forms demonstrated by prelates of the type of Feofan Prokopovich. Would their added weight and vigour have caused the Church effectively to reject the insinuations of theosophy and the secret societies among the higher clergy and laity in the 19th Century, or the romantic confusions of the intellectuals still faithful to the Church in the same period? Would their influence have counteracted the official programmes of the Church schools and academies, where "philosophy" meant Leibnitz and Wolf, "ethics" blossomed from Budde, Schleiermacher, and Rothe, and Hegelianism in every form was propagated by manuals and teachers, making of the seminaries themselves inevitable nurseries of revolution once the Marxian revision of Hegelian dialectic was buzzing in everyone's ears? (Let us not forget that no traditional programme was ever approved by the Church Schools Commission, although such were recommended by the best religious minds of the age, culminating in our own time with the unique Florenskii, who recommended a true traditional programme based solidly on the training of the symbolic intelligence, on the patterns of mysticism and thaumaturgy and the authentic forms of sacred government, on the perennial principles of traditional metaphysics as universally valid in themselves and the only possible means of refuting the myriad deviations of secular thought, whether materialist, rationalist, or sentimental). If so, it is indeed conceivable

that the catastrophe itself might have been averted; it certainly would have taken another course, rising, as you write, above the warring sides, an integral and independent spiritual whole. For it is clear, if nothing else is clear, that the Church and the tradition that devolved into the *Raskol* formed the parts of a single predestined unity, a unity that had been preserved through the centuries of traditional Russia, whose division gave the first and calamitous sign of the impact of western laicism on the old sacred life. If the Old Believers preserved the sacred forms, and with them the antique integrity and rigour, they fell into exaggeration and eccentricity, they lost an inner unction and the bond of truth. If the Church, in spite of all, could hold the Spirit, its outward servitude and compromise, as well as much of its public practice and instruction, in a word its carelessness and misunderstanding of FORM without doubt led directly to the crisis. If the sin of initial uncharity was a hidden cause of the Revolution, as you say, then the direct consequences of that sin were the open cause, at least so far as the Church was concerned. For the Church, needless to say, was not the *only* cause. All were responsible; everybody pushed it on (just as everyone today in the West, with few exceptions, is making his "unique and personal contribution" to the next like catastrophe). However, it is the Church's duty to take upon himself the full burden of responsibility, for the Church is not a department of society, as it became, officially at least, under the Empire; the Church is not even merely the centre of society; the Church as the Body of God is responsible, short of martyrdom, for nothing less than the whole of life.

Your heart was no doubt gladdened by the news that the Council to which your letter was addressed concluded by removing all of the existing strictures against the Old Believers, their books and customs. The gesture was the more meaningful as the Russian Church Abroad has become, in effect, the spokesman and guardian of traditional Orthodoxy in the West. What you may not know, and what is even more important, is that the same Church is the only official Orthodox body in open communion with the modern equivalents of the Old Believers, I mean the admirable Greek Old Calendarists, who have suffered half a century of proscription and persecution only for wishing to preserve intact the Church's traditional liturgical structure, including the indispensable astronomical-symbolic frame of the Julian Calendar. (Ancient, simple, sacred calendar of Christianity, prescribed by the Fathers, sanctified by the prayers of the people and the sign of the Saints! During the Council on the eve of the Revolution its maintenance was recommended as a cultural mission of Russia to the West, until all the Christian churches should return to the old form. Now, instead, it is rejected by half of Orthodoxy itself in favour of the liturgically destructive, mathematically pretentious secular calendar in current use). Saving these pure,



redoubtable elements from the accusation of schism, the Russian Church Abroad is performing an inestimable service to the whole of Orthodoxy. Indeed, can there be any truer, any more effective reparation for the sin of the past?

The responsibilities of the Russian Church Abroad to the Greek Old Calendarists is but one aspect of the relations of that Church with the surrounding non-Russian world. Within its jurisdiction there are now found not only whole parishes of Greeks, Rumanians and Syrians and a flourishing monastery of Greeks, but individuals, often in conspicuous numbers, deriving from a variety of national Churches, not to mention the increasingly large body of western converts, most of whom, while owing their church life entirely to the Slavonic liturgy and tradition, do not even speak Russian. Many parishioners, moreover, of Russian background belong to the second or third generation of expatriates, and it is highly unlikely that either they or their children will ever take up life in Russia regardless of the political future of their parent's homeland. It is apparent then that the Russian "jurisdictions" cannot be judged from the Russian viewpoint alone, from the viewpoint, that is, of communities existing exclusively to preserve the Church among exiles while preparing for return to the motherland. Neither you nor the Metropolitan mention the problems of the diaspora as such—of course they were not the agreed subject of your letters—yet without at least a passing reference to them no assessment is possible.

Metropolitan Philaret was certainly right to deny your assertion that fraternization and even Holy Communion to the dying had been forbidden among members of different Russian jurisdictions (indeed, who of us has ever heard of such a thing?); is it not deplorable, however, that non-Russian Orthodox within the same jurisdiction are refused church membership in certain parishes, or even denied the possibility of burial in the common church grave? Contempt and disregard causing bitter feeling and the grievous waste of talent and good-will are, alas, complaints too frequently heard among the non-Russian faithful of our churches. Such sins of uncharity, unrepented and often unrecognized, coupled generally with total indifference to the spread of the light of Orthodoxy in the gathering darkness of the outside world, are sufficient of themselves to explain the drastic depletion in numbers, the thefts and other disasters with which various parishes are afflicted. On the other hand, all of the jurisdictions actively promote performances of the liturgy in modern western vernaculars (sometimes several of these mixed together!), generally to the accompaniment of old Slav church music, forgetting that the Slavonic language and music constitute an incomparable and indissoluble whole; without the language the music is structurally nonsense, the very possibility of such *pastiches* being a reflection of the merely impressionistic habits that culminate in mass-media. These depressed rites are sometimes imposed on

western Orthodox as a kind of iron duty, irrespective of their deepest needs, exactly as in the present-day Roman Catholic Church. Their apology, disregarding the many translations now available for study where required, is the need for comprehension, yet their actual effect is to obstruct spiritual meanings and lock the mind at the level of rational concepts. Speaking as one myself, I can think of no healthier exercise for converts, given the tyranny of reason in the West, than standing for two hours at a liturgy without understanding a word. When every word is grasped, what after all has been understood of a liturgy whose objective purpose is the direct communication of the sacred, whose subjective purpose the concentration of attention at a level *above* the conceptual? Properly speaking, modern languages are of no more use to the Church than icons by Rubens or Picasso. As the recovery of the Sacred Icon was the task of the last two church generations, so let the preservation and recovery of the Sacred Language be ours!

Hovering at the heart of the forest of difficulties in which the "jurisdictions" find themselves, both in their relations to one another and to the outside world, is another problem, however, compared to which all the others take a second place, indeed are hardly worth considering except insofar as they reflect or contradict it. I refer to the vast, the ever more subtle menace of Modernism in the contemporary world of the mind and the spirit. On account of its presence alone I fear that your noble vision of a strong, united, independent Russian Church, bought with the tears of the deprived and the blood of the martyrs of half a century, is doomed to bitter disappointment—and I should dare to say that as soon as the Russian Church is finally restored it will fall apart into the divisions of modernists and traditionalists—like all the Christian Churches and sects, like all religions and spiritual philosophies, for that matter, in the world today, for there is not one that is not infected or imperilled by the prevailing ENEMY WITHIN. Rooted in the Renaissance, cautiously pruned in the Enlightenment, rendered slippery and indefinable by Romanticism, the tangled over-spreading growth is now hung with the bright plastic labels of populism, sentimentalism, and progress, of historicism, iconoclasm, and ceaseless experiment. In Russia it first stood out clear to view in the form of the "Living Church" which, protected and encouraged by the Bolsheviks as the obvious means of destroying Orthodoxy, signified at the same time the first public alliance between the Enemy Within and the Enemy Without. The Living Church was identified and expelled as compound heresy by Patriarch Tikhon in circumstances of almost incredible endurance; it has returned, this time welcomed by many, unopposed by most, to flourish among the Christians of the West in a hundred new-seeming forms.

In little more than a decade, although the beginnings can be traced back much further, the entire mystical and liturgical edifice of the



Latin Church has been skilfully dismantled. Interior prayer and the sense of divine mystery are obviously discouraged, altars have been broken down or substituted, sacred instruments discarded and sold. Replaced by what is officially known as "service", or the attendance to the social welfare of others, asceticism is, to all effects, no more. The lofty unbroken tradition of the Roman Liturgy has been rejected in favour of a choice of novelties, all having in common an embarrassingly childish conceptual structure, flat insipid sentiments, awkward gestures, and a speech redolent of nothing more than solemn journalism. The relation of the traditional liturgy to this is that of an old red wine to a glass of coca-cola (Fr. Florenskii once compared the Orthodox liturgy to Protestant services as an old red wine to tepid sugared water); the effect of the combined innovations is of course to render the Church totally ineffective as a clear, hard, spiritual reality.

Let us make no mistake. The same thing can happen and most certainly *will* happen to the Orthodox Church unless the common enemy is thoroughly understood and squarely faced on the ground of principle—and principle alone—, his sources and his allies pitilessly revealed, his every move traced out beforehand. After all, have not some of his most obvious tricks, as old as the Renaissance and the Reformation, already been played upon us with resounding success? Reductions of the liturgy into modern tongues, as already mentioned, with their exclusively ratiocinative and associative connotations, are now uncritically employed by all our Churches. The "new Calendar", introduced by the same Patriarch of Constantinople who publicly championed the Russian Living Church is now accepted by practically all Orthodox Churches except the Slavonic, and soon, sponsored again by Constantinople, the plan is to settle a "common fixed date for Easter", in "common", that is, with the West, and "fixed" in spite of the grave, reiterated anathemas of the Fathers beginning with those of Nicaea. We shall then be presented with the spectacle, unique I suppose in the history of religion, of half the Church observing the calendar of their Fathers, and the other a completely different calendar including the solemn Easter observance, in community not with their brothers but with the secular world and members of other confessions! Practically all Greek churches outside Greece now use significantly curtailed versions of the Sacred Liturgy, and more progressive clerics have already introduced complete substitutes. Instead of thanking God that the Eastern Churches today are the sole surviving witnesses of traditional Christianity, many leaders lament that they still linger behind in the race for mediocre novelty; honoured divines speak openly of "demystification", of "adaptation of the Church to the present-day world", of levelling the mystical and material divisions between priests and people, and, copying their Protestant and Catholic colleagues in the total disregard of Sacred Tradition as the creation

of the Holy Spirit in the Church, justify every innovation in advance by an appeal to historical relativity or the return to the "purity and simplicity of the Early Church". (To be sure, it is no more possible or even desirable to return to the "Early Church" than it is to your "Church of pre-revolutionary Russia". On the other hand, as the work of the Spirit moving with unbroken continuity from the past into the future, Holy Tradition precisely *is* both past glory and future hope conveyed in terms of *concrete present reality*).

Are we, servants and lovers of the Church, to witness the liturgy turn by turn twisted and debased out of recognition, the ascetic obligation submerged in wordly ease and convenience, the iconostases destroyed and vessels and vestments suppressed, and that not by "commissars of religion" or CHEKA guards, but by the fashionable theologians and hierarchs of the "free world"—the sacred books, as a distinguished Catholic writer says, cast out by their own custodians? The microphones and loud-speakers smartly installed in hundreds of Orthodox churches, distorting and displacing the calculated vibrations of the church music and the very natural voices of the liturgical ministers themselves—irreplaceable pure basis of every auditive church symbol—are these not lies to the soul at least as great as those of "writer's unions" and propaganda bureaux? And you, Alexander Isaievitch, may it not be that the Lord has predestined you to face and to fight *both* of the dread besetting enemies, both the ENEMY WITHIN as well as the ENEMY WITHOUT? With your sagacity, your intellectual purity, and your rock-like resistance you have braved and will surely follow to the defeat the whole arrayed might of the material Destroyer. Is it not possible that you have been called from your homeland to accuse our foolishness and conceit, our confusion, vulgarity, and deceit as well? Fire-breathing dragon in the East, seductive serpent in the West, no doubt they both come forth from the same historical pit, and are both determined to an identical end—kill but one and the other fright remains.

Be it as it may, let me with a full heart remind you in conclusion of all those *here* as well as there who need your pen and your power, who pray always that you may be protected from both harms. Who do not know you and never will in this life, but, for what you are and what you will be still, love you more than a brother and hold you closer than any friend.

John Lindsay Opie

(Dr. Opie's article represents a strong reaction from "fashionable" attitudes, secular and sacred. If any of our readers feel they should defend these, or advocate moderate policies, they are invited to send their counter-arguments, which will be published as space permits. *Editor*).



# EASTERN SAINTS AND KINGS IN THE ANCESTRY OF HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II

The ancestry of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II contains many Western saints. She is descended from St. Margaret of Scotland, the heiress of the Saxon line, and, if we count the Calendar of the 1928 Prayer Book as authorization for sanctity, from King Alfred the Great. St. Edward the Confessor's sister St. Goda; St. Louis of France; St. Ferdinand of Castile and Leon; St. Leopold; St. Olave of Norway; St. Cadwaller of Wales and St. Arnulf among others are all ancestors of Her Majesty in the direct line. Interesting collateral ancestors are Clothaire I of France, who was the husband of St. Radegonde (died 587) who transported a relic of the True Cross to Poitiers which was celebrated by the composition of the hymn "*Vexilla Regis Prodeunt*" sung for the first time on the 19th November 569.

St. Thomas of Hereford, who died in 1180, had a sister Julia de Cantilupe who is an ancestress of the Queen. So also are More, the sister of St. Lawrence O'Toole, a Dublin saint, who died in the same year as St. Thomas of Hereford; Eanfrith of Bernicia, brother of St. Oswald (d. 642); Humbert I, Count of Maurienne, great uncle of St. Anselm (d. 1109); Theodosia of Cartagena, sister of St. Theodore of Seville (d. 636); Pedro Ruiz de Guzman, uncle of St. Dominio (d. 1221); Adenolfo, brother of St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274); King Bela IV, Brother of St. Elizabeth of Hungary (d. 1231); King Geza, father of St. Stephen of Hungary (d. 1038); Seadha of Tyrconnel, uncle of St. Columb of Scotland (d. 598); Uffa of Cardigan, uncle of St. David of Wales, all these are sainted aunts or uncles of our Sovereign. From Ireland to Hungary spans the whole of Western Christendom so we can now turn to those Eastern saints without whom the Queen would not be here.

If one traces the ancestry of the English kings back as far as Hugh, Count of Vermandois, one discovers that his father was Henry I of France, the husband of what in modern parlance would be the Princess Anna, daughter of Jaroslav the Wise, Grand Prince of Kiev (reigned 1019-1054), the son of St. Vladimir of Russia. St. Vladimir was the grandson of St. Olga. St. Olga was the widow of Prince Igor who had been killed in battle by the Drevilians in 945 A.D. or 6453 by the Old Russian Calendar. The victors sent, somewhat undiplomatically, emissaries to persuade Olga to marry their own ruler, but she avenged her husband's death by burying alive the first envoys, boat and all. The second group of ambassadors were talked into having the Russian version of a sauna bath. Having safely locked them all in the bathhouse St. Olga roasted them alive!

Via the Princess Anna, the line cannot be traced back to the Byzantine Emperors; it is thought by most historians that the Royal

House of England was descended not from the sister of Basil II and Constantine VIII, but from one of St. Vladimir's other wives—Rogner of Polovtsk, who is looked upon by Byelorussians as their great female national hero, much as the French look upon St. Joan of Arc.

If we travel to the southern extremity of Russia to Georgia (or Iberia) and Armenia we discover that the Royal Houses of those two Christian countries are amongst the oldest in the world.

Armenia, according to the traditions of the Gregorian Armenian Church, was missionized by St. Bartholomew the Apostle, but the history of the present Armenian Church begins, as the name of the Church implies, with St. Gregory the Illuminator, whose mummified arm known as the Holy Atsch is still regarded among Armenians as a sign of legitimate Holy Orders as it is used in the blessing of the oil used at ordinations. St. Gregory the Illuminator was Primate or Patriarch of Armenia from 314-325. He was Prince of Acilene, Taraun-Ashtishot and Bagravendene, was instrumental in the conversion of Georgia, of Caspian Albania and of Atropatene, and died while the Council of Nicaea was still in session. Gregory's sons succeeded him; first the younger, who was unmarried, St. Aristakes (325-333); then the elder married son, St. Vratanes (333-341). His son St. Husik succeeded him (341-347). The Patriarchal dignity was confined to the family of the Illuminator at the wish of the Armenian nation, but the sons of St. Husik refused to take Holy Orders and a certain Pharen of Ashtishat, a distant cousin, followed by the grandson of St. Husik, St. Nerses.

The marriage of St. Husik into the Royal House of Armenia in 317 brought in a descent from the first Christian king of Armenia, Tiridates IV. Yusik's son, Prince Athenogenes, married his niece Princess Bambishen, daughter of Yusik's other son, King Chosroes III of Armenia (reigned 330-339). The son of this union was another patriarch and Saint, as noted above, St. Nerses, otherwise Nerses I, the Great, Prince of the Gregorid domain (335-373). His wife was Princess Sandukht, the daughter of Prince Vardan I of the Mamikonids (c. 350-365). She is regarded as a saint of the Church of Armenia. The son of this marriage, Isaac, is also in the hagiology and was Patriarch of Armenia. He reigned over the Gregorid domain as Prince Isaac I.

St. Isaac's daughter, Princess Sahakanysh, succeeded to the Gregorid domain and married the first cousin of St. Nerses twice removed, Prince Hamazasp I. Their sons were Prince Hamazaspian, St. Vardan II and St. Hmayak. It is from the former prince that our Royal family descends.

Skipping over twelve generations we arrive at the Byzantine Emperor, Basil I (b. 813; reigned 867-886), who married Eudocia Ingerina, from whom was descended the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913-959), who, having married Helena, daughter



of Romanus I Lecapenus, their son was Emperor Romanus II (reigned 959-963). In the reign of his sons Basil and Constantine a princess named Theophano was given in marriage to Otto II the German Emperor, around whom there has been a certain amount of genealogical controversy. In a letter to me Mr. Montague-Smith, the editor of "*Debrett*", writes:—

"... though Theophano was always described as a sister of Anna, and daughter of the Emperor Romanus II, modern historians now discount this and state that she was a member of the Tzimisce family, and a near relation of the Emperor John I Tzimisce."

G. Ostrogorski in his *History of the Byzantine State* supports this view, but genealogists and Byzantinologists are still in dispute over Theophano's parentage.

In a letter to Sir Arthur Wagner, Garter King of Arms, Prince C. Toumanoff has commented that he believes Theophano to be the daughter of Emperor Romanus II:—

"That she is referred to as a niece of John Tzimisce, instead of as a daughter of Romanus II is no argument, because at the moment of her marriage she was indeed the niece of the then reigning Emperor, i.e. John I. Vasiliev has shown that Romanus and Theophano indeed had another child, so that there is room for Theophano in their family. Her name, rare enough, is that of Romanus II's low-born wife, assumed after her election. Finally there is only one serious argument, cited by Rüdiger-Collenberg, namely, that of affinity and no trace of dispensation in connexion with the proposed marriage, or just betrothal, of Romanus II's grand-daughter Zoë to Theophano's son Otto III, i.e. her first cousin. But the situation is not as simple as that. On the Western side, the fact (adduced by Rüdiger-Collenberg) that we have no trace of a dispensation for such a marriage is rather an argument from silence, and silence complicated by an anti-Pope; he was a Byzantine creature and it was he who, prior to becoming an anti-Pope; carried on the negotiations for the marriage; he quite obviously would have acceded to the wishes of his Imperial protector at Constantinople. On the Byzantine side, one notices very often that the intransigence of the clergy withers before a forceful Emperor such as Basil II. Indeed Zoë later married her second cousin (once removed) Romanus Argyrus, and no questions were asked. In view of all this, I personally consider Theophano a daughter of Romanus II, unless a stronger argument to the contrary is produced."<sup>1</sup>

Taking it as possible that Theophano was the daughter of the Emperor Romanus II we are able to continue the descent to Mathilda, the daughter of Theophano and her husband the Emperor Otto II (973-983); who married Esso, Count Palatine of Lorraine. Their

daughter, Richenza, married in 1013 King Mieczslav II of Poland (reigned 1025-34), whose son, King Casimir I of Poland married the Princess Dobroniega Vladimirovna, the daughter of St. Vladimir, the Founder of Holy Russia as noted earlier.

Another Armenian and Byzantine descent was brought into the Royal House of Plantagenet through Philippa of Hainault, consort of Edward III. On her mother's side she was the great-great-granddaughter of King Bela IV of Hungary and his wife Mary Lascaris, the daughter of Theodore I Lascaris, Emperor of Nicea (120-822) and his consort the Armenian princess, Phillippe, daughter of King Rupin II, great grandson of Constantine I of Armenia (d. 1100).

To come down to the present generation of the English Royal Family we find that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales had a Greek Orthodox nun as a paternal grandmother (Princess Alice, the widow of Prince Andrew of Greece) and on his maternal grandmother's side an Anglican priest as an ancestor. Thus in our present Sovereign and in her successor we have embodied Kings and Saints from throughout Western and Eastern Christendom venerated by Anglicans, Orthodox and Armenians. The Queen represents in her person the Sovereigns and saints of those émigrés from Eastern Europe who have had to sing the *Lord's song in a strange land*. In her the émigrés might perhaps see the personification of their own ancient Christian dynasties.

John Salter

1) A. Wagner: *Pedigree and Progress*, London, 1975, 258 and references there.

#### YOUTH AND THE GOSPEL

The Gospel is not just a Book. The Gospel is rather a Person. It is Christ Himself. The words of Christ can be found in the pages of the New Testament, but His life is not limited to that which is within the Book. The Gospel is rather a radiant living existence; it is proclaimed as special inheritance, as revealed Truth, as applied morality, as model of holiness evident in the life of the Church which is the continuation of Christ on earth destined to last until the end of time.

In the appreciation of the Church as the Body of Christ comprising all the faithful, we may discern therein the clergy and the laity. The Church is neither the Clergy nor the Laity—the Church comprises both in an undivided unity in mutual dependence, displaying the visible and the invisible side of her Mystery.



The administration of the Church cannot therefore be one-sided; it may neither be localised in the Clergy nor in the Laity. Since the Church is described as being Flock and Shepherd, then the Church in its administration cannot be either chaotic or dictatorial, democratic or arbitrary. The Church must be seen as a Unit in which the Laity and the Clergy serve together in unanimity the needs of the Body with an administrative system which is called synodical.

An example of this form of administration of the Church is to be found in the gathering of the first Christian Community which is described in the Third Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. According to this testimony 125 persons—the members of the first Christian Community—were invited. With them were the Blessed Virgin Mary and the eleven Apostles, with the exception of the wretched Judas. At this gathering St. Peter, as presiding officer of the Apostolic College on account of his age and of his other qualifications, addressed the gathering of the Christians on behalf of the other Apostles and asked them to elect a person to take the place of the traitor Apostle to become a witness of the Resurrection of the Living Christ. The Christians then elected two persons, Joseph Barsabas and Matthias. After the prayer of the Apostles they cast lots and the lot fell upon Matthias who took his position with the eleven, thus becoming the Twelfth Apostle (Acts Ch. 1 13–26).

In this Apostolic practice we find the method and the system of the administration of the Church in which the Apostles and the people after prayer elect and thus proclaim Apostles who later on received the name of "Bishops". The Apostle-Bishops came out from the people, and as the people cannot exist without the Apostle-Bishops for the maintenance of the Church, so in the same way the Apostle-Bishops cannot represent and administer the Church without the consent of the people. Again, as ecclesiastical authority was evident in the initiative of the Apostles and in St. Peter's address, so in the same way the authority of the Church continues with the agreement of the bishops, in whose name their Primus speaks, and the people recognise it and co-operated in love and concord in the administration of the Church.

In the Orthodox Church this form and method of administration is diligently upheld and guarded by the Oecumenical Patriarchate. Its bishops guide the people of God and with the people they examine the affairs of the Church and try to solve the problems which the complexity of life and the signs of the times bring before the Church.

Our time is considered to be a critical one. One can discern without effort that an attack is under way on the moral and spiritual foundations of life. Violent movements and revolutionary plans are darkening the judgment of the people, confusion seems to be reigning, with the denial of accepted values and uninhibited contempt

of religion and the spiritual aspects of life evident in every corner of the earth.

More emphatically, this situation of our time can be discerned in the lives of its youth. It is against youth that one hears many accusations today. Many people are nowadays accustomed to consider that young people are responsible for whatever is wrong in our time; but it is only just to observe that the young have not created our crisis, nor are the young people led astray, except by the example of their parents and elders.

St. Peter teaches the youth to submit themselves to their elders and advises the elders to submit to each other under the rule of humility before God (*1 Peter 5.5*). The humility which St. Peter suggests refers to the relationship of man and God. The men who have displayed contempt of God are not the young of today, but their parents and grandparents, who felt so proud of their achievements in the field of science and technology, financial development, social progress, means of transportation and enjoyment, as to consider God inferior to their technical inventions and scientific methods; they were the ones who adopted humanism and transmitted its tenets to youth by their example, and now the elders reap the reward of despair when they see the young becoming attached to nihilism, to moral corruption, and dangerous social theories. They feel very sorry and are afraid, and curse the youth and speak of themselves with pride as being morally and spiritually superior.

St. Titus the Apostle advises the elders to teach the youth self-control (*Titus 2.6*), but if the elders are preoccupied with actions that show their moral wretchedness and confusion, and they speak with contempt of God and religious traditions, how can they teach the young to control themselves?

The Holy Bible presents to us a picture in the seventh chapter of the Book of Proverbs in which we may see on the one hand an unstable young man ready to fall into temptation and on the other hand the father who advises his son.

"One night I saw from the window a rather foolish young man walking in the street towards a corner where a person of questionable character lived. This person was dressed in provocative attire, and with evil mind rushed to meet the young man. The same person is described as being over-disturbed, always in and out of the house. Often this person used to run in the square waiting in every corner to meet passers-by. There in the corner this person caught the young man and addressed him in these words:—

"I came to meet you and to offer you rest. Everything is ready. My house is adorned and perfumed. Come, let us fill ourselves with love until morning. My partner is not in, he has gone on a long journey and he took with him a lot of money and will only return after many days." The young man was attracted and followed like an ox going to the slaughter, like a bird in its cage, like a deer



wounded in its entrails." This is a description of an induced young man to whom the following advice was offered—"Listen to me, my son, and be attentive to the words of my mouth in order not to lose your way and go into stray paths where moral danger invites you. Many are those who have been drawn into these dangerous paths, and the number of those who have lost their lives there is legion. The invitation guides to hell, and leads into the caves of death and into spiritual and moral degradation. We are all very familiar with this picture, but what is unusual is the audacity of our contemporary elders who offer advice. They suggest the dangers of the moral and spiritual perils to the younger people because they think that only they have lost the power of conviction, moral integrity, balance of temperance and consequently the sense of responsibility to God.

Parents, teachers and leaders of communities, clergymen and laymen alike have the duty to repossess themselves with Christian convictions of moral integrity in order to be able to exercise their authority when advising the young to keep away from inducements to moral degradation, from drug addiction, from gambling, from abortions, from the temptations which attack the sacredness of conjugal unity, from the other plagues of contemporary society which destroy the dynamism of life and pollute the beauty of the Christian conscience. We are bound in duty and ecclesiastical obligation to offer the Gospel to our youth; that is why it is necessary to show to them not only the Gospel as a book but the Gospel as the Living Christ, and the example of His Apostles and of His Saints, the well-known imitators of Christ. It is right to confess that we have failed to offer this Model to the youth in a systematic and profitable way. One of the causes of this our failure is because the great majority of our young people cannot understand us. Our language is not spoken in the homes, only (and then scarcely) in schools and in churches. Our sermons cannot influence the young people, because our words cannot reach their ears. How shall we reach our youth?

This is the problem which our Fifth Ecclesiastical Conference has to investigate. The central theme of the Conference is "Youth and the Gospel". This theme is to be examined during this meeting by nine speakers, who have between them 45 to 55 minutes altogether. The members of the Conference have a bounden duty to attend to what the speakers say, and then to take part in the discussion and to comment upon the addresses, adding to the suggestions of the speakers and contributing in this way to the crusade for the protection of the youth within the Sacred Ark of the Church and its holy traditions.

In his First Epistle, St. John the Apostle says: "I write to you young men because you are strong and the word of God abides in you and you have overcome the evil one. Do not love the world or

the things in the world; for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, is not of the Father but is of the world. (*1 John 2 14-15*). This advice is often repeated by every priest from the pulpit, because it refers both to the young and to the old, because the three centres of temptation, that is, the flesh, the eyes, and pride are common to all and open the way which usually leads to moral indifference, which is always connected with contempt for God.

St. John observes that the young are strong. He means by strength the endurance against lust, against the inducement to selfishness, and often against what is just and right, proper and true. For this reason John's observation is completed by the question raised in the Bible—How can a young man keep his way pure? How can the young man keep his strength, which is co-natural and which John finds to be analogous with spiritual strength? The answer is this—"by guarding it according to Thy Word." (*Psalms 119, 9*).

Keeping the words and commandments of God we keep the integrity of our moral and spiritual life. We become pure images shining and ever reflecting the prototype, the Model for imitation that is Christ. It is there that we may find the strength which young and old need. The source of our strength is the Gospel, that is, Christ Himself.

We must all know, young and old alike, that morality without religion is impossible. It is philosophical nonsense, it is a dangerous experiment—the theory which dis-integrates our integral nature by separating the two characteristics which perfect man and make him an image approaching the beauty of the archetype, God, the Creator.

So please pay due attention to the speakers who will analyse for us the central theme of this Conference in their nine addresses.

May the Grace and the Enlightenment of the Lord be with the speakers and with us all.

Address by His Eminence Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira and Great Britain introducing the Main Theme of the Fifth Ecclesiastical Conference of the Greek Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain—March 6th to 9th, 1975.



## NEWS ITEMS

### The Greek Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain

Archbishop Athenagoras officiated at the Monastery of Penteli on 15 August, His Eminence preached before many thousands of worshippers who were observing the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary there. On 19 August His Eminence officiated on Patmos at the Monastery of St. John where he addressed the newly-elected Abbot of the Monastery, Archmandrite Isidore. He also officiated in All Saints Chapel of the Skete of Appollos on Patmos and on the 24 August in the newly erected Church of St. Nicholas on Patmos. On Sunday 31 August the Archbishop officiated in St. Nicholas' Church in Athens where he ordained Andrew Gines, whom he had named Seraphim, to the diaconate. The new Deacon now serves at the office of the Archdiocese. While in Athens the Archbishop had an opportunity to discuss various questions concerning education and the schools of the Archdiocese in Great Britain with the Minister of Education and Religious Affairs Mr. Chrysostom Karapiperis. On 1 September 1975 the Archbishop visited Salonica where he had meetings with the Panteleimon Metropolitan of Salonica and Dionysios Metropolitan of Neapolis. While in Salonica the Archbishop visited the Theological school of the University and had conversations with Professors Maezalides and Zeses. He preached in the Church of St. Eleftherios, where he met all our clergy who have been sent by the Archdiocese to study theology at the University.

### The Church of All Saints, Camden Town

After lengthy conversations the freehold of the Church of All Saints Camden Town is to be bought by the Community from the Church Commissioners. Archbishop Athenagoras, the Priest in Charge of the Community, and its Board exchanged views with the representatives of the Church Commissioners and it is hoped that the deal will soon be completed.

### The Greek Orthodox Community of Croydon

According to an announcement by the Archdiocese, the Greek Orthodox Community of St. Constantine in Croydon is buying St. Andrew's Church in Upper Norwood near Croydon, which belongs to the United Reformed Church. The price of this freehold is £30,000. The President of the Community Mr. E. Giorgas and the other members of the Board will organise a Fund-raising Committee in order to buy the Church.

## ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX COMMISSION VISITS TRURO

The Bishop of Truro writes: "The visit to Truro of the Sub-Commission of the International Doctrinal Commission for discussions between the Anglican Communion and the Orthodox Churches has given great joy and encouragement (as well as much hard work for some of us). The Diocesan Eucharist and the Orthodox Liturgy in the Cathedral were glorious acts of worship. I much appreciated the presence of so many of the clergy and laity which reflected the interest and concern which the visit evoked. I am most grateful to the Mayor for the splendid Civic Reception at which so many interests in City and County were represented, to the Dean for the unstinted help given by the Cathedral staff and the Reverend Mother and Sister of the Community of the Epiphany for their loving hospitality. The expert guidance of Canon Miles Brown on the tour which the Sub-Commission made of West Cornwall was much appreciated.

"The results of our deliberations have to go to the full Commission before they can be published but I can say that they were most wonderfully fruitful. As you know, we were discussing Scripture and Tradition in the life of the Church. We built on the agreement we reached last year in Crete and were fully in accord on many deep and fundamental issues. We were able to say that as far as our subjects are concerned our agreement affords a solid basis for further rapprochement between the Churches.

"My Co-Chairman, Archbishop Stylianos and the members of the Sub-Commission wish me to express their warm appreciation of the wonderful welcome and hospitality which they received. They were very conscious of the prayers which were offered throughout the Diocese and thank God that they were answered in such measure."

(Reprinted with permission from *The Cornish Churchman*.)

## REVIEWS

Valentine Zander: *St. Seraphim of Sarov*. London, S.P.C.K., 1975, £2.50 (paper).

In 1968 Dr. Zander produced a small résumé of the basic facts and ideas of St. Seraphim as a preliminary towards this longer and more detailed work. This was well received, as the only previous work in English, Lady Namier's *Flame in the Snow*, was published in a small edition in 1945, had been long out of print, and had in any case been an over-emotional, slap-happy presentation of a mighty subject which deserved better of a biographer. In the present book we receive a solidly printed volume of 150 pages, and an indication that here is a study of original sources.



Alas, this book will not do either. The footnotes are monuments of unhelpfulness; had the author or the publisher but obtained the services of a competent senior member of the staff of any public or academic library to scrutinise and tidy them, much embarrassment would have been spared them for the most modest of honoraria, and the reader would have benefitted in proportion. The disclaimer that this book is intended only for the devout reader will not serve either as an excuse: the devout reader is as entitled to accurate and helpful citation as the most exacting of professorial examiners of a doctoral thesis. To take just a few examples of incompetence: 1) "Isaac of Nineveh: Treatises" (p. xii); where and when were these *Treatises* published, and from what page does the citation come? 2) Why is there no reference to Professor Nadejda Gorodetskii's *St. Tikhon of Zadonsk*, O.U.P., 1951, on p. 13, note 3; the reader is entitled to a lead towards the one solid modern study of a saint who is given so good a repute by the author; 3) *Where* in "the old archives of Sarov" is the description cited on p. 13, note 7? 4) Why has the admirable recent study of the Jesus prayer by Dr. Kallistos Ware (*The Power of the Name—the Jesus Prayer in Orthodox Spirituality*, Oxford, Community of the Sisters of the Love of God, 1974), reviewed in this journal (no. 71, 30–31), been omitted in the all-too-brief list of Western works on the prayer on p. 14, note 11? 5) What is the proper bibliographical description of the memoirs of Meletius (p. 24, note 2)? 6) What are the memoirs of Fr. Sadvoski (p. 52, note 1)? 7) *Where* is the citation from the works of St. Ephraim the Syrian found (p. 77, note 1)? 8) *Letters of Philaret*—where is the rest of the citation (p. 114, note 2)? 9) Where are the *Notebooks* listed so meticulously on pp. 147–49 now kept? If the author is following the printed text of Bp. Serafim (i.e. L. Chitchagov) (ed): *Letopisi Serafimo-Diveyevskago monastir Nizhegorodzkoi*, then the pagination of whichever edition was used should have been given, as neither the 1896 nor the 1903 edition is available in the West without great trouble.

I have merely selected the most exasperating cases of bibliographical slovenliness here, but the entire citation apparatus should be given to a competent professional to put in order before any new edition or reprint of this book is contemplated. It is now necessary to look at the text itself, and here a grave weakness is immediately apparent—one which disfigures the whole book and does a disservice to the memory of a man wise, holy and richly endowed with grace by Our Lord. St. Seraphim's character does not fail to shine through the fog engendered by the emotional heat of the prose, however, and the sanctity to which he was permitted attain can be seen from this. In the seventy-four years in which he gradually attained that austere, utter self-surrender which marks the man on whom God has laid His hand, Seraphim of Sarov lived an intense, Christ-centred, God-driven life, at the end of which the transparent

holiness of his personality has left an indelible mark on the church in which he served with all his might to further the extension of the Kingdom of Heaven. It is, however, no service to his memory to write of him in the loose, emotion-ridden clichés of nineteenth century Ultramontanist, for his own words and works, such as have survived in evidence that can be relied upon, spell out the power and glory of God at work in His obliterated servant far more clearly than any attempts to depict them in the screaming language of the newspaper headline. The simple, earth-bound phraseology of the saint himself should have been the biographer's guide, and his meticulousness in all his deeds her example.

In spite of its faults, however, this book is valuable for one thing. In St. Seraphim's life we see two most valuable lessons for our own times, hagridden as they are by the pressures of a technologically based way of life that is geared towards an ever louder, ever faster, ever more mob-dominated existence. Prokhor Moshnin determined on surrender to God in faith, and his life shows how he realised—and so accepted—that this meant surrendering and sacrificing everything and anything to be able to become the selfless instrument of Our Lord in Russia. He realised that this had to mean the crushing the self, not by the self, but by absolute surrender to Christ, and he followed the Lord's example by withdrawing from the racket of the world into stillness and solitude to fight the battle which would enable him to be sent back into the world as its servant, self rooted out and Christ enthroned in the being. The balanced beauty of the act, made holy by God's acceptance, comes over in this imperfect biography as it did in Lady Namier's version, for the Seraphims of the earthly church live the Christian life with a fulness that is recognisable through all human frailty of expression. The grace given to him made him unconscious of it, in the sense that he was incapable of parading it as a virtue, and profoundly conscious of it as the fulfilling, burning power that consumed him, directed him and drove him in obedience to serve whoever came to him, in whatever way, and whenever he could, for the love of Christ which constrained him. This biography makes this plain; it will be even plainer when one appears in which the sources are so declared as to be verifiable, and St. Seraphim himself is allowed to speak at greater length.

B. S. Benedikz

P. O. Sjögren: *The Jesus Prayer*; trsl. from the second Swedish edition by S. Linton. London, S.P.C.K., 1975, £1.60.

For a paperback containing barely eighty three pages of text proper, the price is either a depressing commentary on the parlous state of inflation, or else it denotes an unnecessarily gloomy prognosis on the part of the publishers of the potential sale and reader-



ship. But this book is no specialist monograph of strictly limited appeal. It has been written as an aid to devotion, in order to introduce the Jesus Prayer in its practice and meaning to the native Churches of western Europe, whether Catholic or Reformed. The Jesus Prayer is something of an acquired taste for the western Christian. It is still something which individuals discover for themselves, rather than a part of normal Church teaching and practice. The Dean of Gothenburg writes as someone who has acquired a real grasp and understanding of the Jesus Prayer, and who wishes to share his discovery with his brothers and sisters in Christ both of his own and other similar traditions.

In the post-war years western Christian traditions have been one in their rediscovery of the value of a simpler and more contemplative approach to the life of prayer. This has led to a much desired retreat from the old double standard: one way for the "ordinary laity" and another for the Religious or the Ordained, while in turn this has brought with it the danger that contemplation or the practice of the presence of God may be regarded by many merely as the "in thing", or maybe even as the softer option. The contemplative way is no soft option; granted, as a matter of course, that all prayer of whatever kind is the gift of God's Grace, it is nevertheless an art which needs to be practised and developed, and very little, as a general rule, is given in our Churches by way of the teaching of prayer and helps to a deeper understanding. Hence this book is important as it fills a gap. To the great majority the Jesus Prayer (if they have heard of it at all) is something rather oriental and exotic. True the situation has improved somewhat recently; the work of Kadloubovsky and Palmer has made the *Philokalia* accessible to English readers, and it can be read as *The Way of a Pilgrim* in R. M. French's translation. Various brief accounts of the Jesus Prayer exist, written by anonymous Orthodox in semi-private editions. Better known is the portrait of Staretz Silouan in *The Undistorted Image*, and though the *Verba Seniorum* still remain locked away in Migne's *Patrologia*, the general reader can catch a good deal of their spiritual atmosphere in Helen Waddell's *The Desert Fathers*. Nevertheless there is still some danger that the Jesus Prayer may come to be regarded as the fad of a few enthusiasts, or worse may be used in ignorance and without proper understanding, leading to serious consequences both for the user and the Church as a whole. It is therefore good to have two sound, recent studies, with the present volume a Western complement to that of Dr. Kallistos Ware (reviewed in *ECNL* 69).

There is much to be learned, then, from someone who has come from outside the Orthodox tradition to study the Jesus Prayer and to pray it. The author makes the point that the Jesus Prayer is not after all so very different from the prayers with which we are already familiar both from the liturgy and from our own private

use. Indeed the use of the Jesus Prayer is not to be taken as supplanting common prayer or the liturgy so as to make it unnecessary. He has some very wise criticisms to make of the fashionable notion of the Church as a kind of citadel or oasis as distinct from the "world" into which we are sent out from it. Prayer is to be unceasing and not occasional. It acts as a continuous fence around the garden of the Christian life. If the Sunday liturgy or the daily office act as the supporting posts, then the unceasing prayer of the heart serves as the mesh that excludes unwanted intruders. Neither can perform their proper function without the other.

The discussion begins with analysis of the Jesus Prayer, taking each of its words in turn: "Lord, Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me". The prayer may look so simple as to be trivial, but in fact it contains everything that a Christian could ever want or need to say. It sums up the totality of the prayer which the Holy Spirit is praying in us and for us in deep and unutterable groans. This leads on, in turn, to a full discussion about the way in which our hearts are to become the temple of the Holy Spirit. The language and thought are very much that of the Desert Fathers, and confirms what has long been suspected, most notably in recent times by Thomas Merton, that the *Sayings of the Fathers* speak very much to our present condition, for they are timeless. Humility is a recurring theme of their sayings and discipline, and here it is re-emphasised that without humility it is impossible for the Holy Spirit to enter our hearts and make them the temple in which he prays. In connection with this, the author mentions and commends the practices of fasting and meditation on death—two common sense and essential but at the same time much neglected disciplines, in the search for purity of heart. Despite possible forebodings, it is made clear that the Jesus Prayer is not just for the élite but for all, whether intellectual or simple, young or old. After all the unceasing prayer of the heart is the practical token of the genuine union of the believer in Christ.

This is true, but it is also here that the problems begin. My own reservations are best illustrated by a conversation with a friend not many months previously, in which he told me that he used the Jesus Prayer habitually while driving on long motorway journeys. My own response was a muted "Alleluia", with the somewhat profane rejoinder that I envisaged an invisible motorcade of angelic outriders to preserve him. I believe that a serious point of substance lay beneath my frivolity. In my own experience, the Jesus Prayer may, generally speaking, be used in one of two ways. In the first it is used as an occasional act of recollection; to my sorrow this represents the limits of my own use of it, and the fault is mine. Or it may be the unceasing prayer of which the book speaks, the prayer of perfect union between the heart and God. However, from what one reads or knows of the experience of the masters of prayer, this



is not something that comes easily, also it is an observed fact that those who are granted the grace of perseverance in the prayer of the heart may well find themselves living "betwixt heaven and earth". Of course detachment is the aim of all asceticism, but the line between detachment and disorientation is very finely drawn. This is why the cell or the community has traditionally been the place for this adventure. One shudders a little at the thought of it being pursued in the circumstances of a technological society. Certainly I do not believe that the problem is insuperable, but, equally, it is not simple. The solution must lie along the lines suggested by the masters of prayer, whether in the fifth century or the eighteenth, that no prayer, least of all the prayer of the heart, should be undertaken without counsel and guidance. The passing reference to the role and importance of the "staretz" on page 89 cannot be said to do justice to this point. After all, it has always been taken as the acid test of humility that the aspirant in prayer should be able and prepared to submit his own judgment and experience to that of someone older and wiser than himself.

It is impossible to make generalisations about the life of prayer. Each individual needs to be treated on his own merits and according to his own circumstances. The Church's difficulty today is not that there are too few people who are open to the possibilities of the prayer of the heart, but that there are not enough "old men" (or "old women" for that matter) with the necessary knowledge, experience or common sense to guide them with frankness and sympathy through the numerous problems and difficulties that are bound to arise on the way. This is something in which above all Christians are to help one another. We can therefore be very grateful indeed to the Dean of Gothenburg for introducing (or rather re-introducing) the whole subject to the Church, and for the light which he has shed upon its ramifications.

W. H. Bates

#### CORRECTION

In the last issue of *ECNL* the article "The Charismatic Movement" which was sent to Editor in typescript without any indication that it was already published, was printed as a new publication. He has since discovered that it was in fact already printed in the *Orthodox Observer* of New York, and wishes to present his apologies to that periodical for the unwitting piracy.



is not something that comes easily, also it is an observed fact that those who are granted the grace of perseverance in the prayer of the heart have first themselves living "between heaven and earth". It is a perseverance in the sense of all aspects, but the line between persistence and discrimination is very finely drawn. This is why the person the community has traditionally been the place for this adventure. One shudders a little at the thought of a being sustained in the circumstances of a total spiritual poverty. Yet this I do not believe that the problem is insuperable, nor insoluble, at least in principle. The solution must be along the lines suggested by the masters of prayer, whether in the fifth century or the nineteenth, and we pray, least of all the prayer of the heart, should be intercession without counsel and guidance. The passing reference to counsel and importance of the "master" on page 38 cannot be used to justify to this point. After all, it has always been taken as the rule, not of humility that the aspirant in prayer should be able and prepared to submit his own judgment and experience to that of someone older and wiser than himself.

It is impossible to make generalisations about the life of people. Each individual needs to be treated on his own merits and according to his own circumstances. The Church's difficulty today is not that there are too few people who are open to the possibilities of the prayer of the heart, but that there are too many "old men" (or "old women" for that matter) with the necessary knowledge, experience or counsel alone to guide them with kindness and sympathy through the many problems and difficulties that are bound to arise on the way. This is something in which above all Christians are to help one another. We can therefore be very grateful indeed to the Dean of Godehard for introducing the rather re-introducing the whole subject to the Church, and for the light which he has shed upon its complexities.

W. H. RACE

#### CORRECTION

In the last issue of ECNL the article "The Cheltenham Movement" which was sent to Editors in typescript without any indication that it was already published, was printed as a new contribution. The late saint discovered that it was in fact already printed in the Orthodox Observer of New York, and when he printed his apology to this periodical for the unwitting piracy.

#### AIMS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The Association exists to unite members of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches for the following objects:

- (a) The principal object for which the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association is established is the advancement of the Christian religion, in particular by means of teaching the members of the Anglican Church and those of the Eastern Orthodox Church the doctrine, worship and way of life of the other.
- (b) The Association exists also to unite members of the two Communions in prayer and work in achieving the principal object, with a view to promotion of visible unity between them.

#### SOME METHODS OF HELPING THE WORK

1. By joining the Association and getting others to join.
2. By arranging for a meeting in the neighbourhood when a lecture may be given on the Eastern Churches and Reunion, and the objects of the Association explained.
3. By asking the PAROCHIAL AUTHORITIES to promise a Sunday collection every year either in the service or afterwards at the doors.
4. By uniting in local centres for the study of Eastern Christendom and for Intercession for Reunion.

Lectures - with or without visual aids - can be arranged by writing to the General Secretary.

#### SUBSCRIPTION

The minimum annual subscription is £1, but none will be excluded solely on account of inability to pay this amount which it is hoped that those who can afford to pay more will do so.

All members receive the Eastern Churches News Letter which is published half yearly.