

PROPERTY OF ARCHPRIEST
Orthodox Church in America
Syosset, N. Y. 11791

Essays of Orthodox Theology

BY
ARCHPRIEST LEONID J. TURKEVICH

DEAN OF THE
RUSSIAN ST. NICHOLAS CATHEDRAL
15 EAST 97th STREET, NEW YORK

PROPERTY OF ARCHIVES
Orthodox Church in America
Syosset, N. Y. 11791
No. _____



PRICE 50 CENT

NEW YORK CITY
1918

Copyright

1918

ARCHPRIEST LEONID J. TURKEVICH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Forward	5
Pope Gregory I	7
A Distinctive Test for Orthodoxy and non-Orthodoxy	15
The Church and the Choir	27
Orthodox Ritual in the Divine Service of the West	47
Problems of the Eastern Orthodox Church in America	57

FORWORD.

The articles we now offer to the readers in our small collection owe their origin to inquiries about this or that subject from the outside. The author, a member of the Orthodox Eastern Church, a missionary of the Russian Church in America, chose the general title of "Essays of Orthodox Theology". His reasons are clear. The author's point of view is orthodox, he having studied in an orthodox theological school in Kieff, and his object having been to establish exactly an Orthodox point of view concerning subjects under discussion. But at the same time, the author by no means attempts to speak in bald way admitting of no other points of view for other orthodox therefore calls these articles merely "essays". Without doubt, in the course of natural progress, the Orthodox Church of North America will produce with the help of God many an original article on theological subjects. The author dares to trust that by his essays he has somewhat furthered the cause of the development, growth and fair future of Orthodox theology in America. If it really is so and if, on the other hand, his articles succeeded in explaining somewhat the attitude of the orthodox towards many a question of faith and order, the author is well satisfied: he never dreamed to expect more than this.

In publishing this collection, the author makes is his duty to express his warmest gratitude to Mr. Silas McBee for his great kindness in permitting to reprint the essays which originally appeared in his magazine,—all except the first—,The Constructive Quarterly for Sept. 1914, June 1915 and June 1916; and to Mrs. Vera Johnston, who translated and added the necessary foot notes at the first appearance of the articles and undertook the proof reading in their present edition.

October 1918.

The Author.



POPE GREGORY I.

The Orthodox Eastern Church honors several bishops who in the past occupied the cathedra of Rome, accepting them as saints. Out of many names we may cite: the holy martyr Clement, Sylvester and Leo the Great. St. Gregory the Dialogos also belongs to their number.

People of little information often are perplexed by the fact that the Orthodox, who do not accept the Pope as the head of the Church, nevertheless render great homage to St. Gregory, during the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts.

This perplexity may well be shared by people of good education but acquainted with the church history from the point of view of the Roman Catholic tendency or lay politics. Both the Roman Catholic and the lay historians consider Gregory I to be the greatest advocate of the idea of Roman universal authority. On this ground his name is even accompanied by the title of Great.

It may prove useful to dissipate this perplexity.

Pope Gregory I lived in the VIth century A. D., before the separation of the Churches. He died 604 A. D. As far as this, the Orthodox Eastern Church has no ground whatever not to count Pope Gregory the Dialogos amongst the greatest prelates of the Church of Christ. The personal character

of this Pope also deserves our greatest veneration. He led the life of an ascetic; he was a monk and later the prior of a monastery. When occupying the episcopal cathedra he did all he could to introduce and strengthen the monastic ideal in Italy and throughout all Western Europe. Moreover, he was distinguished for his humility, gentleness, patience and love of his neighbour. His letters show all these qualities, even when he wrote to persons whose ideas were wrong. Therefore the moral features of St. Gregory make him worthy of the veneration of the Church, showing him to have been a man of saintly life, acceptable to God.

His missionary activity especially deserves our consideration, having been very fruitful yet entirely peaceable and Christian in all its ways. Besides the conversion of the heathen in Italy and Gall, he also worked for the same end in the northern lands of Europe. To him belongs the honor of sending out missionaries to enlighten the Britons. Besides, he worked very hard to attract into the pale of the Church the heretical followers of Arius, the Donatists and the Roman Jews. In this respect the merit of St. Gregory is very valuable and above any doubt.

Moreover, he deserves much credit for bringing order into the Divine service of the Roman Church. However, the Roman Catholics ascribe to him more than really belongs to him. But it is certain that this prelate was the first to introduce in the liturgic services such exclamations as *Halleluia*, *Kyrie eleyson* and the reading of the Lord's prayer. And it is worthy of note that St. Gregory

borrowed these innovations from the Greek Church. In the grade of an archdeacon he represented the Roman patriarch in Rome, and was greatly impressed by the beauty of the Greek Divine services. And it is not to be wondered at, that on becoming the bishop of Rome, he began to transplant into his own Church that which he thought was best in the "Universal" Church of Constantinople and the East in general. Neither did he make any secret of his innovations. In a letter concerning the resistance some of his innovations met with, he writes that he will borrow what is good wherever he met it. It seems that the idea of the Roman ascendance was not far from the minds of his opponents, even at that epoch, for they criticized severely the chief of their priests saying: "How can he subjugate the Church of Constantinople, when in everything he follows its customs?" St. Gregory quotes these words in one of his epistles.

Does not this conformity of St. Gregory with the customs of the Universal Church bear testimony to the moral superiority and irreproachability of the ecclesiastical activities of this prelate, in spite of the resistance of the western bishops?

It is also most probable, that the school of singing, established by St. Gregory, and the church harmony, which obtains in the west and is called *Gregorian*, took its origin in Constantinople, when St. Gregory lived there, though later the Gregorian chanting in time grew very different from the Greek.

We must not forget that St. Gregory also borrowed directly from the Greeks a whole church

service for his local Roman Church. St. Gregory brought to Rome the so-called Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, which bears the signs of the greatest antiquity, reference to which we find in the works of the oldest ecclesiastical writers, for instance in Sosomenos. However, at present this Liturgy is sung by the Romans only once a year, on Good Friday. But still it is performed. And its origin is doubtlessly in the East. And so in this case, the borrowing and—what is more—the agreement of St. Gregory with the Universal Church are indisputable and obvious. Therefore honoring the authors of the two other Liturgies, St. Basil the Great, and St. John Chrysostom, the Church deemed it fit to honor St. Gregory also, who acknowledged the importance of this Third Liturgy, showing his respect for the ancient institutions of the Universal Church.

We have no foundation to ascribe it completely to this prelate, but according to Church tradition it ought to be connected with his name. His introducing the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, in spite of the resistance of the Latin clergy was quite occasion enough for stamping his name on the Liturgy. Hence, the name of St. Gregory becoming for all future attached to the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.

This explanation shows both how considerable was the intercourse between the two halves of the Church in the VIth century, and how important were the borrowings of the Roman Catholics of our day, in all that concerns Divine service and ecclesiastical practices in general.

Moreover, the Orthodox Church owes its profound reverence to St. Gregory, in his capacity of an upholder of perfectly orthodox theories. And it is a subject of profound astonishment, on our part, to see how readily the Roman Church contradicts facts, conferring the title of defenders on those even who went against it.

In one of his dialogues, from which St. Gregory I got his appellation, this prelate states without any hesitation: "It is known that the Holy Ghost descends from the Father and rests in the Son." A sufficiently clear statement.

However, later on Latin editors have changed these words to make them have a meaning conform with their own erratic teaching, disfiguring completely their very sense. But the hapless correctors overlooked the fact, that a century after St. Gregory's time, his dialogues were translated into correct Greek. The Latin original had been tampered with, but the Greek translation preserves the passage exactly as it came from the pen of the prelate.

And here is another astonishing point! Though in Greek this passage was perfectly intelligible, consistent and noble, the Latin biographers of St. Gregory insist that the Greeks have spoiled the true reading of the dialogues. Yet the translator was no other than the Roman bishop Zacharias, who could have no possible object in distorting the words of St. Gregory. The obvious conclusion is, that the Latin original contained once upon a time the passage as it now stands in Greek.

In another work of his, commenting on the

Book of Job, St. Gregory writes: "The Holy Ghost is ever ready tenderly to hasten to help our weak understandings, descending from the Father and also absorbing that which belongs to the Son."

Needless to say that in this the agreement of the Holy Father with Gospels and the Orthodox Church is perfect.

It is a fact, that St. Gregory can not be accepted as a great dogmatist. Yet in his interpretation of the descent of our Lord Jesus Christ in hell we could not find any reference whatever to the later Latin dogmas of the two hells.

It is also worthy of note, that the same Holy Father advises his flock to honor no carvings (which came into use among the Latins later on), but the painted picture images, the exact Icons of the Greeks.

That it never entered his thought to demand any supremacy for the Bishop of Rome over the whole Church, as a religious dogma, is sufficiently proved by the following passage from a dialogue of his: "The ignorance, which, in certain passages of the Holy Scriptures, is shown by Jesus Christ must be accounted for not by the fact that in Him is the Head, but by His Body, which is composed of all of us." That is not excepting the Pope who speaks.

St. Gregory was far from claiming any sort of infallibility for his religious work. At the time of his consecration to the cathedra of Rome, this prelate speaks without any cavil of his own opinion, that it is against justice for him to hold any spiritual authority as well as any lay power. This

alone shows the perfectly orthodox attitude of this prelate. And is not it wonder ^{ful}, that, in the same homily, *he asks all the patriarchs of the East to help him with their prayers, that he might commit no sin in the exercise of his service.*

Adding this to some other features of his preaching, we cannot miss seeing that in the person of this prelate we behold the same rule of faith and example of gentleness, as in the other prelates of the Universal Church.

These are the indubitable and perfectly obvious qualities for which the Holy Eastern Church honors him as a saint. But it is a fact, which is worthy of every consideration, that, if we examine closely the personality of St. Gregory, we cannot help noticing, that the cause of our reverence for him is exactly in those features, in which he is the most unlike the characteristics of the more recent successors to the bishopric Rome.

And, therefore, to accuse the Orthodox Church of inconsistency in the matter of its honoring Pope Gregory I is to show ignorance of the true state of affairs.

As to the fact, that history claims St. Gregory as the person who started the growth of the Roman episcopacy to the disadvantage of all the other churches in Western Europe, it must be stated, that the Orthodox Church never gave its sanction to any act of this Pope, which tended towards uncanonical developments. But we also must keep in mind, that, in St. Gregory's time, the claims of the Roman bishop to the supremacy in his own patriarchate, had not as yet reached to the full of its

uncanonical growth. And Gregory I demanded from the western bishops only that, which was granted to him by the First and Third Ecumenical Councils. And, though his relations with the Emperors of Byzantium show a trace of civic disobedience, this was not always the result of the personal characteristics of this Pope, but of the general tendency of national opinion on one side, and, on the other, of the personal disposition of the Emperors themselves.

When St. Gregory protested against the title of "Universal", which Emperor Justinian granted to the archbishops of Constantinople, his grounds for the protest were not canonical and still less dogmatic, but purely moral; in this title St. Gregory saw a display of the spirit of pride, to which a true disciple of Christ ought to remain a stranger.

Unfortunately, we can perceive in this protest the germ of the decline of the Western Church towards the material understanding of the church unity, which became fully manifested only later. But still, in the protest itself there is more mutual misunderstanding, than deliberate injustice.

Therefore, the personal activity of St. Gregory, his private life, his confession of faith and his attitude towards the Universal Church, all fully free the Eastern Orthodox Church from the reproach of inconsistency, when it honors this prelate with the title of a Holy Father of the Church.

June, 1907.

A DISTINCTIVE TEST FOR ORTHODOXY AND NON-ORTHODOXY.

At times it is difficult for a missionary of the Holy Orthodox Church to express himself concerning the question as to what it is exactly, that is the distinctive peculiarity of participation in the true Church. Many people are in the habit of pointing to the "Orthodoxy" of the religious dogmas. If, they say, the belief is without any admixture, if it contains no later, evidently thought out human adjustments, it is correct, true in harmony with the apostolic faith. But if the confession contains additions, changes and distortions, it is clear that such a belief is not Orthodox.

But it has been pointed out to us that, even amongst the Lutherans of orthodox leanings, as the Old Catholics, and the Episcopalians of the High Church party, who agree with the Old Catholics in very many things, all our dogmas are acknowledged to be true, and accepted with an easy conscience. Therefore the distinction between Orthodox and non-Orthodox must not be sought in a correct confession of faith. It would seem as if it were possible to remain Orthodox outside Orthodoxy.

And in most cases this is exactly the opinion of Christians who have separated themselves from

the Western Latin Church, and seek union with the Eastern Greek Catholic Church. In their view, it seems entirely unnecessary to comply with the demand of the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church that they should enter into its communion by the very act; that is, by the way of the Church rite.

Neither would reference to the holiness of the ideals of life, contained in the Orthodox Church, to the spirit of self-abnegation expressed more conspicuously in the attitude towards life of the pastors of the Eastern Church, such as we sometimes make, be a very clear criterion; the achievement of self-abnegation is rather a gift of nature than a custom of the Church. At any rate, this achievement manifests itself in various forms among the Christians of the West, and even among non-Christians. Lastly, reference to the achievement of self-abnegation as a characteristic feature of an Orthodox missionary is not always possible, because that quality might not be possessed by that very missionary at its highest.

We are compelled to say that the difference between Orthodoxy and non-Orthodoxy is to be sought in forms and aspects which, in the first place, are more general, and, in the second place, are more palpably evident. And in looking for these more general and more palpable signs of distinction between the Orthodox faith and the non-Orthodox, we are compelled to turn to the very life of the Orthodox Church, at work in the world almost for the last twenty centuries.

It is certain that in practice the distinctive

characteristic of an Orthodox person would be that, when seeking the surest way of saving his soul, he will turn, to secure life eternal by receiving the Holy Sacrament of partaking of the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, to no other than an Orthodox priest who performs the Sacrament of the Eucharist exactly according to the Orthodox rite and the Orthodox canon.

People do dispute concerning the meaning of the rite. But it is evident that whereas a dogma, as something abstract, grasped by the mind, evades the touch, and again, as moral life is something fluid, the significance of which can be caught only by the heart and by feeling, so it is only in a rite which is completed and penetrated with thought and feeling, that these can be seen and understood. Applying this indubitable proposition to the question under consideration, we may say that it is so only the more because Orthodoxy and non-Orthodoxy can be distinguished only by the way in which confession celebrates the Eucharist. We mean the final judgment concerning the truth of the confession.

We are confirmed in the position we have taken by the fact that every confession, in departing more or less from the true faith (and life at the same time, of course), marks its theoretical departure from Orthodoxy (or its approach to it), by changes in the rite of the Eucharist. As a matter of fact, no information has been handed down to us as to the way in which the Eucharist was performed by the ancient followers of Arius, but the Nestorians (at present in Persia) for some reason

begin it not with wine but with water; the Jacobites (Monophysites) use leavened bread for the liturgy with a mixture of oil and salt, freshly baked; the Roman Catholics have introduced unleavened bread, and do not admit laymen to the holy cup; unleavened bread is used by the Episcopalians, and so on, and so on. In short, it would seem that, according to some unwritten but immutable law, theoretical peculiarities of confession are sure, sooner or later, to reflect themselves upon the rite of Eucharist. And, *vice versa*, whenever (as among the Bohemians, for instance), the original type of Communion with leavened bread and wine begins to be restored, there also begins a theoretical approach to Orthodoxy.

Then what is the chief point of all this? Doubtless, it is the fact that, with the change of dogma, there follows a different idea of the order of the Church of God, and the change of this central canonical point becomes manifest in the cultural part of the confession in this or that method of performing accepted rites, and, among them, in changing the Sacrament of Sacraments, the rite of the Holy Eucharist.

Possessing, thus, a positive and clear test for the recognition of Orthodoxy and non-Orthodoxy in the rite of Communion, we may use it to recognise, with sufficient circumspection and exactitude, the nearness of the various Christian confessions to truth.

In the centre of humanity, renovated by our Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, there will stand the confession which preaches His un-

doubted presence in the Sacrament of partaking of His Body and Blood. In other words the Church of God lives and is the pillar and foundation of truth. Within this Church no member is deprived of the participation in the only Bread of Life: all partake of the One. The better preserved the apostolically established order of the Communion is, the more truly a member partakes of the Body of Christ—the Church of Him who is the very Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ. The commandments “this is my Body” and “this is my Blood” if carried out with precision can be further applied to “take and eat” and “drink of it all.” No one is deprived of the Body and Blood; the Bread and Wine have the appearance of the Body and Blood; the very method of partaking of the one Body by means of breaking bread and of the one Cup by means of drinking are preserved in the method of the Lord’s Last Supper. The integrity of this fundamental and central Sacrament, which is the greatest of all will lead to the integrity of the other Sacraments performed in the image of the same source and accomplishment of our faith, the Lord Jesus Christ. Baptism will be performed through immersion, Chrismation will be performed immediately after it, as the image of Christ being filled with the Holy Ghost immediately on His Baptism; Confession will be performed in the image of God’s forgiveness of sins; Matrimony—in the image of Christ’s union with the Church; the Holy Orders, in the image of the fulness of grace; Consecration of Oil will be performed for imparting strength to the weak body and soul.

Such are the rite and the order of the Church among the Orthodox of the Eastern Greek Catholic Confession. It is noteworthy that we very readily accept the possibility of salvation and feel the nearness to Orthodoxy wherever the rites of these Sacraments remain in their integrity, the corruption of the apostolic tradition not having as yet touched the rite of the sacraments and the Holy Eucharist, the chief among them; we do so, even though the Christians of such confession were endangered by their connection with a doctrine and a community which are unorthodox beyond any doubt. As an example we may refer to our brother Slavs who entered by the power of circumstances into a union with Rome. The Roman dogma loses its power to penetrate or rather it is made harmless when the salutary grace is administered in the form of the Eastern liturgy, though it be administered by priests ordained in Rome. We can make this clearer by the following illustration. Imagine that a pure spring of water was made harmful by some poisonous admixture about which there could be no doubt; yet that a part of the stream flowing from this spring had found a sandy bed possessing the power to absorb and destroy the poisonous elements: thus those who drink of it might quench their thirst to the benefit of their health, though not entirely without some risk of absorbing a particle of poison. Therefore, the use of that particular branch of the stream would be somewhat dangerous, but not altogether fatal.

There is a central group of Christians in which takes place the true renovation and consecration

of humanity, in which man turns directly to the source of grace, to his Saviour, in which, therefore, the truth of religion must be purer and moral life higher, which endures forever, and in which are to be found the true disciples of Christ; but outside of this central group, yet touching the only true and salutary Orthodox Church, there stand other groups, in which the Eucharist affords no complete union with the Lord Jesus Christ, which is shown by their defective rite of the Eucharist, differing from the apostolic rite, which came down to us from antiquity. Deflections and even distortions of dogma are confirmed by peculiarities in the ritual of Divine Services, as well as by a certain dullness of morals; from all of which it follows that the latter groups can have no communion of the Body and Blood of our Lord with the central group. The Eucharist of these non-Orthodox communities have no leavened bread of life and no communion in the cup; their rite of Baptism in attenuated to a mere sprinkling with water, which is but a feeble image of the Saviour's immersion in the Jordan and His being buried in a tomb; in the Eucharist and the Chrismation (confirmation) the flow of the Holy Spirit's grace is weakened because of the use of the dry unleavened bread and the postponement of the reception of the life-giving force of the Holy Spirit to a more mature age; in Penance, sin and punishment have come to be measured by human measures; in the Holy Orders, the superior grades consider these inferior grades as insufficient conductors of grace; Matrimony is concerned only with the physical union suddenly filled the whole church. It grew stronger

of sexes; the quickening and restorative power is removed from the Consecration of Oil also. In short, if we translate all this into the language of images, we behold before us an old tree still mighty in its built but which is doomed to destruction. It is a wild tree of many branches; it still has bark, leaves, sap and even fruit, but the process of destruction is mightier in it than the process of growth. The pith of the tree is so hard that the sap circulating in it can hardly reach the ends of the branches, and for lack of the life-giving fluid, the fruits have the appearance of health, but no nourishment and no flavour.

This is the second concentric circle of Christianity, which is outside of the first.

In the first is the Church of Christ, in the second its mere semblance. Many are deceived by this semblance, especially those who are ignorant of the true Church.

In the one there is grace; in the other chiefly the outward forms of good life and true rite, lingering since the time when they still lived in grace, but even these are changed and distorted.

In the one everything is within, in so far as the power of man's spirit is directed to the renovation of hearts and souls, to the uniting of man with Christ and bringing him into unison with the angels and all the saints of God. In the other much that is merely for display, the power of man's spirit straining to improve the human "worldly world" and to subject man himself to the visible, the obvious, to him, we may say, who occupies the place of our Lord Jesus Christ; the greatest effort goes

to the uniting of many a member of society, with the visible head of the Church, in this terrestrial life of ours.

The material union of men with the man pope obscures the inner vital and spiritual union of man, member of the Body of Christ, with the man God, draining the life out of it and annulling it.

We would be led too far if we at present examined some Christian communities of Eastern origin, which, by separating themselves from the central group of Christians, by changing belief, changed the rite of the Eucharist, as for instance the Copts, the Jacobites, the Armenians and others. Yet does not it agree with our criterion, that the Armenian monophysites, for instance, do not use the leavened bread in the Sacraments of the Communion, but the unleavened, not wine diluted with water, but wine undiluted.

Christian communities, in which the faith of Christ has been shaken still more, in which the connection of individuals with society is still weaker, as well as the connection of man with the Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ, have the rite of the Eucharist so changed that we may say of all the features our Saviour established they have kept only the name.

Protestantism does not believe that the Church is the body of Christ, and lo! — the bread and wine of the Sacrament of Communion for them are merely either an "image" or a "reminder." With them it is not any more the communion with Christ that saves, not the blending with Him, not the partaking of Him for the reception of life everlasting,

but either "predestination," or "faith." With them the fulness of the seven Sacraments are dwindled to two or three. The ideals of life eternal are replaced by ideals of temporary prosperity, of study and preaching alone. Rationalistic tendencies prosper, but the divine worship in the heart is weakened. The ideals of religious life in the spirit of self-abnegation are almost extinct. The grace of God is either believed to act irresistibly, or it is altogether unnecessary, possessing in general no "clay" out of which to make a salve that the eyes of the blind should be cured and see.

This is the third concentric circle, removed still further from the central group than the second, which still has the outward image of the Church. Doctrines, calling themselves Christian but depending on the various systematizers of wrong thinking, after whom they are preferably named, could be compared to shrubs with their small stature, quickly blossoming and bearing no fruit. Of course, we know that this is not exact. But our choosing this comparison is somewhat justified by the easy quick growth of such shrubs and their short life.

What are we to say about communities, which formerly tainted with the wrong dogma in the bosom of the Latin Church, live now a separate life of their own, preserving the appearance of the Church and the true ritual and canonical order, but not very well satisfied with their life? We mean the Old Catholics, the Episcopalians and the recently appeared Mariavists.

It is evident that in them the connecting links

with Christ, though weakened in the Roman Church, were never broken completely; and in all cases when the withering process of the evolution of Latin dogma decreased, the opposite process was restored to life, the process of quickening, renovating and resurrecting of the Church as the Body of Christ, as well as of the union with Christ by means of the rightly reestablished rite of the Eucharist. Oh, that this returning process might be accomplished with power and regularity. The Orthodox cannot fail to feel in it an inevitable sign of self-denial and self-sacrificing activity. This process is guided beyond any doubt by the belief in that which is eternal and dwells on the other side of life and in the Providence of God. It is a good hungering and thirsting for salutary truth.

A spreading dead tree kills by its volume all other trees in its neighborhood even if these trees are well. But a living tree, preserving moisture in its roots and shedding no dead matter on its neighbours encourages good plants to grow all round it. Rome attracts the ancient heretical communities of the East: like is drawn by like. But in the West as in the East, Orthodoxy restores life to religious communities, which were nearly withered. The centripetal force, it would seem, is as active in the regions of religion as in any other part of the cosmos.

What is the condition of the people who have no faith in Christ? They are beyond the limit of the third concentric circle, they are still further from the life-restoring centre of human life—the incarnate Lord Jesus Christ. As yet they are not

even within the sphere of his attraction. Centuries will pass and the power of gravitation will move them mightily. The drawing towards God through the Lord Jesus Christ begun in Palestine one thousand nine hundred years ago is destined to attract them, whether by the dissipating force of Protestantism, the withering power of Rome, or the life-giving strength of Orthodoxy.

Life in these non-Christian communities, guided only by the instinctive sense of natural laws preserves the appearance of growth and fruit-bearing only to some extent. Yet, pale leaves, withered fruit and the lack of connection between quantity and quality point to the lack of vivifying healthy flower of the grace of God. Even moss is beautiful and rich at times, and weeds grow high and thick. But their beauty is not that beauty of vegetation of which one speaks with love and spontaneous and disinterested admiration.

And so, only the participation in the true Lord's Supper and the possibility of Communion in partaking of the one Body and one Blood of Christ can serve as an unmistakable sign of union with the Apostolic Church and a guarantee of the Orthodoxy of both dogma and life. Let God the Allmerciful so work that "all may be one," or in the words of St. Paul: "Let God be over all, in all and through all of us."

1913, February 25th,
Day of St. Alexis,
Metropolitan of Moscow.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHOIR.

The Editor gives me now a chance to record on these pages of "The Constructive," much beloved by me and eagerly propagandized in Russia, the attitude and views of the Orthodox Greek Eastern Church concerning Church Music. I confess I think it a very great honour; indeed, is it not a daring enterprise to speak, in a way, on behalf of a huge branch of the Church of Christ and, what is more, on a matter of principle? On the other hand, though the customs and rules, problems and objects in themselves have become an ancient heritage of our Church, we who call ourselves Orthodox are not in any great habit of theorizing about or of merely discussing them. In the words of Macarios the Great, later generations of Christians will be essentially different from the earlier in this, that the earlier knew what was necessary for the salvation of their souls, and acted accordingly without cavilling, while the later generations, nearer to the end of the world and the Second Advent, though knowing still better what is necessary for their salvation, will lack the impetus to realize what they think necessary. It would seem to me that, as far as I am concerned, my chances to be

among the latter are only the greater because I have to symatize and give expression exactly to that which was practically worked out and transmitted for our use by the former.

Yet in the present invitation of the Editor there is a certain feature which urges me *volens nolens* to take up my pen and try to do justice to a thing which briefly can be called The Church and the Choir. What, then, is this feature? It is that in spite of the great variety of the articles in this magazine, the Editor has already succeeded in sounding one beautiful sonorous and harmonious chord of many notes to the greater glory of God. The harmonizing of many elements, the bringing of parts which are different into accord with each other, the guiding of the singers, so that the lines of one group became a support, a continuation and an amplification for all the other groups, resolving the whole in a complete harmony—is not all this a purely musical problem? It is brought to my mind how majestic was the singing of the victorious hymn by those of “every nation and clime and country, who, having come victorious from the beast and from his image and from the number of his name, standing by the glassy sea, saving harps of gold, sing the song of the Lamb, saying: Great and marvellous are thy works, O Lord God Almighty” (Rev. 15:2—4). And it is not to be wondered at that, as the result of such harmonious confession of truth and unanimous participation in singing the praise of the Lord God the Almighty, “the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened” (Rev. 15:5)

and a new revelation was given of the wonderful manifestations of God’s providence concerning the world, until once more the glory of God became the gift to the temple.

The Orthodox Greek Eastern Church allows no instrumental music in its services. This is one of its oldest legacies and customs. It orders its children to praise the Lord by means of the music of human voices, by means of “intelligent” singing. In the words of the great Apostle: “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God” (Col. 3:15). “I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the understanding also” (Cor. 2:15). Accordingly our Church endeavors that everything, psalms included, should be for the common profit and mutual edification (Rom. 14:9), that even “he who occupies the room of the unlearned”, the uneducated, should be able to receive edification and to say “Amen” when the whole assembly gives thanks, signs and prophecies (I Cor. 14: 16, 17).

Let no one take it amiss in any way if I quote Nicholas V. Gogol who perhaps accidentally but in a highly artistic way described the effect instrumental music made on an Orthodox man:

“At this instant the majestic roar of the organ suddenly filled the whole church. It grew stronger and stronger. It spread, it changed into heavy thundering, and then as suddenly reducing itself

into a heavenly music, it soared high under the vault, tender tones sounding like singing girlish voices. Then once more it turned into voluminous roaring and thunder, and then all was silence. The thunder rolled on for a long time, vibrating under the vault, and Andrew wondered with open mouth at the majestic music.'*

*Taras Bulba, chap. 6

That's it exactly: wonder, even depression, caused by something one's soul cannot contain, even fright and humiliation, are created in men of our nation by these mighty thundering, by these tender and appealing chords of mechanism-made music. It would seem that it was not one soul speaking to another, not one individual appealing to another, but some all-embracing, dispassionate impersonal nature manifesting itself, allowing human beings to behold it, although it still remain far above the insignificant, the puny human life. In a way the impression made on a human being by the music of the organ or any instrumental music makes him go through the whole gradation of feelings recorded for us on the eternal pages of the Old Testament:

"And he said, Go forth and stand upon the mount before the Lord. And behold the Lord passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains and brake in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire: and after the fire

a still small voice. And it was so when Elijah heard it that he wrapped his face in his mantle and went out and stood in the entering of the cave" (I. Kings 11:19).

When listening to *Dies Irae* or the *Requiem* of Mozart our thought of itself turns to the above quotation. But whether it is like threatening thunder or charming in its gentleness, for this reason the very sound of this music is overpowering, so that it would seem that we are moved to ecstasy, gentle tears, repentance, torture, hope, and faith by some exterior power, almost violence. In modern operatic music these all-powerful inexorable harmonies work like the stabs of a sword on quivering hearts, so that we stand comatose or prostrate ourselves in an attempt not to be any more, to disappear into nothingness. The words of St. Paul sound true when he speaks to the Corinthians concerning their almost unconscious visits to idols for all their high culture, all their pride of refinement: "Ye know that ye were Gentiles carried away unto these dumb idols even as ye were led" (I Cor. 12: 2). This kind of being led is not admissible, in the opinion of the Christians of the Eastern Greek Catholic Church, even in its purest and most spiritualized and exalted form, when their church is concerned.

In the painting of its icons the Eastern Church avoids any too palpable naturalism. We shrink from the plastic imagery of our Lord's passion, for instance, admitting sculptured images only to a very limited degree. Similarly our Church legalizes in its music only certain means of drawing

man to God and a salutary faith in Christ. These means are purely human (Hosea 11: 4), peaceful, caressing, tentative and cautious, but never oppressive to the soul's liberty or self-consciousness (Isaiah 56: 7).

Some thirty years ago a young poet died in Russia—people said of tuberculosis, or was it, rather, that he was consumed by the fiery intensity of his inner life? With a Jewish father and a Russian mother, Sergius Nadson's emotional nature was so tense that it did not seem as if he could have survived in the common surroundings of common life. Upon his death he left some beautiful verses, greatly loved by the youth of Russia to this day. Here are a few lines of which bear rather directly upon our subject:

"It is not Him I pray whom hardly dares my soul
To name, confused and wondering.

To understand or grasp whom a barren quest
it were

Which silences and terrifies my mind;
Before whom stand I speechless, with sealed lips—
As naught I feel before Him.

"But there's another Presence, another who
draws me.

He has no kingly splendour, but scourge
and cross.

Mine is the God of sufferers, of bleeding wounds—
God-Man, God-Brother who comes to me from
Heaven.

Before His pain and his triumphant love
I bow my head and fervent is my prayer."

Another aspect of the same subject is well expressed by one more Russian poet, I mean the Grand Duke Constantine, a man of much achievement and culture. Highly polished rhythmic verses, singing of the beautiful and plastic side of Nature, found lasting favour in a broadcast way among all sorts and conditions of Russians. With all that, there was a much more serious side to his intellect and his religious nature. This is attested by the fact that in addition to his military duties he carried out for many years the obligations of the Chairman of the Academy of Sciences in Petrograd. He died at the beginning of the summer of 1915 of heart disease which took an acute form because of the many sorrows which the war brought to his family and to his country.

"Oh no! I can't believe that to the other side
the tomb

We carry no memories of life,
That death, ending forever sorrow and suffering
Will make us sleep the inert sleep of forgetfulness.

"Re-opened somewhere there beyond, shall our
eyes be blinded,

And our ears cease forever to hear?
Is our freed mind ne'er to preserve in the dark
night beyond the grave
The memories of what once used to be?

"Becoming conscious in the other world, can
Raphael forget the Sistine?
Can Shakespeare not remember Hamlet,
Or Mozart cease to love his Requiem?"

"It cannot be, no! no! All that is holy, beautiful,
We shall live again, having said good-bye
to life.

Oh, no! we shan't not forget, but in a purer
passionless way

We shall love again, blending with God."

This poem, written in the anguish of doubting whether any works of human genius, in colour, in marble, or in sound, can penetrate the brighter life beyond the grave, indicates in a lyrical and plastic way a sensation with which every introspective writer is familiar. Once more it makes clear that the soul of an Orthodox Russian fears to imprison his thought, his feeling, or his consciousness within the limits of rigid forms, which, for all that they are lifeless, are still too plastic, too beautifully finished wholly to satisfy his craving. Russian longing can be satisfied not by the finished in art but by the sense of accessibility, the sense of ever growing nearer to that which is completed, which remains for ever and is therefore endless and eternally serene.

By saying all this we doubtlessly transmit into the region of faith, the mood of expectancy which transforms for us the Nicene Creed into a majestic melody ever calling forth admiration but never satiety. This melody we sing, for in the words of St. Paul (Heb. 13:14): "Here have we no continuing city, but we seek the city which is to come." In spite of the opinion of Professor M. Tareeff, a very profound and ponderous theologian, that no poetry is to be sought for in an ab-

stract building up of dogmas in which every line, every word, is an idea appealing to the mind but by no means able to affect human feeling in any direct way, the Creed to us is the best of melodies, the supreme realization of faith victorious over unbelief, of truth over deceit, of hope over the despair and depression coming from the vanities of life close around us (I John 5: 19).

Then what is it we look for in the real? What is it that we are always willing to listen to in music? Is it the continuity of life that we treasure in both? We have life in order that we should continue to be alive. The victory of life over death, this is our lasting, our undying joy, our joy that cannot die. "Christ has risen." In this short announcement there is so much joy, serenity, radiance and light, so much spiritual sun, that we repeat it countless, millions of times with the same strength, the same enthusiasm and gladness. "It's the Day of Resurrection. Let us be brighter, oh men! Easter, it is the Lord's Easter! From death to life and from earth to heaven Christ-God has led us. So let us sing victoriously" (Irmos of the First Song of the Paschal Canon). The singing of this chant is closely associated for us with the first fresh breeze of spring, the first songs of birds, the new abundance of sunlight, the tender green of the trees and the grass, new space around us, new heights and new depths. But none of these are as effective in making us spiritually glad the song which with a joyous daring we sing at the end of the Paschal Canon: "O the greatest, the most holy Passover! Thou who art Christ,

the Wisdom, the Word of God, and the Power! Grant to us to partake of Thee in a truer way in the Day of Thy Kingdom, the Day which hath no evening" (Ninth Song of the same Paschal Canon). The joy we have in this song, announcing to us the coming of the endless dwelling with the most gentle Jesus, is so great that before it darken even such songs as "Many Years", in which we wish long life to those whom we honour and love. Such a wish of long life, is it not merely a condition which enables us better to confirm ourselves in the hope of our future endless dwelling with our Lord Jesus in the life to come (I Thes. 4: 17)? That this is a correct interpretation is proved by the willingness with which we listen to another song on the same subject of life eternal, a song which we sing solemnly and gravely, in which we wish "eternal memory" to our dead. Everything passes, everything that is shallow, that is superficial, earthly, vain, commonplace or insignificant. For our life beyond the tomb nothing remains but that which is deathless. But with whom does it remain? Whither does it go? Where does it rest after its heavy labours? With Him Who alone is All-Mercyful (Rev. 14: 13). Let Him receive them who have died in the Lord as He received them when they still lived on earth before Him, "for whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's (Rom. 14: 8). Lord God, grant to those who passed away" "eternal memory" in His light!

The great value of church singing is exactly

in this, that it relieves man's soul from the oppression of sorrow. When it is perfectly intelligible it easily affords an escape to the scum life deposits in our hearts. Evil is inevitable, though the soul shuns it. Small cares that our bodies should be comfortable have too much power over us, and the spirit of man is weighed down by them. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4: 4). And lo! an harmonious chord is sounded, intelligible to us. Our souls hear "the word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Our daring increases, our hope revives, the wished-for escape from a condition of depression is found. Impenetrable gloom spreads over our past—yet "Open the doors of repentance to me, O Life-Giver" (Prayer sung during Lent). Mean was the condition into which we had fallen—"Yet Thou, O Lord, be generous to me" (Penitential Canon of St. Andrew of Crete).

The weapons of logical reasoning or of the most eloquent words, do not touch sides of our spiritual nature which need a breaking away, an impetus towards motion and a change. In the words of Alexander Pushkin: "But at the lightest touch of the divine word on my sensitive hearing, my soul will shudder and soar up like a startled eagle."

It is often pointed out to us that our Russian music is too sad. That sadness is also preponderant in the singing of the Eastern Church. And indeed in the Orthodox Church there are almost twice as many chants of sorrow and repentance as chants of joy. It is true that it is a great satisfaction for

us to listen to the chants of the Passion Week and especially those of Good Friday. They are sung in the so-called Bulgarian mode, though it would be more accurate to say the Servian. These chants are: "To Thee Who art clad with light as with a garment", "The fair Joseph", "Come, let us glorify Joseph the ever-to-be-remembered", and others. The daring rapidity of the changing moods in the chants touch our emotions, moving us to pity or joy, and reconciling us. It would seem that in these chants piety entered in perfect blend. It is true they are sorrowful, yet this sorrow is not of oppression but of regret that we are still so far from the ideal, from holiness and divinity. The consciousness of our sinfulness blends with the longing to become one with our Saviour, suffering now for us. Yet the whole reconciliation has been granted to us, and so the final chord sounds solemn and triumphant. Needless to say that Slavonic psychology has to a considerable degree affected vocal music in the Eastern Church. The Orthodox Church has never at any time suppressed national differences. All that was asked was that the spiritual idea of this or that community, or of a whole nation, should be truly exalted. Under this condition only, any composition of any artist may be admitted into the cycle of chants accepted by the Church. This is why, having mentioned the Bulgarian, or rather ancient Servian chants, we must mention the Greek. The Orthodox Church uses these latter chants throughout all the divine services of Easter. Their simplicity, their easy grace and rhythm charm the listeners. So light, joyous

and lively are the recitatives that the ear assimilates them without any difficulty whatever. In the Greek chants the joyous chords, lightly hurrying forward, remind the listeners of a bright blue sea and the incessant motion of its waves.

Side by side with these stand local chants, among which the chant of Kieff occupies the first place in the prayers for the dead, the services and liturgy of Lent. He who has heard the "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, teach me thy statutes" of the mortuary service, or "The Bridergoom cometh at midnight", has certainly realized both the anguish of a soul which has wandered away from its divine Shepherd and the relief of a tired navigator who has at last entered the haven. Another local chant is called after an unknown singer whose name was Hierasimos. The Ambrosian hymn, "We praise thee O Lord", and others, belong to that class of chanting. We may also mention the Ipatieff chant and that of the Lavra of Kieff, called after the monasteries which use them.

But the predominant character of chanting is the famous eight-part singing which was introduced by St. John Damascene in the ninth century. It is in general use throughout all the Orthodox and even the non-Orthodox East. The regular uniformity and the resolving of the many melodies to the definite eight is borrowed from the music of ancient Greece. This would almost seem to be the dogmatical part of singing in the Orthodox Church. The whole order of its divine services rests on these chants, which are generally rhythmical and simple. At times they are strong and

broad as in the first chant, or vigilant as in the eighth. They are tender and beseeching as in the second or the fifth. The ancient Doric, Ionic, Phrygian and Lydian melodies with their derivatives are distributed according to voices, so that the first voice corresponds to the fifth, the second to the sixth, the third to the seventh, and the fourth to the eighth. The confident simplicity of the third corresponds to the gentle softness and music of the seventh. The calm gravity of the melodies of the fourth voice is supported by the alertness and sweetness of the eighth. Then the sixth is more direct and more soul-reaching.

The Greeks in working out the patterns of church singing reached the highest point of their musical genius. But the Slavonic nature could not be limited by this norm altogether. Perhaps in no respect does there exist a more graphic instance of the difference between the Slavonic spirit and the Greek, the Byzantine, than precisely in church singing. The Greeks like complete unison, but the Slavs admit singing second and also the harmonious singing of many voices. The former give us regularly alternating rhythms. With the latter, lack of symmetry is predominant. Of course unity is preserved in Russian Church music, but this unity admits of so much diversity in details that it will be preserved only in the fundamental tones. To illustrate my idea in architecture, let me mention the cathedral of St. Basil the Blissful in Moscow; and in music, the arrangement of the Kieff chant, "Glory be to God on High". Consequently the Russian Church is continually creative in its

music, whereas it would seem that the creativeness of the Greek Church in that region is never heard of.

Creativeness is not only allowed by our Church, but encouraged. At present we have a great number of fine church composers. The Holy Synod monthly examines and approves for use in church choirs scores of musical works. We have only to name Rimsky-Korsakoff, Archangelsky, Kastalsky, Fateef, Rakhmanioff, and others, to demonstrate the breadth of view of the Russian Church in the use of new compositions.

However, we should mention that not every one of these new religious compositions can be accepted for general use. Some of the composers are far too subjective to be able to express the essence of the faith of the people to whose community they belong. The Orthodox people highly appreciate the religious compositions of P. I. Tschaikovsky. The music he wrote, in 1879, for the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, though forbidden for the use of churches, was sung everywhere as soon as it was published by many choirs, beginning with the Imperial Capella. His music for the all-night vigil, in which the famous Russian composer experimented with the harmonization of ancient melodies, is also very important. Anton Rubinsten can be numbered among religious composers though he hardly ever touched church music. His "Moses", "Christ", "Paradise Lost", and "The Tower of Babel" could not possibly be included among the habitual chants of the Orthodox people. The example of these two greatest

Russian composers clearly demonstrates that the only compositions in which the Russian people recognizes the expression of its belief and its ideal, the invisible ideal dwelling in the collective consciousness of the Orthodox Church,—a perfectly objective expression which finds a simile in the Orthodox icon—can become the property of the people indivisibly and for all time.

Here is a pretty illustration of what I have tried to say above. In 1911, the Choral Society of Pskoff gave a musical celebration in their town. The festival continued for two days. A huge choir composed of a great number of village choirs sang first; then separate choirs began to sing. There was a very large audience, but it seemed that every one missed something, though the programme in its secular part was both serious and very carefully composed of pieces belonging to operatic music, and in its ecclesiastical part contained many complicated and difficult works. Then there came on the platform the choir from the village of Churki. They walked hesitatingly. They did not know enough to stand in a semi-circle. They just crowded one against the other like a flock of astonished sheep; frank grey and blue eyes, sunburnt faces, flanked by the choirmaster, the village school teacher. Their choir sang only the very simple pieces accessible for any choir: "I open my lips and announce Thy glory" to an ancient tune of their city. And the listeneres were actually moved to tears. With the thin trebles of small boys and only two or three tenors and basses, the singing was hardly audible, but silence reigned complete; ten thousand

human beings crowded together stood motionless and noiseless. It was the vibrating, almost conscious silence that made men aware that every one felt the inspiration, that they were at one with the choir in its true art. The singing brought images of poor parish churches which each of the listeners had known and loved, memories of their past prayers. People recognized in this singing religion; no consciously assumed transitory mood, but an even and bright burning of the spirit before God. People listened delightedly when this choir sang, their voices penetrated with true faith, such chants as "And I shall appear luminously triumphant and shall sing in my joy Her (the Virgin's) miracles." And so the small choir of a poor country parish gained everyone's attention, everyone's delighted appreciation. It sang many times later, and every time with the same result.

This certainly demonstrates that the true nature of religious singing expected and demanded by the Orthodox people must be strictly objective, well able to afford free soaring to their prayerful mood. First of all, it is necessary that such singing evoke in the listeners the desire to praise God, to bow down before His greatness, that the soul should long to soar into sacred regions which fervently desired to reach yet could not. It is necessary that such singing, even if it be deprived of majesty or any great art, should be the expression of the collective feeling of the whole Church, that it should be at one with the beliefs and sympathies of the people for whom it is designed. It is necessary that it should be the outcome of communion of

faith, the result of contact with other souls moved by the same religious consciousness, that it should give us that which is our own, shared with all our kindred, but at the same time shared by all humanity—that it should be universal. Only then will church singing be able to affect our souls, pouring into them faith, hope and charity, peace, trust and light.

Even the people who are not Orthodox are impressed exactly in this way by some of the simplest of our prayer tunes, for instance, the habitual Lord's Prayer or "Lord, save Thy people", or "Take me under Thy shelter, Virgin Mother of God", and many others. These religious hymns are as deeply rooted in the Orthodox, occupy as broad a place, as the national hymn "God save the Tsar". When the personal creations of individual composers come near, in their quality, to the widely spread and accessible expressions of the common profound religious consciousness, they easily take their place in the catalogues of choral music and begin to be sung in churches everywhere throughout Russia.

Once such a demand exists, it becomes clear why instrumental music does not satisfy the Orthodox believers. It is far too complicated. It becomes also clear why oratorios and religious operas never became generally approved. They are too subjective and too far-fetched. Incidentally it also becomes clear why it is unimportant whether the church choir has many varied parts or sings in unison, whether the choir has fine octavists and soloists, whether it is a mixed choir, or a choir in

which only men and boys sing—all that is really important is that the praise of the Lord God should be intelligent, human, direct and sincere. It also explains why Orthodox Christians are perfectly able to love and treasure and deem holy even such melodies as were originated by the non-Orthodox West and which have been developed on the subjective foundations of religious creation alien to Orthodox. If a Western composer has been lifted up by the power of his personal genius to the highest sphere of artistic composition, on reaching which—be it only for a moment—has ceased to be merely a Western Christian and become just a Christian, the work that has come from him gives a solution of the most exact and sublime problems of church music. In the West there exist religious compositions which fill Orthodox Christians with true religious elation, as there are buildings raised by truly believing architects of the West, on entering which the Orthodox will cross themselves as in one of their own churches. Natural precious ties attach Raphael's Madonna to the hearts of the Orthodox, as some of the great mediaeval cathedrals of the West including the demolished cathedral of Rheims are to them most precious and intelligible.

In 1843, Philaretos the Metropolitan of Moscow wrote with regard to a new movement among the painters of the ancient city: "To wishes of good success I join the wish that their art should have a national tendency, and in particular, that painting should tend towards the character of ancient sacred painting. The icon is the beginning and end of Christian painting which insists that art should

worthily supply the needs of the Orthodox Church in Russia." The wish of the saintly prelate came to be realized: Vasnetzoff, Nesteroff, and other Russian painters began long ago to use their skill and their inspiration in the region of truly artistic icon painting. By reason of the pure affinity between the arts, in the region of music the church chants have grown to be both the beginning and the supreme end of vocal composition in general.

For this reason the love of Russian church music, the growth of which we see of late in America and in England, makes all the truly Orthodox so truly glad. In this appreciation and the desire to learn more of our divine services we see the gage of kinship, even of the unity, of all Christian souls in which the One Christ should reign supreme, on the foundation of our common longing and the grave.

1916.

ORTHODOX RITUAL IN THE DIVINE SERVICE OF THE WEST.

Though it is customary to speak of the differences between the fragments of once united Christendom, it would be unjust to say that the differences between Christians of different confessions have altogether swallowed up the oneness of their original foundation. The names of the Lord Jesus and the Virgin Mary, of the Holy City, of Zion, of Golgotha, and the like, are truly sacred for every Christian of whatever denomination and in all countries. The fundamental dogmas are so fervently guarded in all Christian lands that even in Berlin the police concern themselves with prohibiting the too realistic cinematograph illustrations of Klopstock's *Messiah*. The symbols of the cross, the chalice, the lamb, the dove, the star, and the monogram of Christ the Saviour are very widely in use among Christians, are understood by all and are piously preserved on church walls, windows, books, vestments and letters. And likewise certain minor details of the church ritual, evidently derived by modern Christians from the greatest antiquity, are preserved in separated Churches with a touching faithfulness to tradition.

We must not forget these details, for, though small they be, they awake the tenderest chords of brotherly love in our souls. It is true that as de-

tails these ritualistic traditions are not so highly valued and consequently are more likely to be lost, especially if it be the purpose of a definite system to destroy ancient tradition even in the externals of divine worship. But it would be unjust to disregard these details where they do exist. More than this, we should dwell on them with every attention, with a true tenderness in our hearts, discerning in them the proof of our former brotherhood. We are similarly impressed by the small things preserved from the remote days spent in the common shelter of our father's home. The brothers have moved away from each other along the tortuous paths of life. To all appearances they have nothing in common. Their everyday surroundings, their ways and manners are all marked by the difference of their present views and the problems of their lives. The brothers themselves cannot help acknowledging that the kinship between them has been almost removed into the region of the "unconscious." But lo! some little thing, a portrait, a letter, a breastpin, or some souvenir noticed by one brother in the house of the other, cause a true outburst of memories of the most vivid, the sweetest, the most heart-stirring images. The cold wall of indifference and estrangement between the brothers melts away, and gazing intently at each other under the influence of their resurrected familiar past, they suddenly recognize that they are brothers, dearest and most beloved.

And indeed, is it not gratifying to learn that as recently as a century or two ago in the West all the Churches were built with their altars towards

the East? How well this coincides with the custom of the whole Eastern Catholic Church. The Garden of Eden was in the East; our salvation was achieved in the East. The Lord giving life to everything is called the East in the Old Testament, or the dayspring from on High (Luke 1:78), or the Sun of Righteousness (Malachi 4:2). And, in the words of St. Basil the Great, antiquity commands us to "turn towards the East when praying as the Scripture taught us" (Rules, 30). Of course, this is but a detail. But taking into consideration that, contemplating the East, we all become nearer to each other, united in the centre of the motion of our hearts, this detail also becomes valuable.

Or let us consider some other details. Everywhere the dead are buried before sunset and the deceased is placed facing the East; reverence for holy water obtains even among the more conservative Protestants; pilgrimage to the Holy Land is the object of an almost ineradicable longing for Christians of all countries; and, as for minor detail, officiating in churches, people universally wear ample vestments. Is not all this characteristic? We need not even mention bowing our heads when in prayer, kneeling down, making the sign of the cross over the heads of the living and the dead, or merely moving our hands, kissing the Bible when it is read either in churches or homes, and taking the oath on the Holy Book, either the Gospels or the whole Bible.

The greatest difference between Christians consists in the fact that a great branch of them rejects the use of the holy images, which are called

icons by the Orthodox. But when we see in a Protestant church, on books and other things appealing to the religious sense of Christians, all kinds of symbols which immediately suggest Christ and His great work of redemption, we cannot help thinking of the edict of the so-called Seventh Ecumenical Council, so often condemned by the West. This edict means exactly the satisfying of the wish ever present in the hearts of human beings to have something close to them, something to remind them in an intimate and vivid way of that which they prize above everything in the world. Why are the images of the sphynx, the fish, the peacock and the anchor, in use among the Orthodox and the Roman Catholics as well as among the Protestants, though the character of this use varies among them; the two former seek a more palpable, a more vivid way of being reminded of the Lord, and consequently use icons and even statues; the latter restrain themselves, limiting the reminder to the bare symbols.

Of course, all these are mere details, yet by the use of them we Christians cannot fail to be distinguished from Jews or Buddhists, for instance, from non-Christian people. But should not these details be precious and sacred in our eyes, bringing us close to each other, even without our knowledge?

Some details, however, obviously testify to the descent of the rituals of different Churches from one common source. At the beginning Eastern preachers spread Christianity in the West. The ritual of the West also came from the East. Investigation shows a striking likeness between the

liturgies of Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt, and those of Gaul, Spain, Upper and Lower Italy, and Great Britain. Rome was a kind of island in the middle of the general transmission of the Eastern heritage from one nation to another. Yet even the customary service of Rome was not exempt from borrowings from the Churches of the East, especially from the Church of Constantinople. The history of Pope Leo the Great shows this very clearly, as well as the activity of Gregory the Great.

Whence, if not from the East, these frequent repetitions of *Hallelujah*, *Hosannah*, and *Amen*? Are not the *Kyrie Eleison*, the *Christe Eleison* and even the custom of saying the prayer *Holy God* in Greek in the Roman services on Good Friday from the same source? And does it not sound familiar to the ears of the Christians of the East when in the most central passage of the prayers for the faithful children of the Church the Roman Catholic service book establishes that Roman Catholic priests should apply to them no other name but that of "Orthodox Christians"? Roman theologians may endeavour to interpret this passage as referring to the Christians of Greece, Russia and other countries of the East who are out of communion with the See of Rome, but an unprejudiced reader sees clearly that the composer of the Roman Liturgy applied the word "Orthodox" to none other than the actual members of his own Roman Church.*

* *History of the Mass and Its Ceremonies in the Eastern and the Western Church*, by Rev. John O'Brien, 15th Edition, pp. 303-304.

It can even be said in some instances that the Eastern imprint on the divine services was better preserved in the West than in the East. For example, the Roman custom of sprinkling ashes on people's heads at the beginning of Lent, what a hoary, patriarchal tradition of the East stamps this custom, like a whiff of the times of Jeremiah, the mourner of antiquity. Or the Passion Week singing of verses from the same prophet after the Hebrew alphabet—*aleph, beth, gimel, dalet*, etc.; salt in the mouth of the baptized, according to the Roman rite, and the preservation of the Great Entrance at the liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts on the Good Friday, are equally remnants of Eastern customs, though Rome limits the use of the latter to a single day in the whole year.

In spite of the disapproval with which the representatives of Protentantism regard prayers for the dead, which are in such universal use in the East, one's soul is cheered by reading the following statement of Martin Luther:

"I am entirely convinced of the lawfulness of good words for the repose of the dead, of prayers and masses for them. The arguments of heretics are no proof to me, because already more than a thousand years ago St. Augustine prayed for his mother in his *Confession* and asked others to pray for her; and his righteous mother expressed the wish on her deathbed that she should be remembered at the altar of the Lord. St. Augustine testifies to the same concerning St. Ambrosius." It would seem that only the awakening religious sense developed in the West of Europe the fear to

display in the presence of brethren at a public service the inner motion of the loving soul, which is still on earth, towards another loving soul, which lives in the everlasting life with God in the regions beyond. We cannot understand otherwise the heart-stirring addition in the Lutheran Apology, Division 24, after the rejection of the Eucharistic Sacrifice: "*Scimus, veteres loqui de oratione pro mortuis, quam nos prohibemus.*"

In the Anglo-American Church there is no rule and no custom enjoining public prayer for the dead, though private prayer is not forbidden. Yet when I recall the almost mystical awe which spread over this country at the time so great a number of Christians perished on the unhappy "Titanic," I cannot but say in this case the fear and trembling before the all-powerful hand of the Lord could be best relieved in the most natural way, not by private isolated prayer of this or that person, but by the collective prayer of the faithful of the nation, in churches, for their brethren who perished in so tragic a manner.

I cannot find any corresponding passage in the American Evangelical prayer books, but I read the following prayer for humanity in the abbreviated prayer book of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, published in 1906 in the City of Moscow:

"I pray before Thy face for my fathers, confessors, teachers, children, brothers and sisters, friends and benefactors, who died blissfully in faith and are resting with Thee. If only my humble prayer is agreeable to Thee, for the sake of

Jesus Christ, transmit to them my gratitude and love, in as far as it is possible."

Here we go beyond the limits of ritual in our discussion, and express the conviction that there exists a common Christian basis, evident in itself, and at times lacking only adequate expression in order that the Orthodox should feel himself at home even in Protestant surroundings. On the other hand, doubtless, it seems that as the universal Christian feeling for the loved departed tries to seek an adequate expression it will find it possible, as did some communities in England, to make use of the ritual of the Orthodox Church and sing over the dead the Orthodox,—“With the saints, O Christ, give peace to the souls of thy departed servants,” and this without fearing the disapproval of the other members of their Church.

However, it is true that the modern practice of Christians of the West is far removed from the traditions of the East. But even the Roman Catholics, who try to adapt theories, in all the branches of their religious life, to justify certain of their beliefs and practices, are beginning to be penetrated by the consciousness of discrepancies between them and the Ancient Undivided Church, and, with it, between them and the Orthodox Church. All the Orthodox greatly rejoiced when the late Pope, Pius X, ordered that children should be brought to take the Holy Communion at as early an age as possible. To those used to the modern custom of sending children to their first Communion at the age of twelve to sixteen the order of the Archbishop of Rome sounded like a painful “innovation.” It

created great discontent in France and embarrassed the Latin clergy a good deal. Yet the return to the ancient Eastern ritual is quite obvious in this order. The papal decree that the readings from the Psalter should be increased in the Western Church was similarly a return to the custom of the past. To what extent this wish of the Pope has influenced the life of the people remains so far unknown.

A similarly natural return to the ritual of the Undivided Church and, therefore, to the practice of the East would be: the exchange of wafers for leavened bread; allowing all Christians equally to partake of the Holy Communion in both kinds; the introduction of married clergy; holding the Latin language not absolutely necessary for divine service; the exchange of instrumental music for vocal, and a few other changes.

Beyond any doubt “innovations” of this kind would be of the greatest benefit to Christians, helping to re-establish among them the consciousness of their indubitable kinship in blood and spirit. Yet it is certainly most important that the wished for return of the holy past should proceed under the guidance of exact investigations in the regions of Christian antiquity. Then only, the great alteration of the present in the name of the past would become intelligible to the greatest majority. On the other hand, it is perfectly necessary that the intellectual symbolical linings, so to speak, of divine service should be properly worked out. If the ideas towards which the consciousness and feeling of a Christian are reaching we expressed in the

simplest and most complete way in the early years of the rise and growth of the Church of Christ, it would be most unwise for us to diverge from the wealth of the church of ritualism of antiquity. It is equally important that the symbolism should proceed in harmony with the imagery of Holy Scripture.

May, 1914.

PROBLEMS OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN AMERICA.

Thirty or forty years ago North America heard but little about the Orthodox Church. This name was applied, as it still quite often is, to the Church of the Russian Empire and the four Eastern Patriarchates, with the Church of the United Kingdom of Greece. But in our days the idea of the *Eastern Church* must include the Church created in Japan by the labours of the late missionary Archbishop Nicholas, as well as the younger offshoot of the Orthodox Catholic Church which at present grows and increases on the hospitable soil of free America. As the statistics of this country now show the number of Orthodox people here to be 465,000, it is certainly worth while trying to learn what is the inner life of Christ's faithful in this religious group. It would not even be superfluous to make clear the relation in which this growing group stands towards other groups already thriving on the same soil of America. These questions are only the more interesting because in America the conditions of the life and expression of each of these groups are entirely different from their condition in the Old World.

The peculiar position occupied by Orthodoxy in America, shared by it, however, with other re-

ligious groups, is the fact that here it does not represent the supreme political power. Anglicanism is powerful in England to a considerable degree because there it is the religion of the sovereign power, of the more influential people of the country. The same can be said of Roman Catholicism in Austro-Hungary, and of Orthodoxy in Russia. But on the continent of North America the three confessions peacefully exist side by side, one city erecting three independent cathedrals, St. John's, St. Patrick's, and St. Nicholas', and the strength of each group, its specific gravity, so to speak, being measured, not by political influence of the people confessing it, but by the productiveness of each religious group in the ecclesiastical sense. In this respect we gladly adopt the point of view of the Honourable Seth Low, in an article published in "The Constructive Quarterly" in 1913 under the title *Christianity in the United States*. True enough, nowhere under the sun Christianity cut into more separate sections than in America. But at the same time in no other country do Christians of different denominations stand nearer to each other. The absence of political support makes all the Churches in America each others' equals, valued only according to the wealth of their inner contents; makes each of them, so to speak, worth only its real price. The absence of the possibility of predominance creates confidence towards each other. The habit of looking truth in the eyes makes people willing to acknowledge what is good, even in their opponents on the same arena. Hence their attitude is not very far from friendly intimacy, in accordance with the

saying: When you understand, you love. This is our first thesis.

The peculiarity of the position of Orthodoxy, as of all the other religious communities in America, is that, away from the constraint of historically acquired standards whose power is almost absolute in the Old World, and pressed by new conditions of existence, it has to manifest its constructive power, changing to some extent what formerly was its own, developing new properties and even absorbing some things from the outside, from the territories of religious denominations which, were it at home in the old country, it could consider only from the polemical point of view. Therefore in America each confession not only shows what is its real authentic essence but also its real qualifications for future existence among other confessions. It is stated, for instance, that the Roman Catholicism of America is in some ways already peculiarly different from the Roman Catholicism of Europe. It is also stated that there is a difference in the order of life of Episcopalians in England and in America. Actual life therefore confirms our second thesis.

The third peculiarity in the life of all existing American denominations is that they are forced by life itself not to stand aside from each other. Often the prosperity of one group creates in another the impulse to make efforts and to use its strength. In a certain sense it is true that in America church life largely depends on the spirit of competition displayed by Americans of different Christian denominations. The activity of the press

is so widely spreaded that for different religious groups isolated existence is impossible. The tendency towards publicity dominant in the country is felt even in the private life of every denomination. And it is no secret that none of them can conceal their good qualities which are verified and confirmed by everyday life. That Roman Catholicism stands above all others in religious discipline is indisputably acknowledged; the Episcopalians excel in the spirit of organization and self-government; the tenacity with which the Baptists carry on their propaganda wins the palm, and so on. It often happens that people change from one denomination into another for no theoretical reason but because the church life in their former group was not satisfactory to them and they think that matters are much better in the new group, which they accordingly join. As a consequence of this the leaders of every group do their best to preserve intact the good qualities they already possess and, at the same time, endeavour to acquire virtues in which other groups excel, so that they may at least not lose by comparison. Doubtless other peculiarities of a more special character could be found, but the characteristics here pointed out are the most general and, in a way, those that define further qualities.

The question we must consider now is: In what way do the above-mentioned general features of religious life in America affect the life of the Orthodox Church? It is interesting to establish what are the strong points of the Orthodox Church in America, independently of the political considera-

tions which may have supported it in Europe. It is important to know the direction which the manifestation of the creative power of this Church may and even must take in adapting itself to the conditions of its new surroundings. And, both for itself and the other denominations, it is altogether necessary to learn what sides of its life will be affected by contact with other denominations which experiences of their life it will repeat, or, perhaps, improve.

Thus we establish the problems of the Orthodox Church in North America.

In solving this question we first of all have to take note of the unity of the religious consciousness which members of the Orthodox Church bring with them to America quite independently of the part of the Old World from which they come. On the foundation of deeply rooted traditions, they do not, once in America, build anew in the region of faith, but merely continue to preserve that which they already had. Seeds preserved since the days of ancient Byzantium begin to sprout up in the soil of the New World. Principles of faith established by the Christian Church in the days of his undivided existence and upheld by the Seven Ecumenical Councils continue to lie unshaken at the foundation of the religious consciousness of the Orthodox when they come to America. The unity of the religious consciousness of the Orthodox is not affected by difference in nationality. More than this: the many tongues spoken by them, the great distances between the places of their birth in Europe, Asia and Africa, mark only the more strikingly their won-

derful unanimity in spirit and faith. In spite of the pronounced differences in their national characteristics, the unity of their Orthodoxy is strongly felt in the fact that quite independently of each other they import to the New World the sympathies and antipathies which all of them felt when they still lived in the Old World. In these they all agree most wonderfully. This feature is accompanied by another which is also very characteristic. This feature is the catholicity of Orthodoxy. Many members of the Orthodox Church step on American soil as such: Russians and Greeks, Serbians and Syrian Arabs, Bulgarians and Georgians from the Caucasus. The national features of every immigrant suffer no effacement whatever; yet in their faith they are one—they are Orthodox.

Their entire content with the spiritual treasure which came down to them from their remote ancestors and was so well preserved shows the manysidedness, the catholicity and the humanness of their faith, the Orthodoxy.

And outside any political support, taken in its essence and also in its practical expression, Orthodoxy in America shows itself to be a confession of Christian faith as it was in the times of the undivided Church, stamped with the character of general applicability to humanity, or the character of unconditional catholicity. In speaking thus we say nothing new but merely bring out that which would not be noticeable on a non-American soil where there exist influences, national, political and historically acquired, which would certainly dim its outlines and cause it to escape the attention of

the observer; whereas in America the general applicability of Orthodoxy is the foremost feature that we notice. And indeed, besides the above-mentioned nations, there are other Orthodox in America, the aborigines of Alaska, the Creoles, Aleutians, Alaskan Indians, Eskimos, as well as immigrants from countries as remote from each other as Macedonia, Persia and Japan. The statistics so far claim but 254 pure-blooded Americans in the Orthodox Church of America. Besides, on the island of Jamaica, there are some Orthodox negroes who came from Abissynia. This great number of nationalities confessing the Orthodox faith without any pressure from an exterior power denotes still more emphatically its catholicity.

To be sure, catholicity stamps as well other Christian confessions enumerated in America. Some of them even make a point of writing this feature on their banner as distinctively their own. But some others, as for instance, the followers of Dowie, who call themselves Universal Christians, merely attempt to mark what is their ultimate object by using this word, whereas for the time being their fundamental teaching is something quite different. The very life nerve of the followers of Dowie is their faith in the continuity even nowadays of the prophetic vision of what life really is and hence the ability to make it better. There are other groups in which we observe the same characteristic of catholicity because of their practical ways in the present without reference to their future object. However, we must confess that all these groups, though possessing the above-mentioned feature, are not

made especially distinctive by it as compared to others. They are marked much more visibly by features, historical and therefore partly local, in their origin or their original propaganda and establishment. To distinguish themselves from all these religious denominations the Orthodox of America have to add to their original title of Catholic Orthodox Christians the name of their own nation as well as of the nation through which they receive their Catholic Orthodoxy. This is the origin of the sometimes exceedingly lengthy names of Orthodox provinces in America. For instance, there exists a Russian Greek Catholic Orthodox Church and a Syrian Arab Greek Catholic Church. By adding to the name of Catholic Orthodox the word Greek the members of this Church intend to prevent the possibility of being suspected of bearing the historical stamp of another branch of Christendom, which in ancient days was centered in Rome and still continues to gravitate towards the local Church of this city and province of Italy. Another Church with the same character of catholicity and at the same time obviously with historical, ethnographical, and even geographical features, is the Church which is called Protestant Episcopal, though (merely from the point of view we have adopted in this article) it would be more correct to call it Anglican Catholic Protestant Episcopal. But, as I tried to mark above, the most characteristic point of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Episcopal Church, practically, is not in their historical and national traits, but in the whole order of their life: With Roman Catholicism it is

in the definitely worked out and rigorously applied demands of discipline in thought and action; and with the Episcopalians it is in the breadth and yet entire strictness of self-governing organizations.

Not for a moment should we forget, however, when making this comparison the respective sizes of the Churches under discussion. The Roman Catholic Church in America has almost forty times more members than the Orthodox, and the Episcopal Church almost three times more than the Orthodox. But what we are concerned with chiefly is the inner significance and the exterior expression of the idea of these religious denominations severally. This is why we have put aside the purely theoretical and the speculative qualities of each confession. We are discussing the matter of the exterior position of the Orthodox Church in America among other Christian Churches. Therefore comparison with the other Churches is not to be avoided. It is only the more necessary because the Orthodox Church has in the two above-mentioned branches of Catholic Christianity examples of the solution of questions which it also in its turn must necessarily solve.

The word catholicity doubtless has its origin in the centuries when, widening the limits of their land throughout the accessible regions of the earth, the Graeco-Roman rulers thought of themselves as the possessors of the "circle of the earth." Christianity, which filled the emptiness of this "circle of the earth" with the miraculous power which regenerated it for a new life, naturally inherited from the Graeco-Roman world this same designation of

its exterior character, and thus the designation of catholic came to be possessed by the Church partly by way of historical development, and still more by way of reference to the commandment of its Founder: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). Consequently the Christian Church comes out in history as a universal or catholic force whose activity is directed towards the spiritual possession of the universe. But though we retain the sense of the word catholicity, which means universality or being spread everywhere, we must not ignore its other significance which was adopted by the Christian Church because of the very formation of the word, "gathered from all." This meaning already found its realization in the life of the Church through the calling of the representatives of all the Christian world to come to special councils with the object of solving problems of faith, morality and church rule which concerned equally all the faithful of the Church. It is remarkable that the Christians of the Greek Catholic confession retain to this day rather the second significance of the word catholic, so that in their speech it is synonymous with "ecumenical", or having representatives from every part of the whole which is governed in its totality.

Being present in most countries is also a feature of Roman Catholicism to an important degree. Besides a very wide geographical region this Church includes in North America a good many nationalities. In addition to the descendants of the ancient Romans, Italians proper, the Roman Church in America includes the French, the Spanish, the Irish,

Germans to a certain degree; to a smaller degree the English, Poles, Hungarians, Bohemians, Slovaks, and many other European nationalities; some Indians, Negroes, and some white people born in America. On the other hand, the principle of universal rule, so graphically expressed in the periodical gatherings of the representatives of the whole Church in general debating and legislating assemblies, without any doubt has been realized in quite the best form in another branch of Christianity which has the right to be named catholic, I mean the Episcopal Church. Having all classes of the faithful represented at its conventions, this Church illustrates in our own days to quite an important degree the fact recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, when for the purpose of discussing the question of accepting heathens into the Church (Acts 15:22), "pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company."

We also must note the general way in which unity is manifested in catholicity, and also what is the instrument and exterior gauge of realized unity. We may say that no such question existed in the world of the undivided Church, because the whole mass of people making part of it spoke the Greek tongue by preference, which is confirmed by the fact that the books of the New Testament were written in this tongue, it being the more popular, the more democratic. In the meanwhile, in the Western part of the Church the Latin language struck deeper and deeper root, as the general conversational and ecclesiastical tongue. To this day

this language remains the autocratic sacred language of the people who received the Catholic faith through the Roman Church, and who remain in union or rather submission to it. As far as the faithful of this Church are concerned, it is exactly this language which is the most general sign of their belonging to Catholic Christianity. Under the banner of this language other names are lost and even become superfluous as far as nationality is concerned, whether it is the French, the German or the Spanish. Next after the oneness of belief and rule it may be said that the catholicity of the Roman Church is defined by the use of the sacred tongue of this Church, the Latin tongue. As the binding cement of this Church this tongue becomes especially noticeable through the fact that those who do not consider it necessary to the expression of their religious needs are cut off by this very circumstance from the unity of this Church, becoming a separate confession according to nationalities. In the United States, for instance, the statistics record "Catholic Polish Christians."

At the same time, in the Episcopal Church we may take for a sign of union the mother tongue of Americans, so that there are quite a number of people who do not hesitate to give it the name of the American Church without the risk of being misunderstood. The unity of belief and government is realized in this denomination without much effort, and naturally; whereas in the Roman Catholic Church the same unity is conditioned by practicing a long time the art of mastering a foreign means

for the expression of religious thoughts and feelings.

In comparison with religious denominations so characteristically different in the outward signs of their inner unity, the special catholic character of the Orthodox Church becomes strikingly clear, as well as the practical problems it has to meet in the nearest future.

First of all, we cannot fail to notice the stamp of the catholicity of the Russian Church in the fact that this Church allows every national group of its members to use their own tongue for church use, without any confusion, mistrust, or sensitiveness. Greeks, Syrian Arabs, Persians, Slavs of various nationalities, Albanians, Eskimos, and in the later days the Japanese and the Chinese, hear the word of God, prayers and divine services in a tongue they all understand. The contents and the ritual offered to all these nations being one and the same, Orthodoxy loses nothing from the use of so many different tongues, each tribe praising the Creator and Master of the Universe, the Triune God, in its own way. The Orthodox Church works on the principle of catholicity so trustingly that every nation in it is allowed to be governed by an independent Church of its own. Church unity suffers no detriment and is not shaken by such a superficial division, the Orthodox believes. Superior powers connect the local group such as the unity of faith and signs of piety, the unity of the hierarchy and the sacraments, the unity of the Presence of Him (I John 4:4, Col. 1:18, Matt. 20:28) who is "greater than all that is in the world"; who "is

the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn among the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence"; who is "with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Consequently the chief problem of the Orthodox Church in North America concerns the national Churches which make a part of it. Are they to be governed independently of each other? But in this case the canonical demand of there being only one bishop for every town, in order that there should be no division of this town within itself, risks being broken (Council of Chalcedon, 12th Rule). Or else, are they to be united by their submission to one representative according to the canonical rule, so that every Church should know its own intercessor (Apostolic Rule 34)? But in this case what will be the dominant exterior organ of the intercommunion between the different-tongued parts of the one whole? It would seem that the Orthodox Church must choose between the two chief directions taken by the religious life of America, the Roman Catholic and the Episcopal. Shall discipline be allowed to become the binding link between the different parts, even with the acceptance of a single sacred tongue (the Greek, for instance, or the Slavonic), following the example of the Roman Catholic Church? But in such a case the national character of the Churches will suffer detriment and the peculiar character of Orthodox catholicity will disappear. Or else, shall the preponderance of the principle of self-government be allowed to develop, as in the Episcopal Church? But in this case could the exterior organ of union,

that is, the language of the country, develop to its full power even in the narrow limits of pure ritual? In other words, in this case will not the Orthodox Church of America become simply the American Orthodox Church, without any distinction between national groups according to the origin of early immigrants from the old world? The existence of national difference, however, will prevent the language of the country from becoming the language of church practices for a long time to come, as at present it prevents all the languages in use among the various communities from becoming *the* sacred language. Yet the americanization of the Orthodox in this country is strong enough to force the members of this Church to have recourse to the neutral language—which to a good many of them has become the natural language—of all American citizens for all everyday affairs. It would seem that by this everyday use of the English language the Orthodox Americans are preparing themselves for the future exterior expression of their unity in faith and spirit. The one thing that still remains to be done is to condense into a single whole and to harmonize the demands of Orthodox discipline with the lawful manifestation of the principle of ecumenicity, in order to enable the Orthodox Church to manifest on American soil its natural character of universal applicability and its creative faculty of uniting organically all the elements within it, as well as its vital right to exist among other religious denominations, to its full power. Already the Orthodox Church practically stands on the basis of discipline; for instance, when

bishops are appointed for separate national Churches. This was the case, in America, when the Archimandrite Raphael was appointed to be Bishop of the Syrian Arabs in Brooklyn; the Holy Synod appointed him after communicating with the Patriarch of Antioch. But in each of these separate national Churches the shaping of their unity is as yet in process of being realized with the active assistance of both the clergy and the laymen in separate parishes only, and only partly in the whole mass of national groups. So far the principle of nationality has stood firm, the language of communication between the various groups being the local English. The form, which this harmonization of the unity of discipline and the diversity of nationalities has to take, is the problem of the Orthodox Church in America in the very near future.

Thus a sphere of immediate activity is already indicated for the Orthodox Church in America. It will not be a repetition of what has been done by Roman Catholicism, because the principle of catholicity will find a much wider expression, for into the bosom of the one Church any language and any tribe will be admitted, without being deprived of its national peculiarities (Rev. 14:6). The Orthodox Church will strive in America, as it has striven everywhere else, to realize the commandment of the ancient psalm singer: "That thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving health among all nations" (Psalm 67:2). Its activity will not interfere with the activity of the Episcopal or any other local Church because in them the great diversity of na-

tionalities does not exist. Yet to some extent the activity of the Orthodox Church will awaken in other religious groups a desire to reform or at least re-examine many phases which until now have remained somewhat vague. For instance, the question of the legality of nationality in pure Roman Catholicism is sure to come out in greater relief; also the degree of original independence which it would be legal for every national group to attain in their religious affairs also more light will be shed on the question of democracy in religion, and limits will be established for the exterior means of drawing within the Church those who endeavour to avoid it; also it will become more obvious that the character of Christianity is otherworldly, not of the earth, for Christianity is truly a rule of faith and life which is the "promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come" (I Timothy 4:8). In a word, because of its general accessibility and primitive purity and intactness, Orthodoxy may to a considerable degree become the very neutral spiritual medium which for so many Christian denominations in America has become obscured. The way in which the Orthodox Church may receive the impulse both from its own inherent life and from exterior circumstances for the realization of this great second problem is again a question of the future, perhaps the very distant future. The details of the solution of this question as usual will depend on the adequacy of the means and forces in its possession. Yet we should not remain silent concerning the first stage of the solution of this second problem, which is suggested by a good many

rather important facts of a certain theoretical and practical solidarity among a number of the separate religious groups of the Orthodox Church in America.

Generally speaking, things are attracted towards each other from motives of their nearness in space and their inner affinity, especially if there is no obstacle raised by some unusual condition of their existence. Concerning the unusual conditions in the religious atmosphere of North America we have already spoken at the beginning of this sketch. We have already made it clear to what extent everything in America helps the *rapprochement*, the trust, the co-operation between various confessional groups in all their religious affairs. It only remains to define with some regularity the nearness and the affinity existing between these groups in order to allow their mutual gravitation to show itself to the full. Once you have taken this point of view, you can immediately become aware of the natural nearness between the representatives of Orthodoxy in North America and their next of kin who had been forced by historical conditions to place themselves outside the Orthodox Church, without, however, losing altogether the signs of their belonging to that Church. Such are, first of all, the Russians and the Slavs who entered into the *Unia* with the Roman Catholic Church as long ago as the sixteenth century, preserving their Greek ritual almost intact and their mother tongue in all church services. And this is exactly the point on which the endeavours of North American Orthodoxy have been concentrated, trying to facilitate

the return within its pale to all the religious national bodies which heretofore were part of the Papal Church in a merely mechanical way. As gradually they leave to join the Orthodox Greek Eastern Catholic Church, the Latin Western Catholic Church becomes relieved of all the elements which are alien to it and enters into the natural boundaries belonging to the region of Latin nationalities. In this case, Orthodoxy works at equalizing values in regions of church interests. The degree in which the legality of preserving nationality in religious affairs is the true backbone of Orthodoxy will define the degree in which its presence and activity in North America is bound to awaken the sense of national foundations in other religious bodies, inducing them to become clearer and more definite. However, this is the second, perhaps even the third, stage of the solution of the problems of Orthodoxy in America.

We perceive much more clearly the first stage of the development of Orthodoxy's problems in relation to other Episcopal Church. The *rapprochement* between the latter and the Orthodox Church is rather of the chemical order, having been brought about by spiritual kinship and affinity. Besides, both the Churches remember their common origin from the East, from the Churches of Asia Minor of the times of Polycarp of Smyrna and Irenaeus of Lyons. The kinship between the two Churches is also demonstrated by the national colouring of both, admitted in theory and practice, as well as the theoretical confessional kinship proclaimed quite distinctly at least by a few individuals who

express the consciousness of the two Churches severally. We have not as yet become identical and are as yet far from intercommunion in the Sacraments, yet no one can deny the fact of mutual affection and friendliness between us, of which unfortunately there is so little where problems of religion are concerned. The solution of the special problem before the Orthodox Church, we indicated above, will guarantee the future peace of other religious denominations of America. Insofar as the Episcopalians are in possession of the correct idea of what the participation of national elements should be in the life of the Church, the Orthodox see quite clearly that between them there can be no strife and no animosity. Insofar as they dispense with preserving the doctrine in the shape which the undivided ecumenical Church has established, the Episcopalians are not Orthodox, but insofar as they decidedly protest against further digression from this doctrine and preserve the episcopate as the true gauge of their integrity and undividedness in thought and in act, in that degree also, from the Orthodox point of view, they retain their rightful place in catholicity and their nearness to Orthodoxy. The Orthodox people have sensed the impulse which moves the Episcopalians towards *rapprochement* and further union; and when the time comes to establish the union in principle, in theory, and in metaphysics, there will be no difficulty in our becoming true brothers in affection and unanimity.

Until now it would seem that the way of differentiation has been dominant in the history of

humanity in general and of Christianity in particular. But it has reached the last stage of its development. The fragmentary condition of Christians in North America proves it altogether too clearly. But the hour is near at hand for the integration of disintegrated parts, for their reunion into a marvellously beautiful and well-proportioned organic whole. The bones that are dry and dusty, in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel, are affected by the invisible breath of God's spirit. In our days they are trying to draw nearer together. And though separately they hardly preserve the spirit of life, in contact and bond with each other they receive all that is necessary for life: arteries, flesh, blood, and, at last, the spirit of life from the Spirit of God. The conclusion of the prophet's vision, that is, the resurrection of all the divided creatures, who seemed to be lifeless, is the hope and expectation of human individuals; and, what is immeasurably greater, it is the Divine wish spoken in the prayer. "That they all may be one."

Annunciation Day, 1915.