

The Christian East

COULD THE ORTHODOX CHURCH ACCEPT PROTESTANT MINISTRIES?

By THE REV. WILLIAM H. DUNPHY.

(Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Nashotah House, U.S.A.)

IN recent discussions on Christian reunion and the Apostolic Ministry, allusion has frequently been made to the passage of the famous Orthodox theologian, Dyovouniotes, to the effect that the Orthodox Church could accept in their orders even ministers who have not been canonically ordained (*e.g.*, Protestant ministers?), without reordination, simply by the exercise of the Church's stewardship and by *Economia*. That this is Dyovouniotes' own teaching¹ seems clear; unhappily the impression has gone abroad, indeed it has been proclaimed from some theological chairs in this country as a certainty, that Dyovouniotes on this point is typical of Orthodox theologians and represents the general tradition of the Eastern Church. It has even been suggested in some quarters (*e.g.*, in connection with the South India Scheme) that the Anglican Church might take a leaf out of Orthodoxy's book and accept Protestant ministers by *Economia*, as clergy of the Church, with no further ordination.

I hope to show that Professor Dyovouniotes, in the passage above referred to, does not represent the general tradition of the Eastern Church; indeed, that in so teaching he stands almost alone among Orthodox theologians, and that it would be most unwise for us to take this erratic speculation of his as a precedent for our own sacramental theory or practice.

In the first place, the Eastern Church has always insisted on the absolute necessity of episcopal ordination and of apostolic succession. This is not simply her canonical practice, but also her dogmatic teaching. Khomiakov, "the father of modern Russian Orthodoxy,"

¹ *Ta hepta Mysteria*, pp. 162-5.

although very liberal-minded in many ways, is uncompromising on this point. In his *Tserkov odna* ("The Unity of the Church"), he states plainly the teaching of Orthodoxy: "If Ordination ceased, all the Sacraments except Baptism would also cease; and the human race would be torn away from grace; for the Church herself would then bear witness that Christ had departed from her."

He does not share the view that any community, having lost the apostolic succession, could originate its own ministry, or that presbyters (in the modern sense of the word) could truly ordain. "The right of laying on of hands in the sacramental sense does not belong to the faithful in general, it did not in the time of the Acts of the Apostles belong even to the preachers of the faith, however great their personal sanctity; it belonged only to the Apostles, just as later on it belonged only to the Bishops."¹ Where the apostolic succession has been maintained, so far as externals and right belief go, outside Orthodoxy, the Church can, by *Economia*, accept such orders (e.g., Roman or Nestorian), but never does he hint that any non-episcopal ministry could possibly be accepted in this way.

The starting point of Khomiakov's conception of the ministry is, like that of the writer of Hebrews and Clement of Rome, the fact that the less is indisputably blessed by the greater, and not the other way around. "C'est pourquoi la plénitude des droits ecclésiastiques, confiée par le Christ à ses apôtres, s'est toujours trouvée au sommet de la hiérarchie, bénissant les grades inférieurs."² "Abolir l'épiscopat est chose impossible, car il est la plénitude des droits ecclésiastiques réunis dans un individu"—[Khomiakov would thus be undisturbed, if it should be definitely proved that the early "presbyter-bishops" ordained—indeed he says as much (pp. 148-9)]—"la confirmation et la bénédiction (car tel est le sens de l'ordination) n'appartiennent qu'à ceux qui ont eux-mêmes reçu cette bénédiction qui couronne toutes les autres, pour que l'Eglise ne se trouve pas infidèle au précepte apostolique, et pour que toutes les fonctions inférieures tirent leur source et leur sanctification de la fonction supérieure. Telle est la doctrine de l'Eglise par rapport à l'ordre épiscopal, dont les autres ordres cléricaux ne sont que la conséquence" (p. 150). Thus the Bishops alone, like the Apostles of old, are the source of apostolic ordination, which is indispensable to the Church, and the Church and her ministry, like the Incarnation, are gifts from above, not an evolution from below. The Church, to quote Soloviev, is, like her Lord (the God-man), divinely human, not humanly divine.

This, then, according to the teaching of the greatest and most representative of modern Russian theologians, is "the doctrine of the Church." But the "Confession of Dositeus," the official and

¹ *L'Eglise Latine et le Protestantisme*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 148.

synodical declaration of the Orthodox Faith set forth by the Council of Jerusalem, and given almost Ecumenical authority by the Greeks, is no less clear. "Episcopacy is so necessary that, if it were taken away, there would neither be Church nor Christian, nor even their name. . . . For the Bishop, being the successor of the Apostles, called to that office by imposition of hands and invocation of the Holy Spirit, having received by a continuous succession the power given by God to bind or loose, is the living image of God upon earth—the fount of all the sacraments. . . . This episcopacy seems to us as necessary to the Church as breath to a man, or the sun to the world."

The answer of the Synod of Constantinople to the Non-Jurors (1672) is equally clear. "The fountain and source of the Priesthood is no other than the Bishop . . . nor indeed can he be a Priest who is not called to the office by episcopal ordination."

The Patriarch Meletios, at Lambeth, expressly rejected the speculation of Dyovouniotes. The Bishop of Gloucester quoted the latter to the effect that the Church could, by *Economia*, recognize the Priesthood and Sacraments even where the Apostolic Succession had been lost. "The Patriarch replied that while it was true that the Church had power to reject the Priesthood of schismatics, it has no power to recognize Ordinations in Churches where the Apostolic Succession has been broken. He said that in the whole history of the Church there had been no example of such an Economy as that. Where the Priesthood of heretics possessing Orders with the Apostolic Succession had been recognized, it had been after thorough examination which in other instances had led to the requirement of reordination." [The painstaking investigation of Anglican Orders, as well on the historical as on the dogmatic side, is a good instance of this.] Economy, the Patriarch added, "could never be used where it clashed with the fundamental grounds of faith."¹ These words of the Patriarch are most weighty and authoritative, and ought to be decisive.

Nor is this teaching any innovation; quite the contrary. Macarius, in his *Théologie Orthodoxe*, points out that the Church does not repeat, but accepts, Orders "régulièrement [= validly] ministrés, même dans les sociétés hétérodoxes" [e.g., Roman Catholic clerics], but that "l'Ordination administrée irrégulièrement et illégalement [i.e., invalidly], comme cela se pratiquait chez les hérétiques, était reconnue comme inefficace par l'Eglise, qui statua de la suppléer par une nouvelle ordination légale." He gives various examples of ordinations which the Church could not accept and concludes: "Ainsi en use-t-elle de nos jours avec ceux qui lui reviennent du protestantisme. Au reste, à vrai dire, dans ce cas-là, le sacrement de l'Ordre n'est pas répété, il est administré proprement

¹ *Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission*, Appendix IV, p. 63, S.P.C.K., 1932.

pour la première fois, la première ordination n'ayant pas été véritable, mais seulement prétendue" (Vol. II, pp. 591-2).¹ That is, Protestant ministers having no ordination at all, there is nothing for Economy to work on, nothing to validate—they are laymen and must be received as such.

Coming down again to the present, Professor Komnenos (whose influence had much to do with the acceptance of Anglican Orders by the Œcumenical Patriarch in 1922) argues that Anglican clergy can be received as true priests by *Economia*, since "they have received not the semblance of ordination but an ordination which is real, and is based upon a most incontrovertible, humanly speaking, succession from the Apostles, upon its canonical transmission, and upon an essentially and fundamentally right conception of it." [I am making use of Dr. J. A. Douglas' excellent translation.] He adds that our Baptism is valid, and that "apparently the recognition of Baptism involves that of Ordination—in so far as the particular conditions necessary for it [specified above] are observed, which conditions are not found among the followers of Luther and Calvin,² but are found among the Anglicans." Thus this broad and liberal Orthodox writer cannot envisage recognition, even by a generous use of "economy," of a non-episcopal ministry. Androutsos (Δογματική—391-3; and Συμβολ 330) seems equally clear in this regard, and Mesolora (Συμβολ : II 335-6) is emphatic that while "schismatics" may be received by *Economia*, all "heretics" must be reordained or rather ordained.

The Holy Synod of Constantinople, in recognizing Anglican Orders (1922) did so (1) because of the fact of the true ordination of Archbishop Parker, (2) because "in this ordination and those subsequent to it there are found in their fulness those orthodox and indispensable visible and sensible elements of valid episcopal consecration—namely the laying-on of hands and the *Epiklesis* of the All-Holy Spirit, and also the purpose to transmit the *charisma* of the *Episcopal Ministry*."³

The learned Dr. Demetry, in his *Orthodox Catechism* (Chicago, 1929), says that the Church can, by economy, accept episcopal orders where the Apostolic Succession is unbroken (Armenians, Anglicans, Romans, etc.), but not where this has been lost, as in the case of Protestants.⁴

¹ Cf., Androutsos *Symbolikē* : Ως πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Διαμαρτυρουμένων ὁμοῦς κληρικοὺς, εὐνόητον ὅτι οὗτοι οὐτε ἱερωσύνην λαβόντες οὐτε κανονικῶς κατασταθέντες, προσιόντες εἰς τὴν Ὀρθοδοξίαν ἀναχειροτονοῦνται ἢ μᾶλλον χειροτονοῦνται το παῦτον, ἐὰν φέρωσι τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς ἱερωσύνης προσόντα.—p. 329-330.

² My italics.

³ My italics.

⁴ Τοὺς κληρικοὺς ὁμοῦς τῶν Ἑκκλησιῶν, ποὺ δὲν ἀναγνωρίζουν τὴν ἱερωσύνην ὡς Μυστήριον, ἢ ἔχουν τὴν ἱερωσύνην διακοσμένην, καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς, ποὺ χειροτονοῦνται ἐπὶ Ἐπισκόπου Ὀρθοδόξου ἑσται, διατελούμετος ὁμοῦς ἐν τιμῷ καὶ καθαρῶς, τοὺς χειροτονεῖ, θὰν προσέλθουν εἰς τὴν Ὀρθόδοξον Ἐκκλησίαν διότι εἶναι τελείως ἀχειροτόνητοι, ὅπως τῶν Προτεσταντικῶν

Since Protestant ministers are "utterly unordained," there can be no question of recognizing them as anything else, even by the widest exercise of *Economia*.

Brilliant articles on the Church have been contributed by Professor Boulgakov, of the Russian Institute of Theological Studies, in Paris, to *The Christian East* and *Theology* in England, and to *The American Church Monthly* on the other side of the Atlantic. His teaching is especially lucid. According to him, the Church "distinguishes between a canonical continuity of priesthood or its absence outside Orthodoxy. In the first case, after reunion, the Church accepts a priest without reordination, whereas in the second case, this is not done. . . . The absence of such continuity in Protestantism cannot, in any way, be compensated by reunion. A Protestant pastor will always be a layman to Orthodoxy if he joins it. On the contrary, if a Roman Catholic hierarch joins Orthodoxy he is received without reordination . . . the Church at all times, as now, recognizes at least potential priesthood in schism, which receives its full lawful strength and jurisdiction through reunion with Orthodoxy. . . . But *ex nihilo nihil fit*, as obviously follows from the relationship of the Church to denominations which have lost their continuity of priesthood."¹

"Continuity of apostolic succession does not in itself suffice for canonical appointment. However, it is also obvious that the absence of such a succession excludes the possibility of ordination. Uncanonical ordinations are not bound to be recognized by the Church; in the absence of such ordinations, nevertheless, the Church can, in no case, and under no circumstances accept such priesthood. Neither the present-day Ukrainian 'self-hallowers,' nor different kinds of sectarian priests, or Protestant pastors, in any kind of circumstances can ever be recognized as priests, because even the authority of the Church has its natural boundaries and cannot make the non-existent, existent. In this lies the immense difference between the objective position of all sorts of 'self-hallowers' and those ordained—that is, the ineffective hierarchy, if certain conditions are present, becomes valid without reordination; such a possibility exists here. It is true that the Church likewise has the right of *not recognizing* a false hierarchy, in spite of all the incontestability of its apostolic succession—in the same way as she did not recognize the hierarchy of all sorts of heretical and schismatic communities. But the Church also can, after reunion, accept these without reordination, which she cannot do with the unordained. Acceptance or non-acceptance at reunion is within the power of the Church, which is here guided by considerations of so-called Church 'economy'—that is, the practical wisdom and good of the Church. By accepting into

¹ "Outlines of Teaching About the Church," by Sergius Boulgakov (*The American Church Monthly*, Vol. XXX, No. 6, pp. 420-422).

the existing order the Church fills the insufficiency, gives power to the ineffective, imparts grace to that which lacked grace."¹

Fr. Boulgakov's articles in the Russian magazine *Put* (the "Way") are equally to the point and his threefold classification of ministries—(1) those valid in the strict sense, possessing both "actuality" and "power" [the Orthodox hierarchy]; (2) hierarchies outside the Church, possessing a true apostolic succession, which suffer a "paralysis" (though not a nullification) until reconciliation with, and acceptance by, the Church [Romans, Nestorians, and probably Anglicans]; and (3) those which are utterly null and void, beyond any possibility of Economic validation [Protestants, etc.], simply makes clear and explicit what has always been plainly implied in the doctrine and practice of Orthodoxy.

I have been assuming throughout that Dyovouniotes, in the passage in question, intends to assert that the Church could by *Economia* recognize any and every kind of ministry outside herself, e.g., those of Protestantism. He does not, however, absolutely say this, and he elsewhere insists on the necessity of a right faith, especially as regards the Sacrament of Ordination, and as he uses the word "canonically" rather loosely in several different senses (sometimes more or less akin to the western term "regularly"), it may be that he has reference to such sects as the priestly "Old Believers" with the Bosnian succession,² derived from one Bishop, which the Orthodox Church does not recognize as valid, but which, perhaps, by an extreme extension of *Economia*, could be validated. When he speaks of the loss of a "canonical" and "apostolic" succession, he may mean no more than this. This interpretation, which I submit tentatively, seems to receive some confirmation both from the ultra-rigid views of Dyovouniotes as to what constitutes "canonical validity"³ and from the fact that he proceeds directly to speak of "the explanation of the Church's action," i.e., he is seeking a *rationale* of the actual practice of the Church, which, as we have seen, and as he must know, has never accepted non-episcopal ordination even by *συγκατάβασις*. In any case, whatever his meaning,⁴ there is, I believe, not another Orthodox theologian of any standing who asserts the power of the Church to do what even Almighty God cannot do—blot out and reverse the past, turn her back on history, and make a non-existent succession existent.

A few words on the *rationale* of Economy may not be amiss. I suppose the nearest equivalent we have in the West is the effect of Baptism on the marriage of the unbaptized. The latter is, of

¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. XXXI, No. 1, p. 17.

² Or possibly such orders as those of the Swedish Church.

³ Also from his insistence upon the necessity of proving the canonicity of Archbishop Parker's consecration before recognizing Anglican Orders.

⁴ Dyovouniotes himself mentions other views on Economy, at variance with his own, held by Orthodox theologians.

course, not sacramental; yet if the parties are converted and baptized they do not need to marry again—the marriage becomes automatically sacramental (though they may, if they wish, have another ceremony). This analogy is used by Khomiakov in one of his letters to William Palmer, the famous Phil-Orthodox Tractarian. It should be noticed, however, that not every kind of union becomes sacramental through Baptism and entry into the Church, but only a true marriage. A temporary liaison or a "companionate marriage," à la Judge Lindsey or Bertrand Russell, would certainly not be validated or made sacramental in this way. So, too, in the exercise of *Economia*, apparently, only such Orders and Sacraments can be validated, as would, if performed *within* the Church (perhaps in emergency) be valid under similar circumstances. To have electric light in one's home, it is necessary not only to have the house wired, but to have the current flow from the power-house. If the current, for any reason, is shut off, the wires themselves will supply neither light nor power—such is the case with hierarchies of Apostolic Succession outside the Church. If the current is turned on again the house need not be rewired—unless the wires have fallen into such a state of disrepair meanwhile as to be useless. But the presence and activity of the power-house, likewise, will supply electricity only to the houses which are properly wired. Both factors are necessary—the wiring equipment (Apostolic Succession) and vital contact with the power-house (the Church). This crude illustration may, I trust, be pardoned, as an endeavour to make clear a conception which, to Westerns, is difficult to grasp.

I think that I have said enough to prove conclusively, from representative theologians and Councils of the Orthodox Church, that she could never, by the farthest stretch of *οικονομία* and *συγκατάβασις* accept non-episcopal ministries. The absolute necessity of an unbroken Apostolic Succession through the Episcopate together with a true (sacramental) conception of it, is maintained by her, without wavering or compromise, alike in her canonical practice and in her dogmatic teaching. Economy cannot be used where it would conflict with the latter.¹ We shall be wise if we do not risk the further dilution—or even destruction—of our Catholicity by acting on a conclusion the premises of which are most precarious.

¹ Or even appear to conflict. See the instructive article by Dr. J. A. Douglas in *Theology*, January, 1932.

TOWARDS REUNION.

By THE METROPOLITAN GERMANOS.

(Being the substance of two Lectures delivered during the Anglo-Catholic Pilgrimage to the Holy Land, 1933).

NEW impetus was undoubtedly given to the work of the reunion of Christendom by the famous appeal to the Christian World made by the Lambeth Conference of 1920. That appeal was, of course, addressed to all the Churches of Christ. If, however, it met with specially favourable attention from the Eastern Orthodox Church, the fact is due to the suitable preparation for it made by the Delegation of the Œcumenical Patriarchate which was present at that Conference. That is why from that moment began the new phase which was entered by our two Churches, the Anglican and the Orthodox, as a result of which their relations from being friendly became brotherly, as His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has called them. The last manifestation of this phase has been the two meetings between representatives of the Churches, held at Lambeth in 1930 and 1931. In touching upon these discussions I cannot but bear in mind the official documents which we finally agreed to sign and publish; but I shall not confine myself to these. For a short while I shall draw the curtain aside and show you the obstacles, the dangers, the fears and the hopes which went side by side with the work, and to stress the necessity of intensive prayer and work for the success of the blessed task of re-union of our two Churches.

THE TWO LAMBETH MEETINGS OF ORTHODOX AND ANGLICANS.

Although none of the participants in those discussions was at any moment deluded by the idea that he had come to sign the Terms of Reunion between the two Churches, yet all knew that the discussions had an official character. Thanks to the happy initiative of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and the willing co-operation of the Head of the Orthodox Church, the Œcumenical Patriarch, all the Orthodox Churches were represented with the exception of the Church of Russia, which is still struggling on the path of martyrdom. At the first meeting the Anglican Communion was more widely represented owing to the presence in London of Bishops from all sections of the Anglican world, for the purpose of the Lambeth Conference. But even at the second meeting it was

possible to have the representation of other Anglican Churches together with that of the Church of England, in order that on this point also the similarity between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches might be demonstrated. This similarity consists in this, that the whole structure of each is formed by a group of autocephalous Churches bound together by the ties of common faith and admitting the primacy of one among themselves. Care was taken that the Anglican Church should at the meetings be represented by delegates belonging not to one, but to all schools of thought in the Church, in order that the Orthodox taking part in these discussions might readily perceive the internal state of the Anglican Church.

A—THE FIRST MEETING AND THE SUBJECTS DISCUSSED.

As there was no pre-arranged programme of work, the discussions at this first meeting of necessity turned on subjects about which each side had shown particular interest. This interest was not the same on both sides. The Orthodox had from the beginning regarded reunion with the Anglican Church as the object, though remote, of the discussions and therefore had desired to ascertain its views on fundamental dogmatic questions about which they were unable to form an exact opinion from the written documents. The Anglicans, on the other hand, had a more immediate object in view, that is, inter-communion by economy between the two Churches—in other words the official ratification of a procedure followed unofficially and in exceptional circumstances where there is no priest of the one or the other Church. Thus they turned their attention more to questions of a practical nature. What were the questions discussed?

1. "Who is the highest arbiter in questions of faith?" was the first question put by the Orthodox. They came to put it since by reason of the established character of the Church of England the view prevails among many Orthodox that on questions of faith it is not the Church but the State which has the last word. The Orthodox wished to ascertain whether the principle prevailing in the Orthodox Church—by which any questions of faith arising are solved by Synods of Bishops, whether local or Œcumenical—holds good among the Anglicans also, irrespective of the different composition of the authorities governing the local Anglican Churches. The reply given that on questions of doctrine in the Anglican Church, also the last word belongs to the Bishops in Synod, was regarded as being satisfactory in principle. But the additional remark that the validity of general decisions is only final when these decisions are accepted by the local Churches, evidently shows that the speaker had in mind not an Œcumenical Synod, as it is understood by the

Orthodox Church, that is, a Synod having its validity in itself, but a Meeting of Bishops, such as the Lambeth Conference, whose decisions are not obligatory, but optional, for each local Church. Agreement was also reached on this point that the local General Synods of the Anglicans include laymen also, as a purely advisory body. For although in the Orthodox Church there are no organized bodies of laymen collaborating with the Clergy in matters regarding the faith, yet the idea of an advisory opinion from the laymen is not in practice unknown, since history records cases of devout laymen speaking before Œcumenical Synods on questions of faith.

2. The second question: "How, and by whom, is the person, who teaches things contrary to the faith of the Church, tried in the Anglican Church?" gave the Anglicans an opportunity to record the excessive tolerance prevalent in their Church, and the customary recourse in such circumstances to public discussions and private admonitions rather than judicial processes. From the examples adduced, however, it was shown that appropriate courts exist in every Anglican Church, although these are not everywhere constituted of clergymen or bishops, and in some of the Churches the decisions of the Courts require State approval before being enforced. The Orthodox recognize the Church's authority in matters of faith as absolute and consequently their ecclesiastical courts are composed of clergymen, and, according to their standing, the courts may proceed to impose the penalties laid down by the Canons.

3. The third question put by the Orthodox was undoubtedly far more important: "Whether the Anglicans recognize the priesthood as a 'mystery,' and Apostolic succession as necessary?" It is well known that some of the Orthodox Churches, foremost among which is the Œcumenical Patriarchate, have recognized the validity of Anglican orders. Others, however, have so far hesitated to do so. To remove these hesitations the Orthodox sought explanations of the above two points. If we bear in mind that the Anglican Communion accepts only two mysteries, Baptism and Holy Communion, as being in the main the mysteries necessary for Salvation, it was inevitable that the Priesthood would not be classed by the Anglicans among the mysteries coming under a special or foremost category. But the wider significance of the term "mystery" as designating a visible sign by which Divine Grace is granted, made it easy to place the priesthood in the so-to-speak second category of mysteries. Moreover the exposition of the relevant directions in the Prayer Book with regard to the ordination of Priest and Bishop, which testify to the special granting of the Holy Spirit at the moment of ordination, dispelled the suspicions to which the 39 Articles gave rise in the minds of the Orthodox that the Priesthood is not a mystery among the

Anglicans. Above all the declaration made by the leader of the Anglican delegation that, in the event of a divergence between the Articles and the Prayer Book, the authority of the Articles must be subordinated to that of the Prayer Book, could not but create a particular impression on the Orthodox who are accustomed to make no distinction of authority between the two.

Agreement between the two sides was even fuller on the second point—Apostolic succession. As is well known, the Orthodox Church clings immovably to the belief that no one may assume the clerical office unless he be ordained, if a deacon or presbyter by a Bishop, if a Bishop by more than one Bishop. Likewise it believes that its priesthood traces its origin to the Apostles by virtue of successive ordination beginning with the Apostles and coming down to our times. The declarations made by the Anglicans that their Church has always diligently observed the Apostolic succession, since it considers that it forms a link with the Apostles, and that ordination is performed in accordance with the directions of the Ordinal as in the Orthodox Church, removed any suspicion that the Apostolic succession had been interrupted in the Anglican Church. But since this is the view held by the Anglicans with regard to the importance of Apostolic succession, the Orthodox were unable to understand how the Bishops who met at Lambeth in 1920 yielded to such an extent towards the ministry—not ordained by Bishops—of the Free Churches and towards the Swedish Church, which is admittedly Lutheran and does not accept the three Orders of Clergy as do the Orthodox and the Anglicans.

The explanation given that, on reunion with the Nonconformists being achieved, the introduction of the Episcopate into the united Church would be laid down as an essential condition did not satisfy the Orthodox. For it was immediately followed by a statement that re-ordination by Bishops would not be required, as it is required at the present moment in isolated cases of Protestant clergy entering the Anglican Church. Nor was the fact of Inter-communion with the Swedish Church controverted.

But the Anglicans took advantage of the Patriarch of Alexandria's characterisation of their attitude to the Nonconformists, as being parallel to the "Economy" which is a feature of the Orthodox Church, to seek enlightenment as to how they should regard this "Economy." And although neither the significance nor the terms of "Economy" are officially established in the Orthodox Church, yet the Orthodox present were agreed that "Economy is a deviation from the strict interpretation of the canons made in certain circumstances where greater advantage thereby accrues to the Church, the fundamental principles of the faith being none the less preserved." The personal opinion of Professor Diovouniotis that this deviation can extend even to the recognition of the orders of heretics and schismatics,

among whom the apostolic succession has been interrupted, as canonical, was not supported by the Orthodox representatives inasmuch as the history of the Orthodox Church has no such example. Since, however, even after this meeting Professor Diovouniotis' opinion was repeatedly invoked as though it were the opinion of the whole Orthodox Church, I must point out that it is a question of a purely individual opinion, by which the Professor sought to extol the wide use of "Economy" made by the Church in cases where great numbers of heretics enter its ranks, but did not mean to say that the Church recognizes the validity of non-episcopal orders, considered in themselves. The Anglican Church, however, does do so, seeing that, in the words of the Appeal, "it in no way places in doubt the spiritual reality of the Ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate." In other words, it accepts the core of their ministry, which is their utilization as a medium of the grace of the Holy Ghost, and thereby reduces the laying of hands on ordinands by Bishops to the level of an external form. It is manifest that this facilitates intercommunion with the Protestants about which we have recently heard so much. Subsequent events have confirmed this, as also has the decision taken lately by the Church Assembly regarding intercommunion with members of the Free Churches, where it has the sanction of the Bishop.

4. "The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist and its character as a Sacrifice," was the fourth of the subjects put forward for discussion by the Orthodox. The teaching of the Orthodox Church regarding the Real Presence is based on the teaching of the ancient undivided Church and may be summarized as follows:—

After the consecration of the Holy Gifts which is affected by the celebrant invoking the Holy Spirit and blessing the Gifts, the Bread and Wine of the oblation are transmuted or transformed into the very Body and the very Blood of our Lord. Consequently, after the consecration they are called neither gifts nor elements, but only the Body and Blood of Christ. As regards the manner in which this transmutation or transformation takes place, the Orthodox Church refuses to busy itself with this question, but teaches that it surpasses human understanding and constitutes a miracle similar to the one by which our Lord in Cana turned the water into wine. And that they are the Body and Blood of Christ, after consecration in themselves, that is, independently of the person partaking of them, is shown by the agreed practice in the East according to which the priest reverently preserves the Body and Blood of the Communion in order to administer it to those of the faithful who are sick or in other exceptional necessity. And while it is true that Orthodox theology adopted and utilized the term "transubstantiation," from

Roman theology, yet it never quibbled over the philosophic distinction between "form" and "substance," which underlies this term, much less did it accept the vulgar materialistic conception of the Presence, since our Lord is present in the Sacrament in his glorious body. The eagerness of Orthodox theologians to introduce terms and explanations borrowed from Roman theologians, which is to be noted in the XVIIIth century, is explained by the desire to repel Protestantism in general, and in particular the Calvinist conception which threatened to penetrate the Orthodox East through the Calvinist Confession of Cyril Lucaris and through his followers who had been influenced by it. From the moment, however, that that danger had been dispelled, modern Orthodox theology returned to the terms which had been in use in the ancient undivided Church and thus stands devout and silent before the mystery of the transmutation. In the face of this clear, single teaching of the Orthodox, the Anglicans were not entirely successful in persuading them, by extracts from the "Catechism," the "39 Articles" and the "prayers" of the Anglican services, that these extracts cannot be interpreted as also signifying the subjective partaking by the believer of the Body and Blood of Christ rather than their actual Presence independently of the communicant. Hence arose the question which was put on behalf of the Orthodox by the Patriarch of Alexandria—whether the Anglicans admit that the consecrated elements which remain after the Holy Communion continue to be regarded as the Body and Blood of Christ. The emphatic answer given by the Bishop of Gloucester was listened to by the Orthodox with joy as it removed the doubts to which a reading of the extract supplied may give rise. Consequently, amazement was created by the fact that in the Committee's Report submitted to the Conference instead of the plain words, "Body and Blood of Christ," as they occur in the "Proceedings," the words "The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ" are used, and in explanation it is added "that they have the same efficacy as before the administration," which would have been superfluous if the compilers of the report had plainly accepted, as do the Orthodox, that these are the Body and Blood of Christ. The conclusions to which a little later the discussion held among Anglican theologians on the Holy Eucharist arrived, and the recognition of the possibility of more than one interpretation of the Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord, provide the key that explains the fear entertained lest an exact phraseology excludes the possibility of embracing within it more than one opinion.

The declarations made by the Anglicans on the second point, that is, the Holy Eucharist as a Sacrifice were based chiefly on the answer given by the two English Archbishops to Pope Leo XIII. and where favourably received by the Orthodox. For the Anglicans also stress the point that the Sacrifice offered on the Holy Altar is

not a repetition of that Sacrifice which was once offered on Golgotha, but is the very offering of that Sacrifice made for the remission of sins and for the good of the whole Church in lasting memory of our Lord's death for the redemption of mankind. By regarding the Eucharistic Sacrifice as one with that made on Golgotha, and without ignoring the belief that our Lord offered himself as a sacrifice, once and for all time, we may explain the blessings granted through such Sacrifices, of which the first is the remission of sins, as emanating from it. And although in the Archbishop's letter it is stated that the Holy Eucharist is offered as a sacrifice for the remission of sins, the Orthodox wished to have a further assurance that the Anglicans agree that it is offered on behalf of the living and the dead. After explaining the hesitation shown by the Anglican Church after the Reformation in praying for the dead, the Bishop of Gloucester added that the words in the Prayer of oblation, "that we and all Thy Whole Church may obtain remission of our sins" include the whole company of faithful people, living and departed. The assurance of the fact that prayers for the dead form a practice of the Anglican Church and, in particular, the extract from the Prayer for the Dead of the Episcopal Church of America, "accept our prayers on behalf of the soul of Thy servant departed and grant him an entrance into the land of light and joy," satisfied the Orthodox. Since, however, in their view the whole phraseology of the Prayers shows some reservation, the Patriarch of Alexandria expressed the wish that the Lambeth Conference should proceed to a formal declaration regarding the teaching in general of the Anglicans on the points discussed, in order that those who had not taken part in the discussions might form a clearer idea of the views exchanged. But the Lambeth Conference not having come together, as it stated (Resol. 33. c.), as a Synod to define teaching, refrained from making such a formal statement on the subjects referred to in the résumé and contented itself with declaring that it accepts the pronouncement made by the Anglican Bishops as a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England.

5. The discussion about dogmatic questions was in the main closed with the subject of the Holy Eucharist. The questions of a practical nature discussed were two in number. The question of intercommunion between the two Churches where there is no priest of one or other of the Churches, and the question of unification of administration in the Orthodox Churches in America. In the course of the discussion on the first question the Orthodox insisted that, whereas an agreement is possible from an Orthodox point of view in so far as Baptism and Marriage are concerned, the Holy Eucharist can only be administered by priests of one Church to

members of the same Church. It was stated that the reception of Anglicans into the Orthodox Communion, of which recent examples were cited, did not meet with the unanimous approval of the Orthodox. As regards the practice by which Orthodox receive Communion from Anglican priests, where there is no Orthodox priest, as happens in certain parts of America or elsewhere, the Orthodox representatives reserved this question, as not being within their competence, for consideration by the Pro-Synod which is to be called together, and contented themselves with accepting the continuance of the present practice as long as no Orthodox authority forbids it. As for the second question, an entirely inter-Orthodox one, it was mentioned that this, too, would be settled at the coming Orthodox Pro-Synod. Inasmuch as the Orthodox in America are actually under Bishops, each one of whom recognizes as his superior authority that Church to which by nationality and origin he and his flock belong, any questions arising have to be referred either to the head of the appropriate Church in the East or to the Œcumenical Patriarch. Thus ended the first meeting of Anglicans and Orthodox, at which agreement between the two Churches on important questions was registered and the way opened to further discussions and wider agreement. But this brings us to the second meeting of Anglicans and Orthodox at Lambeth.

B—THE SECOND MEETING AND THE SUBJECTS DISCUSSED AT IT.

Whereas at the first meeting, as we noted, the discussion turned on subjects which were raised at the moment by one or other of the discussing parties, the programme of the second meeting had already been arranged at the first. Its subject-matter was the Terms of Intercommunion, which had been compiled by the Archbishop's Committee on the Eastern Churches, and duly forwarded to the Œcumenical Patriarch; on account, however, of the circumstances in which the Œcumenical Patriarchate found itself at that time, they had not been circulated to the Orthodox Churches, just as they had not been communicated by the Archbishop to the various Churches of the Anglican Communion.

When the question of these Terms arose at the first meeting, on the one hand the Anglicans declared that they express the spirit and teaching of the Anglican Church, while on the other, the Patriarch of Alexandria showed that they can form the basis for discussions with the Orthodox with some amendments. The result of this agreement was the appointment by the Archbishop of representatives of the Anglican Church in accordance with the decision of the Lambeth Conference, and also an invitation forwarded to the Œcumenical Patriarch to appoint representatives of the

Orthodox Church in order to establish a Joint Doctrinal Commission to prepare a statement on the theological points about which there is difference or agreement between the Anglicans and the Eastern Orthodox Church. As is shown by the designation of the Committee as doctrinal, its object was to deal mainly with dogmatic questions, seeing that the Terms which were the underlying basis of the discussions were by their nature dogmatic. But the shortness of the time at its disposal did not permit of its dealing thoroughly with the whole of the Terms, much less of adding other points to be examined. But although the points discussed were few in number, they afforded ample material for the compilation of a joint report to show the existing agreement or difference between the two Churches on the points discussed, as also of a résumé of the Proceedings of the joint Doctrinal Commission. The points discussed were the following :

1. "*The Christian Revelation.*" The first of the Terms presupposed that we accept the Divine Revelation as it is taught in the Holy Gospel, as we have received it in the Creed of the Ancient Church and as it was expounded in the dogmatic decisions of the Œcumenical Synods of the undivided Church. The first thing which the Orthodox missed in the phrasing of this Term, was any mention of the Church and of the Mission which it has as guardian of the Divine Revelation handed down to it, as the expositor and teacher of this Revelation to the faithful to this day. Independently of the question whether the Bible contains the whole of Revelation or not—since this was to be discussed later when they came to the question of Gospel and Tradition—the Orthodox were unable, on an historical examination of the question, to admit that the Christian Revelation, that is, the totality of its truths and facts, was included in the Creed of the Ancient Church or was expounded by its Œcumenical Synods. They hold the view that just as external circumstances brought about the compilation of the books of the Bible without the purpose of including the whole of Revelation, so, too, the Church, by expounding it in the Creed or interpreting it in the decisions of the Œcumenical Synods, did not expound or interpret the whole of Revelation, but only that part of it which was called in question by the Heretics.

According to the Orthodox view, therefore, the interpretative or dogmatic activity of the Church, is not exhausted in the above records but can continue to operate on other points of Revelation if necessary. But this activity, functioning under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is not independent, but bases itself on the sources of Divine Revelation, the Bible and Tradition. Consequently the Orthodox Church accepts only so much of the so-called dogmatic development as suffices for the interpretation of the Divine Revelation and its

expression in the circumstances that may arise, but rejects any evolution that alters the contents of the traditional Revelation, and consequently that makes innovation, or introduces new teachings, as does the Roman Church in distinguishing between implicit and explicit dogmas. Hence whatever the Orthodox Church to-day teaches is not only such Revelation as was expounded in the ancient Church, but also the whole content of Revelation, the one part of it in the form it assumed by Synodical decisions, the other on the basis of its sources, the Bible and Tradition. These Orthodox view-points were expressed in an amendment to the Term proposed, and the subsequent agreement reached regarding a joint Term "on Divine Revelation" was the result of a long discussion.

It exalts our Lord Jesus Christ as the bringer of Revelation, and as the source from which we draw the revealed truths, the Holy Bible and the Apostolic Tradition, which, by the aid of the Holy Spirit has been maintained in the Church throughout the centuries. Thus the unique position occupied by the Holy Bible in the transmission of Revelation, for which the Anglicans strove, was preserved, but at the same time due recognition was afforded to the importance (upheld by the Orthodox) of Apostolic Tradition as maintained in the Church through the medium of the Holy Ghost.

2. "*Holy Scripture and Tradition.*" But whilst the disagreement that arose over the first Term was easily overcome and full accord was reached regarding the Canon of Holy Scripture, of which the second Term treated, it did not prove possible to surmount all the difficulties which presented themselves in the phrasing of the third of the Terms "of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture." In the first place the wording of the title gave rise to objections on the part of the Orthodox, on the grounds that it entirely leaves out of account the Orthodox view of the importance of Apostolic Tradition, and it was therefore agreed that the second and third Terms should be combined under the title, "Holy Scripture and Tradition." The Orthodox are, of course, aware of, and respect, the reasons for which the Anglican Church insists, both in the 39 Articles of Religion (VI and XX) and in the Form of Ordination of Bishops and Priests, on confining the Divine Revelation within the limits of Holy Scripture, just as they are not unmindful of the fact that the Roman Church drew from Tradition many of the innovations and practices with which, after the schism of East and West, it exerted pressure on the consciences of the faithful and exploited them. But the abuse of this Tradition does not remove its use. The fact that a Church was found abusing the purposes of Apostolic Tradition does not mean that that Tradition must, in consequence, be sacrificed, and with it the smallest particle of Divine Revelation. We Orthodox hold that the preaching of the Gospel, in other words the truths of Revelation, were in the

beginning handed by the Apostles to the Church by word of mouth, that external reasons called for the compilation of the Gospels and the writing of the Epistles, that for many generations the Church lived as a whole, functioned and disseminated the Christian faith without any common written record, that even after the appearance of the Gospels, oral tradition was a source of truth and a weapon to defend it in the Church, in short, not the Church for Scripture, but Scripture for the Church. Moreover, none of the Orthodox denies that Divine Providence granted that the greatest part of Divine Revelation should be included in the Holy Canon which the Church drew up, establishing whatever was apocryphal on the basis of the Tradition that existed in it and was preserved through the Holy Spirit, but none would admit that after the drawing up of the Canon, Tradition became superfluous or unbeneficial. Those who maintain that God desired that Tradition should be the source of Revelation only until the establishment of the Canon, but that afterwards God's will altered with the result that to-day its only source is Holy Scripture, are, in our opinion, attempting to probe the inscrutable purpose of God, and for ourselves we are not able to follow them in this.

And if some of the Fathers in attacking arbitrary errors that have no support from Holy Scripture, demand of the Heretics that they should prove the truth of their ways by Holy Scripture and stress the importance of it in proving the truth, as does St. Athanasius, there are others, as for instance St. Basil, who base the faith of the Church on both these—Holy Scripture and Tradition. It is precisely the fear lest perchance some element of Revelation is not included in Holy Scripture, but is preserved in Apostolic Tradition, that led the Orthodox to formulate that Holy Scripture is supplemented by Apostolic Tradition. In spite however of this radical difference in principle between the two views, which is in part explained by the categorical expressions regarding the question used by the Anglican Churches, we must admit that agreement between the two parties was greatly facilitated by the recognition of the utility of Tradition, given by the Anglicans on the strength of what is said regarding Tradition in the Catechism of Philaret of Moscow. For they accepted the view that Tradition is a guide to the understanding of Holy Scripture, to a proper celebration of the Mysteries and to the maintenance of customs and practices in their original purity. But they insisted that only Holy Scripture contains whatever is necessary for Salvation.

Hence it was deemed indispensable that in the joint Report the two view-points should be recorded side by side—the Anglican and the Orthodox, the former accepting that whatever is necessary for salvation is contained in Holy Scripture, the latter that Tradition not only illuminates and expounds Holy Scriptures, but also supple-

ments it in those points also which are necessary for Salvation. After the recording of these two varying view-points, further discussions ended in agreement between the two parties on the following three points:—

A. It was agreed that the source of Revelation in those matters which are necessary for salvation, is Holy Scripture, but that Holy Scripture must be supplemented, illuminated and expounded by Holy Tradition. By the formulation of this view the pre-eminent importance of Holy Scripture as the source of Divine Revelation was maintained, but recognition was shown of the necessity that in matters necessary for salvation it should be not merely illuminated and interpreted, but also supplemented by Tradition. What was particularly welcomed by the Orthodox was the reference at this point to the Church as interpreting the meaning of Holy Scripture and Tradition, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit which dwells in it and leads it to all truth.

B. The meaning of Tradition was jointly established. Tradition embraces the truths, which, having their origin in our Lord and His Apostles, have come down to us from the Fathers of the Church, have been continuously and unanimously confessed in the undivided Church, and taught by the Church with the guidance of the Holy Spirit. In this way it was recognized that Tradition does not in the main signify customs, practices or ceremonies having an Apostolic origin, but truths; and it was established that to discover this unbroken and unanimous Tradition we must turn to the Fathers of the undivided Church. As far as we know it was the first occasion since the time of the leaders of the Oxford Movement (who sought the standards of the teaching of the Anglican Church in that of the ancient united Catholic Church) that Anglicans of all the schools of thought thus officially recognized the importance of the Tradition of the undivided Church.

C. Inasmuch as the Orthodox accept that true Apostolic Tradition, in the same way as Holy Scripture is part of one and the same Divine Revelation, they felt no difficulty in agreeing with the Anglicans that there can be no opposition between these two. Tradition that is opposed to Holy Scripture cannot be true Tradition. But Scripture and Tradition, as parts of the same Revelation, although logically distinguishable, form essentially one whole and cannot be divorced from one another, nor be conceived as distinct from the Church, which is appointed the guardian and teacher of the Divine Revelation, which is contained in them. Thus through the agreement reached in these three points, even if the original disagreement between the two views was not entirely

removed, its extent, at any rate, was greatly reduced, so that it need no longer be regarded as an insuperable obstacle to *rapprochement* between the two Churches, when they come to an understanding regarding the content of Revelation.

3. "*The Creed of the Church.*" Inasmuch as the Orthodox Church admits the only Œcumenical Creed to be that of Nicæa-Constantinople, as exposed at the Synod of Chalcedon without the addition of the "*Filioque*," its representatives gladly accepted the fourth of the proposed Terms in which this is recognized as the Creed of the Catholic Church. Nor did they find any difficulty in accepting the Statement of the 4th Synod of Chalcedon as a development of the teaching contained in the Creed regarding the person of Jesus Christ and the relation of the two natures in Him. They did not, however, fail to add that, although they hold the Creed in especial reverence on account of its antiquity, they do not in any way set its dogmatic authority higher than the other decisions of the Œcumenical Synods, just as they do not admit a difference in authority between the Statement of the 4th Œcumenical Synod and the dogmatic Statements of the other Œcumenical Synods. But objection was provoked by the first part of the VI. Term, according to which since the Synod of Chalcedon forbade the drawing up of another "*faith*" that is, Statement, it is unlawful for a Church to require another Confession of faith as an essential condition of Intercommunion. In other words, that acceptance of the Creed of Nicæa-Constantinople and the Statement of the 4th Synod of Chalcedon, should be sufficient to obtain the privilege of receiving Communion at the Altar of the Orthodox Church. This formulation is due to a patent misunderstanding of the object of the prohibition. The Synod of Chalcedon by those words declared illegal the compilation or issue of another Statement—for that is what the word "*faith*" signifies—which should treat of the truths dealt with in the Statement drawn up by itself, it forbade, that is to say, the tendency to substitute for that Statement any other one compiled by individual or by Synod. But that the Synod was not disposed to prohibit the compilation by other Œcumenical Synods of Statements dealing with other truths of the faith, is testified to by the activities of subsequent Œcumenical Synods which likewise issued Statements in connection with other matters of the Faith, as, for instance the VIth Œcumenical Synod against the Monothelites, and the VIIth against the Iconoclasts. The Orthodox, however, agreed with the Anglicans in the second part of the VIth Term, in which it is stated that the Churches, which have received and utilize other Creeds whether in Baptism or in Divine worship or in their teaching may continue to do so, provided, however, that their contents are in accordance with Scripture and Tradition. In this way the

three Terms were united into one with the title "*the Creed of the Church*" and in it agreement was declared:

- (1) Regarding the one Creed of Nicæa-Constantinople, it being prohibited to issue any other Creed or to add to, or subtract from it.
- (2) Regarding the use in the West of the so-called Apostolic Creed and
- (3) The use was permitted in the services of the Church or in the teaching of the faithful of other written records provided that their content does not deviate from the Orthodox faith.

4. "*The Teaching regarding the Holy Spirit.*" The Anglicans' contention in the VIIth Term that the existing difference between East and West on the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father, or from the Father and the Son, is merely a matter of words and that both expressions are equally legitimate and express the same faith, was not acceptable to the Orthodox. It has now been historically shown which of the Western Fathers it is whose theology is responsible for the phrase "*from the Father and the Son*," which diverges from that which, taken from Scripture, is recorded in the Creed and generally accepted. It has been shown also what were the reasons which gave rise to it, where the "*Filioque*" was first added to the Creed and how after being introduced into the Creed by Rome, it became established in the West. By itself the precaution shown even today by some of the Anglicans and the fear expressed by them lest, if the addition be removed from the Creed, the truth revealed by it be dimmed, is sufficient without further analysis to prove that the difference does not lie merely in the word and that the "*Filioque*" did not originally mean what is meant by the "*through the Son*." The recognition, however, by the Anglicans of the fact that the addition to the Creed was illegal and that in joint Synods of East and West it must be recited without the addition, lessened the objections of the Orthodox, as also did their assurance that every phrase or formula connoting the existence of two sources or agents in the Trinity is to be rejected. For that reason they showed great readiness to accept the phrase of John Damascene "*through the Son*," as showing not that the Holy Spirit exists by the Son, but that the Spirit is manifested through him and transmitted to creation, as the Orthodox representatives had done at the Bonn Conference (1875).

In the VIIIth Term the question was raised by the Anglicans of preserving the addition to the Creed for those Churches in the West, which originally received it with such addition, since its removal might cause offence to the people. In their reply the Orthodox

emphasized the danger of misunderstanding, to which the maintenance of the "Filioque" might give rise, as also the difficult position of the Orthodox *vis-à-vis* the Uniates in certain Orthodox countries, if the addition be tolerated, and finally declared that to concede the maintenance of it in given localities, was not within the competence of the Orthodox delegation. In the end, as neither side wished to resume discussion of the whole question, since it had been thrashed out at Bonn, we agreed to accept the proposals jointly adopted regarding the teaching concerning the Holy Spirit, but rejected every proposal or formula of expression suggesting the existence of two sources or agents in the Trinity, and accepted the teaching of John Damascene, that the Holy Spirit proceeds "from the Father through the Son," combining the VIIth and VIIIth terms into one only, "the teaching concerning the Holy Spirit."

5. "*Variety of Customs and Permissible Practices in the Church.*" In the IXth of the proposed terms a juxtaposition of the passages from Augustine and from Photius on customs makes it immediately clear that the former ranked among these such practices as have received the authority of our Lord and of Holy Scripture, while the second confined them to the purely ecclesiastical practices. Seeing that the first belong by their nature to Apostolic Tradition and as such form part of Divine Revelation, the Orthodox judged that a discussion about them could not, at that point, be held. And since the Anglicans agreed with that view, the passage from Photius was taken as the basis for the new formulation of the term. According to that passage, only those customs and practices are absolutely obligatory for the whole Church, which are founded on a general or Catholic agreement, whereas each Church remains free to accept or to reject those customs which have a local character. What, however, holds good for the Churches, regarded as a whole, does not hold good for the members of each Church, who must abide by the customs and practices of the Church to which they belong. The Orthodox, indeed, admitted that differences in practices that existed between East and West and were tolerated as such before the Schism, could not but continue to be so tolerated to-day. Likewise they added that the local Canons prevailing in the West have validity insofar as they contain nothing opposed to the Orthodox faith or to the Canons of the Ecumenical Synods.

6. "*The Sacraments.*" As in the discussion on Scripture and Tradition, so in that on the number of the Sacraments, the Orthodox at once noticed that the Anglicans insisted on the acceptance of only two Sacraments, Baptism and Holy Eucharist, not because they differ from ourselves as to the significance of the Sacrament, but because they were restricted in this matter by their creeds and

particularly by the 39 Articles. The reason for which the Reformers confined the Sacraments to two, pretexting that the remainder were not immediately established by our Lord or that they lack any external sign, or again with some of them there is no connection with the remission of sins, the *sine qua non* of every true Sacrament, is too well known for us to deal with it at length here. The abuses of the Roman Church in mediæval times against which the Reformation was aimed, had their origin in the Sacraments, and especially in the Sacrament of Confession, which in the hands of its priest, was not only an instrument for weighing down the conscience, but also a readily available means of material exploitation. The careful observer may in many passages of the Prayer Book of the Anglican Church notice that the public confession of Christians, as well as the remission of their sins by the Priest, takes place at this or the other service. Its utility, therefore, when practised publicly is recognized, although private confession and remission of sins is avoided for fear that through their use there may arise in the Anglican Church the ugly practices of the Roman Church. In discussing the number of the Sacraments we Orthodox willingly recognized the exceptional position occupied in the list of Sacraments by Baptism and Holy Eucharist, the first since it introduces us into the Church, the second since in an extraordinary manner it unites us with Christ. Likewise we admitted that the number of the Sacraments varied in tradition at different times, but contended that evidence is to be found in Scripture and tradition of the seven Sacraments now in use, and that each one of them bears those signs which show this Sacrament to be in practice. We insisted that we can make no distinction between these two and the other five as to their essence, but confine the distinction to the relatively unapproachable height of the Divine Grace imparted by the first two. The Anglicans further explained the phrase in the *terma* that the two sacraments "are generally necessary for Salvation" and declared that they are "necessary for the salvation of every Christian," whereas "the others may prove necessary in given circumstances." But they did not give a satisfactory answer to the question whether Confirmation is a Sacrament necessary for the salvation of each one, although they declared that the Anglican Church requires that everyone baptized should receive Confirmation in order to partake of Holy Communion. Since in the course of the discussion it appeared that the theory of the necessity of this or that Sacrament arises from an erroneous conception of the significance of the sacramental Grace, the writer deemed it right to explain how the Orthodox understand it. According to him, "Sacramental Grace is the totality of the gifts by which our Lord, through his death upon the Cross, has assured salvation to us men. The Steward of Grace is the Body of Christ, *i.e.*, the Church continuing the work of Jesus Christ. To further

the salvation of men the Church makes use of this Grace in its wholeness according to the needs of the spiritual life of Christian men. She made use of this or the other ray of the Divine Grace. Insofar as the use which was made of Divine Grace was more important with regard to its effects, they could speak of the Divine Grace as being of more or less importance. However, in the appropriate circumstances he thought the Grace afforded to them in every Sacrament was necessary. That did not mean to say that every Christian individual was obliged to use the Grace of each Sacrament. For instance, no one would say that Ordination was obligatory for everyone, but it was absolutely necessary for the life of the Church, for without it the continuity of the Church could not be maintained. That is what he meant by saying that it was necessary and not obligatory. It must be admitted that, in spite of their insistence that the name Sacrament should be applied only to the two Sacraments, the Anglicans greatly contributed to the approximation of the two viewpoints, first because they recognized that the other Sacraments also which have an Apostolic origin bring great advantage to the Church, secondly because they, too, agree with the Orthodox, that, for example, in the Sacrament of Ordination a special Charisma is bestowed on the ordinands. Hence, although in the term the two viewpoints of Orthodox and Anglicans, regarding the seven Sacraments, were formulated side by side, yet the agreement achieved as to the significance of the Sacraments and the utility of all of them in the spiritual life of the Church and all Christians was greatly applauded. Furthermore, it was admitted on both sides that there can be variety in the method of celebrating the Sacraments, provided, of course, that the essential elements of each be observed.

DIFFICULTIES AND HOPES.

The impression which the Orthodox took away with them from these two meetings of the representatives of our Churches in connection with the ulterior purpose of them, that is, the *rapprochement* and re-union of the Churches, was, generally speaking, favourable. The ancient preconception of the Orthodox that the Anglican Church is nothing other than a branch of Protestantism, only distinguished from the other Churches in that it has preserved the Episcopal order as a relic of Catholicism from which it broke away at the Reformation, was in great part dispelled as a result of these meetings. Immediate personal contact and discussion demonstrated that the Anglican contention that their Church is also Catholic, as the Creed calls it, and that it forms a part of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, gradually began to be regarded as not entirely unfounded. Whether its catholicity is manifested in it to such a

degree as to make its reunion with a consolidated Catholic Church, such as the Orthodox Church, an easy matter, is, of course, a different question. The nature of that question depends on the answer to the question as to how great has been, and is, the influence of Protestantism in it, whether, that is, the Protestant element in it is the greater, so as to prove it a Protestant Church, or whether that element is in such a minority that the Church remains a Reformed Catholic Church. The answer to this question is, however, a difficult one on account of the peculiar character which, owing to its composition, the Anglican Church had from the beginning, and still has to-day. Although those who steer a middle course, among whom are the Archbishops, call it both a Catholic and Protestant Church, consequently a Bridge Church, yet the parties in it regard it otherwise. Thus the Evangelicals and the Modernists exalt its Protestant character to such an extent that they call it absolutely Protestant. The Anglo-Catholics, on the other hand, discern in it such a strong Catholic element, that they are accustomed to call their Church "Catholic" and themselves "Catholics" or "Anglo-Catholics," in order to distinguish themselves from the "Roman-Catholics." But that brings us to the various schools of thought in the Anglican Church, regarding which the Bishop of Gloucester thought it right to give some enlightenment to the Orthodox at the second meeting, as he had previously given to the Old Catholics.

In speaking lately about these three Schools, about their shortcomings as also about their advantages, the Headmaster of Harrow said that, so far from constituting an obstacle to the unity of the Anglican Church, on the contrary, they contribute to such unity, since each of them supplements the other. The Bishop of Gloucester in his report preferred to place these schools rather on the fringe of the Anglican Church, and in the midst of them, uninfluenced by them, the greater part of Anglicanism, which steers a middle course. The spirit of this tendency which avoids the extreme views of the schools is represented, according to him, by the Lambeth Conference in its decisions regarding the questions, dogmatic, ethical or even purely ecclesiastical arising from time to time. But whether we accept the one view or the other the fact remains that all these schools of thought are admissible in the Anglican Church and their members continue to belong to the Church and to enjoy as well its other spiritual blessings as also Communion from its spiritual table. But does this, perhaps, happen because the subjects of difference between the schools do not touch upon the essence of the dogmatic system of the Church, that is to say, are of secondary importance? But in opposition to the acceptance of this view there is, first of all, the history of the Anglican Church which shows many examples since the Reformation of mass withdrawals or even individual desertions, precisely because the differences between the parties at variance

were insuperable or irreconcilable. In the second place, if we follow the struggle to-day being carried on between the various parties, we know well that the contestants themselves do not attribute a secondary importance to their differences, but regard them as touching the very essence of Christianity as a revealed religion. So numerous and so well known are these points of variance that it is difficult to occupy ourselves at this moment with an exposition of them. But how do we explain the fact that, in spite of these essential differences, the unity of the Anglican Church is preserved, except for isolated withdrawals?

First. The Anglican Church has learnt from its past history how precious a thing is the unity of the Church, and how great has been the damage and loss sustained at various times through secessions of groups which contained in themselves the seeds of vigour and action invaluable to the development and advancement of the joint religious life in the whole Church. Hence the Anglicans in all discussions regarding reunion always stress the point that they undertake them, not in the name of this or that party, but in the name of the whole Anglican Church. Secondly. As long as each one of the parties continues, within the framework of the one Church, to struggle for the prevailing of its own principles, it cherishes the hope that it will finally succeed in setting its own seal upon the pattern, which in the course of time the Anglican Church will assume. But if it withdraws from the unified ecclesiastical life and activity, it runs the risk of being isolated and finally becoming one of the many separated Churches, not to say Sects. Furthermore, the Church of England, if torn asunder, will cease to be the Church of the English people and will be dismembered into small groups not able to exercise the influence which to-day the Church exercises as a whole on the spiritual life of the nation. This conviction in conjunction with a well-conceived patriotism, that is, the higher interests of the English nation, inspires the members of the various Schools with the spirit of broad toleration, which is not comprehensible to those who have not closely followed the evolution of the Anglican Church.

However, since this is how the internal condition of the Anglican Church appears, is its re-union with the Orthodox Church possible? It is well known that the Orthodox Church, when it found itself within the great Reformation currents of the 16th century, did not immediately feel the Protestant influence, but continued to carry on the tradition of the ancient undivided Church. Of course, even for Orthodoxy, the 17th century was not entirely free from Protestant incursions which in particular date from the time of Cyril Lucaris' Confession. But that Confession recalls also the struggles to which the Orthodox Church devoted itself in order to repel them and preserve its true Catholic character. And if the success of its struggles

was occasionally achieved even by borrowing Roman Catholic phraseology and arguments, this is easily comprehensible and is explained by the condition in which Orthodox theology found itself after the fall of Constantinople. But that the Orthodox Church was not thereby bound to the chariot of Roman teaching is proved by its attitude to the decisions of the Council of Trent and of the Vatican Synod and its reaction to every innovation of Rome, in the past as in the present. The tendency of present-day Orthodox theologians is to proceed free from influence from one side or the other to the formulation and exposition of Orthodox teaching on the basis of the dogmatic definitions of the Seven Œcumenical Synods and having, as their unfailing guide, Holy Scripture and Tradition. This, however, in no way signifies that in the Orthodox Church the existence of theological views or Theologoumena is not permitted. But such theological views do not deal with the main points of dogmatic teaching, which is essential and indispensable for salvation, but only with those of secondary importance. It is, therefore, an unsuccessful attempt which is made by some of our Anglican friends to discern in the existence of such theological views something analogous to the schools of thought existing in the Anglican Church. Let us illustrate this by means of an example. While no Orthodox can be such if he denies the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist after the consecration, irrespectively of whether he uses this or that term to explain its reality, the Anglican continues to be such whether he accepts the Real Presence or denies it and inclines to the views of the Receptionist, or the Calvinistic or so-called symbolical views. Consequently, whereas the Orthodox Church diligently avoids using terms which might be construed equally in one or the other way, the much talked-of comprehensiveness of the Anglican Church aspires to such terms in order to satisfy the various conceptions of one and the same truth.

Since, therefore, in this respect the Orthodox Church continues to be an unreformed Catholic Church, as it is reproached for being by the Protestant party, how can it be united with a Church which contains in itself Protestant elements? One of two things must occur. Either the Orthodox Church will, in course of time, lay itself open to Protestant influences and in altering its character as a true Catholic Church will acquire those elements which will approximate it to the present condition of the Anglican Church, or the latter will, by increasingly appropriating Catholic principles, approximate to the teaching of the Orthodox Church. The careful observer of the spiritual development in each of the Churches is persuaded that while the theological leavening in the Orthodox Church is turning more and more to the revival of ancient tradition, the prevailing tendency in the Anglican Church is that which embraces Catholic principles. In effect, by reason of the more rapid

prevalence in the Anglican Church of these principles, we feel optimistic that the *rapprochement* and re-union of our two Churches is not beyond the bounds of possibility.

But, besides the existence of various schools of thought in the Anglican Church, the Orthodox are somewhat estranged by the narrowness of the frame of the Doctrine as set out in the appeal of the Lambeth Conference of 1920. In its desire to facilitate the re-union of the Anglican Church not only with the Catholic Churches, but also with the Free or Protestant Churches, the Conference concentrated Christian teaching on four points, forming the well-known quadrilateral; *i.e.*, Scripture, Creed, Episcopal Order and the two Sacraments, that is the totality of the truths which each local Church must accept in order to become a member of the one united Church of the future. And, indeed, as long as the Anglican Church starts from such beginnings and can find in some one of the Catholic Churches the elements which alone it regards as essential, there is nothing to prevent it from coming into Sacramental intercommunion, as it did lately with the old Catholics. It had merely to characterize the other truths which go to form the dogmatic system of that Church as of secondary importance and not necessary for Salvation. But this quadrilateral of Lambeth disregards the importance of Tradition as supplementing Holy Scripture or limits it to those particulars only which were included in the ancient Creed. Consequently it does not recognize any further tradition, it confines the dogmatic development to the first five centuries and does not admit the right of the Church, when the occasion presents itself, to formulate and determine its teaching. Likewise, there is no mention of the significance of the Church, nor of its nature and composition, nor of its authority as guardian and interpreter of Divine Revelation, but only of the Episcopal order, as necessary to the fulfilment of its mission on earth. And there is proof that the Conference regards even the Episcopal order in a peculiar way, in the fact that it decided to hold sacramental communion with the Swedish Church merely by reason of its conviction that that Church has maintained the Apostolic succession of its bishops, without taking into account that the Swedish Church is a purely Lutheran Church. Because, as is well known, Lutheranism makes no distinction between the orders in the ministry, but accepts the ministry as something which has its origin not in the desires and injunctions of our Lord, but in the wishes of the Community. The Bishops continue as such in the Swedish Church, because their usefulness has been recognized, and not because it holds the belief regarding bishops, as a special order, which was held by the ancient Church, and it is supposed is held by the Anglican Church. We refrain from embarking upon a criticism of the views regarding Apostolic succession formulated by the Bishop of Gloucester after the discussion and agreement on it reached

at the first Lambeth meeting, contenting ourselves with characterizing it simply as a denial of it. Likewise the discussion regarding the Sacraments held at Lambeth makes it superfluous to dwell upon the importance which the Orthodox attach to the other sacraments as well. The narrowness of this quadrilateral even then attracted the attention of the Patriarchal delegation as is shown by the report it submitted and must indeed always do so and compel the Orthodox to extend any discussion with the Anglicans to points which have not been dealt with by the quadrilateral. We thus have a clear idea of the difficulty which the Orthodox meet with, through having a wider framework of truths that must be believed, in becoming united with a Church which has so much restricted it. This difficulty will be overcome when the Anglican Church gradually proceeds to appropriate the Catholic principles and widens its dogmatic framework, so as to include also those truths which to-day are regarded as of secondary importance. Insofar as the development of the Anglican Church tends towards this, hope and optimism regarding the reunion of the two Churches increase.

Since, however, we have been bold enough to speak about the difficulties in the way of Re-union that are due to the Protestant elements in the Anglican Church, we do not hesitate to give a piece of advice to the opposite party, that is, the one which in its excessive Catholic zeal tends to confuse Catholicism and Romanism. We do not ignore nor do we minimize, as do some of the Anglicans, the internal relationship and connection between the Church of England and the Church of Rome before the Reformation. But since this relationship was interrupted by the Reformation, which sought to rid the former of the teachings and practices which had been introduced by Rome, it cannot on any account be to its interest to return to these, as certain members of the Anglo-Catholic party seek to do. It is not to the advantage of the consolidation of the internal peace of the Anglican Church, since it irritates one section of the Church, the Evangelicals, and makes it turn against even the truly Catholic principles and practices. It also harms the work of reunion with the Orthodox Church, which if it looks with suspicion on anything that reeks of Protestantism, turns with much greater vehemence against any attempt to establish in the future United Church principles and practices that are purely Roman. We know that they constitute a small minority. But if they continue unbridled, they create the impression that complete dogmatic anarchy exists in the Anglican Church and confirm hesitations that perhaps exist as to the possibility of reunion.

RUSSIAN MISSIONS: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH.

By PROF. G. FLOROVSKY.

(Reproduced with acknowledgment from The Church Overseas.)

I

IN a certain sense the whole history of Russia is a process of colonization, the peopling of a country or the settling of inhabitants in different parts of it. In this movement the Church took a creative part and not only did she follow the people but often she led them. Strangely enough, she led them even at the time when she seemed to be deserting them by withdrawing from the outer material world into the world of spirit, for it frequently happened that the ascetics and hermits were the pioneers on the rough and half-wild virgin soil in the north and north-east of Russia. For them the dense forests served as a desert, but they were followed by the world from which they wished to escape and so they had to depart from their settlements and get away still farther, cutting into the very depths of the primeval forests. Thus the ascetic retreat from the world attracted, as it were, the advance of the world; a process which historians call monastic colonization.

This was an important factor and moment in the social history of the Russian people, and at the same time it was a missionary process, that is, a geographical propagation and extension of the Church. The baptism of Russia cannot be looked upon as a single fact; it was rather an extensive process spread over centuries, a process of Christian occupation of new lands and territories. For a long time the Russian Church was in a state of constant movement, wandering about, practically leading a nomadic life and always entering into the lands of the unbaptised either simultaneously with the State or often even before it. Up to the last the Russian Church was like an island in the midst of a pagan sea, and even inside Russia itself she was always a missionary Church. Missionary work, that is the calling of unbelievers to the faith, was a part of her daily life.

It was from Byzantium that the Russian Church received the bequest of carrying on this missionary work and to this end it adapted the Byzantine methods.

This meant putting in the forefront the use of the vernacular or local dialects in preaching. In other words, it was evangelization as a way of awakening the new peoples to a Christian life, and at the same time it was an adaptation to a tradition of culture, but without any negation or suppression of national differences and peculiarities. By this means the Slavonic people, enlightened and

baptized by the Byzantine missionaries, were drawn into the vortex of Byzantine civilization and yet did not lose their Slavonic features.¹

Canonical and administrative correlations were difficult and complicated, but they had no effect on the inner life.

Translation as a method of missionary influence is a major premise of Byzantine missionary work, and that method was adopted by the Russian civilisers and missionaries from the very beginning. In this respect the personality of St. Stephen of Perm, the civiliser of Zirian and a friend of the Revd. Father Sergius († 1396), is most brilliant and expressive. Of his own accord he undertook a missionary journey through the district of Perm. He not only preached but even officiated in the vernacular, with which purpose in view he had to translate the holy scriptures and Church books, and to do this it was first necessary to work out a Zirian alphabet which he probably based upon the local Runic signs.

St. Stephen's idea was to create a local "Perm" Church in which all the spiritual forces of a newly civilised people would have revealed themselves and received their consecration. His immediate successors in the see of Perm were inspired by the same ideal, which however, was not attained, his Zirian Orthodox Church being finally absorbed by the Russian Orthodox Church. It is indeed possible that St. Stephen wanted to give the Zirians somewhat more than they really needed or were able to absorb and retain. Not all peoples possess their own culture, or indeed can possess it, and that "can" or "cannot" is a bare historical fact. Not every people or tribe has its own spiritual words, its own creative style for biological and spiritual expressions and phenomena of different grades. These facts present great difficulties for missionary work and a missionary must possess great tact and sensitiveness in order to learn and find the right way.

In any case, however, it was the missionary ideal of St. Stephen of Perm that continued to be a typical guide in the Russian Church till quite recently. The Gospel was preached and divine service performed in many tongues.

Particularly noteworthy is the creation of an Orthodox Church for the Tartars with their own native clergy in the Kazan region. But the most brilliant example of that missionary nationalism is the creation of a Japanese Church, which grew up and still remains as one of the dioceses of the Russian patriarchate.

Missionary work must start first of all with translation, as it is always necessary to begin in the vernacular. The Gospel must be translated and reduced to writing, or at any rate related in the tongue of the country; but as the work goes on questions arise. Is it necessary to translate the whole Bible and the whole cycle of Church books as well as to work out in each tongue the theological

¹ The history of the Georgian Church should be compared in this connexion.

terminology which is necessary for the translation of dogmatic formulæ? The difficulty here lies in the fact that many of the tongues are still undeveloped and insufficiently flexible and rich in their vocabulary to be used in mystical and sacred quotations. The missionaries often have not only to invent an alphabet but, as it were, to invent and work out the tongue itself. Another difficulty arises in translating into languages of non-Christian civilisations, for here are many old associations and a lack is felt of words to express the new conceptions because the old words have too many old connotations. In any case a missionary must have a great philological gift and sensitiveness; a loving and lively sense of the tongue; a desire and power to penetrate into the foreign soul and understand it; that is to say, one has in a certain sense to have the faculty of sympathetic reincarnation.

The same is, no doubt, required from every pastor and teacher in general, but the claim on these qualities in missionary work is especially acute. Very often missionaries have to create and build up the civilisation of the natives, for it is often impossible to draw the line between the evangelical doctrines and everyday life. Too often it is necessary to change or even to break up the whole structure or mode of life which has become too closely amalgamated with the pagan past and too firmly a part of daily life. Sometimes it is necessary to isolate the neophytes from their own people, often for the sake of their own safety. Again, for them to benefit from the preaching of the Gospel, it is important to enlarge the mental outlook of a flock that is being sought for, so as to arouse and elevate its requirements, and this again is only possible by bringing them into touch with a higher civilisation which has already taken root. It is generally only by the acceptance of this higher civilisation that the hidden forces of a newly enlightened people can be awakened. In experiments in real life one cannot draw a line between religious and worldly things. According to the inner logic of missionary work itself a missionary ought to enter into the daily life of his people. It is not wrong that a missionary should be involved in worldly business and cares; this is only wrong if he loses the true perspective of the Gospel and yields himself up to the spirit of the world. It is inevitable for the mission to come face to face with the State, *i.e.* to co-operate with it, or at least to work alongside the State's compulsory and organising institutions, but it is difficult to say which is more difficult, to co-operate or to struggle. Help and facilities from the State generally rather complicate the inner work of a missionary. The application of direct force is not so dangerous, but the strength and power of the State unwittingly overawe, and superiority of culture attracts, with the result that the genuine simplicity of a Christian conversion and its growth is hampered and the *tempo* of missionary work becomes too rapid. Sometimes the mission inevitably enters into controversy

with the State; for it may happen that the interest of the State demands delay in the Christianizing movement among younger nations; or sometimes, on the contrary, baptism acquires for the empire the means of forcing them into a central civilised political union. In the case of local dialects, too, the methods of evangelization may appear injurious from the point of view of the State. To find a way through all these difficulties and conflicts in the process of creating the Christian life is only possible by creative inspiration and sagacity.

II.

The concrete tasks of Russian missionary activity were defined by the growth of the empire. At first it was the evangelization of an inhabited country, above all of a Slavonic population. Then the movement spread into the region of the Finnish tribes. Strictly speaking, the conversion of the smaller Finnish tribes has never been completed. The influence of pagan inertia remained strong up to the last and was responsible for the fact of masses falling back to paganism after the Russian revolution. In this respect the North-East of European Russia may be taken as an example. The religion of these Finnish tribes may be defined as animism with a strongly developed belief in magic and sorcery; in this sorcery and still more in the sorcerers themselves lie the chief causes of the pagan stability.

In the sixteenth century the Russian Church came face to face with Islam, and especially in the time of John the Terrible, after his conquests and annexation of the Tartar kingdoms along the river Volga. The meeting with Islam was rather hostile. It is true that many Tartar races accepted baptism at once, but on the whole the mass of the Tartars remained faithful to the traditions of their fathers, and it was only for the sake of preserving their national characteristics that the principle of toleration was advanced against any intrusion of the Orthodox mission into the secluded world of the Tartars. The right course of making missionary influence felt was found here only when the ideal of Tartar Orthodoxy was brought forward openly and fearlessly. But one has to bear in mind that the presence of a Russian mission amongst the local Moslems was only one of the incidents of the great world struggle of Christianity with Islam, and that it was always affected by the broad religious and political perspective. The regions along the river Volga remained the experimental fields for missionary work up to the last. Here the old paganism was still preserved amongst the natives, and all this country overlooked Asia with its religious zeal and inertia.

Here the Orthodox mission for the first time came into touch with the Lamaism of the Kalmuck who migrated to the province of

Saratov at the end of the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century the circumstances of missionary activities were not, in general, favourable: the State interfered too powerfully with the affairs of the mission, pursuing its own interests, that is to say, getting the maximum benefit for itself from the people. Often enough, indeed, the State put obstacles in the way of the missionary work, especially among Moslems, and generally speaking the eighteenth century was a difficult period in the history of the Russian Church, which was somewhat restrained by the supervision of the State and weakened materially by the secularisation of her property. Only a few held fast at that period of general indifference and spiritual backwardness. The advance started again only at the beginning of the nineteenth century. This delay is very important to note. With it are bound up the chief difficulties of the mission of the nineteenth century. A new tradition began and was established.

As a matter of fact it was only at the beginning of this nineteenth century that the mission commenced its development in the provinces along the river Volga. This was above all due to the activities of the Bible Society and its branches. In the first decade of the nineteenth century the New Testament was published in the following translations: Nogay, Tartar, Tchuvash, Morduates, Tcheremiss, Kalmuck, Zirian, Votjak and Korel. It must, however, be noted that these translations are far from being always satisfactory and reliable.

At that same time native schools were opened and teaching was commenced in the local dialects. Special courses were organised, and ecclesiastical seminaries for the training of teachers and the more serious study of the native environment and the work to be undertaken by the mission were founded in the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy (founded in 1842). Here a special section of missionary training was opened in 1854. In the year 1867 was also started the missionary brotherhood of St. Gouri, which occupied itself with the external and internal arrangements of the mission and especially with the publishing work and the starting of schools. In 1883 it was generally recognised in principle that the performance of divine services in the local tongues was admissible and desirable. A whole series of brotherhoods came into being in other dioceses and a network of native schools began to spread abroad. The missionary struggle with Islam was particularly difficult owing to the well-developed network of Moslem schools and to the great zeal of the Moslem clergy. In order to succeed it was generally necessary for the missionaries to break up the primitive form of life and to work out new and independent ways of social life for the neophytes.

It is well to point out yet another object of missionary activities within the boundaries of European Russia, the enlightenment of

the Eskimo who led a nomad life on marshy plains in the Government of Archangel. Since the twenties of the nineteenth century the whole New Testament and catechism had been translated into the Eskimo tongue, and a grammar and dictionary were compiled (Mission of Archimandrite Veniamin Smirnov).

The missionary activities in Siberia were still more intricate. There they had to preach to pagan Shamanists (predominantly small Finnish tribes) and to the Moslems, and, above all, to the Lamaists, and one must strictly distinguish these different spheres of missionary work and the varied methods that they required.

The great extent of territory and the roughness of the climate fully explain the comparative slowness of regular Church and even governmental organisation. Small and isolated oases sprang up in the midst of an empty, and, for a long time, inimical world.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century it is well to draw attention to the activities, full of inspiration (particularly amongst the Finnish tribes) of Phylophei Leshchinski, the missionary who was twice on the throne of Tobolsk, and between these appointments became a monk. In spite of this he carried on the missionary work, personally exposing his life to great risks. He made several journeys to preach the Gospel to the Ostiaks and Voguls, etc. To consolidate the results, he opened schools and organised churches, though for a long time the newly opened churches could only be served by visiting chaplains. The new parishes were at enormous distances, and consequently the chief centres, monasteries and cathedral cities, were of great importance, these providing the constant stream of active workers. It is particularly necessary to note also the missionary expeditions (in the middle of the eighteenth century) to Kamschatka, whence Christianity spread across the islands to the Alaskan shores of North America.

In the eighteenth century, also, there sprang up an Orthodox mission in China, at Peking, principally on behalf of the Russian prisoners of war who had settled there, but also for the purpose of collecting information. But, generally speaking, missionary work in the eighteenth century was very insignificant. Its revival in Siberia begins only in the nineteenth century, and once more we must emphasize the rather unfriendly attitude adopted by the State towards the Orthodox mission. In the eighteenth century, preaching to the Kirgeeses was forbidden, and conversions to Islam were, if anything, patronised. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Lamaian hierarchy was recognised by the State. The spiritual awakening which followed conversion and baptism troubled the local representatives of the government. The raising of the tone of life meant that the pulse was quickened and strengthened, and that appeared to be troublesome. In the eighteenth century the too zealous missionaries were moved farther

on, to places where there was no one to convert. But at last, in the nineteenth century, several outstanding and permanent missionary centres arose in Siberia, amongst which the Altai mission deserves above all to be noted. It was started in 1830 at the initiative of Evgeni Kazantzev, at that time Archbishop of Tobolsk, and at the head of it was placed the Archimandrite Makarios Gloukarev. Archimandrite Makarios was a remarkable man, of great spiritual earnestness and very profound, but rather exalted by eschatological interests and those Utopian ideas which were characteristic, even in the West, of the beginning of the nineteenth century. Undoubtedly a mystic, and the translator of eastern and western mystics (e.g., St. Teresa of Spain), he knew how to find common expression with others and to weep even with the Quakers. He himself led a very rigid, ascetic and evangelical life, and the Metropolitan Philaret, who knew him intimately and loved him, called him a "romantic missionary." And, indeed, Makarios introduced into his missionary work a literally romantic zeal and ardour. He looked upon his missionary calling with sincere humility and he tried to arrange it on the principles of a strict communism. "Let it be our rule that we should possess everything in common, money, food, clothes, books and everything else, and let this be a means of facilitating our inspiration towards unanimity." It is an apostolic rather than a monastic ideal. Makarios had few assistants, but with them he succeeded in achieving unanimity. He did not hurry to baptize, and during the thirteen years of his work he converted only about 650 persons. In his work he laid great stress on the "call to faith." He endeavoured to attain spiritual regeneration and to awaken sincere and sparkling faith in sleeping souls. He preached Christ crucified, and great stress was laid on re-education and the achievement of moral ideals. In accordance with his ideas a sisterhood of widows and young women was attached to the mission.

Makarios himself was much occupied with translations, and at one time he was possessed with the idea of translating the Bible (especially from the Hebrew), but his work was disapproved by the central authority, and to this resistance he attached great importance. He worked out a general missionary scheme which was called "Some notes on the means for an intensive propagation of the Christian Faith amongst Jews, Moslems and heathen in the Russian Empire," 1839. For those destined to missionary work he considered it necessary to establish in Kazan an educational missionary centre, a monastery-school for which a more elaborate scheme for ecclesiastical and ethnographic education was to have been worked out.

The full significance of Fr. Makarios' enterprise can only be appreciated when the harsh and rugged nature of the region of the

Altai is borne in mind, and the poverty of the mission as well (up to 1857 its budget was only 571 roubles a year).¹

After Makarios the Altai mission continued to flourish, particularly under the management of Father Vladimir Petrov, who later on became a bishop in the Altai, and died Archbishop of Kazan. Still later another Makarios worked there, who in the time of the Great War was Metropolitan of Moscow. Less valuable work was done by the Obdorsk and Surgut missions in the same diocese of Tobolsk.

In course of time the missionary duties were distributed amongst the parish clergy, and they had to face the work unaided by special missionary institutions. This step was somewhat untimely and indiscreet. The missionary advance ought to have continued constant and persistent in view of the general low standard of life, and the absorbing influence of environment.

The second bright page in the history of the Siberian mission opens with the activities of Archbishop Nilus in Eastern Siberia (Irkutsk 1838 to 1853, depicted in Leskov's famous novel *On the Edge of the World*) and in particular of Innokenti Veniaminov, later Metropolitan of Moscow after the death of Philaret.

Archbishop Nilus took an interest in mission work while Bishop of Viatka, even before he was appointed to Siberia. In Irkutsk and the Trans-Baikal region it was necessary to preach to the Buriats who belonged to the Lamaian Faith. Nilus worked a great deal on the translation of Church books into the Mongol-Buriat language and still carried on that work after his reappointment to Yaroslavl. Innokenti Veniaminov commenced his work on the Aleutian Islands, which at that time belonged to Russia. Here he preached to the Koloshes and the Aleutes for about fifteen years. He studied local dialects, compiled a grammar and a dictionary and began to make translations; he also left us a description of the country and the ways of life there. According to his scheme made in 1840, the mission at that time in the Russian possessions in North America was legally organised and placed under the management of the Bishop of Kamschatka. Innokenti was appointed to the bishop's throne, and for twenty-eight years he worked in this new country, new and yet his by birthright. His diocese covered enormous distances, and most of his time was spent in travelling. His assistants translated the Church books into the Yakut and Tungus tongues.

Mission work against the Lamaian faith in the Trans-Baikal Country was most difficult; yet many improvements were made there by Parpheni Popov, the Archbishop of Irkutsk, and later on by the Archbishop Veniamin Blagonravov. The mission in China never could attain any noticeable growth, though a great work was

¹ About £58. (Translator).

done in translation, and the mission at Peking was the general centre of sinological studies for a long time. The mission workers were in consequence more prominent for their scientific than for their apostolic achievements. China is in general a very difficult country and unfavourable for missionary work.

In a very different way the life of the Russian mission in Japan was progressing. Of course, it was very much owing to the personal qualities and exploits of the first of the Russian missionaries Nikolai Kazatkin, who, later on, became Archbishop of Japan, or rather its apostle in the true sense of the word. He began his work in 1861, soon after Japan opened her doors to Europeans and prior to the declaration of toleration. Yet the mission began to grow very quickly. Again the method of translation was adopted and many years were spent in the translation of the Christian service books, and a net of Orthodox parishes spread gradually all over Japan.

In the history of the Japanese Orthodox Church one is struck by the astonishing simplicity and strength of the immediate corporate Church feeling. Parish life goes on very actively and intensively. Diocesan meetings with the parishioners participating are organised every year. The work of the catechists goes on slowly and steadily and the cultural level of Japanese Orthodoxy is sufficiently high for it to spread also among educated people. For many years an ecclesiastical seminary existed in Tokio, and the Japanese Church has long ago become an independent diocese with complete internal status and management and is canonically a member of the Moscow patriarchate.

III.

Missionary work does not lend itself well to schemes of management and organization issued from the centre. It is, above all, the work of pastoral creative power and inspiration. Therefore it depends much more upon the personality of the individuals who are the active workers than upon plans and programmes, and that is why the history of a mission is bound up closely with names. Therefore, too, missionary work often progresses spasmodically and stops altogether at intervals. And yet it is very important that the personal initiative should find an encouraging response, sympathy and facilities in the whole Church body. Therefore when in 1865 the Orthodox Missionary Society was inaugurated this was considered an event of great importance. Its work, however, became really effective only after its reorganization in 1869, when Innokenti, at that time Metropolitan of Moscow, became its president and its activities became more interwoven with the metropolitan see.

The missionary society had its branches in the centres of work

and took the financial cares of the mission and its parishes upon itself. Yet there was another important task which required organised help, the scientific and scholastic training of the missionaries who were in need of good knowledge and understanding of the environment in which they would have to work. It was necessary to know the language of the people, their history and their ways of living, all leading on to an understanding of the soul. It was necessary to see how to approach that soul with the word of Christ's truth, and for this, knowledge of a language and folklore is not alone sufficient. The specific blending of an apostolic divine light and the *pathos* of a stranger's philosophy is essential and these qualities are more easy to be found in natives.

The necessity for a high ecclesiastical missionary school was not realised at once. Only in 1854 was a special missionary section opened in the Kazan Ecclesiastical Academy, and it was left there even after reforms had been introduced in ecclesiastical schools in general in 1870. A specific teaching of missionary subjects had already begun in 1845 with the participation of the professors of the Kazan University, but as a matter of fact the studies were concentrated exclusively on languages.

Names such as Sabloukov, Ilminsky, Bobrovnikov, are important and unforgettable in the history of the Kazan Academy. Sabloukov was a man self-taught in the Arabic and Tartar philology. By hard work, fired by scientific enthusiasm and a natural love of work, he attained to profound erudition not only in the languages themselves but in history and archaeology as well. His translation of the Koran is especially well known. Not all the books written by him were published, many of them perished in a fire at his home. His teaching in the Academy and his participation in all missionary undertakings amongst the Tartars meant very much.

Still more important was the work of Ilminsky, who arranged his experiences of preaching to the Tartars in systematic order. Ilminsky was adverse to the method of polemics. He tried to work out a scheme of preaching for the purpose of conversion. He not only had scholastic and theoretic training, but understood intimately the life and ways of the local Tartars. He visited their villages and lived amongst them for some time in order to penetrate intimately into their manner of life. He also in 1851-3 travelled in the east with many breaks by the way, making long stops at Cairo, Lebanon and Constantinople. As the outcome of this practical acquaintance with the mass of the people he came to a very important conclusion with regard to translations. He insisted on the necessity of these being made in the living conversational Tartar language and not in the literary language, and this was of the utmost importance. In the first place the literary language of the Tartars was laden with Arabic and Persian words and had a general flavour of Islam, and by the use of the colloquial speech it

was possible to escape that hidden Moslem taint. Secondly, the translation into a colloquial tongue requires great creative powers and intensity on the part of the translator and this was exactly what Ilminsky wanted. He was aiming at the formation of a specific Christian Tartar language in opposition to an Islamic one and saw in this an important step in the matter of preaching. The language itself was not to him something already developed and stationary, it was a living spiritual element which it was possible to transmute and transfigure. With this was connected a scheme for working out a whole network of Christian Tartar schools with the teaching carried on in the tongue of the people. Thirdly, there was in view the democratization of the mission, which spread far and wide among the masses, avoiding the book-learned and the aristocrats. Ilminsky's scheme was a complete system for the Christian transformation of the Tartars, yet without the least trace of any Russification. A note should also be made about the Arabic letters which he changed into Russian, as being more convenient, since he saw in the Arabic alphabet the presence of Moslem culture while that of Russia bore the symbols of Christianity. He did not believe in the fruitfulness of any preaching unless done in the people's own tongue. "Christianity as a living principle should work as a leaven in the thoughts and feelings and after having taken shape in men of advanced minds it should come from and through them to others. We believe that the evangelical word of our Saviour Jesus Christ, having become incarnate, so to speak, in the living tongue of the Tartars and through it having associated itself most sincerely with their deepest thoughts and religious consciousness, would produce the Christian revival of this tribe." Nevertheless, the Ilminsky scheme did not spring into being at once nor without some opposition both in the Kazan district and in Turkestan.

A net-work of schools, with a seminary as a centre at Kazan, was organised and Ilminsky was appointed director of the seminary. Yet the most important work was still translating. This required great creative power and for it Ilminsky found help amongst the baptized Tartars. Furthermore, the introduction of divine service in the Tartar language proved one of the most effective missionary methods. Of Ilminsky's assistants and followers should be mentioned such persons as the Archpriest Malov, Ostrooumov, and the Tartar Timofeiev. The principles laid down by Ilminsky were also applied to other spheres of missionary enterprise among the natives. In connection with the study of anti-Lamaian controversies, there were no such outstanding organisers in the Kazan Academy as this man.

A. A. Bobrovnikov was a great authority on the Mongol-Buriat dialect and he compiled the first successful Mongol-Kalmuck grammar of that period. A native of the Irkutsk district and the

son of a missionary, he felt, when mingling with the Buriats, an intimate nearness to this Mongol people. His book studies were supplemented by his scientific expeditions. Yet he was not a man of initiative and could not find the true methods of translating though he did expose some faults of the previous literary translations. In spite of all its incompleteness the work done by the Kazan Academy was of great importance for the help given to the missionaries to penetrate into the souls of non-Europeans, and it has not even yet been fully appreciated or used to the uttermost.

IV.

Russian missionary work amongst the foreign tribes was put an end to forcibly. The Gospel of Christ on Russian soil became an impossibility and as a consequence a return to former beliefs took place especially among the Shamaist tribes in the districts of the river Volga and in Siberia, though at one time for some reason a partial freedom was enjoyed by Islam.

It is not given to us to foresee the future or to make guesses with regard to the fate of the Christian Faith among the native tribes of Russia; but we can, and it is necessary that we should, look back, so as to understand and consider well the lessons of the past which bear on the words: "Whosoever shall do and teach them the same shall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven." (Matt. v. 19.)



A RUSSIAN WEEK-END ON MONTPARNASSE.

By PAUL ANDERSON.

NO one can have connection with the Russian Christian Movement, pioneer organization in youth work among Russians, and not have all sorts of interesting things happen to him all the time. In our headquarters here at 10, Boulevard Montparnasse are centred a dozen enterprises varying all the way from a "Sunday-Thursday" School of religion for 350 children, to the principal publishing concern in the world printing Russian religious-philosophical books. There is a Superior Technical Institute with its flourishing evening courses and its thousands of correspondence students, Russians living in 46 different countries. Three magazines are published here; here is the headquarters for the Russian Student Christian Movement with a dozen branches in other lands. There is vital and varied activity.

The past few days have brought a score of interesting incidents and I put down a few of them here, to share with folk at home.

FROM "WALRUS" TO "ST. ANDREW'S."

When I first made the acquaintance of this group of boys, I learned that they called themselves the "Walrus Club." And I thought it not a bad title. They are a bit rough, more than a bit awkward, with some rather chaotic ideas in their heads. They are not sure just what they should do, but one item stands out clear—their first duty, even before that to their families, is to serve their country. More than half their life has been spent in emigration, but Russia is the centre of their dreams and the goal of their aspiration. The notion of a naval-military formation has expressed itself in their uniform designed by themselves; a boy-scout sort of shirt with plenty of room for "distinctions" on the sleeve, and sailor trousers with bottoms two feet in diameter.

The mention of pants leads me to digress slightly and tell of one particular pair, in the club. Bundikov is one of the gang's leaders, for the moment out of work, whose father, an artist, combines the usual amount of practical sense which genius is supposed to have with very strict ideas as to proper conduct of his son. They live in extreme poverty. Bundikov wanted his father to get him a pair of trousers so he could go to a dance in full "Walrus" uniform: he had had his old Scout shirt dyed dark blue to match the trousers he wanted. But the father was opposed to the idea of dancing and refused to do anything about it. From somewhere, no one seems to know exactly how, Bundikov produced the cloth and made the trousers himself. Still determined that the boy should not

visit the dance halls, his father put the new trousers into the stove. Here club solidarity asserted itself: the other members turned in to help: somehow another pair of pants with the proper flare at the bottom, was provided. And I very much suspect that Bundikov went to his dance.

Last Sunday, at the time for our regular session, there was no meeting. One or two members came in at a time, then left, and others turned up. From the general uneasiness I learned that there was "a split in the club." A serious personal difference between two of the most active members had increased the difficulty. So we gave up the idea of a regular meeting. Part of the gang stayed in the game-room and part of us went down to attend service in the lovely little church the students have made out of the former garage.

The church was crowded, mostly with young folks. It was the beginning of Lent, "Forgiveness Sunday," and the service was especially solemn. I am sure most churches in America never heard their pastor make a speech like that of the priest, this evening. Instead of trying to quote it, let me give you his own words, in a paragraph from his letter to the members of the Movement. This evening Fr. Tchvetverikov said about the same thing.

"The first day, on the very threshold of Lent, is the great and moving Forgiveness Sunday, when in accordance with ancient custom, we meet in our churches for common prayers of repentance and the mutual request for forgiveness for pain we have caused each other, for unkind feelings, for lack of attention, coldness or carelessness. On that day the whole Movement feels a sense of repentance and mutual reconciliation, and flowing from this, a sense of pure joy and inner peace.

"Conscious of my own deep responsibility before the Movement for lack of love and attention, for the feebleness and lack of warmth of my prayers, for my indolence, faint interest, unapproachability, for my incapacity to fulfil as I should the duties of spiritual leader of the Movement, to respond to the questions and needs of young hearts and minds, I bow to the earth before the Movement and beg forgiveness for my weaknesses and failings."

For a moment there was absolute stillness. Then the choir went on with the moving "prayers of repentance." Here and there in the crowd people turned to each other and whispered a request for forgiveness. Suddenly Boris, one of the club leaders standing beside me, turned and left the church. Through the open door I saw him cross the courtyard directly toward the group where stood Volodya, the "other side" of the dispute mentioned above. In five minutes Boris was back in the church once more.

I had asked Volodya and Pavel, his closest chum, to go out to a café for a chat. "Nothing special—let's just have a good talk about things in general." As we started off together after church,

Volodya suddenly said: "Donald Ivanovich, do you know what happened? Boris asked my forgiveness." There was no need to inquire if it had been granted. One difficulty in the club life had been settled.

"You know," they told me, "we decided the other night to change the club's name. Now we are the St. Andrew's Club. And we have a dandy new flag with the St. Andrew's Cross on it, almost finished. But we decided that perhaps it would be better to wait until our club amounts to something, before we bring the flag to church to have it blessed. Somehow it would be more suitable. What do you think?"

Yesterday the new president asked permission to put up a new poster he had made. With its vivid picture of a soldier going into attack against a background of battle-smoke and bursting shells, it represents hours and hours of work. The text may not indicate such an amount of thought and Volodya found it difficult to understand why our non-political principle prevented publication of the poster, but it represents this group's type of thinking.

TO YOUTH!

Who among you does not burn with the desire to serve our long-suffering fatherland?

Whose heart is not wrung as he sees how our fatherland is being destroyed?

Whoever loves our fatherland with all his soul, let him join our group.

St. Andrew—(The Walrus)

for its idea is battle for our faith and for the holy things which have been desecrated. Battle

for Great Russia instead of USSR,

for a strong national Government

for government by those who love Russia,

for freedom of religion, free speech and free press (except that of the left),

for freedom to hold property, for private property, free trade and free labour,

for the equality of all before the law,

for independent and just courts,

for order and justice,

for free schools for all,

for our Fatherland,

FOR RUSSIA.

They sound like fifteen-year-olds. As a matter of fact they are 18. Part of the "first generation" of emigré children, who spent their most impressionable years in the chaos of civil war and

refugee camps, went to school, if at all, one term in Constantinople, two in Prague, and finished in Berlin or Paris, they have a psychology of their own. They are a bit uncouth, not a little immature, but shining out like a diamond in a coal heap is a burning, almost fanatical love of Russia and a determination to serve her. Just what will come of them no one can tell. They are boys without a country—living in France but not of it. It is a difficult and a dangerous position, but as long as a free and mighty Russia fills their thoughts and originates their plans, they are certainly not hopeless.

FRIED-CAKES FOR THE UNEMPLOYED.

One of the most interesting bits of social service the Movement instituted last year was its kitchen for the unemployed. Themselves without means, the students have collected funds to enable the operation of a kitchen providing bread and soup for an average of 60 men daily throughout the year. The sum approximates 1,000 francs per month. One Russian newspaper has helped to raise funds, but for the greater part of the material support necessary, the group has had to depend upon their own efforts among Russian emigrés. How the project appeals to the Russian public was shown by a recent incident.

It was "Butter-Week"—the last week before the strict fasting of Lent begins, the week traditionally devoted to good eating. Claudia Pereshnev, the girl who manages the kitchen for the unemployed, works in an office on the third floor. The other day she was summoned to the street level to meet an old lady who could not climb the stairs. She found a Russian peasant woman, kerchief over her head just as though she had come from Pskov or Vologda instead of a town in France. She carried a large basket which she offered the girl.

"Here are 95 fried-cakes I made for your kitchen. It seemed a shame that the unemployed should not have something special for Butter-Week."

The material outlay for such a quantity of food is considerable, to say nothing of the labour of preparation and transport to Paris. The visitor was so evidently neither rich nor physically robust, that Claudia was touched.

"And whom are we to thank for this?" she inquired.

"Oh, that does not make any difference," the woman replied. "Just tell them a woman from Velizy made them." (Velizy is a suburb thirty minutes from Paris.)

"But I am sure the men would like to know the name of such a kind person," Claudia insisted.

"That is not important at all," the donor stated, "let them eat these cakes to the glory of God"—and she went slowly out, refusing any further information about herself.

PASTORAL OF BARNABAS, PATRIARCH OF SERBIA.

Summarized from a translation by L. Patterson, D.D.

BARNABAS, Orthodox Patriarch of Serbia with the Holy Archi-episcopal Synod, sends his fatherly blessing and greeting to all his Orthodox clergy and people, the heads of the people, fathers and children, and issues this epistle about the Penitential Year of the Lord, which begins now at the beginning of the loyal fast.

God-loving brethren in Christ and faithful children of Orthodoxy, Peace to you and grace from our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ now and for ever!

Fateful events have occurred in nineteen centuries. Fateful and so great, that everything else that is called great in the world appears as an ant-hill in front of a mountain. The one true lover of men, the one faithful friend of all men in the world, our Lord Jesus Christ, gave Himself to be crucified on the cross out of love for the human race.

From this event of events, from this miracle of miracles, there have passed fully nineteen centuries. And His holy Church, holy from end to end, is able to-day to celebrate this jubilee of jubilees. The Serbian people, who celebrate the defeat of Kosovo as a victory, can more easily than other peoples understand how to celebrate Christ's Golgotha as a victory.

How then must the universal Orthodox Church celebrate this rare jubilee?

In such a way as best corresponds to the most accurate title of this year. And the most accurate title of this year, we think, is—"The Year of Penitence."

I. Of what must this Year of Penitence remind us?

II. What does it require of us? and

III. How can it profit us?

I.

This Year of Penitence must remind every individual Christian of all his past. Everybody should review and verify all that has happened to him in this earthly life: pleasant or unpleasant, light or dark. He should measure all by the standard of Christ's Truth and Justice. He should penetrate into the secrets of his life and recognize the Divine Providence in all things. With judicial strictness and as before the face of God he should reveal all, judge

all, and separate it to left and to right. As representing the judgment of others he should become the judge of himself, according to the words of the holy apostle; "if they would judge themselves, they would not be condemned."

This Year of Penitence must also remind our whole people of their past, the great teacher of life, which clearly shows what befell our forefathers, when they walked according to the law of God, and again, when they trampled on the law of God. Let this Year of Penitence remind us of the father of our nation, the holy Sava Nemanyich and his spiritual dynasty of Serbian saints, men and women, to this fair pleiad of national heroes, who for ever bound the national soul to the honourable cross, wed the national heart to the King of the heavenly Kingdom, and clearly cut out the road of right progress and salvation for all future generations. Then, having reminded themselves of all this, let them look, consider, and see: where do we, their descendants, find ourselves to-day and in what ways are we walking?

Finally, the Year of Penitence must remind all baptized peoples of the saving sacrifice of Christ for the human race. If all, then in any case and in the first place, it should next to us remind our Orthodox brethren: Russians, Bulgarians, Greeks, and the rest of God's peoples with Apostolic traditions and great history of martyrdom for the true faith. Let all baptized peoples look at their past and see what grace they all received from Christ. Let them estimate to what nobility and enlightenment they have risen from savage darkness, in which their pre-Christian forefathers languished for thousands of years waiting for the light. Let them remember and see, again, what misfortunes have befallen them all, when they have sinned against the seal of baptism set on them and have wandered in anti-Christian ways.

II.

What does this Year of Penitence require of us?

It puts us before the Lord of glory crucified on the Cross and requires of every Christian soul penitence. Having remembered the goodness of Providence in his life, as well as his negligences and lawlessness, let every soul repent contritely and change his life from darkness to light. He who has done evil let him refrain from evil, till evil has been wholly stifled in him. He who has left off fasting let him return to fasting, as an extraordinarily helpful means of bodily and spiritual health. He who has neglected prayer, let him light the extinguished lamps in his house; let him renew prayer to his all-highest Creator and the saints of God.

This Year of Penitence requires penitence not only from the individual, but also from the whole people.

Let all our people rouse themselves from spiritual somnolence and moral frailty. Let them cleanse themselves from sin. Let them bring to the Lord sacrifices of grace and goodness. Let the penitents in the course of this year go in smaller or larger groups, to our numerous shrines, monasteries, pious foundations of their kings and saints, many many heroes of spirit and virtue. With the people—both the heads of the people, priests and clergy, men and women teachers, and all the descendants of those steel characters of Ustanak, all sons of Prince Lazar of Kosovo, all spiritual sons of St. Sava. Let them in pilgrim throng fill all our land with spiritual song and thankful prayers.

III.

Let us ask ourselves, what profit will this Year of Penitence bring to us?

All possible benefit, both heavenly and earthly if only we understand its summons, and fulfil its demands. We expect, dear brethren and children, that this year will bring a general awakening from the sleep of sin; the calming of strife; the opening of eyes to the spiritual, heavenly world; moral purification and regeneration of our whole life, personal, social, and national. This cannot be achieved by any earthly power, or any external reform and reorganization of national life. This can be achieved only by the grace and power of God, this very tireless and inexhaustible heavenly power, which has shown this wonder countless times till now in penitent sinners, individuals and nations. Apostolic witness says: we all who with open face behold the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same likeness from glory to glory as from the Spirit of the Lord. What does this mean, except that a fundamental transformation of people and nations is firstly possible, and secondly—possible only with Christ and through Christ! They who look at His glory, are transformed into His likeness.

This is the Year of Penitence. Let every soul awake and look at the life-giving Cross of Christ. There is no sickness, which this Cross does not heal. There is no evil power which does not flee from it.

Christ is our life and salvation in both worlds. If we turn to Him, all problems will be easily solved. For we shall not solve them, but He.

If we believe in Christ, all the wounds of humanity will be quickly healed. For earthly weakness will not heal them, but heavenly power. He will heal them, who is at the same time Healer and Remedy. AMEN.

The Christian East

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE

BY the kindness of the Œcumenical Patriarch, Mr. Edward Every has been received as a student at Halki, the famous Theological Academy of Constantinople. In pre-war days Halki was known as the Bishops' College because for centuries a majority of Greek Orthodox Bishops had been its alumni. Among its modern *shloarcheis* were Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, who discovered the Didache and the Second Epistle of St. Clement, and, as Metropolitan of Seleukia, Archbishop Germanos of Thyatira. During the war, Halki was almost closed. Nor until a few years ago was it possible to revive its life. Mr. Every writes, however, that it has now seventy students, including a Russian priest from Poland. Its present head is the Bishop of Miletosis.

FATHER SOLODNIKOV, whose most interesting article on "Russia under the Terror" we are publishing in this issue, was the representative in London of the Metropolitan Anthony and the Karlowicz Synod for the six months' vacancy which followed the lamented death of Bishop Nicholai.

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

OUR Association sustained a severe loss in the death of our distinguished Vice-President, John Gennadios, Minister Emeritus of Greece to the Court of St. James's. Born in 1844, he entered the Greek diplomatic service as far back as 1875; ten years later he became Greek Minister in London and remained at this post till 1897. Shortly before the Great War he returned as Minister, and only retired in 1918, at the age of 74.

A Greek of good family, of high culture and fastidious literary tastes, his long residence in this country had so assimilated him to English ways and habits of thought that it was difficult to believe



ܡܪ ܝܨܝܐܝܐ ܝܥܩܘܒ ܥܦܪܝܡ ܝܥܩܘܒ ܡܪ ܝܨܝܐܝܐ ܝܥܩܘܒ ܡܪ ܝܨܝܐܝܐ ܝܥܩܘܒ

HIS BEATITUDE MAR IGNATIOS, EPHREM I,
Syrian-Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, 1933.

that he was not an Englishman. In fact, he may be truly said to have become an Englishman without ceasing to be a Greek; he was equally at home with both races and he thoroughly understood their different mentalities. His successful career at St. James's was largely due to this combination, no better representative of the Greek nation could have been found. Gennadios was a deeply religious man and conspicuously loyal to the Orthodox Church. But he understood Anglicanism better than any of his co-religionists, and when the opportunity came after the war, in 1918, he threw himself wholeheartedly and with all his power and personal charm into the cause of Re-union. How far he was the inspiration which brought Meletios, then Metropolitan of Athens and now Patriarch of Alexandria, to England in December, 1918, to make the first approach of the Orthodox Church to the Church of England, we do not know. What is certain is that from that moment he did all in his power to promote the *entente* of which we see the fruits to-day. As host of the Eastern prelates, as their interpreter at Lambeth and at the various conferences, an office for which as himself a student of theology he was peculiarly fitted, he did a service which no other person could have performed. Though, owing to his advanced age, he had latterly withdrawn from his active pursuits, his death leaves a gap which it seems impossible to fill. His soul has gone to the God he served on earth and with it we send our prayers to the Throne that he may find rest and peace and that reward which the Lover of mankind bestows upon His faithful servants.

ATHELSTAN RILEY.

ON January 6th, the Russian Christmas Eve, a pilgrimage to the Church of St. Philip, Buckingham Palace Road, was organised by the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. About two hundred Anglicans were present from various parishes, most of whom had had no previous contact with the Orthodox Church, and it is hoped that this pilgrimage has resulted in the establishment of several fresh centres of interest in the Re-union movement. The Anglicans owe a special debt of gratitude to the members of the Russian congregation for the charming way in which they made them feel at home, and also to Fr. Theokritov, who showed a number of them over the church before the service. The singing was, of course, as usual, excellent, and did perhaps more than anything else to impress the visitors with the beauty of Russian worship.

THE student of the history of Mt. Athos is aware of the brilliant Athonite seminary which once functioned there. Founded at the beginning of the eighteenth century, through the initiative of the Patriarch Cyril V. and with the help of the priest-monk Meletios

Vatopedinos, on a hill near the monastery of Vatopedi, it began its work in 1752, with the wise, inspired and very learned Eugenius Bulgaris as its first teacher. Unfortunately, owing to the very mediocre standard of secular education possessed by the students, the Athonite School did not function as it should have done under this highly-gifted ecclesiastic for more than four years. Still, even after the four years' educational activity under Bulgaris was over, the Athonite School continued its labours under other excellent teachers of the Greek race, such as Neophytos, Cyprian, Parios, Zertoulis and others, till about 1821, though it could not show the same activity as under Bulgaris. Neglected after the departure and death of these teachers and falling into ruins, the Athonite School was not rebuilt till 1842, no longer near the monastery of Vatopedi, but in Karyes, the market town of Mt. Athos.

Various learned bishops and monks taught in this Athonite School, but it was not able to show very important results from the educational point of view, owing to the varied vicissitudes which the whole Greek nation was passing through at that time under the Turkish tyranny. Yet both the Athonite School of 1752 and that of 1844 were able, despite their reduced educational curriculum, to train and present monks and clergy, preachers and teachers, worthy of their religious and national mission. The present Athonite School is the successor of the ancient. Beginning its educational work only three years ago, under favourable auspices, it has set as its aim the training of the young monks of Mt. Athos. The present Athonite School carries on its work in a beautiful building in the Russian Skete of St. Andrew, near Karyes, after the type of the Rizareion School at Athens. Up to the present it has four classes . . . in which the whole curriculum of the seminaries is taught by professors who are graduates in theology, philosophy, mathematics and the technical sciences. The educational labour expended on the 55 students of the school is notable and it were to be wished that both the Church and State would show more interest in this school on Mt. Athos and follow its work through their representatives, seeing how indispensable is the training of Greek Orthodox monks in the present age of enlightenment, progress and civilization.

A NEW theological quarterly, called *Œcumenica*, is to be issued under the auspices of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations. It will thus endeavour to speak in the name of the Church of England; it will set out to describe what the Church of England is and how she lives, and also to say those things which the Church of England is able to say about the œcumenic cause and the position of Christianity in the world. The Church of England is an inheritor of many traditions; she is at once Catholic, holding to the historic creeds, the episcopate, the sacraments, and liturgical

forms of worship, and Protestant, having received the heritage of the Reformation, and being closely in touch with the nonconformist Churches of Great Britain. It may be that she has, therefore, a vocation from God to help other Christians to understand one another. *Œcumenica* is, therefore, being issued in the French language because French is spoken in many parts of the world where English is little known. The name *Œcumenica* expresses this universal aim; the sub-title, *revue de synthèse théologique*, means that it will be concerned with theological ideas, and not be a mere chronicle of external events, and that it will aim at synthesis, the putting together of the pieces which have been broken and scattered in the schisms of Christendom. It will be published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2, and may be obtained from there at the price of 4s. per annum, or 15 French francs. All who are interested are invited to send for specimen copies. It is hoped that the first issue will appear before the end of March.

THE ELECTION AND CONSECRATION OF THE SYRIAN-ORTHODOX PATRIARCH OF THE APOSTOLIC THRONE OF ANTIOCH, HIS HOLINESS MAR IGNATIOS EPHREM I.

(Editor's Note.—Our gratitude for this Biography of His Beatitude is due to a Syrian-Orthodox layman.)

HIS Holiness was born at Mosul (Iraq) on June 15th, 1887, of an old, noble and pious family named Barsawm, whose history goes back to the seventeenth century. His mother was of the Abol-ul-Nur family, which is well known at Mosul. Beginning at an early age, he attended the schools of Mosul from 1891 to 1904. In 1905 he left for the Patriarchal Convent of Zafran, where he studied religion and the Syriac language. He was ordained a deacon on March 19th, 1908, was professed as a monk on April 1st, and ordained a priest on March 8th of the same year by the Patriarch Mar Ignatios Abdallah II. For three years he taught the Catechism and French literature at the school of the same Convent. He was then appointed director of the Convent's press, which he managed successfully from 1911 to 1913. In this year he went to Europe, where he studied widely, visiting the famous libraries of Paris, London, Oxford, Cambridge, Rome and Florence from which he collected much valuable information on the history of the Syrian Church. He then returned to Jerusalem, where he studied philosophy and psychology. Studying under a *privat docent* he graduated at Lausanne University. He represented Gregorios, Metropolitan of Jerusalem, at the election of Mar Ignatios Elias III,

Patriarch of Antioch, at the meeting of Synod in the Zafran Convent in 1916. In September, 1917, he was appointed Vicar of the diocese of Syria, and was consecrated Archbishop on May 20th, 1918, by the late Patriarch Elias III at the great church of Mardin, taking the style and name of Mar Severios. In 1919, at the close of the World War, the Patriarch sent him as his legate to Paris and London to discuss the interests of the Syrian people, Canon J. A. Douglas being specially detailed by Archbishop Lord Davidson to show him hospitality. He visited many of the great politicians of Europe, returning in May, 1920. In 1925 he attended the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work. In 1927 the Patriarch sent him to attend the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, and then as Patriarchal legate to the United States of America and to Canada, where he spent three years, successfully accomplishing his great mission. He was received with great respect by the leaders of Providence and Chicago Universities, who appointed him a member of the Oriental Institute upon his giving a special lecture to a great meeting of the Universities' professors. He also published a valuable article in Arabic in the *University Review* under the title of "A Treatise on Character Training by the great Syrian philosopher, Yahia Ibn Adi" (973).

As an Arabic scholar Mar Severios has published a Prayer Book in 1909, a Catechism and a Syriac edition of the Service of the Holy Liturgy in 1912, the History of the Zafran Convent and, in the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*, an old Syriac history of the fourth to the ninth centuries. The latter he wrote in Paris. In 1930 he published in Chicago the famous book of the Massara of the Holy Bible and his edition of the New Testament, the *opus magnum* of Mar Jacob of Edessa, Doctor of the Church (708), in Chicago. He has also written many articles dealing with theology, history and morals, which were printed in the various reviews of Beyrut and Jerusalem, and has published a great history of the Syrian Church in four volumes, an abridged history of the Church, an Arabic-Syriac dictionary and a book of sermons called "The Bread of Life." He superintended the cataloguing of the famous Syriac libraries of Zafran and Jerusalem. The Arab Academy in Damascus recognising his great educational ability appointed him a member. In 1930 he attended the Synod of Mar Mattai.

Mar Severios has done much for the advancement of his diocese, and has been active in particular in the building of churches and schools.

On the death of the Patriarch Mar Elias III in February, 1932, Mar Severios was unanimously elected *locum tenens*, and on November 10th, 1932, summoned the Holy Syrian Synod, over which as *locum tenens* he presided, which in its turn summoned the Metropolitans and Bishops of Malabar to take part in the Electoral Synod. The Holy Synod met on Sunday, January 16th, 1933, at the Church of

St. Mary at Homs, and elected Mar Severios almost unanimously, by fourteen votes to one, Patriarch of Antioch.

On Sunday, February 12th, 1933, at Homs, in historic Syria, more than five thousand people witnessed the solemn consecration of his Holiness Maron Mar Ignatios Ephrem I, Patriarch of Antioch.

When we consider the great affection His Holiness has in the hearts of all who know him throughout the universe, there is nothing strange or astonishing in saying that Syria had never before seen such a day.

At the close of his consecration the new Patriarch delivered a sermon, after which he went out surrounded by metropolitans, monks, priests and deacons, who could scarcely pass between the great crowds which were crying loudly and happily, "Long live our new Patriarch, Mar Ignatios Ephrem I," until the procession reached the archiepiscopal hall, where His Holiness received further greetings and congratulations. Numberless telegrams arrived one after another from all parts of the world.

Patriarchs and Metropolitans of all Christian Churches, British, French and Syrian governors, judges, chieftains, Moslem leaders, politicians and distinguished officials in Syria, the Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq, all sent congratulations upon his election and consecration. Many came personally and congratulated His Beatitude, for he is known and esteemed the world over on account of his piety, wisdom, impartial administration, humanity, intelligence and culture, as well as for the outstanding qualities of his high character.

THE ROUMANIAN PATRIARCH ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE DAY.

THE following remarkable address was delivered by His Beatitude Mgr. Miron Cristea, Patriarch of Roumania, on the occasion of the Congress organized in Bucharest last May by the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, the Y.M.C.A and the S.C.M.

For its illustration of the outlook of the Roumanian Church alike upon the general problems of the day and upon the particular problems of the Orthodox Church, the readers of the *Christian East* will be grateful to have it printed *in extenso* :—

MESSIEURS LES CONGRESSISTES,

"L'Association pour la fraternisation des peuples par l'Eglise" se propose, sans doute, un but supérieur, comme l'indique sa dénomination même. C'est pourquoi, son congrès—qu'il siège ailleurs, ou qu'il siège à Bucarest, comme c'est le cas maintenant—est toujours bienvenu. De multiples et lourdes occupations m'ont empêché de saluer les représentants du Comité central de Genève,

ainsi que les délégués de presque toutes les églises autocéphales orthodoxes, dès le début de leurs réunions. Je m'excuse donc de ne participer qu'à la clôture de ce congrès. Notre collègue allemand répondra, sans doute, par la maxime : "Ende gut, alles gut"—tout est bien qui finit bien !

Jamais les peuples n'ont senti un plus pressant besoin de fraternité et de paix. Et le christianisme—y compris l'Eglise Orthodoxe—est dans la plénitude de sa mission quand il prêche la *paix* et travaille pour sa réalisation, selon le commandement de Notre-Sauveur Jésus-Christ : "Je vous donne ma paix. . . ."

Dans notre rite orthodoxe, avec tous ses offices-publics ou particuliers—on prie pour la *paix* et on la recommande instamment. De la bouche du prêtre et surtout de celle de l'évêque orthodoxe on entend plusieurs fois, pendant la Sainte Liturgie, cette exclamation, qui est en même temps un commandement : "La paix soit avec vous" ; "La paix soit avec vous tous." Ce qu'il faut, c'est de trouver les méthodes d'une action systématique pour la réalisation de cette fraternité si nécessaire et tant souhaitée.

Dans ce domaine encore, il faut appliquer le principe pédagogique : commencer par nous mêmes et nous étendre ensuite, par des cercles concentriques de plus en plus larges, jusqu'à embrasser tout le monde. Par conséquent, ce qu'il faut tout d'abord, c'est d'avoir la bonne entente et la paix dans notre propre maison, je veux dire dans les relations entre les différentes églises orthodoxes nationales.

1. Pour la réalisation de cette partie du programme de travail—que je me suis proposé en ma qualité de Patriarche de l'Eglise orthodoxe roumaine et qui est aussi le programme de l'Eglise orthodoxe roumaine toute entière—j'ai cru accomplir un devoir sacré, en insistant, dans ma première lettre "irénique" envers toutes les églises autocéphales, sur la nécessité d'une réunion de toutes les églises orthodoxes en un synode oecuménique, c'est-à-dire pan-orthodoxe. L'idée était, sans doute, dans l'esprit de tous et la preuve c'est qu'elle a été reçue partout avec sympathie. De plus, j'ai personnellement affronté les fatigues d'un long voyage pour visiter les patriarchats de Constantinople, d'Alexandrie et de Jérusalem, et l'Eglise grecque d'Athènes.

Le but en était de mieux nous connaître, pour mieux nous aimer et "en nous aimant les uns les autres, confesser la même foi par l'unité de l'esprit." La conférence de Mont-Athos Vatopédi doit être continuée, car il n'est pas un orthodoxe qui désire que l'église russe soit laissée de côté, mais bien qu'elle soit respectée et encouragée, et que ses représentants légitimes collaborent avec les autres orthodoxes, pour le bien de tous.

2. J'ai été le premier à tendre une main fraternelle à l'Eglise voisine orthodoxe bulgare, en envoyant un délégué de la part du Saint-Synode de chez nous, à Sofia, pour officier la Sainte Liturgie

avec les évêques bulgares, pour ouvrir ainsi la porte qui permette à ceux-ci de rentrer dans le concert de l'orthodoxie, où ils doivent être reçus avec de fraternels embrassements. J'ai fait personnellement des démarches auprès de Constantinople et des autres patriarchats et églises pour lever le schisme bulgare. J'ai envoyé, à plusieurs reprises, des délégués à Sofia et Constantinople dans ce but et je continuerai—appuyé par l'Eglise roumaine toute entière—à saisir toute occasion pour faire cesser les divergences.

3.—Les questions restées—à la suite de la grande guerre—en suspension entre la Roumanie et la Yougoslavie, ont été résolues pour le contentement des deux parties et en ce qui concerne l'unique problème, d'ordre religieux, dont la solution n'était pas encore trouvée, on vient de nous télégraphier qu'il a été enfin mené à bien, avec l'accord de tous, à Carlovitz, où ont participé aussi les délégués envoyés par moi.

4.—Je me suis entremis à plusieurs reprises, au nom du Saint Synode roumain, pour aplanir le conflit entre Constantinople et l'église albanaise, qui tend, avec un désir tout naturel, à l'autocéphalie, maintenant que le peuple albanais s'est reconstitué en état indépendant.

Nous roumains, nous n'avons aucun intérêt à faire retarder la reconnaissance de l'autocéphalie albanaise et souhaitons de trouver la voie de réconciliation avec Constantinople, qui devra accorder le "*thomos*" nécessaire. Notre Eglise a cédé, depuis des dizaines d'années, aux Albanais une église spéciale à Bucarest, pour qu'ils puissent fonder une église nationale, faire traduire les livres rituels et officier la Sainte Liturgie en leur langue. En Roumanie se sont formés nombre d'intellectuels et hommes d'Etat Albanais. Aujourd'hui encore beaucoup d'Albanais font leurs études chez nous. Dans les écoles théologiques de Bucarest sont logés et nourris gratuitement quelques jeunes étudiants ; et les candidats albanais, qui veulent embrasser la vie monacale, font leur noviciat et apprennent les hymnes ecclésiastiques dans un monastère de Bessarabie.

5.—J'ai fait venir à la Faculté de Théologie de Bucarest des étudiants des autres églises orthodoxes, pour leur permettre de connaître, dès l'âge jeune, les nôtres et pour que des liens fraternels les unissent les uns aux autres. Ainsi nous avons, en dehors des albanais, 2 étudiants en théologie russes orthodoxes de Pologne, 2 de Bulgarie, 1 grec, et hier encore est arrivé chez nous le jeune étudiant Emile-Georges Mouraccadé, le fils d'une honorable famille de Damas, Syrie.

D'un autre côté, j'ai envoyé, à mon tour, 2 étudiants roumains à Varsovie et 2 à Athènes ; le personnel de l'église roumaine de Sofia a suivi des cours à la jeune Faculté de Théologie bulgare. Pendant plusieurs années, nous avons eu des dizaines d'étudiants à la Faculté de Théologie protestante de Montpellier, à celles de Paris, Stras-

bourg et nous en avons envoyé 1 même en Amérique. Nous avons élevé des étudiants aussi dans les Facultés de Théologie Catholiques de Paris et de Strasbourg. Aujourd'hui encore nous avons une dizaine d'étudiants à Strasbourg.

Les autres métropolites roumains ont envoyé eux aussi des étudiants à l'étranger, dans la mesure de leurs moyens.

Se maintenant fermes sur le rocher de la foi orthodoxe, ces jeunes gens pourront absorber de partout des connaissances utiles, de la source commune du Christianisme, et pourront créer et maintenir des liaisons de fraternité chrétienne.

6. A l'occasion de mon investiture comme premier patriarche de l'Eglise orthodoxe de Roumanie, j'ai réuni les distingués délégués des églises autocéphales de Constantinople, de Grèce, d'Alexandrie, de Jérusalem, de Russie, de Pologne, de Yougoslavie et de Bulgarie. A cette occasion—là, j'ai contribué à la réconciliation entre les évêques russes qui étaient présents, en faisant cesser les divergences et la tension provoquées par des raisons politiques. En ce qui concerne les évêques russes qui sont en exil, je les ai priés personnellement, et toutes les fois que l'occasion se présente je leur conseille, de prendre garde aux nuages noirs qui se sont amassés au-dessus de leur tête et, se rendant compte de leur menace, instinctivement qu'ils se rassemblent pour s'encourager et se fortifier les uns les autres, au lieu de s'anathématiser réciproquement, et déchirer aussi l'âme des pauvres expatriés russes, déjà assez malheureux.

7. Après la dernière guerre, entre les Turcs et les Grecs, les Turcs victorieux voulaient réduire la dignité du patriarche oecuménique de Constantinople à un simple évêché pour les Grecs de Turquie. Le St. Synode roumain et moi nous avons soulevé des protestations dans le Congrès de paix de Lausanne et le délégué roumain, Mr. J. Duca, a démontré que le patriarcat de Constantinople est le centre spirituel, oecuménique de toute la chrétienté orthodoxe du monde et que ce droit, plus que millénaire, ne pourrait être annulé. Ce point de vue a triomphé et le gouvernement d'Athènes d'alors m'a exprimé ses chaleureux remerciements pour cette amicale intervention. Nous avons demandé aussi que l'historique "*Hagia-Sophia*" (la Ste. Sophie) fût rendue à l'Eglise grecque étant le plus incomparable monument de la chrétienté et notre demande était d'autant plus légitime que les chrétiens, après la guerre mondiale, avaient respecté les monuments musulmans de Philippopoli, qui sont de chers souvenirs pour chaque musulman.

Toutes les fois qu'on a touché au prestige de ce patriarcat, nous ne sommes pas demeurés indifférents. Il doit être soutenu, parce que si l'Orthodoxie prenait d'autres directions, cela éveillerait des susceptibilités nationales qui, au lieu de nous rapprocher et consolider, ainsi que nous devons tous le désirer et de tout notre cœur, nous éloignerait les uns des autres et nous diviserait encore davantage.

Il faut ajouter cependant que le patriarcat oecuménique devrait avoir un Conseil—un Synode—formé par les représentants de tous les peuples orthodoxes, pour étudier et résoudre les questions oecuméniques. C'est ainsi seulement qu'il pourrait consolider sa position.

En ce qui concerne les peuples orthodoxes des républiques soviétiques, il faut incessamment prier Dieu pour qu'ils soient soulagés dans leurs souffrances cruelles et fortifiés dans leur patience jusqu'à l'heure de la délivrance. Les peuples non-anarchisés du monde entier devraient de coaliser contre le communisme, qui est aujourd'hui l'ennemi le plus acharné de la paix, le destructeur de la culture, de la civilisation mondiale et du travail pacifique millénaire.

Jadis on organisait des croisades contre le paganisme anti-chrétien ; mais aujourd'hui, malheureusement, des intérêts matériels et relations commerciales facilitent et prolongent la vie de ces féroces démolisseurs de l'ordre social, qui lui seul peut nous aider à harmoniser les intérêts des classes et à obtenir l'équilibre de la vie, sur les bases naturelles et réelles de la justice sociale.

Notre défense contre le péril communiste doit nous rapprocher tous, dans le but de sauver l'humanité de cette épidémie sociale.

Avec les vieux-protestants, d'une nuance plus modérée nous autres orthodoxes collaborons sur ces terrains sociaux, où l'on peut appliquer les principes communs à tous de la vaste doctrine morale pratique du Christianisme. Dans l'intérêt général de l'humanité, cette participation des orthodoxes doit avoir aussi le but de montrer et de recommander, avec un fraternel amour, au protestantisme de comprendre que, une concentration de leur part, autour de certains principes fixes de dogmatique apostolique et orthodoxe traditionnelle, est absolument nécessaire comme il est nécessaire aussi que leur âme soit plus profondément pénétrée du souffle de ce zéphir, qui descend de la région surnaturelle du mysticisme chrétien et de la grâce divine, à la suite des prières d'une Eglise possédant la plénitude de la hiérarchie et des sacrements chrétiens.

Ceci préserverait le protestantisme, à l'avenir plus que par le passé, du morcellement en d'innombrables nuances confessionnelles, avec toutes sortes de variantes sectaires, sorties des raisonnements humains capables de pousser l'éparpillement et la division jusqu'à la réalisation de la maxime latine : "Quot capita, tot sensus" autant de têtes, autant d'avis, autant de religions. Cela augmente les frictions intestines. Dernièrement, les sectes sont devenues chez nous aussi un fervent instrument de dissension, surtout quand les moyens financiers étrangers contribuent à l'alimenter. L'exemple des vieux-catholiques et des protestants anglicans, qui ont fait de grands pas dans la voie de rapprochement avec l'orthodoxie chrétienne, doit être pour les protestants toujours vivant et actuel.

10. En ce qui concerne les cultes éterodoxes de notre pays:

romains-catholiques, grecs-catholiques, calvinistes, luthériens, etc., on ne doit pas les plaindre. Ils sont bien plus favorisés par l'Etat roumain que l'Eglise orthodoxe roumaine elle-même. Ces jours derniers "l'Assemblée annuelle de l'Archevêché de Bucarest" a voté un mémoire, pour demander au gouvernement roumain d'accorder à notre Eglise qui compte quelque 13-14 millions fidèles orthodoxes et à ses institutions, du moins le même traitement et le même secours matériel qu'aux autres cultes éterodoxes, qui sous plus d'un rapport sont mieux subventionnés et traités avec plus de bienveillance. Cela est nécessaire afin de maintenir un équilibre d'équité et de justice entre les citoyens de la Roumanie, en donnant satisfaction aussi du point de vue ecclésiastique à leur grande majorité.

Ainsi groupés et unis entre nous—d'abord nous les orthodoxes et ensuite tous les chrétiens—nous pourrions travailler avec plus de succès et plus d'effet pour l'infiltration de l'esprit chrétien dans toutes les actions de la vie pratique, qu'elles soient sociales, éducatives, artistiques, ou politiques et d'état.

La jeunesse de plusieurs pays et de chez nous a commencé à revenir au Christ, à l'Eglise et à ses saines traditions et d'un pas ferme elle s'achemine vers le maintien et la pratique des vérités chrétiennes.

Elle veut échapper ainsi, elle et le peuple auquel elle appartient à l'influence désastreuse de l'anarchie, du bolchévisme, le l'athéisme et de la francmaçonnerie, lesquels tendent tous à détruire les individualités si originales et si colorées des différentes nations, ainsi que les puissantes traditions qui les ont soutenues, et sauvées à travers les siècles, pour les faire fondre dans le "nirvana" d'une vie pâle, universelle, non naturelle et artificielle.

Avec ces pensées, je souhaite à l'Association un bon succès dans l'oeuvre de fraternisation par l'amour chrétien envers le prochain et même envers nos ennemis, en faisant le bien et en désarmant, par cet amour, ceux qui voudraient nous faire du mal.

La Roumanie, ayant à sa tête son premier roi orthodoxe Charles II, appuiera toute action de paix, pour le bien des peuples et pour la gloire de Dieu.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN FINLAND, ESTONIA AND LATVIA.

By C. B. Moss.

THESE three countries, which were formerly subject to the Russian Emperors, and at an earlier period belonged to the kingdom of Sweden, became independent republics after the Russian

Revolution. In each of the three the majority of the population is Lutheran, but there is also a self-governing Orthodox Church. In Latvia there is also a powerful Latin minority: in Estonia and Finland the Latins are negligible.

Finland, the greater part of which was Swedish from the thirteenth century until 1809, was for centuries debatable land between Sweden and Russia: and therefore between the Swedish and Russian Churches. East Finland was annexed by Russia in the time of Peter the Great: and the Orthodox Church is chiefly confined to that part of the country. The great monastery of Valamo, on an island in Lake Ladoga (an article on which appeared in *The Christian East* for October, 1929), was founded by SS. Sergius and German before the fourteenth century. At present the Orthodox Church of Finland consists of an archbishopric with its see at Sortavala, a small town on the N.W. shore of Lake Ladoga, and the bishopric of Viborg (Finnish "Viipuri"), which is at present vacant. There are about thirty parishes, with a population of about 70,000. Besides Valamo, there are two other monasteries: Konoveta, also on an island in Lake Ladoga, farther south than Valamo; and Petsamo, on the Arctic coast, where about 25 monks endure the rigorous climate of the most northern monastery in the world. There is also a nunnery near Viipuri, at a place called Lintula.

During my visit to Finland last summer I was able to pay a second visit to Valamo, and to call on Archbishop German at Sortavala. Since my last visit, in 1929, the monks of Valamo have started an orphanage for small boys, the sons of Orthodox Finnish peasants, at the *skete* called the New Jerusalem, about five miles from the monastery but on the same island. Almost as soon as I arrived, I was taken to see this orphanage by the Prior, accompanied by Professor Boris Sové (formerly a student at St. Stephen's House, Oxford, and now Professor of Hebrew in the Russian Theological Academy, Paris), who arranged everything for me both in Finland and Estonia, and acted as interpreter. We saw the little boys, their chaplain and their matron, and were present at their evening prayers, conducted in Finnish, which lasted about ten minutes.

I was only able to spend one night at Valamo, and we returned to the mainland next day. On arriving at Sortavala we were met by the Archpriest Solntsev, and taken to see the Archbishop of Finland at the new Church House which has been built there by the Orthodox Church. This is a large block of flats, which contains the Archbishop's rooms, a hall for the Synod, and a number of flats which can be let. It is the property of the Church, and it is found to be a very good investment. The Orthodox seminary with its chapel is close by: the education given there is of a more elementary kind than that of the Academy at Paris. The seminary was unfortunately closed for the vacation. The Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul

was formerly a parish church (for the bishopric of Sortavala is modern).

The Orthodox Church is supported by the State, on equal terms with the Lutheran Church, and the seminary receives a generous grant. The relations of the Orthodox with the Lutherans are good: I was shown a photograph of Archbishop Soderblom of Upsala praying at Valamo during his visit there. It is not the Lutheran Church but the sects which attempt to proselytize the Orthodox: and there is Communist propaganda among the peasants, as in all the border countries. When it was proposed to secularize Valamo after the proclamation of the Republic, it was a Lutheran ecclesiastic who led the opposition to the suggestion.

The chief difficulty of the Church appears to be to find men to fill the vacancies in the monasteries. Finland requires that all who are professed must be Finnish citizens: a rule which is easy to understand, and yet makes the future of the monasteries very doubtful, since the Orthodox population is so small. And yet the collapse of Valamo, the greatest Russian monastery now existing, where the old Orthodox life of Russia can still be seen and felt, would be a first-class calamity, not only for Orthodoxy but for all Christendom.

It would be an excellent thing if members of the English Church who are interested in Orthodoxy would go to Valamo for a holiday. Finland, which has come off the gold standard, is a much cheaper country than France, Germany or Switzerland: and you can go direct by sea from Hull to Helsingfors. There is a guest house at Valamo where women as well as men can stay: and for those who like quiet, and a complete absence of all modern inventions, as well as of the English language, it is an ideal spot. A visit to Valamo is a great spiritual experience: here, perhaps better than anywhere else, the life of the Orthodox Church can be seen and felt. A Swedish lady, who had been all over the world, once told me that she had never understood the Orthodox Church till she went to Valamo. It is especially desirable that some of our religious should go there, and that direct contact should be established between the monastic piety of the two Communions.

Estonia, divided from Finland by the Gulf of Finland, has a different history, and presents a different situation. The Estonian language is a dialect of Finnish, which is unlike any other European language, but has some remote connection with Magyar. Reval, the capital, now called Tallinn, is separated from Helsingfors by a four-hours crossing. No two cities could be more strongly contrasted than ultra-modern Helsingfors and Reval with its mediæval walls and ancient German churches (all Lutheran). For the first conquerors of Estonia were neither the Swedes (as in Finland), nor the Russians, but the Germans: Reval was an outpost of mediæval German culture: and the lords of the soil were German-speaking

till 1917. In the nineteenth century there was a strong movement from Lutheranism to Orthodoxy among the peasants, which was not altogether encouraged by the Russian Government. To-day the population of Estonia is about a million, of which one-third is Orthodox. Among the Gothic towers in the centre of Reval rises the beautiful dome of the Russian Cathedral of St. Alexander Nevsky. We arrived in time for the first vespers of the Patron Saint, and I was invited to go "within the Altar." After the service I was introduced to some of the leaders of the Russian Christian Student Movement in Reval.

Besides the Russian Cathedral there is also an Estonian Cathedral, which is chiefly remarkable for the tomb of the first bishop, murdered by the Reds in 1920. The Orthodox Church in Estonia is autonomous, under the Patriarch of Constantinople. It contains two bishoprics, Reval and Narva: and there is also a suffragan bishop to Reval, who lives at Petseri.

Shortly before my visit a conference had been held at Narva, between the Orthodox and German Lutheran clergy of Estonia, with a view to joint action against Communist propaganda. The atmosphere was most friendly: it was decided to continue the conferences, and to publish a series of tracts in common. (The Lutherans of Estonia have only one bishop, who is in the Swedish succession, having been consecrated by Archbishop Soderblom.)

The Orthodox Church of Estonia possesses one monastery, Petseri, and one nunnery, where the nuns are now so poverty-stricken that they are compelled to work in the fields to support themselves. I did not have time to visit the nunnery, which is in the north-east, but I paid a short visit to Petseri, which is a whole night's journey by train from Reval, and three miles from the station. In contrast to Valamo, where the buildings are all modern, Petseri dates from the fifteenth century, and is surrounded by a strong wall like a mediæval castle, broken at one point to allow room for an early nineteenth-century church. The curious belfry is, I am told, of a type peculiar to the Pskov district, and only found in that part of Russia. Besides the church mentioned above, there is a much older church, dark and rather like a cave. There are also catacombs, very like those at Rome, but still in use for the burial of the monks: we were conducted through them. Petseri had been part of Russia for centuries, and the village is completely Russian: nothing but Russian is spoken there. Tsar Ivan the Terrible once visited the monastery, and suspecting the Abbot of plotting against him, had him put to death. The monastery chronicle recorded the event thus: "On this day, by order of the earthly Tsar, the Abbot went to the heavenly Tsar." The Abbot of Petseri at the time of our visit was Bishop John, the suffragan to the Archbishop of Reval, who is a "Set," that is, he belongs to a local tribe who speak a dialect of Estonian but are Orthodox in religion.

The Bishop of Narva, a Russian, died recently, and the candidate for the bishopric elected by the diocese was rejected by the Estonian Church Council on nationalist grounds: they wanted an Estonian, not a Russian, and elected Bishop John. He, however, refused to accept the bishopric or to leave Petseri: whereupon he was placed under discipline and deprived of the control of his monastery, so that he could not show us the treasures as he would have liked to do. He might have been more severely treated if he had not been, besides being abbot and suffragan bishop, a member of the Estonian Parliament!

Petseri is only about 25 miles from the frontier of Soviet Russia, and is more Russian than any other place I went to. But I cannot say that I found there the spiritual atmosphere or the romantic beauty of Valamo.

A curious incident occurred when I crossed the frontier into Latvia. When the customs official came along the train, I was beginning to go to bed, and had taken off my collar. I was carrying a large parcel of ikons from Valamo, and he told me (in English) that these were subject to duty. When I pointed out that my passport only allowed me to stay four days in Latvia, he said that I should not be charged any duty if I left the parcel in the cloakroom at Riga. Ten minutes later he came back and said, "I see from your passport that you are a 'reverend': I thought you were a business man. Of course we recognize that these ikons are necessary for your church, and you need neither pay duty nor leave them in the cloakroom." (I may add that Latvia is the only country we entered where any difficulty arose about duty on these ikons.)

Latvia, the country of the Letts (German "Lettland"), is a larger country than Estonia, and has for its capital the great city of Riga. Lettish, unlike Finnish and Estonian, is an Aryan language with affinities to Sanskrit, as well as to the languages of the west of Europe. The majority of the people are Lutherans, but the Latins are stronger than the Orthodox and have even succeeded in grabbing one of the old Lutheran churches for their cathedral (it was the church of the German aristocrats, so the Letts did not take much interest in it), as well as the palace of the Orthodox Archbishop. I did not see the Archbishop, as he was in the country, but I went to the fine (modern) Orthodox cathedral, in which the Liturgy is sung every day; and I called on Archpriest John Janson, the Rector of the small Orthodox seminary. The building which this seminary once possessed is now an anatomical museum, and the seminary occupies a flat. Father Janson took me to the club of the Russian Student Christian Movement, where I spent a very interesting evening talking to the young people about the English Church and answering their questions. (Only one or two could speak English, and the language we used was mostly German.)

Father Janson told me that the Orthodox churches in the three Baltic States differ in their ecclesiastical position. In Estonia the Orthodox Church is autonomous, under Constantinople; in Lithuania (south of Latvia), it is still subject to the Russian Patriarchate and the Metropolitan Sergius. In Latvia, it is neither. "We are waiting," said the Archpriest: "we do not wish to commit ourselves yet."

Lithuania, which I did not visit, differs from its northern neighbours in this, that the religion of the majority is Latin, and not Lutheran.

In conclusion: I had two chief impressions from the few days that I was in these countries. One was that these small churches are defending the front line of Christendom: they are exposed to ceaseless Communist propaganda from beyond the frontier, and they need all the help, moral, intellectual and spiritual, that we can give them. Whether Orthodox or Lutheran, Christianity in these lands is fighting in defence of us all.

The other was that the monasteries and convents are necessary to the life of the Orthodox Church, and must at all costs be preserved. Here, I think, something could be done by our Religious Orders, if the authorities on both sides would consent, to bring about spiritual and cultural contact. I believe that such contact, if the difficulties of language, etc., could be overcome, would be of the greatest possible value to both sides: for each has much that the other needs.

PALESTINE REVISITED.

By THE REV. JOHN T. MITCHELL, M.A., B.D., Canon of Liverpool.

I WISH to contrast the impressions of two visits to Palestine. Soon after leaving College I went up the Nile, and then in the spring of 1888, I came to the Holy Land.

The conditions of travel at that time were very different from those at our disposal to-day. The sole road in the country was one from Jaffa to Jerusalem. The only way of getting about was to ride, or walk by the rough bridle tracks. It was necessary to take tents. Two other young men were with me, so we were a party of three friends. I had engaged a dragoman in Egypt and made all arrangements with him as to routes and times, so that when we landed at Jaffa we found him with tents, horses, mules and men ready to start. The first day we rode by Yebnah to Ashdod, and the following day by Askelon to Gaza. We used to start each day about eight and ride till mid-day. Then, we halted in the shade for lunch. The mules with the tents would pass us.

After three or four hours we went on, and would find the tents ready pitched at the camping ground. I had written to the dragoman from Egypt, telling him to bring mineral water as I did not take wine. My letter did not reach him and I had to drink the water from the wells, with results that were nearly disastrous.

From Gaza we rode by the wonderful caves of Beit Tibrin to Hebron. One evening, as we lay swathed round with rugs in our deck chairs, before the tents with the horses tethered round, one of the party said—"I feel like Abraham"—another said, "I feel like a mummy," and the third, "I feel like a travelling circus." We nearly had trouble at fanatical Hebron, as I used my riding whip to a youth who tried to push me down some steps, where I was making out an inscription. However, we got away all right. At Jerusalem, we tented under a great carob tree on the Mount of Olives. The country outside the walls was very rough, with broken vine terraces. The way round the city at night was not easy to find, and the muleteer who was supposed to guide us, and whom we called "the idiot," was worse than useless. I nearly fell into an open well, thinking the dark patch was herbage. There was snow and wind, and the dragoman was up all night, fearing the tents would be blown down. We piled rugs and floor coverings on the beds, and put up umbrellas, but nothing availed to keep out the snow and the cold. From Jerusalem we rode down the hot defile to Jericho. Our guard was a picturesque ruffian, whose musket was nearly eaten through with the rust of centuries.

The night was spent by the wonderful monastery of Marsaba.

The mound of Old Jericho still kept its secrets, locked and undisturbed. From thence we came to Ai and Bethel, past the black tents of the Bedouin. They did not trouble us, but, if I separated far from the party, the dragoman became anxious.

We rode by the usual route by Jacob's Well to Shechem. From the lofty summit of Gerizim the voice travelled far, and it was easy to believe that a response might come from Ebal. Thence we went on by Samaria, Dothan with its dry pits, Engannin, Esdraelon, Jezreel, haunted by Jezebel, to Nazareth, nestling among the hills.

One delightful ride was to Mt. Tabor, its glorious view reached from the Mediterranean on the west, to the hills across Jordan on the East; while to the north, beyond the Sea of Galilee and the Waters of Meron rose the glistening white peak of Hermon.

There were many flowers on the uplands. Here was the flag-like splendour of the iris—perhaps the lilies of the field, which our Lord held in His hand as He spoke—blue and purple and white. By the rock edges grew the anemone, and the beautiful white and pink cyclamen.

Capernaum was a deserted place, and round the ruined synagogue nettles grew six feet in height.

Our route led by the sources of Jordan to Banias. It had rained

THE APPEAL OF RUSSIAN WRITERS.

By VIOLET JACKSON.

IT is curious what a fascination, what an appeal Russian writers have for English readers, and I think it is largely because they express themselves both in style and subject with a lack of restraint and self-consciousness which makes us experience in their work a great sense of freedom. They bring into actuality our vague unspoken thoughts and wonderings, even their fault of driving everything to excess is to us an excitement, we see that because they are unafraid of suffering, though they sink into the depth of despair, they rise to the highest pinnacles of joy.

Life as depicted by these writers is something marvellous in itself. The mere fact of being, breathing, knowing the strength of the muscles and every faculty, being aware of movement, eating, sleeping, all these are gifts to be enjoyed to the full, not to be taken for granted. Life is a mystery to be explored but not understood, the wonder within ourselves, in nature and in a future existence. They dwell on simple characters, incidents and places lovingly, lingeringly because they are so brief, so intricate, so dear—and because it is so hard to see the ultimate meaning of all these things.

They have a keen discernment and can perceive the minutest details and use material which we might glance at casually and despise, while they with a thirst for spiritual knowledge look deeper and see as in a magnifying glass.

Taken in comparison with the majority of countries Russian literature is of a recent date, except for folk stories and religious books the bulk of their work began in the 14th century. Perhaps it is this which gives such freshness and originality, all through those long years of suppression there must have been an accumulation of longing for expression, a yearning for exploring the paths of literature, perhaps this, too, is responsible for the urge and vitality in their writing.

Theirs is the gift of simplicity. I have often heard it said how animal-like and terrible the peasants must be; and yet, consider their singing, and the wonderful quality of their voices! It is unknown elsewhere except among some of the negroes. The more educated and advanced people of other nations have lost this art. The farther you move from nature the farther you get from these natural gifts, and the earth takes back her treasures and hugs them to herself. Quite untaught, the Russians, like the Welsh, can sing together, each finding his own part and forming an harmonic whole like chords on an organ. They can produce infinite varieties of tone, now booming deeply in the base, now soaring with extra-

ordinary clearness, higher and higher, never shrill but soft and audible so that a thrill must shoot through the whole being of the listener. Now they can merely whisper or swell like huge waves of sound, always vibrant with feeling and confidently executed.

Frequently examples of their love of singing as an expression of life occur in Russian stories. Out of the soil came their singing, as they toiled in the fields, reaping and mowing, towing barges and hauling timber, the women soothed their babies at the breast with songs and at their sweeping, milking, washing and baking, in all their emotions of sadness and joy, youth and age, and in times of fulfilment these songs were born. All these elements are blended together, in the poetry and accompaniment. As often as they sought the consolation of music, when work was done they could take out melodions or balalaikas and forget the dreariness of toil in a soothing valse or an impetuous dance, quicker and quicker till it left off suddenly. . . .

In Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, Nastasia went to her uncle's estate in the forest after a day's wolf hunting, and having finished supper listened to the peasants playing to them till she could sit no longer, the rhythm called to her and she danced and danced in the wild peasant fashion. The music insisted on the union of her body with the beat of the dance. The peasants were delighted as all people are to realize the common bond of unity which runs in us with such strength. Here Nastasia the lady, had the same impulses and emotions, the same manner of expressing them. What strength lies in this unity of purpose, this oneness of feeling!

In Tchekov's *The Privy Councillor*, we read, "When the shadows merged into one thick mass of shade, then Fyodor would come in from the fields. . . Tatyana and I were sitting on the steps by the lodge. We did not talk, and indeed what is there to talk about when every subject has already been talked over . . . ? After resting a little Fyodor would sink into silence. 'Let us sing?' I would suggest. We would begin singing, my tutor in a deep bass voice, Fyodor in a scarcely audible tenor, while I sang soprano in unison with Tatyana. When the whole sky was covered with stars and the frogs had left off croaking they would bring in our supper . . ."

The Russian writers show us the necessity for accepting suffering and feeling. It is these things which we are afraid of that they make into the kernel and core of their stories and novels, characters we might reject as being morally unsuitable or uninteresting, they use to show the variety of man's mental make-up, the effect of contrast and the very good in the very bad. All types and classes are recognized as being valuable sources of information, they delve into the very spirit of man and into the depth of human nature, finding, however murky and disappointing the surface may appear, something unusual, something vital and intense deep down.

Their realism becomes as romantic and mysterious, as intense as the improbable fiction beloved by the sensationalists. Things we are apt to omit as too sacred or deep to talk about they show in a calm way so that when the great forces overtake us and we have to face them, these stories show us how others managed. We cannot always hide our feelings and laugh away anything serious.

Dostoevsky's wonderful study of an epileptic in *The Idiot*, gives an insight into the spirit of a man the world looked down on and tried with sharper wits to do down on many occasions, but in whom it had at other times, to admit the almost holy and childlike attitude which it only half understood. Yet they felt there was in this man they despised a lovable quality, a goodness they had to admit. How often is cleverness used for nothing better than a personal gratification at the expense of others? Lust for power, oblivion to suffering the distortion of the character and mind frequently accompanies the fertile brain.

In Russia the Slavs had a superstition that the Fool was a Holy person, they revered him as being different, a being with no complicated view of life but one who at the same time had a naive faculty for understanding right and wrong. Hence the ballet, "The midnight sun," in which the fool in a long white shirt dances as the principal figure in the front, while the villagers in their gay "best" costumes form an admiring crowd at the back in the shape of a half moon. It is the bowing down and worship of the unseen power represented in the fool.

They accept suffering and seem to find satisfaction in the fact that it is a necessary part of life. Not to feel is to them as much a crime as not to suppress feeling is with us! It is surely the duty of every individual to have an open mind and to know the truth and see reality in order to maintain a proper balance. "We do not see and we do not hear those who suffer and what is terrible goes on somewhere behind the scenes," says a character in Tchekov's *Gooseberries*, and "However happy he may be, life will show him her claws, sooner or later trouble will come."

This is not merely a pessimistic outlook, but a warning to us to prepare, and reading these writers' works enables one to be in touch with characters one might otherwise never have come into contact with.

The psychology and philosophy they reveal is marvellous, but in uprooting and breaking down they are in a chaotic state so that the fruits of their labour are mostly expressed in art.

Their faith is such that even the terrors of revolution cannot stamp it out, their faith in the ultimate state of brotherhood, the religious faith which the most awful mutilation and persecution cannot terminate. Such natures need faith in something greater than themselves, faith in one who created the life which is loved so passionately, and faith in a life which will be the fulfilment of

the yearning, half-understood spirit which is seen in music and in all art.

Masha, in *The Three Sisters*, expresses this longing for faith. "I think man ought to have faith, or ought to seek faith, or else his life is empty, empty . . . to live and not to understand why cranes fly, why children are born, why there are stars in the sky . . . one must know what one is living for or else it is all nonsense or a waste." These writers do not depict life as the crowd with its shallowness think they would like it to be,

"Dearer to us the falsehood that exalts
Than lots of baser truths,"

being so often its motto. They write simply and as things are, confidently and without pretence, leaving us to find the complete meaning.

Within the Russian people there is a secret force at work, an unseen power that is sometimes used for evil; but Gorki having suffered the deprivations and horrors of poverty among the desperate and the destitute tells us, "I knew them to be a worthless people and yet I recognized that they worshipped beauty with a religious fervour, and served it with a complete self-sacrifice which went to the length of drinking its poison and committing suicide for its sake."

As long as there is this instinctive love of the beautiful which is also the good, the result of such a following must surely be a satisfactory one? With minute perception they visualize the scenery around them and describe it in a manner only possible to those who reverence and adore nature, seeing her as the natural companion and as the background of their life. Feeling the same blood running in their veins as in the animals, the same urge as in every perceptible organism. This sympathy flows in such beautiful passages as Gorki gives us:

"As I watched how the Volga stirred the brocaded strip of light and rising into the black shadows of the hilly shore I felt my thoughts becoming bolder, freer, and more subtle. It was easy to think of things eluding expression and remote from everyday life. The stately flow of that volume of water hardly made a sound, along its broad dark way crept a steamer like a monstrous bird of fiery plumage and a soft sound floated after it like the beating of heavy wings. Under the bank on the meadow side floated a small flame and from it a sharp red beam of light spread over the water. It was a fisherman at work with lamp and trident, but it was easy to imagine a wandering star had dropped from the sky into the river and was being borne on the water like a fiery flower.

"What one reads in books develops into strange fancies and the tireless imagination weaves pictures of incomparable beauty as if one were floating down the river on the soft night air. Igor, the fisherman, was a curious character, simple, lawless, he came to his end by being murdered by his fellow villagers. He lived with all

their wives as he would. Igor was a nocturnal creature. He was very sensitive to beauty and spoke of it understandingly in the quiet language of a dreaming child . . . He pictured God as a tall, beautiful old man, the wise and good master of the Universe, who was unable to subdue evil for the sole reason that he could not keep up with the population.

"Well, he will keep up with it you will see! but I can't understand Christ at all. He is nothing to me. There is God, well that is all right, but then there is another one! He is the Son they say. God isn't dead so why do we need a son?" "It is good to be alive," he would say.

"The velvet strip of dark water moved restlessly along and above it curved the silver strip of the milky way. The big stars shone like golden larks and my heart quietly sang its foolish thoughts about the secrets of life. In the distance the rays of the sun were breaking out of the rosy clouds and now it was spreading its peacock tail over the sky. 'What a marvellous thing the sun is,' muttered Igor with a happy smile. The apple trees were in bloom, the village enveloped in rosy snowdrifts and a bitter scent permeated everything, drowning the smell of tar and dung. A hundred blossoming trees decked in holiday array of pink satin petals ran in straight rows from the village to the fields. On moonlight nights the butterfly blossoms fluttered in the faint breeze with a scarcely audible rustle. The village seemed flooded by heavy blue gold waves and the nightingales sang with passionate persistency."

Descriptions like this show the deeply meditative spirit of the writer and the extreme love of beauty. Others have clothed small incidents with infinite meaning as Korolenko in the *Bellringer*, where the old man rings the bells for the last time at the Easter Midnight Service. Up in the belfry he hears the distant chanting and through the little windows he sees the great stretch of blue night and the stars. . . . He remembers other Easters, all the times, and past and present become merged into one another. After it is all over they find he is dead.

Bunnin, a modern writer, creates a marvellous atmosphere in his post-revolution story of a man revisiting an estate, now emptied of occupants and deserted except for one old Chinaman who sits like an image. You can feel the silence, the desolation of the untenanted house, the empty church, the overgrown garden where the birds make nests unmolested. All the grandeur is faded now, so long enjoyed but brought to an unexpected climax.

English writers so frequently twist and distort the truth in order to maintain the moral of the story, to make it as they think it should be. Russian writers do not strive for such an end nor do they point a moral, except Tolstoy perhaps. Like a friendly hand stretching out to us and to all those who are in need, these stories reach us, answering many of our questions, sympathizing with our failures and sharing our suffering and joy.

PERSECUTION OF RELIGION IN SOVIET RUSSIA

By THE ARCHPRIEST SIMEON SOLODOVNIKOV.

FOR the past fifteen years, over an area covering a sixth part of the globe—there has been a Satanic attack upon Christianity. All that which is fundamental to humanity—faith in God and religion—has been mocked and destroyed. The introduction of this awful, diabolical experiment has separated the people by force from their spiritual life which is considered not only a useless burden, but a thing harmful to the communistic aim.

Inevitably there arise the questions: Why are Communists and Bolsheviks particularly hostile to God and religion? Why do they persecute believers?

The persecutions in the first centuries of Christianity are easy to understand. It was then a struggle between two systems, each of which admitted the existence and necessity of religion. One was armed materially and the other spiritually. And, of course, the spiritual conquered. But now the position is entirely different. Bolshevism totally denies the existence of God and the human soul and, therefore, denies all religions. It is not merely a socialistic doctrine that supplies a new foundation of society; it is a system of thought that denies belief in God and the human soul, not merely as dangerous socially and politically—but as a philosophic possibility.

Indeed, one of the most startling characteristics of Bolshevism as a doctrine is its peculiar hatred of Christianity . . . "we hate Christianity and Christians, our bitterest enemies," declared Lunacharsky in his speech. And this prominent representative of Bolshevism explains the reason of this hatred. "They (Christians) are preaching love and mercy to their neighbours, which is a contradiction of our principles."

These words make obvious the intensity of their endeavour to exterminate religion, faith in God and belief in the soul. Let us see, therefore, how these servants of Satan are devising methods for the struggle and how they endeavour to apply them.

The first years of Bolshevism saw an indiscriminate shooting of priests and clergy. Thousands were tortured and shot; thousands were cast into prison to await the verdict they knew was inevitable. The aged Metropolitan Vladimir was killed, the Metropolitan Veniamin was shot. Archbishop Andronin was burnt at the stake. Archbishop Germogen was tied to the wheel of a steamer and was drowned. Many bishops, priests and monks have been tortured to death. Their number amounts to 8,500. And how many of those still alive are pining in prisons and exile.

But are the Bolshevik attempts to destroy God and religion proving successful?

The mass of the people attend Church still more fervently, silently grouping themselves about their priests. Not only has the open terror failed to achieve the expected result; it has brought glory to the persecuted.

The mass shooting and exile of bishops and clergy have not killed the people's faith, nor carried them away from their pastors. It has done the very thing the Soviet Government least wanted. It has aroused the attention and called forth the strongest protests from the Christians of Western Europe—and especially from the Anglican Church.

From the first it became obvious that a long, systematic struggle was necessary. The whole administrative machinery, as well as the law of the country was called to aid this struggle. And although the people have officially been given the freedom of religious and anti-religious propaganda, in point of fact, this freedom was understood as only the freedom of anti-religious propaganda. This latter the Soviet Government has carried in later years in three directions.

1. Work to make divisions inside the Church.
2. Persecution: (a) by law, (b) by terror.
3. Propaganda.

In the first case, they met with some success, although not for long. Here their aim was to break the unity of the Orthodox Church by supporting the extreme, liberal section among the clergy by giving them privileges of an economic and political nature.

As a result of such policy were established the Living Church, headed by Bishop Antonin, who gave his support to the Bolshevik cause; the "Ancient Apostolic Church"; the Renewed Church, headed by the married Metropolitan Vvedensky; the Autocephalous Church of Ukraine, called after the name of the head of a small group of priests—Lipkovsky—who waived away, for the sake of his narrow, national interests, the canonical rights of the Orthodox Church; and the so-called *Samosviaty* (lit: self-consecrated) Church. In addition there were a few small groups who abandoned the true Church owing to their lax moral principles; but neither they nor the above schismatic Churches persuaded many of the faithful to follow them. So that here the Bolshevik attempt has failed.

Then the Soviet Government decided to liquidate religion by means of the law.

From the beginning of the revolution in 1917, the Church had been deprived of the right to take part in the government of the country and although afterwards it was totally separated from the State it had been regarded as a religious organization with

judicial rights. But by the law of April 9, 1929, the Church was abolished and blotted out from the order of socialistic government. Article 17 of this law states:

"Religious societies are prohibited."

It is lawful to organize any society or league other than religious. In order to give the persecution of the clergy a lawful appearance, the Soviet government organized a number of law-suits accusing the clergy of counter-revolutionary activities. The slightest hint of religious propaganda is considered always as counter-revolutionary propaganda. It is unnecessary to give examples, for all newspapers print articles on law-cases against the clergy.

It is noteworthy that lately these law-cases have not resulted in shooting, but in deportations to the Solovetsky monastery or the Narym district.

At first sight this may be taken to denote some softening of the Soviet policy towards religion. But on closer acquaintance with the conditions under which the exiles exist, one can see the cunningness and cruelty of the Soviet Government.

All these judicial farces, calculated only to deceive foreign countries, cannot deceive those who have even the slightest knowledge of the Bolsheviks. Only naïve foreigners who have never seen the terrible reality of the Soviet *régime*, can believe in Soviet justice. Deportation to Solovetsky or the Narym district is much worse than condemnation to death. It is more horrible than death because it prolongs an agony which cannot be described. Thousands of exiled priests drag out a deplorable existence, suffering incredible privations, from hunger and cold, enduring the awful labour of collecting timber in the far northern forests. Aged bishops and priests as well as young equally carry their crosses. Although the Soviet Government advertises its indifference to religion and the absence of religious persecution, reality shows the opposite. According to Soviet information, during recent years the following priests have been executed: Siletsky and Pomriasinsky (Schoolmasters' Newspaper, 29.10.1929); Rimarevitch and Sladkopevtzev (Isvestia, 26.1.1930); Modestov (Isvestia, 26.1.1930); Koudriavtzev, Vinogradov, Pavlenko and Didenko (Besbozhnik, 6.11.1930); Voinov (Evening Red Newspaper, 11.11.1930); and many other unnamed martyrs. Lately the Soviet rulers have invented a new way of exterminating the clergy. They have declared them *lishensy*, i.e., deprived of all rights and privileges, such as the right to receive food by cards, of earning money, of protection by the law. As we have seen, long ago they were deprived of political rights. The persecuted clergy cannot even use the post, because the Union of Godless Postmen decided to stop delivering letters and parcels addressed to "servants

of cults." The unfortunate priest living under such deplorable conditions must exist on donations and the generosity of his parishioners. And priests without a parish have only to die of starvation. Such is the way by which they try to exterminate clergy in Russia. This system is very convenient for the Bolsheviks as it achieves its aim without superfluous publicity and, therefore, without giving cause for protest from abroad.

We have shown above the persecution of the clergy. To complete our subject we must write of other methods in the Bolsheviks' struggle against religion.

Since the faithful find their strength by attending Church services, the Bolsheviks decided to deprive them of this consolation by destroying the churches with all their sacred possessions. The newspaper "Labour" in December, 1929, declares: "Religion is moving like a strongly-tied wild beast." It has been persecuted without pity and will continue to be so persecuted. At present there are 287 churches in Moscow, but there were 657. In the U.S.S.R. 1,000 churches have been closed. The Bolshevik rulers have not hesitated to demolish all that is most sacred to the Russian people. The Iverskaya Chapel as well as the ancient historical monastery of St. Simon; the Cathedral of our Saviour in Moscow; Cathedrals in Kharkov; Archangel; Belgrade (Russia), and in Petrograd, have been closed and turned into anti-religious museums. They have closed the Cathedrals of Isaak, the Resurrection and Kazan in Petrograd and the churches of Telicey and St. Catherine. The Chapel of Our Saviour has been demolished. In different towns many churches have been turned into museums, clubs, theatres and stores for storing grain and potatoes. Many examples could be found to prove this.

It is a significant fact that in most cases the Bolsheviks do all they can to shift the responsibility of this on to other people, arranging with the assistance of the so-called *comsomoltsi* meetings to pass resolutions expressing the people's anger, and their wish to "destroy the symbols of the cult."

The Bolsheviks realized that all their efforts—the assaulting religion from every side, introducing disorders among the clergy, shooting and sending them into exile, demolishing the churches—did not give the desired results. For the people's faith had not become less but, on the contrary, had increased and strengthened. Then they decided to use the strongest means: corruption by propaganda of the younger generation.

Everyone knows of the great scale on which the anti-Christmas and anti-Easter campaigns have been carried out and of the enormous sums that have been spent on them. They established special Godless universities, newspapers and literature; special lectures, performances in the theatre and processions on the eve of

those days have been organized. A five-day week was introduced in order to compel not only labourers but business men and schoolboys to work on Sundays.

Much effort and money are spent for these purposes, but to small purpose. The masses of the people still keep their faith in God and love their Church services. The very hysterical articles on religion in the Soviet Press is proof of their growing realization of failure.

For well they know that, in spite of all their efforts, religion still lives and represents the greatest obstacle to the achievement of the Bolshevik ideals.



THE SACRED THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL IN HALKI.

By EDWARD EVERY.

IN the year 1844 the Œcumenical Patriarch Germanos IV. established in the monastery of the Holy Trinity, on Halki, in the Principonese, the sacred theological school of the Great Church of Christ. His purpose was principally the training of the higher clergy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. He established over the school a governing body of four archbishops, all being members of the Holy Synod, and a Scholarches, or principal, who has generally been a bishop. The present Scholarches is the Bishop of Miletus, Mgr. Æmilienos. He is assisted by a staff of resident and non-resident masters. Of these one professor of exegesis is a priest. The rest are laymen. The school has a master of the Novices, who is a deacon, and several of the older students have been ordained to the diaconate while continuing their studies.

There are now in all 70 students. Of these 23 are in the three higher classes which form the theological academy. The rest are completing their general education under the roof of the school, in the four classes of the *gymnasium*, or grammar school. The students who are successful in their examinations twice a year in the academy and present satisfactory theses, are entitled "Masters of Theology."

The subjects studied in the academy are the following:—(1) Encyclopædic Theology, (2) Hermeneutics and Introduction to the Old and New Testaments, (3) Exegetics, (4) Ecclesiastical History,

(5) Patristics, (6) Dogmatics, (7) Christian and (8) Philosophical Ethics, (9) Pulpit Rhetoric, (10) Pastoral Theology, (11) Ecclesiastical Law, (12) The History of Philosophy. In the *gymnasium*, which almost all entering Halki have to pass through for a year at least, the following subjects are taught in addition to religious instruction: (1) Greek Literature, (2) Latin, (3) Ancient History, (4) French, (5) Turkish, (6) Modern History, (7) Political Geography, (8) Hebrew and Christian Archaeology, (9) Cosmography, (10) Anthropology or Hygiene, (11) Natural History, (12) Chemistry, (13) Physics, and (14) Ecclesiastical Music. Instruction in Physical Exercises, by the Swedish method, is given regularly.

The day begins at 7 a.m. with *orthros* (Matins) on every week-day. On Fridays this is postponed till 7.30 a.m. On Sundays and on the more important holy days it takes place at 8 a.m., and is followed immediately by the Divine Liturgy. Lectures are given from 9 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. and from 1.30 p.m. to 4 p.m. on all week-days other than Fridays and the days when there is a Liturgy. The hours of the day when on six days of the week a student has to be either in the lecture room or at his desk are 9½. One hour a day on the ordinary week-day is spent in church, half an hour in *orthros*, half an hour in *hesperinos* (vespers), during the afternoon. The climate of Halki is very bracing and this lessens the difficulty of long hours of work.

At the present time the students include a priest-monk from the autocephalous church of Poland, two laymen from the Jugo-Slav Patriarchate, two members of the autocephalous church of Cyprus, and a novice from the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre. A few belong to the Church of Greece. The rest, apart from the Anglican writer of this article, are ecclesiastically subjects of the Ecumenical throne. One is an American citizen. Three or four have homes in the Dodecanese, which belong politically to Italy. The great majority of the school and its staff, have their homes in European Turkey. The school has a Turkish title. The Turkish flag flies in the garden. The programme of periods in each classroom is written in Turkish.

Most of those who finish the school's course and are shortly afterwards ordained at once occupy official positions on the staffs of the Patriarchate and other Metropolitan Churches, in and near Constantinople. Some help the bishops to minister to the Patriarchate's widespread flock. The school has just sent a deacon to New York. From official positions on episcopal staffs, which belong to the category of the monastic or celibate clergy, they rise into the ranks of the numerous higher clergy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Comparatively few marry on leaving the school and become parish priests, though that is not now as rare as it was. The school's chief purpose is to maintain the historical traditions of Constantinople and

the names and honours of the ancient sees of Thrace and Asia Minor.

A history of the theological school of the Great Church of Christ, by one of its present professors, is now in preparation.

OUR BOOKSHELF.

AGNETS BOZHIY.

(The Lamb of God.)

A STUDY of the Incarnation. Part I. By Archpriest S. BULGAKOV. 473 pp. Y.M.C.A. Press. 1933.

Fr. S. Bulgakov is already well known to English scholars as a forceful and voluminous writer on theological subjects. He is a frequent contributor to *Poot* and *The Christian East*, and has written shorter works, such as *The Friend of the Bridegroom* (on John the Baptist), *Jacob's Ladder* (on the angels), *The Ikon and Ikon-worship*, *The Gospel Miracles*, and others. But we venture to think that *Agnets Bozhiy*, which has recently appeared, will be regarded as a valuable and comprehensive contribution to dogmatic theology.

The book is divided into an Introduction (pp. 7-111), and five chapters (pp. 112-468). The Introduction sets forth what Fr. Bulgakov calls the Dialectic of the idea of the God-manhood in the period of the Church Fathers. He traces the course of Christological doctrine from Apollinarius, Bishop of Laodicea, to the Sixth General Council of Constantinople, 681 A.D. This is common ground for all students, so we must pass on to Fr. Bulgakov's statement of the doctrine of God and man and their union in Christ.

He begins with a comparison of Divine and Created Sophia, understood in the strictly theological sense. Sophia, as Wisdom, is the self-revelation of the Logos, and the Glory of God, conceived not in relation to the world, but to Himself. Sophia is Eternal Humanity, or the Logos is the Divine Man. Man, as created, has the image of God both in his spirit and in his relation to the world, but the type is not the same as the Prototype. The divine likeness is the free realization of his image by man. The Fall did not destroy the image of God in man, but only weakened and obscured it.

The postulate of the Incarnation appears to be a certain fundamental identity, existing between the Divine Ego of the Logos and the human ego, which does not remove the differences existing between them.

Therefore the hypostasis of the Logos, the heavenly God-man, could itself become the hypostasis of the created man, and realize his fundamental God-manhood.

The union of two natures in Christ presupposes some form of Kenosis. In this connection Fr. Bulgakov deals with our Lord's temptations and His limitations of knowledge. Lastly, he deals with the work of Christ, which he considers under the three heads of the prophetic, high-priestly, and kingly ministry. The kingship of Christ begins with the Incarnation, is continued at the Ascension, and culminates in the Second Advent. So the book ends with the apocalyptic appeal, "Come, Lord Jesus!"

We shall look forward with interest to the second part of this important work.

L. PATTERSON.



The Christian East

SCENES FROM RUSSIA UNDER THE SOVIET

By "CLEMENTINA."

[NOTE BY THE EDITORS.—These vivid reminiscences of the normal measures dealt out to the ordinary professing member of the Orthodox Church by the O.G.P.U. is from the pen of a lady now safely out of Russia, whose name we withhold for the sake of her relations still in Russia.]

SCENE I.—THE JOURNEY INTO EXILE.

THE winter of 1930 was bitterly cold. Outside the church doors in Archangel, numb with cold, stood rows of priests. They had come from every part of Russia, hundreds of priests, monks and even bishops. They had been exiled to the north for professing their religion, and on arrival were allowed to go where they pleased. But where could they go? They knew nobody in that strange town, so they wandered about the streets. Some found shelter in empty barges that lay frozen on the shore, a few were taken in by compassionate people, who for that were often arrested.

In Soviet Russia only those who work receive a bread ration, 10½ ounces of black bread a day, but those exiled priests were not allowed to work and so they had no means of obtaining food, they were merely left to die.

Every Saturday night, and on Sunday morning, they stood outside the church door begging for alms. Never have I heard any complaint, though God knows they had enough cause for it. Half-frozen, half-starved, there they stood. People came to church bringing with them food and warm clothing which they distributed amongst the needy, but secretly, for fear of being denounced.

Time passed. It was February and still bitterly cold, but spring was in the air. By now some of the priests had found lodgings, mostly out of town, others had written to their relations at home and were receiving food parcels. The local population helped where they could.

The G.P.U. was becoming anxious. There were too many priests assembled in the town, soon the port would be open for navigation, and foreigners would arrive and would ask inconvenient questions.

Besides, new batches of prisoners were expected, and so the G.P.U. decided to send the priests away. The next time the exiles went to report to the G.P.U. they were told to get ready as they would be sent farther on to Petshora, a vast district about 800 miles from Archangel. For centuries it had been used as a place for exiles.

But the journey there had always been made in summer, because during the winter the way was impassable. Those that came to the north in winter had always remained in Archangel until spring thawed the ice-bound sea, and had then been sent away by the first steamer that could navigate the waters. It had never occurred to anyone before that it was possible to travel to Petshora in winter, but the G.P.U. thought differently.

The 15th February found the exiled priests standing and waiting patiently outside the G.P.U. There were 200 of them—they had all their belongings tied in a bundle on their backs. In that dreadful frost, when birds fell down dead and the thermometer had frozen the previous night, only a few had overcoats—many, especially those from the warm south, had only their thin cassocks. It was a Sunday. People going to church stopped involuntarily at the sight of those patient martyrs. Some of them took off their scarves and gloves. One old woman gave her knitted jacket to an old country priest—it looked so pathetic on him that one could not help crying.

At last they were sent into the inner court of the G.P.U. Perhaps the spectacle was too much like an anti-Soviet demonstration. At 6 o'clock in the evening they were led away under strong military escort. But many of the soldiers returned next morning. There was no need for such an escort. Those prisoners would not escape.

Patiently they trudged on. Many of them were old—all were exhausted and weak from hunger. Distances between the villages are very long in the north. Many fell down on the way, but no one was allowed to stop and help them—they were left to die.

Peasants told me later that they had often found half-frozen priests on the road. We shall never know how many fell in the forests and marshes. What happened to them? Probably they were devoured by wolves. It is known that of the 200 priests who set out, less than half arrived at their destination.

* * * * *

Throughout the next two years prisoners streamed into the north. In summer the journey was bearable. They could spend the night in some shed or bath-house, and find work more easily. I remember one nun, Catherine, a native of Archangel. Every day she found shelter for the homeless and food and clothing for the priests—she was really most wonderful. Of course this ended, as everyone knew it would. She was arrested on Good Friday. When I went to console her sister, she looked at me in amazement and replied:

"Sorry, why? She has been honoured to suffer on the same day as Our Saviour."

Catherine died of typhus fever soon after in prison.

At last my turn came. I suppose that all those who gave help to the priests were under suspicion, and one night in January, 1931,

I was arrested. The same night the local archbishop, three exiled bishops and most of the local clergy suffered a similar fate.

In prison our baptismal crosses were taken away from us. We heard through the door how the archbishop refused to take off his episcopal cross.

"As a servant of Christ, I dare not take off this cross," he said.

"If you dare not, we dare," was the answer.

Interrogations are sometimes conducted for many hours—the officials change but the prisoner remains. I personally have never been questioned for more than five to six hours, but even that was more than enough. Once a peasant woman refused to answer a question and the infuriated official jammed her hand in the door—I saw her when she returned to the cell—her hand was all purple and swollen.

The same official, in order to mock a woman, placed a mitre on his head, took a crucifix in his hand and insisted on her kissing the crucifix, saying:

"I'm told that you believe in the Crucified One. If so, kiss this cross."

But she answered: "We don't kiss a cross when it is held by an anti-Christ."

I shall never forget one particular night. It was about 10 o'clock and we were all sleeping. Suddenly we were awakened by a man crying: "Please, please, stop beating me."

Ours was the only woman's cell. Not a man's voice protested, and he continued to scream. It was dreadful to listen to him. We could stand it no longer. Two of us jumped up and started banging on the door, and shouting at the top of our voices. Warders hurried to us and asked what the noise was about. We explained that if they did not stop beating the man immediately we would complain to the commandant.

The threat was not very serious, but all the same the beating stopped.

Two years before I had been imprisoned in Moscow and with me there was a young girl. It was Easter night. We were being led to the lavatory through a long corridor, where to the right and to left there were cells. We were strictly forbidden not only to speak but to cough when going along the corridor, and so terrorized were we that no one dared to disobey.

The young girl had been thinking all day about the Resurrection, and now walking in the corridor it seemed to her as if she were moving among the tombs where the living dead were buried. Later she could not explain how she had dared to do it, but suddenly she shouted our Easter greeting, "Christ is Risen," and from all the sealed doors came the answer, "He is Risen indeed."

She did not return to the cell that evening. She was punished

and isolated in an unheated cell with a stone floor. But she told me later that she was glad she had done it.

But I must return to my life in prison in 1931. Our cell was damp, very dark and overcrowded. Worse than hunger and thirst were the vermin that crept on the walls, bit under our skin, and disturbed our sleep. We had already been confined to the cell for two months and still there was no change—only we became weaker through hunger and lack of fresh air. Suddenly, one evening we were led out of the cell.

It was bitterly cold when we reached the prison yard. At first I did not feel the frost, as I felt giddy from the fresh air. Our cell had been about $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards long and $2\frac{1}{2}$ yards wide, and there had been nine of us in it.

It was about 8 o'clock in the evening and rather dark. We were drawn up in rows and silently led away. Where to? None of us knew, and it was not worth while asking, as we would receive no answer. So on we went into the cold dark night. Soon we were out of town on the wide D— river (in winter the rivers serve as roads). It began to snow. The temperature was about -25° Reamur. We might have been marching about two hours and still we saw no huts, only snow and the blue-white glittering of the ice. Suddenly the soldiers stopped beside a barge frozen in the ice.

"We have arrived," said one, "you will lodge here to-night."

Several soldiers came hurrying in our direction.

"There, take those documents, with these 50 head of men, and nine head of women" (prisoners are counted like cattle per head).

The barge was to be our new abode.

We were led down to a hold that had been divided by partitions into small cells without any windows. On the floors were standing small iron stoves that had to be heated day and night in order to thaw the ice-covering on the floors. There was thus water on the floor, and we were obliged to wade through it. Into such a cell we were locked, in the day a small electric lamp being our only light. The cell was dark, wet, gloomy and full of smoke.

Scarcely had we entered, when from all sides we heard taps on the walls: they came from neighbours who had already been confined for months, and who wanted to know if any of us had by chance met any of their relations somewhere.

"I shan't be able to endure such a life for long," I thought.

Suddenly I saw in the half-light dark objects crawling about all over the place. They were bugs and we were almost devoured by them. Never has one to endure more than one can, but I felt frightfully depressed as well as ill. My feet ached, and I suffered from scurvy. Our prison food consisted only of 300 gr.¹ of black bread per day, two teaspoonfuls of brown sugar, two glasses of hot water

¹ 300 grammes = about 10½ oz.

and one plate of soup—hot water with fish bones. We found this very insufficient.

Twenty-four hours later, however, we were all summoned to continue our journey. Many times have I marched in Soviet Russia under military escort, but still I cannot get over the disagreeable impression, which was always produced upon me by the loading of rifles and words of the leader of the escort, addressed to the prisoners as they stood in long, even rows:

"All must walk in step; no one may smoke, talk or turn. He will do this on his own risk."

I usually lost all wish to join in conversation after those words.

We marched very fast, 15 kilometres¹ in two hours. Those who lagged behind got encouragement through blows from rifle butts. We went through the town towards the railway station, situated on the other side of the river. There stood goods trains. On the vans was written "timber," and we represented the timber loads.

There are, I believe, small windows in vans used for the transport of cattle. We had one also, quite high up, only it was barred and whitewashed. In the middle of the wagon stood a small iron stove, which we kept on heating day and night, as the temperature was about -30° R.² In one corner of the wagon was a square hole in the floor, for ventilation and other purposes.

On both sides of the stove were erected two rows of boards—one above the other—on which we were supposed to lie. But there was room only for 40 women, and we were by now 50. There were ten, therefore (of whom I was one), who could not lie down. We crouched on logs round the fire not merely for hours, but for days. We did not know whether it was day or night, and where we were going. But we were so exhausted with hunger and so faint, that we had but one wish—to reach our destination.

The doors were locked and fastened with iron bars. The van was opened twice a day, when we got our portion of hot water to drink, one pail at a time. We had received our bread ration for a week on the day of our departure, and that was all our food for the journey.

But, God, what happened when the water was brought. Women fought like mad for one drop of water, as the pail (which we usually got half-empty and in which the water smelt of rust and oil) did not suffice for all. Some of those who especially suffered from thirst used to tie a tumbler to a string and lower it through the hole in the floor, in order to scrape a little dirty snow from the rails.

When we halted at stations we were not allowed to talk. Later on I understood the reason. Our train was on the way to Siberia, where there are express trains running from Vladivostock to Poland, and travellers from abroad might be astonished at hearing human voices from the inside of vans labelled "timber" or "corn."

¹ A kilometre = $\frac{1}{5}$ of a mile.

² i.e., 35° below zero Fahrenheit.

Towards the evening of the sixth day of our journey our door was suddenly flung open, and a rough voice ordered us to get out. The train was standing in a forest, we saw nothing but firs and snow. We had reached our destination. But where were we? From the long sitting and crouching we felt stiff in every joint and could not obey quickly.

"Are you coming?" shouted the voice and we tumbled into the snow. Not very far off were a few huts and barracks. There we were supposed to stay for the night. I was so happy to be allowed to lie down full length that I did not mind the numerous bugs, fleas and lice. I stretched myself out on bare boards beside a dirty old woman and rejoiced.

The next morning at 6 o'clock we were called upon to continue our journey, to go on foot about 70 kilometres through forests and over rivers (in that part of Russia there are practically no villages). My feet ached, otherwise I should have enjoyed the journey. Our escort became much more friendly. It was quite impossible even to make an attempt to escape, and so we were allowed to talk to one another and even to sing.

It was the first week of Lent. The Greek Orthodox Church observes a seven-weeks Lent before Easter, of which the first, fourth and seventh are the strictest. Special and beautiful prayers are sung at that time. At my side was a priest, who was singing half-aloud the following prayer:

"My soul, my soul, why dost thou slumber? Thy end is near, and fear will overpower thee, but rise and cry out: holy, holy, holy art thou, O Lord. Have mercy upon me."

Since that day I can never hear that prayer without thinking of that priest. I heard that afterwards he was shot.

Next day we came to a broad river, which we crossed, and the third day we reached our destination. On a front of 356 kilometres thirty-three forced labour camps had been set up to build a new railway line. In these thousands of prisoners, men and women, of all ages and professions, the frail equally with the stronger, are driven merciless to work every day. This slave labour was to be my lot for some indefinite time.

SCENE II.—IN A TIMBER CAMP.

THE timber camp, where we were sent to, was about 300 miles beyond Viatka. In a large area, where there were very few villages, were scattered 33 timber camps. A new railway line had to be built from station Pinig up to Ust-Sisolsk, of a length of about 250 miles. We were brought to No. 1 of these camps by railway in

cattle trucks from the north of Russia, without air ventilation, in complete darkness, with only a square opening in the floor that had to serve for all purposes. Anyhow, after six long interminable days this journey came to an end. We were unloaded—really we could hardly move, so stiff had we got in all our members from that day-long crouching on the floor, or lying on the planks. The timber camp we were destined for was No. 9. The next day, after a night's rest, we started thither on foot—about 50–60 miles. I must say, it was very difficult to march—we were too exhausted, too weakened by our previous sufferings and long imprisonment that we had pains to move. But the surrounding woods were so beautiful, the frozen rivers we had to cross were so vast and wide, all around us we saw game, reindeer, that I began to feel a little less miserable—it helps one to see beautiful surroundings. The forests we went through were perfectly wild, of villages or peasants there were none in these parts, so that our escort, knowing we had nowhere to escape, got more friendly, allowed us to talk one with another, and even to rest every six miles for a few minutes.

So we marched for three days. The night we stayed at the timber camps. At last we saw a few barracks, situated on a cleared space amid dark fir trees—that was to be our new home. The buildings were few and we had to live in a small square room with a very high ceiling. A kind of scaffolding was on every side of the room. It had three to four storeys, one over another, with steep ladders between. Those who were on the lowest got all the dust and dirt from the upper storeys that fell between the openings in the planks, and froze—those on the highest shelves suffocated. But all had to lie close one to another, as we were 75 women on approximately 15 square metres. Of all these only one except me could write or read; of the 73 that were left about 6 were criminals and over 65 simple peasant women, mostly from Little Russia, sent hither as anti-Communist element. They had not committed any crime, but had not joined the collective farms and therefore entire villages were banished to Siberia or to the north. These women had lost all—home, belongings, family—as very often wives were sent in one direction and husbands in another elsewhere. But none of us complained—what was the use of it? It would not make matters better. We had to endure.

I must say, women in prisons have more to put up with, more to endure than men. They are often forced into becoming the mistress of some of the chiefs—to refuse costs too much, and to accept often makes that dreadful life more bearable; besides, many lack courage to refuse. As has been told, I was one of the two women who could read. Next day I was sent to the medical attendant who required a nurse, and I had been that during the War. The first day all went smoothly—I did my duty, bandaged, distributed

medicines and so on. Next morning he told me to bring my belongings, as I was to occupy the same room as he did. I did not quite understand the real meaning of his words and answered it was not worth while, as I was already lodged with the other women. "I wonder," said he, "whether you really do not understand, or just pretend not to. Don't you see, you have to be my mistress." Not being answered at once he continued: "I see, you think about the Commandant—you need not! I'll see to that!" "But I did not think about the Commandant, I think about myself only and I refuse!" "You refuse? Don't you know, that your fate lies in my hands: whom the medical attendant declares too weak for hard labour is kept for easier tasks in the camp, but whom I pronounce perfectly healthy is sent to the worst, hardest work—to felling trees? Be careful! You might in case of refusal be sent there!" But as it did not shake my purpose, I was sent next morning to the woods.

We were awakened at 4 o'clock. At 4.30 we got our breakfast—frozen sweetish mashed potatoes and hot water. At 5.30 was the call-over; at 6 we had to leave the barracks and were sent off to do various jobs. Of all the women only about 12–15 stayed in the camp, where they were employed at the laundry, kitchen, and so on, all the others were sent to work in the woods. It was still quite dark when we left the camp, and gradually it began to dawn; often we had to walk about 2–3 miles. Then we were left with one or two soldiers and told to fell trees and to saw them up to a special size. Two women had to fell 50 trees a day. It was impossible, and those who ordered it knew it perfectly well. Men who did not complete their task were severely punished: their food ration was reduced, sometimes they were left for several hours to stand barefoot in the snow. But I must say with us it was better. All the women came from the south of Russia, none had ever done such kind of work before, therefore I was not worse than the rest of them. No one of us ever completed the appointed task. But we worked from about 6.30 in the morning till it was dark, that is, till about 5.30 in the afternoon, and that without interruption. If we stopped for a moment's rest, or sat down on a stump, the soldier, who was with us, at once gripped his rifle-butt, and one felt cured of any fatigue. Men are more ill-treated than the younger women—we are fewer, soldiers are often brutal to us, too, but less than with men. I have never seen soldiers striking women with rifle-butts, but I have seen blows raining on men. Priests are especially most brutally handled, pushed about, knocked down, gripped by their long hair and pulled about under laughter. I remember a priest had fallen on the way, and he had been raised by his hair by a soldier, roaring with laughter.

It was February and March. The sun was shining, it began even to thaw. Therefore the snow gave way under the weight of one's body, and one fell waist-deep into the snow. Mostly we worked by 6.

A group of women that worked near us had an accident: a tree fell down and broke the skull of one woman. But she had enough strength left to walk to the hospital-barrack. The medical attendant bandaged her head and allowed her to stay for two days in the barracks—"but mind," he added, "the third day you are to return to the wood!" All of us were jealous of this lucky woman—fancy, having two days of rest! A consumptive priest was in the same camp. One day I saw him going to the medical reception. His cough had got so bad that he hardly could go. He asked for a few days rest, but all the answer he got was: "What, you want rest, you lazy old rascal! Work you shall, and if you die of it, so there is one less left of you." He did die a week later.

But sometimes we had variations in our life—not always had we to fell trees; sometimes we were ordered to chop ice-blocks of the river-bed, or dig the road. As to the trees they had to be of about 60-centimetre diameter, they had to be felled, sawn up, branches and top cut off, and the trunks carried and piled up on the road. When it grew dark we were allowed, although our task never was completed, to return to our barracks. We never felled over 11–12 trees, and I felt quite proud of such a number. I suppose the soldier who escorted us got too frozen, waiting while we worked, that he conducted us back, in spite of our not having completed the task. My feet, legs and arms were covered with purple-black spots—probably scurvy; they ached a good deal, but I could not help it. It was impossible for me to ask the medical attendant for an advice after our conversation. At the end of our day's work I hardly moved and often fell down on our way back. When we arrived we mostly were too exhausted to feel any hunger. Our supper awaited us there. It consisted of a plateful of soup with a few cabbage leaves, sometimes with fish bones (the fish had probably been eaten by the cook), and our daily bread ration—1½ pounds of black bread. Hot water we could get all the evening. At 7–7.30 was again call-over, we lay down and the day was over. The next day was just like the previous one. I had but one skirt, as I had been unexpectedly arrested and sent away without anything with me. I had to take my linen off in the evening, wash it and hang it up, and to put it on next morning. But when I came from the woods, my skirt was usually drenched—all day we had been waist-deep in the snow. In our room there was a small iron stove, where we used to hang up for drying all our wet clothes. But over 60 women did it, and the stove was much too small, therefore we had to put on in the morning quite damp things. I asked the administration to give me some working clothes. I got a pair of grass-green trousers with patches in the most intimate places, torn at the edges, as if by dogs. Those I put on over mine, the head I usually covered with a black shawl, as nuns do—I think I looked a sight. Once I happened to

overhear a conversation between two soldiers that concerned me: "I wonder who she is—she must be a communist girl—only these would risk wearing trousers." "No," replied the other, "don't you see by the way she wears her shawl that she is a nun." So it still remains to them a riddle.

Life went on in Europe—football matches, parliament debates, speeches, dances, travelling by "train de luxe," yachting. Life went on in Russia, too—persecution, arrests, perquisitions, interrogatories—also speeches, also travelling by trains, but in cattle trucks, timber camps, executions and prisons, prisons. . . . At the entrance of our camp stood a few poles (one would not risk putting a cross) put over the graves of prisoners who had died here. Of course, there was no coffin—who should trouble about it? And, of course, the corpse was naked—living ones need skirts more than dead. And every day, when going to our tree-felling and when returning from it, we quite unconsciously looked there—all had but one thought—"is that to be my end, too?" I wonder. . . .

SCENE III.—THE DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP ANTONIOS OF ARCHANGEL.

The year 1931 was beginning. It was the eve of Epiphany. We were on our way to vespers to the only remaining church of the town, situated on the outskirts of a cemetery. All the reality of Soviet life was concealed by darkness. Among the whirling snowflakes suddenly appeared dark human forms, all going in one direction toward the church, and it seemed that one was still in the old former Russia.

The church and its premises were soon filled with people. In spite of active anti-religious propaganda in U.S.S.R. there arises a new mighty outburst of faith among all classes. Many atheists, who used to laugh and to mock at religion, now return to church, seeking comfort and rest for their weary souls. The church is the only refuge amid all the ocean of sin.

At the church entrance there stood as usual the exiled clergy. Bishops, priests, monks in shabby old cassocks, driven into exile from all parts of Soviet Russia, stood in long rows, holding out their hands. They were especially numerous that winter. Released from prison soon after their arrival in town they were entirely left without any help and driven into the streets. Not being permitted to work, the State did not supply them with any food and they had to depend only on compassion. Having nowhere to live, even to stay the night, they walked the streets. The local clergy—that is, what remained after all those years of arrests and executions—with Archbishop

Antonios at the head, helped their brethren where they could, collecting warm clothes, food, even money. One could see them every Saturday at the church entrance, begging for alms.

Archbishop Antonios was officiating. He was a handsome, tall old man of about 75, with long white beard and hair, who looked in his glittering gorgeous vestments a true Prince of the Church. With him were officiating several priests, the protodiakon and two ippodiakons. Alas, that was to be the last solemn and pompous service! After the reading of the gospel the Archbishop announced that no Te Deum with the blessing of waters would take place on the following day, as it was prohibited by the local Soviet authorities. His sermon was on the text, "The voice of one calling in the desert—come and prepare the Lord's ways." We still remember this peculiar atmosphere of peace and grace that spread through the half-lit church. The same night the O.G.P.U. arrested Archbishop Antonios, almost all the local clergy, and three exiled bishops.

The Archbishop lodged in a private house. He had only one small room. At 11 p.m., shortly after his return from church, the head coroner of the clerical department of the O.G.P.U. (a former student of a theological college) with his assistant and three soldiers came to him. The questioning lasted for five hours—from 11 until 4 a.m. Naturally nothing was found as the clergy of U.S.S.R. never meddle with politics and are interested only in Church matters. Archbishop Antonios was one of those people who always keep apart from politics. He was perfectly calm and self-possessed throughout the questioning, although he knew very well that independently of the results of the investigation his arrest was certain. Toward morning the police official came upon a morsel of the Sacraments. As a former theological student he knew that only priests are allowed to handle them. "Citizen Coroner," said the Archbishop, "those are the Holy Sacraments. The Church does not permit laymen to touch them." At the same moment they were flung with laughter down on the floor and the coroner began to trample on them. The Archbishop fell on his knees, trying to shield them and fainted. About 4.30 a.m. the Archbishop was brought under military escort to the Tuner Prison of the O.G.P.U., and the room was closed and the door sealed (soon after a member of the O.G.P.U. entered it). The poor old man had been arrested many times previously, and he knew that in Soviet prisons there are neither beds nor anything else, but he was so horrified by the blasphemy (desecration of the Sacraments) that he forgot all about himself and took with him only his episcopal staff. At the prison, before being led to a cell, he was asked to take off his episcopal cross. "As a servant of Christ, I dare not take off His cross," replied he. "If you dare not, we'll do it ourselves," was the answer, and the cross was torn off.

He was led to a cell where there were only criminals. The O.G.P.U. often resort to that in order to frighten the clergy. But they are greatly mistaken. They expect to see the spirit broken, as a result of being among thieves and murderers. But the criminals behave very decently toward the clergy and the counter-revolutionists.

The cell in which the Archbishop was locked contained three bedsteads of canvas. They were occupied by seven prisoners. Five were criminals; the sixth was a worker who had, when the worse for a drink, abused the Soviet Government, and the seventh was a soldier of the Red Army who related that he was in prison for having refused to shoot people. (Later, however, it appeared that he had simply stolen while working as head manager of a canteen. He had been transferred to this cell that same day in order to spy on the Archbishop; later on he contrived to steal from him all his linen.) The criminals offered to sell the Archbishop a place on the canvas bed for bread or tobacco, but when they learned that he had nothing they gave it to him without payment.

Archbishop Antonios was called for questioning after five or six days' imprisonment, and it lasted for seventeen hours without interruption. It was conducted by several officials. During that time he was given salted herring without bread, but they refused to give him water. The coroner accused him of being the head of an anti-Soviet organization that helped the counter-revolutionary element, the exiled clergy. The accusation was absurd, and both the accused and the accuser knew it. First, all the exiled clergy were registered in the O.G.P.U. and had to report once a week. Secondly, the fact that the Archbishop had only occasionally taken some of the exiled who otherwise had to stay overnight in the cold street for the night could not be considered an anti-Soviet crime. As to giving them material help, the clergy stood at the church door and begged quite openly for alms and all who were able helped them. The Archbishop was then asked to give an answer in writing to the following three questions: (1) his view of the position of the Church in Soviet Russia; (2) what future the Church had, and (3) if he desired an overthrow of the Soviet Government. His answers were: (1) that he considered the position of the Church very trying, but at the same time, as a God-sent grace; (2) the future of the Church would be glorious through the martyrdom of its saints, as in the first centuries after Christ. To the third question he replied that he daily prayed to the Lord that he should pardon them their sins and soften their hearts and cause them to relax their power without bloodshed. Thus finished the first questioning and the Archbishop was led back to his cell.

The first three months of the prison life were easier; three

times a month prisoners were allowed to receive food and clothes from home, a doctor visited the cells once a month, and, although not very learned in medicine, provided the prisoners with the simplest medicines. The Archbishop received large parcels of food, being very respected and loved in the town, but he took for his own use only some biscuits, clean linen and a piece of soap. All the rest he left to his fellow-prisoners. He even tried to share with them the poor prison food, black bread, two spoonfuls of brown sugar, a plate of soup, made of fish bones, and some millet porridge cooked with water, without any oil or fat. Although old and ailing, he was still always brave and cheerful. He suffered his long imprisonment in one cell deprived of books, fresh air, and not summoned to any questioning after the first one, with a patience and high moral strength not to be compared with any of his fellow-prisoners.

The most demoralized was the worker; sometimes he was abusing the Soviet Government, sometimes he was in black despair, crying and sobbing passionately. The criminals did not like him and used often to beat him, when the Archbishop slept. They consisted chiefly of very young people who had committed crimes, having lost all principles and traditions as a result of the present education. But the Archbishop they soon worshipped. By and by he began to talk to them about the Gospel, that was completely unknown to those modern heathens; in the nights he used to kneel in the darkness and to pray. Gradually his strength began to fail. So passed February, March, the Passion week—when he ate nothing but a few crumbs of bread with water—and Easter approached. Three and a half months after the first questioning the Archbishop was summoned for the second time. The same absurd accusation was repeated. The examining official shouted at the old man, pointed at him with a revolver, insisted that he should confess. "Your Eminence shall rot in prison until you confess." At the same time he offered to liberate the Archbishop if he consented to enter the Secret Service of the O.G.P.U., but to no result. That was the Archbishop's second and last interrogation.

He was not brought back to the same cell, but conducted to a separate cell of the new prison building. Summer was beginning and with it the heat. The whitewashed walls, erected in winter, got soft and damp and were soon covered with moisture and mould. White drops ran down to the floor. At the same time all sending of parcels from home was prohibited, and prisoners were practically left without any linen, soap or even food. Almost all had only one set of underclothes, as they had sent the rest home to be washed. Visits of physicians were stopped, as well as were the hairdressers who used to shave the prisoners twice a month. That lasted from May to August. Into the cell where the Archbishop was kept were

brought five peasants from Little Russia, who had escaped from camps. There was no place for them all to lie down. The air was thick with perspiration of six unwashed human bodies, the odour of damp clay walls and of a stinking pail with excrements, that stood in a corner, as one was not allowed to leave the cell except twice a day. Of ventilation there was none. One glass of water was given twice a day to each prisoner and the people suffered dreadfully of thirst.

They were so exhausted by heat, thirst and lack of air that they were not only unable to move, but even to speak, and they sat for hours in silence on the floor, leaning against the wall and breathing heavily with open mouths, like fishes on the shore. Their linen had mouldered and their bodies were covered with a few dirty rags, the hair had grown long. Lice bit under the skin and covered them. But the numerous fleas were perhaps worse. On the damp walls appeared fat white worms. Disease was fast spreading. Teeth fell out, arms and legs began to swell and to be covered with red and blue spots.

Some of the peasants, who were with the Archbishop, also fell ill. Their wounds, received in the war, opened afresh. One of them died, not having any medical help, and the body was not taken away until the next evening. To his place in the cell was at once brought a young boy of 19, the son of the deceased. The Archbishop, being old and stout, was too weak to lie on the canvas bed; he lay underneath on the floor, where the parasites did not attack him so fiercely. He hardly ate anything, but suffered dreadfully from thirst; but no one had, alas, the moral strength to give him his own portion of water.

Worms crawled in the beard, entered the mouth, nose and ears, until at last some of his fellow-prisoners took them out. From time to time he seemed to lose consciousness, then he called out, or cried, but else he only prayed. Days dragged on, the door was daily opened in the morning, the bread rations were put on the floor. At last, one day, an exiled bishop was brought to the same cell. He heard his confession and absolved the dying Archbishop Antonius. A few days later the newly-arrived bishop was interrogated. "Have you seen His Eminence? That is the way we shall make you rot, too," announced the coroner. The bishop refused to answer all questions, as long as Archbishop Antonius was not brought to a hospital. But his protest was of no avail. The death of the Archbishop had been decided upon by the Presidium of the O.G.P.U. At last he caught dysentery, which had infected one of the peasants first. The first days the Archbishop had heavy losses of blood, but in spite of supplications of the fellow-prisoners, he was kept in the same cell. His fever rose. He was so weak that he could not move. At last it seemed fit to transfer him to the hospital of the town

prison. He could not understand where he had come to and only repeated: "Please, don't beat." A few hours later he crossed his arms on the breast, murmured prayers and died.

News about the Archbishop's end spread quickly through the town. The clergy addressed itself to the O.G.P.U. with the prayer to let them bury the dead Archbishop. But their prayer was refused. A telegram was sent to the Attorney of the Republic, Catanjan, but no answer was received. Late in the night the Archbishop's naked body was buried without a coffin by the soldiers in the churchyard. Two women, who had been by turn watching the prison gates, followed from afar. After the Archbishop's death there was a sudden change in the prison regime—food parcels from home were permitted, as well as ten-minute walks, and medical help was given.

In the only remaining church of the town a solemn service was held for the dead. The church was half-dark—electric wires had been cut off in all churches of U.S.S.R., and candle-mills had been confiscated. In the middle of the church stood the little table on which service for the dead is celebrated. On it were put the Archbishop's mitre, and tall wax candles that are carried by the bishop at Church celebrations. All the church was decorated with flowers. Exiled priests sang the service. They began the chant: "Let us come and give the last farewell." And the folk came streaming to the vestments and fondly kissed all that remained of their Archbishop. Many sobbed and wept.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE STATE IN THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS.

By DR. FRANCIS DVORNIK, *Professor of the Charles University of Prag.*

[A Translation of the Lecture, *De Auctoritate Civili in Conciliis Oecumenicis*, contained in the Acta VI Congressus Velehradensis, Olomucii, 1933.]

INTRODUCTORY NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

This monograph was delivered as a lecture at a Conference organized in 1932 at the famous Monastery of Velehrad in Czechoslovakia by Latins and Uniates especially concerned with Papalist propaganda among Russian, Ruthenian, Ukrainian and other Orthodox Slavs. Its author, the Rev. Dr. Francis Dvornik, who holds the Professorship of Ecclesiastical History in the famous Charles IV. University of Prag, is recognized by general consent

as among the foremost and most able of the Byzantinists of the present day and as carrying on worthily the tradition of that master of all Byzantinists, Charles Diehl, under whom he studied in the Sorbonne, and for whose chair in the University of Paris, if he had not been a priest, he would probably have been a strong candidate this year.

The two solid works which Dr. Dvornik has published already, "Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome," Paris, 1926, and "Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance," Prague, 1933, are the fruit of independent as well as thoroughgoing and indefatigable research of the type which takes nothing for granted but which goes to the source and re-examines every conception, recaptures and reconstructs history scientifically. In result, it is certain that the ecclesiastical history of Centuries IX and X, as it has been traditionally set forth in the West must be amended, and it is possible that it may have to be rewritten.

The same holds good with this valuable monograph. Dr. Dvornik is a Roman Catholic priest. He is a scientific historian, not a partisan. Here again he passes back beyond the controversial Western tradition which germinated in Latin monasteries and stretching back for its origin to the days when the Donation of Constantine and the forged Isidorian decretals were held to be pillars of the theory of the Papacy, represents the Popes as "de jure divino" convoking, directing and dissolving the Ecumenical Councils and as conferring or annulling the decisions and canons of those Councils at their discretion.

In the past three hundred years the collapse one after another of the spurious props on which that mythical theory was based, has been followed by determined efforts to reconstruct its front. Thus as recently as ten years ago, the late Mgr. Battifol was labouring to show that the Fathers of the first four Ecumenical Councils explicitly recognised the Pope as their infallible overlord. Assuredly the ingenuity is amazing by which here a chance individual word and there a corporate adulatory exclamation, recorded in the narrative of the Councils' proceedings have been seized upon and worked into a mosaic which pictures Eastern Christendom as postulating and proclaiming the universal overlordship and infallibility of the Papacy. Nor is it surprising that a writer such as Dr. Scott, the Vicar of Oddington, in his strange thesis for his Oxford Ph.D., "The Eastern Churches and the Papacy," which is actually listed as a classic of reference by the vocal, if exiguous, group of Anglicans whose organ is "The Pilot," has gone one better upon Mgr. Battifol, and in bodily appropriating his arguments and conclusions, has embroidered them with his own deductions from them.

But if we must dismiss Dr. Scott with a mere "quantum maxillae," Mgr. Battifol was a scholar and a Byzantinist of some

repute. If it is the case that Dr. Scott, and his collaborators, are not equipped to resort to such primary authorities, Mgr. Battifol must have been aware of the letters and other documents, to which Dr. Dvornik has resorted, and which were passed over in silence by Hefele, Leclercq, Duchesne and other Papalist interpreters of and commentators upon the Ecumenical Councils in the Papal interest. That he must have desired that those "litterae scriptae" might remain forgotten, is obvious. That somehow or other, he was ready to essay discounting their damaging production, may be taken as certain. But that he must have hoped that their awkward evidence would not be disinterred is a reasonable conclusion.

It would be altogether unfair and inequitable to ignore the fact that while producing these documents and while interpreting them by the only honest and scientific method, Dr. Dvornik has gone far to shatter the traditional Papalist hypothesis that the Popes convened the Ecumenical Councils and that through their legates they controlled their procedure and confirmed their decisions or not at their discretion.

Instead, he leaves no doubt that those functions were claimed and exercised by the Emperors. And he presents the Popes or their legates as occupying in the Councils that primacy of the Princes of the Roman Senate which involved (1) not a presidency but a seat of first honour, and (2) not a right of veto or control but a right to vote first.

In short, while Dr. Dvornik stands firmly by the dogmas of Papal Supremacy and Infallibility, he warned the Velehrad Congress in effect that the Ecumenical Councils cannot be adduced as evidence that the Eastern Church ever accepted those dogmas explicitly.

I

INASMUCH as it touches the basis of catholic doctrine concerning the Roman Pontiff's supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, the question of civil authority in the matter of the convening, of the guiding of the procedure and of the confirmation of the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils is of the greatest importance. That those who, according to their point of view, defend and those who attack the doctrine of the Papal Primacy have invariably set themselves either to add to or to detract from the importance of the authority of the Roman and the Byzantine Emperors in regard to the first eight Ecumenical Councils is not surprising. That which rather is surprising is that hitherto in spite of the pains devoted to that end by men of the greatest erudition, the question has not been definitely resolved. Our present purpose is to elucidate the question in the light of the documents which we have found in our studies of Byzantine history, by which it may be more conclusively examined.

The three matters of importance for our consideration are: (1) the authority of the Emperors in regard to the convocation of the first eight Œcumenical Councils; (2) the presidency over those Councils; and (3) the confirmation of their canons by imperial decrees.

As to the convocation of the Œcumenical Councils, it would seem agreed that all the first eight Œcumenical Councils were convoked by the Emperors.

How can that fact be reconciled with the Catholic Doctrine of the Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff in matters ecclesiastical? Must we hold with Catholic theologians, such as Bellarmine, Hefele, Mazzella, Palmieri, Phillips, Wernz, etc., that this imperial convocation was not of independent action and command, but only subordinate and involving a delegated authority from the Pope, either explicit or implied?

Not at all.

It is noteworthy that this theory is described in his *Essays on Church History*¹ by that most erudite scholar Funk, as having been finally abandoned. And for ourselves, we conclude that the contentions by which those theologians, to whom we have referred above with esteem and respect, have wished to establish it, are quite inadequate.

Accordingly, we ask leave to expound the documents which are relevant; from which we shall see that in convoking the Œcumenical Councils the Emperors judged themselves not to be exercising a power delegated to them, but a power which was an attribute of and, as it were, emanating from their office as Emperor.

II

The First Council was convened in the city of Nikæa by the Emperor Constantine the Great, in 325 A.D.

In describing the convocation of that Council of Nikæa, neither Eusebius² nor Socrates³ make mention of the Pope.

They say simply that Constantine convoked the Council of Nikæa, "by the inspiration of God and for the welfare of the Church."

The Second Council was convoked by the Emperor Theodosius the Great, in Constantinople, 381 A.D.

His successor, Theodosius the Less, convoked the Council of Ephesus, 431 A.D.

We are in possession of the two letters of convocation by which the Emperor commanded the bishops to attend those Councils.

These letters are of the greatest importance, inasmuch as they give the clearest expression of the Emperors' conception of their right to convoke the Councils.

¹ *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, Paderborn, 1897-1907, I, pp. 39 sqq.

² Eusebius, *De vita Const.*, M.III, c.XII, P.G., Vol. 20, col. 1,068.

³ *Historia Eccles.*, I.Ic.X., P.G., Vol. 67, col. 85.

The very words of the Emperor are these:

"Forasmuch as God has given us the succession of the reins of Empire and has willed that for those who obey our imperial rule, we should be the bond uniting them in piety and in right living, we hold those reins fast in their integrity, as trustees alike for God's Providence and for humanity, whose servants for the furthering the welfare of the State we are. Accordingly, passing as it were, under review those who are subject to us, we make it our care that they should believe rightly and should frame their lives as befits those who believe rightly. In short we cease not to bestow our care on both objects as of equal obligation to us. Above all, we labour that the condition of the Church should be such as is both worthy and as helpful as may be for our times. . . . Furthermore, being of the mind that by the love of God and by the unanimity of the faithful through mutual charity these ends may be achieved, on account of which has already happened frequently . . . we have adjudged that a religious council of most reverend bishops brought together from every part of the world is the need of the day. . . . Wherefore, lest those things which bear upon our search of that which will be so helpful should result by neglect of proper attention in further deterioration, your Right Reverence will by God's Providence make your endeavour to resort as soon as the next most holy season of Easter is over to the City of Ephesus in Asia, on the very day of the holy Pentecost, and you will bring with you then and thither such reverend bishops of your province as you may think fit. . . . For our part, we shall not suffer with indifference any such as yourself to be absent therefrom, and neither before God nor before us will anyone be held excused who does not strive his uttermost to be present at the time indicated and at the place appointed."¹

The Emperor also sent a further letter to St. Cyril of Alexandria, which letter expresses as clearly as daylight the conception of his right to convoke an Œcumenical Council.²

In regard to the Fourth Œcumenical Council, we possess the letter which the Emperor Marcian sent to Pope Leo, inviting him to that Council.

That letter expresses the greatest respect on the part of the Emperor towards the Roman Pontiff. None the less, in that letter the Emperor in no way derogates from his own rights as regards the steps which are to be taken for the convocation of the Council; "It remains that if it shall please your Beatitude to come to these parts and to hold the Synod,³ it will be worthy of your devotion to religion, and your Holiness will thus both satisfy our wishes and will decide upon what will be expedient for our Sacred Religion. But if your coming to

¹ Mansi, *Conciliorum ampl. collectio*, IV, col. 1,111-1,115.

² Mansi, IV, 1,110-1,111.

³ *Synodum celebrare* = τὴν σὺνδὸν ἐπιτελεῖν.

these parts be burdensome, let your Holiness notify us of the fact by your own letter, so that sacred letters of our own may be sent to the whole East, as also to Thrace itself and to Illyricum, to the end that all the most reverend bishops may come together at such specified place as may seem good to us¹ and by their own ordering may in the manner which your Holiness has defined according to the rules of the Church, make known that which will be serviceable for the Religion of Christians and the Catholic Faith."²

The letter which, on the same occasion, the Empress Pulcheria sent to the Pope makes even more explicit mention of the Emperor's right as touching the deciding the conditions for holding a Council.³

The declaration of the Emperor made at the sixth session of the Council affords us an excellent commentary on this letter.⁴

"Desiring to apply a remedy to this, we have brought you together in this Council, believing that the result of the labours which by your journey you have undertaken, will be great, to the end that true religion may be strengthened and that every error that has been brought in and every confusion may be removed from the minds of those who have been led astray. . . ."

The Emperor Justinian expresses the same opinion as to the Imperial right to summon a council in regard to the Fifth Œcumenical Council (the Second Council of Constantinople), which met in 553. It is well known that this Council was summoned to settle the dispute about "the Three Chapters." "Whereas," says the Emperor,⁵ "even after the condemnation you have decided, certain men persist in their own opinion, asserting the Three Chapters, we have on this account summoned you to the imperial city, bidding you to come together and once more to make manifest your will as to these men."

In regard to the summons which he sent to the Roman Pontiff, Justinian states: "We have charged him by means of our own judges and by certain of you to come together with them all, and in company with them to discuss the aforementioned Chapters in order that a fitting formula of the Right Faith may be issued."⁶

The Acta⁷ of all the sessions of the Sixth Council begin with these words: "The Holy Œcumenical Council assembled by imperial decree in this God-guarded, imperial city, being in session. . . ."

And further, Pope Leo II. makes it plain that this Council was convoked by the Emperor,⁸ by writing "with the Grace of God by

¹ Ubi nobis placuerit = ἐνθα ἂν ἡμεῖς δέξῃ.

² Mansi, VI, 99.

³ Mansi, VI, 102, "in order that all the bishops of the whole East . . . in accordance with the pleasure of the Emperor, my husband, may be able to arrive as quickly as possible in one city."

⁴ Mansi, VII, 131.

⁷ = minutes.

⁵ Mansi, IX, 181.

⁸ Mansi, XI, 728.

⁶ Mansi, IX, 182.

imperial command"; and elsewhere in the same letter to the Emperor, "by the approval of your Serenity."

The Empress Irene convoked the Seventh Council, as she states herself, in her letter to the Pope:¹ "We have decreed that an universal Council shall take place. And we ask your paternal Beatitude to acquiesce and to make no delay but to come hither to confirm and strengthen the ancient tradition as to the venerable images."

Also in her address to the bishops who attend the Council, the Empress says:² "Therefore, by His good pleasure and will, we have brought together you His sacred priests who minister His Testament concerning the Unbloody Sacrifice, in order that your decision may be in accordance with the definitions of the Councils which have given right dogmatical precisions and that the glorious Light of the Spirit may illuminate all."

The Eighth Council was convoked by the Emperor Basil the First, Pope Hadrian II. consenting.

The above are proofs of first importance for establishing that the first eight Œcumenical Councils were convoked by the Emperors who, in so acting, held themselves to be exercising their right.

But though this is true, we should be in error if we maintained that the co-operation of the Roman Pontiff in the convocation of the Œcumenical Councils was unnecessary.

We possess documents of the Vth, VIIth, VIIIth and IXth centuries which afford us very good evidence of what was the mind of Christians of those times upon this matter.

Evidence of the greatest weight is to be found in the Vth century, in reference to the Council of Chalcedon, 451 A.D.

In his 114th letter which deals with the convocation of that Council, Pope Leo I. wrote: "It has been agreed that a General Council should be assembled both by the order of the Christian Rulers (of the Empire) and by the consent of the Apostolic See."³

Somewhat later, the Bishops of Moesia, writing to the Emperor Leo I. in reference to the Council of Chalcedon, stated that that Council had been convoked "by the order of Leo, the Roman Pontiff who truly is the chief of bishops and of the venerable Priest and Patriarch Anatolios."⁴

There is VIIIth century evidence concerning the First Council of Nikæa. The Fathers assembled in the Sixth Council state in their preamble that Constantine and Sylvester convoked the Council of Nikæa.⁵ Also the *Liber Pontificalis*, which was probably drawn up in the VIIth century, says of the Council of Nikæa: "In his (Sylvester's) times a Council took place with his consent at Nikæa."⁶

¹ Mansi, XII, 985.

² Mansi, XII, 1,004 (Actio I).

³ P.L., Vol. 104, col. 1,029. Mansi, VI, 227.

⁴ Mansi, VII, 546.

⁵ Mansi, XI, 661.

⁶ Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, Paris, 1886-1892, I, p. 75.

rights, even though it could have no rights in regard to the affairs of the Christian Church. The very genius of the new religion forbade that the affairs of that religion should be submitted to the members of the Senate, the majority of whom were pagan.

That right only bishops could possess.

Those Emperors who brought themselves to accept a limitation of their rights alike in the civil and in the religious sphere were enabled to recognize without difficulty a certain limitation of that power in the affairs of the Church which they claimed for themselves.

In the mind of the Emperors the Œcumenical Councils were marked out to occupy the place of the Roman Senate in the affairs of the Church.

Thus, the institution of the Œcumenical Councils was a necessary result of the christianization of the Empire.

Assuredly the Senate continued to persist in the Christian Roman Empire. But its functions were limited solely to the affairs of the State. To pronounce decisions upon ecclesiastical matters was the function of that other Senate, the Œcumenical Councils—with this difference that the Senate was permanently in being but the Councils were intermittent.

Yet the Emperors who had the right to convoke the sessions of the Senate, reserved for themselves the right to convoke the Councils.

We may perceive in other matters a like analogy between the sessions of the Senate and the Councils. As the expense of the sessions of the Senate was defrayed from the public purse of the State, so the Councils were subsidized by the Emperors.

The Imperial Post provided the transport of the senators to the place of their assemblage. On the same principle, the bishops—the senators of the Church—were transported by the Imperial Post to the place designated for each Council. Even in its precedence and in the procedure of its sessions the Senate may be paralleled with the Councils.

This comparison is made easy for us on the one hand by the *acta* of the session of the Senate held on December 23rd, 438, at which session the Senate ratified the Theodosian Codex,¹ of which some fragments are preserved in the *Historia Augusta*,² and on the other, by the acts of the Sixth Œcumenical Synod and the scheme of the sessions of the Second Œcumenical Council.

As in the Councils, so in the Senate, seats of honour, in the centre and facing the door, were occupied by the members attending. The places to the right of the president were of greater honour than those to his left. Precedence was taken by the Leader of the Senate³ and

¹ Cf. J. B. Bury, *History of the Latin Roman Empire*, London, I, 1923, pp. 232 et seq. *Gesta in senatu Urbis Romæ de recipiendo Codice Theodosiano, Theodosius II.* [Nov. 1.]

² Ed. H. Peter, Leipzig, Teubner, 1884.

³ (Princeps Senatus.)

in the Councils by the legates of the Pope and by the Patriarchs. Then came the prætors—in councils, the metropolitans—then those of ædile rank—in the councils, bishops—then the knights—in the councils, the abbots, which last were required to stand and did not possess the right of voting.

The Gospel was set in the centre of the Council in the same place as in the Senate was set that "mystic ark"—the Altar of Victory. Every senator and every bishop held the right of speaking freely and of opposing freely.

The same analogy existed in the manner of voting.

As the senators in the Senate, so the bishops in the Councils were called by name by the president and, being so bidden, gave their votes.

As in the sessions of the Councils, so also in the sessions of the Senate the practice was to acclaim the Emperors; the so-called *ἐκδοσεις*

As an instance of that practice, let us here only quote the acclamations of the Fathers of the Councils of Chalcedon; at which the Symbol of Faith having been read through, all the bishops applauded, saying: "That is what we all believe. We have one faith, one mind. We are unanimous in this. That is what we have determined and have subscribed. The Faith of the Fathers is our own. This faith hath saved the world. All hail, Marcian, the new Constantine, the new David, the new Paul. May Marcian live the years of David. . . . Long live the Empress, long live Pulcheria, the new Helena. Your Faith is the doctrine of the Church." Which acclamations were repeated in every session of the Council.

IV

And further, a point is of the greatest importance, by this analogy of the Councils and the Senate, a solution, not only of the question of the right to preside at the Councils but of the question of the right to confirm their canons, may most readily be reached.

In general, when treating of the presidency of the Councils, theologians have assigned to the Emperors nothing more than a presidency of honour or a presidency of protection but have assigned to the papal delegates a factual presidency. By that distinction they have aimed at conserving the Catholic doctrine of Papal Supremacy.

The present is not the occasion for an exhaustive examination of the theologians' dissertations upon this matter. It will be enough to refer the reader to the works of Hefele-Leclercq, viz., *Histoires des Conciles*, Paris, 1907, I, pp. 41–58, or to F. Forget's contribution upon the Councils in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, Vol. III, col. 636–655.¹

¹ Compare also what is said in the *Dictionnaire apologétique*, Paris, 1925, I, col. 588–628.

Yet, in our judgment, there is no need here to adduce evidence of this kind: *for the Catholic doctrine of Papal Supremacy is not at stake in our present research.*

The contention advanced by some of the theologians that in effect the Papal legate did preside over the Councils cannot easily be reconciled with the *acta* of the Councils.

For example, at the Council of Chalcedon the Papal legates were obliged to obtain the permission of the Emperor's officials before they spoke in the Council.¹

In general it may be laid down that in the sessions of the Councils the discussions were controlled by the commissaries of the Emperors and not by the legates of the Supreme Pontiff. And in particular, during the Council of Chalcedon, those commissaries exercised their right against disorderly bishops.

Again, any difficulty as to how this could be, can be removed by comparison with the Roman Senate.

As, though the Emperor's commissaries presided at the sessions of the Senate, they had no right to a vote, so also in the Councils the Emperor's commissaries had no right to a vote. The senators had freedom of speech and of voting: and so had the bishops in the Councils.

In regard to the position of the Papal legates in the Councils, it is to be noted that they always had that chief seat in the Councils which in the senate corresponded to the seat of the Leader of the Senate.²

In consequence of that fact, the Roman legates derived very great authority from the Fathers who were present at the Councils. And it may be asserted that in the sense that they voted first in the giving of suffrages, they exercised a presidency in the Councils. Moreover, the words used by Pope Vigilius in bidding his legates on more than one occasion to take presidency in the councils are explicable in no other sense—even though, in fact, his legates did not preside at the sessions of the Councils to which he commissioned them.

In regard to the confirmation of the Canons of the Œcumenical Councils by the Emperors, the same conclusion must be stated.

In order to become laws of the Empire, even the decrees of the Roman Senate had to be confirmed by the Emperors. And in this matter, it must be noted that according to the most recent conclusions of the theologians, the subsequent confirmation of the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils by the Roman Pontiffs was not indispensable in order that those decisions should become Laws of the Church. It is agreed that the decisions of the first Œcumenical Councils never failed to receive this, either concomitant or preceding, confirmation on the part of the Roman See.

¹ In particular at the beginning of its 16th session, Mansi, VII, 426.

² (Princeps Senatus.)

As to the part played by the Emperors in the Œcumenical Councils, we may perceive a certain evolutionary process which implies a limitation of the Emperors' authority in the Councils.

After it had secured the defeat of the Iconoclastic Heresy, the Eastern Church yielded less and less authority to the Emperors, inasmuch as they had at one time greatly favoured that heresy.

Assuredly, from that period forward the part played by the laity became less than it had been in the first ages of the Church; which conclusion is illustrated very amply by the *acta* of the Councils held in the VIIIth and IXth centuries. Thus the procedure of the Seventh Council, the Second of Nikæa, was directed by the Patriarch of Constantinople Tarasios and not by officials representing the Emperor. Also the procedure of the Photian Council, held 879-880, which at that period was reckoned as Œcumenical and indeed was convoked expressly as Œcumenical, was directed by the Patriarch Photios and not by the Emperors. Which fact we consider to be of great importance, inasmuch as it denotes a certain limitation of the power of the Emperors in regard to the Councils and inasmuch as it presages a further development whereby the convocation and the presiding over the Councils would be by the Roman Pontiffs to whom by divine ordinance that right exclusively pertains.

The above treatment of the whole question of secular authority in regard to the Councils is somewhat though not altogether new, and differs very widely from the treatment of that question by many theologians.

Whereas some have enterprised a comparison of the organization of the Œcumenical Councils with the constitution of the Roman Senate, they have not investigated the whole question which, as we have seen, is of the greatest importance.¹

That this should have been so is not surprising, inasmuch as historians, and even those most expert in the history of the Christian Roman Empire and of the Byzantine Empire, have usually taken it for granted that after Constantine the Great the Senate, which had formerly been of the greatest importance in the Roman Empire, was of no importance and inasmuch as in exaggerating the absolutism of the Emperors they have asserted that after Constantine the Great, the Emperors claimed for themselves exclusively the highest authority in the affairs of the Church. Even that most expert Byzantine historian, J. B. Bury,² took it for granted that the Senate exercised no authority in the Christian Roman Empire and in the Byzantine Empire.

¹ Henricus Gelzer was the first to investigate this question thoroughly. In his work, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Leipzig, 1907, are two dissertations which for our purpose are of the greatest importance: "The Relationship of State and Church in Byzantium," pp. 56-141, and "The Councils as Parliaments of the Empire," pp. 142-155.

² *The Constitution of the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge, 1910.

For many this assumption has had the force of an axiom.

Such being the case, it is not surprising that it should have entered no one's mind to make a comparison of the organization of the Councils with the constitution of the Senate.

None the less, the assumption that after Constantine the Great the Senate had no importance in the Roman Empire is altogether false. Charles Diehl, the doyen of Byzantinists, has recently established the fact that the Senate was of very great importance in the Byzantine Empire of the VIIth and VIIIth centuries,¹ and that even the Byzantine Emperors were constrained to pay respect to its opinion in some matters of polity.

In earlier times the Senate held a great place in the Empire and thereby the analogy of the ecclesiastical senate—the Œcumenical Council—with the senate of the state is amply illustrated.

That analogy, as is plain from what has been written above, is of the greatest importance in reference to the authority of the State in the matter of the convoking and the directing the procedure of the Œcumenical Councils and of the confirming of their *acta*.

We may well marvel how, even in the times which most threatened the authority of the Roman Pontiff in the Church, the Divine Providence safeguarded his rights in matters of the Faith: for being, as it were, their "Leader of the Senate," the Roman Pontiff, and his legates, in fact had lordship² in the Councils: and the Councils were, in fact, recognized by the Emperors as the organ which possessed supremacy in matters of faith and morals.

WITH THE RUSSIAN PRIESTS OF TO-MORROW

By H. BYERLEY JOHNSON.

(Student of the Theological Faculty, King's College, London.)

[Editor's Note.—Mr. Johnson is a theological student at King's College, London. We print this account of his visit to the Russian Academy of Paris in the conviction that a young man's viewpoint will interest our readers.]

DURING this Easter vacation I have had the opportunity of visiting the Russian Theological Academy in Paris. It had been decided that I should stay there for the Orthodox Easter. I was told that I was the first English guest they had ever had.

¹ *Le Sénat et le peuple byzantin au VII et VIII siècles*, in *Byzantion*, 1924, pp. 201-213.

² (*dominantur*.)

WITH THE RUSSIAN PRIESTS OF TO-MORROW 109

I arrived at the Academy one morning, having travelled from London by aeroplane. I at once had the good fortune to run into a student who could speak English quite well. He took charge of me, showed me over the Academy, and did all in his power to make me feel welcome.

The Academy is not very large. It consists of a Porter's Lodge, two small houses for the professors, a small building in which the meals are served, and a larger building containing two dormitories and two lecture rooms. Above the dormitories and lecture rooms is the church. This is very beautiful and has been painted by a famous Russian artist. One of the churchwardens told me that the way the church had been built up can be described only as miraculous. The number of students at the Academy at the present moment is about thirty. They are of all ages. Two of them at least have escaped from Communist Russia.

During my stay there I lived exactly like one of the students. This had been decided upon beforehand, as I wanted to make friends and gain first-hand knowledge of this unique place. We were able to converse with one another quite well by speaking either Russian, French or English. As it was Holy Week the ordinary way of life was altered. The rising-bell was rung at eight o'clock. At nine o'clock there was bread and tea—tea without milk or lemon. At ten o'clock there was a service lasting till about one o'clock. Then we had a meal consisting of soup, another course of, say, fish and potatoes, and then tea. The afternoon was free. At six o'clock there was another service of about three hours. Then a meal similar to the preceding one. After this we generally talked or went to bed. Often I heard practising the choir which was shortly to visit the churches and cathedrals in England.

I thoroughly enjoyed the Russian services with their beautiful singing and ceremonial. I had a privileged place by the choir, and was told that I could sit down any time I liked. There are only one or two chairs in a Russian church. Russians are used to standing sometimes six hours at a time. Anyone who is not used to these long services should sit if possible, as they cannot be fully appreciated if one is thinking of one's bodily discomforts. Everyone was most kind to me, and did all they could to help me understand the services, which are in Slavonic. In the evenings the services were by candle-light, which to me was very effective.

On Great (Maundy) Thursday I went to the Russian Cathedral with the Archimandrite, Father Bulgakov and Father Kassian. We hurried in a taxi from a service in the Academy church to the Cathedral, and were just in time for the service. This was the Service of the Washing of Feet. The Metropolitan washed the feet of twelve priests in memory of the washing of the feet of the twelve Apostles by Christ.

On Great (Good) Friday is commemorated the redeeming sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who for our sakes endured being beaten, jeered at, and death upon the Cross. Every morning during Holy Week part of the Gospels which narrate this were read by the clergy taking it in turn. It was so arranged that by Great Friday every Gospel had been read. The clergy came forth from the Sanctuary with the book of the Gospels to the centre of the church. The book was placed on the lectern. The clergy lighted candles (as did also the people) and censed the church and those present.

At two o'clock on Great Friday the winding-sheet (*plashtschanitza*) was brought into the centre of the church. Before the service the sheet had been placed on the altar. In the centre of the church was a tomb representing the Tomb of Christ. While hymns were being sung the clergy lifted the winding-sheet from the altar, and with assistants going in front with lighted candles made the circuit of the altar, bearing the sheet on their heads. Then they proceeded to the middle of the church and laid it on the tomb. After that the winding-sheet, the church and the people were censed. This represented the Burial of our Lord. Then the priest, followed by the faithful, approached the tomb, knelt down and kissed it.

At eight o'clock on Great Saturday evening there was the reading of the Acts of the Apostles. These were read until the beginning of the Easter Midnight Service, which ended with the stroke of midnight. Midnight was, of course, the climax. Everywhere there was an appearance of joy. In the courtyard were many coloured lights. The clergy wore their brightest vestments, and everybody held a lighted candle. As the joyous Easter Sunday came in the church bells rang merrily. The priest announced "Christ is Risen!" The people replied, "He is Risen indeed!" and all exchanged the Easter Kiss. After this service there was the Liturgy. During the whole of Easter Week, whenever one meets anybody for the first time one always greets him with the words "Christ is Risen" (*Kristos Voskresey*), and he replies, "He is Risen indeed," and then both kiss.

When the service had ended, which was about half-past two in the morning, we had a feast. This was where we broke the strict fast which had been kept all the week. It consisted of special Easter food. In his speech Father Bulgakov welcomed me to the Academy as "our friend from London."

During my stay in Paris I had the honour of being introduced to the Most Reverend Archbishop Evlogie, Metropolitan and Exarch of the Russian Church in W. Europe. I also had the pleasure of having tea with Professor Zander and Doctor Zernov, who both have official positions in the Russian Student Christian Movement.

My main object in going to the Academy was not to see the Easter services. These can be appreciated in any Russian church. I went

in order to see the Academy itself, the people there, and to form a general opinion about things. I can say without hesitation that everything I saw impressed me greatly, and filled me with admiration for the wonderful way in which they are carrying on in the face of so many hardships. Their chief trouble is, of course, lack of money. There are no servants, for they cannot afford them. The students do everything themselves: cooking, cleaning and scrubbing. Besides this they have their studies, which are no light matter, and above all their devotions.

What I noticed above all was the spirit there. It is the right sort of spirit. They are truly living up to the high positions to which they have been called. In spite of the frugal way in which they have to live, there is there an atmosphere of cheerful co-operation and optimism for the future. In spite of all the harm and suffering which the Communist Revolution caused to the Russian Church it did one good thing: it has brought out the best in those who are faithful to the Church. In that handful of her followers at the Academy it was easily to be seen. Their present hardships are bringing out in them that which will best be able to meet a hardship which is going to surpass all other—and which is bound to come. It is when they are called upon to preach once again the gospel in the land of their fathers. They are the future priests of Russia. By what I saw of them, I am sure they will carry out their tasks nobly. The lamp of faith which is kept burning at the Academy will once again shine from shore to shore of a Russia of the future.

I should like to thank here Sir Bernard Pares and my mother and father who made my visit possible, and also Father Bulgakov and all other members of the Academy for their kindness during my stay there. I consider my visit was a thorough success from every point of view; but if it has done nothing else it has enabled me to make friendships which I hope will be life-long.



THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

BY THE REV. A. F. MATTHEW, CHAPLAIN AT ADDIS ABABA.

ACCORDING to tradition, the founder of the Church in Abyssinia was St. Frumentios, known to the Abyssinians as Abba Salama. While travelling down the Red Sea his ship was wrecked and all the inmates massacred except himself and a companion, who were sent as slaves to the King at Axum, the capital at that time of the country. Rising to a position of trust and eventually becoming tutor to the King's son, he used his opportunities to spread the knowledge of Christianity and, on the accession of his former pupil, he was allowed to go to Alexandria to ask the Patriarch to send a bishop to look after the flock. He himself was consecrated for the work and returned to carry it on as the first Bishop of Abyssinia. The date of the foundation of the Abyssinian Church is said to be 330 A.D.

The connection with the Church of Egypt thus begun has never been severed. The Church of Abyssinia became Monophysite after the example of the Mother Church, and throughout the centuries the head of the Church has been a bishop sent from Egypt—a Coptic monk, not an Abyssinian sent to receive consecration. Though there have been long periods when the see has been vacant owing to the difficulties caused by the Moslem rule in Egypt, the practice has gone on to the present day; usually there has been only one bishop and he a Copt, sent from the Patriarch of Alexandria to rule the daughter Church.

Second in importance to the Bishop is the Ichégé, who is Prior of the important monastery of Debra Libanos and, theoretically, head of all the monastic establishments in the country. He is an Abyssinian and, in the interregnum between the death of a bishop and the appointment of his successor, administers the affairs of the Church.

The priests, according to the general custom of the Eastern Churches, must be married before Ordination, and in the event of the death of the wife may not marry again; they may continue their work if they remain unmarried.

Deacons are unmarried and, in order to ensure against their taking part in the service of the sanctuary while indulging in any irregularity of life before marriage, the custom has arisen of using only boys in this office. They may be made deacons at the age of seven, and cease to officiate after attaining manhood. There is then an interval before marriage and Ordination to the priesthood, which, however, does not invariably follow.

The preparation for the diaconate and priesthood is very slight,

consisting of little more than the knowledge in each case of the actual duties to be performed and the words of the service to be said by each. It is necessary to know how to read, but it is not necessary to acquire a knowledge of the language, Geez (usually known in Europe as Ethiopic), in which the services are conducted. In theory, a deacon must have knowledge of his duties before being ordained; but as in former days, with only one bishop in the whole country, opportunities for Ordination had to be taken as they occurred, it was possible for a boy of seven to be ordained and to learn his duties afterwards. As no real knowledge of the ancient language, in which all the books were written, was expected, naturally no great knowledge of the Scriptures, or of doctrine, was required, and there are many priests being ordained to-day who are lamentably ignorant.

Reckoned as part of the ministry of the Church, though without Ordination, is a body of men whose functions correspond somewhat to those of choirmen in the Church of England. They are known as "deberas," and it is their duty to chant the daily offices when these are performed and also to attend requiems and do duty at other services. There is hardly a service at which they are not in attendance, though they do not officiate alone; a priest must always be present to initiate the service. Their chanting is often accompanied by a drum, and they accompany themselves with sistra which they hold in the left hand; they also perform the so-called "dances of the priests," which are held at Easter, Epiphany, the Feast of the Holy Cross and other occasions. Owing to the variety of the services in which they take part and the necessity of knowing exactly the words and the chant (a kind of plainsong) to be employed at each, the training of a "debera" takes as much as seven years, far longer than is needed for the preparation for the priesthood. It is among these men and not in the priesthood that the majority of the theologians and learned men of the Church are to be found—men who have spent years at a school where they have learned from the lips of a teacher the exegesis of the Psalms or Gospels or some theological work, which has been passed down orally for generations. A knowledge of Ethiopic is not essential for a "debera," but it is among them that the knowledge of the language is mainly to be found.

As there has seldom been more than one bishop, there was no division of the country into dioceses, but there is a division into parishes, and the priests of each church are responsible for the population of the district in which their church is situated. They have to see that all babies are baptized, and that at the proper date—40 days after birth for males and 80 days after for females—and they teach prayers in Ethiopic to the children. Each Abyssinian Christian has a "soul-father," though not necessarily, if he has changed his residence, from among the priests of his parish, who is

responsible for his spiritual welfare and is expected to see that he makes his confession and attends the Church services.

As in the case of the Church of England, there is no endowment belonging to the Church in its corporate capacity; all endowments belong to the parish churches. A head, usually a layman, is appointed by the Government for every church, whose duty is to look after the property of the church and to see that the staff is kept up to its full numbers. From the endowments and offerings made to the church, a pittance is allotted to the staff of priests and deacons and to some of the "deberas," others of whom will serve voluntarily in the hope of being enrolled eventually on the staff. Apart from this pittance, everyone who officiates at a private service, such as a baptism or a requiem, receives gifts either in money or kind, and a certain number of the staff are given, to support themselves, a piece of land which they may either let or till themselves. The foundation of a new church, in the absence of any corporate Church income, depends on the generosity of the local landowner or the King to endow it with sufficient land or charges on land in the neighbourhood to support the staff.

The principal service of the Church is the Holy Eucharist. This in an important town church may be celebrated daily; in a country church, in addition to Sundays, it may be celebrated on only three other occasions in the month, the 12th, 21st and 29th being the days set apart each month in memory of St. Michael, the Blessed Virgin and the Nativity of our Lord. Where the size of the staff allows of it, three priests and four deacons take part in every celebration, though in country churches there may be only two priests and three deacons. The consecration takes place behind the closed doors of the sanctuary; the clergy come out to communicate the faithful who receive in both kinds. Leavened bread is used, and in the place of wine a liquor made by steeping raisins in water.

The Holy Eucharist is the only service which the laity is expected to attend, and there is usually a good congregation on Sundays. Of the Feasts of the Church, the laity only attends in any number at Easter, Epiphany and the Feast of the Holy Cross.

The fasts are numerous, but only that of Lent is of strict obligation on the laity. During that fast, which lasts eight weeks, eggs, milk and cheese are forbidden as well as meat, and from Monday to Friday no food or drink is taken until mid-day; on Saturday and Sunday the same kind of food only is allowed, but it may be taken at any time. The observance of other fasts, such as that before Christmas and before the Feast of the Assumption, is a matter of choice for those who wish to acquire merit.

On the doctrinal question which separates the Abyssinian Church from the greater part of Christendom, the natures of Christ, there is no doubt or ignorance as to the belief that they hold; every priest

will say that there is only one nature, though there are probably but few that could explain their belief satisfactorily. There does not seem to be any other point of material difference in theology. In practice, one would say that veneration of the Saints, the Blessed Virgin in particular, is carried to extremes, but it is understood by the educated that worship is due to God alone.

There are many monasteries and some nunneries in the country. Some men will feel the call to the monastic life early and take the vows in early manhood; but a larger proportion only retire later on in life, and many are priests who have become widowers. They take a threefold vow of obedience, poverty and chastity, but in their life they seem to lack the common rule and corporate life associated with conventual life in the West; their monasteries may be better described as collections of hermits living on one spot for the convenience of receiving their food from the monastic establishment, while continuing their self-contained life of prayer in the separate huts in which they dwell.

Although the custom of appointing a Coptic monk to be Bishop has continued through many centuries now, there are not wanting signs that the Abyssinian Church would like to free itself from this tie to Egypt. When the late Bishop, Matthew, died in 1927, the Abyssinian Government tried hard to secure from the Patriarch permission for the new Bishop to consecrate other bishops. This he refused to give, but as a compromise consecrated four Abyssinians at the same time as he consecrated the present Archbishop, Cyril, and when he came to Addis Ababa in January, 1930, he consecrated yet a fifth Abyssinian to the episcopal office. But the Patriarchal decree which provided for the appointment of the Archbishop and Bishops denied to them the authority to consecrate other bishops, reserving that as a right of the Patriarchate alone.

Still, something has been gained in the appointment of other bishops to the Abyssinian Church, and if they will rise to a proper conception of their office, the Church should be better administered than before. One effect that it should eventually bring about is to ensure a more careful selection of candidates for Ordination; but before this can result, some reform is essential in the method of their preparation. This the Archbishop has in mind and he is desirous of opening a theological college for their preparation. The instruction would have to be of a very elementary kind to begin with, but the idea is to enlarge the curriculum as time goes on. There are, however, no funds belonging to the Church which he can use for this purpose, and the scheme was (April, 1933) awaiting a gift from the Emperor before it could be put into operation. Until such a place of preparation is ready and working, it is impossible to insist on a proper standard of knowledge before Ordination without cutting off almost entirely the supply of ordained men, though the

Archbishop is exercising more care and discrimination than has been the wont of his predecessors.

In another direction he is attempting to enforce a point of Church order, in the matter of the canonical age for the making of deacons. He wishes to regard the youths now being presented not as deacons but as readers, until they reach the age when they can be properly ordained to the diaconate.

One of the great scandals of the Abyssinian Church is the disregard of the Church's requirements in marriage. It is the ordinary custom for Abyssinian Christians to contract a civil marriage which can be easily dissolved; very few, except the priests, are married in church, though many of the older people, having settled down in married life, validate their marriage in the eyes of the Church by a promise of lifelong fidelity and then receiving the Sacrament of Holy Communion. Only those whose marriage is validated in this way or by a Church marriage are allowed to receive Holy Communion; those civilly married are forbidden to do so; the result is that the majority of Christians are excommunicate, and it is taken as a matter of course that only a few should ever partake of the Sacrament. The Archbishop is using his influence to get people to be married with the Church's blessing, and in the last eighteen months four people of importance have been so married, who a few years previously would never have thought of so doing.

A change is also to be expected in the conduct of the services. It will be very difficult, as all the services are sung, to change from Ethiopic to Amharic, the spoken language; it is not a change that can be made without a great deal of preparation. But the Emperor has recently issued a letter to all the heads of churches earnestly requesting them to take the step of reading all passages of Scripture in Amharic instead of Ethiopic. The change was only expected to be made with the new year (September 11th, 1933); it is a change much to be desired and it is to be hoped that it will be rapidly carried out.

The Church of Abyssinia is in many ways comparable with the Church of England in pre-Reformation days. There are influences now at work in the country which are also comparable with those which had such effect in England. It is not too much to hope that the same result may follow and the Church of Abyssinia be revived to take its proper place in the work of furthering God's Kingdom.

The Christian East

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE

OUR OWN FUTURE.

"*THE Christian East*," we have been told, "is good reading and worth reading. But it appears spasmodically, and some quarters does not appear at all. Under such conditions, are you not surprised that we continue to support it?"

The criticism is valid. If it were not that in spite of only getting seven issues—this is the last for 1934!—in the past two years, the subscribers to *The Christian East* still number over six hundred, it would cease publication. But, in spite of its irregularity, the demand for it clearly persists, and the need for it as an organ is greater than ever.

Things are happening of great interest and of the greatest moment which need chronicling and concerning which it is of first importance that information should be spread. The material is available. The trouble has been the lack of time for thinking out and for getting together that which ought to be published.

Accordingly, at the Editors' request, the Committee of the A. and E.C.A. has decided to make one more effort before concluding that the carrying on *The Christian East* worthily is beyond its powers.

That which, it is hoped, may be described as a new series of *The Christian East*, is planned to begin with an issue in April next. The new *Christian East* will be under the direction of an Editorial Committee on which well-known Orthodox as well as Anglican members have consented to serve. Among them will be the Great Archimandrite, Michael Constantinides, and the Revd. R. M. French, to whom our readers owe a great debt and who, in spite of the heavy burdens upon him, will take his share. Canon J. A. Douglas, who had chief responsibility for *The Christian East* from 1920-27, and has been associated in its editorship from the former date, will be Chairman of the Committee.

If this, the last issue of the old *Christian East*, is something of a hotch-potch of articles, etc., which were in hand, we are confident that the members of A. and E.C.A. will give the new series a full trial and a generous support.

AN ENGLISH DEPUTATION TO THE CHURCH OF RUMANIA.

We learn on reliable information that his Beatitude the Patriarch of Rumania, with the consent of his Synod, has set up a strong Commission of Theologians, both clerical and lay, the reference of which is in general to investigate the relations of the Anglican and the Orthodox Communions and in particular to examine the recommendations of the Orthodox Delegation which attended the Lambeth Conference of 1930. We are informed further that his Beatitude has not only expressed his desire to welcome in Bucarest in the early summer of 1935 an official English Deputation which would be competent to supply that Commission with answers to any question which it may think fit to put forward, but that he will probably pay a visit to the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth during the first week of July. We understand, further, that his Beatitude's invitation will be accepted and that the Bishop of Lincoln will be the leader of the English Deputation to Bucarest. The date suggested is the end of May.

Except only the Patriarchate of Alexandria, no one of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches has expressed hitherto a judgment upon the recommendations made unanimously to their home authorities by the official Orthodox Delegation to the Lambeth Conference of 1930. The five years' delay is unfortunate; for it gives the impression of the Anglican Communion being kept "standing on the doormat" by the Orthodox Communion. But in fact, the reason for the delay has been that in 1930, the Œcumenical Patriarch had actually convened a Pro-Synod, *i.e.*, a conference in which all the autocephalous Orthodox Churches were to have been represented. That Pro-Synod would have served as a natural organ by which the Orthodox Communion could have formulated Œcumenical decisions. But owing to its persecution preventing the Russian Church—and no Orthodox likes the idea of Œcumenic action in which the Russian Church does not take part—and of the attitude of the Turkish Government to the Œcumenical Patriarchate, the project of a Pro-Synod was adjourned indefinitely. If, as we may reasonably anticipate, the Rumanian Commission discusses the Lambeth 1930 recommendations with the English Deputation which is to confer with it, we hope that assessors at least from the Church of Greece and the Serb Patriarchate will be present. The value of an agreement reached by the Rumanian Commission would thus be vastly enhanced. The adhesion of those two Churches by reinforcing the decisions of Constantinople and the other ancient Patriarchates, would establish an Œcumenical consent of the Orthodox Communion. If Russian assessors can be present also, the gain will be very great.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

In our next issue we look forward to printing a sketch of the present position of the Russian Church in Exile. Meanwhile, we may say that the visit of the Metropolitan Evlogie to Belgrad last spring was very far from being the relative failure which a writer in the *Church Times* and *Œcumenica* has described it as having been. On the contrary, its result was the removal of the canonical bars to the conjoint worship and communion of the parishes which respectively recognize the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Antony as president of the Karlovcezi Synod and of the Metropolitan Evlogie as Exarch over the Russians in Western Europe. It remains to be seen whether the parishes of the two jurisdictions will be merged for the purpose of organization. But all lovers of the Russian Church will rejoice that—a symbol of the end of the schism—Archbishop Seraphim, the chief bishop of the Karlovcezi-Synod for Western Europe, stood last October by the Metropolitan Evlogie during the celebration of the Liturgy in the Russian Cathedral in Paris.

INTERCESSION FOR RUSSIA.

All English congregations are invited by the Russian Church Aid Fund to make intercession for the Russian Church during the week Saturday, May 11th, to Sunday, May 19th. It is urged that where possible a special service should be held, and, maybe, a sermon given. A service paper of intercession is being issued by the R.C.A.F., and may be obtained from its hon. secretary, Major Tudor-Pole, 20, St. James' Square, S.W.1, who will gladly receive any alms which may be collected at such services and allocated to the help of the Russian Church.

In London the central service during the Octave of Intercession is being arranged to take place in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, at 6 p.m. on Thursday, May 16th. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who is Patron of R.C.A.F., has intimated the intention of being himself the preacher. The Metropolitan Evlogie and Archbishop Seraphim are both expected to be present and to assist in the service, which should prove as memorable as noteworthy.

VISIT OF THE PARIS RUSSIAN CHOIR TO ENGLAND.

Mr. Dennisov's Russian Choir, which last year had so fine a welcome in England, is to repeat its visit this spring. Arriving early in May it is to make a two months' tour of the English and Scotch Cathedral cities and other great centres. Its visit to St. Paul's Cathedral on Thursday, June 6th, will be contemplated eagerly

by all lovers of Russia and of music. Perhaps there is no other shrine in the world so perfectly suited for the rendering of the mystic traditional Slav sacred music of which Mr. Dennisov's programme consists.

A purpose of the visit of this Choir to England is to raise money for the Russian Academy in Paris, that principal centre of training for the Russian priesthood which in providence seems destined to do great service to the Russian Church in those days of restoration for which Russia is waiting.

THE JERUSALEM PATRIARCHATE AND THE CHURCH OF CYPRUS.

Our most hearty sympathy is with the Metropolitan Keladion of Ptolemais, who, after bearing bravely its heavy burden since the death of the Patriarch in September, 1931, has resigned the office of Topoteretes of the Jerusalem Patriarchate. When last the writer saw him eighteen months ago, the Metropolitan Kaladion was suffering from chronic chest trouble, but weariness at the manœuvres and delays which have protracted the widowhood of the Patriarchate, undoubtedly was upon him. The Metropolitan Meliton of Madeba has succeeded him.

The position in Cyprus remains the same. The Government refuses to permit the exiled Bishops of Kyrenaia and of Kition to visit the island for the election of a new Archbishop and the two bishops refuse to nominate deputies for that election. Without their taking part in it, personally or by deputies no election can be canonical.

That the two principal sees of the Orthodox Church which are in territories under British rule, should be kept vacant for a long period at the very time when they need strong leaders, is a sad business.

THE ASSYRIANS.

All that can be said of the Assyrian Question is that it is no nearer a happy solution than it was eighteen months ago. Few of their friends but would have been sorry, if British Guiana had been pronounced a suitable place for the Assyrians' new home. On the other hand, anywhere would be better for them than nowhere. In Iraq they are not only suffering from hunger and other privations, but are threatened and hated by the Moslem Arabs who surround them. They are losing heart and becoming hopeless. *What is to become of them?*

Far and away the most valuable book which has yet appeared on the Assyrian Question is that of Lieut.-Colonel R. S. Stafford, *The Assyrian Tragedy* (Allen and Unwin, London), which has just

come out. Colonel Stafford, who was lent to the Iraqi Government as its Administrative Inspector of Minorities, writes with first-hand knowledge of what took place in Iraq in 1933. The matter-of-fact story which he has to tell, leaves the reader in no doubt as to the deliberate intention of Iraqi ministers of state and generals to massacre the Assyrians out of hand. While he tells his tale frankly, and hides nothing, he does not comment on Sir Francis Humphrys' policy in regard to the Assyrians; but the story, as he tells it, leaves no doubt as to Great Britain having assumed moral responsibility for the Iraqis' behaviour. It is a ghastly and shameful business. All friends of Eastern Christianity should read Colonel Stafford's book.

THE ASSYRIAN PATRIARCH.

Of necessity the machinery of the Assyrian Church is almost out of action. Mar Shimun, its Patriarch, who has been in exile since August, 1933, is not permitted by the Iraqi Government to have any communication with his people. Even though in his exile he has resided mostly with friends in London, the position of his Beatitude must command sympathy in his isolation. Indeed, if he had not felt able to use an Anglican Altar and, with the ready concurrence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to bid the clergy of St. Michael's, College Hill, E.C., to communicate with him—a rare privilege for them—he would have been deprived of the Holy Communion itself. The fact that his Beatitude has done so, will be a satisfaction to the readers of *The Christian East*.

THE METROPOLITAN GERMANOS OF THYATIRA.

Archbishop Germanos is to be congratulated on having been translated by the whole of the British daily Press into the select company of distinguished men who have been distinguished by widespread obituary notices in their lifetime. The origin of the jadelike rumour was the passing of the Metropolitan Germanos of Arnasia, the Œcumenical Patriarchate's Exarch of Eastern Europe—R.I.P.—whose residence was at Vienna and who had been ailing for many months. Since the Archbishop of Thyatira came to London in 1922 as the apokrisarios of the Œcumenical Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury, he has become both a dynamic in English religious life and a popular figure with the British public in general. The detailed Press descriptions and illustration of the Orthodox ceremony in the wedding of the Duke of Kent with Princess Marina had impressed his name and his face, which even before last November were familiar enough, on the mind of the man in the street. The

services which he is rendering to the cause of Reunion and to world movements such as Faith and Order or Life and Work, make him a leader in the religious world. In fact he is *par excellence* the ambassador, and as such far better known than most ambassadors, of Eastern Christendom to English Christianity, and he is as well loved for himself as he is valued for his influence and office. That *The Times* gave its correspondent's telegram a most prominent place in its foreign news on February 10th is not surprising. We could almost wish that he had not read it in his own house in Bayswater, and that it had remained uncontradicted so that we might have collected some of the biographies and appreciations, which every English paper would have published. But in all seriousness even those of us who knew at sight that the report could not be true were relieved profoundly to find it false. Among those who enquired was His Majesty the King, who we rejoice to know has conferred the K.C.V.O. upon him. In the East they say that those who learn of their own death live to a hundred. May Archbishop Germanos long be a power among us. *Eis polla etc.*

AN APOLOGY.

The Editors desire to express sincere regret both for the personal reference to the Revd. Dr. Herbert Scott and for the depreciation of his book, *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy*, in the prefatory note to the translation of the lecture by Dr. Francis Dvornik in the last number of *The Christian East*.

Dr. Scott writes that, in fact, he sees nothing in Dr. Dvornik's valuable lecture which contradicts what he wrote in that book. "Indeed," he says, "I took care to point out that the Councils were called together by the Emperor and for that quoted the words of Guizot on the Seven Councils were 'all held in the East under the Emperors of the East.' My express object was thus to emphasize the significance of what I deduced from the *Acta* and the documents of the See of Rome."

While the Editors do not agree that certain of Dr. Scott's deductions are defensible, they feel it due to themselves and to their readers, even more than to Dr. Scott, to apologize to him for the lapse of *The Christian East* into a type of controversy which is unworthy. In making their apology for it, they desire also to express regret for having suggested that Dr. Scott is responsible for *The Pilot*, of which publication they are glad to learn from Dr. Scott that he ceased to be editor after its first issue.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

(We reprint from "*The Times*" of July 21 this report of the address delivered by his Grace to the Canterbury Diocesan Conference. The importance of recording its firm refusal to compromise on the nature of the Episcopate will be apparent.—THE EDITORS.)

IN his address yesterday to the Canterbury Diocesan Conference the Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking as "one who is deeply pledged to the cause of Christian unity," expressed thankfulness for many of the current efforts towards "the restoration of the visible unity of the Church of Christ," but uttered a serious warning about "certain tendencies which have recently disclosed themselves."

Dr. Lang said that the tendencies which he had in mind were those which seemed to whittle away existing differences in an endeavour to reach some lowest common measure of agreement, and to empty the Church of England of its distinctive character and witness. The aim of the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 was not the easy and superficial one of reducing to some lowest common measure of agreement those treasures of faith and order to which it referred. It sought to appreciate the value of those respective treasures and to conserve them for the good of the whole United Church.

They must insist that the Church of England, and indeed the Anglican Church throughout the world, had a distinctive heritage of faith and order which it could not barter away even for the sake of union, for it was a trust which it was bound to hold for itself and for the whole Body of Christ. The committee of 74 Bishops who presented the report on the unity of the Churches to the Lambeth Conference of 1930, which report, he was satisfied, expressed the general opinion of the 300 Bishops of the Anglican Communion who received it, said:—

Our special character and, as we believe, our peculiar contribution to the Universal Church, arises from the fact that, owing to historic circumstances, we have been enabled to combine in our one fellowship the traditional faith and order of the Catholic Church with that immediacy of approach to God through Christ to which the Evangelical Churches especially bear witness, and freedom of intellectual inquiry, whereby the correlation of the Christian revelation and advancing knowledge is constantly effected.

It was a daring ideal, not easy to attain or to manifest, for the attempt to keep in the unity of one fellowship elements which elsewhere were in sharp contrast or even conflict often gave rise to an appearance of indecisiveness and of internal difference. Yet it was a noble ideal; and it was the upholding of that ideal, with all its difficulties, which gave the Anglican Church its special place in Christendom.

LIVERPOOL CONTROVERSY.

It was to all the parts of their heritage that they must strive to be faithful. But that part which they had called the traditional Faith and Order of the Catholic Church stood as the abiding basis of the other. The Faith was that which was set forth in the Nicene Creed. Its centre was the Deity of Christ. The Church of England dare not for the sake of promoting unity with good men who revered Christ as a man, but could not worship Him as God, even seem to compromise its loyalty to a truth so essential to the whole Gospel committed to its charge. Yet he could not doubt that if recent happenings in Liverpool Cathedral had passed without some authoritative protest it might have seemed—to quote the words of the Bishop of Durham—"that the vital truth of Christ's Deity was so lightly esteemed by the Church of England that even its explicit denial was not regarded as a disqualification for admission to her pulpits." He (the Archbishop) therefore welcomed the resolution of the Bishops of the Province of York that invitations to preachers should not be extended to any person who does not hold, or who belongs to a denomination which does not hold, the common Christian Faith in Jesus Christ as "Very God of Very God, Who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven, and was made man." That matter illustrated the danger of trying to further the cause of unity by blurring vital distinctions.

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

There were signs of a similar danger in regard to Order. The issues had come to centre round what was called the Historic Episcopate. Theories about the origins of Episcopacy varied, but there was no question that by the end of the second century of the Christian era it had secured a place in the life of the Church which, even in the midst of the controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries, remained unquestioned. Its position historically was analogous to the Canon of Scripture and the Creeds. All alike emerged through a process of gradual growth into a place of accepted authority.

He deprecated in that respect the use of the old and, as he thought, irrelevant distinction between the *esse* and the *bene esse* of the Church. In a spiritual society, as in a man's own spiritual life, what was good was what was right, and what was best might be regarded as what God desired. Thus in stipulating that the episcopate and an episcopal ministry must be maintained in any united Church of which the Church of England could form a part they were not contending for any mere form of government, however venerable. In a manifesto recently addressed to the Free Churches by a number of respected and influential members of the Church of England the words occur—"We hope that Episcopacy may commend itself to the Free Churches as a method of Church order of ancient tradition and historic value." It might well be asked, if that were all, what justification could they have in making the acceptance of even what they might deem to be "the wisest and most efficient form of Church order" a condition of union when they knew that but for that condition union might be achieved. Such a position could only be justified by belief that here there was a Divine provision for the right ordering of the Church to which they must be loyal. The Archbishop proceeded:—

"We do not, we dare not, question the spiritual reality of duly constituted ministries in non-Episcopal Communion, nor would we seek to impose the acceptance of any theory about Episcopacy upon our brethren as a necessary condition of union. But we would be doing them as well as ourselves a wrong if we sought merely to commend it as a form of Church government. Rather we would hope that if by the acceptance of Episcopacy itself union were made possible, then through the united life of the Church they would themselves come to share with us our own sense of its significance and value. I venture to ask that in any negotiations towards union both in our own country and in other parts of the world the considerations which I have imperfectly expressed may not be forgotten."

MIDDLE OF THE "BRIDGE."

Many outside their own Communion (he added) have shared their hope that the Anglican Church, by virtue of its distinctive character and witness, might prove to be a "Bridge" Church. At one end it had affinity with the great Latin Church of the West and with the Orthodox Churches of the East, and at the other end it had affinity with the various Protestant Churches. Some of their members naturally laid stress on one affinity rather than the other. But it would be disastrous if that double stress were to imperil the unity of their own fellowship. A bridge was useless which consisted merely of ends, and broke in the middle. There

was real danger lest in seeking unity with their Christian brethren at one end or the other they should impair their own. Rather they must seek to strengthen their own Unity, of bringing together the co-existing elements in their Church life in the reality of a fellowship in which each was welcomed as contributing to the life of the whole body. There were happily many signs of a new desire to achieve that end.

The great cause demanded infinite patience. Short cuts to unity only hindered and confused the journey. Far more patient thought, far greater mutual understanding, a far wider and deeper desire for unity, were needed. Meanwhile two immediate duties were clear. While seeking to understand points of difference from their fellow Christians they should eagerly rejoice in and act upon the far greater points of agreement. He thanked God that co-operation with their fellow Christians in the impact of Christianity upon the world was being realized in a way which would have seemed impossible 50, or even 25, years ago. The second immediate duty was to refuse to let delays and difficulties daunt them in the quest of the visible unity of the Church of Christ. Resolute purpose must steady and inspire patience.

CITY REUNION CIRCLE.

A REUNION CIRCLE has been started at the Church of St. Michael Royal, College Hill, E.C.4. It is intended to get together all those in the city who will pray and work for Reunion. During Lent there is a Low Celebration at 12.15 p.m., an address on Reunion at 1.5 p.m., and Devotions at 1.30 p.m., every Friday. The Lenten speakers are (1) The Rev. R. M. French (Gen. Sec.), (2) The Rev. Ivan R. Young, (3) Sir B. Pares, (4) Canon J. A. Douglas (Rector), and for the last two weeks the Rev. Father J. Virvos, of the Greek Cathedral, Bayswater. After Easter we shall revert to Wednesdays, when there will be Low Celebration at 12.15 p.m., and Devotions at 1.15 p.m. There is a list in the Church porch for the names and addresses of those who will support us by their prayers and sympathy. We are asking for no subscription, and any money given is voluntary. Some books on Reunion will be found in the porch. Enquiries may be addressed to the Joint Secretaries at the Church.

H. C. KERRIGAN, } Joint Secretaries.
H. R. STRINGER, }

AN APPEAL FOR ST. KATHERINE'S CONVENT, MT. SINAI.

BY THE REV. E. M. BICKERSTETH.

IN June of last year Bishop Gwynne, accompanied by Archdeacon Johnston of Cairo, and Canon Harper of Khartoum, paid a visit to the Monastery on Mt. Sinai. They travelled by car and their guide raced them up waterless wadis, over stony beds of dried-up rivers, where the motors bumped for nearly six hours before drawing up at what looked like a mediæval fortress on the side of a hill surrounded by mountains of great height.

The Bishop writes, "A watchman, like Old Testament times, stood on an eminence and signalled to the monastery as soon as I appeared, and on my arrival at the gate a salute was fired by a gun and the ancient bells rang out, during which I was given the Kiss of Peace by the Archbishop and welcomed in a less effusive way, I am grateful to say, by the rest of the monks."

"According to ancient custom and with true religious intent I was escorted into the 6th century Church of St. Katherine, where I was duly installed next to the Archbishop's throne and received an Address of welcome in Greek which was translated into English. In my reply I expressed a wish that in some way the daily devotions of these good priests guarding this scene of great spiritual experiences might be linked on to the work of the Spirit of God in the extension of the Kingdom of Christ in the world. The Archbishop, a member of the Fellowship of Unity in Egypt, replied that they would gladly so pray in their Services for any Christian effort. Could we give him topics for prayers?"

"The ceremony of welcome was not yet over for I was escorted into the original Guest Chamber dating from the time of Justinian, who granted their first Charter. I was placed in the seat of honour and regaled with delicious jam and helped myself with a spoon which was then placed in a glass of water. Coffee was also served and a glass of most potent spirit made from dates by the monks themselves and called 'Mastika.' I excused myself from consuming this on the grounds that I had vowed a vow. As this was described as 'a liquid flame devouring one's vitals' I felt glad that I had not experimented on their strong ecclesiastical spirit."

"I was then taken to my room, beautifully clean and richly carpeted, where I had a wash and joined the Archbishop and his archimandrites in their open-air rendezvous on the roof, overlooking the great valley of Horeb and swept by cool breezes."

After the Bishop's visit he received the following letter from Archbishop Porphyrios III:—

Your Eminence,

I have received safely your gracious letter of the 16th June last, by which Your Eminence expresses your thanks for the hospitality received in our Convent, during your recent visit and short stay with your two companions.

And, as we feel that we have only done our duty towards a respected and beloved brother in Jesus Christ, as His Eminence the Bishop of Egypt and the Sudan is to us, we consider your thanks as proving the abundance of the goodness of your heart and we hope to have the honour and the pleasure of receiving your Eminence in our old and quiet house for a longer visit, to our greater happiness.

We thank your Eminence very much for the generous gift of £5 which you very kindly wished to make to our Convent.

We wish also to express to your Eminence our grateful thanks for the willingness and the kindness with which you agreed to be the bearer of our letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and we hope with you that our letter will be favourably received by the Primate of the Anglican Church, whose great interest in the Eastern Church is known throughout the world.

We are especially praying God to accord to your Eminence a pleasant voyage to England, and a safe return to the great and sincere joy of your devoted flock and numerous admirers, friends and brothers in Jesus Christ, among whom I have the honour to be always

PORPHYRIOS III, *Archbishop of Mt. Sinai.*

The Bishop duly delivered the letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and at the request of the Archbishop is to reply.

It was in this Monastery of St. Katherine that Tischendorf discovered the famous Codex Sinaiticus which is now at the British Museum. There seems little doubt that the discoverer stole the manuscript from the Monastery, though the Tsar of Russia paid a generous sum for it, as he stated that it would be in safer hands with him than it was at Sinai.

The Monastery still has priceless documents and ecclesiastical heirlooms, which are guarded most jealously by the monks. In their libraries, which are small, the manuscripts are tabulated and kept in order. Some of the priests are scholars and during the visit which the Bishop paid he saw these scholars, together with a distinguished expert from Athens, at work on the manuscripts.

On the other hand, the Monastery is now very poor. After the war Russia confiscated valuable property which belonged to them,

and other countries did the same. Before the war many important persons from Russia and the Balkans made pilgrimages to this sacred shrine, and now only a very few people come. At the earnest request of Bishop Gwynne, and with the full backing of the Council on Foreign Relations and the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, a small Committee has been formed with the object of raising a sum of money to provide better libraries for the preservation of the valuable manuscripts still at Sinai, or for any other purpose in connection with the Convent of which Archbishop Porphyrios approves. It is hoped to raise £200 as a gesture of goodwill and a token of respect from Anglicans—to the Archbishop of Sinai and the monks of his Convent.

Committee:—Bishop Gwynne (Bishop in Egypt and the Sudan), Lord Hugh Cecil, Sir Harry Luke, Canon J. A. Douglas, Mr. Athelstan Riley (Hon. Treas.), and the Rev. E. M. Bickersteth, Commissary to Bishop Gwynne (Hon. Sec.).

All donations should be paid to the Hon. Secretary, and sent to 12, Warwick Square, London, S.W.1.

THE ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX ADVANCE TOWARDS REUNION.

THE PROGRESS AND THE HINDRANCES.

By THE METROPOLITAN GERMANOS OF THYATIRA.

AN address to the members of the Anglican and Eastern Church Association delivered after the Liturgy in the Cathedral of St. Sophia, Bayswater, on the occasion of the Association's Anniversary, November 17, 1934.

"There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." (Eph. 4. 4.)

Dear Brethren in Christ,

We have again assembled, Orthodox and Anglicans, under this sacred dome, that we may offer our joint prayers for the blessed cause of the union of our Churches. A good deal may be said, indeed, in favour of the practice decided upon by our Association, that a formal meeting of its members should be convened once a year for the purpose of a joint prayer and worship. It is a well-known fact, that each of our Churches, well aware of the great importance and effect, which unity in faith and administration exercises in the way of promoting the work of Christ upon earth, has arranged that special prayers for the union of the churches

should be offered daily in the course of its holy services. This joint service, however, assisted as it is by so many promoters of the work of Christian Reunion, aims at a twofold object. On the one hand, it shows that the relations between our two Churches have grown so friendly as to bring about the collapse of the old barriers, which separated us even in the very act of prayer. On the other hand, this joint service, by bringing us closer together, is destined to reinforce us with the necessary spiritual stimulus and to rekindle our zeal for a more active prosecution to its final successful end, of our cause of union. Foretasting, as it were, in this joint service, the great privilege, which the future has in store for us, we acquire the vision that the day will come when, approaching in common the same Table of our Lord and partaking of the one Bread, we shall become, according to the Apostle, "one body and one spirit even as we are called in one hope of our calling." But are there any actual indications that this longed-for day is not a Utopia and that it will rise some time in its full glory, shedding light upon the souls of the faithful and rallying the forces of the Church, so that it may be enabled to carry on its task on earth with a fuller measure of success?

Will you allow one, who has from the very beginning believed in, and has since devoted his modest powers to the promotion of, the cause of understanding and union of our Churches, to declare at this signal moment what are the indications, on which he bases his optimism?

* * *

Firstly, there can be no fear that this optimism of his is due either to ignorance or under-estimation of the obstacles standing in the way of the union of our Churches. Can he really be so lacking in historical information as to be ignorant of the difference, which has from the beginning distinguished the East from the West as to the conception of Christianity and the manner of its adoption by either? The Greek, straggling along the various philosophical systems, already decrepit and in decay, has discerned in the Christian religion the revelation of the supreme truth, the calm haven, in which his deluded spirit might find rest. The Westerner on the other hand, had greeted Christianity rather in the sense of action and life, as a deliverance from the state of depravity to which man had fallen through his sins and as the beginning of a new ethical effort which, assisted by Divine Grace, would lead to the fulfilment of his celestial mission. This divergence in conception, not bridged over in early times, kept the two worlds at some distance from each other. But the chasm between the two became deeper with the different historical evolution of the two Churches. A thorough student of the causes of the breach between East and West, which was definitely sealed

with the Schism of the eleventh century, must inevitably come to the conclusion that the estrangement had started much earlier. But this estrangement was not apparent so long as the two worlds had not yet formed their own complete sets of individual traditions, morals and customs, which were becoming incomprehensible to the other. So long, that is to say, as the differences were confined only to matters of secondary and non-essential nature, which were dictated by external considerations and were designed as remedial measures for certain local needs, while the common treasure of faith and administration remained integral and intact, the Church was running no danger whatever. From the moment, however, that traditions and local customs came to be substituted for ancient common conceptions, traditions and customs, the unity between East and West had already gone.

Does not, it may be asked, that original difference in conception survive even to-day? Does not the Orthodox Church attribute a greater importance than the Anglican does to the accuracy of the dogma, i.e. to what should be believed, rather than to action, and does it not seek by a direct approach to God to satisfy its religious feeling by a mystic exaltation? And does not the Anglican Church, on the other hand, by turning its attention mainly to the application of the Christian principles in daily human life, and by seeking to remould the whole social system by this means, does it not neglect accuracy in some measure, and does it not avoid terms which might narrow the wide ambit within which the free dogmatic perceptions of its members are moving? Who will not understand that the difference of opinion as to what is the framework of the dogma which must be laid down as the basis for an understanding or union of the Churches, constitutes an important obstacle to a complete dogmatic agreement? Indeed, a long time of friendly contact, of discussions and explanations is required before an accurate definition is achieved of the dogmatic framework, the agreement on which will lead to a real and permanent union. To achieve this object it is not enough to confine ourselves to the official discussions alone, which every now and then are carried out between the representatives of the two Churches. A constant preparatory effort is needed on both sides and this should be organized, to the best of its ability, by the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association by recruiting from each side the theological forces required. There is need not only of a warm interest, but also of a dispassionate and impartial approach and investigation of the questions, and of avoiding carefully any ambiguous term in the formulas to be prepared.

These few words are, I think, sufficient to show what is the main obstacle in the way of a speedy realization of the union. In spite of all this, therefore, what is it that inspires in myself the

confidence that the cause of the union is on the way to its realization? Firstly, the fact that both Churches are standing on the common basis of Faith of the ancient Church. Members of the Orthodox Church know full well that there was a time when this common basis was shaken with you, when the Catholic residue which survived within the Anglican Church had to carry out a long and arduous struggle to avoid being smothered by the Protestant current, which had swept them in Continental Europe. But thanks to God! From the middle of the last century the scales have, thanks to the Oxford Movement, turned decisively in favour of Catholicism, and Catholic ideas and customs have made their way, not only into the teaching, but also into the worship of the Anglican Church. I refer to the conclusions reached by an inveterate Protestant, as he calls himself, the *Dutch Dr. Visser T. Hooft*,¹ in his work on the Anglican Church of to-day: "Slowly but definitely the Church of England is moving in the direction of a Catholic rather than a Protestant conception of faith and order. If we compare the attitude of the official representatives of the Church in the three important issues, Malines conversations, Revision of Prayer Book, relations with the Orthodox and old Catholic Churches, with the attitude of their predecessors of a hundred years ago, we find evidence that the 'Catholizing of the Church of England,' is not a mere phrase invented by quarrelsome extremists of the Catholic or Protestant variety. In each of these three issues one can observe signs of the process of the Catholic viewpoint within the Church as a whole."

Is not any Orthodox entitled to rejoice at this change, slow though its pace may be, on seeing his hope strengthened for an approaching union of his Church with the Anglican and his confidence reinforced that "He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it"? (Phil. 1. 6.)

But this hope grows stronger and stronger, when I review the steady paces of progress made following the two meetings at Lambeth between representatives of the two Churches. I need not enter into details here. Everyone of us knows well the conclusions reached in the Report which the representatives of the two Churches signed jointly and submitted to their respective ecclesiastical authorities. What I want to emphasize now is this: As the result of the meetings above referred to, the curtain which screened the real face of the Anglican Church from the eyes of the Orthodox has been pulled aside. The Orthodox representatives not only of the Œcumenical Patriarchate but of all the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches as well, have understood that the Anglican Church does not constitute merely a branch of

¹ A member of the Dutch Reformed Church, and a prominent official of the Student Christian Movement. Author of *Anglo-Catholicism and Orthodoxy*.

Protestantism which, as a relic of Catholicism, has retained the Episcopal order, but that the Anglican Church does really present the character of an essentially Catholic Church, which has gone through the testing fire of the Reformation. They formed this view not only through the academical discussion of the issues, in which divergency was apparent on points of secondary importance rather than on the principal ones, but also through the study, from close quarters, of the various manifestations of Anglican religious life. During the latter study, they were able to discover the great vitality of the Anglican Church in the propagation of the Holy Gospel, in the task of defending the principles of Christianity against the various anti-Christian and anti-religious currents, in its ministration for purifying social conditions, in its work of revivifying monastic life, widening religious feeling and resuscitating of ceremonial splendour. Can it be doubted that knowledge of all this by the Orthodox must tend to mould public Orthodox opinion and must kindle a more fervent desire for union with the Anglican Church?

And further, inasmuch as union cannot be confined to clergymen and to theologians, but must include a great section of the Christian world, it is our bounden duty to work with a view to teaching and enlightening the public. One of the objects for which the Eastern and Anglican Churches Association was established, has been and is to inform the English people not only of the benefits which will accrue from the union of the Churches, but also of the nature and essence of the Orthodox Church. It is the duty of the Anglican members of the Association to do so with an increased zeal in future. But it is also the duty incumbent upon us the Orthodox, having learned the truth about the Anglican Church, not to hide it, but to disseminate it among the Orthodox, to as wide an extent as possible, either by the spoken or the written word.

Only by working on these lines can we contribute to a speedier accomplishment of the union of our Churches through the grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ, to whom the glory and the power now and for evermore, Amen.



AN ORTHODOX VIEW OF CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIANITY.

BY THE REV. L. PATTERSON, D.D.

THERE was a penetrating and comprehensive survey of present-day Christianity in a recent number of *Preb*, contributed by the well-known Orthodox writer, Nikolai Arseniev. He begins by quoting a remark of N. A. Berdyaev, who characterizes the present epoch as the time of a ripening neo-mediaevalism. Arseniev thinks that it would be more correct to point out that the fresh winds of primitive Christianity are passing again over the world. An atmosphere of religious tension is spreading, not of fanatical exaltation, but of a feeling of the nearness of the Lord, not of an eschatological nearness of the Lord appearing in the second coming, but of the nearness of the Lord, marching along the road of history. The words of Christ are being fulfilled, "Look upon the fields, for they are white and ripe for the harvest."

Those who have lived through the religious crisis in Soviet Russia, know that there in many ways this harvest is already ripening and perhaps has already ripened. There again Christianity is revealed as a conquering power, more clearly perhaps than it has ever been revealed since the times of the primitive Apostolic Church. There are many apostates, many backsliders, much that is, humanly speaking, reprobate, but in the midst of this the power of God has been revealed, sustaining the faithful remnant. It has been felt that the Kingdom which is not of this world is stronger than the kingdom of this world; that "fools for Christ's sake" and "the foolishness of preaching" is the power which takes hold of the heart. Christianity is not ashamed even now of "the foolishness of preaching," for when the world in its wisdom knew not God in the wisdom of God, then it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe! As for the Athenian philosophers, so now the chief stone of stumbling for the wisdom of this world appears to be the preaching about the *Risen Christ*, that is, the Conqueror of the lifeless, soulless laws of the world. But it is in this that lies the chief power and essence of Christianity, "for the life was manifested." In this, we know, is the whole spirit of Orthodoxy. The truth, living, real, conquering truth of the Resurrection of Christ has been revealed with peculiar power amid the torments and persecutions of the Soviet régime. And, for Western Christianity, the risen Christ begins to stand more and more in the centre of the life of faith. So many Protestants and Catholics, without forsaking their own Churches, are drawn to the spirit of Orthodoxy, which is fulness of joy in the

Risen Christ. So, a Catholic monk (a German Benedictine) in a letter to Arseniev, quotes a passage from the Life of S. Eutychius (*Acta Sanctorum*): "The day has dawned, the fulfilling of the times, the crown of the year, the beginning of the general Resurrection, the Resurrection of Christ our God, to whom the heavens and earth sing a triumphal hymn (*cui triumphalem hymnum canunt coeli et terra* ").

The same conviction is expressed by many Protestant writers. For instance, Pastor Glinz (North Switzerland), in the review "Una Sancta," never ceases to underline the centrality of the Resurrection. Not long ago two remarkable personalities in the Protestant world, the two Blumhardts, father and son (1805-1880 and 1842-1919), laid as the corner-stone of the faith the risen Christ, simply in the spirit of the Apostolic preaching. The elder Blumhardt longed for the "radiant beams of the glory and goodness of the risen Christ." The whole atmosphere in which he lived and died was that of the Resurrection. Blumhardt the younger speaks again and again in his sermons about the Resurrection as fundamental and most important. "What is the centre, the fundamental fact in the Kingdom of God?—it is the Resurrection!"

In passing, it may be noticed that the Christian mystic Sundar Singh has placed in the centre of his missionary preaching the Gospel of the living and risen Conqueror of death. Prof. Heiler has lately defended him against the charges of deceit or hysterical fanaticism.¹

Catholicism, which is at present, especially in Germany, passing through a period of spiritual deepening or revival, is striving through many of its best representatives to return to the psychology and "Weltanschauung" of the primitive Church. In contrast with scholastic formulas, harmoniously arranged in allogical system (though they do not reject these formulas), they underline the fundamental and primitive faith in the Incarnation and Resurrection of the Lord, from which is derived the power of the Sacraments and the transformation of mankind and all creatures.²

These currents of thought are influencing wide circles of Protestantism. "The redemption of the material creation—which is the sense of the physical Resurrection of Christ"—such phrases as this, whether they are addressed to liberal theologians, or to dogmatic theologians of the old school, with their one-sided "Verinnerlichung" (subjective religious experience), no longer appear to be the voice of one crying in the wilderness. N. Arseniev has addressed Protestant and Catholic audiences in Germany, and has found a sympathetic response to this point of view. Religious thinkers are beginning to value both the body and matter from the standpoint of *Christian*

¹ Cf. "Apostel oder Betrüger?" (Apostle or Impostor), 1925; and a work just published, "Christuszeuge oder Hysteriker?" (A witness to Christ or a hysterical person).—Author's note.

² Cf. especially the book of Ildenfon Herwegen (abbot of the monastery Maria Leach) and Romano Guardini.—Author's note.

realism.¹ This spirit lives in every page of the review "Una Sancta," the organ of the idea of Universal Christianity.

Again the Jugendbewegung (Youth-movement) is, in its basis, an attempt to return to a wider and richer internal or spiritual life. This movement is a fruitful soil for the development of Christian realism, for the acceptance of faith in the transformation or rehabilitation of the creature through the incarnate and risen Son of God.² The leader and representative of the Catholic section of this Youth-movement in Germany, the Quickbornjugend (so called from the place of their annual meetings) is a man of deep faith and ardent spirit, Romano Guardini, professor of Catholic theology. In this very point Catholics are near in spirit to the Orthodox, for the transformation of the creature through the power of the incarnate and risen Christ is the essential content of Orthodoxy.

Further, there is the deeply rooted experience that the world is not independent of or alien from God. The whole of our life, private as well as public, must be sanctified by Him. Yet the Holy Spirit of God, who sanctifies us, is not given to each individual taken separately, but to the fellowship of the body of Christ. Especially now, after the War, when it has been shown, whither extreme individualism has led Protestantism, the eyes of many in the Protestant world are being opened to the importance of the community principle: the Spirit of God breathes among brethren, united by love in Christ. The new discovery of the Epistle of the Ephesians—as Hans Ehrenberg calls it,³ is the opening of the eyes to the teaching of the Apostle Paul about the Church, or, more truly, about the mystical experience of the Church, which had become entirely alien and misunderstood.⁴ But now the longing for the Church has revived in the Protestant world. Pastor Glinz characterizes this longing for the Church as the reawakening of the Church in souls and the corresponding trend of considerable parts of present Christianity to the Church. Not only is there the longing for the Church, but often the definite seeking of the Church. On this account a great impression is produced on many Protestants by Khomyakov, when they are acquainted with him; so at Berlin, in February, 1926, a course of five lectures arranged by the Protestant "Ausschuss für Innere Mission" (Home Missions Committee), included a lecture on Khomyakov, read by a Russian lecturer. Again, Heiler could write "In the end this is the one idea, which has taken hold of the whole Christian world: not an idea only, but a Divine reality, the reality

¹ On the other hand, Barth, in his book, "Die Auferstehung von den Toten," seems to give the impression that this belief is not a fact, but only an idea.

² Their views are expressed, for instance, in the review, "Der Weisse Ritter" (The White Knight).

³ Article in the "Christliche Welt" (1925).—Author's note.

⁴ "The Church is for us Protestants a secondary factor (etwas Nebensächliches)." Sic Fr. Heiler in an article on "Evangelical High Church principles" in "Una Sancta" (1926).

of the one Church of Christ, which is His creation, His Body, His very Self." But "it is impossible to have fellowship with the *Ecclesia invisibilis* if we consciously turn our backs on the *Ecclesia visibilis*. The contemporary Protestant teaching about the invisibility of the Church is a rationalistic abstraction, which abolishes the idea of the Church of primitive Christianity. The visibility of the Church depends on the Incarnation of the Son of God."

Other religious leaders in different countries are working to the same end. We can only refer to the late Cardinal Mercier, Dr. Nathan Soderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, the leaders of the Old-Catholic movement, and others in England and America. In the conference of Protestant Churches, Orthodox and Western Episcopal Churches, to be held at Lausanne in August, 1927, for the consideration of the question of the re-union of the Christian world, it is important to avoid all attempts to create a scientific minimum of belief as a basis of external union between extreme Protestants and the Orthodox East. Therefore, those movements in Western Christianity which acknowledge the Church or strive after it, should do all in their power to combine with Orthodoxy. The obstacles, which now separate the Christian world, are not eternal, and will be overcome in the spirit of brotherly love. On this note Arseniev ends his article. "Love for the Church cannot exclude love for the brethren, but, on the contrary, consecrates it, nay, more, requires it."

OBITUARY

THE METROPOLITAN PLATON, R.I.P.

THOSE of us Anglicans who were privileged with personal knowledge of the Metropolitan Platon loved him and valued him alike for his personality and for his splendid work both as pastor and as leader among the Orthodox Russians in exile.

The tragedy of the divisions in the Russian Church in exile is apparent to us Anglicans and we pray that they may cease speedily. None the less, we realize that those divisions are not wanton but result from grave differences in matters of principle. It is not for us to presume to adjudicate on the canonical question which came between the Synod of the Russian Church in exile over which the Metropolitan Antony presides and the Metropolitan Evlogie, the Metropolitan Platon and the other bishops who agreed with and held by them. Only the Orthodox have the right, or are able, to decide upon that question.

Our call is to use every opportunity of showing our admiration

and sympathy with both sides in their brave efforts to hold together the Russian exiles in their sufferings.

We are indebted to the Rev. M. Mansur of St. Mark's School, Massachusetts, U.S.A., for the following Obituary compiled from the U.S.A. Press in the days following the Metropolitan's death on April 16 last.

NOTICE.

The Metropolitan Platon, recognized by a large body of Russian Orthodox exiles in America, Canada and Alaska, as their supreme spiritual ruler, died at 12.25 at his home, 683, West 240th Street, New York. He was sixty-eight years old.

The body of the Metropolitan was brought from his home to the Cathedral of the Protection of the Holy Virgin, at 105, East Houston Street, near the Bowery, for the funeral. There he lay in state, while priests read the Holy Gospel day and night unceasingly for two days, until the funeral was held. During that time services were held every morning at 10 o'clock and every evening at seven. At the funeral three bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church in America officiated.

The life of the Metropolitan Platon falls into two sharply divided phases. In the years between his consecration as a Bishop in 1902 and his return to America for the second time in 1921, the course of events carried him smoothly and easily to the highest positions in the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Communist hatred of wealth and tradition led to the overthrow of the Orthodox Church, the persecution and imprisonment of the Patriarch Tikhon and the establishment of the so-called "Living Church" in the Soviet Union. This religious upheaval had a profound effect on the fortunes of the 300 Russian parishes in the rest of the world. The last thirteen years of the Metropolitan's life were marred by a succession of legal controversies with representatives of the Soviet Church.

At the time of his death the Metropolitan occupied an anomalous position. Theoretically he was the Western representative of a mighty Eastern Church. In actuality, he represented no one. He had been vested with authority by a power that disappeared in the revolution of 1917, and by a prelate who later was declared unfrocked and imprisoned by the Soviet government. Yet for more than a dozen years he retained the loyalty of tens of thousands of expatriate Russians, who clung to their traditional religion rather than bow to a government they felt to be godless.

Thus, through tradition and his own personality, the Metropolitan remained in the eyes of a vast body of Russian-Americans the head of the Orthodox Church in this country, despite Soviet attempts to shake his position. Years of litigation robbed him of his seat in the St. Nicholas Cathedral at 15, East Ninety-seventh

Street, which since 1905 had been the location of the American See. A Soviet churchman has presided since 1926 in that pulpit, and the Metropolitan's headquarters have been housed in a portion of St. Augustine's Chapel, in East Houston Street, by the kindness of Bishop Manning and of the American Episcopal Church.

One of the strangest chapters in the controversy occurred between 1923 and 1926, when the late Rev. John S. Kedrovsky was waging his successful fight to oust the Metropolitan from St. Nicholas Church. Priest of a struggling Church in Hartford, Conn., he sailed for Moscow and obtained a Soviet appointment as Archbishop of America.

With his family, "Archbishop Kedrovsky" moved his baggage into St. Nicholas one day and announced that he was taking over the control of the Russian Church. The Archbishop was conducted to the sidewalk. The next day began the series of lawsuits, which terminated the Metropolitan's expulsion. There were a series of reversals in the courts, arrivals and departures of church envoys and police intervention. Finally, the Metropolitan was "excommunicated," but retained his place in the esteem of his followers.

Porfiri Rozdestvensky was born in Kursk, Russia, on February 23rd, 1866, and graduated from the seminary there when he was twenty years old. For the next five years he was a Secular priest. When his wife died he entered the Theological Academy at Kiev, became a monk in 1894, and was graduated from the Academy in 1895. Subsequently he became professor of theology at Kiev and finally Rector of the Academy. In 1902 he was consecrated as Bishop of Chichirin.

In 1906 he came to America and succeeded Metropolitan Tikhon, who returned to Russia to become Patriarch of all the Russian Church. Six years later the Metropolitan returned to Russia to become Archbishop of Kishinev. He was elected a member of the second Russian Duma, and in 1915 became Exarch of Georgia and a member of the Most Holy Synod. From 1917 to 1918 he was Archbishop of Odessa, and in 1921 Patriarch Tikhon appointed him ruling Archbishop of America, Alaska and Canada.

THE METROPOLITAN'S FUNERAL.

Antiphonal chanting, earnest and effortless, rendered for five hours yesterday the last tribute of the hierarchy and faithful of the Russian Orthodox Church for Porfiri Rojdestvensky, Metropolitan Platon, Russian Archbishop in America, who lay in state before the Altar of the Cathedral of the Protection of the Holy Virgin at 105, East Houston Street. The ceremony began at 10 a.m., and did not end until 3 p.m., when the choir and the clergy followed the coffin in a long procession through the streets before its journey by rail to South Canaan, Pa., where burial services were held the next morning.

The Cathedral was filled early with communicants who stood in a packed, hushed mass through the morning and afternoon, while 2,000 others, unable to get in, formed a solid line for nearly two blocks outside the Cathedral. Inside, around the bier, candle light glittered on the jewelled mitres of bishops and abbots, casting a yellow glow on the gold-embroidered chasubles and bearded faces.

The service was conducted by three prelates, Bishop Arseny, of Winnipeg, Canada, Bishop Leonti, of Chicago, and Bishop Benjamin of Pittsburgh, aided by Proto-deacon I. Semoff and Archimandrite Inna, personal confessor of the Metropolitan, who performed the last rites. Among the eighty clergymen assisting were two archimandrites of the Greek Orthodox Church, representing Archbishop Athenagoras, and the Rev. Dr. Robert Frederick Lau, counsellor on ecclesiastical relations of the American Episcopal Church, representing the Rev. Dr. James De Wolf Perry, Presiding Bishop.

The Requiem Liturgy, sung by the celebrants with a choir of fifty voices, which stood on a dais on the left side of the nave, was the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, one of the earliest and greatest of the Eastern Fathers, Bishop of Constantinople at the end of the fourth century. The whole service was marked by scrupulous observance of the ancient symbolism of the Eastern Church. The present head of that Church, the Metropolitan Sergios, Acting Patriarch of Moscow, last summer decreed the expulsion of the Metropolitan Platon as ruling head of the Archdiocese of North America, but the greater part of his clergy and laity remained faithful to him.

At the head of the bier on which the Metropolitan's body lay in full vestments, two crossed candles burned on one side, the symbol of the dual nature of Christ, and on the other side three candles were crossed to symbolize the Trinity. Over him, two priests held the staffs with the *ripides*, the golden images of angels which are carried only at the funeral of a bishop.

While the Liturgy was in progress, a line of men and women toiled through the press to reach the side of the coffin, where in turn they made the sign of the Cross and bent to kiss the *Evangelion*, or book of the four Gospels, which rested in the Metropolitan's hand. Members of the sisterhood of the Cathedral, wearing white lace, stood at each side under the banks of flowers, with tall, slim candles before them.

Just after noon, when the slashes of sunlight on the windowsills at the edge of the dim interior were pointing straight down, Bishop Arseny came forward and at the conclusion of the Gospel spoke in Russian. He was followed by others who eulogized the dead prelate, including Bishop Benjamin, Bishop Leonti, and Dr. Pavelic, vice-consul of Yugoslavia, who represented the minister

of that country. All spoke in Russian. The language in which the service was conducted, was, of course, old Slavonic.

When the long service was ended, the procession issued from the Cathedral and formed in the street while a ten-piece band from the 2nd Combat Train of the New York National Guard played a funeral march. The band and the guard of honour accompanying it were under the command of Sergeant Alexis Stoopenkov, who was a Captain in the 18th Regiment of the Russian Imperial Army. First in the procession came the flag of the United States, and the white, blue and red ensign that was the national flag of Russia; then the crucifer, followed by priests bearing the eikons of the Cathedral. Behind them came the coffin, the choir and the eighty clergymen, walking two by two, their vestments resplendent in the sunlight. The cortege made the round of the block and then the coffin was closed and placed in the hearse which carried it to the Monastery of St. Tikhon, at South Canaan, Pa.

THE LATE ARMENIAN ARCHBISHOP LEON TOURIAN.

[Though crowded out of our last issues, it is right that this tribute should find record in the *Christian East*.]

MY impression of Archbishop Leon Tourian gained by fairly frequent intercourse in the past eighteen years was that of a bigly built—expansive, kindly, somewhat shy man, a delightful, cultured, scholarly companion, and a very sincere, warm-hearted Christian. The nephew of the late Armenian Patriarch Tourian of Jerusalem (d. 1931), whose name both as the most learned in Armenian history, romance and *belles lettres* of all modern Armenians, and as a poet, patriot and saintly ecclesiastic, was a household word throughout the worldwide Armenian dispersion, Leon Tourian, if he had not his uncle's talents, had his tastes. That he was drawn into the vortex of Armenian politics was because the Armenian Church and Nation is a bilateral identity and because *nolens volens* his family tradition claimed him in his youth for a prominent role in both. Leon Tourian served as a young man at the Armenian Patriarchate of Constantinople adequately and even with distinction, and being its assistant Vicar General, came with the Patriarch Balakian to London in 1919. Certainly he had the grand style for politics but he had no heart for them and when he became bishop of the large Armenian colony of Smyrna in 1920, he realised his vocation. With one accord the witness is complete, not only that he was beloved by

his people but that he won the goodwill of the poorer Smyrniote Turks by his kindness, chivalry and generosity towards them during the Greek occupation. That he did not suffer the terrible martyrdom at the hands of the mob to which the saintly Greek Metropolitan of Smyrna was consigned during the Holocaust of Smyrna was due to his Turkish well-wishers forcibly conducting him to a French gunboat. The horrors perpetrated upon his people of which he was an eye-witness left a permanent mark upon him. After a period in Cyprus, he came to England to act simply as a parish priest of the Armenians of Manchester. There he was intensely happy until 1931 when to his outspoken regret, he was selected to go to America to exercise episcopal control of the Armenians of that continent.

While in England, he represented the Armenian Church in the World Conferences of Life and Work, Stockholm, 1925, and of Faith and Order, Lausanne, 1927, and was a member of the Continuation Committees of both. He also took part in many Anglican functions and conferences, e.g., in the ceremonies of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, the report of his discussions with the relevant Committee of which forms an important Reunion document. In result, he had a wide circle of friends both among Anglicans and among the leaders of the Continental churches concerned in the General Reunion Movement, who will regret his untimely loss as deeply as they will be shocked by the fact of his appalling assassination when making his solemn entry to Church for the celebration of the Holy Mysteries.

Very succinctly the motive of his murder was this. With very considerable wisdom the rulers of Red Russia have allowed the Armenians practical autonomy in the Armenian Soviet Republic of Erivan. Accordingly, for the first time in 2,000 years, the Armenians have a national home in which Armenians rule Armenians and Armenian is the language of the State. That Armenian Republic's being mildly communist economically and dependent on Moscow politically counts for little with the ordinary Armenian in comparison with the fact that under its protection he can be an Armenian. Moreover, in the past three years, the Armenian rulers of Soviet Armenia have been permitted by Moscow to show benevolence towards the Armenian Church of which 95% of the Armenians are members and which to all Armenians is identified with Armenian patriotism. Thus not only was freedom given last year for the election of Mgr. Khoren as Supreme Catholicos of all Armenians, but the Central Soviet of U.S.S.R. made arrangements whereby Armenian bishops from Syria and Palestine should visit Etchmiadsin for the purpose, and after his election Mgr. Khoren was accorded a ceremonial procession on his way to his enthronization. In result there has been no small rallying of Armenians all the world over to the Armenian Republic, several

thousand of the Armenian refugees from Turkey have accepted its invitation to become its citizens and, Moscow giving them facilities, have made their way to it.

In consequence, the Supreme Catholicos of Etchmiadsin had urged that Armenians in all parts of the world should accept the Soviet regime of the Soviet Republic as *de facto* deserving loyalty. Acting under those instructions and in spite of his intense personal dislike of Red Communism, Archbishop Tourian ordered the display of the Republic's flag in the Armenian Church in New York. By doing so he aroused the fury of the Dashnag, one of the two traditional rival political Armenian societies, which, the Hentchakists having accepted the Supreme Catholicos' requirement, has made him the victim of a terrorist *macabre* assassination.

Incited by violent attacks upon him in the Dashnag papers of New York, three members of the *Dashnagsoutune* attended the Armenian Church of the Holy Cross in that city on the 24th December, 1933, and attacked him as he was proceeding ceremonially to the altar for the Liturgy, one of them stabbing him repeatedly in the groin with a butcher's knife, so that he bled to death on the spot.

J.A.D.

DR. ZEKHO RHOSSES.

TWO or three years ago when staying in Athens I was fortunate to be bidden to a theological function, where Dr. Papa-Michael was receiving the guests. Taking him for the doyen of the faculty, I was undeceived by the announcement of the arrival of Professor Mesoloras from whose writings I first derived in the 'nineties a nodding acquaintance with Modern Greek Theologians. On expressing my ignorant surprise that Dr. Mesoloras was still alive and my admiration at his brisk health, the man with whom I was chatting laughed and said, "He is 87 but we have one still older. Zekho Rhosses is 97." I rubbed my ears. Zekho Rhosses' books held the field in Modern Greek Theology in the 'seventies and 'eighties when Androutsos and Dyovouniotes were in their 'teens, 30 years before they systematized their respective schools of Modern Greek Theology. Also Zekho Rhosses was one of the Orthodox Conversants in those famous Old-Catholic-Orthodox-Anglican Reunion Conferences of 1874 and 1876 in which Bishop Christopher Wordsworth and Dean Liddon played so great a part, which Dr. Pusey followed with keen hope and in which Dr. Dollinger laboured to find a compensation for the Infallibility decree. In those days few Orthodox knew anything of the history and tradition of the Anglican Communion—except, as the Metropolitan Philaret once

put it, through "Jesuit introduction." Consequently, as the pages of the narratives of the Bonn Conferences published by Dr. Liddon show, neither he nor his Russian Orthodox confrère Maltzev were ready to agree that Anglican Ordinations could be recognised as valid on Orthodox principles. But as he himself told me, he rejoiced at their recognition by the Dutch Old Catholics in 1925, and judged that Professor Komnenos had made out in 1922 a sufficient preliminary case for the presupposition that complete investigation by the Orthodox would justify the Constantinople recognition.

To the end of his long life, Dr. Rhosses was full of work, humour—and devotion. A man of many friends, his happy passing has been the crown of a life of service to the Greek Church, the Orthodox Church and Christian Theology in General. R.I.P.

J.A.D.

OUR BOOKSHELF.

Patriotism Perverted, a discussion of the deeds and the misdeeds of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, the so-called *Dashnagtsoutune*, by K. S. PAPAZIAN, Boston, Baikai Press, 1934.

The *Dashnagtsoutune*, or Armenian Revolutionary Association began as a secret society organised to employ terrorist methods against the Sultan Abd-ul-Hamid and the Ottoman Government, its object being to compel the Turks to concede the liberation of the Armenians of Turkey.

The history of the *Dashnagtsoutune* is obscure. From its start to the present it has possessed a large membership and, whatever may rightly be said in criticism of its methods, has retained remarkable efficiency as a secret society.

As Mr. Papazian presents the case, the Dashnags have failed altogether in their objective and again and again have ruined the Armenian cause when hope of its success was promising.

Thus he charges them with having given excuse and provocation for Abd-ul-Hamid's ordering those atrocious Armenian massacres against which in the nineties Mr. Gladstone roused Great Britain to passionate indignation. He indicts them for having by their folly and wanton acts of terrorism played into the hands of Talaat and those Turks who used the fog of the Great War to extirpate the Armenians from Turkey. And he maintains that the suppression of the Armenian Republic of Erivan which was set up by the Treaty of Versailles was the consequence of the machinations.

That Mr. Papazian's case is not without substance is probable.

But if it be disputed, there can be no question but that the Dashnags were responsible for the murder of Archbishop Tourian in New York last year.

THE SLAVONIC REVIEW.

Price 6/- a quarter, 16/- per annum; published by Eyre and Spottiswoode, 6, Great New Street, London, E.C.4, for the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in the University of London.

Hard though the times be, students of Eastern Christianity will be wise to reckon a subscription to this fine quarterly a necessary item in their budget.

That the *Slavonic Review* is produced by the London School of Slavonic Studies denotes its academic standard and quality. But that fact also invests it with an especial allure for those who know the story of the School of Slavonic Studies.

A glance at the names of the teachers of the School, at its curricula and research programme and so forth can leave no doubt but that here we have an institution of major academic importance. Nor can anyone cognisant of the University of London fail to reason that unless the School satisfied the highest tests of value and efficiency the Senate of the University neither would be privileging it by avowing responsibility for its well-being and permanence nor would ever have decided that a habitat must be found for it in the great buildings of which King George laid the foundation stone last year and which by 1936 will be ready to serve the University as a home.

No doubt, the London School of Slavonic Studies ought to have been brought into being in consequence of the recommendations of a Commission, appointed to consider and report upon the need for a school of the kind in the metropolis of the Empire. In result adequate funds ought to have been provided by public grants and private benefactions. And a well-equipped and comfortably financed teaching and research institution should have been established according to plan.

As has been the case in England with so many institutions of first-grade academic value, the London School of Economics was born with no such golden spoon in its mouth. It owed its inception to men who were visionaries and visionaries who were practical men. It struggled into being as a department of King's College, London, the chief function of which was to teach Russian and to interpret Russian in particular and the Slav world in general to the British mind. *Ex ovo* it has had a hard fight to exist, and has persisted and evolved into the independent, first-class academic organism

which it is to-day, only because Sir Bernard Pares, its director from the beginning and the staff which its allure has attracted, are not only teachers and experts of a category which any University would be proud to possess, but are devotees of the idea.

"The game is more than the players of the game, And the ship is more than the crew."

Presumptively, most of them have bread-and-butter questions, but the very competent and distinguished men who have "taken shares" in the London School of Slavonic Studies have put their capital into it on the basis that they do not expect even "a Bank rate interest upon their investment."

To translate the metaphor, whereas if not all, several of them could almost certainly have commanded other secure and in comparison well-remunerated positions, they have been glad and eager to devote themselves to the School as to a child of love and have been content to put up with whatever remuneration it could give—relatively that remuneration has never been a "living wage" for any of them—and to risk being left at long last unemployed.

Certainly, the Czecho-Slovak—when in exile President Masaryk was a teacher of London University—the Jugo-Slav and other states concerned in Slavonic and East European studies have contributed generously to maintenance and endowment of the School. Indeed, the first-named has given £20,000 towards the building which is to be put up on the University's Bloomsbury site. And according to its limited resources, London University has untied its purse-strings liberally.

Considered for what it is, the School is a splendid institution. Considered for what, if the money needed were there, it might be—and for its field ought to be—it is a starveling, a vigorous, lusty starveling, but none the less a starveling.

Historically, politically, economically, in every category of study or research things Russian are predominant in the School's purview and scope.

But since 1918, on the one hand the starkness of the Soviet régime has forbidden the School to have direct contacts with intellectual and political Russia, the small value possessed to-day by the Russian language as equipment for a common and real career and the general public lack of British interest in Soviet Russian which have been the natural repercussion of the Marxist intransigence which has characterized Red Russia, have restricted alike the activities in service and the clientèle of the School.

Sooner or later—and perhaps very soon—that *rassroidissement* will cease. Then the School will enter into its own and when that time arrives, its value and importance will be recognized, realized and appreciated.

Meanwhile, among the many notable activities which in these hard times characterize the School and symbolize its genius, the

Slavonic Review is remarkable peculiarly. Even the most captious or biased of its critics could not risk the suggestion that any of its numbers has been partisan. From title page to colophon all the articles in its issues have been impartial, valuable and scientific contributions to knowledge. Many of them have been of first distinction and deserve a place in general Russian bibliography and among these not the least important are these which deal with the life and history of the Russian Church under the Soviet.

The staff of the School, and therefore of the *Slavonic Review*, consists of men who are not only academics but have helped and are helping to shape the evolution and history of the countries with which the School is concerned. To mention no others, all the world knows of the part Sir Bernard Pares played in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, of his efforts in the past sixteen years for the liberation of Russia and of his services to the Russian Church. Dr. Seton-Watson's name is almost a household word in Czecho-Slovakia. His influence in Jugo-Slavia is an effective imponderabilia. And the *History of the Roumanians* which he published this August is not only a monumental and massive work which is certain to be a principal authority for the past of the Balkans but, just because it is the product of a mind which even when it has sympathies and predilections, wills to be impartial and is altogether single, is bound to set going practical and far-reaching reactions upon their future.

Laus Deo! Sir Bernard Pares, Dr. Seton-Watson and their colleagues are sincere and inspired, if candid, friends of the Orthodox Church.

The University of London cherishes its tradition that from its foundation its doors have been open to all comers without restriction and belief or opinion. Necessarily a condition of that impartiality is that its chairs and classrooms may not be abused for propaganda. But that does not debar its teachers from publishing their views or for that matter from taking public action.

It is that while never polemical or propagandist and always judicial and scientific, the *Slavonic Review* is the expression of the mind and of the activities of the Staff of the School. As such while their contributions which we gather are written gratis and most of those which they secure from others, deal directly with things spiritual, every article in the *Slavonic Review* is full of information or atmosphere of value and interest to the student of Eastern Christianity.

Thus the first fifty of the two hundred and thirty pages of its July issue are occupied by translations of two delightful odes of Pushkin by Maurice Baring and of a long narrative poem, the *Brazentloiseman*, a Tale of Petrograd of the same author, by Oliver Elton, of the Serbo-Croat Ballad of Tsar Lazar and Tsaritsa

Militsa, and of five fascinating short stories, Slovene, Bulgarian, Yiddish and Russian among which the Slovene Lampret, the Warlock Marksman and the Thief are supreme.

Under the title of "Democracy and Dictatorships" Alexander Kerensky writes of the forces of chaos which enabled the Bolsheviks to subvert the democratic Russia of 1917, and Peter Struve in his *Contacts and Conflicts with Lenin*, presents us with a valuable human document. In his tenth instalment of *Soviet Legislation*, A. Baikolow gives us a selection of decrees and documents some of which deal with schools and the U.S.S.R. educational system. Litvinov's "very able and important speech" to the Disarmament Conference at Geneva on 29th May, 1934, is published with an editorial note advising its careful study. Otahar Odlozilik tells the story of Archbishop Wake's relations with Jablonski and the latter's plans for efforts to create a united Continental Protestant Church which should be in communion with the Anglican.

Among the reviews A. Dobbie-Bateman contributes a review of Bulgakov's great book, *Agnets Bozyg* (the Lamb of God), which is far and away the best and most understanding that we have seen.

