

The Christian East

A QUARTERLY REVIEW, DEVOTED TO THE STUDY
OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

VOL. II. NEW SERIES. NOS. 5 AND 6.

SUMMER, 1953

PUBLISHED FOR

The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association

BY

THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.

7 TUFTON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1

5/- per copy (double number). 10/- per year post free.

Co-Editors:

THE REV. AUSTIN OAKLEY, 63 Ladbroke Grove, London, W. 11 (to whom cheques, postal orders and enquiries should be sent)

THE REV. DERWAS J. CHITTY, Upton Rectory, Didcot, Berks.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
NOTES AND COMMENTS	121
LONG LIVE THE QUEEN!	125
RESTORATION OF THE BULGARIAN PATRIARCHATE—D.J.C.	128
CHURCH AND STATE IN YUGOSLAVIA	132
THE ORTHODOX AND THE THIRD WORLD CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIAN YOUTH—Archimandrite Panteleimon Karanikolas	135
THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF ORTHODOX YOUTH —Vladimir Rodzianko	139
THE BYZANTINE CONGRESS AT SALONIKA, APRIL 1953 —Elfride Bickersteth	149
THE "FILIOQUE" DISPUTE AND ITS IMPORTANCE—Vladimir Rodzianko	151
A HESYCHAST IN THE MAKING	161
MOUNT ATHOS	168
PROFESSOR L. A. ZANDER'S REPLY TO FR. G. FLOROVSKY	172
REVIEWS AND PERIODICALS RECEIVED	179

THE CHRISTIAN EAST

VOL. II. NEW SERIES. NOS. 5 AND 6.

SUMMER, 1953

NOTES AND COMMENTS

MEMORIES of other coronations had hardly prepared us for the spiritual experience opened to us in the crowning of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II—an experience into which all the principal participants appeared to be completely caught up. And it is fitting that we should remember here, not only that that ceremony is in part at least a heritage from Byzantium, but that the truth there proclaimed is one in which we stand very close to the Orthodox Church—as seems to stand out clearly between the lines of the short account we publish from Fr. Antony Bloom, who represented the Russian Church in the Abbey. Nor should we overlook the presence in the Royal Gallery, along with the Duchess of Kent and the other Royal ladies, of the Queen's mother-in-law in the garb of an Orthodox nun.

In a suggestive, if somewhat tendentious, letter published in the *Church of England Newspaper* for April 10th, the Rev. C. E. Douglas reminds us that the day of the Crowning was, in its position in the liturgical year, the actual quinqucentenary of that Tuesday (May 29th, 1453), when the City which for eleven centuries had stood for the vision of a Christian State, fell to the Muslim conqueror. In such a year we have to commemorate the long Christian witness of old Byzantium (that City whose power to draw men to the Faith, inexplicable to the political historian, is easily understood by those who see her in the Lives of her Saints). And we must thank God for the miracle which enabled the conquered heirs of that tradition to be held together through the generations by the sense of Christian nationhood. But the proclamation of Christian Kingship—the vision of the first Constantine—did not die with the Palaeologue. To that vision—the Cross, on Crown and Orb and Sceptre, reigning over the globe—we have been recalled. The mantle of Constantine rests upon our Queen.

Fr. Douglas reminds us that the title of Basileus was adopted by Anglo-Saxon Kings. And while we may question the reality of any direct historical link between their Kingship and the Empire of the Caesars, the connections between Anglo-Saxon England and Byzantium in various fields deserve far closer investigation than they have received.

THE ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE. On June 28th, the Rector of the Greek Church of St. Stephen in Paris, Archimandrite Meletios, was consecrated by the Metropolitan of Thyatira as titular Bishop of Rhegium

(Reggio). His co-consecrators included Mgr. Silvester, titular Bishop of Messina. We are reminded that Mgr. Cassian, Rector of the Institut St. Serge, is titular Bishop of Catania. We hope in our next issue to publish an article giving something of the historical background to these titles. Our best wishes go to the new Bishop. His consecration will help to lighten the heavy burden which lies upon the shoulders of Mgr. Athenagoras.

The New Year number of *Pantainos* (the weekly periodical of the Patriarchate of Alexandria) contains an article on "The Russian Orthodox Church and the Idea and Essence of Autocephaly," by the Archimandrite Parthenios Koinidis, in which the claims and attitude of the Ecumenical Patriarchate are strongly upheld against Russian criticism and counter-claims, particularly in relation to Polish autocephaly.

BULGARIA. News of the re-establishment of the Bulgarian Patriarchate is commented on later in this issue.

YUGOSLAVIA. We publish in this issue the new Yugoslav Law in regard to religious bodies, preceded by some comments from a correspondent. His remarks in reference to Cardinal Stepinac will be noticed. We publish them because we feel it to be important that it should be known that there are other points of view on this matter, adopted by informed Christians in Yugoslavia and elsewhere, besides the Roman Catholic. For the expression of the latter, we would refer to *Tito and the Catholic Church*, by Michael Derrick (published by The Sword of the Spirit, 6d.), and to the current number of *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* (Vol. X, No. 2, Summer 1953), which contains a valuable and informative leading article on the subject by the Editor, who quotes at length from Mr. Kitson Clark's "Note on General Principles," published in our last issue. For an Orthodox point of view, we print here a letter from an Orthodox who was in Yugoslavia during and after the War. He writes:—

"I quite agree with the author of *Tito and the Catholic Church* that Cardinal Stepinac was arrested and sentenced because of his courageous pastoral letter, and not because of his conduct during the war. The trial was artificial. I read the Pastoral Letter myself at that time with great satisfaction, in general. But I think that some of his expressions in that letter were too extreme, and more of a political than a religious character. I do not think it wise for the Church to attack Communism as such, especially within a communist state: it is wrong to identify that political and social way of life as a whole with the anti-religious propaganda which is only one of its main characteristics. It would be much wiser to stand for our religious and spiritual truths on their own spiritual ground, without confusing our spiritual life and fight with any earthly policy. Such is the attitude adopted by the Orthodox Church, which has been leading with much success the Christians' enormous spiritual struggle for more than thirty years.

"And I cannot understand why such a courageous person as Cardinal Stepinac could not state publicly, or at least in a similar pastoral letter to his clergy, that it was wrong and un-Christian to force people to become

catholics against their will, and to kill them because they are not catholics. I see the point of saving people from death by accepting them into the Roman Catholic Church, even though it is against the canons to do so. But I cannot understand why the national head of that Church could not issue a pastoral letter publicly condemning such a policy of a government which consisted of Church members. That would not have been a political move, but purely religious: for all these crimes were committed by so-called members of the Roman Catholic Church, and many of them by her clergy and in her name.¹ Cardinal Stepinac could not have been ignorant of this. Yet none of them were punished or excommunicated for these horrible crimes. If Cardinal Stepinac could not condemn them himself for some reasons of diplomacy, he could surely have asked the Pope to raise his voice against them, and to excommunicate the 'Ustashi' as he excommunicated the Communists later.

"I cannot agree with the Communists' arguments in their unjust fight against Cardinal Stepinac as a Christian Bishop. But it is difficult, at the same time, to agree with the arguments of Michael Derrick. The comparison of those more or less private letters against the crimes of the 'Ustashi' during the war, with the Pastoral Letter against Tito after it, shows quite clearly that Cardinal Stepinac himself believed there was a great difference between them. In the first case, he was acting just as a Christian diplomat: in the second, he preferred to be a martyr. His wonderful character leaves us no doubt of his sincerity in both cases. It means that he did not regard the murder by Roman Catholics of the bodies and souls of thousands of Orthodox Christians in the same light as he did similar treatment of Roman Catholics themselves. Humanly, one can understand it. But one cannot praise it as an example of Christ's spirit, or of a Christian martyr."

There is clearly room for debate on this matter, which the letter here published raises above the level of any kind of personal attack upon the Cardinal, who is a very sick man after all his sufferings. We would quote the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* article: "By this time Catholics have come to expect the authorities of the Orthodox Church to take one line in questions of Church and State and the Catholic Church to take another, though both are the outcome of Christian principles, which are often not fully appreciated by either side." This is sincerely generous language. But the question needs to be raised whether in fact we are concerned here with two divergent, but equally Christian, and no doubt ultimately reconcilable, methods, or with a more fundamental ideological difference, involving on one side or the other a real aberration from Christian principles which needs to be discovered and corrected before reconciliation is possible. We shall welcome further discussion.

CONFERENCES—continue to multiply. We publish below as of special interest a Greek account (translated from 'Εκκλησία) of the Third World Conference of Christian Youth held at Kottayam in December; a long and constructively critical account by Fr. Vladimir Rodzianko of the Inter-

¹ See the book, *Magnum Crimen*, written by Victor Novac, an ex-Catholic, which gives documentary proof of all this.

national Conference of Orthodox Youth held at Sèvres in April; and a short account, by one of the few Anglicans who took part, of the Congress on Byzantine Studies held at Salonica, also in April. It is much to be hoped that there will be many more Anglicans at the next Byzantine Congress, at Istanbul in 1955, as the inseparability of Byzantine studies from vital matters of the Christian Faith cannot be too much stressed.

FLOOD RELIEF. Two gifts to our need should be recorded here with sincerely felt gratitude. In May the generous sum of 5,000,000 drachmae was sent by the Church of Greece to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the victims of the flood-ravaged areas, as an expression of deepest sympathy. Such generosity, from a nation rarely far above subsistence level, after twelve of the hardest years in its history, is no surprise to those who know the Greek people. Poignancy is added to the gift by the news, when these notes were already in the press, of the terrible earthquake disaster in the Ionian Islands. May the gesture be worthily requited! Not, of course, comparable in quantity, but at least equally moving, was the gift of £25 from the Russian "Action Orthodoxe" in Paris, for the use of the Church of England among poor children, sick people, and flood victims. "She of her penury—" We had been accustomed to think of this organization as concerned with care for the poorest of a very needy community. We did not expect them to give to us, and are deeply stirred by this further evidence of their Christian character. It was decided to send their gift to the St. Mary's Home for Children at Broadstairs, which is run by the Kilburn Sisters, and very much in need of money.

A NOTABLE OCCASION. On Saturday, May 9th, the Bishop of Salisbury inducted the Rev. W. H. Macartney to the Vicarage of Upavon. The service must surely have been unique, for an English country church, in the number of clergy of foreign Churches who took their place in the procession. For the Orthodox, Fr. M. Nikolič represented the Serbian Church, Fr. F. Galdau the Rumanian, Fr. A. Gramatins the Latvian, and Fr. N. Hinde the Estonian—the first two robed in stole and chasuble. The Armenian Vardapet, Fr. B. Toumayan, also took part. And there were representatives of the Swedish and Estonian Lutheran Churches, and of the Dutch, French, and Swiss Reformed Churches. Such a gathering speaks for itself of the appreciation felt for Mr. Macartney's devoted work during the past years as Assistant General Secretary of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, and of the affection he has won from all who have had to deal with him. We are sure that the achievement of his wish for what we certainly could not call *retirement* to a country parish will not put an end to his work in building up international Christian friendship and understanding. Our very best wishes go with him.

OBITUARY. Among those who have passed from sight since our last issue, we must first honour the memory of Cyril Douglas Horsley, Bishop of Gibraltar (and formerly of Colombo), whose death at the age of forty-nine comes as the reward of six years' indefatigable work in the diocese which spreads from the Mediterranean to the Caspian, involving special responsibilities in relations with the Orthodox Churches in that area, which

he accepted to the full. May he rest in peace—and may a worthy successor be found for him!

William Ainger Wigram was a brave old veteran who will perhaps chiefly be remembered for his constant championship of the deeply-wronged Assyrian nation, but who could also write on the "Separation of the Monophysites"—in a book which, however, hardly does justice to the Chalcedonian Orthodox. But that is not all. He was British Chaplain in Constantinople through the 1914-18 War—during which he suffered imprisonment. And from 1922-6 he was British Chaplain in Athens. He was a notable figure who will be greatly missed in our gatherings. R.I.P.

We must apologize for the tardy appearance of this double number—a series of obstacles in regard to some of our more important matter held up publication until summer holidays intervened to cause still further delay. But in any case it seems probable that we shall frequently publish in double numbers in future, as this has the great advantage of giving room for more variety within each issue, and also of enabling us to publish longer articles without having to curtail or divide them.

LONG LIVE THE QUEEN!

Impressions of the Coronation from Fr. Antony Bloom, Priest of the Russian Church in London

THOSE who take an active part in the life of our Parish know that, long before the Coronation, it had begun to prepare itself for the great event for which we were all waiting. Two lectures had been given in our Church House to describe the Russian Orthodox rite of the Coronation of the Emperor; extensive explanations had been given as to its meaning and history, and parallels drawn between the Russian Orthodox and the Anglican rite had stressed the outer analogies, and the inner identity of spirit, between the two rites.

On the Sunday before the Coronation, a special service had been held in our Church, after and in addition to the usual prayers offered at every service for "our sovereign lady Queen Elizabeth, the Royal Family, the country, its people and all who dwell therein"—a votive office was sung: all those who could leave their homes and come to Church were present: and it is from their whole heart that they presented their petitions to God that He would give to the Queen the fullness of His grace, the abundance of His gift of counsel and wisdom, of strength and charity; that He would lead her into all truth, and make her people to live in peace and concord, in worship and righteousness, during her reign, and protect her against all foes visible and invisible.

Before this service, a sermon was preached on the meaning of the service to which the Queen was about to come, and its significance for, and in the lives of, all those who are privileged to live under her God-given rule.

* * * * *

But all this was only the keeping of a vigil.

At last the long expected great day came.

I am not to tell about things that every one has seen, or could see and

hear—things already abundantly spoken of: but I shall tell of the thoughts and feelings which have found their way to the depth of my heart.

* * * * *

At the Queen's command (as the invitation issued by the Earl Marshal said) I was given the privilege of being present at the Coronation Service in Westminster Abbey, with a group of Anglican Bishops from overseas (Jerusalem, Sumatra, New Zealand . . .), and with the Metropolitan of Thyatira Athenagoras, Apocrisarius of the Patriarch of Constantinople in Great Britain. There were no other Orthodox with us: the other clergy of our various Churches were seated in different parts of the Abbey.

I arrived early in the morning, as I had been directed, in a car with the Vicar of St. John the Baptist, Holland Road, who was driving thither a friend of his. The latter had a permit, the former a car—and I was kindly offered the benefit of both!

One could hardly recognize either the Abbey or its surroundings. A great many tribunes, an annexe to the Abbey itself, and a variety of decorations, had been built round the Abbey. Everything was colourful and glorious—both things and people—in spite of the rain. And obviously, people had come together not to “look at” a ceremony, but to take part in a great, gladdening event—to rejoice at *their own* feast.

Inside, also, the Abbey was quite new. From the floor to the roof tribunes had been built, solid and beautiful, with the arms and ciphers of Queen Elizabeth II. Later, I discovered that more than 7,000 people had found place under the vaults of the shrine of Great Britain's glory. But when I arrived, people were still few. I took the opportunity to see things which later, as I rightly expected, would not be visible for me—the Altar, covered with golden dishes, cups, patens, etc., the pride of Westminster Treasury. Shall I avow my feelings? I was disappointed by all the dishes. So much better do I love its usual sober beauty!

I was seated at the junction of the Sanctuary and the North Transept, in the East gallery of the latter, looking West. I could therefore see the Throne and its surroundings very well, and all the way to it from the West Door. So each of the processions came towards me, and their slow dignity made it easy to recognize each one.

By and by, guests began to fill up the Abbey. I do not venture to describe the colourful variety of the costumes, the vivid, spectacular beauty of the scenery, the sober intensity of every action, the joy, devout and shining, of all those to whom it was given to take part in the Feast—their own feast, and that of all the peoples of the Empire. I only feel sorry for those who were not given the privilege of experiencing it, or proved unable to see or sense it. But to those who have seen and understood, the old Abbey Church of Westminster—so often misunderstood by idle and superficial tourists—has revealed all its grandeur, all its eternal glory, and will remain dear as only a flag or an ikon can be.

Leaving aside now everything else, I shall concentrate upon a few impressions immediately connected with the person of the Queen.

* * * * *

When the Queen entered the Abbey all the rest faded away—or rather,

all its shining beauty was focussed and became meaningful. Nothing was left of the dazzling pageantry, of all the diversity. Greatness only remained. And each and all were spellbound, merged into silence deep and worshipful: not an outward silence only, but an inner sense of it.

The Queen was being brought to the Altar by two Bishops. And she walked towards her destiny merged into a deep and severe thought, with the amazing simplicity and recollection which is hers. She was going forth consciously to the Altar of the Living God, to be a living sacrifice, like the daughter of Jephthah—to die to herself, in order to live *with* and *for* her people. In the words of the Russian writer Leskov, “A life was coming to an end: a ‘*Vita*’ was beginning.” The young Queen did not prepare her heart for a feast, but for a consecration—that is, a sacrifice. How could one not respond with one's whole heart, one's whole soul, and one's whole strength, “O Lord, save the Queen: and hear us when we call upon Thee.”

The Queen has brought all her youthful life, and given it up to God *for* her people. And not only God, but all, have accepted and received this gift. How carefully, worshipfully, are we to live now, to remain true to the gift of God, and the oath pledged on both sides.¹

* * * * *

The Service begins with the Recognition of the Queen by all those who are present both in the Abbey Church and in the wide world. The Archbishop of Canterbury presents the Queen to her people and asks, “All you who are come this day to do your homage and service, are you willing to do the same?” Thus did he turn to the four quarters of the earth, and from each of them came a firm, truthful, and decided reply—“God save Queen Elizabeth.” And all those who heard *how* that reply was given, without any hesitation, will witness that her people stand as a faithful, devoted bodyguard round the Queen, speaking of whom Churchill said, “. . . the Lady whom we respect because she is our Queen, and whom we love because she is herself.”

After the Recognition, follow the Coronation, and the Holy Communion Service. First of all, the Queen takes the Oath that she is to rule the peoples and countries given to her by the will of God in accordance with law, justice, mercy, and freedom: that she will keep whole the Faith of her people. Of this she is to be reminded by the Holy Bible, presented to her by the Moderator of the Church of Scotland with the words, “Here is wisdom: this is the royal law: these are the lively oracles of God.”

* * * * *

I will not attempt to describe the Service. All could read, see, or hear it. But I want to say a few words about the Homage. The representative of each of the orders of peers approached the Queen seated upon her throne in full regalia, surrounded by her supporters. He knelt down before her, and put his hands in hers, reading his Oath in the name of those whom he was representing, all of whom knelt at the same time, thus taking part in the action.

¹ Cf. the Queen's Address to her People—“I have in sincerity pledged myself to your service, as so many of you are pledged to mine. Throughout all my life and with all my heart I shall strive to be worthy of your trust.”

The first to approach was the Duke of Edinburgh. And this, it seems to me, was a great and beautiful thing—a “mystery”—the acceptance of all that kingly service meant to her: the recognition that his wife is also his queen—a sacrifice of self as great as the Queen’s; a new depth in their life; a renewal, at the greater depth of the Church of God, of the marriage vows which build the “Small Church of the Christian family.”

* * * * *

While entering the Abbey Church, and during the days that followed, I watched the crowd; I looked into the faces of all whom I met; I listened to the comments made by various people—from the simplest folk up to the varied company the Archbishop of Canterbury called together at his Coronation Garden Party. Each and all were full of a true, vivid gladness, without a shadow of indifference, or of envy; a joy personal, direct, that the Lord had given to the Country and to the Empire a Queen who in her short lifetime had won the love and respect and wholehearted devotion of all. It really has been a “spiritual spring of life and joy,” a time of renewal, of raising of our best hopes, of a vital and cheerful move towards the building up of a new life, the life of the Kingdom of God. And this shall be, if only we, all, unfeignedly, soberly put our hands to the plough, and, with the Queen and *for* the Queen, give up our lives into the hands of God.

RESTORATION OF THE BULGARIAN PATRIARCHATE

We print here (translated from the French) the letter received by the Archbishop of Canterbury from the newly-elected Patriarch of Bulgaria and Metropolitan of Sofia, to which the Archbishop has replied offering his congratulations:—

Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Church, No. 3697, May 23rd, 1953.
Sofia.

TO THE MOST REV. THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY GEOFFREY
FRANCIS FISHER, LONDON.

YOUR GRACE,

With brotherly affection in Christ, we announce to Your Grace that on May 10th, 1953, at Sofia, that city protected by the Almighty and capital of the National Bulgarian Republic, your humble servant was elected Patriarch of Bulgaria and Metropolitan of Sofia by the Church Council in conformity with the Statute of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. On the same day in the patriarchal cathedral of St. Alexander Nevsky, the enthronization took place according to the ecclesiastical order approved by the Holy Synod with the participation in the prayers of the whole Bulgarian episcopate, of well-beloved representatives of dear and much honoured sister Churches—Russian, Georgian, Antiochene, Rumanian, Polish, Czechoslovak—of clergy devoted to the Lord and of the pious faithful people.

Other very dear sister Churches associated themselves with this great solemnity and in the deep joy of our faithful people, manifesting their sentiments in a touching manner.

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church has existed for more than eleven centuries (since A.D. 865) and during this long period of a life overwhelmed with blessings, she has attained spiritual maturity in giving birth to a large number of Saints and servants of God. Already in A.D. 927, following the order laid down, she was honoured with the dignity of a Patriarchate which was confirmed in A.D. 1235 by the Great Council of Lampsacus (on the Asiatic shore of the Dardanelles).

When Bulgaria, at the end of the 14th century, was conquered by the Turks, the independent Bulgarian Church also ceased to exist. However, her autocephaly was reinstated a long time ago and this forced the necessity for her once more to have her canonical head, so that her ancient universally recognized patriarchal dignity could be restored, as had long since been agreed by the Holy Synod and foreseen in the Statute for the Bulgarian Orthodox Church.

The election of the head of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church became a canonical and vital necessity after the resignation in September 1948 of its then head, His Beatitude the former Exarch Stephan, which was accepted by the Holy Synod. On May 10th, 1953, by the voice of the Church Council, this heavy and responsible lot became that of your humble servant, who up to the day of the election had served by the Grace of God as Bishop for 17 years, 15 of them as Metropolitan of Plovdiv and nearly 2½ as Acting President of the Holy Synod.

Following the custom adopted in relations between the Churches, We inform Your Grace by this brotherly letter of our election to the Bulgarian Patriarchal Throne and enthronization. At the same time we announce to you that we are going to continue as at present, in full accord with the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, to be fervent in the unalterable Faith of Salvation, to strive to maintain it both in its purity and activity and in the truthful preaching of the Saving Word of God.

We shall be eager to strengthen the Holy Church of God in the spirit and truth of its founder, Jesus Christ, and of the apostolate of the Holy Apostles, observing jealously the canonical estate and the pious traditions of the Holy Catholic Church. We shall take our full part with joy in the Lord in strengthening and deepening the links of love between the Churches of the different countries. As much as we can we shall work, and we shall also pray for peace, goodwill and brotherhood among the peoples.

We beg you to pray that God will bless our ministry, that it may be agreeable to him, of service to the Church and beneficial for your humble servant and for the faithful people.

We remain, Your Grace, with all our love in our Lord,

Your humble brother and fellow officiant

CYRIL

Patriarch of Bulgaria.

—The Patriarchal status thus resumed by the Bulgarian Church is very much older in its origins than that of the other Slav Churches—its recognition dating from A.D. 927, while that of the Serbian Patriarchate dates

only from 1346, and that of the Russian from 1592. Nor should we forget that it was in Bulgaria that the disciples of SS. Cyril and Methodius, expelled from Moravia, completed the work of translation of Scriptures and Liturgy, with the result that the language in liturgical use throughout the Slav Orthodox world is really Old Bulgarian. But the Serbian Patriarchate lapsed only from 1766 to 1920. And in Russia, from 1700 to 1917, the office of Patriarch was suppressed, but not the Patriarchal status of the Church. In the list of Bulgarian Patriarchs, the name of the newly-elected Cyril immediately succeeds that of Euthymius, who was expelled in 1393. And the Patriarchate had also been suppressed between 1018 and 1235. The vicissitudes of Bulgarian desire for full independence bring before us very clearly that tension between Orthodox hallowing of nationalism and Orthodox Romaic supernationalism, which has ever been one of the most creative, if also one of the most disturbing, factors in Eastern Church history.

From 1393 to 1767, a certain measure of autonomy under Constantinople was allowed to the Archbishops of Ochrida. But even this was at last suppressed. And Ochrida itself has, of course, long been far outside actual Bulgarian territory—though momentarily reannexed thereto during the last war. With the resurgence of the Balkan peoples during the 19th century, Bulgarian aspirations for an independent Church revived. And in 1870 a firman was obtained from the Sultan for the establishment of an Exarchate. But Bulgarian insistence that this Exarchate should have jurisdiction over all Bulgarians in Europe, independently of territorial boundaries, led to a breakdown of negotiations with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and a schism which was only healed in 1945. Actually, the Exarch was resident in Turkey until 1913. And on the death of its second holder in 1915, the office was left vacant, owing to various circumstances, until the end of the last war, when steps were taken, under Russian auspices, to reorganize the Bulgarian Church, and the Metropolitan Stefan of Sofia was elected Exarch. His resignation was secured in 1948. And two years later an elaborate Church Statute was passed providing for the election of a Patriarch. The Council prescribed in the Statute was convened on May 8th, 1953, and the Metropolitan Cyril of Plovdiv was duly elected by an overwhelming majority (104 out of the 107 electors). So Bulgarian aspirations approach to their fulfilment.

We say approach. For their full achievement can only come with the recognition of the Patriarchate by Constantinople and all other Orthodox Churches. And the one-sided action of the Bulgarian Council in failing to consult them—and Constantinople in particular—before proclaiming the Patriarchate, has put an obstacle in the way of such recognition. It is to be noted that, while all the autocephalous Churches in the Soviet sphere (with the noticeable exception of the Albanian Church) were represented at the Council, of the Churches outside that sphere Antioch alone was represented—and that, in the end, only by the Antiochene apocrisiarius in Moscow, Archimandrite Basil Samaha. Other Churches (Alexandria, Jerusalem, Serbia) replied with a certain guardedness to the invitations. And the Ecumenical Patriarch and the Archbishop of Athens have refused

recognition to the restored Patriarchate. The attitude of the Ecumenical Patriarch has been set out in an Encyclical¹ in which the Patriarch states that with the termination of the schism in February, 1945, the Bulgarian Church had autocephaly, but a nominal subordination to the throne of Constantinople remained. "The Ecumenical Throne is astonished at the unilateral action of the Bulgarian Church, which is introducing innovations, and, with complete contempt for the authority of her mother Church, departing from Church order, and from the agreement signed in 1945. It would have been fitting for the Bulgarian Church to demonstrate in action its zeal and standing in Church life, and only then to ask from the Ecumenical Throne elevation to the Patriarchal dignity, with the agreement of the other heads of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches." The Encyclical concludes, however, on the note that the restoration of the Patriarchate, lost in 1393 as a result of the destruction of the Bulgarian State, would be "a natural solution of the Bulgarian question." So the door is not closed. And it is to be remembered that the Rumanian Church, with no ancient history of a Patriarchate on which to base its claim, assumed Patriarchal status by unilateral action in 1925, and yet the Ecumenical Patriarch, though not without some protestation, recognized the new Patriarch before the end of the year. And the first creation of the Bulgarian Patriarchate also might be claimed as a kind of precedent. The Tsar Simeon had assumed Patriarchal status for his Church, and the imperial title for himself, without Constantinople's authority, some years before both were given, on his death in A.D. 927, the requisite recognition from the City.

The new Patriarch's record and personality arouse our interest. Born early in 1901, he had his early theological training in Sofia and Belgrade, returning in 1922 to Sofia to teach in the newly opened theological faculty there. He became a monk towards the end of 1923, then went for two years to continue his theological education at Cernauti. On his return to Bulgaria in 1926, we find him as secretary of the Rila monastery, but he went back to Cernauti the next year to take a doctorate, then spent two years (1928-9) specializing in Philosophy at Zagreb, Vienna, and Berlin. Ordained Priest early in 1930, he became Protosyncellus of the Metropolitan of Sofia in 1931, Archimandrite and head of the cultural and educational section of the Holy Synod early in 1932, Secretary of the Holy Synod in 1935; was consecrated Bishop in July, 1936, and became Metropolitan of Plovdiv in 1938. Since January, 1951, he has been Acting President of the Holy Synod—the third holder of that office since the resignation of the Exarch Stefan in 1948.

The Council which elected him to the Patriarchate was occupied also with the election of a Supreme Church Council, and with amendments to the present Constitution of the Church. There is much here which deserves our attention, and it is hoped to publish fuller accounts in a subsequent issue.

D.J.C.

¹ Published in *Tserkovni Vestnik* (June-July, 1953)—the organ of the Russian Church in Paris of the Constantinople jurisdiction.

CHURCH AND STATE IN YUGOSLAVIA

(From a Correspondent)

The Law to regulate the legal position of religious bodies. (Duplicated text with comment)

Yugoslavia: the Church and the State (92 pages)

BOTH these documents are issued by the Yugoslav Embassy in London, and the text of the Law is printed here. It will be observed that the provisions of this law are not very specific or clearly defined and their actual application is obscure. Many questions are left unanswered, and it is doubtful how far such a law as this will be a protection for the Church against the State.

The present position in Yugoslavia is notable for the considerable powers wielded by the authorities of the various constituent Yugoslav Republics. This has been a feature of Tito's policy since the earliest days, and this present law clearly leaves the decision about details to the authorities in each locality.

The result of this state of affairs is that the treatment of the Church varies very much from place to place according to the attitude of the local Communist officials. In Montenegro, for example, the Orthodox Church has a particularly difficult time. The Central Government may therefore claim to have the most blameless intentions towards the Church without much affecting the local situation except perhaps in Belgrade.

Some of the provisions of the law are not clear. For example, it is not plain from sections 12 and 13 whether priests are to be permitted by law to go to the houses of their parishioners for the celebration of Masses, and it looks as if they will not be allowed to conduct classes of instruction in private houses. If such restrictions are indeed to be imposed they would rightly be regarded as unwarrantable and oppressive interferences with religious liberties.

There is no doubt from the present actions of the Communist authorities in Yugoslavia that official policy is to use the educational system in order to implant materialism in the young and in order to root out Christianity. It will be observed that there is nothing in the law to defend Christian children against being brought up as little atheists in the schools. It is therefore extremely disingenuous of the Yugoslav Embassy in its comment to pretend to the public that the attitude of its Government is the same as that of the Government of France, where private schools may be freely built and staffed by religious bodies.

The printed pamphlet "Yugoslavia: the Church and the State," which runs to 92 pages, contains a review of the relations between Church and State over a number of years, both before and after World War II. It is unfortunately necessary to admit that the strictures which are applied to Archbishop Stepinac have ample justification, and that the account given of the matter by the Yugoslav Government is substantially accurate. One must recognize that on this subject the views of the Orthodox in Yugoslavia correspond in the main with the views of the Communist Government, and are based on personal experience.

Other parts of the account of events since the war are, however, open to objection. It is somewhat misleading for the author to try to make out that the Priests' Associations are spontaneous expressions of the desire of clergymen to associate with one another. It is well known that these bodies are sponsored by the Communist Government and are run by pro-government priests, apparently for the purpose of undermining the authority of the hierarchy of the Church. Indeed one may discover on page 66 of the pamphlet an indiscretion admitting this, the Vatican's opposition to the Priests' Associations being put down to its general opposition to everything the State does.

The pamphlet quotes the statement of the Serb Patriarch in reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury's statement of December 1952. There is good reason to suppose that the Archbishop's remarks were widely welcomed among Serb Orthodox both inside and outside Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav Government is very anxious to try to persuade Western Christians that it takes a neutral attitude to religion, neither "for" nor "against." This is not true, and is no more than a dish for Western palates. The relaxations which have taken place have been on the surface. The power of the State is directed to rooting out religion wherever possible, to decreasing its influence and to preventing the young from learning anything but Communist materialism and atheism.

THE LAW TO REGULATE THE LEGAL POSITION OF RELIGIOUS BODIES

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 1. Citizens of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia are guaranteed freedom of conscience and freedom of profession of religion.

Citizens of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia may profess any religious belief or belong to whatever religious body they wish, or profess no religion nor belong to any religious body.

The profession of a faith is the private concern of citizens.

Section 2. Citizens are free to found religious bodies.

All creeds enjoy equal rights and all religious bodies are equal before the law.

The activities of religious bodies must be in accord with the Constitution and the law.

Section 3. Religious bodies are free to conduct their church affairs and their religious rites.

Religious bodies may publish and disseminate religious publications, such publications being governed by the general regulations regarding publications.

Section 4. Education is separated from the church. There is freedom to impart religious instruction in churches, temples or any other premises appointed for this purpose.

Religious bodies are free to found special religious schools (lower secondary, secondary and higher schools) for the training of priests and may administer such schools.

Section 5. The misuse of religious affairs, religious instruction, religious publications, religious rites or any other manifestation of religious sentiments for political purposes is prohibited.

The incitement or exacerbation of religious intolerance, hatred or dissension is prohibited.

Any prohibition of or obstruction to religious assemblies, religious instruction, religious rites or of any other manifestation of religious sentiments is prohibited.

Section 6. Nobody may in any manner whatsoever be compelled to become a member of any religious body, to remain in any such body, or to leave any such body.

Nobody may in any manner whatsoever be compelled to take part in religious rites, processions or any other manifestation of religious sentiments.

Nobody may prohibit citizens from taking part in religious rites or any other manifestations of religious sentiments.

Nobody may compel any member of a religious body not to take advantage of the rights he possesses as a citizen under the Constitution and the laws.

Section 7. The rights of citizens under the Constitution and the Laws may not be limited on account of their religious convictions, on account of their belonging to any religious creed or any religious body, or on account of their taking part in the carrying out of religious rites or any other manifestation of religious sentiments.

Religious bodies, their priests, religious representatives or members of any profession of faith enjoy no preference, privilege or special protection.

Membership of any creed or the profession of any faith frees no person from those general civic, military or other duties which the law imposes on citizens.

Section 8. Religious bodies and their administrative units are legal entities in civil jurisprudence.

Section 9. The priests of the various creeds have the right to form their own associations.

Such associations of priests shall be subject to the general regulations regarding public associations.

Section 10. The decisions of religious bodies regarding matrimonial disputes or in matters of a disciplinary nature, or any other decisions of religious bodies, are void outside the religious body making them.

Section 11. The Federal Executive Council or the Executive Council of any Republic may give religious bodies material aid. The decision by which such aid is allocated may include provisions that the aid so granted shall be used in whole or in part for a specific purpose or purposes.

Religious bodies dispose of any allocated material resources independently, though where such aid is granted for a specific purpose, the religious body in question may be required to account for the use made of it.

Section 12. No person may be compelled to contribute to any religious purpose or prevented from so doing.

The collection of contributions for religious purposes is allowed in churches, temples and other appointed premises. Outside such premises contributions may be collected only with the permission of the People's Committee of the district or town.

Priests may receive emoluments for their performance of religious rites on the request of individuals, either in money or in some other customary manner, and regardless of whether the rite is performed in a church or temple, in the home of the believers or in any other place where such a rite is customarily performed.

THE PERFORMANCE OF RELIGIOUS RITES

Section 13. Religious rites, held in assemblies, may be freely performed in churches, temples or other public premises appointed by a religious body for the performance of such rites, as well as in courtyards, at lych-gates, in cemeteries or in any other public premises connected with a church or temple.

The holding of processions and other such religious rites outside premises listed in the preceding section may be permitted by the People's Committee of a district or town on the basis of regulations determined by the Executive Council of a Republic.

The provisions of the above paragraph do not apply to religious celebrations of family festivals, marriages or burials.

The competent People's Committee of a district or a town, as part of general

measures undertaken for the protection of public health and public order, may prohibit the holding of religious gatherings whilst the conditions giving rise to the measures exist.

Section 14. The act of christening and the act of circumcision of minors may be performed only on the demand of both parents of the child, or of its guardian. If the minor is over 10 years of age, his or her consent shall also be required.

Section 15. A wedding according to religious rites may be performed only after conclusion of marriage before the competent state representative and a christening only after the birth has been registered.

Section 16. Persons in hospitals, homes for the aged, hostels and similar institutions may within the limitations of the domestic rules of the institution, profess their faith, and be visited by a priest if they so desire.

Section 17. Bells on churches and temples and church buildings may be rung at times of general danger (fire, flood and so forth). The religious representative who administers the church building may not refuse the use of bells in such circumstances.

THE GIVING OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Section 18. Religious bodies themselves administer schools for training priests, freely draw up the programme and scheme of instruction and freely appoint teachers.

The State only maintains general supervision of the work of religious schools.

Section 19. Pupils of the regular educational establishments may not attend religious instruction in school hours. For attendance at religious instruction the approval of both parents or of the guardian and the consent of the minor concerned are necessary.

Schools for the training of priests may be attended only by persons who have completed their obligatory basic education.

Section 20. Persons attending schools for training of priests can enjoy those rights which are recognized to other students.

More immediate regulations concerning the enjoyment of these rights will be issued by the Federal Executive Council.

CONCLUDING PROVISIONS

Section 21. Any person infringing the provisions of this Law, provided such infringement is not otherwise a criminal act, shall be liable to a fine of up to 10,000 dinars or of up to fifteen days imprisonment.

Section 22. If by misuse of religious instruction a criminal act is committed, the court may, in addition to the sanctions provided by the Law, also close the religious school for a period of from one to ten years.

Section 23. The Federal Executive Council or otherwise the Executive Council of any Republic shall have charge of the administration of this Law and where necessary prescribe more detailed provisions for this purpose.

Section 24. This Law comes into force one week after publication in the Official Gazette of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.²

THE ORTHODOX AND THE THIRD WORLD CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIAN YOUTH

(The following account of the Conference was published in *Ekklesia*, Feb. 1st, 1953, from the Archimandrite Panteleimon Karanikolas, of the Church of Greece, an Orthodox member of the Conference.)

THE Third World Conference of Christian Youth was held in the city of Kottayam in Travancore in Southern India from the 11th to the 25th of last December.

² The Law was published in the Official Gazette of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia No. 22, May 27th, 1953.

Since the First and Second Conferences had met in Europe, at Amsterdam in 1939, and at Oslo in 1947, it was decided that the Third should be called in Asia.

India was preferred as the place of assembly, first because this would give moral encouragement to the Christian minority there, which scarcely reaches the number of 9 million in a total population of 427 million inhabitants; secondly, because the Syrian-Orthodox Churches were celebrating the 19th Centenary of the visit of the Apostle Thomas to that part of India; thirdly, because Travancore is famous throughout the world for its incomparable natural beauties; and finally, because, in view of the many colleges in this province, it would not be difficult to find accommodation for the 3,000 and more representatives of the fifty and more countries represented at the Conference.

The Conference met under the aegis of the following organizations: the World Student Christian Federation, the World Council for Christian Education, the World's Alliance of Y.M.C.A.s, and the World Council of Churches.

The general character of the Conference was mutual understanding between the representatives, and mutual respect, within the Christian spirit and civilization.

The aim of the Conference was the gathering together of representatives of Christian youth from all the world for the practical demonstration by each one of the indwelling of Christ in his heart, and for the common discussion, on the basis of Christ and His Gospel, of the great contemporary problems which are occupying Christians and all mankind.

The five subjects which occupied the Conference are the following:—

1. *How shall we teach Christ and His Gospel to those of other religions, to the intellectuals without religion, to the Marxists, and to the indifferent?* The conclusion was, in a few words, that we should preach the Gospel to all fervently and without ceasing, by our life and by our words, in the manner best adapted to the differing circumstances.

This preaching of the Gospel of Christ should be done with zeal, with much love, and with effort to understand the life of those to whom the preaching is directed.

In this ministry, it should be no matter if one is thought "foolish" or suspect, given that the preaching of Christ is, for the indifferent and the unbelieving, "foolishness," while for every one, and for the unbelievers themselves, when they believe, it is changed into the "power of God" and the "wisdom of God."

Likewise in regard to Christians, work is needed for mutual understanding between them and between the Christian Churches, and for restoration of the Christian community to the spiritual level of virtue of the Christians of New Testament times.

2. *The Christian teaching in relation to the present-day search for social justice and personal freedom.* The conclusion of the discussions was that all things in man are imperfect, and that he who denies his dependence on God is not free at all.

Human freedom is understood as that which results from man's serving the purpose and plan of God.

The fundamental error of communism is that it bases freedom outside the purpose of God, and limits all things to man and the present life.

Communism puts freedom in danger: and the reply of Christianity to communism is the opposition of the former to the latter not only on the ground of purely economic systems and beliefs, but also by the study of communism, and more especially of its ideas about man; by profound study of the Christian religion; by the setting of Christian love against communistic hatred; and by the effort of Christians, individually and corporately, to champion the poor and the suffering, and to make their influence felt for the solution of social problems.

3. *The Church as witness of Jesus Christ.* What was achieved here, and afterwards incidentally in the discussions about the nature of the Church, was the formulation about the Gospel that this is the Good News about what God did by His intervention in History, by the sending of His Son to live as a man, to die on the Cross, and to save man; as also no less by the founding of the Church after His Resurrection to continue His work.

4. *The demands of Christ in our personal and family relationships.* In the discussions on this point we touched on the problems of human misery resulting from divers factors, including war; and the necessity of help on the part of Christians for the radical or partial healing of this misery.

Likewise we discussed the problems of the present-day family, and the two extremes—first, the unbridled liberty observed in the West; second, the tradition still in force in the East, where only the decision of the parents is of force in the case of the marriage of their children: and it was agreed that both these extremes, and especially the first, led to the present-day loosening of family ties, the dangers of which the Christian youth of to-day is called to face in the light and power of the Gospel.

5. *Christ and His teaching in the present-day world of international tension.* On this subject, there was no disagreement in regard to the view that there is no difference in the face of Christ between coloured and white men and races. As to the question of war, likewise, there was agreement that the Christian ought always, both individually and corporately, as also when he disposes of power and influence, to work in such a way that war may, if possible, be averted, and peaceful solutions found for the various problems.

In regard to the participation or otherwise of the Christian in war, the majority of the Asiatics, and of the coloured races generally—except those who had had personal experience of communism—and almost all the representatives of Latin America, ranged themselves with the pacifist view, while on the other hand the English-speaking delegates, and we Europeans, held the view that in the case of war the Christian has not to choose between good and evil but, unfortunately, between two evils; when he can, and must, choose what is not the worse.

Finally all agreed that on the issue of the Christian's partaking or not partaking in war, he ought to choose the lesser of two evils.

Apart from the discussions on these five subjects, through the whole length of the Conference, the representatives were split up into groups for study of the New Testament: and we discussed it, crystallizing our thoughts

as to the right way of study of it and of Holy Scripture in general—that such study should not be dry and formal, but oiled and based upon a fervent inner disposition and a rich religious consciousness.

Likewise, when we have to teach it, we should first create the above conditions for the others also. In regard to the manner of teaching, it was judged that this generally can vary from theoretical teaching to visual means.

We Orthodox representatives at the Conference were few—three from Greece, one from Constantinople, one from the Russian Diaspora, and two from the region of Antioch—the one from Lebanon, the other from Syria.

The fact was also noticeable that the Roman Catholics were at last showing an interest in the Ecumenical Movement. Thus at this Conference, for a concrete example, on December 20th, the day of the celebration of the 19th Centenary of the visit of the Apostle Thomas to India, three Roman Catholic Bishops took part in the festivities, and sat with the Bishops and clergy of all the other Churches and confessions, and one of them was included among the speakers of the day, and spoke to the representatives and the rest of the people assembled, which exceeded 30,000, at Kottayam.

We Orthodox representatives had the opportunity to follow discourses delivered specially for the representatives by learned professors like the German Professor Niemöller. Likewise we had the opportunity to speak both in the group meetings and in the full meetings of the Conference. We were listened to by all with great attention, and it was said by many of the Protestants that the Orthodox Church enjoys a great respect from them all, since it has not a past of a kind that should irritate separated Christians, nor a totalitarian organization, while on the other hand it has a rich and impressive ritual, an exceptional and well-conceived conservatism, as also the coherence and the Faith of the One and undivided Church, elements of which have been lost by most of the Protestant Churches—and they are conscious of this defect.

We had the possibility, in the conduct of the meetings, of formulating our opinions, and influencing the taking of decisions and the formulation of findings.

Our conservatism, on another side, gave the occasion for the examination and re-examination of the various questions, and likewise gave occasion to the representatives of the Protestant churches to think very seriously about the existence and life of the Orthodox Church, which constitutes one of the three principal groups of the Christian world, and on the one hand holds elements which cannot be slandered as Roman Catholic, while on the other hand it disagrees radically with the greater part of Protestant teaching, and believes, finally, that it possesses in itself all the prerequisites and marks of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

In private conversations, we had the opportunity to reply to questions and doubts of many of the representatives, and to speak to them about the texture, the life, the faith, and the organization of our Church, and about very many other things.

Many expressed their amazement at what they heard, since what they

knew about the Orthodox Church had come from Roman Catholic sources.

The result of all this was, first, the expression in full conference by the mouth of David Wilcox of an exhortation that all the Protestants should try to get to know the Orthodox Church better, since it has very many things to teach them; and secondly, the desire expressed by the representatives to the Council of the Youth Section of the World Council of Churches, that there should be organized in the near future a Conference in which half the number of the representatives should be Orthodox, so that opportunity might be provided, by intercourse with them and by discussions in the meetings, for the Orthodox Church to be known at closer quarters by the Protestants.

The general title of the Conference, set from the beginning, was “Christ is the Answer”; because Christians from the ends of the world were going to discuss on subjects and problems with the Christian teaching for their criterion.

The Conference ended with the same slogan, and with the fuller understanding of it—that always, and in proportion to our virtue, and our penetration by study and experience into His divine Will, He is for all questions the only and final Answer.

Archimandrite PANTELEIMON KARANIKOLAS

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF ORTHODOX YOUTH

APRIL 7TH–12TH, 1953

ON Easter Tuesday, the very day of the Annunciation, a momentous Conference of Orthodox Youth was opened in the small Paris suburb of Sèvres—truly momentous because of the magnitude of the tasks which it was facing for the first time in the history of the Orthodox Church; tasks the fulfilment of which would indeed be epoch-making.

The first cause for rejoicing was in the actual composition of the conference. There were representatives, though not always official, of almost all local Orthodox Churches, and of the different nationalities entering therewith. The second cause for rejoicing was the peaceful participation in the work of the conference of delegates belonging to the same nationality, but to different and usually hostile jurisdictions. There was the overwhelming sense of true Orthodox universality—of our all belonging to the One True Church.

There were present representatives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and of the Patriarchates of Antioch, Moscow, and Serbia, and of autocephalous and autonomous Churches—the Greek; the Finnish; the Russians-in-exile; the Russian Exarchate in Western Europe of the Ecumenical Patriarchate; the Rumanians-in-exile; the Georgians in France; French of the Western rite; and German and English Orthodox belonging to various jurisdictions. Representatives of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches were present as guests; among them the well-known Dominican theologian, Fr. Dumont; Mr. R. Strong representing the Y.M.C.A., and the Rev. B. T. Molander and Mr. Ph. Maury from the World Council of Churches in Geneva.

The Conference was centred round prayer. And it was due to this that seemingly insuperable difficulties were miraculously overcome.

The first Liturgy (Wednesday, April 8th) was celebrated in French by a Georgian Priest from Paris, Fr. Elias Melia. The choir also sang in French: and it was thus possible for all nationalities to be united in the service.

The difficulties facing us when we started our work were so great that at times the whole conference seemed non-existent. The two problems, of nationalism and of jurisdiction, left to us by the previous generation, were like horrible festering wounds. To ignore them was impossible: to touch upon them would cause pain, and perhaps ruin our work. But before we had decided upon a course of action, the questions arose before us in a practical way. One of the national committees in Paris, the Serbian, which has no internal divisions, and is canonically under its own Patriarch, refused to send delegates to the conference on the ground that the organizers of the Conference took an unfriendly view of their Church. The attitude of the Paris Serbs was upheld by others, such as the Rumanians: and it seemed that the Conference was going to end before it had begun.

The Greek delegates kept emphasizing their caution and unwillingness to compromise themselves in the eyes of their brothers in Greece by the creation of an "Orthodox Centre" in Paris (which of course we were not doing): and the different Russian groups each reflected the attitude of its own jurisdiction towards the hierarchy, the Ecumenical Movement, and the solution of national and territorial questions.

One might well have despaired.

But the Spirit breathes where it lists. Peaceful co-operation in the Holy Spirit prevailed. Among the young people at the Conference the urge to unity and canonicity, to membership of the One True Church in the face of an unbelieving world, to the victory of Orthodoxy, was so strong that the miracle happened.

In response to the call of their Serbian brothers in Germany and England, the Serbian delegates from Paris came to the Conference, after one of its organizers with truly Christian humility had publicly underlined his friendly attitude towards them. They not only came, with the other dissenting groups, but joined in the work of the Conference with sincere enthusiasm, showing how much they were in sympathy with the main idea.

After this incident particularly, there is no doubt that all delegates were agreed that this main idea is infinitely dear to us. And that was everything: the success of the Conference and of the work that would follow it depended upon this. By this inner agreement, by this truly Orthodox faith in One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, the Spirit of God vanquished the evil one.

Liturgical communion was achieved, and this turned out to be the most important thing. As a result of the presence of Priests of different Churches which were in canonical communion with both, even those who might have appeared to be out of communion with each other were able to be included—as has happened more than once in the history of the Orthodox Church.

On Thursday the Divine Liturgy was celebrated in Slavonic (Russian and Serbian style) and Finnish; on Friday in German and Arabic; on

Saturday in Greek, English and French. Thursday evening Vespers was a full episcopal service (with Bishop Cassian of Catania), conducted in Greek and Slavonic. Priests of different jurisdictions celebrated together, and at the last solemn Liturgy, held at the Theological Academy in Paris, every one received Communion, irrespective of jurisdiction or opinions held. Here indeed was the greatest victory there could have been.

Lit up by the rays of this Divine Light, the problems before the conference appeared less formidable than they would otherwise have done:—

1. The formation of an organization to unite Orthodox youth all over the world:

2. Our attitude to the Hierarchy:

3. Our attitude to the Ecumenical Movement:

4. National and Territorial boundaries:

5. Methods of Church work among Orthodox young people:

6. The missionary tasks of Orthodoxy:

7. The layman's task:

8. The Catholicity of the Church:

9. Orthodoxy in the present day.

Some of these questions arose according to plan, others spontaneously.

The programme included several papers:—

(a) J. F. Meyendorff (Lecturer at the Theological Academy in Paris) on "The Catholicity of the Church."

(b) Fr. Vasily Zenkovsky on "Sins and Shortcomings."

(c) P. A. Evdokimov on "The Layman's Responsibility."

(d) L. A. Zander on "Orthodoxy and Ecumenicism."

(e) Octavian Vuia (the Rumanian representative) on the same subject.

(f) Fr. P. Zacharias (German Orthodox Priest) on "The Catholicity of the Church in Orthodox Liturgical Life."

Discussions followed these papers both at the plenary sessions and in study groups: they were lively, and undoubtedly fruitful.

The lecturers' task was to answer the pressing questions of ecclesiology—i.e., the Orthodox teaching about the Church: for without the theoretical answers, it was impossible to make any progress in practical matters. From the choice both of themes and of lecturers it was obvious that there would be a large measure of theological agreement in the answers to these questions. This produced both good and bad results. The outlook presented to the audience was well thought out: but its one-sidedness inevitably produced an immediate reaction in the people who took a different view. This made the discussions more lively, and was a distinct advantage, since there was fundamental agreement about the main idea—Orthodox Unity.

J. F. Meyendorff in his exhaustive survey showed the essential Catholicity of the Church as unity and indivisibility. Any one familiar with his writings, and with those of Fr. Alexander Schmemmann and other representatives of that school, would see that his talk was an exposition of his main contention that the Church as the integral Body of Christ is present in all its fullness wherever it happens to be. From this followed the conclusion that the territorial principle was essential to Orthodoxy, and that diverse nationalities and authorities cannot affect this principle. This conclusion was not

explicitly stated in the lecture, but was made abundantly clear in the discussion.

One cannot but agree with the principle of fullness and wholeness in the Church, and its territorial corollary. But in any one-sided enthusiasm for a certain truth there is danger of error. And so in this case, one may overlook the human element in the Church if one gives too much attention to the divine. In the opinion of J. F. Meyendorff, as in the rest of the Paris school, one feels the danger of "ecclesiological monophysitism"—a peculiar idealism which does not or will not see the contemporary human problems of the Church as they really are. Since this mystical approach combined with an enthusiasm for history presents a Church very far removed from reality, the second lecturer's conclusions were no surprise: his task was to show this reality, which is in fact a Church full of sin. Nor was it surprising that one of the Greek delegates hotly opposed such a conception of Catholicity, insisting on philological grounds that the word meant not "wholeness in a particular place," but a practical agreement of the parts with the whole—i.e., of each individual Church-member, parish, diocese, or patriarchate, with all the rest, with the Church as a whole. In this discussion an old argument was reopened which filled the pages of the Parisian church press some years ago, the chief protagonists being Fr. A. Schmemmann on the one side, and Fr. Sophrony on the other. Both held somewhat extreme views: but it seems to me that the truth lies in a combination of the two.

Fr. Vasily Zenkovsky's paper was convincing both in form and content, but it still left one wondering how the holy and spotless Bride of the Lamb could be full of sin. One of the English delegates correctly remarked that we should change a preposition, and speak of the sins *in* the Church, not the sins *of* the Church. Perhaps Fr. Vasily meant to say precisely that: and in the discussion he did come to it. But there was good reason for his audience to be perplexed. When you are shown on the one hand an ideal divorced from reality, and on the other the sad facts, your only alternatives seem to be either to say that the Church does not exist at all, or that it has sinned in its entirety.

P. A. Evdokimov's paper also left one dubious. He showed most beautifully what the layman's ideal role in the Church should be, basing it strictly on Holy Scripture and liturgical practice in the Orthodox Church. But that vision seemed cut off from the integral conception of the Church, particularly in relation to the Hierarchy and practical life. In idealizing the Church's catholicity, Evdokimov like Meyendorff kept insisting on the "general priesthood of the laity." Although he did not deny the principle of hierarchy, and the sacrament of Orders, as such, he did not even mention the latter. This made the paper incomplete and obscure. And whenever one's thoughts descended from the heights of the lecturer's ideal to practical life, one was once again faced with the choice between saying either that the ideal was unattainable, or that the Church as such had sinned, and should be "reformed in an Orthodox manner."

The logical conclusion of this series of papers was Professor L. A. Zander's talk on "Orthodoxy and Ecumenism." Ecumenism is the only

way out for Orthodoxy, which finds itself in it, and obtains deliverance so from all its internal troubles: Ecumenism as true Orthodox universality is the embodiment of the Catholic Church on earth, provided the confessional basis is strictly observed: that this is so is confirmed both by actual life and by the canonical decisions of Orthodox hierarchs: any one who is against Ecumenism is against Orthodoxy itself. That was Prof. Zander's main theme. But here too the audience was left perplexed. This time the ideal was depicted on a world-wide scale: but again there was the tragic disparity between it and real life. Either one had to believe with the whole force of the Russian spirit, with its insistence on all or nothing, in the all-conquering movement of Christian Ecumenism, or to say "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

This is the outline of the papers. I may have presented them in too simplified a form and too subjectively: but that was my personal reaction. Of course there was not, and could not have been, a "plot" among the lecturers, as some people supposed. They disagreed with each other on many points, and each honestly put forward what he believed. But they all belonged not only to one nationality with its particular characteristics, but to one group within it, in jurisdiction and in theological ideas. They probably were not aware that, looked at from outside, they appeared as a group. In practice they denied their own main idea, that the fullness of the Church is present in any part of it. They found it necessary to take into account what others had to contribute. Here was the justification of Ecumenism; but only of an Orthodox Ecumenism, inspired by common participation in the Liturgy, one Faith and one Truth.

The paper read by Fr. Octavian Vuia went, as he himself warned us, beyond the limits of pure theology, and described a peculiar existentialist philosophy; while Fr. P. Zacharias's paper was highly specialized and dealt with the historical aspect of the Orthodox Liturgy. For this reason neither of these papers was reflected in the discussions.

There is no room here to report everything that was said: I can only summarize first the general conclusions, and then those on particular subjects.

The chief thing that became clear at the Conference was that in the interpretation of the Church there was a lack of balance between the human and divine elements. When the balance is preserved, the ideal becomes real and the real ideal. Grace is divine, and its vessels weak: but the strength of God is manifested in weakness. Unity and holiness are divine attributes: catholicity and apostolicity, human. The divine has no need of catholicity, which is a relationship with the whole. The very existence of this term shows the imperfections of the human element, which needs the union of the parts with the whole. One would not say of the Angelic Church that it is "catholic," because it is unity. But in contrast, only that man is a true Christian (in the full sense of the word) who is a Catholic—i.e., a member of the Church in word and deed. Apostolicity—i.e., the hierarchy with canonical succession—is the outward sign of this deed. In this human part of the Church there are, and are bound to be, sins (until the wheat is sifted from the tares): but there is always a sign of

the link with the divine holiness (the Sacraments) and unity (Love). "Schism" of whatever kind and "the Church" are incompatible conceptions.

A great merit of this Conference was that this idea became clear to all, and with that, problems which were insoluble became soluble.

To turn to these problems, listed earlier:—

1. *The Creation of an organization to bind together Orthodox Youth all over the world.* A special group of delegates devoted its energies to working out this problem. It consisted of representatives of all Churches and all nationalities; and it was agreed from the beginning that the Conference could not break up without forming some kind of permanent link which would continue the work here begun. The desire for the unity of all Orthodox youth (who represent the future of the Church) was so strong that it triumphed over all disagreements. These, however, appeared from the beginning. Some considered that a *Centre* was necessary, in the full sense of the term; while others were afraid of centralization, and suggested a federation. After night-long discussions, the suggestion of the Greek delegates was accepted that the name of the new organization should be the Greek New Testament word "*Syndesmos*" (= *bond*, Eph. iv. 3, Col. ii. 19, iii. 14): thus both Vatican centralization and Protestant federation would be avoided.

The Serbian delegation worked out the terms of association, and provided each delegate with a copy in French, which served as a basis for subsequent discussion. The final text was to be submitted at a Plenary Session. This was where the greatest difficulties began. A Greek delegate immediately said that the "*Syndesmos*" should be limited to Western Europe, because if it was "universal" in character it might cause misgivings in the Greek and other Orthodox Churches. To this objection many delegates (including the Russian) answered that the whole point was the gradual, if not immediate, uniting of all, and that geographical limitations would bring nothing but harm. The Finnish and Serbian delegations, who always spoke in the same strain, having previously agreed among themselves, said that though Finland and Yugoslavia were not in Western Europe, they had no intention of cutting themselves off from their countries and mother-Churches. In Finland there exists an organization of Orthodox Youth which is successfully developing under the leadership of the hierarchy; and it wants to take part in "*Syndesmos*" too: in Western Europe, on the other hand, there is only one Orthodox Finn, a student at the Theological Academy in Paris; and he will have to return to Finland. In Yugoslavia, no Youth Organizations on a religious footing are allowed by the Government: but young Orthodox are to be found in the Theological Faculty of the University, in the Seminaries, etc.: and they could be afforded much help and support by "*Syndesmos*" if it was not limited to Western Europe; particularly as all the Serbs living abroad as Churchmen support their Patriarch.

Still, greater disagreements arose over the question of the actual organization. Whom were the members of "*Syndesmos*" to represent? Some said, Churches: others, nationalities: a third group, youth organizations:

and a fourth stood for personal membership. The Serbian and Finnish delegations, who had come to the Conference with the blessing of their Bishops, kept insisting on hierarchical and canonical correctness. The Russians of the Constantinople Exarchate, who mostly represented youth organizations, wanted to keep that form of representation: while the Rumanians from Germany, who have neither their own Church nor organization, stood for representation by nationality. The remaining delegates joined one or other of these parties.

Eventually the following was agreed:—*Syndesmos* is not limited geographically, but is not yet called "world-wide"—that will depend on the Churches which take part in it. There will be represented in it Churches, according to their jurisdiction; the existing youth organizations (if they receive the blessing of a canonical hierarchy); and any nationalities not already represented in other ways. Furthermore, *Syndesmos* will have the power of co-opting a limited number of individuals who might be useful to it, regardless of membership of any particular Church, organization or nationality. But all members must have the blessing of their canonical Bishops.

Syndesmos will carry on its activities through a Conference, a Committee consisting of six members elected by the Conference and not more than four co-opted members, and a General Secretariat to deal with all current matters.

Both in electing and co-opting members, the different nationalities and jurisdictions must be borne in mind, so that none should be forgotten and none over-represented. The members of the Committee must all live in the same town for the smooth working of the scheme. It was unanimously decided that at present Paris is just such a centre. But it was clear from the beginning that the most difficult problem would be the choice of a General Secretary. All agreed that the whole responsibility and initiative in the work would be his: so it would be all the more difficult to find someone who would be suitable both personally and in jurisdiction and nationality. P. A. Evdokimov, who was Chairman of one of the discussion groups, proposed Professor L. A. Zander. But the Rumanian group hotly opposed him, considering that in spite of his authority he would be unsuitable because of his age (they wanted a *young* secretary) and the one-sidedness of his Church views. The Greeks, on the other hand, were most emphatic in their support of Professor Zander, pointing out his weight and connections in the Greek ecclesiastical world. Opinions were divided, so the Serbs suggested that the General Secretary should not be a Russian but a Greek, since in the Greek Church there are no "different jurisdictions" and such like difficulties. A representative of the Church of Greece was unanimously accepted as a second candidate—a theological student named John Lappas. But the Rumanian delegation then proposed that there should be a third candidate, a Serb. On the recommendation of the Priest of the Serbian Church in Paris, Fr. Vladimir Garič, Marko Marković, the secretary of the Serbian Church community, was chosen as third. He is a young man, a good organizer, who speaks several languages, and finished the Theological Academy in Paris. The candidates left the room,

and the discussion went on until the early hours of the next morning. It became clear that at the present time it would be wrong to hand over the running of Syndesmos to one person, and it was unanimously decided that there should be two General Secretaries. J. Lappas withdrew his candidature; so the names of M. Markovič and L. A. Zander were presented jointly for election at the plenary session. But here two other names were put up—Paul l'Huillier, an Orthodox French scholar of the Moscow jurisdiction, and J. F. Meyendorff, lecturer at the Theological Academy of St. Sergius (under the Constantinople Exarchate). There was a secret ballot, and Marko Markovič¹ and J. F. Meyendorff were elected.

They were to decide between themselves who should do the office work, and whose address should be the official one. They easily agreed that Marko Markovič should do the office work: and Syndesmos fixed him an appropriate salary out of its funds which would accrue from the monthly subscriptions of the various Churches, youth organizations and national groups that will form Syndesmos. Paul l'Huillier became a member of the Committee as a representative.

Thus the organization for linking together Orthodox Youth was formed—a great achievement when we consider all the difficulties that had to be overcome.

2. *Attitude to the Hierarchy.* This also was a difficult question. The Serbian delegation had prepared a list of all the existing Orthodox Patriarchates, etc., whose blessing Syndesmos should seek for its activities. The Serbs thus wanted to emphasize their own strictly canonical attitude, and the undividedness of the Serbian Church. But the representatives of the Church of the Russians-in-Exile were insistent that the Patriarchs should not be mentioned by name, and a phrase like "the chief Hierarchs" should be used: for they considered that Orthodox Youth could not turn to the Patriarch of Moscow for a blessing. Such an attitude was, however, unacceptable to the delegates of the Moscow jurisdiction, who, while they agreed that members of all other jurisdictions should take part in Syndesmos, and regarded that as in itself a good thing, naturally could not give up the blessing of their own Patriarch.

After a long discussion the following formula was evolved:—"With the blessing, prayers and guidance of all the Orthodox Patriarchs and heads of Autocephalous Churches." To make the hierarchical principle still clearer, the words were added, "And with the blessing of the local Bishop." Syndesmos itself should not apply for this blessing, but all its constituent members should apply, each to his own Patriarch or chief Bishop, according to his jurisdictional affiliation. In this way Orthodox Youth was united independently of its different jurisdictions, while each group remained faithful to its own hierarchy. The aim of Syndesmos is not to solve the problem of Church jurisdiction, but to work together for the good of Orthodoxy.

3. *Attitude to the Ecumenical Movement.* This question evoked an

¹ The address is: Mons. Marko Markovic, 9-bis, rue Jean de Beauvais, Paris Ve. All Orthodox, wherever they are, who are interested in "Syndesmos," are asked to write to this address, or (if in England) to Miss N. Theokritov, 36 Wynne Road, London, S.W. 9.

even more heated argument. On the actual invitation to the Conference was written "Centre of Orthodox Youth (in connection with the World Council of Churches)." The initiative came from circles connected with the Ecumenical Movement; and the question of this connection was apparently considered prejudged and undoubted. However, by no means all the delegates shared this view. It is well known that the majority of Orthodox Churches refused on ideological grounds to join the World Council of Churches. The Church of Greece at the last moment failed to send delegates to Lund. The Serbian Church, while maintaining good relations with Christians of other denominations and ecumenical organizations, is very cautious about its official participation in the movement. On the other hand the Ecumenical Patriarchate, and in particular its Russian Exarchate in Western Europe, take a very active part quite officially. For the Church of the Russians in exile this was one of the stumbling-blocks, and a cause of the unfortunate divisions as far back as 1926.

Thus the Orthodox Church as a whole has made no pronouncement on this subject: and for many delegates, to treat the answer to this question as a foregone conclusion would have meant usurping the rights of their Bishops. In practice it would have meant that Syndesmos, instead of being truly "pan-Orthodox," would have become a one-sided and provincial "child of Ecumenism."

The Serbian delegation, which was agreed within itself, considered that official mention of a link with the World Council of Churches would divide Orthodox Youth into two camps, and thus prove to be "anti-ecumenical" by separating those who so far had been united. They proposed that in the resolution it should be said that Syndesmos is not a part of any religious organization formed outside the Orthodox Church, or of the Ecumenical Movement. This proposal called forth a heated argument, ending in a unanimous agreement not to mention the word "ecumenical," or the World Council of Churches, at all, but just to point out that Syndesmos is independent of all non-Orthodox organizations. The word "ecumenical" appeared, however, in the resolution on missionary work, where it dealt with the attitude of the Orthodox in preaching to Christians of other denominations. The Serbs proposed that here too the word should be omitted to avoid any misunderstandings. Their proposal was accepted, and the phrase "a brotherly attitude" was substituted.

So Syndesmos is not part of the Ecumenical Movement nor of any of its organizations, and will not be until a decision has been reached by the whole Orthodox Church. But it leaves its members free to follow the ruling of their own local hierarchy in this matter.

4. *Nationality and territorial boundaries.* This question was no less awkward. The reader has already seen how the misunderstanding with the Serbian delegation began over this particular matter. It was further complicated by the fact that the organizers of the Conference held the theological view about territorial boundaries—i.e., that more than one Orthodox jurisdiction could not exist within the same territory. For theological reasons the Georgian Church in France put itself under the jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan Exarch, considering him the

"local" Bishop for all Orthodox in Western Europe, since "Western Europe is a territory of the Ecumenical Patriarchate." Conversely the Serbs, who for a long time were unable to procure themselves a separate Church, absolutely refused to leave the jurisdiction of their own Patriarch, and denied the theory of a "local" Bishop in France. This attitude was taken up by some other national groups, sometimes in an extremely chauvinistic form. Argument was very fierce, particularly in connection with the lectures. People were so carried away by the extremity of these views that they began to forget that the main point was *agreement*, and not a dissection of jurisdictions; that all the canons of the Church had this aim in view, but no single method of achieving it.

Reconciliation was effected during the discussion by Fr. Vasily Zenkovsky with a remarkably successful formula, which was particularly surprising in view of the accepted opinion of the Theological Academy of St. Sergius in Paris. Fr. Vasily said that we have here the result of sin (the Tower of Babel): but at the same time it is Divine Providence which sanctifies man through his national culture, and so brings him nearer to God. It is however unnatural for Orthodox people in the same territory not to be together. So both the national and the territorial principle have equal rights in the Orthodox Church. This should be the practical solution:—those who consider themselves to be permanent residents in a given territory should try to unite themselves in a single jurisdiction under the local Bishop; but those who are in a given place temporarily, and hope to return to their native land, have good reason to remain in the jurisdiction of their national mother-Church. It follows that parallel jurisdictions in the same territory are quite possible, though only as exceptions, and with the mutual agreement of the Hierarchy in a spirit of Love.

This new attitude among the members of the Theological Academy of St. Sergius may have far-reaching results. The different jurisdictions in the Orthodox Church may be able to make peace—as did the Orthodox Youth at the Conference—and the local Churches come to an agreement.

5. *Methods of Church Work with Young Orthodox.* There was little disagreement over the missionary tasks of Orthodoxy, and the "layman's task." Every one quickly agreed on the main issues. But the working out of these questions was valuable, thanks to the detailed attention they received in study groups. There is no time to deal with them here, but they might form the subject of another article.

When we gathered together for the final Liturgy, we felt that something really great had happened. The Spirit of God had conquered the evil one. That was clear to all, and we gave thanks to the Lord. We thanked too the initiators and organizers of the Conference with the warmest appreciation for their selfless work, which gave us the chance of feeling and realizing our Orthodox unity.

Words of thanks were spoken in their own languages by delegates on behalf of the national Churches during the final brotherly Easter meal.

VLADIMIR RODZIANKO,
Priest of the Serbian Church in London.

THE BYZANTINE CONGRESS AT SALONICA, APRIL 1953

THE Ninth International Congress on Byzantine Studies began at 9 a.m. on the first Sunday after Easter with a celebration of the Liturgy in the church of the Holy Wisdom at Salonica. This ancient city, named after Alexander the Great's sister, is a fitting place for a gathering of this kind to take place. It played an important part in the later history of the Empire, it was the chief centre of the Hesychast controversy, and it contains a number of very fine Byzantine churches. Although it was liberated from the Turks only just over thirty years ago, it already owns a flourishing university, within whose walls most of our activities took place.

After the Liturgy we made our way in the rain to the university, where in the great hall under the fresco of St. Demetrius, patron and protector of the city, after a prayer from the metropolitan the Congress was officially declared open by His Majesty King Paul of the Hellenes. Then began the complimentary speeches: first we were welcomed by the Greek officials of the Congress, and afterwards the representatives of over twenty different nations expressed their pleasure at attending the Congress in five different languages and many more different styles. The delegate from Austria spoke ancient Greek, and several others used the modern language instead of their own. Reference was made to St. Paul's sojourn in the city, and to the fact that Gregory Palamas and the apostles to the Slavs, St. Cyril and St. Methodius, had had their home there.

The next day the serious work of the Congress began. In the mornings from half-past nine till one papers were delivered in different sections: archaeology, history, literature, theology, law, and on one day only folklore. Those scholars whose interests were not strictly confined to one section found inevitably that they had to miss several of the papers they would have liked to hear as there were always four or five being delivered simultaneously in different rooms. This difficulty was increased by the tendency of many speakers to exceed the fifteen-minute limit, so that it was impossible to tell how much of its daily programme any section other than one's own had at any moment accomplished. The most popular section was probably the archaeological, whose work was continued in the first two afternoons by visits to the churches of the city conducted by Professor Sotiriou and Professor Pelekanides. One of the most interesting was the Church of the Twelve Apostles, with its beautiful but very fragmentary mosaics of the great festivals, which were only recently discovered. It was not of course possible to examine the churches adequately in so large a crowd, or to hear all the explanations provided, but there were plenty of opportunities to visit them again at one's leisure. On two other afternoons papers were given as in the mornings, and on the fifth day there was a performance of Greek folk songs and dances in the theatre. On four evenings there were receptions, and on the fifth a concert of modern Greek music was given. On the Saturday afternoon we were invited to evening prayers in the church of the Holy Wisdom, for which the metropolitan had provided an English version, so it was possible to follow the whole of the impressive service right up to the blessing of the loaves at the end. The next day there was the final meeting in the great hall of the university, when speeches of thanks were

made by the various delegates, and hope was expressed that we should meet again at Constantinople in 1955 for the Tenth Congress.

Although the Congress proper was now at an end, the next week was occupied by the related activity of two excursions, the first in eight motor buses to Kastoria, and the second by boat round Mount Athos, where a day was spent, and then by bus from Kavalla to Philippi, Drama, and Servae. We went first to Vérroia (Berea) where St. Paul was sent after the uproar in Salonica. Here we listened to an address from the mayor, and visited a tiny frescoed church. After lunch overlooking a deep valley on the other side of which rose the snow-capped peaks of Pieria, we passed through Kozani and reached Kastoria, near the Albanian border, in the evening. It is a small town on the neck of a peninsula in Lake Kastoria, which served as the place of exile for Byzantine political prisoners, who built over three hundred churches, of which only seventy-two now remain. The inhabitants now live by the fur trade. There is only one hotel, so the eight bus loads of visitors were accommodated in the private houses of many Kastorians who had willingly offered hospitality for two nights to the visitors. The next day we were shown some of the many churches, which are of the basilica type, only one being domed. A number of them contain frescoes of great interest. In the afternoon we were taken by boat to the Mavriotissa monastery further along the peninsula, where there are two churches with frescoes both inside and out, one of them containing a very full series of the life and miracles of Christ. That evening at a reception the freedom of the town was presented to Professor H. Grégoire from Brussels, and to Professor A. A. Vasiliev of Dumbarton Oaks. The following day we returned to Salonica through magnificent scenery near the Albanian and Yugoslav borders, stopping on the way at Edessa to admire the waterfalls.

The excursion to Athos was of the greatest interest. At dawn we approached the Holy Mountain, which rose sheer to its snowy height from a grey smooth sea. The ship coasted slowly along both sides of the peninsula, so that the monasteries with their welcoming monks could be clearly seen. Landings were made at three monasteries, Dochiariou, Vatopedi, and Dionysiou. The attempt of five women to join in these landings was the talk of the local newspapers for days afterwards.

What chiefly remains in the memory after returning home from the Congress, apart from the beauty of many places visited, is the unfailing hospitality and kindness of the Greeks. The secretary, Professor Zepos, whom we have to thank for the splendid organization of the Congress, made it his business to give each member a personal welcome, and the general atmosphere was friendly rather than official. The generous hospitality offered to the Congress quite as a matter of course by the Kastorians has already been mentioned. The whole fortnight was an unforgettable experience, which future Byzantine Congresses will find it hard to rival.

ELFRIDE BICKERSTETH.

THE "FILIOQUE" DISPUTE AND ITS IMPORTANCE

by VLADIMIR RODZIANKO

IT is very difficult to speak about this old dispute between the Eastern and the Western halves of Christendom without pointing out straight away its great importance. There is a tendency to-day, both in the East and in the West, to present it as a logomachy of the old days, to use Fr. Bulgakov's term—as an obscure inheritance from the darkness of the Middle Ages—and simply to neglect it as unimportant. There are people in Church circles to-day who even do not know its meaning, or have never heard of it at all.

At the same time Roman Catholic theology simply states that any opposition to the "Filioque" is the "Greek error," and there is no real *problem* in it at all, and it is not really important except for those who are devoted to special studies, or for practical questions of the Uniate Movement. There is nothing really new on the subject in Roman theology since the Councils of Lyon and Florence,¹ except a few articles in which Roman Catholic writers express the view that a solution of the problem is really needed. But they are very few and exceptional. We shall speak of them later on. Otherwise the whole tradition of the East concerning this subject is neglected in the West, and is often forgotten in the East itself.

In the Anglican and the Protestant world at large there is little interest in the "Filioque" problem, except for some valuable pieces of historical research in the last century, which we shall also mention later on in the course of this lecture.

I myself think that such an attitude is not a sign of any progress in theology or spiritual life, but its very opposite: it shows the ever-increasing spirit of lukewarmness and indifference which is so threatening to Christianity as a whole to-day, especially in the face of the new and powerful spirit of materialistic religion which vigorously confronts us.

The whole history of this dispute, which began much more than a thousand years ago, and has continued to such dates as 1947 and 1950,² shows that there is something really important underlying it.

It is our task to find out its meaning, and to try to give the real answers to the questions it raises.

First of all we must look more carefully at its history. Usually it is

¹ Both of these were summoned by the See of Rome, the first in A.D. 1274, the second in A.D. 1439, after diplomatic negotiations with the Greek Emperors, in order to establish the reunion of the Greeks with the Church of Rome. At these Councils the official teaching of the Roman Church about the "Filioque" was accepted as dogma. Largely based on St. Augustine's teaching, it stated that the Father and the Son constitute the one *principium* of the Holy Spirit, who proceeds "*ab ambobus tamquam ab uno principio*." The Council of Florence moreover declared that the Greek formula, "*ex Patre per Filium*," was quite as correct as the Latin "*ex Patre Filioque*." Hence came the official Roman theology of "*principium principatum*"—i.e. that the Father is the "original principle" and the Son the "originated principle" of the Holy Ghost (St. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, P.L. T. 42, cols. 1095–1096; Mansi, *Concil.* t. XXIV, col. 81; t. XXXI, cols. 1030, 1031; Palmieri, "Esprit Saint" in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Paris, 1913, 813; *Kohomsky Khristianskoye Chteniyé*, 1875, 298).

² In October, 1947, a Conference was arranged at Blackfriars, Oxford, concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit, at which papers on the subject were read by Roman Catholic, Anglican and Orthodox theologians (*Eastern Churches Quarterly*, Supplementary Issue, Vol. VII, 1948). In 1950 a similar Conference was held in France at Saulchoir ("Russie et Chrétienté," 1950, Nos. 3–4).

limited to the East-West dispute itself. Although some writers on the subject mention earlier dates, they still consider its real beginning to be on that day in the seventh century when, according to St. Maximus the Confessor, the Greeks reproached the Latins for their use of the "Filioque."³

Secondly, it is usually looked at in isolation from the historical and dogmatic background. Writers argue with each other, or try to find some solution, simply on one point—whether the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, or from the Father alone.

In such terms, and in such isolation, it does seem a useless logomachy, and one feels that it is better not to think of it at all.

But it is not so. For we cannot and must not isolate it either historically or dogmatically. We all know very well how unscholarly it is to take a word or an expression out of its context, neglecting its broad meaning, and to argue only on one narrow point. If it is true of philology or general history, why is it not the same with theology or Church history? We must be grateful to Fr. Bulgakov, who first noticed that isolation and opened the doors for further investigation in his most interesting study on the Holy Ghost, "The Paraclete."⁴ But it is strange to see how he himself cannot escape from that vicious circle, and is bound by an isolation similar to that which he himself combats.

We have no time in this short lecture to present Fr. Bulgakov's theology as a whole. But we can outline his main ideas on the subject, which Professor Lossky describes as "breach of equilibrium."⁵

It is false, says Fr. Bulgakov, to think that God the Father is the origin or source, in the causalistic sense of the Greek "*αἰτία*," of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and that they are "derivations" or "*duae processiones*" out of Him. There is no "becoming" in God, but eternal co-existence of the three Divine Persons. The scriptural words "begetting" and "proceeding" only describe the modes of existence, "*τρόποι τῆς ὑπάρξεως*," and nothing else. They only mean the mutual relations of the Three in One, of which the Father is the first as God "*par excellence*." Both sides in the dispute, he says, not excluding the Ancient Fathers, are wrong when they speak of the problem of the origin of the Holy Ghost as *from a cause*. There is no cause or *principium*, in this sense, in the Godhead at all, and therefore the main point of the dispute itself is removed: it is lawful to say both—"Ex Patre Filioque" and "*ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς*." The whole argument of the Latins at Lyon and at Florence—"ab uno principio" and "*principium principatum*"—on one side, and the Photian argument of the Greeks against "*δύο ἀρχαί*"⁶ on the other, are dropped.

³ In his Letter to Marinus, a priest in Cyprus, St. Maximus defends the Romans for their use of the term (P.G., XCI, col. 136). Anastasius the Librarian of Rome in the ninth century refers to this letter in Latin (*ibid.*, 133, 136). The passage was read by St. Mark of Ephesus at Florence (23rd Session).

⁴ Y.M.C.A. Press, Paris, 1936, p. 93.

⁵ "L'équilibre entre l'essence et les hypostases est rompu . . . en faveur de l'hypostase." Vladimir Lossky, "La Procession du Saint-Esprit dans la doctrine trinitaire orthodoxe." Paris, 1948, p. 31.

⁶ The argument of St. Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who accused the Latins in his *Mystagogia* of introducing "two principles in the Godhead—the Father and the Son." It is to combat this accusation that the Councils of Lyon and Florence introduced the formula "*tamquam ab uno principio*." (Photius, "*Δόγος περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μυσταγωγίας*"—P.G., CII, 280–392; *δύο αἰτίαι*—*ibid.*, 292.)

Speaking both in terms of "*Ex Patre Filioque procedit*" and of "*ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον*," Fr. Bulgakov unites them in one, but isolates himself from the dogmatic and historical background both of the Patristic times and of the dispute itself.

In this particular problem it is really difficult to agree with Fr. Bulgakov's very interesting and philosophical, but at the same time very personal, arguments. If we are to speak about the "Filioque" dispute as it was and as it is, we must first of all accept the main idea of all parties in it, based on the Trinitarian theology of the great Cappadocians on which they all unanimously agree.⁷ It is, of course, a matter of personal conviction either to believe it or not: but it is difficult to be a Catholic (which for us means "Orthodox") and not to accept in faith the unanimous catholic tradition of the Church.

The isolation of the "Filioque" is really *fatal*. Since the bitter fight between East and West began, people have become, one may almost say, absolutely blind on this particular point. And here we must agree with Fr. Bulgakov, that the lack of love, which is always a gift of the Holy Ghost, and the existence at the same time of the spirit of Schism, which is always opposite to Him, made it impossible to understand and profess the real doctrine on His Divine Person for so many centuries.

St. Maximus the Confessor was in fact not the first to deal with the matter, but the last to speak on it without bitterness. And perhaps we shall find the key to the problem in that famous letter of his to the Priest Marinus, preserved by Anastasius the Librarian, and read at Florence.

This letter is usually quoted by Eastern theologians for the sake of the words in it, "*Ita eum procedere fateamur ex Filio, missionem nimirum*,"⁸ and hence comes into existence a very large theological school of thought in the Orthodox Church, which explains all patristic texts, sometimes even those of St. Augustine, with their terms of "*δι' Ὑλοῦ*," "*per Filium*," or "*Filioque*," as referring to the "temporal mission" only, and not to the eternal procession in any sense.⁹ It appears in the "Circular Epistle" of the Eastern Patriarchs,¹⁰ so finding its way into present-day Greek theology, being introduced much earlier by Adam Zernikav¹¹ and

⁷ St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and St. Gregory of Nyssa, who first introduced into theological language the term *αἰτία*, meaning the "essential cause," with reference to the Father as the source of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

⁸ St. Maximus, defending the Latins, said that the difference is only one of language: they translate by "*procedit*" two different Greek terms, "*ἐκπορεύεται*" and "*πρόβεισι*," the last one being translated back into Latin by Anastasius as "missionem." Perhaps the Latins had erred simply on account of the limited nature of their language, "inasmuch as they employ the same term to denote the causation of the *communication* of the Holy Ghost, and the causation of His *being*,"—says Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrida, five centuries later. (Dr. A. Neander, *General History of the Church*, Vol. VI, p. 421.)

⁹ The Greek Fathers of the first six centuries use the term "Through the Son," and even "From the Son," but never with "*ἐκπορεύεται*." They always use "*πρόβεισιν*" or similar verbs. It seems that St. Augustine and other Latin writers used the "Filioque *procedit*" in the same sense. The question is, what is the real meaning of that "*πρόβεισιν*." The theological school of thought we are speaking of thinks it to be temporal, and distinct from the eternal procession—the sending of the Holy Ghost by the Son into this world only.

¹⁰ "Okrujnyoe Poslanije Edinyoy Svyatoy Sobornoy i Apostolskoy Cerkvi." Khristianskoye Chteniye, 1849, p. 168.

¹¹ Adam Zernikav, Studies on the procession of the Holy Ghost (in Russian) Pochayev, 1902.

accepted by the Metropolitan Theophanes Prokopovich of Novgorod,¹² as well as by the Metropolitan Makary of Moscow¹³: the same opinion was represented by some of the Orthodox delegates at the Bonn Conferences in 1874 and 1875,¹⁴ and was expressed in a very valuable study on the subject by Archimandrite Silvester,¹⁵ translated into German and published under the title, "Antwort auf die in dem altkatholischen Schema enthaltene Bemerkung von dem Heiligen Geiste." The well-known Serbian dogmatist, Fr. Justin Popovich, introduced this argument without any change or comment into Serbian dogmatics,¹⁶ and it was accepted by the Serbs without reserve so far as I know. And we still hear it nowadays at the Oxford conference of 1947, and the Saulchoir Conference of 1950, though with some reservations.

I do not think this is what St. Maximus meant—at any rate not with such a sharp distinction between the eternal and the temporal as is supposed by this school of thought. Thus there came about a double isolation of the term—from its historical and its theological background.

Another theological school of thought in the East, much more learned, which was represented by the famous Bolotov¹⁷ in his *Thesen über das Filioque* published in *Internationale Theologische Zeitschrift* in 1898, was opposed to it. His and his followers' opinion was that the "Filioque" is not an *impedimentum dirimens* for reunion. That opinion was largely based on historical researches, and on the common reconciling formula of St. John of Damascus, "δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύομενον,"¹⁸ which was understood in the Eastern tradition and accepted by the majority of the Orthodox delegates at Bonn.¹⁹ Such was the resolution of the Conference. But, as Palmieri stated it, the solution of the problem by the Old Catholics did not appease the conflict on that ground between East and West. Neither of them could actually depart from their own teaching—the "Filioque" on the one side, the "ἐκ μόνου" on the other.²⁰ It seems to be irreconcilable: the Orthodox insist upon the "Monarchy" of the Father: the Son and the Holy Ghost are one in Him; they are both from Him, and

¹² "Istoriya o iskhoideniyi Sv. Dukha." Moscow, 1773.

¹³ Macaire, Eveque de Vinitza (Bulgakov, later Metropolitan of Moscow) "Theologie dogmatique orthodoxe" traduite par un Russe. Paris, 1859, pp. 391-414.

¹⁴ The Old Catholics, after their secession from the See of Rome, were seeking reunion with the Orthodox Church and with the Anglican Church. On their initiative two theological conferences were held at Bonn in 1874 and 1875, where the most eminent theologians from all national Orthodox Churches, and from the Church of England, were present.

¹⁵ Archimandrite, later Bishop, Silvester was a famous Russian dogmatist at the Church Academy in Kiev. Publ. St. Petersburg, 1875.

¹⁶ J. Popovich, *Dogmatics*, Belgrade, 1934.

¹⁷ V. V. Bolotov was a famous professor of Church History at the Church Academy in St. Petersburg. He took part in the Commission of the Holy Synod appointed for the reunion of the Old Catholics with the Orthodox Church, under the presidency of Metropolitan Antony, in A.D. 1892.

¹⁸ It was studied, in connection with the teaching of St. John of Damascus, by another representative of that school—Bogorodsky.

¹⁹ St. Tarasius of Constantinople and St. John of Damascus were the first and the last of the Greek Fathers to use the term "δι' Υἱοῦ" with "ἐκπορεύεται." It is difficult to say what they really meant by it. Bolotov and others thought it to refer to the eternal relation of the Holy Ghost to the Father and the Son, not as cause of His being, but as condition of it. Silvester and others thought it to refer to the temporal mission, like *πρόεισιν*.

²⁰ Palmieri, "Filioque" in *Dict. de Theologie Catholique*, Paris, 1913, p. 2339.

from Him only—ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς: the Westerns insist on the completeness of the Trinitarian relations—"Filioque." Here are two different approaches to the same problem of the Triune God. And both are equally important. But they exclude each other! The "per Filium" seemed to be at Bonn (as much earlier at Florence) only a compromise.

The Orthodox who accepted "δι' Υἱοῦ" were bitterly attacked by the other school of thought, and very interesting discussion followed for more than forty years. The Bolotov school was less isolationist, for it looked back to the ancient Church teaching. But it could not escape the isolation altogether. The problem was still being approached from the same angle—if not "Filioque," nor "ἐκ μόνου," then "per Filium"—which was, as a matter of fact, an obvious surrender to the Western tradition. "Le résultat de ces polémiques a été nul—et après une lutte théologique de quarante ans, la question du Filioque attend encore sa solution," is the conclusion of the famous Roman Catholic theologian.²¹

The Right Rev. Cassian, Bishop of Catania and Professor of the Orthodox Academy of St. Sergius in Paris, tried at the Saulchoir Conference to represent both these Orthodox schools of thought, insisting on the isolation of the eternal procession from the temporal mission in the New Testament, and at the same time accepting the "δι' Υἱοῦ" formula of the Fathers in its Bonn interpretation.²²

At Oxford Professor V. Lossky, who defended there the Eastern cause three years earlier (1947), went on the same path much more theologically. He published a year later (1948) his "essai" in French²³ where he tried to show the real meaning of the "δι' Υἱοῦ" avoiding the isolation of the "temporal" procession from the "eternal" on the one hand, and the acceptance of the "principium principatum" (in any sense) on the other. But he could not avoid another thing: "the clear distinction between the hypostatic existence of the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father alone and His eternal shining forth from the Son." The first, he said, was "hypostatic," the second only of "one substance."²⁴

But then comes another difficulty: the sharp distinction between the "hypostatic" and "substantial" processions of the *person* of the Holy Ghost, even if we call it in Greek *πρόεισιν* or *ἐκλάμπει*, makes Him to proceed in a much more *double* way than under the Latin interpretation of "una spiratio duorum." And that was the reason why the Eastern theologians, like Zernikav (in spite of the fact that he himself was purely Western by origin), preferred to interpret that δι' Υἱοῦ *πρόεισιν* as of a purely temporal mission.

²¹ Palmieri, *ibid.*, p. 2335.

²² S. Ex. Mgr. Cassien, "L'enseignement de la Bible sur la procession du Saint-Esprit," in *Russie et Chrétienté*, 1950, p. 125.

²³ *Op. cit.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 32. That same argument was mentioned, as an eastern opinion, by W. Palmer last century (*Dissertations on the Eastern Orthodox Church*, Oxford, 1853). As a matter of fact it had its history in the course of the dispute: "Ce n'est pas un 'développement dogmatique,' mais une seule et même tradition défendue sur des points différents par les orthodoxes, de S. Photius à Georges de Chypre et St. Grégoire Palamas" (Lossky, 32). Father Bulgakov remarks about that tradition: "what actually that 'eternal shining forth' as distinct from the procession means is difficult to understand" ("The Paraclete," p. 134).

So we must go back to St. Maximus the Confessor. But we shall not touch here upon the history of the whole problem in the West, especially in Spain, before and immediately after St. Maximus, as it would take too much time. When the first objections were raised by the Greeks, St. Maximus reconciled them with the Latins in a most marvellous way.²⁵ But when, a century and a half later, the matter fell into the hands of Charlemagne, even the Pope, Leo III, could not altogether stop his initiative. The sad date of the Jerusalem trouble and of the Aachen Council of A.D. 809²⁶ is the real date of the beginning of the Schism. The later dates, 860 and 1054, are only the consequences. The "Filioque" term became (probably very sincerely, as is usual in such cases of schismatical blindness) a sacred flag of the political struggle of the Western Empire against the Eastern. It was only natural that the irenic attitude of Leo III and of such of his contemporaries as Anastasius the Librarian, could not long maintain itself even in Rome itself and the Filioque was subsequently introduced into the Creed even in the Papal Chapel, in spite of its having been so energetically forbidden by the Pope himself "pro amore et cautela orthodoxae fidei," as Anastasius informs us. The first Western theologian who made, at Charlemagne's request, a collection of Patristic texts to defend the Filioque against the Greeks—without any polemics, however—was Theodulph, Bishop of Orleans. But the following words of his speak for themselves:—

"Tuque manum injicias, vegetat quem Spiritus ille,
Causa tuo cuius tempore coepit agi."²⁷

And his collection, half a century before Photius, was the real starting-point of that isolation from Catholicism which was one and the same both for the Latin term in its conception and for the Church of the West as a whole.

The subsequent history of the dispute in the West becomes ever more and more characteristic of that isolation. St. Anselm of Canterbury in his "De processione Spiritus Sancti contra Graecos,"²⁸ and St. Thomas Aquinas in his "Contra errores Graecorum,"²⁹ both speak in the same

²⁵ We do not know exactly how he did it. His letter and its references and quotations are too short and obscure. But it is evident that he achieved it without any compromise or misunderstanding. The present problem of the "temporal" and the "eternal" did not exist at that time at all. Such a distinction is typical only of later centuries.

²⁶ The Greek monk John accused the Latin monks who came to Jerusalem from Charlemagne of heresy because of the Filioque in their Creed. These monks said it was the custom of the Emperor's Chapel, and wrote letters to the Pope and to Charlemagne, who used this as a good excuse for accusing the Greek Empire of heresy at Aachen.

The Caroline Books however reveal to us that Charlemagne was the first to make accusations of heresy—long before the Jerusalem incident and the Council of Aachen. As soon as he received the reports of the seventh Ecumenical Council, he wrote to Pope Hadrian accusing the Patriarch Tarasius for his use of the term "per Filium" and not "Filioque," and for his veneration of the Images. The Pope replied to him that this was quite orthodox, but he repeated his accusations after the Pope's death. His purely political aims are evident. (Libr. Carol. III, 3; P.L., XCVIII, 1117.)

²⁷ "And do thou put in thy hand, who art quickened by that same Spirit Whose cause in thy time only begins to be moved."

—Theodulph, *De Spiritu Sancto veterum Patrum sententiae quod a Patre Filioque procedit*: P.L., CV (2) 239–275; 241.

²⁸ P.L., CLVIII, 285–326.

²⁹ St. Thom. Aq., "Contra Err. Gr. ad Urbanum IV," Rome, 1880, 449–481; Palmieri, *op. cit.*, 824.

spirit and way: whether or not? St. Thomas, as is typical for the whole of his theology, especially in the "De Trinitate" and in the Summa, looks at this particular subject in his own peculiar way; and hence come the classical Roman arguments of the "una spiratio duorum" and the "ab uno principio," as well as of the "distinctio Spiritus Sancti a Filio," taken from St. Augustine, but explained in a scholastic way very different from that of the saint.

And the enormous list of Western writers on the subject through the centuries, including Paul Henry, Camelot and Dondaine of our own days, add nothing new to these classical arguments apart from more or less interesting personal explanations of it,³⁰ or illustrious historical researches by Anglican and Old-Catholic theologians such as Swete³¹ and Howard,³² or Döllinger, Langen and Reusch.³³ They all still keep to the same spirit of isolation. How difficult it is to escape from it!

Still, it would be true to say that both at Oxford and at Saulchoir considerable progress was made in this direction by the Eastern and the Western schools alike. But the main atmosphere was the same—"Patristic talmudism," as Dr. Zander once described the Saulchoir Conference, where he was present.

So we are now confronted with this isolation in the two following forms:—

(1) from historical theology, in Fr. Bulgakov's fight against the opposite extreme, and

(2) from the theological problem as a whole, in the dispute itself.

It is impossible for us here, in a lecture which is only an introduction, to solve the problem at once. It needs a great deal more of research and proofs. But what we can do here is to define the following four questions, and try to give the answers to them:—

(1) Why is the dispute so important, and wherein does its importance lie?

(2) How can we escape from the isolation of the problem?

(3) What is the real message of both, the historical and dogmatical inheritance of the Church?

(4) Can the problem really be solved?

(1) "Filioque is a theological formula of great dogmatic and historical importance," says A. J. Maas in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* of 1910 edited in New York (p. 73). But he does not say that it is a *problem* of importance. There are no *problems* in the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. Yet Paul Henry in 1947 goes further: he draws "not unimportant conclusions—concerning the possibility or necessity of expressing one and the same dogma by means of more than one set of metaphysical categories. On theoretical lines, it would appear that one dogma at least is officially expressed by the Catholic Church, united at Lyon and Florence,

³⁰ E.C.Q., VII, Suppl. Issue, 1948; *Russie et Chrétienté*, 1950, Nos. 3–4.

³¹ H. B. Swete, *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, Cambridge, 1876.

³² G. B. Howard, *The Schism between the Oriental and Western Churches with special reference to the addition of the Filioque to the Creed*: London, 1892.

³³ H. P. Liddon, *Report of the Conference at Bonn, 1876*; Reusch, *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, No. 21, 1875, Bonn. (Dr. Langen on Silvester's book.)

in two formulations which are not strictly equivalent or identical, but complementary. If this plurality of systematic expression is possible or even necessary for one revealed truth, it might not be impossible or unnecessary for other data of the one divine revelation—The much controverted dogma of the procession of the Spirit is not or should not be, as is generally thought, the main dividing line between Eastern and Western Christianity, but, paradoxically, their central, God-centred, uniting point.”³⁴

“Le Centre d’étude Russe-Istina,” a Russian Roman Catholic Society, goes in 1950 even further than this: “La question de la Procession du Saint-Esprit *a Filio* n’a cessé de tenir une place importante—il est bien évident—qu’aussi longtemps que le problème ainsi posé demeurera sans solution, toute perspective de liquidation du schisme d’Orient se trouvera fermée—dans le cadre de rencontres amicales périodiques entre théologiens catholiques et théologiens orthodoxes, cette question du Filioque est venue à l’ordre du jour.”³⁵

While the lukewarmness of present-day Christians generally simply refuses to notice the problem, there is a small minority, both in the East and in the West, who are longing to see it as “their central, God-centred, uniting point.” And the more they study, the more they realize its enormous importance not only for the dogmatics or ecclesiastical practice of their Churches, but for their spiritual life itself.

Its importance lies first of all in the coming back to the Orthodox life of Christians in and with the Blessed and Undivided Trinity, as revealed to the Catholic Church. We believe³⁶ that this revelation is everlasting, and the spiritual life of the Church in the Triune God was, is, and ever shall be, one and the same. We believe that all dogmatic definitions are only the explanations in words of some parts of that mystical life; translations into human logical terms of the supra-logical Divine World to which we are called. We do not accept the idea of the evolution of dogmas independently of that unique Eternal Life which is the only source of all the doctrines. The whole revelation given us is there: there is nothing to add to it: its wholeness is not in human terms, but in the Spirit Himself who is with us and in us, as the Soul of the Body, the Church of Christ. We believe that the solution of all the problems is already there; we have only to accept them on our way to God, and in our obedience to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, to her orthodox oneness and wholeness. Our Saints knew that solution very often without any theological training and without special terms, like St. Seraphim of Sarov, but they knew it with much wisdom and understanding. We believe that we cannot come to the genuine answers by study only, or by isolated logical terms in themselves. The Fathers of the Church, and the Ecumenical Councils, were orthodox only when they obeyed that general rule. All their definitions, accepted as

³⁴ Rev. Fr. Paul Henry, S.J., “On some implications of the ‘Ex Patre Filioque tamquam ab Uno Principio,’” *E.C.Q., loc. cit.*, p. 29.

³⁵ “The question of the Procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio* has not ceased to be of great importance—It is evident—that so long as this problem is not solved, all hopes for the liquidation of the Eastern Schism will be found closed—In the framework of periodical friendly meetings between Catholic and Orthodox theologians, this question of the Filioque has become the order of the day.” *Russie et Chrétienté, loc. cit.*, p. 123.

³⁶ In saying this, I try to represent the belief of the Orthodox Church. V.R.

dogmas by the Church, were such only when they reflected that supra-logical everlasting spirituality—a *posteriori*, and not a *priori*.

We believe that the Divine Revelation on the nature of the Procession of the Holy Ghost is there too, preserved and spiritually expressed by the Orthodox Church. We have only to come and to drink from her living waters. But we know at the same time that there is no dogmatic definition of that part of Revelation made by the Church in words, just as there was not the “*ὁμοούσιος*” definition before the Council of Nicaea. And this means that the Revelation of the Holy Trinity—a revelation which was, is, and ever shall be, one and the same, and which exists in its fulness in the mystical life of the Church—has not yet been given its final definition in our human words, and we are still waiting for it. We deny the development of dogmas, but we acknowledge the development of definition. Without the definition of the nature of the relation of the Third Person to the First and Second, we cannot claim to have the Trinitarian dogma adequately defined in our words. The relations between the Father and the Son were, after a bitter dispute, defined by the Church in words historically in a very short time. It was then that the Deity of the Holy Ghost was defined, but nothing else. His Procession from the Father was taken literally from the Scriptures, without any explanation of its nature. Then the Christological questions emerged: and the teaching on the Holy Trinity was not then completed—the Filioque dispute later on was only the natural continuation of the Trinitarian problems of the first centuries. The process was interrupted by Christology for a comparatively short time—some three or four centuries. The Iconoclastic dispute was in fact a Christological one. And Christology itself was only one aspect of Triadology. It was, then, only natural that the *real* Ecumenical Councils, those recognised by East and West alike, should stop just there. The time had not yet come for definition of the main Trinitarian problem which was, and still remains, on the agenda. It was only mentioned in obscure terms by St. Tarasius at the seventh Ecumenical Council,³⁷ and became, as we see from the Caroline Books, the occasion of the twelve-centuries-long dispute. A real Ecumenical Council could not be summoned in such a bad spirit of bitterness, intrigue and hate, to proclaim the truth about the Spirit of Peace, Holiness and Love. And the Holy Spirit patiently waited for a change of heart.

The Western part of the Church proclaimed her one-sided teaching as the necessary dogma for the whole Church: and that was her main failure.

The Eastern part remained Orthodox, faithful to the ancient tradition and the ancient Creed, never presuming to proclaim as dogmas, in an “ecumenical” council, the extreme opinions of some of her theologians. She was waiting, and is waiting still.

It is really worth noticing that a Roman Catholic theologian can speak now in a manner so unusual for the Roman tradition as does Paul Henry.

³⁷ Πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεὸν ἡμῶν—καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι’ Ὑιοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον Epist. ad Summos Sacerdotes, P.G., XCVIII, 1461.

It was this passage that Charlemagne attacked so strongly in his letter to Pope Hadrian—the real beginning of the quarrel.

It can only be explained by the words of "Istina"—"les rencontres amicales." For the first time in the history of the Church, the Filioque problem has been discussed by a small group of Christians in a really friendly way. Even the Bonn discussions of Eastern representatives with Old Catholics and Anglicans were not so simple and friendly—for the politics of the Russian and British Empires were underlying them. But now both the Eastern and the Western theologians were meeting without any earthly aims. They simply wanted to find the truth in one and the same Spirit of Truth about that same Spirit. And His fruits immediately came forth.

It is difficult to foresee how important these fruits will be for the future of the Christian Church. Only the future generations of Christians, confronting the neo-heathen world, will know it.

The Christian spiritual life cannot prosper without the spiritual, mystical solution of the "Filioque" problem. It seems strange, but it is so: all genuinely holy men actually achieved it. It means that the inner Life of the Holy Blessed and Undivided Trinity, not in terms of words but in the Holy Spirit Himself, must be present in the soul of a Christian. Without intellectual understanding, without verbal explanation, he is aware of the main mystery of the Three in One and One in Three, the completion of which is the Third Person and His eternal relation to the Father and to the Son. St. Paul knew it. St. Athanasius lived in it. St. Basil the Great spoke of it. And St. Augustine tried to express it in his Latin terms. They were not adequate: they were not complete: but they were a pious attempt to represent that which cannot be represented by a single man in its dogmatic simplicity and fullness. The greatest mistake of the Western followers of St. Augustine, especially in Spain,³⁸ was that they accepted his personal Latin terms as the fullness of the dogmatic expression of the Church, and fell into his one-sidedness. They failed to understand that only if we take all inspired words of different doctors of the Church, in their different languages, and combine them together, never isolating them either from their own general teachings or from the general teaching and history of the Church, can we have an adequate picture of that Divine Mystery in words. Such a picture, we foresee and hope, will come into the view of the real Eighth Ecumenical Council of the Catholic Church which some time in the near or far future—when God pleases, will define this dogma in infallible terms.

The spiritual life of the whole Church is tied to the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, no less than is that of every Christian in the world. And that means that all questions of doctrinal, canonical, and moral importance are dependent on it. The "Filioque" problem is the key to them all. And neither ecclesiology with her ecumenical problems, nor eschatology in her theory and practice, can come to a solution without the clear expression of the Faith in the Holy Ghost and His eternal procession—which the Church has, and always has had, in her heart. I do not think there is anything as important as that for all Christians in the world.

(2) I do not think, after all we have said, we need spent much time on

³⁸ Concilia Hispana, Madrit., ed. Garsia Lovisa. Kohomsky, *op. cit.*

the second question. There is only one way of escaping from the isolation of the problem—in love both to God and to men. If we speak about the Procession of the Holy Ghost remembering that it is not a "theory" only, or a "part of theology," or an "idea," but the very Life of God—we shall immediately turn to Him and try to see without words, in prayer, what we long for.

Secondly, we shall at once remember that our aim is *not* to combat and conquer each other, but to help each other to come as near as possible to what we want to see.

And thirdly—in practice, in our theological researches, we shall not start from St. Photius, or St. Maximus, or even St. Augustine, in terms of the East-West dispute, but from those Trinitarian problems and writers which are so characteristic of the Nicene and even ante-Nicene times.

(3) The real message of both the historical and the dogmatic inheritance of the Church will not be difficult to discover. It will show us that the main problem is not in the question, whether the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son together, or from the Father through the Son; nor in Fr. Bulgakov's question, whether the Father is the origin of the two other Persons, as the Catholic Church states, or not; but in the question, *what does the procession (ἐκπόρευσις) mean in itself, and what is its nature.* We shall find the implicit reply to this in many writings of the Fathers, and that will be all we need.

(4) I myself firmly believe that, if we proceed in that way, the problem *can and will be solved satisfactorily for the East and for the West*, without any compromise and without any loss of the importance of the problem. It will be simply a further explanation in words of the main Trinitarian Mystery, in full accordance with the Orthodox Faith of the Catholic Church. But of course we cannot accept as dogmas any of the existing definitions except what was stated in the Creed at its origin by the second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople in A.D. 381.

The Letter of St. Maximus to Marinus will explain the real cause of all misunderstandings—the difference between the Greek and Latin languages, their words and expressions.

All this means that our researches must be based on the three following scientific disciplines: (1) Theology, (2) History, and (3) Philology, combined together, and on those connected with them.

One thing we can state already—The Holy Ghost is leading His Church towards the solution of this problem: and we can see, after the thousand years of darkness, its wonderful dawn.

A HESYCHAST IN THE MAKING

(continued)

[In this second instalment of the Letters of Varsanuphius, we learn of the last stages in the active life of John of Beersheba, and of his final entry into the hesychastic cell. A third instalment will show us something of his trials within that life itself. D.J.C.]

XXIII. *Question of the Same to the same Great Old Man:—I beseech thee, Father and Teacher, not to be wroth with me at the things*

wherein I stumble; and to give me a rule how I should act in fasting and psalmody and prayer; and whether one should make a difference between days.

Answer:—

Brother if thou hadst given heed to the words of thy questions, thou mightest have observed what would enable thee to understand. Holding me as father and teacher, why also as wrathful? For a father is compassionate, having no wrath at all. And a teacher is long-suffering, and is a stranger to wrath. But as for the rule that thou askest—by many round-about ways thou protractest thy *entering by the strait gate unto life*¹ eternal. Behold, Christ tells thee concisely how thou must enter. Leave the rules of men, and listen to Him saying that “*He that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved.*”² If then a man has not endurance, he will not enter into life. Do not, then, want an ordinance. For I want thee *not to be under the law, but under grace.*³ For He says, *Law is not made for a righteous man.*⁴ And I want thee to be with the righteous. Hold to discernment as a helmsman steering the boat according to the winds. And when thou art sick, act accordingly in all the things of which thou didst write; and when thou art in health, accordingly. Since indeed when the body is sick, it does not receive food in its customary manner: so that in this also the rule has proved idle. And as for the days—hold them equal, holy, good. Do all things, then, with understanding, and it will issue for thee in Life that is in Christ Jesus our Lord. To Him be the glory unto the ages. Amen.

XXIV. When a division of opinion arose between him and the Abbot concerning a matter, and each of them was striving to be long-suffering, the Old Man sent them this answer, showing that their long-suffering was not clear of vexation, that they should always be watchful towards the perfectly unvexed condition:

Beloved child, do not suppose that it was of yourselves that you understood yesterday's chapter from the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians. But I, knowing that the vaunting of your patience was mingled with wrath, prayed God for you that you might understand it. For in it lies all the force of the letters written from me by thee to brother John. And not only that, but give heed also to the chapters you are going to read to-day, I mean that of the Apostle Paul and that of the Holy Gospel; for they have the same force. And read them three times over, examining closely the force of the words, for the profit of your soul. For I am bearing you and caring for you according to God. Toil then together, and contend together to cut off from yourselves *wrath and anger*. For a struggle is needed, with God helping. The chapters are these:—from the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, from “*But we beseech you, brethren, to know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord,*”⁵ to

¹ Matt. vii. 13–14.

² Matt. x. 22.

³ Rom. vi. 15.

⁴ 1 Tim. i. 9.

⁵ 1 Thess. v. 12.

the end of the Epistle: likewise from the First to the Corinthians, from “*Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, we would not have you ignorant. Ye know that when ye were gentiles,*”⁶ to “*Howbeit in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue*”⁷: from the Gospel according to Matthew, from “*And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and he healed their sick,*”⁸ to “*And they that were in the ship worshipped him, saying, ‘Of a truth thou art the Son of God.’*”⁹

XXV. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same and the Abbot when they wanted to tighten up the rule all at once against the brethren:—

I say both to thee, my child, and to the brother—You have been written to before about long-suffering, and now I say, “*Milk out milk, and there shall be butter: but if thou tighten thy hand upon the teat, blood cometh forth.*”¹⁰ And again St. Paul says, “*To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews,*”¹¹ et seq. Afterwards he says, “*I am become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*”¹² For if a man wants to bend back a tree or a vine, he bends it back gradually and it is not broken. But if he pulls it violently all at once, the thing is broken. Understand what I am saying.

XXVI. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he had revealed some things about which he had told him to tell no one, and for this cause had fallen into temptation; and about perfect long-suffering:—

Say to the brother—It is written, “*If any man have not the Spirit of God, he is none of his.*”¹³ Give heed, from whence is come to thee the distraction of the anguish of the affliction of these thoughts, if it be not from the betrayal that has taken place, the transgression of my commandment. For I often commanded thee to tell no man the secret, and thou hast spread it abroad to many. Am I Christ—since when He commanded that they should tell no man, then they spread the word abroad exceedingly to the multitudes and to all men? But all the same, not to wound the thought of thy neighbour, this is the way of Christ, who came in great meekness and gentleness for the salvation of men. For if a man become not as a crumb, he cannot dwell with men. See that Christ said to His disciples, “*Ye did not choose me, but I chose you.*”¹⁴ If then the calling of thy love unto us is from God and not from men, toil to obtain great patience. For to thee was written what was written of old—“*In your patience possess ye your*

⁶ 1 Cor. xii. 1.

⁷ Ibid., xiv. 19.

⁸ Matt. xiv. 14.

⁹ Ibid., 33.

¹⁰ Prov. xxx. 33.

¹¹ 1 Cor. ix. 20.

¹² Ibid., 22.

¹³ Rom. viii. 9.

¹⁴ John xv. 16.

souls.”¹⁵ Make then again a beginning of keeping and guarding the things told thee from me. For it is not time to reveal them yet. Therefore be of good heart in the Lord.

XXVII. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he was grieved because he had been a long time writing to him, and as a result he supposed that he had cast him out of his memory:—

Write after a time to the brother, first joy and gladness and greeting in the Lord, and say to him—Do not suppose, my beloved, that I had given over thy memory to oblivion from my heart, because of my delay in writing to thee. But giving heed to thy conduct I have been long-suffering until now. But be assured of this, that as God is not forgetful of us, to have mercy on the world, nor am I forgetful of thy love, praying God night and day for the salvation of thy soul, that thou mayest attain to the measure I have prescribed to thee. And learn this, that when thou goest on a service of the Cœnobium, certainly my heart goes with thee, with God’s consent. Lose not interest, then, my brother, in any matter. For I hope that all the things I wrote to thee are coming to thee. For God does not lie. For “*He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.*”¹⁶ Understand what I have said, and what is in store for thee. For “*Through many tribulations must we enter into the kingdom of heaven.*”¹⁷ “*Rejoice then in the Lord. Again I say, rejoice.*”¹⁸ Let none then learn the secret. For it is written, “*And these words seemed to them as idle tales.*”¹⁹ For if a man have not his heart firm, he cannot bear it.

XXVIII. The Same had a mind to decree for himself not to go out anywhere in the fasts. And the Old Man forbade him this, lest when a need according to God required that he should go out, he should be troubled as transgressing the decree:—

Say to the brother—Hast thou not heard from me that wherever thou goest, and whatever thou doest, for God’s sake, my heart is with thee? And now, brother, as thou hast heard before, decree nothing for thyself: but if thou goest out when need arises, thou shalt not find trouble in thy thought. Observe then the meaning of the things written to thee from me, and do so, and thou shalt have rest. Peace be unto thee from me, or rather from God.

XXIX. Answer of the Same Great Old Man to the Same, confirming his faith in the things promised him, and by means of such assurance leading him to greater eagerness:—

Say to the brother—Rest, and every good gift, and every divine grace-gift, comes by faith to man. Be not then unperceiving of the power that comes upon thee daily from God through my lowliness. And know that no little marvel marked thy coming unto us. Run then towards the prize set

¹⁵ Luke xxi. 19.

¹⁶ Matt. x. 22, etc.

¹⁷ Acts xiv. 22.

¹⁸ Phil. iv. 4.

¹⁹ Luke xxiv. 11.

before thee, that thou mayest obtain it. And remember continually from whence God delivered thee, and give Him thanks in all things, praying that He may fulfil His mercy with thee unto the end. Amen.

XXX. Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he asked if he ought to sail with the brethren to Egypt for obtaining handiwork. For he was hesitating because both he and the brethren were without experience of the sea and of the country:—

Say to the brother—So long as thou art without, thou must toil with the brethren. Set then the tribulations of the Apostles before thine eyes. For *he that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved*,²⁰ in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be the glory unto the ages. Amen.

XXXI. They went about much in Egypt before finding handiwork, and suffered in divers ways much tribulation and distraction: and in consequence loss of interest came upon him. The Old Man foresaw this in the spirit, and prepared him an answer beforehand which ran thus:—

Write, my child, the things said by me, or rather by God, and prepare them to give them to brother John: first, greeting in the Lord: after that, say to him—Why dost thou in tribulations lose interest, like a man of flesh, who has not heard that tribulations await thee—even as the Spirit said to Paul,²¹ and then he exhorted those who were with him in the ship, rejoicing.²² Dost thou not know that *many are the afflictions of the righteous*,²³ and they are proved therein as gold is proved in the fire? If we are righteous, let us be proved in the afflictions. But if again we are sinners, let us be patient as deserving them. For *patience worketh probation*.²⁴ Let us take in mind all the Saints from the beginning, and see what they endured. Both doing good and speaking good, and standing in all truth, they were being hated and afflicted by men unto their end, and were *praying for their enemies and those who despitefully used them*,²⁵ according to the saying of the Saviour. Hast thou also then been sold like the worshipful Joseph, and have thy *hands served in the basket*?²⁶ and hast thou gone down into two pits?²⁷ Or like Moses hast thou suffered ill from boyhood to old age? What hast thou endured, thou slothful one? Like David, who was pursued by Saul, and by his own son, unto death, and mourned for them when they died? Or like Jonah, hast thou been cast into the sea? Lethargic and beloved, why is thy thought fainting? Be not afraid nor in dread as unmanly, lest thou come short of the promises of God. Be not frightened like an unbeliever, but give courage to thy thoughts of little faith. Love afflictions in all things, that thou mayest become a proven son of the Saints. Remember the patience of Job and of those who came after

²⁰ Matt. x. 22, etc.

²¹ Acts xx. 23.

²² *Ibid.*, xxvii. 22, 33.

²³ Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii.) 19.

²⁴ Rom. v. 4.

²⁵ Luke vi. 28.

²⁶ Ps. lxxxi. (lxxx.) 6.

²⁷ Gen. xxxvii. and xl. 15.

him, and be zealous to come into their footsteps. Remember what Paul endured, dangers and afflictions and hunger and bonds and a multitude of other ills, and say to thy pusillanimity, "I am a stranger unto thee." Remember me who have written to thee; and whether the matter prosper before thee or not, give thanks unto God. Observe that matters are corruptible and passing away, but patience according to God saves him who has got it. Behold thou art struggling to bring handiwork and work at it. Let me then show thee the apostolic word, that *it is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy.*²⁸ Behold, God is sending you men who have the world's need. Receive them, and do not tell them that I said anything about them, lest they should catch vain-glory. Love them as true brothers, and make your thought give rest to their thought. For they despise the world, desiring to save their souls. And God, writing by me according to foreknowledge, is leading them here to you, that you may learn that they have altogether despised the world. Do thou then, brother, held by my hand, walk in *the strait and narrow way that leadeth unto life eternal,*²⁹ in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be the glory unto the ages. Amen.

XXXII. *Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when he asked if he ought to eat by himself, and if he must not come down on Wednesdays and Fridays to Holy Communion, and if it is necessary for him to leave the care of works; and should it happen that he should fall sick in his quiet, if he should employ some treatment; so that commandments might be given him unto salvation:—*

I do not want thy love to be ignorant about the benefit that is coming to pass with thee from the loving-kind God. For indeed, behold, the pangs have arrived, and Jesus has begun to do with thee, and to introduce thee in order into His blessed quiet, and into the patience that needeth not to be ashamed. Even, then, if debility or other sickness follow upon thee, cast all thy hope upon thy Master, and thou wilt have rest. For indeed I hope in my God that thou art not far from the way of God. But concerning eating alone in thy cell—it is best for thee, and profitable. But if occasion arise for eating also with the brethren, do not hesitate or take it ill: and little by little draw thyself in. As for Communion—so long as thou comest in and goest out, prevent it not: for the matter may cause offence to others. And give heed how thou makest thy settling in lowliness and fear of God and love to all without hypocrisy, and *buildest thy house upon the firm and unshakable rock.*³⁰ For it says, "*And that rock was Christ.*"³¹ But concerning some other commandments—at present there is no need. Enough has been written to thee from me. For they have sufficiency to lead thee from a novice to a perfect man. Meditate them, and remember them, and forget not. For they contain the whole library. Have strength in the Lord continually, being of humble mind in words and deeds and motions.

²⁸ Rom. ix. 16.

²⁹ Matt. vii. 14.

³⁰ Matt. vii. 24.

³¹ 1 Cor. x. 4.

XXXIII. *Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same when his brother according to the flesh was considering withdrawing to the monastic life, and asked the Old Man about it by way of him:—*

Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "*No man cometh unto me except the heavenly Father draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.*"³² And *I will manifest myself unto him.*"³³ See "*that the fields are white unto harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal: that he that reapeth may rejoice, and he that soweth. For herein is the saying true, One soweth and another reapeth.*"³⁴ Brother, no one desiring to go into the city sleeps. And no one desiring to work, is idle when he sees the sun. And no one desiring to tidy up his field is careless. For he who desires to go into the city, will walk quickly before it grows late. And he who sees the sun will go out to his work with speed lest he should be hindered. And he who desires to tidy up his field, will make haste before it is corrupted with rust. *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*³⁵

XXXIV. *When his brother came to him again a second time, he was troubled for his salvation, and reminded him of his former promise. But he asked for a sign to be given him about this from the Old Man. And the Old Man declared thus:—*

But about the brother of whom thou spakest—unbelief is making war upon him. And this is the sect of the Pharisees, to whom the Lord said, "*This generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it.*"³⁶ I have nothing to say to him but as the Apostle says, "*The old things are passed away: behold, all things are become new,*"³⁷ and "*Now, O Israel,*"³⁸ and "*Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God,*"³⁹ and "*To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.*"⁴⁰ *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.*⁴¹ Pray for me.

XXXV. *Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same, when he asked about brethren who were sick in body, and about others sick in thought, if he ought to take them to be with himself; and if he must tell the Abbot to lighten the novices a little from the vigil; and about his long silence:—*

Brother, the answer to the three thoughts is one—Do not force the will, but sow in hope. For our Lord also never forced any man, but preached the Gospel, and whoever would listened. I know that thou knowest that I am not careless of thy love, nor despise it. But the forbearance is for the best. For even when we pray, and *God is long-suffering*⁴² over

³² John vi. 44.

³³ John xiv. 21.

³⁴ John iv. 35–37.

³⁵ Luke viii. 8.

³⁶ Luke xi. 29, Matt. xii. 39.

³⁷ 2 Cor. v. 17.

³⁸ Deut. iv. 1, x. 12.

³⁹ Deut. vi. 16, Matt. iv. 7.

⁴⁰ Ps. xciv. (xciv.) 8, Heb. iii. 8.

⁴¹ Luke viii. 8, etc.

⁴² Luke xviii. 7.

hearing, He does it for the best, that we may learn long-suffering, and may not grow weary, saying "We have prayed and we have not been heard." For God knows what is best for man. Mayest thou rejoice in the Lord, my brother: and be care-free from everything; and pray for me, my beloved twin soul.

XXXVI. *Answer of the same Great Old Man to the Same, permitting him to begin his quiet in all freedom from care: and in answer to the thought that had come upon him that it is the last hour: and because having conversed with one of the fathers for a long hour, he bethought him whether he had done well or no:—*

Brother, hear from me who love thee in Christ Jesus. About the cell—Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "*The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, even so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.*"⁴³ And I say to thee, the time for thy entry is come, with God's help. Establish thy new cell, and enter therein having God for guide. And when thou art settled, have no care for anything at all. For indeed the need of matters and the proving calls itself. But concerning the thought sown in thee—it is idle, bringing in with it vain-glory. For who does not know that we are in the last hour? But about the talk—when thou seest thyself almost talking theology, know that silence is more wonderful and more glorious than that. Anything further, then, thou hast no need that I should write to thee. For I have written to thee from Alpha to Omega, as thy love knows well. Therefore I commit thee to God. For His is the help and the mercy. Amen.

[To be continued.]

MOUNT ATHOS:

A CRITICISM OF FR. BASIL KRIVOCHINE'S PAPER

(We publish here the substance of an article which appeared in the Greek periodical, *Εκκλησία*, March 15th, 1953, under the title "Inaccuracies about the Holy Mountain." And we add a reply from Fr. Krivocheine which will, we hope, satisfy his critics.)

IN the Autumn, 1952, number of *The Christian East* an article was published bearing the signature of the Hieromonk Basil Krivocheine, about the Holy Mountain.

In this article, Fr. Krivocheine alleges that those in the West who occupy themselves with the Holy Mountain, have fallen, in their publications on this subject, into errors which would never be tolerated on any other subject. But the Holy Mountain, the writer adds, is, in the West at least, unknown, and in consequence the inexactitudes recorded pass unobserved.

But Krivocheine himself has fallen into errors of this kind.

He attributes to St. Athanasius the purpose of giving to the Holy Mountain an inter-orthodox character, basing this opinion on the fact that he "attracted to Mount Athos—monks from all parts of the Christian world," including Iberia and Amalfi.

⁴³ John v. 25–26.

We do not think it probable that St. Athanasius would have had the inter-orthodox ideas attributed to him, at least in the sense given to the term "inter-orthodox" by the writer of the article. Certainly the presence of Amalfitan and Iberian monks on the Holy Mountain does not justify Krivocheine's views on the subject. In fact, a Byzantinist of the standing of the Hieromonk ought to have had in view the fact that Iberia (Georgia), though she was autonomous and had native kings, recognized in greater or less degree the sovereignty of the Greek Emperors, and from the time of Leo, son of Basil the Macedonian, the King of Georgia bore also the Byzantine title of Curopalates. Apart from this, in 991 David the King of Iberia left his kingdom by will to Basil the Macedonian. It follows that we are concerned with a country which was closely bound up with the Byzantine Empire. On the other side, Amalfi was subject to the Byzantine Empire, as is recorded by J. B. Bury (*A History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, in 1912, p. 312) "Gaeta and Amalfi belonged nominally to the Duchy of Naples, and like Naples, to the Eastern Empire."

We are not concerned, then, with monks coming "from all parts of the Christian world," as the writer of the article affirms, but from parts of the Byzantine Empire, or a country closely linked to it and subject to its suzerainty. If in a monastery in England, e.g., there were monks coming from English Colonies, or from powers belonging to the British Commonwealth, would that monastery be described as having an international character?

Finally, it is to be noted that the Monastery of the Amalfitans was founded before the Schism, and after the Schism the monks died out, and the monastery ceased to exist.

Going on to examine the evolution of the position on the Holy Mountain after the Liberation, and from the time when it became part of the Kingdom of Greece, the Hieromonk asks why, when before 1914 the monasteries there numbered about 10,000 monks, to-day these amount to about 2,000.

In the opinion of the writer, this is due in part at least to the fact that after the First World War the Holy Mountain was cut off from Russia, and after the Second, from all the other Orthodox powers.

As Fr. Basil admits here, conditions of life on the Holy Mountain are very hard, and demand an exceptional attachment to the monastic life, such as to-day has died out, or at least is seriously diminished, generally in all Christian countries. On the other hand, it is to be noted that it is not only the number of foreign monks on Athos that has been diminished, but also that of the Greeks. And this diminution is observed in the monasteries of all the powers in general.

It is an inaccuracy that the Hellenic Government interposed difficulties in the way of the manning of the monasteries of the Holy Mountain, by purposely excluding foreigners. It only practises, as it has the right to do, a test of those who seek such candidature. The writer of the article certainly knows that appeals of the foreign monks to the League of Nations (in 1932 and 1933) on this subject were rejected by that international organization, which recognized the justice of the views of the Greek Government on this subject, declaring these to be in absolute agreement with its international undertakings relative to the Holy Mountain.

On the other hand, we ask the Hieromonk Basil what are the Powers of the free world which accept without examination the establishment in their countries of persons coming from the communist Powers.

It is to be noted that by force of the Greek Constitution, and Art. 6 of the Statutory Charter of the Holy Mountain, those who are enrolled as novices or monks in the monasteries of Athos, claim Greek citizenship by right: and this justifies still more whatever reservations the Greek Government may have in regard to their establishment on the Holy Mountain.

Further, the Hieromonk records the shortage of education, of novices and of monks, which is found on the Holy Mountain. Clearly the writer of the article forgets that Greece has gone through two wars, has undergone a triple occupation, and after her liberation still had to face new struggles; while on the other hand her budget has been so heavy that only with American help has she been able to answer to her most imperative necessities: and in consequence there has been a slowness in the return to functioning of the Athonite School.

It is now purposed that this School should function, and so fill the gap created by *force majeure* in the education of the monks of Athos. At this School, apart from courses in Theology, History, etc., Agriculture and Forestry will be taught—thus providing the monks with the ability to exploit the sources of wealth found in the Peninsula, and to face with greater hope of success the economic problem which seriously occupies the monasteries.

Fr. Basil also stresses that the Holy Mountain, confined to one nation (obviously the Greek), is destined to gradual decay. But the desire of the Greek Government has certainly not been to exclude the admission of foreign monks—under the prior condition, of course, that these desired sincerely to become monks, and to give themselves exclusively to their monastic duties.

The reasons which have sometimes compelled the Greek Government to diverge from this principle, and take definite measures against foreign monks, are to be found in the lately published *Actes de la Conférence des Eglises Autocephales Orthodoxes à Moscou*, 1948 (tom. II, pp. 340–60)—a Conference certainly not inspired with philhellenic sentiments. In these Acts, speaking in the Commission in regard to the Holy Mountain, Bishop Benjamin stressed that opposition to foreigners on Mount Athos was provoked by the chauvinism of the non-Greek monks, and especially the Russians. This attitude of the foreigners, the Bishop further said, compelled at an earlier date even the Patriarch Joachim III himself, who was known in other matters for the width of his views, to take the measures defined on October 31st, 1911, in support of the Greek monks.

Still the same Bishop records further, that if the paragraph which concerns the Holy Mountain in Article 62 of the Treaty of Berlin, took such an indefinite form, this was due to the intervention of Lord Salisbury, who saw political aims in the objectives on Athos of Ignatiev, the Russian Ambassador in Constantinople.

At the same Conference the Bulgarian Archimandrite Methodius spoke on this subject at still greater length, saying (*ibid.*, p. 351) that Lord Salis-

bury considered that Russia was pursuing "military aims" on the Holy Mountain, and brought up the case of two Russian officers who had embraced the monastic life in a monastery on the Holy Mountain. The British Government shared and supported these views at the Congress of Berlin.

It is easy to defame the Greek Administration on the Holy Mountain, especially when writing for a milieu which is of necessity completely ignorant of the agreements there established. The Greek Government never pursued the aim of prohibiting foreign Orthodox from becoming monks in the monasteries of Athos: but it is disposed to allow this only under the prior conditions recorded above.

D.S.

FR. BASIL KRIVOCHEINE'S REPLY

As regards my essay—my object in writing it was to make a historical review of the spiritual life of the Holy Mountain in the past, and an examination of its present-day position in the spiritual life of the Orthodox Church in general. Consequently I occupied myself especially with the two most significant epochs in the spiritual history of the Holy Mountain—that of the Hesychasts in the 14th century, and that of the "Collyvades" in the 18th. And I tried to study the phenomenon of "Athonite Mysticism," and the special contribution of Athonite monasticism to the spiritual treasury of Orthodoxy.

Such a systematic study of Athonite Spirituality has not yet been written from the Orthodox side. And my present endeavour must be considered as simply an attempt to fill this gap. Consequently I should be sincerely grateful for any objective criticism. Unfortunately I do not find this in the article in *Ἑκκλησία*. For the writer passes over in complete silence the main content of my study—does not find it necessary to record even the title, "Mount Athos in the Spiritual Life of the Orthodox Church"—and occupies himself exclusively with certain very small points in the final part of my work, where I examine the manifold causes of the present-day spiritual crisis in Athonite monasticism. In this way the real character of the study is altered, and an inaccurate impression is created in the mind of the reader who does not know it in its entirety. It is quite untrue that in it I defame the Greek Administration. I simply record facts, and am only sorry that in consequence of restrictive measures of the Greek authorities (a fact which the writer of the article does not dispute) the rate of diminution in numbers of the monks in the non-Greek monasteries of the Holy Mountain has been accelerated. All the same I do not give a primary significance to this factor, but also examine in detail other deeper and more general causes of the steep decline in the population of Athos observed in the last decades. Certainly I could not pass over in complete silence the part played also by these measures, since in a scientific study all the causes of a phenomenon should be examined, and there cannot be allowed either omissions or exaggerations to suit the purpose of the writer.

I am sorry that the writer of the article, in spite of his promise to indicate the errors into which I have fallen, confines himself only to the case of

St. Athanasius, saying that the Saint did not attract monks "from all parts of the Christian world," but only from the Byzantine Empire, and that Georgia was not an independent power, but dependent on Byzantium. Only it is not I who say that St. Athanasius attracted with his holiness and spiritual experience monks from all parts of the Christian world; it is his contemporary biographer who says so, and considers it as his greatest glory. Why then does the writer of the article want to confine the radiation of St. Athanasius within the limits of the Byzantine Empire? As for Georgia—it is an anachronism to employ terms of recent international law, like "independent" and "dependent," in reference to the Byzantine epoch. The Christian world—in the East at least—formed then a single whole with Constantinople for centre, without its being possible to speak of relations of political dependence between its different parts. The Princes of Moscow used to bear, up to the 15th century, titles of the Byzantine Court, without being politically subject to Constantinople. Besides, were there not also living in community on the Holy Mountain monks from the parts of the East under Arab rule, as is witnessed by the nomenclature of the Monasteries? At the same time it is not correct that I attribute to St. Athanasius "inter-orthodox" views. I do not employ the term "inter-orthodox" at all in my study: and I can add that I also reject it as not reconcilable with the unitive character of the Church. I find especially unfortunate its employment in regard to the Holy Mountain, which has belonged from the first exclusively to the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. I only say that already in the epoch of St. Athanasius, and on from that, the Holy Mountain was established as a *pan*-Orthodox centre of monasticism, and that this is also its mission, and an indispensable condition of its spiritual prosperity and of its very existence. But I add that the supernational composition of Athonite monasticism does not deprive the Holy Mountain as a whole of its properly Greek character which it has had from the first (p. 47).

With such additions and subtractions, the writer of the article has perhaps succeeded in creating in those who have not read my study the impression that they are concerned with an anti-Hellenic publication. But I am sure that every one who reads it will take away the assurance that my study was written with love for the Holy Mountain, for the Orthodox spiritual life, and for the beautiful Greek-Christian civilization of Byzantium. Besides, the very fact that my essay was welcomed by that most philhellenic English periodical *The Christian East*, constitutes a proof that, to the eyes of the distinguished editors, it did not have any anti-Hellenic colour.

Hieromonk BASIL KRIVOICHEINE.

PROFESSOR L. A. ZANDER'S REPLY TO FR. G. FLOROVSKY

POLEMICS are always unpleasant, but in the present case they are unavoidable, if only out of respect for those who have received my book favourably. Foremost among them are the Bishop of Chichester (to whose help I am indebted for the publication of the book), the Rev. O.

Tomkins (who wrote about it in the *Ecumenical Review*), authors of reviews in *Theology*, the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, *Worship*, *The Student Movement*, *Blackfriars*, and many others. Their reports were extremely kind and I am grateful to them both for the attention they have given to my work and for their valuable criticism of it; and indeed I would gladly accept the severest critical remarks, if they really referred to what I have written and not to fantastic assertions wrongly ascribed to me. But the Rev. G. Florovsky's article cannot even be called a critical review: it is founded on misrepresentation and is a mere diatribe. In consequence, it is difficult to say anything in reply to it. How am I to disprove the assertion that my book is "treacherous, misleading, untimely, reactionary, and anti-ecumenical"? How am I to clear myself of the charge of being an ignoramus in theology and history, and incapable of either love or suffering (I am said to enjoy my suffering!)? At times Fr. Florovsky indulges in simple abuse and talks of my "antiquated platitudes."

I do not propose to deal with his evaluation of *Vision and Action* but will confine myself to the methods he uses against me. He appears to be expounding my ideas, but in truth he systematically distorts them and ascribes to me things which I have not and could not have said. He draws absurd conclusions from those distortions and thus produces a ridiculous caricature of my book.

I cannot point out all his distortions—this would take up more pages than the actual review. My book itself is an answer to him. If any of my readers are sufficiently interested, I would ask them to open the book on pages indicated by him, and they will see for themselves that I assert something very different from what he imputes to me—often, indeed, the very opposite of it. It is not true that in my opinion the East and the West *must* be divided and that this division of the Christian world is final and inevitable. It is not true that I regard every agreement as dangerous and undesirable. It is not true that I propose "to cut across the confessions and to start a new ecumenical communion." It is not true that I "deliberately reject all dogmas, canons, Dominical institutions as 'human accretions' or even 'superstitions'" (the reviewer puts these words in quotation marks). It is not true that I profess Orthodoxy simply because I happen to have been born in a Russian Orthodox family. I have always declared that I belong to the Orthodox Church consciously and by conviction. It is not true that abstinence from proselytizing prevents me from bearing witness to the truth in which I believe. It is not true that I assert "the equality of conflicting doctrines." It is not true that for me "Christendom replaces the Church." And so on, and so on.

The Rev. G. Florovsky ascribes to me not only all these monstrosities but also ideas against which I have fought all my life both in print and by word of mouth—and he knows this perfectly well, because for 25 years we worked side by side. Thus he writes that for me "ecumenical communion" has a deeper insight into the ultimate mystery of God than any 'institutional' church or denomination can ever attain, being imprisoned in the narrow limits of 'dogmas, canons and rites'" (p. 211). I would ask my readers to open p. 211 of my book: they will not find in it anything of

the kind! The words 'dogmas and canons' (which the reviewer puts in quotation marks, adding the word 'rites') occur at the end of the page in quite a different connection: I say there that a theoretical knowledge of a church's dogmas and canons does not give us sufficient insight into it and that a living experience of its prayer is necessary. On p. 77 I quote a resolution of the W.S.C.F. which says "we believe that the ecumenical work can be spiritually successful only in so far as the participants in it are conscious of the dogmas, and faithful to the tradition of their own church" Fr. Florovsky knows that it was I who drew up this resolution and that I have for years fought in the W.S.C.F. for the dogmatic, as against the interconfessional, principle. He also knows that I regard Orthodox dogma both as the norm of religious faith and as the source of inspiration of philosophical thought and culture.¹ Why then does he impute to me the very reverse of what I believe? Why does he refer to p. 211 and quote words chosen at random and taken out of their context? He uses this method throughout: taking a sentence, or even a part of one, from my book, he puts it in quotation marks, thus creating an impression of authenticity, adds a few words of his own—and forthwith ascribes the resulting absurdity to me—evidently, in the hope that a trustful reader will not verify his statements. I feel bitterly ashamed of having to accuse, on the pages of a theological journal, a Christian theologian of actions which I do not want to call by their real name.

In the Rev. G. Florovsky's exposition not only my ideas but even the words I use lose their original meaning. For instance, I say that "my church is naturally regarded by me as the true Church"; he picks out the word "naturally," makes a whole theory out of it and, arguing against it, remarks that "the real question is not what is natural to me, but what is true." Or again, I say that the growing sense of the unity and solidarity of all Christians does not create the one Christian Church (for it does not exist)—meaning one Church which includes *all* Christians; the Rev. G. Florovsky construes this into an ecclesiological heresy and says that "for the author one Christian Church simply does not exist."

Sometimes Fr. Florovsky does actually quote my ideas but declares them to be fallacious; the surprising thing is however that in his own writings he puts forward exactly the same ideas as unquestionably true. Thus, in his review he says that "the antithesis of West and East belongs more to the polemical and publicistic phraseology than to sober historical thinking," but in his article *The Problems of Christian reunion* (Put N. 37, pp. 11–12) he writes: "not to feel the seriousness of the division and disagreement between East and West is truly dangerous. It is a kind of mystical insensibility, and is the source of crude over-simplification in the plans and projects of union." He sternly denounces my pessimistic attitude to the reunion of the churches, but his own attitude in this respect is even more pessimistic than mine; at the Amsterdam Conference he said to the interviewer representing the French magazine *Réforme*: "The differences between Orthodoxy and Protestantism are dogmatic; they are a matter of faith. With

regard to them (especially with regard to Apostolic succession) agreement between us can *never* be reached" (italics in the text).² He condemns my eschatological point of view and says that I "disbelieve in the possibility of any ecumenical advance on the level of history" (this is not so! my whole book bears witness to the contrary, L.Z.). "One is invited to indulge in a sort of eschatological vision and there is no call to sober and responsible action." But in his article on *Reunion in Put* (mentioned above) he writes: "Reunion is possible only in spirit and in truth, in inspiration and holiness. Therefore it is not likely to be reached at theological conferences, at congresses of hierarchs, hardly in Lausanne and certainly not in Stockholm. And if reunion is destined to take place in history, it can only be in eschatological twilight, on the eve of *Parousia*. It will be an anticipation and foretaste of the destinies beyond this æon."³

The Rev. G. Florovsky does not find a single thing to commend in my book (and, consequently, in my work, since the book sums it up). Everything in it is said to be un-Orthodox, anti-ecumenical, false, pernicious and dangerous. Why in that case had he not denounced me before? My ecumenical convictions were not formed yesterday. The first sketch of *Vision and Action* was published as an article in 1936 under the title *The Essence of the Ecumenical Movement* in Russian, English, French, German and Dutch. It was followed by articles *What is Unity?* (1939), *The Meaning of "Ut omnes unum sint"* (1943), *The Problem of Ecumenism* (1948), and several others. In all these articles I developed the same ideas as in *Vision and Action*. If those ideas are so dangerous, why has he not issued his warning sooner? Is it simply because my book "was unfortunately favourably received in many ecumenical quarters?"

The Rev. G. Florovsky's article is written with a kind of inspired vindictiveness and is aimed at discrediting both me and my book. But leaving aside polemics and self-defence, I should like to make clear what is the real difference between his attitude to ecumenism and mine.

I take as my starting point the ecumenical experience which forms a *religious* bond between Christians of different denominations and convictions. Therein lies the painful paradoxality of ecumenism. "We form a community to disagree; we unite to face our divisions," writes the Rev. O. Tomkins in *The Wholeness of the Church* (p. 14). (Florovsky does not protest against this, although Tomkins's position is closely akin to mine.)

The Rev. G. Florovsky's conception of ecumenism is very different. He writes⁴: "To participate in the Ecumenical Movement means for me to take part in ecumenical *Conversation* (italics in the text). . . . The part played by the Orthodox in the Ecumenical Movement should be conceived in the categories of missionary activity." The problem of ecumenism is thus reduced to nought. Conversation and missionary work do not imply that your listeners are Christians, involve no inter-Christian problems, and avoid all the difficulties of being one in Christ and yet divided in faith. But

¹ See my article *Logic and Dogma* in the Journal of the Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris.

² *Réforme* 1948, September 11, N. 182.

³ This sentence is quoted in *Vision and Action* (p. 83).

⁴ *Participation of the Orthodox in the Ecumenical Movement* in the Journal of the West-European Orthodox exarchate, May, 1949.

when Fr. Florovsky leads in prayer at ecumenical conferences (as he did at Edinburgh and Lund), does he regard this as mere "conversation"? When he takes part in decisions made by the most responsible organs of the World Council of Churches, obviously assuming his share of responsibility for the ecumenical policy as a whole, does he regard this too as merely "missionary activity"?

Apparently ecumenism is not a matter of religious experience for Fr. Florovsky, and he denies that it may be that for others. This is why he calls my standpoint romantic and emotional; he explains that which I regard as a Divine gift—the brotherhood in Christ with members of other denominations—by the fact that I am "impressed by the friendliness of the encounter."

The ecumenical paradox cannot be solved in logical terms. In saying this I am not "sacrificing reason" or "diluting" my faith. I merely put certain limits to reason and guard myself against theological rationalism which seeks to include all divine mysteries within the framework of human words. Ecumenism is and has always been for me a Divine gift transcending my understanding, a spiritual reality in which poor human efforts are crowned with a new and unexpected joy of brotherhood in Christ. The purpose of my book was to give expression to that miraculous experience, and not to preach anything. And in any case I am not guilty of passivity or of a desire to destroy the very possibility of ecumenism. I hope this is obvious to every one who has read *Vision and Action*.

L. ZANDER.

[Fr. Florovsky's review has, as we had hoped, called forth from Professor Zander an explicit repudiation of some attitudes which had been attributed to him—especially of the charge that he was setting "Christendom," or "Ecumenical Communion" above the Church. And it is to be recognized that in a number of passages the review seems seriously to misrepresent the book. For instance, it quotes phrases from Professor Zander's advocacy of "non-proselytizing" as if it were treated as an absolute principle that every one should stay where he is. But the important passage (p. 116) is overlooked in which it is admitted that there are cases in which "remaining in one's own Church may become spiritually impossible."

On the other hand, a large proportion of the quotations in the review do represent fairly, though rejecting, what the book says and means to say. And here the cleavage between our two friends seems real. To take one example—it is true that Professor Zander says that the Pantokrator of the Byzantine ikon, and Ude's Galilean, are images of the same Christ. And we must ask whether in fact he means that there is no limit to this principle, no such thing as a *false* picture of Christ, or a *false* way of holiness, which it is the duty of every true lover of Christ, and even of the Ecumenical Movement, to reject with abhorrence. Perhaps Professor Zander is here overstressing one side of his case as a challenge, to set us thinking. But if so, it was the duty of an Orthodox reviewer to take up the challenge.

We would urge readers to study the book for themselves, and form their own judgments.—ED.]

LETTER

DEAR MR. EDITOR,

In sending you my reply to the Rev. G. Florovsky's misleading review of my book *Vision and Action* I should like to answer your remarks upon it as well. I should of course feel much happier if my explanations had been published in the same number of *The Christian East* as the attack upon me; now, six months after, the readers have no doubt forgotten most of the arguments and merely retain the general impression that there is something wrong with my book. But in any case I must reply.

You write: "We find it hard to understand how an Orthodox writer can loyally say (p. 30) that the one Christian Church *does not exist*." It should not be necessary for me to remind you of the elementary rule of logic that the meaning of a proposition depends on the context. What I said on p. 30 is this: "Summing up the matter in psychological terms it may be said that under the influence of the Movement the sense of unity and solidarity of all Christians is growing irresistibly apace in the modern world. It is not correct to speak of the one Christian Church (for it does not exist), but one may speak of the one Christian world, of all Christendom—*tota Christianitas*—which, in spite of its dogmatic contradictions and indefiniteness, embraces all who bear the name of Christ . . ." It is obvious that the words "it does not exist" (which are in brackets and therefore have no meaning apart from the rest of the sentence) refer to the idea of a single Christian Church embracing all Christian denominations. My meaning is that the organization, or fellowship, or whatever else we may call it, which comes into being as a result of ecumenical work is not entitled to be called a Church. A gathering of all Christians who disagree in their ideas and beliefs is not a Church. The truth of this is clearly grasped and formulated by the World Council of Churches, but in ecumenical practice the term "Church" is constantly misused. My parenthetic remark is simply a protest against this abuse, but you take the phrase out of its context, italicize it and interpret it as an ecclesiological heresy. A Freudian would probably regard this as proof of an unconscious bias, but I am only surprised at your ascribing to me, whom you have known for twenty years, an idea which is utterly foreign to me.

You go on to say that "the verdict on the book" must depend on our agreement or disagreement with Fr. Florovsky's remark that "it is precisely this spirit of penitence that is missing in the book." But my book is not a moral call—it is an inquiry into the problem of ecumenism. Calls to an unspecified repentance in which ecumenical literature abounds have always seemed to me to conceal, under cover of pious rhetoric, a desire (perhaps an unconscious one) to avoid the problem itself. May I ask, what kind of penitence do you miss in my book? Obviously repentance of my personal sins, ready as I am to offer it, is not relevant to the subject. Repentance offered by a church body for historical sins of the past is also irrelevant to the point at issue. It may have good moral effects, but it does not go to the root of the matter. Thus, penitential services held by the Roman Catholic church in France for the massacre of St. Bartholomew's were undoubtedly a comfort to the Protestants, but have done nothing to bring Calvin's

doctrine closer to that of St. Thomas Aquinas. And yet the fundamental problem of ecumenism is that Calvinists follow Calvin, and Catholics St. Thomas, and neither can feel penitent about it. When I am told that in order to end disunity we must repent, I answer that in the last resort disunity is due to the fact that some Christians profess Orthodoxy, others Lutheranism, others the Baptist tenets, and so on. I cannot repent of being Orthodox, and the same thing applies to Christians of other confessions.

The ambiguity of the call to repentance becomes even more obvious at ecumenical conferences. The usual stumbling block is the impossibility of intercommunion. And so we are told: repent! (meaning, repent of your exclusiveness and intolerance)—repent, and then we shall be able to communicate together!

I resolutely protest against thus replacing dogmatic consciousness by psychological moralizing. Such a call to repentance may be, and often is, a call to dogmatic compromise. This should not be forgotten.

If, however, you mean by penitence a different mentality, a change of attitude—in fact, all the positive attainments of the Ecumenical Movement, my whole book is devoted to this theme. Look especially at pp. 20–25, and you will find a description of this spiritual *metanoia*.

Your third remark concerns the philosophical problem of method and is of particular interest to me. You accuse me of a “propensity to Hegelian dichotomies.” I think you are wrong there. I always strive to think in the category of “in so far as,” and not of “either—or.” I would remind you that dichotomy is a binary division based on the absence of some quality, and therefore limits the subject under investigation to two contradictory and incompatible attributes. In contradistinction to it, the category of “in so far as” presupposes a number of transitional stages standing to one another in the relation of partial compatibility. The dogmatic presuppositions of negation and of its bearing upon other kinds of judgments are discussed in my article *Logic and Dogmatics* in the Journal *Pravoslavnaia Mysl* (the Orthodox thought) published by the Orthodox Theological Academy in Paris.

I am yours very sincerely

L. ZANDER.

[We are thankful to have Professor Zander's reassurance that his statement that the one Christian Church “does not exist” is to be taken in its context and not absolutely. At the same time, we do not feel that, even taken in its context, the unqualified form of the statement was justified. Also, if we do in any sense believe in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church on earth, then, whatever the visible community with which we identify it, we must surely believe that to be a Christian is to be linked to it in some fashion, however tenuous the links. For it is the Body of Christ, and to be a Christian is to draw one's life from that Body.—Ed.]

REVIEWS AND PERIODICALS RECEIVED

Aktines (Athens), monthly.

Catholica Unio (Roman Catholic) Fribourg, monthly.

Dans l'Esprit et la Vérité (Chrétiens Orthodoxes des pays de langue française), monthly.

Eastern Churches Quarterly (Roman Catholic), Vol. X, 1 & 2.

Ecumenical Review (World Council of Churches), July, 1953, No. 4.

Gregorios ho Palamas (Saloniki), March–April, 1953.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift (Berne), January–March, 1953.

International Review of Missions, January–March, 1953.

Irénikon, Tome XXV, 1^o & 2^o trimestre, 1953.

Le Messager (Paris), Action Chrétienne des Etudiants Russes, 2 monthly.

Nea Sion (Jerusalem), January–March, 1953.

One Church (Russian U.S.A.), monthly.

Oriente Christiano (Roman Catholic, Madrid), monthly.

Orthodoxia (Ec. Patriarchate), January, February, March, 1953.

Proche-Orient Chrétien (Roman Catholic, Palestine), Tome 4, Fasc. 1.

St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly (New York), Vol. I, No. 1.

St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary Bulletin, 1952–3.

Sobornost, Series 3, No. 13.

Syndesmos (Paris), June, 1953.

Zoe (Athens), July, 1953.