ECUMENISM II
A HISTORICAL APPROACH

ABOUT THE COLLECTED WORKS

Fr. Florovsky devoted much attention to his *Collected Works*. Until shortly before his death, he had continued to supply a variety of materials. These included suggestions for the structuring of the volumes; changes in certain texts; new materials; updated materials; notes; revisions; suggestions for revisions; updated bibliography; and several outlines for a new structure to his work on the Byzantine Fathers. Substantial time has been expended to implement his suggestions and instructions. Some materials will be included in the final volume, a volume which also contains an Index to the entire *Collected Works*, Appendices, Notes, Errata, Bibliography, and Miscellanea. To publish *The Collected Works* in English has entailed the translation of his works from several languages, including Russian, Bulgarian, Czech, Serbian, German and French.

NOTE FROM THE PUBLISHER ON

ECUMENISM I: A Doctrinal Approach
ECUMENISM II: A Historical Approach

The time and energy Fr. Florovsky dedicated to the Ecumenical Movement was enormous. This is reflected in the numerous articles he wrote on the subject. His writings on this subject span many decades and were written in various languages. Some of his writings repeat certain points. In these two volumes, however, most of the repetition has been deleted; some pieces in these two volumes have been excerpted from their original form in order to cut down on repetition. Many articles appear for the first time in English. For Fr. Florovsky's writings on doctrinal subjects, see his other volumes, especially volumes I-IV and XI-XII.

ECUMENISM II
A Historical Approach

VOLUME FOURTEEN
in *THE COLLECTED WORKS* of

GEORGES FLOROVSKY
Emeritus Professor of Eastern Church History
Harvard University

General Editor
RICHARD S. HAUGH
Visiting Scholar
Andover Newton Theological School

Translated from Various Languages by Translators Mentioned at the End of Each Work

BÜCHERVERTRIEBSANSTALT
Postfach 461, FL — 9490 Vaduz, Europa
[Exclusive Sales Agent: Notable & Academic Books
P. O. Box 470, Belmont, MA {USA} 02178]

ECUMENISM II
A Historical Approach

ISBN 3-905238-18-7

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF GEORGES FLOROVSKY

Volume I ..... *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*
Volume II ..... *Christianity and Culture*
Volume III ..... *Creation and Redemption*
Volume IV ..... *Aspects of Church History*
Volume V ..... *Ways of Russian Theology: Part One*
Volume VI ..... *Ways of Russian Theology: Part Two*
Volume VII ..... *The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century*
Volume VIII ..... *The Byzantine Fathers of the Fifth Century*
Volume IX ..... *The Byzantine Fathers of the Sixth to Eighth Century*
Volume X ..... *The Byzantine Ascetic and Spiritual Fathers*
Volume XI ..... *Theology and Literature*
Volume XII ..... *Philosophy: Philosophical Problems and Movements*
Volume XIII ..... *Ecumenism I: A Doctrinal Approach*
Volume XIV ..... *Ecumenism II: A Historical Approach*

[Additional forthcoming volumes. The final volume contains an Index to the entire *Collected Works*, Errata, Bibliography, Appendices, and Miscellanea]

SECOND PRINTING

CONTENTS

Volume XIV of
The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky

ECUMENISM II: A HISTORICAL APPROACH

Acknowledgments

"On the History of Ecclesiology" originally appeared in *L'Église et les Églises, Études et travaux sur l'Unité Chrétienne offerts à Dom Lamber et Beaudon* (Édition de Cherotogne, Belgium, 1954). "The Reformation Spirit and Early Christianity" originally appeared in *Put'*, No. 22 (1930), pp. 129-130; *translated from the Russian by Linda Morris.* "The Early, 'Undivided' Church and Communion" originally appeared in *Intercommunion*, ed. by D. Baillie & J. Marsh (Harper & S.C.M. Press, 1952), pp. 47-57. "The Historical Problem of a Definition of the Church" appeared in *Unity We Seek.* "Ecumenism and the Reformation" is excerpted from "An Orthodox Perspective on the Amsterdam Assembly, 1949" and from "Confessional Loyalty in the Ecumenical Movement (1950)." "The Greek and Latin Mind in the Early Ages of the Church" is excerpted from "The Eastern Orthodox Church and the Ecumenical Movement" in *Theology Today*, VII, 1 (April, 1950). "St. Cyprian and St. Augustine on Schism" is excerpted from "The Doctrine of the Church and the Ecumenical Problem.""Rome, the Reformation, and Orthodoxy" was translated from the Russian by Linda Morris; the original title was "The Problematic of Christian Reunion.""Peter Mogila" originally appeared in *Put'*, No. 9 (1927), pp. 120-124 as a review of *La Confession orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila, Metropolite de Kiev (1633-1646).* Texte latin inédit publié avec introduction et notes critiques par A. Malev et M. Viller de la Compagnie de Jésus in *Orientalia Christiana*, vol. X, No. 39 (Rome/Paris, 1927); *translated from the Russian by Linda Morris.* The section on "Early Russian Ecumenism" was excerpted from a section of *Ways of Russian Theology.* "Russian Orthodox Ecumenism in the 19th Century" is the *full text* of an abridged article which appeared in volume II of *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*; this *full text* does not appear in any other BVA volume of *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky.* "The Russian Orthodox in North America" originally appeared in *The National Council Outlook* (November, 1955), pp. 10-13. "My Personal Participation in the Ecumenical Movement" originally appeared in *Ecumenical Experiences*, ed. by Luis V. Romeri (Maryland, Newman Press, 1965). "Orthodox Participation in the Amsterdam Assembly" originally appeared in *Irenikon*, XXII, No. 1 (1949); *translated from the French by Leyla Rouhi.* "Oxford and Chichester (1949)" originally appeared in *The Living Church* (September 4, 1949). "The World Council of Churches" originally appeared in *St.Vladimir's Quarterly*, II, No. 4 (1954), pp. 11-18. "Evanston 1954" originally appeared in *The Star of the East* (March, 1955), pp. 8-10. "An Overview of the Ecumenical Movement Since 1927" originally appeared as "The Challenge of Disunity" in *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, X, No. 1 (November, 1954), pp. 15-20. "On the Upcoming Council of the Roman Catholic Church" originally appeared in *Vestnik russkogo khristianskogo dvizheniia*, 52 (I) (Paris), pp. 5-10; translated from the Russian by Linda Morris. "Some Contributors to 20th Century Ecumenical Thought" originally appeared in *Rediscovering Eastern Christendom: Essays in Commemoration of Dom Bede Winslow* (London, 1963).

In Memoriam

Fr. Georges Florovsky
1893-1979

"Preeminent Orthodox Christian Theologian, Ecumenical Spokesman, And Authority on Russian Letters."

[All quotations are from pages 5 and 11 of the *Harvard Gazette* of October 1, 1982, written by George H. Williams, Hollis Professor of Divinity *Emeritus*, Harvard Divinity School and Edward Louis Keenan, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University and "placed upon the records" at the Harvard Faculty of Divinity Meeting on September 16, 1982.]

"Archpriest Professor Georges Vasilyevich Florovsky (1893-1979), preeminent theologian of Orthodoxy and historian of Christian thought, ecumenical leader and interpreter of Russian literature . . . died in Princeton, New Jersey in his 86th year" on August 11, 1979.

Born in Odessa in 1893, Fr. Florovsky was the beneficiary of that vibrant Russian educational experience which flourished toward the end of the 19th century and produced many gifted scholars. His father was rector of the Theological Academy and dean of the Cathedral of the Transfiguration. His mother, Klaudia Popruzhenko, was the daughter of a professor of Hebrew and Greek. Fr. Florovsky's first scholarly work, "On Reflex Salivary Secretion," written under one of Pavlov's students, was published in English in 1917 in the last issue of *The Bulletin of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.*

In 1920, with his parents and his brother Antonii, Fr. Florovsky left Russia and settled first in Sophia, Bulgaria. He left behind his brother, Vasilii, a surgeon, who died in the 1924 famine, and his sister Klaudia V. Florovsky, who became a professor of history at the University of Odessa. In 1921 the President of Czechoslovakia, Thomas Masaryk, invited Fr. Florovsky and his brother Antonii to Prague. Fr. Florovsky taught the philosophy of law. Antonii later became a professor of history at the University of Prague.

In 1922 Georges Florovsky married Xenia Ivanovna Simonova and they resettled in Paris where he became cofounder of St. Sergius Theological Institute and taught there as professor of patristics (1926-1948). In 1932 he was ordained a priest and placed himself canonically under the patriarch of Constantinople.

In 1948 he came to the United States and was professor of theology at St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary from 1948 to 1955, and dean from 1950. From 1954 to 1965 he was professor of Eastern Church History at Harvard Divinity School and, concurrently (1962-1965) an associate of the Slavic Department and (1955-1959) an associate professor of theology at Holy Cross Theological School.

"Although Fr. Florovsky's teaching in the Slavic Department [at Harvard University] was only sporadic, he became a major intellectual influence in the formation of a generation of American specialists in Russian cultural history. His lasting importance in this area derives not from his formal teaching but from the time and thought he gave to informal "circles" that periodically arose around him in Cambridge among those who had read *The Ways of Russian Theology* [then only in Russian], for decades a kind of "underground book" among serious graduate students of Russian intellectual history, and had sought him out upon discovering that he was at the Divinity School . . . During a portion of his incumbency at Harvard . . . patristics and Orthodox thought and institutions from antiquity into 20th century Slavdom flourished. In the Church History Department meetings he spoke up with clarity. In the Faculty meetings he is remembered as having energetically marked book catalogues on his lap for the greater glory of the Andover Harvard Library! In 1964 Fr. Florovsky was elected a director of the Ecumenical Institute founded by Paul VI near Jerusalem." Active in both the National Council

of Churches and the World Council of Churches, Fr. Florovsky was Vice President-at-Large of the National Council of Churches from 1954 to 1957.

"After leaving Harvard, Professor *Emeritus* Florovsky taught from 1965 to 1972 in Slavic Studies at Princeton University, having begun lecturing there already in 1964; and he was visiting lecturer in patristics at Princeton Theological Seminary as early as 1962 and then again intermittently after retirement from the University. His last teaching was in the fall semester of 1978/79 at Princeton Theological Seminary."

"Fr. Florovsky in the course of his career was awarded honorary doctorates by St. Andrew's University . . . Boston University, Notre Dame, Princeton University, the University of Thessalonica, St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary, and Yale. He was a member or honorary member of the Academy of Athens, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the British Academy, and the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius."

Fr. Florovsky personified the cultivated, well-educated Russian of the turn of the century. His penetrating mind grasped both the detail and depth in the unfolding drama of the history of Christianity in both eastern and western forms. He was theologian, church historian, patristic scholar, philosopher, Slavist, and a writer in comparative literature. "Fr. Florovsky sustained his pleasure on reading English novels, the source in part of his extraordinary grasp of the English language, which, polyglot that he was, he came to prefer above any other for theological discourse and general exposition. Thus when he came to serve in Harvard's Slavic Department, there was some disappointment that he did not lecture in Russian, especially in his seminars on Dostoievsky, Soloviev, Tolstoi, and others. It was as if they belonged to a kind of classical age of the Russian tongue and civilization that, having been swept away as in a deluge, he treated as a Latin professor would Terrence or Cicero, not presuming to give lectures in the tonalities of an age that had vanished forever."

Fr. Florovsky's influence on contemporary church historians and Slavists was vast. The best contemporary multi-volume history of Christian thought pays a special tribute to Fr. Florovsky. Jaroslav Pelikan of Yale University, in the bibliographic section to his first volume in *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, writes under the reference to Fr. Florovsky's two works in Russian on the Eastern Fathers: "These two works are basic to our interpretation of trinitarian and christological dogmas" (p. 359 from *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition: 100-600*). George Huntston Williams, Hollis Professor *Emeritus* of Harvard Divinity School, wrote: "Faithful priestly son of the Russian Orthodox Church . . . , Fr. Georges Florovsky — with a career-long involvement in the ecumenical dialogue — is today the most articulate, trenchant and winsome exponent of Orthodox theology and piety in the scholarly world. He is innovative and creative in the sense wholly of being ever prepared to restate the saving truth of Scripture and Tradition in the idiom of our contemporary yearning for the transcendent."

PART ONE: EARLY ECUMENISM

ON THE HISTORY OF ECCLESIOLOGY

It has been suggested by a contemporary writer that the doctrine of the Church is still in a "pre-theological phase."[1] This statement is perhaps slightly exaggerated. What is obviously true, however, is that there is no commonly accepted pattern in the treatment and presentation of ecclesiological doctrine. This depends, to a large extent, upon the lack of an established patristic tradition. Years ago, writing about Origen, Mgr. P. Batiffol had to make the following statement: "The Church is not among the subjects discussed *ex professo* in the *Peri Archon*. He discusses divine unity, eschatology, even tradition and the rule of faith, but he does not discuss the Church. A strange omission, destined to perpetuate itself in Greek dogmatics, as in the Catechetical Oration of St. Gregory of Nyssa, for example, and especially in the work of St. John of Damascus, — an omission destined to be repeated in the scholastic system."[2] Obviously, it was not just an "ommission," and not theological carelessness or oversight. The Fathers of the Church, both in the East and in the West, as well as the later and more systematical writers in the Middle Ages, had much to say about the Church, and actually did say very much. But they never attempted to summarize their intuitions. Their suggestions and comments were scattered throughout their various writings, chiefly exegetical and liturgical, in their preachings probably more than in their doctrinal essays. In any case, they had a very clear *vision* of what the Church actually was, although this "vision" was never reduced to a *conception* or definition. It was only in relatively "modern times," in "the autumn of the Middle Ages" and especially in the turbulent age of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, that definitions and summaries were attempted, more in the spirit of confessional controversy and for polemical purposes than in the mood of a dispassionate theological meditation. The need for revision was strongly felt by theologians of the last century, and the doctrine of the Church is one of the favorite topics of theological inquiry in our own time. A certain bias, however, can be easily detected even in the contemporary discussion about the Church. It will be fair to identify this bias as "ecumenical." On the other hand, recent research in ecclesiology has been strongly influenced by the new shift in Biblical studies. In contemporary research, there is a strong, and on the whole sound and healthy, tendency to construe the doctrine of the Church in the wide and inclusive perspective of Biblical Revelation, against the background of the Old Testament "preparation." Unfortunately, we have no comprehensive study on the history of the doctrine and "vision " of the Church in Patristic and later times, although there is an impressive amount of occasional and monographical studies. There is, however, no general survey which would enable us to discern the main lines and trends in the age-long

"development." The only exception is probably the great work of Fr. Émile Mersch, S.J., *Le Corps Mystique du Christ*, to which his later and partly unfinished writing should be added.[3] This monumental work revealed the immense richness of the "ecclesiological material" scattered throughout Patristic (and later) documents, and placed considerable emphasis on the prevailing tendencies of the whole historical process. Yet not only was this survey incomplete, since the author restricted himself to *one* particular theme or aspect of the ecclesiological concept, but the analysis was also rather hasty. In any case, Mersch's book is no more than a starting point for a theologian who would attempt a systematic presentation of the Catholic doctrine of the Church in the light and spirit of the continuous tradition of Catholic faith and contemplation. Probably the first problem with which the contemporary theologian of the Church should wrestle is *the question of perspective*. What is the right place for the "treatise" on the Church in the total fabric of a balanced and orthodox system of theology? As a matter of fact, the prevailing tendency has been, and to a great extent still is, to draft the ecclesiological "chapter" of Dogmatics as a more or less "independent" and, as it were, self-explanatory "treatise." Of course, its relation to "other chapters" has never been completely overlooked, and certain valuable suggestions, of a rather occasional and casual character, have been accumulated. But on the whole, the doctrine of the Church does not seem to be adequately incorporated into the integral structure of "Catholic" theology and, although there is a growing desire for such integration, there is no clarity and no agreement on the ways in which such an integration can be achieved. Moreover, there is obvious *dis*-agreement concerning his very point.

The *corporate character* of Christianity has been strongly reemphasized in the theological study and discussion of recent decades, as it has also been rediscovered in the devotional and liturgical experience of Christian communities. *Christianity is precisely the Church*, in the fullness of her life and "existence." One may even ask, should a systematic exposition of the Christian Faith not start precisely with at least a preliminary "essay" on the Church, because it is *in the Church* that the "deposit of the Faith" has been kept until now through all the ages of her historical existence, and it is *by the authority* of the Church that all Christian doctrines and beliefs have been, and still are, handed down and commended from generation to generation, and are again received precisely in obedience to the Church and in loyalty to her continuous and identical Tradition. Protestant theologians usually preface their systems with a treatise on the Word of God, i.e. on Scripture, and it seems to be a very logical move for them. "Catholics" sometimes follow the same plan, only, they would of course add "Tradition" to "Scripture." In actual fact, it is nothing but a "treatise on the Church" in disguise, offered as an indispensable "*Prolegomenon* " to the theological system as such. From a didactic point of view, it is probably the only reasonable procedure. One cannot avoid some

reference to "sources" or "authorities" at the beginning of one's system. There is, however, a double inconvenience involved in such a procedure. On the one hand, so much may be said about the Church in the *Prolegomenon* that really very little is left for the "system" itself. Is it not symptomatic that in many theological *compendia* there is actually no special place for the doctrine of the Church? It is enough to quote but one example, — there is *no "treatise "* on the Church in the voluminous and justly renowned manual of Dogmatics by Mgr. J. Pohle. Of course, there is probably room for Ecclesiology in some other sections of the total theological curriculum, and yet it is very curious that one can develop a *system* of Christian Theology without saying anything about the Church. As a matter of fact, there is not even a *prolegomenon* in Mgr. Pohle's manual, which opens simply with the general treatise on God. On the other hand, but little can be said about the Church in the *prolegomenon*, at least in a convincing manner, because this can be done *only in* a wider *perspective*, simply because the Church is the Body of Christ, and it is therefore impossible to speak of the Church before enough has been said of Christ himself. There is more in this than simply an inevitable difficulty inherent in all "introductions." All "prologues" are usually rather "epilogues," and are often written at the last moment, after the main body of the study has taken shape. The problem is not only that of the order or sequence of doctrinal "chapters" or "treatises." For the Church is not just a "doctrine," she is rather *the existential presupposition* of all teaching and preaching. Theology is practiced and cultivated *in the Church*.. Theological study and interpretation *is the Church's function*, even if this function is exercised by individuals, yet always in their capacity as Church members. It seems that this was precisely the main reason for the "reticence " of the Fathers and others in the matter of Ecclesiology. In any case, the inherent difficulty, or even ambiguity, must be frankly acknowledged right from the start. One may anticipate from the very beginning that in actuality the doctrine of the Church simply cannot be presented as an "independent" item.

If we turn to modern theological literature on the Church, beginning at least with the theological revival of the Romantic period, we can easily discern two different approaches or two different manners of expounding the doctrine of the Church. There is certainly some warrant, in Scripture and in "Tradition," for both. One may at once ask whether these two approaches or manners could not be somehow integrated into an inclusive, synthesized whole. Indeed, this should be done, and one may hope and wish that it shall in fact be accomplished. Yet one does not yet see quite clearly how it could and should be done. On the one hand, it is almost traditional to develop the whole doctrine of the Church on the basis of the Christological doctrine and to take for guidance the famous Pauline phrase: *the Body of Christ*. In the final account, "Christology" and "Ecclesiology" will be organically correlated in the inclusive doctrine of "the Whole Christ"— *totus Christus, caput*

et corpus, in the glorious phrase of St. Augustine. It would be but fair to submit that this was the prevailing attitude of the Fathers, both in the East and in the West, not only in the times of their "union," but also long after the "separation." In the East, this Christological approach or attitude is well illustrated by such a late writer as Nicholas Cabasilas, especially in his admirable treatise on the *Life in Christ.*[4] This is obviously connected with his Christological interpretation of the Sacraments and the centrality of the Eucharistic mystery and sacrifice in his general conception.[5] It should not be forgotten, however, that this strong Christological emphasis has been seriously obscured and diminished in modern times. In practice, the Christological doctrines of the ancient Fathers have been almost completely ignored. The classical conception of the "Body of Christ" has had to be rediscovered within the "Catholic" tradition itself. Or in any case, Christological doctrines have been little used in the Ecclesiological discussion. In post-Reformation theology, the Church has been considered more as a "body of believers," *coetus fidelium*, than as the *Corpus Christi.* When this approach to the mystery of the Church is practiced on a sufficiently deep level, it brings theologians to the Pneumatological conception of the Church. It may be true that, as is often contended, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been somehow "underdeveloped" in Christian tradition and has never been adequately formulated in spite of, or rather probably because of, the intensive discussion on the *Filioque* clause. And yet there is still a strong tendency to overemphasize the Pneumatological aspect of the doctrine of the Church. Perhaps, the most conspicuous example of such an overemphasis is the great book of Johann Adam Moehler, *Die Einheit in der Kirche*, although the balance was restored in his later writings, and already in his *Symbolik.*[6] In Russian theology the same overemphasis was typical of Khomiakov and especially of his successors. The doctrine of the Church is in danger of becoming a kind of "Charismatic Sociology."[7] Of course, this does not mean that Christ is "left out," and again there should be room for some "sociology" in the doctrine of the Church. But the real question concerns the pattern of the ecclesiological construction. One may put the question in this form: Should we start just with the fact (or "phenomenon") of the Church's being a "Community," and then investigate her "structure" and "notes"? Or should we rather start with Christ, God Incarnate, and investigate the implications of the total dogma of the Incarnation, including the glory of the Risen and Ascended Lord, who sitteth at the right hand of the Father? The choice of a starting point for our ecclesiological construction is in any case far from irrelevant. The starting point determines the pattern. Obviously, there is no ultimate contradiction between the two formulas of St. Paul: "*in Christ*" and "*in the Spirit.*" But it matters much, which of the two is given precedence, or preference. Our "unity in the Spirit" is precisely our "*incorporation*" into Christ, which is the *ultimate* reality of Christian existence. It may

happen, as has actually occurred more than once, that an unfortunately-chosen starting point may cause a very serious distortion of the total theological perspective and preclude the normal development of the inquiry. It is only fair to suggest that this has actually happened in many cases when the doctrine of the Church has been treated without any organic relation to the Incarnate life and the Redemptive sacrifice of the Lord of the Church. The Church has too often been represented as a community of those who believe in Christ and follow him rather than as his own "body" in which he is continually active and acting "through the Spirit," in order to "recapitulate" all things in himself. The result has been that it has proved impossible to ensure the normal development of Christological doctrine itself, and many of the riches of the Patristic Christological tradition have been actually lost or overlooked in modern theology, both in the East and in the West.

The preference given to the Pauline image of the "Body of Christ" in the theology of the Church can be contested from the Biblical point of view. First, the Church of Christ must be regarded as the "New Israel," and for this reason it may be suggested that the true key is rather the notion of the "People of God." Secondly, it seems that, according to St. Paul himself, the Church is the "glorious body of the Risen Christ," and the notion of the "Mystical Body" should therefore not be traced back to the Incarnation, as far as one remains within the limits of St. Paul's teaching.[8] Both arguments are far from being convincing or decisive. If it is perfectly true that the Church of God in the New Testament is the "recreation" of the Church of the Old, this "recreation" includes the august mystery of the Incarnation. The continuous existence of the "Church" throughout the whole of the Biblical *Heilsgeschichte* should be conceived and interpreted in such a way as to include the unique "newness" of Christ, the Incarnate Lord. And the notion of the "People of God" is obviously inadequate for this purpose. Nor does it provide a sufficient link with the mystery of the Cross and Resurrection. Finally, the doctrine of the Church must be built up so as to sufficiently exhibit the *sacramental* character of the new existence. The Ecclesiology of St. Paul admits of a number of interpretations, and it may be contended that the conception of the "Body of Christ" had a more important place in his vision of the Church than is admitted by certain modern scholars. Again, the difference between the state of Incarnation and the state of Glory should not be exaggerated. The Ascended Christ is obviously still the "New Adam." The attempt to replace the simile of the "body" by that of the "family" and to base this interpretation on the concept of "adoption" is hardly convincing at all.[9] Men are "adopted" to the Father precisely "in Christ," and the sacrament of adoption is exactly the sacrament of death with Christ and co-resurection with him and in him, or again it is the sacrament of "incorporation" into Christ. In any case, the Catholic doctrine of the Church cannot be built up merely on the texts of the Scriptures, which themselves may be fully assessed only in the context of the living

Tradition. The patristic emphasis on the simile of the "body" cannot be easily dismissed by systematic theologians. The decisive argument, however, will be from the integral vision of the Person and work of Christ.

The main presupposition of the existence of the Christian Church is the *new* and intimate unity between God and man which was established in the Incarnation. It is precisely because Christ is God-man and, according to the formula of Chalcedon, is at once "perfect in his Godhead and in his Manhood" that the Church of Christ is possible and real. And in the redeeming mystery of the Cross we observe the movement of God, of Divine Love, toward man. Christ's "identification" with man and humanity was consummated in his death, which was itself the victory over the powers of destruction, and this death was fully revealed in the Glory of the Resurrection and consummated in the Heavenly Ascension. There is but one indivisible act of God. The Church is constituted by the sacraments, all of which imply intimate participation in Christ's death and resurrection and personal "communion" with him. The Church is the fruit of Christ's redeeming work and, as it were, its "summary." The Church is, as it were, the purpose and the goal of his "coming down" for us men and for our salvation. Only in this perspective can the nature of the Church be fully and properly understood. The crucial point of the interpretation is that of the character of Christ's "human nature," his own and yet "universal." This is the existential presupposition and basis of the Church. Only in the complete system of Christology can this basic relationship between the Incarnate Lord and Redeemer and redeemed man be adequately and convincingly explained. In the present context it is not possible to do more than give hints and suggestions for a further study. It is true that the concept of Incarnation, taken by itself and not expanded sufficiently to include the life and work of Christ up to their climax on the Cross and in the glory of the Resurrection, does not provide a sufficient ground or basis for Ecclesiology. Nor would it be sufficient to analyze the mystery of the Incarnation exclusively in terms of "nature." In fact, the Incarnation was itself a disclosure of Divine Love and its redemptive presence and operation in "the world," or rather in the midst of human "existence." This presence and operation still continue in the Church. The Church is precisely the continuous presence of the Redeemer in the world. The Ascended Christ is not removed or separated from the world. The strength and the power of the Church Militant are rooted precisely in the mysterious "Presence" which makes the Church Christ's Body and Christ her Head. The crucial and ultimate problem of Ecclesiology is namely to describe and to explain the mode and character of this "Presence." The *Epistle to the Hebrews*, together with the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, seems to be the most appropriate scriptural starting point for Ecclesiology. In no sense would this exclude a strong emphasis on the operation of the Holy Spirit. One should only keep in mind that the Church is the Church of

Christ, and he is her Head and Lord. The Spirit is the Spirit of the Son: "He will not speak on his own authority . . . because he will receive of what is mine and declare it to you" (*John* 16:13-14). In any case, the "Economy of the Spirit" should not be so construed as to limit and reduce the "Economy of the Son." The problem has been recently stated in an admirable and clear manner by Vladimir Lossky in his stimulating little book, *Essai sur la Théologie Mystique de l'Église d'Orient.* [10] But his own solution is hardly acceptable. It is hardly possible to distinguish between the "unity of nature" and the "multiplicity of human hypostases" as neatly as Lossky seems to suggest. "Human nature" does not exist apart from "human hypostases," and Lossky himself is obviously fully aware of this, as he insists that man is precisely "a (human) person," "a being who contains the whole in himself," i.e. is more than just a "member" of Christ's Body. The implication seems to be that *only* in the Holy Spirit, and *not* in Christ is human personality fully and ontologically re-established. It is perfectly true that the Church is the place in which the communion of human persons with God is realized. But it is very doubtful whether it is correct to make so sharp a distinction between the "nature" of the Church and the "multiplicity" of the constituent "persons" or "hypostases." Lossky's conception does not leave enough room for the *personal relationship* of individuals *with Christ.* Of course, this personal communion with Christ is emphatically the gift of the Holy Spirit, but it is misleading to suggest that "in the Church, through the sacraments, *our nature* enters into union with the Divine nature in the hypostasis of the Son, the Head of the Mystical Body," and then *to add* as something different that "each person of the (human) nature must become like unto Christ" and that this is accomplished "*in the grace of the Holy Spirit.*" The motive underlying this sharp distinction is obvious and deserves attention. Lossky is anxious to avoid the danger of such an over-emphasis on the "universality" of the healing of human "nature" as might exclude the *free* participation in the "theandric organism" of the Church. His pattern is very clear: the Church, *one in Christ and multiple by the Spirit:* one human nature in the hypostasis of Christ, several human hypostases in the grace of the Spirit. One may ask: is the multiplicity of "human hypostases" not fully established by the personal "communion" of the many with the One Christ? Is the relationship with Christ, established and wrought "by the sacraments," not personal — *a personal encounter* — and is it not effected by the Spirit? And, on the other hand, are not all personal encounters of Christians with Christ possible only in "the fellowship of the Holy Spirit" and by the "grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ?" It is misleading to trace the "organic" aspect of the Church, "*un accent de nécessité,*" to Christ, and to reserve the "*personal* " aspect, "*un accent de liberté,* " to the operation of the Holy Spirit? It is also misleading to speak of the "Christological structure" of the Church and to reserve the whole dynamism of the Church's life for the operation of the Spirit. This is

precisely what Lossky endeavors to suggest. In his interpretation, the Church, as Christ's Body, seems to be just a static "structure," and it is only in her "pneumatological aspect" that the Church has "a dynamic character." In practice, this would imply that Christ *is not dynamically present in the Church*, an assumption which may lead to grave errors in the doctrine of the sacraments. Almost everything that Lossky says is acceptable, but he says it in such a manner that the basic pattern of Ecclesiology is in danger of distortion. There is some inadequacy namely in his *Christological* presuppositions. Lossky's chapters on the Church in his altogether admirable book deserve serious attention, because they expose very clearly the dangers inherent in any attempt to reduce the Christological pattern of ecclesiological doctrine. He was not the first among Russian theologians to make such an attempt, although he makes it in his own manner.[11] And other attempts may again be made. It must therefore be stated that no coherent Ecclesiology can be constructed unless *the centrality of Christ*, the Incarnate Lord and King of Glory, is admitted without reservation.

These few pages of comments and suggestions should not be mistaken for an "outline" of a Catholic Ecclesiology. The purpose of the writer is simply to share with his prospective readers some scattered observations made in the process of study in the field of patristic literature and in the search for what he himself is used to describe as a "neo-patristic synthesis." Probably, what is needed first is rather a good history of the patristic teaching about the Church, taken in a very comprehensive sense. And only later on shall we be able to safely proceed to the formulation of doctrine.

Columbia University

NOTE: The recent book by Ernest Best, *One Body in Christ, A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul*, London, S.P.C.K., 1955, came into the author's hands too late to be used in this text. Dr. Best strongly insists that the simile of the "Body" in St. Paul should not be interpreted as "ontological" and that the Church should therefore not be regarded as an "extension" of the Incarnation. The present writer must confess that he was not convinced by Dr. Best's elaborate exegesis, but this topic obviously does require special study.

[1]See M. D. Koster, *Ecclesiologie im Werden* (Paderborn, 1940).

[2]P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise Naissante et le Catholicisme* (Paris, 1927), pp. 395-396.

[3]Émile Mersch, S.J., *Le Corps Mystique du Christ, Études de Théologie Historique*, Deuxième édition, revue et augmentée, 2 vols. (Buxelles, 1936); *Morale et Corps Mystique*, Deuxième édition (Bruxelles, 1941); *La Théologie du Corps Mystique*, 2 vols. (Paris et Bruxelles, 1949).

[4]The text in *P.G.*, t.150; there is a French translation by Fr. Broussaleux, ed. Amay s/Meuse. Cfr. M. Lot-Borodine, *Le Cœur théandrique et son symbolisme dans l'oeuvre de Nicolas Cabasilas*, in *Irénikon*, XIII, 6 (1936); *La Grace déifante des sacrements d'après Nicolas Cabasilas*, in *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, XXV and XXVI (1935, 1936).

[5]Cfr also the Introduction and the notes by Fr. S. Salaville to his French translation of Cabasilas' "Exposition" of the Divine Liturgy, *Sources Chrétiennes* (1943).

[6]Cfr *L'Église est Une, Hommage a Moehler* (1939).

[7]The theology of Khomiakov needs re-evaluation, especially because it has been so variously understood, interpreted and used. There is an English translation of Khomiakov's famous tract, *The Church is One*, with an Introduction by Nicolas Zernov, S.P.C.K. (1948). See Pierre Baron, *Un Théologien Laic Orthodoxe Russe au XIX Siècle, Alexis Stepanovich Khomiakov* (Rome, 1940); (bibliography) and Serge Bolshakoff, *The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomiakov and Moehler*, S.P.C.K. (1946). Neither of these recent books is adequate.

[8]See L. Cerfaux, *La Théologie de l'Église suivant Saint Paul* (Paris, 1942) and *Le Christ dans la Théologie de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1951), 259 ss.

[9]See Bishop Cassian, *The Sons of God*, in *The Messenger* of the Russian S.C.M., No.31 (1954; in Russian).

[10]Paris, 1944; see especially chapters VII, VIII and IX, this last is entitled: "Deux aspects de l'Église," pp.131-192.

[11]See e.g. A. Katansky, *On the Place of the Treatise on the Church in the Scheme of Dogmatic Theology* (in Russian), in *Tserkovnyi Vestnik* (1895), no. 15 and 16.

THE REFORMATION SPIRIT AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

A Review of Articles by Berdiaev and Fricke

Three parts of this new journal, devoted primarily to the inner alignment of Orthodoxy and Protestantism, have been published. And of course, three parts are not enough to reveal in all of its sharpness and completeness the problematic born of the opposition of Tradition and Reformation. Nonetheless, the fundamental topic has already been alluded to — especially in an article by N. A. Berdiaev ("The Crisis of Protestantism and Russian Orthodoxy") in the first issue, and in O. Fricke's reply ("Protestantism in Orthodoxy and Bolshevism") in the second one. This topic has both theological and culturo-philosophical meaning: it is a question of the meaning of God's Incarnation or Godmanhood, and of the meaning for human existence and action which may be determined through it. It is very typical that Fricke responded to Berdiaev's article with agitation and spiritual vehemence — something intimate and important was touched upon. The ultimate distinction was revealed: is history locked into the narrowness and pettiness of the created world, or is the fatal circle of natural events broken by the Incarnation of the Logos into Man? Is it possible that the world is being transformed? Orthodoxy answers these questions with a firm, joyful and triumphant —Yes! Perhaps not every Protestant would answer with a direct negation, but the sharp, alarmed and indignant negative answer of Fricke undoubtedly expresses one of the basic motifs of Reformational religiosity, renewed in modern times in the modern "dialectical theology" of the school of Karl Barth. There is no need to tone down the contradictions — only real antitheses are synthetically overcome. This does not signify confessional polemic, and Orthodox theology should not consider itself the spokesman of one of the Christian "creeds." We are talking about something else — the meaning of the Reformation as an integral and living religio-historical event in the Christian world. The religious consciousness born of the Reformation is now undergoing a definite crisis as well as a rebirth, and this is also a judgment of historical Protestantism. Orthodoxy is being revealed for Protestantism as the fulfillment of ancient dogma — to a certain extent, like early Christianity. This is well expressed in the irenic article "Orthodoxy and Protestantism" by F. I. Lib, published in Russian in *Put* (No. 16, 1929). The basic theme is developed in the following manner: do the spirit of early Christianity and the spirit of the Reformation coincide, and to what extent? This question is more important than the collation of dogmatic formulae, and in any case should be put before others — for its answer determines the very sense, the very timber, of all the remaining questions. Moreover, this is not only a question of dogma, but also one of the general religious state, of

self-definition and action. In one sense, the problem of the Reformation coincides with that of Christian culture — in one of its tragic aspects, and insofar as it is now acquiring an especially practical relevance. It is to be wished that a live dialogue would unfold between Orthodox and Protestants on the pages of the new journal — and there is no need to be embarrassed in advance about the fact that it will most likely be unhealthy and sharp. The time has come for dialogue, not only because the need for mutual understanding and unity is now so great but also because the unconscious and unidentified encounters, of which there were so many in the past, are becoming impossible. Now everything must become evident and clear. In the past issues of the new journal one must note the significant article on Dostoevsky by F. I. Lib, the interesting essay on the worldview of Berdiaev by V. A. Unru, the essay on the principles of European culture by the Czech professor Gromadka and the remarks on the East by P. Shiuts. Of the Russian articles, one must mention the article on the Church by Father Bulgakov. The chronicle of religious life in Russia is of interest.

Translated from the Russian by
Linda Morris

THE EARLY, "UNDIVIDED" CHURCH AND COMMUNION

"The Undivided Church": the term may be vague and a bit ambiguous, and yet it has been successfully used in certain ecumenical quarters to denote the state of the Church Militant before the canonical split between the East and the West, finally consummated in the eleventh century. In a sense it was a modern substitute for an earlier slogan, coined already in the age of Reformation: *consensus quinquesaecularis*. To be sure, there were manifold splits, and conflicts, and tensions, in the early Church as well. Communion between the East and the West had been broken many times before the Churches were ultimately separated. Some big provinces of the Church in the East broke away from the Catholic unity, based on the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils at Ephesus and Chalcedon. The Iconoclastic controversy was another violent cut across the body of the Church. The whole history of the ten centuries of Christianity has been precisely a history of schisms and their healing, and the healing was never complete. Nevertheless there was a sense in which the Church at this epoch could still be described as undivided. There was still a very considerable and traditional "consensus" in essentials. It is so obvious when we compare the scope of dissentions then with "the unhappy divisions" of modern times. Ecumenical Councils were possible at this epoch, even in the periods of the most bitter strife. Representatives of the most divergent convictions could confer together on the points of divergence, and the split would be consummated only after all hopes of reconciliation had been frustrated. The controversy itself was only possible because there was some common ground. In no case had the Apostolic Succession been broken, at least before the formal split, and this Succession was unanimously regarded as a token and a guarantee of unity. One could always appeal to certain uncontroverted standards. The terms of unity were under discussion throughout the whole period, and the terms of unity were the terms of communion.

We have to keep in mind that the early Church had not yet been fully unified in its administration. Gradually the local churches were brought together into some larger units, under the presidency of Provincial Metropolitans, and then of the Patriarchs — and yet a very large autonomy had been preserved in these local churches. The true unit of the Church was (and is still, at least in theory) precisely a local church, under a bishop. The growth of Papal claims for a universal authority and jurisdiction ultimately wrecked the unity of the Church. The highest authority in the Church was a Council, i.e. a representative gathering of all ruling bishops, and each of them had a right to speak not only for his particular church (a diocese, or a local community), but precisely for the Church Universal. And what was sought was not just a

majority vote, but rather a unanimity, or consensus. The history of the Trinitarian controversies in the fourth century supplies abundant material on this matter. Only with great difficulty can one find his way through the labyrinth of creeds, composed by various groups and synods at that epoch. But ultimately we discover a common theme going across many divisions. What was important in this search for the Catholic faith was precisely a belief in consensus. There was no compromise in the final reconciliation of the "Old Nicene" group with the new "Homoiousian" (cf. the Council of Alexandria under St. Athanasius in 363). It was rather a rediscovery of the consensus that was obscured by the use of discordant phraseologies. And no such consensus could be established between the "Nicenes" of all descriptions and the Arians. For several decades, between 325 and 381, there was no commonly accepted presentation of the Catholic belief. But there was an intensive search for such a presentation. It is difficult to see to what extent a factual unity of the Church had been kept at that time, i.e. communion between the local churches. No generalization is permissible. In many cases communion was actually broken, including the famous "Schism of Antioch," which, however, had more than just doctrinal reasons. Yet we should not forget that many champions of Orthodoxy were, at least for some periods of time, still in communion with bishops and churches of a very doubtful orthodoxy of belief, including St. Basil or St. Cyril of Jerusalem, to quote the most conspicuous instance. Two main conclusions can be drawn from an impartial study of this tumultuous epoch. First, consensus was regarded as a prerequisite of communion, and therefore communion could be kept or practiced as long as there was a justifiable hope of an ultimate consensus; on the other hand, every reasonable suspicion of a real dissension in essentials would justify, in the situation at that time, an (at least provisional) break of communion (as it were, by precaution). As a matter of fact this was the normal procedure in an age when there was no unified administration of the Church Universal. A member of any local church would be, as a rule and in principle, entitled to be admitted to any other local church in any other place, where he might happen to reside, provided he could prove not only his own good standing but also the orthodoxy of his original church. Sometimes difficulties would arise. The best known instance in the early period is the Paschal controversy between Asia Minor and the West (in the second century.) In a period of debate the scrutiny would obviously be very rigorous and strict. Secondly, the main prerequisite of communion would be the validity of orders, i.e. ultimately an unbroken Apostolic Succession. It was the main guarantee of the good standing of a particular local church itself. One has, in addition, not to forget that at this period the Apostolic Succession was never regarded *in abstracto*, i.e. there was a question not only of a continuity in consecration, but above all of a continuity within the limits of every particular or local church. "Abstract" consecrations were prohibited and disavowed, and no

titular or nominal bishops were allowed to function as such. In the best case, and by the use of "economy," they would be given bishop's honors, but no bishop's rights or privileges. And finally both conditions were closely correlated: strictly speaking, no valid continuity could be recognized or admitted outside of a Catholic consensus. The ultimate reason for that was deeply grounded in an organic conception of the Church. Unanimity (in essentials) was just the formative factor of the Church (as far as its human aspect was concerned). Were this unanimity broken, the unity itself was broken, and no room for communion left. The limits or the scope of this unanimity could be variously circumscribed, and in some cases a narrow description had to be overruled by an authoritative statement of a wider and more competent instance, on a wider basis of charity and understanding. This was, for example, the case of the "Neo-Nicene" group. In some other cases, on the contrary, there was an obvious danger of compromising the adequacy of the dogmatic standing. To this category belong all the unsuccessful attempts to restore communion of the Chalcedonian Orthodox with the Monophysites. Consensus needed to be real and spiritual, and not just nominal, or achieved by evading the controversial issues.

In brief, there was no problem of intercommunion (in the modern sense of the term) in the undivided Church. It was so precisely because the Church was undivided, at least in aspiration. There was simply the question of "full communion," i.e. of membership in the Church. And there were identical terms of this membership for all, or at least identifiable or equivalent terms, if we consider the variety of actual language used in the Church. On some occasions it was of primary importance to assure the identity of meaning of the terms used for the same conceptions in Greek, or Latin, or Syriac. And there was some room for misinterpretation, in a literal sense. Possibly some of these misinterpretations considerably handicapped the agreement beween Byzantium and the East, especially Armenia. Yet, as a rule, there was some liberal room for variety, which is not to be mistaken for compromise. The reconciliation of St. Cyril of Alexandria with the Orient was by no means a compromise, but rather a rediscovery of a wider consensus. In any case there was but one desire — to establish the complete identity of a universal Orthodox Faith, which in itself was the main term of communion. It was, however, not to exclude a legitimate use of theological freedom. The Alexandrian and the Antiochene trends of theology happily survived along with each other in a perfect communion, if not without some occasional tensions, yet within the same and undivided Church. The only intercommunion practiced in the undivided Church was the communion between the various local churches, within an objective consensus and a recognized "unity of the undivided (Catholic) episcopate," to use an admirable phrase of St. Cyprian. But this unity was, in the last resort, not so much a unity of administration, as a unity of Faith or *Orthodoxia*.

Now there was still a very urgent problem with which the Church had to deal persistently time and again, precisely because she was engaged in the healing of schisms and the realization of a true unity. It was the problem of schism itself. On the whole, all schisms were utterly abhorred as such, as a flagrant violation of the essential unity of the Church: "the Church is one," she simply cannot be divided. We may leave this wider problem aside in the present context.[1] We have to confine ourselves now to its implications. And this was precisely the problem with which the Church actually dealt in the age of the Councils. Or, rather, there was a series or a complex of problems arising from time to time and always "situation-conditioned," and accordingly solved every time with an eye on the concrete situation. These decisions were never codified, at least with authority, and do not easily admit of a generalization. All these decisions were casual, and probably this was their strength. There was no concern with a rigid theory, but rather a preoccupation with an immediate harm already done, with a sickness to be cured. The problem can be put (as it has been actually put) in this form. People involved in an actual break of communion (including clergy and bishops) are now admitted to a full membership in the Church. Their personal or individual guilt or sin is adequately covered by their repentance. There is no longer any question of their moral integrity, or of the integrity of their belief. Yet what is their status? As a matter of fact there was no special question if the Church were dealing with "dissenters" in a narrow sense, i.e. with those who had lapsed for a time, after having been in full communion with the Church. Their unhappy secession could be forgiven and their occasional sickness cured by an appropriate discipline, more or less rigorous or charitable. In any case there was an exercise of charity and forgiveness, i.e. of a discipline of penance. However, it took some time before some measure of unanimity was achieved even on this matter (we would have to recall the rigorism of St. Cyprian and the whole problem of Donatism, and all kindred trends through the ages). There were some doubts about the limits of the Church's authority in the dispensation of spiritual charity and forgiveness, in so far as some issues of order and administration were inevitably involved in the problem. And these issues were spectacularly burning in a more complicated case, which was unfortunately the most usual, viz. in the case of a perpetuated and inveterate schism. The first question of this sort the Church had to consider was the whole problem of an heretical baptism — and we know that from the very beginning the emphasis was not only on the actual heresy but no less on the schismatic character of every heresy, i.e. on the fact of the separation (or a temporal separatedness) itself. Next came the problem of heretical (and deliberately schismatic, i.e. administered with a definite aiming at separation or rivalry) orders (ordination and consecration.) Of course there was no question of intercommunion with heretics and schismatics. Heresy had to be abrogated first, and schism cured. So there was a new

question about what to do with those ex-heretics and schismatics who had never been before within the fold of the Church, i.e. strictly speaking, with a specific and peculiar type of neophytes, for these were now for the first time to be admitted to full membership in the Catholic Church. The question was especially difficult in the case of those who had a reason to claim clerical status. The real point was precisely this: would not a recognition of a Christian status of the reconciled schismatics and heretics, be it their baptism or their orders, imply a tacit intercommunion with those schismatic and heretical bodies, in which that status had been acquired? To recognise a schismatic baptism would amount to an intercommunion in baptism. To receive a priest ordained by heretics would amount to a recognition that these heretical bishops did somehow belong to the unity of an undivided episcopate. In other words it would mean that a particular schism (or heresy,) in some enigmatic sense, had still been a part of the Church Universal, i.e. that unity had never been actually broken, but only rather disguised. Or again it would mean that communion had never been really broken. It is well known that such was, in fact, the mind of St. Augustine: that does not mean, of course, that he underestimated the disruptive and sinful character of any schism. And the Western Church has been officially committed ever since to this interpretation of the schismatic sacraments. It is more difficult to identify the mind of the Eastern Church. St. Augustine's conception was never formally repudiated in the period under discussion. On the other hand, those conciliar decisions by which the Church in the East had been bound for centuries were "ecumenical" decisions, as the Ecumenical Councils were synods of the Church Universal, and not just Eastern synods. We are not concerned, in the present context, with the problem of application of the ancient canons to the modern situation, which obviously could not have been anticipated at that time. Nor have we to discuss to what extent such an application (or "extrapolation") can be canonically justified. We have to deal with a plain historical question: was there any definite *theological* conception behind those *canonical* regulations, which were from time to time promulgated and enforced by the lawful authorities of the Church, in the period of Ecumenical Councils and later, up to the separation between the East and the West in the eleventh century? It has been sometimes suggested that all these canonical measures were simply practical measures, which it would be a mistake to condense in any theory. Possibly there was no theory at all. It was rather a practice of charity, which it really was, to be sure. Yet, on the other hand, it is difficult to see how charity in the Church can be totally detached from the rule of Faith. In any case the theological question must be asked. An exhaustive survey of all the historical evidence is of course quite beyond the scope of the present inquiry. We have to confine ourselves to some typical instances. The most comprehensive regulation on the whole problem is offered in the 95th canon of the Council in Trullo (692), which at the same time codified and authenticated all the previous

synodical decisions. The Council openly rules that Nestorians and Monophysites should be received into the Church by a renunciation of their errors, Arians and Apollinarians by the sacrament of the Holy Chrism. In neither case was there any question of a new baptism. But this was by no means a new practice: it was, on the contrary, the authorization of current practice. The canon does not mention the clergy in particular. Yet there is no doubt that Nestorian and Monophysite clergy were usually admitted to communion in their orders. This practice was quoted as a precedent at the Seventh Ecumenical Council (787), and accordingly the Iconoclast bishops and clergy were restored to the Church in their orders, which were illegally acquired in the heresy. It is true that at this point some serious objections were raised, not so much of a theological as of an historical nature: what was the custom and the rule of the early Church? Obviously there was no rigid uniformity in practice. Yet the final decision seems to imply that some illegal (or "illicit") sacraments could be still regarded and recognized as valid (i.e. "real,") or, in other words, there was no impelling duty to administer those sacraments again in the Catholic Church, which had already been conferred in the schism or heresy. The distinction made between various categories of schismatics or dissenters seems to suggest that there was some objective difference in their Christian status. It is true that no coherent synthesis had ever been offered on the matter. No doubt there were some real variations in practice, and this is the main objection which is usually raised by those who hesitate to make any doctrinal inference from the canons. Yet obviously the main doctrinal issue had been openly raised already by St. Basil. He felt himself compelled to do so in the face of a confused canonical situation. His advice or opinion, first given in a letter to Amphilochius, the Bishop of Iconium (*Ep.* CLXXXVIII, a. 374,) was incorporated as a canon into the Canonical Codex of the Church, authorized and authenticated by the Council in Trullo. First, some variety in the existing practice is plainly admitted (with regard to schismatic baptism) and it is suggested "that we should follow the custom existing in each region, embarrassing as it may be." Secondly, St. Basil introduces a distinction between different types of schism, already made by the ancients. He distinguishes three cases: heresy, schism, and illegal congregation (*parasynagoge.*) The first is completely broken off and alienated in faith. A schism is at variance (with the Church) on questions that admit of a remedy. A conventicle is rooted simply in insubordination. This classification is not, however, so simple to apply as might be expected. This becomes obvious when St. Basil comes to the case of an "inveterate" schism (he had in view particularly the Cathari, i.e. the Novatians.) At this point he refers to St. Cyprian and obviously accepts his point of view that sacramental life expires "because of the severance of continuity," i.e. by the fact of separation itself. An alienation in faith separates from the Catholic body — there is no communion where there is no consensus. But an alienation in

what taken by itself may admit of remedy, seems to have ultimately the same consequences. "For those who separated first had ordination from the fathers, and through the imposition of their hands possessed the spiritual gift; but those who had been cut off, becoming laymen, possessed the power neither of baptizing nor of ordaining, being able no longer to impart to others the grace of the Holy Spirit from which they themselves had fallen away." One may pretend that St. Basil was simply quoting St. Cyprian and giving his arguments without making them his own. The context, however, does not allow so easy an escape. St. Basil acquiesces in a milder practice, it is true, but only "for the sake of discipline," which was the true basis of such a mild practice. He would abstain from the severity which may endanger reconciliation. And he was prepared to apply this dispensation even in the case of an illegal episcopal consecration. In fact, St. Basil does not speak of discipline but of a "Catholic economy." On the other hand he hesitated to disavow the mild practice in order to avoid a worse confusion (as it is clear from his later letter to the same Amphilochius, *Ep.* CXCIX, a. 375). On the whole, St. Basil was quite aware of the theological issue involved in the discharge of discipline. Yet he did not press it. The stress he laid on the moment of separation can be easily understood against the concrete situation he had to face. Of course St. Basil was seriously concerned with the restoration of a doctrinal unity which had been so grievously endangered in his time, and he was prepared to use charity and wisdom in order to heal the dissentions. At that time there was dire controversy between local churches, precisely on theological issues. For St. Basil, to be sure, an alienation in faith also meant an estrangemnet from the Catholic Church. Yet, under present circumstances, a canonical communion between the orthodox and the heterodox bishops had not yet been broken. It led to those intricate cases with which the later synods had to deal, namely that the consecration of some leading "Orthodox" bishops appeared to be compromised by an irregular status of their consecrators (such was the case of St. Meletios of Antioch and of St. Cyril of Jerusalem). In such a situation it would have been unwise, nay detrimental to "catholic economy," to lay primary stress on a factual heresy as long as communion had not been formally and openly broken. On the other hand, in an inveterate schism the spiritual estrangement was consummated and all links with the Catholic body deliberately broken. St. Basil was first concerned with the reality of communion. Before an authoritative condemnation of errors and a formal enforcement of a definite doctrinal standard there was still some hope of curing the internal disease. This hope would be lost every time an actual break took place. And for that reason an agreement in matters of faith alone would not restore the broken unity. It accounts for a certain ambiguity in the argument of St. Basil. He hesitated to admit that a separated minister, openly outside of the communion with the Catholic Church, could act, as it were, *on behalf of* the Church in which he had no status

whatsoever and whose communion he had deliberately avoided. But such was, strictly speaking, St. Augustine's solution. For St. Augustine, indeed, schismatic bishops and ministers were acting, even against their own intention, on behalf and in the interest of the Church Catholic. Was then the unity of love of secondary importance? What makes St. Augustine's conception difficult is precisely his emphasis on the elements of unity, which seems to imply that distortion of an actual unity does not vitiate the integrity of these constituent elements. But the unity under discussion is not so much a canonical order, as the ultimate catholicity of the spirit. Is not this catholicity openly frustrated by the spirit of sectarianism? We are not surprised, therefore, to discover that, in spite of a comparatively mild discipline enforced by the Councils, theological doubts were not completely removed and that a great Byzantine canonist of the twelf century, Theodore Balsamon, the titular Patriarch of Antioch, hesitated to recognize any orders conferred outside the catholic communion of the Orthodox Church. On the other hand, even at a later date, no immediate conclusion can be drawn from the fact of the separation of the Churches, i.e. the schism between the East and the West, inaugurated by the mutual excommunications in 1054. There are many instances of a continued intercommunion between the Churches after the schism had been officially promulgated.[2]

Let us summarize. In the light of the doctrine and practice of the "Undivided Church" the following guiding principles can be formulated:

1. The Church is one. This unity is both based on and expresses two things. On the one hand it is rooted in a dogmatic consensus, however wide or narrow it may be. The Church of that time was just building its theological system, which had to be an adequate scheme of the "faith that was once delivered unto the saints," and therefore admitted no innovation. A Catholic communion (and no other could be allowed) was visualized only on the basis of an integral unity in faith. On the other hand, the actual communion (or communication) was of vital importance, for the very reason that Christianity is not just a doctrine but the Body. For that reason any isolationism would not only inhibit the normal life but endanger the reality of any spiritual life at all.

2. Accordingly no intercommunion would be allowed, if the term be given its modern connotation, which was indeed quite unknown in the early Church and alien to its spirit. Any intercommunion between the local churches would presuppose, at that time, an actual unity, both visible and invisible, on the basis of a common confession of faith and of an unbroken continuity of sacramental structure (and above all, of the "Apostolic Succession"). No exception could be allowed from this general rule.

3. The whole problem of the limits of the Church had been thoroughly discussed, and its practical implications were clearly seen. Divergent opinions on the matter were offered, but no final syntheses had been accomplished. Yet even when a distinction had been admitted between a strictly canonical boundary and an ultimate charismatic or

sacramental limit, it was never regarded as permissible to transgress the canonical limit: whatever the real status of "separated (Christian) bodies," no communion could go beyond the canonical limit, simply because this limit indicated the absence of unity. Communion and an integral unity were exact correlatives.

[1]Cf. two articles of mine on this subject: "The Limits of the Church," and "The Doctrine of the Church and the Ecumenical Problem."

[2]The whole question needs a careful reexamination; some valuable material can be found in the study, *The Byzantine Patriarchate*, by Br. George Every, S.S.M. (London, S.P.C.K., 1947).

THE HISTORICAL PROBLEM OF A DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH

It always helps a discussion if one can begin with a clear and precise definition of the subject. Definitions at once focus our attention and provide guidance for further research. Strangely enough, we are denied such guidance in a discussion of the Church. There is no "definition" of the Church which could claim any doctrinal authority. The credal phrase "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" is not a definition. No definition can be found in the Fathers. None has been given by Ecumenical Councils. None has been formally adopted in modern times. The current "definitions" in our catechisms and theological manuals have no credal or binding authority, and they are rather of a descriptive character. Moreover, there was no special chapter on the Church in any of the ancient expositions of Christian doctrine, from St. Irenaeus and Origen down to St. John of Damascus. On this point there was no basic difference between the Christian East and the West. Even St. Thomas Aquinas only spoke of the Church in passing. An outstanding Roman theologian has recently contended that actually the Church has still not defined her own nature.[1] On the Orthodox side, it has been claimed more than once that no strict or formal "definition" of the Church is possible and that no such definition is needed. Indeed, the Fathers of the ancient Church did not care for formulas simply because they had an existential knowledge of the Church, an intuition or vision of her mysterious reality. One does not define what is self-evident.

This vision of faith can be adequately expressed in images rather than in logical concepts. There are many images of the Church in Scripture.[2] In our search for an adequate description of the Church, we must begin with these great scriptural images: the body of Christ of which he is the Head; the bride of Christ of which he is the bridegroom; the Vine and the branches; the people of God — "a peculiar people"; the house of God of which God is the builder and believers are "living stones"; the pillar and ground of truth; and many others still. This was the way taken by the Fathers. Their theology of the Church grew out of their exegesis, as well as out of their liturgical and devotional experience; and it was shaped in scriptural idiom, in images rather than in definitions. It is in its tradition of the Fathers that the Orthodox conception of the Church is grounded.

The Church is the body of Christ. Of course, this is not a definition. It is an image or a simile. It is no more than an analogy. But this analogy focuses our attention on basic features of Christian existence. No doubt, it was not an accidental metaphorical phrase in St. Paul; it was a summary of faith and experience. St. Paul's main emphasis was always on the intimate union of the faithful with the Lord, on their sharing in his fullness. His vision of the Church was essentially

Christological. As St. John Chrysostom has pointed out, commenting on *Colossians* 3:4, in all his writings St. Paul wanted to prove that believers "were in communion with him in all things" and "precisely to show this union did he speak of the Head and the body."[3] The term could be suggested by the eucharistic experience (cf. *I Corinthians* 10:17), and was deliberately used to suggest a sacramental connotation. Christian sacraments are social sacraments, sacraments of incorporation. The social character of Baptism is obvious. And Eucharist is communion. The Church of Christ is one in the Eucharist, for the Eucharist is Christ himself, acting still as the High Priest of the New Covenant. He abides sacramentally in the Church, which is his body. The Church is a body indeed; that is, an organism and not just a society or congregation. It seems that "organism" is the best modern rendering of the phrase *to soma*, as used by St. Paul. The Church is the body *of Christ*, not simply a "body of men, "a corporation." The Church is *in Christ*, as well as Christ is in his Church. The Church is not merely a community of those who believe in Christ and walk in his commandments. She is a community of those who abide and dwell in him, and in whom he himself is abiding and dwelling by the Spirit. Indeed, the favorite phrase of St. Paul was precisely *en Christo*.

The Church is the body of Christ and his "fullness," *pleroma*. These two terms, "body" and "fullness," are correlative and are closely linked together, one explaining the other: "which is his body, the fullness of him who all in all is being fulfilled" (*Ephesians* 1:23). Interpreting this verse of the epistle, St. John Chrysostom suggested that *pleroma* actually meant "complement." "The Church is the complement of Christ," he contended. "Observe how he [St. Paul] introduces him as having need of all the members. This means that only then will the Head be filled up, when the body is rendered perfect, when we are all together, co-united and knit together."[4] In other words, the Church is the extension and the "fullness" of the holy Incarnation or rather of the Incarnate life of the son, "with all that for our sakes was brought to pass, sitting on the right hand."[5] The Incarnation is being completed in the Church and in a sense the Church is Christ himself in his all-embracing plenitude (cf. *I Corinthians* 12:12).

The crucial problem of ecclesiology is the double condition of the Church. The Church exists at once in two different dimensions, and the relationship between these dimensions is the ultimate crux of interpretation. The Church is at once on the road (*in statu viae*), to once more use the language of St. Augustine. She has, as it were, a dual life, or rather "two lives" at once.[6] The Church is a visible historic community or institution and at the same time she is also the body of Christ. She is at once a company of frail men, always in travail (*in labore*), and a glorious communion (*koinonia*) with the Lord. This crucial mystery can be adequately conceived only in the categories of the Chalcedonian dogma. We are facing here the same paradox. if only analogically. "The form of the servant" is obvious in the Church. But

faith discerns under this "form," or rather within it, "the new creation" and the abiding presence of Christ, through the Spirit. The life of Christians "is hid with Christ in God" (*Colossians* 3:3). The "two lives" are united and interrelated in the identity of subject: unconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably. There is but one Church, "visible" and "invisible" at once, humiliated and glorious at once. The human condition is not abrogated by divine grace but only redeemed and transfigured. And the presence of the divine is real and genuine. That which "is not of this world" is already here "in this world." And this presence gives new significance and meaning to "this world" itself. On the historical level, the final goal is not yet attained. But the ultimate reality has already been manifested or rather granted. And this ultimate reality, the *eschaton*, is always available, in spite of all historic imperfections.

*It is sometimes objected that Orthodox ecclesiology is unbalanced and one-sided, that it does not do full justice to the status of the militant Church. Yet, in that respect, it simply continues in the steps of the ancient Church. In fact, an integral theology of the Church cannot be oriented on the historic realm of the Church militant. The doctrine of the Church can be developed only within the comprehensive scheme of the divine *oikonomia* of salvation. The "historical" and the "canonical" are intrinsically subordinate to the "charismatic" and "sacramental." From the Orthodox point of view, there is an unresolved tension or even rupture in the Western theology of the Church: the balance between the "historic" and the "eschatological" has been broken and the indivisible identity of the Church has been obscured. Either the "historic" was overemphasized, as in Roman theology; or the "eschatological" has dismissed the "historic" and the "visibility" of the Church has been denied. In both cases the Chalcedonian balance has been distorted. In any case, "historic" in the theology of the Church means historic in the plan of salvation, not on the plane of "secular" history taken within its own limits. In other words, the realm of the militant Church can be properly understood only in its relation to the ultimate realm of the Church triumphant. Life on the road (*status viae*) is inwardly determined precisely by life in the homeland (*status patriae*), for the way should be oriented toward the goal. One must withstand the temptation to separate or to oppose the two realms. Action and administration in the Church are organically subordinate to her sacramental and charismatic function, and are sound only in the context of the sacramental fabric of the Church as the body of Christ.

The Church is the unity of charismatic life, of life in the Spirit. The source of this unity is hidden in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and in the mystery of Pentecost. And Pentecost is continued and, as it were, made permanent in the Church by means of apostolic succession. This succession is not merely the canonical skeleton of the Church. Ministry (or "heirarchy," *hierosyne*) is itself primarily a charismatic principle. It belongs not only to the *institutional* fabric of the Church; it is rather an

intrinsic *structural* feature, just in so far as the Church is a body, an organism. Ministers act primarily *in persona Christi*. They are "representatives" of Christ himself, not of believers, and in them and through them the Head of the body, the only High Priest of the new covenant, is performing, continuing and accomplishing his perennial pastoral and priestly office, till he comes again to judge the quick and the dead. He is himself the only true minister of the Church. All others are but stewards of his mysteries. They stand *for* him, *before* the community; and just because the body is one only in the Head, is brought together and into unity by him and in him, the ministry in the Church is primarily the ministry of unity. The unity of every local congregation springs from unity in the eucharistic meal, and it is as the celebrant of the Eucharist that the priest is the builder and the minister of Church unity. But there is another office: to secure the universal and "catholic" unity of the whole Church in space and time. This is the episcopal office and function. As "ordainer" to ministry the bishop is the builder of Church unity on a wider scale. In the episcopate, Pentecost becomes universal and continuous; in the undivided episcopate of the Church, unity in space is secured. Through its bishop, or rather in its bishop, every particular or local Church is included in the Catholic fullness of the Church, is linked with the past and with all ages. In its bishop every single Church outgrows and transcends its own limits and is organically united with the others.

Thus the apostolic succession is not so much the canonical as the mystical and sacramental foundation of the Church's unity. It is an ultimate means to retain the mystical identity of the body through the ages. By the continuity of her ordinations, the entire Church is consolidated in unity. Of course, the episcopal order is never detached from the body of the Church; it is not a self-sufficient system since, especially in ordaining and consecrating, bishops always act as leaders of definite local communities. A retired bishop has no right to ordain, not because he has no "authority" or "jurisdiction," but rather because he is not representing or leading a particular local Church. For the same reason "abstract" ordinations, i.e., ordinations without a particular "title," are canonically prohibited (see the sixth canon of the Council of Chalcedon). Ministers must be attached and allocated to particular flocks and congregations. The privileges of order must be used always in the midst of a particular community. Sacramental authority is given to ministers for their congregations, as they are with the flock which is committed to their service. In this sense they act also *in persona ecclesiae*. But these two aspects, Christ and Church, can never be separated from each other.

The Church is one. There is but one Church of Christ. For the Church is his body and Christ is never divided. Unity is not one note of the Church among the others. It denotes rather the very nature of the Church: one Head and one body. "The unity of the Spirit" has been given from the beginning in the mystery of Pentecost. But this unity

must be maintained and strengthened by "the bond of peace," by an ever-increasing effort of faith and charity in order that "speaking the truth in love, we grow up in all things toward him who is the head, the Christ" (*Ephesians* 4: 3,15). "Unity" and "catholicity" are two aspects of the same living reality. One Church is intrinsically Church Catholic.

The term "catholic" is used in the ancient creeds. The origin of the term is uncertain. By its etymology the word denotes primarily "togetherness" or "entirety" in opposition to any "particularity." In early documents the term "catholic" was never used in the quantitative sense to denote the geographical expansion or territorial universality of the Church. It was used rather to emphasize the integrity of her faith and doctrine, the loyalty of the Great Church to the original and primitive tradition, in opposition to heretics and sectarians who separated themselves from this original wholeness each to follow a particular and particularist line. "Catholic" at that time meant "orthodox" rather than "universal." It is in this sense that the term was used for the first time in the Epistle of St. Ignatius of Antioch to the Church of Smyrna and in the *Martyrium of St. Polycarp*. In his *Catechetical Orations* St. Cyril of Jerusalem later gave a synthetic description of the term in which the original meaning was well stressed:

> The Church is called "Catholic" because she exists on the whole surface of the earth, from one end to the other; because she teaches integrally and without omission [*katholikos kai anelleipos*] all dogmas which must be brought to the knowledge of men, both on things visible and invisible, on things celestial and on things earthly; because it brings to the same worship all categories of people, rulers and subjects, learned and ignorant; finally, because she nurses and cures integrally [*katholikos*] all kinds of sins, carnal as well as those of the soul; again because she possesses all kinds of virtues, in deeds, in words, in spiritual gifts of all sorts.[7]

The original stress on integrity and qualitative comprehensiveness is obvious in this description. The universal expansion in the whole world is rather a manifestation of this internal integrity, of the spiritual plenitude of the Church. It was only in the West that the word "catholic" was given a quantitative meaning, especially by St. Augustine to counteract the geographical provincialism of the Donatists.[8] St. Augustine knew well, however, that the word "catholic" meant *secundum totum, quia per totum est*. Since that time the two words "catholic" and "universal" have come to be regarded as synonyms, first in the West and finally in the Orthodox East also. This was a regrettable reduction of the great catholic conception, a mutilation of the original idea. It transferred the accent from the primary meaning to the secondary and derivative. Essential catholicity is not a topographical conception. The Church of Christ was not less "catholic" on the day of Pentecost when she was no more than a small company at Jerusalem,

nor later when Christian communities were like islands scattered in the ocean of paganism. Moreover, no territorial reduction can affect her catholic nature. In brief, in the phrase of a contemporary Roman theologian, "catholicity is not a matter of geography or of numbers."[9]

In order to reemphasize this internal catholicity of the Church one uses in Russian the word *sobornost*. Originally this was not more than a translation of the Greek term for "catholicity" and is used in this sense in the Slavonic translation of the Creed: *ekklesia katholike* equals *sobornaia tserkov*. Accordingly, this Russian term does not mean more than catholicity. There was no need to borrow it and use it in English as if there was a peculiar "Russian" conception of the Church which could be denoted by a foreign neologism. It is true that certain Russian writers use the word in a peculiar sense, but their interpretation is in no sense characteristic of Eastern Orthodoxy at large. Instead of borrowing a foreign term, it would be more helpful to recover the ancient conception of internal catholicity, which can be adequately denoted by traditional words.[10]

Moreover, "catholic" is not just a collective term. The Church is catholic not only as an ensemble of all local churches, not only as a world-wide community. The Church is catholic in all her elements and branches, in all her acts and in all the moments of her life. Each member of the Church also is and must be "catholic," not only in so far as he is a member of a catholic body, but primarily in that his personality is spiritually integrated and in this sense "catholicized." "Catholic" denotes a spiritual state or attitude, exclusive of all "particularism" or "sectarianism." The goal and the criterion of this internal catholicity is "that the multitude of the believers were of one heart and one soul" (*Acts* 4:32).

Catholicity is both an initial gift of grace — in the integrity of the apostolic faith and in comprehensive charity — and a task or problem to be solved again and again. Objectively the Church is catholic in her sacraments. Sacramental grace is always a grace of unity. The Holy Spirit unites us to the Lord by incorporating us into his body. The spirit unites us together to form "one body," the catholic Church. And in each faithful soul the Spirit is the living source of peace and inner concord, of that peace that "the world cannot give." In Christ and "in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit," the catholicity of the Church is already given and grounded. On the other hand, it is still a task and a goal, to be achieved by every new generation, in every local community, by every faithful person. Internal catholicity implies the total transformation or transfiguration of life and behavior which can be achieved only by constant spiritual effort, by the constant practice of renunciation and charity. There is no room for selfishness and exclusiveness, or for any individualistic self-sufficiency, in the catholic structure of the Church.

At this point we may recall the beautiful simile of the second century, the Shepherd of Herman. The growth of the Church is

described here in the image of a tower in the process of construction. In the field and elsewhere, various stones are scattered. Some are bright, others black. Some are square, others round. No round stones can be used for construction, even if they are bright.[11] The symbolism is clear. Of course brightness denotes purity, but this does not seem to be sufficient for inclusion in the walls of the Church. Roundness is the symbol of self-sufficiency and splendid isolation. The round stones do not fit each other — there are always holes left. But the square stones do fit. And when the building has been completed, it appears to be made as if "of one stone." To be used in the building, the round stones have had to be cut and adjusted. The emphasis is precisely on this mutual adjustment. Indeed, this adjustment can be completed only within the Church, within the body and by the power of the Spirit. But a certain disposition towards adjustment is a prerequisite to the operation of the Spirit. This fraternal disposition must precede incorporation, although it can be maintained only by the help of grace. There is always a synergism of freedom and grace.

The unity of the Church is not created, however, merely by human affection and charity. It is indeed created by love, but rather by the redeeming and redemptive love of God. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us" (*1 John* 4:10). He made us brothers by adopting us all in his only Son. Likewise, the body of Christ was created and formed already by the Incarnation, which was itself the supreme manifestation of the creative love of God. The Fathers of the Church had much to say on this subject. St. John Chrysostom, in particular, used to emphasize the intimate relation between Christian charity and the eucharistic reality. Christ feeds the faithful with his own body and blood because he wished them to mingle with him and so to become his own body.[12] The eucharistic altar is sacred and august. But still it is made of stones. There is another altar, no less venerable and even more awesome and majestic, which is the body itself, the Church, made of living beings. On this altar the sacrifice of alms and charity can be, and must be, continuously offered.[13]

The language of St. John Chrysostom was sharp and realistic. The Greek Fathers of the Church were often accused of holding a crude and naturalistic conception of the sacraments and also of the Church herself. This charge is an unfortunate misunderstanding, for the realism of the Fathers was always inspired by their intuition of intimacy with Christ the Savior. Eucharist itself was conceived under this aspect of intimacy, which is the very foundation of the Church. "For between the Body and the Head there is no room for any interval — if there was any, there would be neither Head nor Body," declared St. John Chrysostom. And he used to reaffirm this statement again and again.[14] This is why the Eucharist is the ultimate revelation of the total Christ and the ultimate sacrament, beyond which one has nowhere to go.

One, holy, catholic, apostolic — these words are not independent of each other but intimately and organically interdependent. The Church is

one only by her "holiness"; that is, by the sanctifying grace of the Spirit. She is holy only because she is apostolic; that is, she is likened with the apostles in the living continuity of the charismatic life, disclosed in the mystery of Pentecost, which is the source of the Church's "holiness." She is catholic by the grace of the Spirit, which makes her one single body of the only Lord. Yet her unity is a unity in multiplicity, a living unity, as the Church is and must be — an image of the Holy Trinity, which is one God and the only God. Here is rooted the mystery of the Church catholic.

The Orthodox Church claims to be *the Church.* There is no pride and no arrogance in this tremendous claim. On the contrary, it implies a heavy responsibility. It is a constant reminder of inadequacy, a call to repentance and humility. In no way is it a claim to "perfection." The Church is still in pilgrimage, in travail, *in via.* She has her historic failures and losses; she has her unfinished tasks and problems. Nor is it just a claim. It is rather an expression of deepest conviction, of deepest spiritual self-knowledge, humble and grateful. The Orthodox Church is conscious of her identity through the ages, in spite of all historic trials and tribulations. She believes that she has kept intact and immaculate the sacred heritage of the early Church, of the Apostles and the Fathers, "the faith which was once delivered to the saints." She is aware of the identity of her teaching with the apostolic preaching and the tradition of the ancient Church, even though she may have failed occasionally and probably too often to convey this message and this tradition to particular generations in their full splendor and in a way which carries conviction. In a sense, the Orthodox Church is a continuation, a "survival," of ancient Christianity as it was shaped in the age of the Ecumenical Councils. She stands for the tradition of the Fathers, which is embodied also in her liturgical structure and in her spiritual practice. This is a living tradition, giving the Orthodox Church her identity. Nor is it just a human tradition, maintained by human memory and imitation. The ultimate identity of the Church is grounded in her sacramental structure, in the organic continuity of the body. The Orthodox Church finds herself in an unbroken succession of sacramental life and faith. She is aware of having been ever the same since the beginning. And for that very reason the Orthodox Church recognizes herself, in our divided Christendom, as the true guardian of the ancient faith and order; that is, as being the Church The whole program of ecumenical action is implied in this Orthodox ecclesiology.

[1]Robert Grosche, *Pilgernde Kirche* (Freiburg i/Br.: 1938), s. 27.

[2]See Paul S. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (London: 1961), p.12.

[3]St. John Chrysostom, *In Coloss. hom.*, VII, MG, LXII, col. 375.

[4]St. John Chrysostom, *In Ephes. hom.*, III, MG, LXII, col. 29. Already Origen called attention to the fact that the verb is in the passive voice.

[5]Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, Prayer of Consecration.

[6]St. Augustine, *In Evangel. Joannis tract.*, CXXIV, 5, ML, XXXV, col. 1973.

[7]St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. orat.*, XVIII. 23, MG, XXXIII, col. 1044.

[8]St. Augustine, *De unitate ecclesiae*, II. 2, PL, XLIII, col. 391 ss. Augustine speaks here precisely of the unity of the *corpus mysticum* and of the organic connection between the Head and the body.

[9]Henri de Lubac, *Catholicisme, Les aspects sociaux du dogme* (2nd ed.; Paris: 1947), p. 26.

[10]Cf. Georges Florovsky, "The Catholicity of the Church," in *The Church of God: an Anglo-Russian Symposium*, ed. by E.L. Mascall (London: S.P.C.K., 1934). In *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky.*

[11]Similit. IX. 6, 8; cf. Vis., III. 6, 5-6.

[12]St. John Chrysostom, *In Joann. hom.*, LXXVI, MG, LIX, col. 260.

[13]St. John Chrysostom, *In II Cor. hom.*, XX, MG, LXI, col. 540.

[14]St. John Chrysostom, *In Ephes. hom.*, III, MG, LXII, col. 26; *In I Cor. hom.*, VIII, MG, LXI, col. 72-73: The smallest interval would bring us death"; *In I Tim. hom.*, XV, MG, LXII, col. 586: "I do not like anything between us: I wish that two may become one."

ECUMENISM AND THE REFORMATION

Ultimately I am trying to answer a particular question and to pose it to myself first. This question can perhaps be formulated thus: is there a place for Orthodox theologians, above all for commissioned representatives (but by no means authorized ones) of local Orthodox Churches in a movement — which is so structured that it is almost an organization — whose initiative and direction belong to "Protestants" (taken in its broad sense, which acknowledges the Reformation)? Could some profit and success be gained from this collaboration ? The overly-critical and the hesitant would easily add: surely such a collaboration indicates a serious confusion in ecclesiastical notions as well as a loose and uncertain ecclesiastic consciousness, a lowering of ecclesiastic standards, a premature and unjustified acceptance of the principles and measures of that which is called the Reformation (which some voices, even Protestant ones, have at times albeit rarely called the deformation)?

It is certainly not difficult to reject the Reformation where its historical aspects are concerned, but it is impossible to do the same thing with the problem or problems which have been raised and discussed since the time of the Reformation in Europe.

Obviously, "Protestants" would suggest that all empirical churches should truly become churches, and in order to accomplish this aim, they should go through a kind of reform and purification, more or less identical with the European Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They are committed by the very logic of their belief to an emphatic claim that the churches of the Reformation are representative of a true kind of church, and that consequently no church can ever be true unless it has gone through a process of reformation. In this context, unreformed is synonymous with untrue.

On the other hand, a "Catholic" will never regard the Catholic Church as one particular denomination among many others. He will identify her with the Church of Christ. The claim may seem arrogant; it may easily be dismissed as a proof of spiritual pride or intransigent hypocrisy. Yet it is to be understood that a "catholic" is committed to this claim by the very logic of his belief and conviction. Again, it is to be understood that this claim does not "unchurch" those who do not belong to the Catholic Church of history. The most rigid "catholic" will regard all faithful Christians as related in a way which remains to be defined, or even as belonging to the Church of Christ. No anticipation of the ultimate eschatological judgment is implied in the "catholic" claim. The claim is laid down on the level of history, i.e. on the level of Christian practice and action. The true composition of the Church is known to the Lord of the Church only — no "catholic" has ever doubted that, and St. Augustine has stated it most frankly and emphatically.

Perhaps the real point is this: was the Reformation a gain or a loss —a step forward or a step astray? Of course, this is only a rough way of putting it, and both the question and the answers must be carefully defined (which is, unfortunately, quite beyond the scope and the competence of the present paper). It may be very painful for a "Protestant" to read this; it is very painful indeed for a "Catholic" to write it. But it is not written to pain or offend anybody. Conviction is bound to be outspoken. And we have to share our respective pains, to bear each other's burdens, and thereby to prove our mutual confidence and our true brotherly affection. Both "Protestants" and "Catholics" are concerned with the marks of a true church. The tragedy is that they identify these marks differently, even in opposite senses.

THE GREEK AND LATIN MIND IN THE EARLY AGES OF THE CHURCH

We have to face the split between the Greek and the Latin mind, in the early ages of the Church. Of course, this split was never complete or absolute, yet its impact on the whole destiny of Christianity was enormous. Somebody has wittily remarked that language is given to man as a means of communication, but it is used rather as a means of isolation. There is dreadful truth in the story of the tower of Babel. Indeed, the common tongue has been lost, i.e., precisely the common mind, because language itself is a system of ideas. The problem of language was acute in the primitive Church. The evangelization of the world, the preaching of the Good News to all nations, or simply to the "nations," gentes or ἔθνη, i.e., to the heathen and non-Jewish world, required and implied a transcription of the original message into the terms and categories of other tongues. The problem was greatly simplified by the existence of a universal or common language at that time, common at least within the limits of the "universal" Empire.

In this historical context the prominence given to the Greek Bible was quite comprehensible. It provided a common ground for Christian preaching, nay, the common language, i.e., a set of categories and terms. It was just the transcription that was wanted for the missionary task and purpose. The need to check it by the "Hebrew truth," *veritas hebraica*, in the phrase of St. Jerome, was felt by scholars (like Origen or Jerome,) but practically and pastorally this was irrelevant and even confusing. The New Testament, in any case, was composed in Greek, though by people for whom it was not their native tongue. In a sense, Greek is still the common language of the whole of Christendom, and indeed the *only* common language, and everybody is bound to refer to the Greek Testament as to the original, even when we detect a Jewish background and a Jewish mind behind the Greek idiom. Moreover, for centuries the undivided Church was thinking in Greek, even when she spoke various tongues. As matter of fact, Greek was used in the West too, even at Rome, as the language of worship and preaching, possibly till the middle of the third century, if not later. The Church of Rome was Latinized only gradually, and only with St. Augustine and St. Jerome did Latin really become the language of great Christian literature and thought. Yet even St. Augustine and St. Jerome were Hellenistic in mind, though St. Augustine's Greek was rather poor and deficient.

Let us keep in mind our true question: we are concerned now not with difference but with isolation. The tragedy comes when people forget that they "belong together" and lose the wider perspective. The East and the West were different from the outset. Yet the feeling of a universal fellowship was strong. Eastern Christians felt themselves quite at home in the West and Western in the East. The disruption comes later.

Already in the time of St. Augustine, Greek was not studied in the West, although his immediate predecessor at the See of Hippo, Valerius, was a Greek and did not know any Latin. The rise of Latin-thinking Christianity in the West has been overlooked, or perhaps contemptuously ignored, in the East. In the East they took little notice of the rising "Latin Christianity" and did not care for translations. Very little of Augustine was ever translated into Greek. On the other hand, Latin translations of the Greek Fathers were never very numerous in the West and did not cover a large field, with few exceptions. Latin Christian civilization steadily decayed since St. Augustine, and fresh nations came on the historical scene, but when the recovery came very little of the Greek heritage was saved, and living continuity with the common past of the Church universal was broken, except what has been preserved in the treasury of worship.

While the West was lapsing into its dark ages, the East was still going on in spite of all external disasters and inner troubles. The final collapse of Byzantine Christianity came many centuries later, when the West had already recovered, or perhaps was already on the eve of its own autumn. This mental divorce of the East and the West was never complete. The common ground was never lost. What really happened was much worse. *It was forgotten that there was a common ground.* And very often what was in fact common was mistaken for something peculiar and distinctive. A custom was developed in the West to treat even the Greek Fathers as exotic Orientals. The Reformation did not change this attitude of suspicion and ignorance. The total outcome of this age-long estrangement was the inability, on both sides of the cultural schism, to ascertain even the existing agreements and the tendency to exaggerate all the distinctive marks. Of course there was another motive for this mutual misunderstanding which is still relevant in our day. Both sides were on the defensive: everything Greek smelt "schism" for the Roman taste, and everything Latin suggested "Popery" to the Eastern.

By no means am I going to suggest that there was no difference between the East and the West. But surely not every difference and not even every disagreement is, or should be, a lawful and sufficient reason for divorce. There is no reason to believe that these differences or varieties are ultimately irreconciliable and cannot or could not be integrated or rather reintegrated into the fullness of the Catholic mind. Possibly this reintegration has not yet been conscientiously attempted. I am pleading now that such a task should be urgently undertaken. We have to examine the existing tensions and divergences with a prospective synthesis in view. I mean exactly what I say: a synthesis and integration, and not just a toleration of the existing varieties or particular views. No ultimate synthesis is possible in history but still there is a measure of integration for every age. Our fault is precisely that we are behind the time, behind our own time. We have to recognize

the common ground that existed a long time ago. This seems to be the most imposing ecumenical task.

In one sense, the Eastern Church is a survival of ancient Christianity as it has been shaped in the age of the Ecumenical Councils and of the Holy Fathers. The Eastern Church stands exactly for the Patristic tradition. Surely it was, and must be, the common tradition both of the East and the West, and here resides its primary importance and its uniting power. But in the West, in the Middle Ages, this Patristic tradition was reduced or impoverished (for a considerable period of time "Patristic" meant in the West simply "Augustinian," and everything else was ignored or forgotten,) and again it has been obscured and over burdened with a later scholastic superstructure. Thus in the West it became a sort of an historical reminiscence, just a piece of the past that had passed away and must be rediscovered by an effort of memory. Only in the East has it been kept alive for centuries up to the present time. By no means is it simply an archaic relic, a shadowy remnant of ages gone. It is *living* tradition. It is what gives to the East its Christian identity. It is what has kept its identity through ages of strife and temptation. I am not speaking now of Patristic opinions, but precisely of the Patristic mentality and attitude.

The Orthodox Church of the East has been speaking for centuries the same old idiom of the Fathers, has kept and cherished it as her true mother tongue, and for that reason is perhaps better equipped for its adequate interpretation than anyone who would merely learn a foreign tongue in order to interpret ancient texts with some respectable dictionary in his hands. A native's command of his own language is ever the safest because it is spontaneous. The Eastern Church is still speaking Patristic Greek, a Greek that was in fact the only theological language of the Church universal for at least a thousand years, and she has been doing it faithfully for ages, at least in her worship, in the devotional and spiritual life of the faithful. Sometimes, especially in modern times, this language has been discontinued or lost even in the East, so far as the school or class were concerned. There were some notable Western accretions in the modern theology of the East, and thereby a kind of divorce of the classroom from the chapel was established. It was a most uncomfortable and unfortunate feature, and there were many grave dangers implied therein. Yet the very fact of this divorce compelled Eastern theologians to be, or at least to try to be, mentally bilingual, as it were, which implied a permanent mutual check on both the idioms involved. And therefore, as it has been recently suggested, Eastern theologians in our time are directly linked with the Fathers without ceasing to be modern and up-to-date. This is the opinion of Hans Ehrenberg, editor of *Östliches Christentum*, who, in speaking of the Eastern theologians, says, "they stand without intermediate connections upon the foundation of the ancient Fathers. With them we are again in the midst of an unbroken stream of living dogmatic thinking; this is not a dogmatism, but dogma itself, not an

ecclesiasticism, but just the Church. Their theology is a true child of ancient Christianity, of the early Church, and an adoptive child of modern Europe." Dr. Ehrenberg was speaking primarily of modern Russian theology. But what he had to say does apply to a great extent to the Eastern Church as a whole.

Many Westerners still believe in the "Unchanging East" even in the Church, "unchanging" in the sense of sterility and stagnation. It is a very dangerous illusion and an obvious historical error. The point is that the Eastern Church has kept the undistorted heritage of the old in a vigorous discourse with the changing times (a German would say: *Auseinandersetzung*.) Since the Fourth Crusade the Christian East never lost living contact with the West, and Western impact on Eastern development was considerable. The ancient tradition was kept in spite of pressure from abroad and not by inertia only. These contacts were often rather unhappy. Yet in this school of historical trial and conflict, the Eastern Church had to learn, and to a large extent did learn, to respond to modern challenges and problems out of the continuous experience in which the old and the new are merged into a living whole. By no means am I going to suggest that all problems have been happily solved and all tensions smoothed or removed. On the contrary, we are just in the midst of an acute tension and conflict. So was the Church in the glorious age of the Ecumenical Councils. I am concerned at the moment only with the right approach to these inevitable and recurrent tensions. We have to meet the challenge of the changing ages on the solid ground of an ecumenical and catholic tradition and experience. Or, in the phrase of F. D. Maurice, we have to check the spirit of our own age not by the spirit of any other particular age, but by the Holy Spirit of God.

It is precisely at this point that the main objection arises. When we recall the old traditon, the witness of Christian antiquity, are we not doing precisely what we are ourselves condemning and disavowing? Are we not simply imposing an obsolete mentality of bygone ages? It is true, indeed, that the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, were interpreting the Apostolic message, the original Good News, in Greek categories and the influence of Hellenic or Hellenistic philosophy on their conception can be easily detected. This is, as it had been already for a long time, the main objection against their authority. Yet the real question is whether we can regard this "Hellenistic phase" of Christian theology, if we are to admit the phrase, merely as an unhappy historical accident, and whether after all we can ever really get away from these "Greek categories." We have to realize that, as a matter of fact, Christian Hellenism was never a peculiarly Eastern phenomenon. Hellenism is the common basis and background of all Christian civilization. It is simply incorporated into our Christian existence, whether we like it or not. One cannot easily undo the whole of history once it has happened, nor is there any reason too long for that. Somebody has remarked that the battle of Marathon belonged to

English history no less than the battle of Hastings. With much more justification we can submit that the Ecumenical Councils and the Fathers do belong to our own history, whatever our local and particular allegiance may be.

We are compelled to recognize this ancestry and this parentage, if we care at all for the identity of our Christian message and for the continuity of our Christian existence. For, indeed, Christianity is not just an abstract and "general" message which could be divorced or detached from its historical context, an "eternal" truth which could be formulated in some super-historical propositions. Christianity is history by its very essence. It is a proclamation and an interpretation of certain concrete historical events. And the first and immediate witness to these events, the only witness by which our beliefs and convictions stand and are proved, has been given in a very definite and "particular" language. We come now to the crucial point. Taking all that had just been said for granted, are we really compelled to go beyond the limits of the Scripture? And is not the Scripture rather Hebrew or Jewish, if in a Greek disguise? Very few indeed would go so far as to suggest a radical elimination of the "Sacred Hebraism" out of the essential fabric of Christian belief. Hebrew will possibly be unanimously recognized as an essential and integral element of the Christian mind. But precisely for that very reason any "Hellenism" would be vigorously contested as an unlawful accretion or adulteration.

I am afraid that in the whole controversy about an "acute Hellenization" of Christianity in the post-Apostolic Church, double standards have been deliberately used. We always claim to be concrete and to keep to events, but practically we cease to do so as soon as we arrive at the beginnings of the Church. We do not regard it as a "pure accident" that the history of salvation has been organically integrated into the history of Israel, of a particular chosen people of God, and therefore we easily accept the Hebrew frame of mind as a sacred pattern of our own mind, nay, of any Christian mind. But as soon as we come to the Church, we start claiming that everything since has been utterly accidental and that the fact that the first authentic interpretation of the Christian message has been given in Hellenistic categories could not have any significance whatever and should be regarded rather as a misfortune and even a mischief. Obviously this duplicity of standards depends ultimately upon our doctrinal assumptions or prejudices. On the other hand, I am not suggesting an exact and literal parallelism of the Hebrew and the Hellenistic. The only point I am really prepared to make, and to make most strongly, is that Christian Hellenism should not be discarded from the outset as a passing accident.

Let us be historical in all realms of our Christian existence. Now, for many of us, historicity means relativity. But it is a very narrow and particular approach, and I doubt most seriously whether it is a true Biblical or Scriptural approach. The sacred history of salvation does not consist of mere happenings that pass away and are irrrelevant as such

but of events that stay for ever. The history of salvation is still going on, is still enacted in the redeemed community, in the Church of God. There are here not only happenings, but events too, that are to stay. The formulation of Christian dogma was one of these permanent events or achievements. We have to take it in that concrete shape and form in which it had been first deposited or delivered unto the Church. Of course this witness of the Church to the revealed truth that had been entrusted to her was, and had to be, phrased in a particular language which is no longer our own , fortunately or unfortunately. It may sound strange and alien to many. As a matter of fact, one can adopt two different ways out of the difficulty. *Either*, and this is perhaps the current solution, we may attempt a translation of what has ben expressed in a foreign language of the past. Translation, however, is not to be a "literal" translation (we have to translate the message, and not the words,) but precisely an "interpretation," i.e., a transposition into another intellectual key. It is just this mental style and structure that makes languages differ, not merely the vocabulary. *Or*, to the best of our ability, we may try to learn the ancient language, to make it our own, so as not to need any "translation," or perhaps to adopt it or to rediscover it as our true mother-tongue. In any case, even for a fair and trustworthy translation we have to know the language of the original which we interpret as thoroughly as we can. To know a language *au fond* means precisely to speak it, i.e. to use it spontaneously, as a natural means of self-expression and communication.

In order to convey and to interpret accurately the message of the Bible in a new idiom and to a new people, we have to have an adequate command of the original Biblical language. In order to interpret Christian dogma and to render it in a modern tongue, we must command the original language, in which it has been first uttered. Unless we can do so, we would always be poor interpreters. We would slavishly depend upon some conventional dictionary, in which certain "correspondences" between the isolated and detached "words" in two idioms are registered and fixed. This isolation inevitably betrays both the musical phrase and the whole style of composition. The best dictionary is not yet the living language. And language lives just when it is spontaneously used, and not when it is used simply for a class-composition. This was the reason for including the sacred languages of the Scripture into the regular theological curriculum, and every reliable minister of the Word is expected to be able to check all the modern "translations" and interpretations, otherwise his interpretation would be inadequate. The same applies to dogma. In order to interpret the mind of the ancient Church, i.e., the mind of the Fathers, we have to be Patristically-minded ourselves. Otherwise, we would be in danger of inventing new meanings, instead of interpreting the old.

Is this suggestion that we learn the idiom of the ancient Church really ridiculous? Are there not in our own time many who endeavor to learn the language of the great Reformers, to rediscover and regain it as

their mother tongue and to use it, in the modern environment, for preaching and theological thinking? In fact there are not a few who really do speak the idiom of Luther and Calvin in our day, and do not mind being out of date for that. Just as there are many in the Church of Rome who use the idiom of St. Thomas. As matter of fact in our troubled age almost everyone is ambitious not to speak in theology a vulgar and debased contemporary idiom but to use something nobler and elaborate. Why should we not try to use the idiom of the Fathers? Why should the idiom of the fourth and fifth centuries be eliminated from the contemporary Tower of Babel? And possibly it is exactly on this ancient ground of the common tradition of all Christians that the divergent denominatins of today might meet, if we take the risk to regain the true ecumenical vision of Church history and to overcome our various provincialisms of space and time. It is at this point that the Eastern Church can be of help.

On the other hand, the Church in the East also has to enlarge her vision and to meet the Churches of the West in a fellowship of common search. As matter of fact this meeting has been taking place already for centuries. It is simply historically untrue that the Christian East is meeting the Christian West for the first time in our day. It has been in contact with Western theology for quite some time. Lutheran and Reformed textbooks of theology were in common use in Russian seminaries in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the Western original can be often detected behind the works of Orthodox theologians themselves. They had themselves to relearn the dialects of the Fathers in recent times. It was really most unfortunate and fatal that the first meeting with the West, and the long conversation that followed, took the form of a "pseudomorphosis" and eclecticism, and many memories of past conflicts and misunderstandings are still rather sad and painful. But is "pseudomorphosis" and imitation the only possible form of meeting or the most natural one? The true meeting will take place only when the common ground has been rediscovered.

It is perhaps only natural that after so many centuries of divorce and estrangement, of conflict and competition, one is inclined to take sides. The major danger and temptation of our present epock is that Westerners will possible overemphasize and exaggerate their Western peculiarity, acting as representatives of the Western tradition only. Surely Eastern people are in the danger of doing just the same. This attitude is not, of course, a safe and promising ground for meeting or the true reintegration of distorted tradition. Yet it is just this reintegration that is, in my belief, the impending duty and the major task of Christianity today. No synthesis or reconciliation can ever be achieved simply by arithmetical operation, either by subtraction of all distinction or by addition of all differences. Synthesis is neither a common denominator nor a sum total.

It is my personal conviction, or, if you prefer, my private opinion, that the real reintegration of Christian tradition should be sought in a

neo-patristic synthesis. The first step to be taken is that we should not take the Church Fathers as links of a venerable, but obsolete "tradition," as pieces of antiquity, but rather as living masters from whom we may receive the message of life and truth. If I am not mistaken it is just this that is going on in our days in the large field of theological research. The fact that many recent theologians are going back to the school of the Fathers, even if they find it hard to walk in their steps, is the greatest ecumenical promise of our age.

ST. CYPRIAN AND ST. AUGUSTINE ON SCHISM

The problem of the nature and meaning of schisms and divisions in the Church was set forth in all its sharpness and precision at a very early date in Christian history, and opposite solutions were at once suggested and accepted. This in itself constituted a new division. All students of Church History are familiar with the controversy between St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen. Strictly speaking, this controversy has never been resolved. In the West, the solution offered by the Church of Rome ultimately prevailed. It was theologically shaped and established by St. Augustine in his vigorous argument against the Donatists, who claimed for themselves, though in vain, no less an authority than that of St. Cyprian himself. Roman Catholic theology still follows St. Augustine very closely. This was very much more than a dispute over questions of discipline — an ecclesiological issue was definitely involved in the controversy. It was the great merit of Western theologians that this problem of discipline was met and discussed from the outset on a theological basis, in the perspective of the doctrine of the Church. In the East, for centuries, this problem has never been faced as a genuinely theological issue. Some of the ancient Fathers, however, among them St. Basil and at a later date St. Theodore of Studium, seem to be inclined to walk in the steps of St. Cyprian. The same attitude can be detected behind some of the canonical rules and regulations promulgated from time to time by the Ecumenical and local Councils. All these ancient canons (which are still binding) deal only with concrete cases, and do not admit general application. Some other canons of the same Councils seem to have been drafted rather in the spirit of St. Augustine.

Moreover, another question arises: are these canonical directives subject to theological interpretation at all? Do they not rather represent only a pastoral discretion and forbearance? Now, a definite theological outlook is already implied in this very doubt or questioning. The right to base any dogmatic or doctrinal conclusions on canonical decisions has often been contested; canons, it has been suggested, belong to discipline, not to doctrine. This is a very ambiguous assumption. Is discipline independent of doctrine? Does this contention imply that canonical regulations may be guided and inspired by pastoral expediency or efficiency rather than by strict doctrine? Can these disciplinary controversies ever be settled in any other way than by working back from them to the doctrinal principles involved? For in fact, we are dealing here not with conclusions; our concern is with presuppositions and implications. There is always *some* doctrine implied in every decision. It is better to plainly elucidate what that doctrinal presupposition is.

Let us state briefly the main elements of the problem. The "rigorism" of St. Cyprian was but a logical consequence of his general doctrine *de unitate ecclesiae*. His point is precisely this. The Church is constituted by sacraments. But the sacraments were obviously instituted in the Church — that is to say, they are effective and can be effective only in the Church. (We may note that for Tertullian the Church alone was entitled to use the Scriptures and "sectarians" had no right of appeal to Scripture just because it was foreign "property"). Now, a schism (any schism) breaks communion and fellowship, and separates from the great Church. Since unity is of the *esse* of the Church, every violation of unity immediately leads in and of itself beyond the last barrier into some utter and ultimate "outside." St. Cyprian was developing with fearless consistency a doctrine of the complete absence of grace in every "sect," precisely for the reason that it was a "sect," i.e. a *separated* body. For St. Cyprian, all the "separated brethren" were not brethren at all and were to be treated exactly as "an heathen man and a publican." They were no longer connected with the Church in any way. They were, in the strictest sense, in the "outer darkness." This was to say that all their ecclesiastical actions were sacrilegious usurpations, and therefore null and void, deprived of any sacramental or charismatic significance, and even charged with some destructive energy.

The primary emphasis of St. Cyprian was on the schismatic will, on the divisive and disruptive intentions of all schisms. It was subversive of unity, and for him unity was the very being of the Church. There was a profound truth in his conception. And it may be that the teaching of St. Cyprian has never been refuted, even by St. Augustine. Yet it seems to be dangerously one-sided. St. Cyprian begins with the unexpressed presupposition that the *canonical and charismatic limits* of the Church completely and invariably *coincide*. This, however, is precisely what is open to serious doubt. Is the unity of the Church really constituted by human unanimity and agreement, by human obedience and loyalty? Or is this unity rather divinely given? If the unity of the Church is constituted by sacraments, do sacraments depend solely upon human loyalty? Again, is it really possible to discern the true limits of the Church simply by canonical marks and signs? As a mystical organism, as the sacramental body of Christ, the Church can hardly be adequately described in canonical or legal terms and categories alone. In her sacramental being she defies and surpasses all merely canonical measurements. It is precisely this that the Augustinian conception tended to emphasize.

St. Augustine inverts the initial presupposition of St. Cyprian, as it were, and starts with another assumption: the Church is where the sacraments are administered, even though it be sometimes in a reduced or imperfect state, compromised by disloyalty and rebellion, for the very reason that the reality of the Church is constituted by the sacraments. This identification of the Church with the sphere of the sacraments is fully accepted by both St. Cyprian and St. Augustine.

But St. Augustine especially emphasizes the *supernatural* aspect of the sacraments. As supernatural, they cannot be destroyed by human disloyalty and disobedience. They have their own subsistence, being grounded in the redeeming will of God, which can never be ultimately frustrated by human failure. It is precisely this supernatural reality that St. Augustine indicates by the word "*character*." What is of decisive importance is that the whole problem is discussed in a wider perspective of the doctrine of the Church. Ultimately, the Augustinian conception points to a basic duality in the Church: *duas vitas novit ecclesia*. There is a strong feeling of enigmatic "disproportion" between the two dimensions of the same Church. There is a disproportion between the "historical" and the "eschatological" dimensions. And there is a disproportion between the canonical and the sacramental dimensions. And yet there is but one Church. This theory earnestly wrestles with the antinomy of schism and attempts to interpret it on a theological level. It is an essay in the "theology of the abnormal." It is by no means successful in resolving the paradox. Instead, it emphasizes it. It admits the existence of some enigmatic "sacramental sphere" beyond the canonical borders of the Church Militant. This is a sort of third "intermediate state," between the Church of God and the outer darkness of "this world." It wrestles with a paradoxical situation, with the existence of that which should not have existed at all, but still does exist.

St. Augustine's view is, of course, no more than a "theologoumenon," a doctrine set forth by a single Father. Yet it must not be hastily dismissed by Orthodox theology simply because St. Augustine wrote in Latin and not in Greek, or because his point of view has been generally adopted by the Roman Catholic Church. St. Augustine is a Father of the Church Universal, and we must take his testimony into account, if we are to attempt a true ecumenical synthesis. The Cyprianic conception is also but a "theologoumenon." And it simply dismisses the paradox. "The abnormal" is treated as a matter of discipline only. The famous dictum: *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* admits a double interpretation. It is a self-evident truth, for salvation is synonymous with membership in the Church, which is the Body of Christ. "To be saved" means precisely "to be in Christ," and "*in Christ*" means "in His body." Yet if we confine ourselves to the canonical or institutional limits, we may force ourselves into a very dubious position. Are we entitled to suggest that all those who, in their earthly career, were outside the strict canonical borders of the Church, are thereby excluded from salvation? Indeed, very few theologians would dare to go so far. On the contrary, one is very anxious to emphasize that the ultimate judgment belongs to Christ alone and cannot be adequately anticipated by man, especially with regard to those who have fought a good fight in this life but happened to be outside the Church, though not by their own deliberate choice or decision. Even the strictest Orthodox theologian would find it hard to believe that Francis of Assisi

and John of the Cross are beyond the promise of salvation and are to be regarded "as an heathen man." But usually the obvious implication of this "eschatological reservation" is overlooked. Just because one can be saved only in the Church, the hope of salvation for "the separated" inevitably involves recognition of the fact that they do possess some kind of membership in the Church, that is to say, if some of those who had been *outside* the Church Militant are saved at all, they will be found in the Church Triumphant. Now, there is *but one* Church and our distinction between the "two Churches" is inexact. Again, "eschatology" does not refer only to the "future" state. The whole being of the Church is eschatological. It will be a dubious escape, if we appeal to the concept of "uncovenanted grace," which hardly fits into the scheme of a "catholic" ecclesiology. Moreover, an "uncovenanted grace" suggests rather some sort of salvation *extra ecclesiam*, as "Covenant" is inseparably connected with the Church. Thus, in the last resort we are driven back, on the strength of our own reasoning, namely to an "Augustinian" distinction between the canonical and mystical limits of the Church, between the "historical" and "eschatological" aspects of her life (of which St. Augustine was fully aware), or else to a distinction between "perfect" and "imperfect" membership in the Church.

ROME, THE REFORMATION, AND ORTHODOXY

In practice, the task of Christian reunification leads first and foremost to the reconciliation and overcoming of both of the great Western schisms: the division between West and East, Rome and Byzantium, the so-called "division of the churches," in the first place; and the Reformation, in the second. It is precisely this reunification of the Christian West which is most important of all. A lesser and not unrelated meaning may be attributed to the reconciliation of the Eastern divisions, which arose at one time in the ardor of the ancient Christological disturbances and disagreements, but continued from then on mainly because of historical inertia. For a long time there has been no true religious problematic in these divisions, and they are maintained rather through the infirmity of nationalistic exclusiveness (the Armenian Church, the Jacobites, the Ethiopian Church and others). And one must now ask what Rome and the Reformation mean in the perspective of the desired Christian reunification. The question of the Reformation is simpler, although not easier. In the Reformation one usually sees self-affirmation and a kind of autocracy of the individual in religious life, the manifestation and celebration of religious individualism. Given this, the predominance of centrifugal, disunifying and unifying forces in Protestantism becomes completely understandable. In other words, the Reformation is in direct opposition to Unification. And thus, Reunification is the overcoming and even denial of the Reformation, and it is and should be a conversion and a return. There is much truth in such a view. But it is not all truth, and not the ultimate truth. For not the self-exaltation of man, but rather his self-humiliation, was the initial premise and motivating spirit of the Reformation. Protestantism was born in the spirit of anthropological minimalism. The Reformation is first and foremost the recognition and confirmation of the endless sinfulness and helplessness of man. And in Christ, man is freed but not transformed. He becomes a "free man" (*volnootpushchennik*) — but whence can he receive the nobility of those born in freedom? In one sense, Protestantism can be defined as hyper-eschatologism. This does not mean, of course, that Reformation consciousness is somehow specially preoccupied with or moved by eschatological hopes and penalties. Nor is there an inclination or gravitation towards chiliasm. Nonetheless, in Protestant consciousness the Second Coming almost eclipses the First. One senses a watchfulness, as if to not exaggerate the meaning of what has already transpired. And the transformation of the world and of man are completely put off until the Second Coming. The reality of the Church therefore diminishes in foreboding of the Approaching Kingdom and the "future age." Hence the distinctive docetism and near-illusionism in the perception and interpretation of the sacraments. The sacraments are

signs of the expected, symbols, rather than the stamp of attained victory. And this very "sacramental symbolism" is the alienating, disunifying force in Protestantism. In this respect, the rupture of Church authority was far more important and dangerous than was the awakening of the willful and rebellious "I." For the Church unites and is united precisely in "the unity of the Spirit" — that is, in the continuity of charismatic currents, in the unbroken communion of the sacraments. The struggle and rupture of the Reformationists with Rome happened in such a way that the ties with Pentecost were broken off and destroyed. This is why only through the restoration of the Priesthood, Church authority (*sviashchennonachaliia*) and Church service (*sviashchennosluzheniia*) can Protestantism return to the Church. One must use precisely this word: *return* — for the Reformation was an objective exit from sacramental participation. The punishment of the Church and a thirst for churchism alone are insufficient, and even dogmatic restoration and insight are not enough. Indeed, it is little to come to believe; one must be baptized, and man is reborn not by the strength of his faith but by the act of the baptismal grace of God. And it not enough even to love the Lord — the betrothal of everlasting life is taught not in this love and in faith alone, but only in the sacrament of the Body and Blood. The Church is alive and united precisely in the Blood of the Lord, in the Eucharist Blood — and where the Eucharist is not performed, there is no Church. And the performance of the Eucharist presupposes the sacramental Priesthood, and thus the integrity or restoration of Apostolic Succession, as well. To express it another way: from the Reformation, as from "a faraway land," it is necessary to return to the Church, to unite with her. Here one can and must speak only of unification. We repeat: unity of thought and spirit are not enough, unity in feelings and faith are still not enough — all of this is only a pre-condition for re-unification, while the unification itself is accomplished only in the unity of and participation in the sacraments. This is why the so-called "High Church Movement" in German Protestantism remains and will remain feeble and doomed. The romantic restoration and "repoetization" of the rite is only evidence of penitence and conversion of the soul. But this is nothing more than a sacramental circumstance. "Waiting for the entrance of the king," so to speak — but the king does not come, and there is a vigil at the gates. But the gates are closed, they remain impassable. It is impossible to replace the reality of the sacraments and sacramental activity. Protestantism is not single-faceted — one could sooner speak of a kaleidoscope of guises and faces. In all the straightforwardness and radicalism of Reformation logic, the ways of Protestantism in history are winding and sinuous. And not without strained simplification can the Protestantism of various countries be embraced by one single, general concept — the deep divergence between German and Anglo-Saxon Protestantism is felt especially clearly. Indeed, only in German Protestantism did the philosophical motif play a determining role. True, to a significant

extent this was already a departure from the Reformation. But this very departure was only the consequence of Reformational principles, the paradoxical turn of these principles. The tragic and frightening dissolution, rather than evolution, of German Protestantism "from Reimarus to Vrede" is in itself a special topic and problem. Now we are speaking of the Reformation itself. One must return from the Reformation. And even "Evangelical Catholicism" is only a shy and unsure step. And one must also add this: one can return to the Church only openly and directly, not through concessions, agreements, accommodations or compromises. And any attempt to revive in Protestantism the seed and breath of Priesthood (*sviashchenstvo*) through appeals to secondary and "wilting" branches of the Church is only a compromise. It is unnatural to restore Apostolic succession in Germany or England through Singalese or Malabar ordination. This is sooner an attempt to abduct grace than to find it. And in any case, the way to Reunification is long, and hardly straight and true. Indeed, in its very premises, it is as if the fact of division and disconnection is recognized. The problem of exiting from the Reformation is indissolubly connected with the problem of Rome. For it is not enough to exit; what remains is namely to return. And here in the West, it is closer to return to Rome itself. It is for this very reason that few do return. Not always is there only falsehood in this abstention from returning through Rome — that is, to Rome proper. For "Rome" is certainly in need of a kind of "reformation" — "in the head and limbs." It is not suitable to censure too harshly those who are seduced by the infirmities and delusions of Rome. Nonetheless, Rome is immensely and immeasurably richer than the Reformation. The Reformation is abandonment, freely chosen and willed. It is a house which has been abandoned and left empty. It is an emptied and even ravaged temple. But the Roman temple is in no way empty or deserted. The cloud of the glory of God is still over the temple. The Spirit of God breathes in Roman Catholicism, and not even all the unclean fumes of pernicious human passions and perversions can disturb this. The Saving thread of Apostolic succession has not been broken. The sacraments are performed. The bloodless sacrifice is brought and offered. And he who would dare to have reservations and to say: but it is not accepted onto the heavenly sacrificial altar, into the smell of spiritual fragrance, must think carefully. The sacred objects are still in the temple. Thus, in any event the way to Rome and through Rome is not a false way. The infirmity and falsehood of the Reformation consist of the fact that this was a human issue, only human, too human — even if it only consisted of self-abasement and self-negation. And the falsehood of Rome is also a human falsehood, for no other falsehood exists. "Your Truth is forever, and your Word is the Truth." But in Rome there is also the truth of God. Rome is incorrect in faith and weak in love. But Rome is not without Grace, not outside of grace. Strange as it may seem, the schism of West and East is a schism and division in faith and

scarcity of love, but it is not a schism in grace and sacraments, it is not a division of the Spirit. And the Comforting Spirit (*Dukh Uteshitelnyi*) is one and indivisible even in schism. Strangely enough, what is most important has been covertly realized — namely, the indivisibility of grace — despite the fact that what is lesser, and seemingly easier because it is human, has not been realized. God has hitherto united that which has crumbled in the deeds and thoughts of man. If, for Protestantism, the way towards unification lies in attaining Priesthood (*sviashchenstvo*) and restoring the sacraments, then the schism of East and West can be solved by attaining dogmatic unity of thought and tender brotherly love. It remains for Rome and the East to unite, and indeed they must, in an act of human heroism. The reality of the division with Rome is in no way diminished by this. And perhaps it is so difficult to meet with Rome for the very reason that the entire force of the division lies precisely in what is human, human energy. There is something of an antinomy— or in any case, something paradoxical — in Romanism. Rome is striving towards unity. Rome is a kind of symbol of unity and unification. Throughout its history, Rome has sought unity. It is namely Rome which has sought and exacted unity above all else — and in any case, in this exigency there is much justice and earnestness. But indeed, the Romans' insistent and hurried demand for Christian unity and Church peace serves as the greatest obstacle, and hinders reunification and unity. Roman hastiness retards the reunification process most of all. For it is not unity, and not on such paths do they search in Rome and from Rome. Indeed, the basic and important falsehood and error of Rome concerned and concerns namely Church unity. And papal dogma is namely a false dogma of Church unity. On the basis of what has been said, the first conclusion to be made concerns the urgent necessity of a dogmatic and theological "explanation" with Rome. In this regard, the example of the failed and unsuccessful theological meetings of the Orthodox and Old Catholics just after the Vatican Council (the Bonn Conference of the seventies) is very significant and instructive. In that exchange of opinions it was immediately evident that the main obstacle to rapprochement and union was concentrated precisely in the dogmatic sphere — specifically, in their dogmatic worldview the Old Catholics remained narrow-minded Romanists, overly Western, and were not capable of accommodating the East in either their consciousness or their conscience other than as a compromise. Here right away were both the Western "closed off" heart and error in its very dogmatic premises. Of course, there was also the pride of its Western history, its historical glory and deeds, its Christian heroism and chivalry. But the heart of the matter was namely in the dogmatic premises, in the original dogmatic formulation itself. Here there was error and falsehood in the dogmatic experience itself, not only in individual dogmatic definitions. It is for this reason that *the way of dogmatic minimalism is so dangerous and fruitless* when attempts are made to restrict dogmatic unity of thought and accord with as tight and

narrow as possible a circle of the completely "necessary" truths of faith, in order to allow for "freedom of doubt" outside their constraints. For such a distinction or demarcation would be possible only if dogma were an inorganic entity or an aggregate of isolated dogmatic convictions or positions. But faith and dogma are an organic whole. And stubborn discord regarding dogmatic "details" forces one to doubt whether there is true accord in the very experience of faith, not only in its formal premises and — if it is appropriate to express oneself thus — in the dogmatic contours. And what is inside these contours, what this contour frames, is not a matter of indifference or "unnecessariness." We are speaking not so much about gradualness and consistency in logical deductions and development, as about the initial "precision and clarity," the vision of the believer — that is, the Revelation itself. One example will suffice to illustrate this point. It is impossible to attribute to the list of the "doubtful" or "unnecessary" such a seemingly external dogma as that of holy ikons. Not, of course, because the holy ikons, their recognition and use, are "unconditionally necessary for salvation." But because the stubborn and unreserved urge to figuratively "sweep the holy ikons under the rug of dogmatic consciousness" testifies to the unquestionable vagueness in understanding of the already completely undebatable dogma of faith, outside of which the painting of and reverence for ikons cannot be justified. In short, the temptation in regard to ikons is in a sense always the same as that of the Incarnation itself, of Divine Nature; it is a kind of aversion to what is historical and sensory. In any case, such questions cannot be expediently postponed or passed over. It is impossible and not worthwhile to go around even the most undebatable rudiments of faith. For here also, a deep inconsistency and lack of accord can suddenly reveal itself.

And once again, one example is sufficient. In the most general conception of God, there is an essential discord between East and West. One may cite the arguments of the fourteenth century over the Light of Tabor and the premises of doctrine concerning it, and the distinction between essence and energy in the Deity. This was not a scholastic argument about the unnecessary and unimportant. Here, not only two theological systems but two worldviews, two experiences, truly met and collided. And the meeting was not only on the polemical surface; rather it revealed a great depth. An irreconcilable and painful discord was revealed. The question has been posed. It will not do to avoid it, and insensitivity to its acuteness and importance would only testify to overall religious callousness. Thus, the dogmatic "explanation" of the East with Rome should be precisely complete and all-embracing — and first and foremost, organic. It is false and expedient to formally reduce all differences to separate "paragraphs" about which it seemingly remains only to agree. What is unacceptable in Rome is namely something fundamental and primordial, and not only certain positions and theologumena or others. For indeed, first and foremost the Papacy was not accepted. One must find a basic sore point in the Roman

experience. It would seem that it can be located and shown. Before us once again is a kind of surprise. In Roman consciousness, the feeling that through his Ascension into heaven, Christ truly and directly (albeit invisibly) abides and governs in the "historical" and earthly Church, has not been completely fortified and expressed. It is as if, in the Ascension, he left and exited from history until the Second Coming (Parousia), until his return. It is as if history had been abandoned, as if little had changed in history. This can be called "hyper-historicism." Hence the need for and possibility of Christ's well-known replacement in history — the idea of a "deputy." Roman or Latin Christianity is not simple at all. And it is impossible to reduce all the diversity and fullness of mystical and theological life in Roman Christianity to one particular "idea." And in any case, Rome is not confined to papism. Nonetheless, though, it is namely papism which is the most distinctive trait in the Western sense of the Church, in Western churchism. On the other hand, it shows an exaggeration of the notion of hieratical charism. Here we find a kind of canonical "Montanism." In any case, the Vatican Dogma is not only a definition and a formula, but also a mystical acknowledgment and testimony. Papism is not only a canonical fact, but a mystical one as well. In this instance, canonical or historico-dogmatic refutation is therefore not as important as the profound transfiguration of the very sense of the Church, the return to the fullness of the Christological vision. In the Western experience there is great Christological vagueness. It is connected with the general perception of history. For Western piety, the perception of Christ in his Evangelical humility in Gethsemane, on Golgotha, in the crown of thorns, is altogether typical. The Resurrection, the victory over decay and death, is insufficiently felt. The very passion and death of the Savior is perceived too historically ("naturistically"). And the Resurrection is therefore perceived as an exit from the empire. Here is the main topic for "explanation" with Rome. And for Rome, the way to reunification is the way of return — namely, of return to the sources. This should be first and foremost a transformation of dogmatic consciousness and experience. And all the ancient topics, topics of the epochs of the ancient Ecumenical Councils which at one time had not been dispensed with in the West, should be newly experienced and reworked. In the Roman conception of Church unity, not only the canonical or juridical narrowing of perspective is false and unacceptable. Much more important and dangerous is the insensitivity to all the seriousness of the schism and the divergence between West and East. It is a kind of mystical insensitivity. Hence such primitivism and simplification in the "union" plans and projects. One may say that it is not so much an excessive exigency but rather namely an excessive mystico-dogmatic lack of requirement or tolerance, which is the falsehood of Rome and its "union" (*unionalnyi*) tactics. Thus is the problem of Christian reunification transformed into a problem and task of Church tactics or diplomacy, pastoral pedagogy or "Christian

narrow as possible a circle of the completely "necessary" truths of faith, in order to allow for "freedom of doubt" outside their constraints. For such a distinction or demarcation would be possible only if dogma were an inorganic entity or an aggregate of isolated dogmatic convictions or positions. But faith and dogma are an organic whole. And stubborn discord regarding dogmatic "details" forces one to doubt whether there is true accord in the very experience of faith, not only in its formal premises and — if it is appropriate to express oneself thus — in the dogmatic contours. And what is inside these contours, what this contour frames, is not a matter of indifference or "unnecessariness." We are speaking not so much about gradualness and consistency in logical deductions and development, as about the initial "precision and clarity," the vision of the believer — that is, the Revelation itself. One example will suffice to illustrate this point. It is impossible to attribute to the list of the "doubtful" or "unnecessary" such a seemingly external dogma as that of holy ikons. Not, of course, because the holy ikons, their recognition and use, are "unconditionally necessary for salvation." But because the stubborn and unreserved urge to figuratively "sweep the holy ikons under the rug of dogmatic consciousness" testifies to the unquestionable vagueness in understanding of the already completely undebatable dogma of faith, outside of which the painting of and reverence for ikons cannot be justified. In short, the temptation in regard to ikons is in a sense always the same as that of the Incarnation itself, of Divine Nature; it is a kind of aversion to what is historical and sensory. In any case, such questions cannot be expediently postponed or passed over. It is impossible and not worthwhile to go around even the most undebatable rudiments of faith. For here also, a deep inconsistency and lack of accord can suddenly reveal itself.

And once again, one example is sufficient. In the most general conception of God, there is an essential discord between East and West. One may cite the arguments of the fourteenth century over the Light of Tabor and the premises of doctrine concerning it, and the distinction between essence and energy in the Deity. This was not a scholastic argument about the unnecessary and unimportant. Here, not only two theological systems but two worldviews, two experiences, truly met and collided. And the meeting was not only on the polemical surface; rather it revealed a great depth. An irreconcilable and painful discord was revealed. The question has been posed. It will not do to avoid it, and insensitivity to its acuteness and importance would only testify to overall religious callousness. Thus, the dogmatic "explanation" of the East with Rome should be precisely complete and all-embracing — and first and foremost, organic. It is false and expedient to formally reduce all differences to separate "paragraphs" about which it seemingly remains only to agree. What is unacceptable in Rome is namely something fundamental and primordial, and not only certain positions and theologumena or others. For indeed, first and foremost the Papacy was not accepted. One must find a basic sore point in the Roman

experience. It would seem that it can be located and shown. Before us once again is a kind of surprise. In Roman consciousness, the feeling that through his Ascension into heaven, Christ truly and directly (albeit invisibly) abides and governs in the "historical" and earthly Church, has not been completely fortified and expressed. It is as if, in the Ascension, he left and exited from history until the Second Coming (Parousia), until his return. It is as if history had been abandoned, as if little had changed in history. This can be called "hyper-historicism." Hence the need for and possibility of Christ's well-known replacement in history — the idea of a "deputy." Roman or Latin Christianity is not simple at all. And it is impossible to reduce all the diversity and fullness of mystical and theological life in Roman Christianity to one particular "idea." And in any case, Rome is not confined to papism. Nonetheless, though, it is namely papism which is the most distinctive trait in the Western sense of the Church, in Western churchism. On the other hand, it shows an exaggeration of the notion of hieratical charism. Here we find a kind of canonical "Montanism." In any case, the Vatican Dogma is not only a definition and a formula, but also a mystical acknowledgment and testimony. Papism is not only a canonical fact, but a mystical one as well. In this instance, canonical or historico-dogmatic refutation is therefore not as important as the profound transfiguration of the very sense of the Church, the return to the fullness of the Christological vision. In the Western experience there is great Christological vagueness. It is connected with the general perception of history. For Western piety, the perception of Christ in his Evangelical humility in Gethsemane, on Golgotha, in the crown of thorns, is altogether typical. The Resurrection, the victory over decay and death, is insufficiently felt. The very passion and death of the Savior is perceived too historically ("naturistically"). And the Resurrection is therefore perceived as an exit from the empire. Here is the main topic for "explanation" with Rome. And for Rome, the way to reunification is the way of return — namely, of return to the sources. This should be first and foremost a transformation of dogmatic consciousness and experience. And all the ancient topics, topics of the epochs of the ancient Ecumenical Councils which at one time had not been dispensed with in the West, should be newly experienced and reworked. In the Roman conception of Church unity, not only the canonical or juridical narrowing of perspective is false and unacceptable. Much more important and dangerous is the insensitivity to all the seriousness of the schism and the divergence between West and East. It is a kind of mystical insensitivity. Hence such primitivism and simplification in the "union" plans and projects. One may say that it is not so much an excessive exigency but rather namely an excessive mystico-dogmatic lack of requirement or tolerance, which is the falsehood of Rome and its "union" (*unionalnyi*) tactics. Thus is the problem of Christian reunification transformed into a problem and task of Church tactics or diplomacy, pastoral pedagogy or "Christian

politics" (as expressed by Vladimir Soloviev). In particular, this reproach is entirely applicable to the newest contemporary experiences of the "Eastern Rite." Here there is a fatal self-delusion. Either a rite truly remains only a rite, no "reunification" occurs and the rite itself is deformed, it is transformed or degenerates into a ceremony, is played out and robbed of its meaning. Or the rite is perceived in all of its hieratic realism, but then the boundaries of the Western or Roman condition are inevitably broken. In both cases, union does not work. It turns out that in reality Rome does not control the "Eastern rite" at all. This is not a "rite" at all, but the living reality of another non-Roman Christianity. There is greater continuity and sympathy among the supporters of simple Latinization. This is a more sober point of view. The schism between West and East is not in rite and jurisdiction alone, but namely in faith and experience.

Translated from the Russian by
Linda Morris

PART TWO: RUSSIAN ECUMENISM

PETER MOGILA

The Orthodox Creed is usually seen as the symbolic book of the Orthodox Church. And more than once was it fortified by the testimony and approval of higher Church powers. However, authoritative and fundamental objections have long been produced against such an assessment. The question of the merit and authority of the Orthodox Church is sharpened and complicated by the fact that on this allegedly symbolic book lies the clear and distinctive stamp of Latin influences. As early as the Kiev Council of 1640, at the first discussion of the "Creed" presented by Metropolitan Petr Mogila, there was dissent in regard to an entire series of issues. Their resolution was transferred to the judgment of the "Great Church." The Kievan representatives met with representatives of the Patriarch of Constantinople in Iassy in 1642. The Greek theologians again indicated the presence of Latin opinions in the Creed of the "Little Russian Church," which had been brought from Kiev. The corresponding places were changed, and in 1643 the Creed was approved in this corrected form by the permanent council of the Constantinople Church and the Eastern patriarchates. However, this Creed was published neither in the East nor in Kiev.

Instead of the Creed corrected and fortified by the patriarchs, Petr Mogila published the so-called "Short Catechism" in 1645, both in Polish and in the local dialect. Regarding the controversial questions, he repeated earlier Latinized judgments, although in softened form. From the very beginning, the Orthodox Creed found most interest in the West, in the circles of foreign faiths. During the eighteenth century, the Orthodox East was widely studied in the West. There was little philanthropy in this interest: this century was a time of intense foreign propaganda in the Greek East, and in this regard Catholics were competing with Protestants. In addition, in the internal debates between them, the testimony of the ancient Greek Church was of great value in regard to many issues, and in particular in the teachings of the sacrament of the Eucharist.

The latinizing character of Kievan and Little Russian theology in general during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has long been known. From pre-Mogila times right up to Feofan Prokopovich (and even later), in Kiev and other areas, the theological work of the Orthodox was captive to the Roman Catholics, and scholasticism completely eclipsed patristics. The Greek language was almost completely forgotten, they almost did not know of their fathers' creations, and knowledge of the Word of God also weakened. In theological teachings Aquinas prevailed — and moreover, he was usually known second and third hand. The Latin and scholastic influence was most strongly felt, it seems, in Petr Mogila. The close dependency of his liturgical activity on Roman Catholic models was noted long

ago: much of his Prayer Book is literally translated from the Roman "ritual" of Pope Pius V, published on the basis of the activities of the Council of Trent. The activity of Petr Mogila called forth misgiving and direct opposition in its time, both from the clergy and from churchgoers. Of course, one must emphasize with all due decisiveness that in his activity, Petr Mogila was a zealous leader of the Orthodox faith and a ferocious fighter against union (*uniia*). Mogila wanted to equip himself for the struggle with the Latins at their expense. Nonetheless, this experience turned out to be ambiguous and unsuccessful. A theological movement was formed which was completely bound by scholastic and Jesuit psychology. The theological system was built on a foreign foundation, and it obstructed creative paths. Here one can hardly see the experience of "doctrinal rapprochement." Here creative poverty and weakness were felt. In Kievan theology there was no living creative spirit whatsoever. One can say that this was a literary movement rather than a truly theological one, for everything in it was reduced to the translation and rephrasing of others' books. In such a school, a particular psychology was, of course, acquired, a unique religious type was formed. It would hardly be too strong to say that the type was decadent. To a significant extent, this was an unconscious process. To this day the history of Kievan theology has not been fully studied, and in Russian literature there is not one broad, all-encompassing work on this topic. And the material that has been collected is still not sufficient. But the general traits of the historical process can now be outlined with complete confidence. Kievan Latinism was met with distrust both in the East and in Moscow. True, the fight with it was not always successful, and in it one not infrequently senses a contradictory excessiveness. This occurred namely in scholastic, non-creative debates. The Kievan influence has not waned since, right up to recent times. And it is curious that namely the representatives of non-creative, sluggish moods displayed an inclination for and tendency towards its habits and opinions. During the twenties of the last century in Russia, the notorious archimandrite Fotius (Spasskii) was an ardent admirer of the Orthodox Creed, and in the thirties it was introduced into religious schools as special teaching material at the request of Over-Procurator Count Pratasov. At that time there were theologians for whom all of Orthodoxy was confined to that book, their "helmsman." And one must recognize one of the greatest services of the ever-memorable Filaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, the overt and covert fight with this non-creative crypto-Latinism in theology. From this point of view, the short "confession" as to the sources of the Orthodox Creed, which was made by one of the publishers of its new text, is of principal interest. In the very choice and distribution of material, there is a close dependency on Latin catechisms from the *Compendium doctrinae christianae* of Petr Soto, O. P., from the catechism of P. Kaniziia, from the Roman catechism, especially that of Aquinas. Mogila resolved an entire series of

theological questions "after the Latin fashion": he recognized purgatory, albeit not a fiery one, he tended towards creationism and almost depicted the original condition of man as did Aquinas, he thought as the Latins did about the time of Divine grace. He apparently shared their opinion of the Immaculate Conception, which in general was very widespread in Kievan circles. The "smaller" (younger) congregation of the "Mladencheskii Brotherhood," consisting of pupils of the Kiev Mogila College, was dedicated to the memory of the Immaculate Conception, and its members ("sodalists") were called "the servants of the Virgin Mary, Blessed in the Highest." A particularly ardent defender of this opinion was Metropolitan Ioasaf Krokovskii (during the period of transition between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries).

It would be too harsh to say that in Kievan theology there was untrue faith, but *there was incorrect thinking*. This narrow and restrictive school was cut off from its living paternal roots; and in this intrinsic narrow-mindedness and nearsightedness lay the source and cause of theological digressions. This should not be disturbing, just as the Latin opinions of St. Dmitrii Rostovskii should not be disturbing, nor should the condoning of "Latin" opinions in the Orthodox Creed which, even after all the corrections, bears the imprint of its sources. In this connection one must recall the ancient theological schools, the silver-haired paternal antiquity — for example, the theological inaccuracies and clear digressions of St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Cyril of Alexandria. And as inadmissible as it may be to see the expression of general Church consciousness and experience in these errors and inaccuracies, it is just as inadmissible to see the reflection of Orthodox thought in Kievan theology. This resolves the question of the merit of the Orthodox Creed. In it one can see neither a "symbolic book" nor an accurate account of the Orthodox faith, transmitting general Church experience as a model determining theological thought with a stringent and decisive authority. This is a scholarly book, the creed of schools, an historical relic, a testimony to the thought of a particular era and of particular movements. In the final analysis, of course, it is an Orthodox Creed, but hardly an accurate one.

To this one final general consideration may be added. With good reason, many contemporary theologians debate the existence and the very possibility of symbolic books in the Orthodox Church. This true thought requires dissection and stipulation. It remains undebatable that *there are no symbolic books*, and this alone is sufficiently eloquent. The very concept of a "symbolic book," of recent and Western origin, was formed during the Reformation and Post-Reformation eras and is connected with the "progressive" character of Western creeds. In this concept, a combination of dogmatic and theological elements is reflected, an attempt to ratify a united and compulsory theological system as an obligatory standard of faith. Symbolic books of a similar type in the Church are, of course, impossible. There was not and cannot be uniform theology, and there should always be diversity of

theological models. And it is not a book, but living and unbroken Church experience, which is the norm and standard here. However, this experience may always be adequately revealed and "cast" — and hardly in council decisions alone. It is better to say that it is constantly being cast, without any canonical forms. There are also supra-canonical paths for distinguishing between spirits. It would be too careless to emphasize the determining character of only the ancient accounts of faith. The strength here lies not only in "antiquity," nor in canonical "universality." All that is "universal" does not automatically have "Catholic" value. "Catholicism" is the gift of God and the mark of the Spirit. God's will disposes of this stamp, manifesting him as he sees fit, overriding the "natural order." Herein lies the pledge of Church infallibility and the foundation of the doctrinal power of the Church. And the Church is broader than theological schools. Scholastic creeds and systems should not be hastily and arbitrarily raised to the level of "symbols." This basic thought still needs to be developed and revealed to contemporary and restored Orthodox theology. In recent centuries it has too often been scholastic, and only scholastic. One is inclined to think that its real "churchification" has begun. And on this path, temporally recent and spiritually narrow books which lay claim to being "symbolic" should not eclipse the treasure which has been graced by God and the experience of serving God.

Translated from the Russian by
Linda Morris

EARLY RUSSIAN ECUMENISM

Konstantin Ostrozhskii

Prince Konstantin Ostrozhskii (1526-1608), founder of the Ostrog community, and later the monk Vasilii, was a controversial figure. He was above all a politician and a diplomat, if not a statesman. His approach to religious problems was pragmatic and cultural rather than theological. As a native of Lithuania, Ostrozhskii was more "westernized" than his friend Prince Kurbskii, who despite his virulent distaste for political and cultural trends in Moscow, and however much his scholarship relied on Latin texts and western publications, remained an adamant Muscovite and ardent Graecophile even in Polish exile. Of the two, Ostrozhskii's cultural horizons were probably the broader, but there was less coherence in his views. He was prone to adjustment and compromise, and his politics frequently vacillated. Without question a staunch defender of Orthodoxy, at the same time he played a role in preparing the way for the *Unia*, which gave cause to those who would brand him a sympathizer.

In a sense Prince Ostrozhskii can be regarded as the first East Slavic "ecumenist." He had a deep interest in the reconciliation of all Christian communions in Poland and Lithuania, if only to secure order in the realm. He pleaded with Christians to cooperate and to live in honest coexistence. Even his personal position was curiously involved. Though a firm adherent of the Orthodox Church, Ostrozhskii was married to a Roman Catholic and kept close family connections with Calvinists and Unitarians. His eldest son, Prince Janusz, was baptized according to the Catholic rite, and only one of his other children remained Orthodox, but even he had a Roman Catholic wife.[1]

The ecumenical interests of Ostrozhskii raised suspicion in several quarters. First of all he was accused of excessive sympathy for the Socinians, who themselves claimed that inwardly he shared their convictions: "*quamvis religionem Unitariam, quam in corde amplectebatur no sit professus, Unitariorum tamen Fautor et Patronus fuerit.*"[2] It is true that Ostrozhskii admired their educational system and commitment to cultural values. And he did not hesitate to turn to them for help. On behalf of the Orthodox he commissioned the Socinian Motovila[3] to write a refutation of the famous book of Peter Skarga, *On the Unity of the Church of God under One Pastor [O iedosci kosciola Bozego pod iednym pasterzem y o Greckim od tey iednosci odstapieniu, z prezest oroga y upominaniem do norodow ruskich przy Grekach stojacych,* Vilna, 1577][4] with which the Jesuits launched their literary campaign to win the Orthodox in Poland to union with Rome.[5] Kurbskii was incensed with Ostrozhskii's act. Motovila was to him "a deputy of the Antichrist" and a follower of the impious Arius,[6]

Photinus,[7] and Paul of Samosata.[8] "Christian leaders have gone to such extremes of insolence and foolishness," he decried, "that not only do they shamelessly harbor and nurture these poisonous dragons in their homes, but they employ them as defenders and assistants. And what is even more astonishing, they summon them to guard the spiritual Church of God against satanic spirits and commission them to write books against the half-Christian Latins." Kurbskii's intransigence was probably only shared by a few, with many more grateful to Ostrozhskii for also enlisting "heretics" in the Orthodox cause. To hesitate or to linger out of scruple was too high a risk in this struggle.

Ostrozhskii's "ecumenical" overtures were not limited to Protestants; they reached to Roman Catholics as well. On a number of occasions he conferred with the famous Jesuit missionary Antonio Possevino,[9] as he did with the Papal Nuncio Bolognetti.[10] Both reported to Rome that he was about to be converted. Ostrozhskii brought along to these deliberations a number of laymen and clergy and when the matter of Church unity came up even the king, Stephen Batory, was included. It was at this time also that Ostrozhskii considered obtaining Greek Uniates from St. Athanasius College in Rome to teach at Ostrog, even though according to his plan the Ostrog school was to remain a stronghold of strict Orthodoxy. Later he persuaded Adam Pociej (Potiy),[11] future Uniate metropolitan and the real architect of the Uniate Church in Poland, to take holy orders, and then, even though Pociej's Roman leanings were no secret, sponsored his promotion to the episcopate.

Ostrozhskii actually had his own scheme for reunion with Rome and was prepared to go to Rome to confer with the Pope. But when union finally came, Ostrozhskii did not follow, and at the Council of Brest convened in 1596 to promulgate reunion, he led the forces of opposition which disrupted the proceedings. For years thereafter he was recognized as a leader of the Orthodox resistance movement which sprang up in the western lands. Ostrozhskii was not inconsistent in these acts. His vision of unity was quite different from that negotiated at the *Unia*. Everything there had been accomplished by the local bishops acting clandestinely and alone. This directly countered Ostrozhskii's plan for a thorough and common discussion of all the issues involved and prior consent from the Churches of Moscow and Moldavia. When in the aftermath of the Council, the Orthodox Church was outlawed in both Poland and Lithuania, Ostrozhskii mounted a fervent campaign to get the decision rescinded. Basing his struggle on the right and necessity of "religious freedom," he once again found himself drawn toward the Protestants, who for some time had suffered discrimination under the law and whose threat to Orthodoxy was now eclipsed by Roman Catholicism.

Before long the Orthodox and the Protestants sought to join forces in their common struggle for religious freedom. The only hope for success lay in concerted action. Having confederated their own forces in 1570

through the Sandomierz Confession [*Confessio Sandomiriensis*],[12] the Protestants took up the issue of closer cooperation with the Orthodox at the end of the Synod of Torun in 1595. In a letter, Ostrozhskii warned this body that a Roman-Orthodox union was in preparation and proclaimed his own solidarity with the Protestants. He declared that, in his opinion, the Orthodox were distant from the Romans but close to the Evangelicals (i.e, Calvinists).[13] In 1599 a joint conference met in Vilna, with the Orthodox represented by a small group led by Ostrozhskii. [14] The immediate order of business was to formulate a common policy in the struggle for religious freedom. But once the two groups were together, the idea of unity readily arose. To this the clerical members on the Orthodox side proved reticent and evasive, if not openly hostile. The chief spokesman for union in the Protestant delegation was Simon Theophil Turnovskii, president of the Czech [Bohemian] Brethren in Poland. [15] He argued that under certain conditions Protestants and Orthodox could unite, and cited the negotiations held in 1451-1452 between the Calixtins of Prague and the Church of Constantinople, which ended in agreement.[16]

Following the Vilna conference, certain Protestants drafted a memorandum which prominently listed points of agreement between Evangelicals and Orthodox and placed items requiring further discussion in an appendix. This was forwarded to Constantinople. Although the Orthodox did not take part in this action, Ostrozhskii seems to have sympathized with it. Meletius Pigas, patriarch of Alexandria and *locum tenens* of the ecumenical throne, acknowledged receipt of the missive,[17] but, reluctant to interfere in Polish affairs, he kept his reply evasive and noncommittal. Meletius did authorize his exarch, Cyril Lucaris, then residing in Poland, to discuss the proposal at local levels. Apparently nothing was done. All in all, it was utopian to expect that an Orthodox-Evangelical union could be formed to counter the Brest Union. Still, the whole episode was of sober significance for the future. During the negotiations between the Protestants and the Orthodox, the question of union was posed in terms which defined "unity of faith" as a common opposition to the Latin faith. As a consequence the Orthodox found themselves in a position where their own standpoint had to be worked out within the frame of the western tension: Rome or Reformation.

Although the plan of doctrinal agreement put forward at Vilna received no further development, Orthodox-Protestant cooperation continued. Orthodox polemists made extensive use of Western anti-Roman literature, especially on the question of papal supremacy, where they regularly utilized arguments advanced at the great Reformation councils of Basel and Constance.[18] Quite popular was *De republica ecclesiastica,* the famed book of Marco Antonio de Dominis (1566-1624), one time Roman Archbishop of Spalatro, who left the Church of Rome and then for a period held a position in the Church of England. In translation, his book was widely circulated in manuscript form among Slavs of West Russia. [19] But perhaps more typical of the

Photinus,[7] and Paul of Samosata.[8] "Christian leaders have gone to such extremes of insolence and foolishness," he decried, "that not only do they shamelessly harbor and nurture these poisonous dragons in their homes, but they employ them as defenders and assistants. And what is even more astonishing, they summon them to guard the spiritual Church of God against satanic spirits and commission them to write books against the half-Christian Latins." Kurbskii's intransigence was probably only shared by a few, with many more grateful to Ostrozhskii for also enlisting "heretics" in the Orthodox cause. To hesitate or to linger out of scruple was too high a risk in this struggle.

Ostrozhskii's "ecumenical" overtures were not limited to Protestants; they reached to Roman Catholics as well. On a number of occasions he conferred with the famous Jesuit missionary Antonio Possevino,[9] as he did with the Papal Nuncio Bolognetti.[10] Both reported to Rome that he was about to be converted. Ostrozhskii brought along to these deliberations a number of laymen and clergy and when the matter of Church unity came up even the king, Stephen Batory, was included. It was at this time also that Ostrozhskii considered obtaining Greek Uniates from St. Athanasius College in Rome to teach at Ostrog, even though according to his plan the Ostrog school was to remain a stronghold of strict Orthodoxy. Later he persuaded Adam Pociej (Potiy),[11] future Uniate metropolitan and the real architect of the Uniate Church in Poland, to take holy orders, and then, even though Pociej's Roman leanings were no secret, sponsored his promotion to the episcopate.

Ostrozhskii actually had his own scheme for reunion with Rome and was prepared to go to Rome to confer with the Pope. But when union finally came, Ostrozhskii did not follow, and at the Council of Brest convened in 1596 to promulgate reunion, he led the forces of opposition which disrupted the proceedings. For years thereafter he was recognized as a leader of the Orthodox resistance movement which sprang up in the western lands. Ostrozhskii was not inconsistent in these acts. His vision of unity was quite different from that negotiated at the *Unia*. Everything there had been accomplished by the local bishops acting clandestinely and alone. This directly countered Ostrozhskii's plan for a thorough and common discussion of all the issues involved and prior consent from the Churches of Moscow and Moldavia. When in the aftermath of the Council, the Orthodox Church was outlawed in both Poland and Lithuania, Ostrozhskii mounted a fervent campaign to get the decision rescinded. Basing his struggle on the right and necessity of "religious freedom," he once again found himself drawn toward the Protestants, who for some time had suffered discrimination under the law and whose threat to Orthodoxy was now eclipsed by Roman Catholicism.

Before long the Orthodox and the Protestants sought to join forces in their common struggle for religious freedom. The only hope for success lay in concerted action. Having confederated their own forces in 1570

through the Sandomierz Confession [*Confessio Sandomiriensis*],[12] the Protestants took up the issue of closer cooperation with the Orthodox at the end of the Synod of Torun in 1595. In a letter, Ostrozhskii warned this body that a Roman-Orthodox union was in preparation and proclaimed his own solidarity with the Protestants. He declared that, in his opinion, the Orthodox were distant from the Romans but close to the Evangelicals (i.e, Calvinists).[13] In 1599 a joint conference met in Vilna, with the Orthodox represented by a small group led by Ostrozhskii. [14] The immediate order of business was to formulate a common policy in the struggle for religious freedom. But once the two groups were together, the idea of unity readily arose. To this the clerical members on the Orthodox side proved reticent and evasive, if not openly hostile. The chief spokesman for union in the Protestant delegation was Simon Theophil Turnovskii, president of the Czech [Bohemian] Brethren in Poland. [15] He argued that under certain conditions Protestants and Orthodox could unite, and cited the negotiations held in 1451-1452 between the Calixtins of Prague and the Church of Constantinople, which ended in agreement.[16]

Following the Vilna conference, certain Protestants drafted a memorandum which prominently listed points of agreement between Evangelicals and Orthodox and placed items requiring further discussion in an appendix. This was forwarded to Constantinople. Although the Orthodox did not take part in this action, Ostrozhskii seems to have sympathized with it. Meletius Pigas, patriarch of Alexandria and *locum tenens* of the ecumenical throne, acknowledged receipt of the missive,[17] but, reluctant to interfere in Polish affairs, he kept his reply evasive and noncommittal. Meletius did authorize his exarch, Cyril Lucaris, then residing in Poland, to discuss the proposal at local levels. Apparently nothing was done. All in all, it was utopian to expect that an Orthodox-Evangelical union could be formed to counter the Brest Union. Still, the whole episode was of sober significance for the future. During the negotiations between the Protestants and the Orthodox, the question of union was posed in terms which defined "unity of faith" as a common opposition to the Latin faith. As a consequence the Orthodox found themselves in a position where their own standpoint had to be worked out within the frame of the western tension: Rome or Reformation.

Although the plan of doctrinal agreement put forward at Vilna received no further development, Orthodox-Protestant cooperation continued. Orthodox polemists made extensive use of Western anti-Roman literature, especially on the question of papal supremacy, where they regularly utilized arguments advanced at the great Reformation councils of Basel and Constance.[18] Quite popular was *De republica ecclesiastica*, the famed book of Marco Antonio de Dominis (1566-1624), one time Roman Archbishop of Spalatro, who left the Church of Rome and then for a period held a position in the Church of England. In translation, his book was widely circulated in manuscript form among Slavs of West Russia. [19] But perhaps more typical of the

Photinus,[7] and Paul of Samosata.[8] "Christian leaders have gone to such extremes of insolence and foolishness," he decried, "that not only do they shamelessly harbor and nurture these poisonous dragons in their homes, but they employ them as defenders and assistants. And what is even more astonishing, they summon them to guard the spiritual Church of God against satanic spirits and commission them to write books against the half-Christian Latins." Kurbskii's intransigence was probably only shared by a few, with many more grateful to Ostrozhskii for also enlisting "heretics" in the Orthodox cause. To hesitate or to linger out of scruple was too high a risk in this struggle.

Ostrozhskii's "ecumenical" overtures were not limited to Protestants; they reached to Roman Catholics as well. On a number of occasions he conferred with the famous Jesuit missionary Antonio Possevino,[9] as he did with the Papal Nuncio Bolognetti.[10] Both reported to Rome that he was about to be converted. Ostrozhskii brought along to these deliberations a number of laymen and clergy and when the matter of Church unity came up even the king, Stephen Batory, was included. It was at this time also that Ostrozhskii considered obtaining Greek Uniates from St. Athanasius College in Rome to teach at Ostrog, even though according to his plan the Ostrog school was to remain a stronghold of strict Orthodoxy. Later he persuaded Adam Pociej (Potiy),[11] future Uniate metropolitan and the real architect of the Uniate Church in Poland, to take holy orders, and then, even though Pociej's Roman leanings were no secret, sponsored his promotion to the episcopate.

Ostrozhskii actually had his own scheme for reunion with Rome and was prepared to go to Rome to confer with the Pope. But when union finally came, Ostrozhskii did not follow, and at the Council of Brest convened in 1596 to promulgate reunion, he led the forces of opposition which disrupted the proceedings. For years thereafter he was recognized as a leader of the Orthodox resistance movement which sprang up in the western lands. Ostrozhskii was not inconsistent in these acts. His vision of unity was quite different from that negotiated at the *Unia*. Everything there had been accomplished by the local bishops acting clandestinely and alone. This directly countered Ostrozhskii's plan for a thorough and common discussion of all the issues involved and prior consent from the Churches of Moscow and Moldavia. When in the aftermath of the Council, the Orthodox Church was outlawed in both Poland and Lithuania, Ostrozhskii mounted a fervent campaign to get the decision rescinded. Basing his struggle on the right and necessity of "religious freedom," he once again found himself drawn toward the Protestants, who for some time had suffered discrimination under the law and whose threat to Orthodoxy was now eclipsed by Roman Catholicism.

Before long the Orthodox and the Protestants sought to join forces in their common struggle for religious freedom. The only hope for success lay in concerted action. Having confederated their own forces in 1570

through the Sandomierz Confession [*Confessio Sandomiriensis*],[12] the Protestants took up the issue of closer cooperation with the Orthodox at the end of the Synod of Torun in 1595. In a letter, Ostrozhskii warned this body that a Roman-Orthodox union was in preparation and proclaimed his own solidarity with the Protestants. He declared that, in his opinion, the Orthodox were distant from the Romans but close to the Evangelicals (i.e, Calvinists).[13] In 1599 a joint conference met in Vilna, with the Orthodox represented by a small group led by Ostrozhskii. [14] The immediate order of business was to formulate a common policy in the struggle for religious freedom. But once the two groups were together, the idea of unity readily arose. To this the clerical members on the Orthodox side proved reticent and evasive, if not openly hostile. The chief spokesman for union in the Protestant delegation was Simon Theophil Turnovskii, president of the Czech [Bohemian] Brethren in Poland. [15] He argued that under certain conditions Protestants and Orthodox could unite, and cited the negotiations held in 1451-1452 between the Calixtins of Prague and the Church of Constantinople, which ended in agreement.[16]

Following the Vilna conference, certain Protestants drafted a memorandum which prominently listed points of agreement between Evangelicals and Orthodox and placed items requiring further discussion in an appendix. This was forwarded to Constantinople. Although the Orthodox did not take part in this action, Ostrozhskii seems to have sympathized with it. Meletius Pigas, patriarch of Alexandria and *locum tenens* of the ecumenical throne, acknowledged receipt of the missive,[17] but, reluctant to interfere in Polish affairs, he kept his reply evasive and noncommittal. Meletius did authorize his exarch, Cyril Lucaris, then residing in Poland, to discuss the proposal at local levels. Apparently nothing was done. All in all, it was utopian to expect that an Orthodox-Evangelical union could be formed to counter the Brest Union. Still, the whole episode was of sober significance for the future. During the negotiations between the Protestants and the Orthodox, the question of union was posed in terms which defined "unity of faith" as a common opposition to the Latin faith. As a consequence the Orthodox found themselves in a position where their own standpoint had to be worked out within the frame of the western tension: Rome or Reformation.

Although the plan of doctrinal agreement put forward at Vilna received no further development, Orthodox-Protestant cooperation continued. Orthodox polemists made extensive use of Western anti-Roman literature, especially on the question of papal supremacy, where they regularly utilized arguments advanced at the great Reformation councils of Basel and Constance.[18] Quite popular was *De republica ecclesiastica*, the famed book of Marco Antonio de Dominis (1566-1624), one time Roman Archbishop of Spalatro, who left the Church of Rome and then for a period held a position in the Church of England. In translation, his book was widely circulated in manuscript form among Slavs of West Russia. [19] But perhaps more typical of the

polemical literature adopted by Orthodox writers at this time was the *Apokrisis*, published in 1597 under the name of Christopher Filalet (Philalethes). It was intended as a reply to Skarga's book on the Council of Brest. Claiming his book was a translation, which probably fooled only a few, the author disguised himself (in a manner frequent among Socinians who came to the defense of Orthodoxy) behind a Greek literary pseudonym, even though it seems his identity was known to many contemporaries. Current scholarship has established, though not with final certainty, that he was neither an East Slav nor an Orthodox, but the Calvinist Martin Bronski, a Polish diplomat who for a while served as Stephen Batory's secretary.[20] He was also an active participant in the meetings between Evangelicals and Orthodox and a close friend of the Ostrozhskii family.[21] If indeed Bronski was the author of the Apokrisis, then it is highly plausible that Ostrozhskii for a second time was instrumental in enlisting a Protestant to counter Roman Catholicism "on behalf of the people of the Greek religion."[22]

The author's aim in the *Apokrisis* was to analyze the proceedings of the Council of Brest from a legal and canonical point of view. Readily discernible in his work at least in key parts, is the influence of Calvin's *Institutiones Christianae.* [23] Protestant bias is most obvious in the emphasis on the rights of the laity in the Church and the minimal authority of the bishops. A somewhat similar bent characterized the closing section of the treatise, devoted to the papacy. Here the author made extensive use of a new and voluminous book by the Dutch scholar Sigrandus Lubbertus (1556-1625), entitled *De Papa Romano* (1594) in which the Pope is identified with the Antichrist.[24] Apparently Lubbertus' book, too, had wide circulation among the Orthodox, with several important writers putting it to use: Meletii Smotritskii,[25] in his *Lamentations for the One Ecumenical Apostolic Eastern Church* [Threnos, 1610]; Zakharii Kopystenskii, in his *Pali nodiia;* Stephen Zizani, in his "Sermon of St. Cyril of Jerusalem on the Antichrist and his Times."[26]

The impact which Protestant literature had on the Orthodox faithful should not be overstressed. However, a "taint" of Protestantism was thenceforth to remain a part of West Russian mentality, and even the much stronger Latin influence of later years did not really eradicate it. Far more dangerous, and of greater significance, was the habit which Orthodox writers acquired of approaching theological problems in a western frame of reference. To refute Roman Catholicism is not necessarily to strengthen Orthodoxy, and many Protestant arguments against Catholicism are incompatible with Orthodox principles. Nevertheless Orthodox polemists unwittingly or carelessly employed them, with the result that on a number of matters Protestant views imperceptibly took hold. There is, of course, a corollary historical explanation. Patristic literature was scarce, a circumstance compounded by the general unreliability of contemporary Greek literature. Greek theology was passing through a crisis at that time. Greek scholars

themselves were studying at schools in the West, in Venice, Padua, Rome, or else in Geneva or Wittenburg. They were more often at home in modern western innovations than in the traditions of Byzantium. In the sixteenth century they were usually of Protestant hue, whereas somewhat later they took on a Latin tint. A prime example is the *Orthodox Confession* (1633) of Cyril Lucaris, a document which was Calvinist in spirit and in letter. And the works of Lucaris were known and appreciated in West Russia. Perhaps this infusion of Protestantism was inevitable. Whatever the cause, under western influence the ancient ideal of Orthodox culture began to dim and blur.

There was, however, another solution to the problem of Rome: to abandon all "foreign learning" and to abstain from discussion and debate. This viewpoint or, more properly, mood, also spread in western lands during the same period. Its greatest exponent was Ivan Vishenskii (d. before 1625). Little is known of his biography, except what can be gleaned from his numerous writings. Born in Galicia, Vishenskii apparently received little formal schooling. He must have left for Mt. Athos when quite young. and he stayed there for the rest of his life. (Once, in 1606 it seems, he returned briefly to his native land, but finding himself no longer at home there he left again for Athos.) Vishenskii referred to himself as a simpleton, a "poor wanderer" [*goliakstrannik*] and in similar vein countered the intellectual sophistications of the West with a "dove-like simplicity" and "foolishness before God." He should not, however, be taken too literally. Careful analysis of his writings suggests he was fully abreast of the philosophical and literary movements current in Poland and in West Russia.

V. Peretts[27] states that Vishenskii was "endowed with literary skill and verve." He was without question a writer of talent, forceful, direct, frequently harsh or rude, but always original and to the point. His prose is full of vigor and humor, occasionally scaling to prophetic heights. Vishenskii probably learned his manner of argument from the Fathers; certainly the *Areopagitica* left an obvious imprint on this style. He was deeply rooted in Byzantine soil, though not from lack of wider learning. His central emphasis was on tradition, and this in its most elementary sense: go to Church, obey the canons and the rules, do not indulge in argument. Vishenskii rejected "pagan wisdom: [*paganskaia mudrost'*] and "ornate reason" [*mashkarnyi razum*] without qualification. He opposed all scholasticism in its style, method and substance, and rejected all "refinements of the rhetorical craft" and all "external and worldly sophistication." A true monk, he had neither taste nor love for the polish and gloss of civilization. He addressed himself to lowly men: "O thou simple, unlearned, and humble Rusine, hold fast to the plain and guileless Gospel in which there is concealed an eternal life for thee." To pagan sophistry Vishenskii opposed the simplicity of faith, the "humbly-wise Octoechos."[28] Yet in his own way he, too, could be rhetorical. "Is it better for thee to study the Horologion,[29] the Psalter,

the Octoechos, the Epistles and the Gospels, and the other books of the Church and to please God in simplicity and thereby to gain eternal life, or to grasp the meaning of Aristotle and Plato and be called a philosopher in this life and then go to Gehenna?" Here Vishenskii is at the heart of the matter. The threat of the *Unia* could be overcome by inner effort alone, by a renewal and revival of spiritual life. Orthodoxy could not triumph by debates or resolutions, but only through ascetic faithfulness, humble wisdom and intense prayer.

The difficulty with Vishenskii's position is that in the given historical realities it was impossible to avoid debate. The issues posed demanded response or else the Orthodox risked leaving the impression that they had nothing to reply. Reticence or silence was not a permanent alternative. Opponents needed to be faced, their challenges met; and the encounter had to be at their level and on their terms. Victory would not come by refraining, but by prevailing. In actual fact, Vishenskii himself did not entirely shrink from intervention. It is enough to mention his *Epistle to the Apostate Bishops* (1597 or 1598).[30] Still his writing is ever concerned with the fundamental predicament: the worldliness of the contemporary Church and the lowering of the Christian standard. Vishenskii's approach to the problem was thoroughly ascetical. The worldliness that threatened the Church he saw as coming from the West, and its antidote was to hold fast to the tradition of the East. His was not simply a call for passive resistance. It was an invitation to enter battle, but a battle of the spirit, an "unseen warfare."

The Union of Brest; "Brotherhoods"; The Kiev Monastery of the Caves

The *Unia* began as a schism and remained a schism. In the apt phrase of the modern church historian Metropolitan Makarii (Bulgakov), "the Union in Lithuania or rather in the West Russian lands, originated with an anathema."[31] The Unia was fundamentally a clerical movement, the work of a few bishops, separated and isolated from the community of the Church, who acted without its free and conciliar consent, without a *consensus plebis*, or as was lamented at the time, "secretly and stealthily, without the knowledge [*porazumenie*] of the Christian people." Thus it could not but split the Orthodox Church, sunder the community of faith and estrange the hiearchy from the people.

This same pattern was followed at a later date in other areas, in Transylvania and in the Carpatho-Russian region of Hungary. The result everywhere was a peculiar and abnormal situation; at the head of Orthodox people stood a Uniate hierarchy. The hierarchs viewed their submission to Roman authority as a "reunion of the Church," but in reality the Churches were now more estranged than ever. Whereas following its own logic, the new Uniate hierarchy considered the resistance of the people uncanonical disobedience to established

authority, the rebellion of an unruly flock against its lawful shepherds; the Orthodox believers, on the other hand, saw resistance to the hierarchy, their so-called "disobedience," as the fulfillment of Christian duty, the inescapable demand of loyalty and fidelity. "Neither priests, nor bishops, nor metropolitans will save us, but the mystery of our faith and the keeping of the Divine commandments, that is what shall save us," wrote Ivan Vishenskii from Mt. Athos. And he forthwith defended the right of the faithful Christians to depose and drive out any apostate bishop, "lest with that evil eye or pastor they go to Gehenna." This was hazardous advice. But the situation had become fraught with ambiguity and complexity.

The *Unia* in Poland not only ruptured the Eastern Church, it also severed the Roman Catholic community. By creating a second holy body under papal authority, it originated a duality within the western Church. Full "parity of rites was never achieved or recognized, nor did the two flocks of common obedience ever become one — indeed, this was not called for in the original agreement. The tensions between East and West now entered into the life of the Roman Catholic Church. As they spread, they intensified. Thus sociologically, the *Unia* proved a failure. The only way out of this impasse, or so some came to believe, was through the gradual integration (i.e., "Latinization") of the Uniate Church. This tendency was reinforced by yet another sentiment. From the start many had viewed the Eastern rite as "schismatic," even if within Roman allegiance. They felt it was an alien accretion, a tactical concession to be tolerated for strategical reasons, but destined to give way to full integration into a uniform, that is, Latin, rite. Hence the subsequent history of the *Unia* in the Polish-Lithuanian state come to be dominated by just this urge for uniformity, this desire for "Latinization."

It has been contended by some on the Roman Catholic side that this development was normal, a sign of organic life and the proof of vitality. In a sense, this is true. But whatever the case, it must be recognized that the *Unia* in its mature form was quite different from that conceived in 1595, and even from that nurtured by the early Uniate leaders. It has also been argued that such a "Byzantine" institution could hardly have survived in a state which by principle and aspiration was wholly western, all the more so after several East Slavic regions went over to Muscovy and the more "intransigent" Orthodox groups were removed from Polish care. All these are but mild and euphemistic ways of saying that in principle *Unia* meant "Polonization." which is what happened historically. This was, of course, one of the original aims. The interests of the Polish state called for the cultural and spiritual integration of its Christian people, and it is for this reason that the state first encouraged and then supported the *Unia*. Indeed, that it survived at all was due to state intervention. But the *Unia* was also a failure politically. It promoted resistance rather than integration and added a "schism in the body politic" to the already existing "schism in the

soul." The other primal impulse for *Unia* (apparently the moving idea of Roman Catholic missionaries such as Possevino) sought a true "reunion of the Churches," embracing the whole of the Russian Church and, if possible, all of the Eastern Churches. This distinctly religious aspiration was dealt a fatal blow by the political and cultural achievements, which had been praised as the proof of success and vitality. The Union of Brest remained as it began, a "local arrangement" for the most part generated and preserved by reasons and forces of non-theological character.

The Union of Brest did not arise out of a popular religious movement. It was the composition of several Orthodox bishops then in charge of Orthodox dioceses in the Polish-Lithuanian state together with authorities of the Roman Church and the Kingdom of Poland. Once it became known that the act would not command the agreement or sympathy of the full body of the church, it could only continue as a clandestine affair. Seemingly fearful that further delay might subvert the whole enterprise, Bishops Pociej and Terletskii (Terlecki) left for Rome.[32] But news of their secret plot became public, and even while they were away open protest against the *Unia* began in the Church. The Council of Brest was convened on their return. It was designed for the solemn promulgation of a *fait accompli*, not for discussion. But before the members could gather, a split appeared in the ranks of the Orthodox. Two "councils" resulted, meeting simultaneously and moving to opposed resolutions. The "Uniate Council" was attended by representatives of the Polish Crown and the Latin hierarchy, together with several hierarchs from the Orthodox Church. It drew up an instrument of Orthodox allegiance to the Holy See, which was then signed by six bishops and three archimandrites. The "Orthodox Council" was attended by an exarch of the ecumenical patriarch (Nicephorus),[33] an emissary form the patriarch of Alexandria (Cyril Lucaris), three bishops (Luke, the metropolitan of Belgrade,[34] Gedeon Balaban,[35] and Mikhail Kopystenskii[36]), over two hundred clergy, and a large number of laymen assembled in a separate chamber. It disavowed the *Unia* and deposed those bishops in compliance, announcing its actions in the name and on the authority of the ecumenical patriarch, who held supreme jurisdiction over the metropolia of the West Russian lands. The decisions of the "Orthodox Council" were denounced by the Uniate bishops and — of greater import — repudiated by the Polish state. Henceforth all resistance to the *Unia* was construed as opposition to the existing order, and any writing critical of the act was branded a criminal offense. Exarch Nicephorus, who presided over the "Orthodox Council," was prosecuted and sentenced as an agent of a foreign state.[37] As a final measure, it was declared that the "Greek faith" would not be recognized by law. Those who remained faithful to Orthodoxy would no longer be simply stigmatized as "schismatics" but also harassed as "rebels". What for the state had been essentially a problem of "religious unity" was instantly transformed into a problem of "political loyalty".

As for the Orthodox believers, they had now to prepare a theological defense of their faith and, more urgently, to fight for legal recognition.

The struggle of the Orthodox against the enforced *Unia* was above all a manifestation of the corporate consciousness of the people of the Church. At first the main centers were Vilna and Ostrog. But soon Lvov came to the fore, to be joined at the beginning of the seventeenth century by Kiev. Of more importance was the change in the social strata upon which the Orthodox apologists could rely for sympathy and support. Whereas in the days of Kurbskii and Ostrozhskii the Orthodox cause was mainly supported by the high aristocracy [*szlachta*], in the next generation noble families experienced an exodus into the *Unia* or even into the Roman Catholic Church. Study in Jesuit schools frequently precipitated or promoted the exodus, and cultural integration into Polish high society invariably demanded it. Another pressure was the exclusion of "schismatics" from all important positions in the civil service, or for that matter in any walk of life. Townsmen came forth to replace the aristocracy at the front lines of Orthodox defense. And with the turn of the century, the Cossacks, or more specifically the so-called "Fellowship of Knights of the Zaporozhe Regiment," took up the cudgels.[38] In these same years there also occurred an important institutional shift. The leading role in the defense of Orthodoxy was now assumed by the famous "brotherhoods" [*bratstva*], whose network soon spread over whole of the western lands.

The origin of the brotherhoods is still obscure. Various theories have been put forth, but none is fully convincing. The most sensible view suggests that they began as parochial organizations, and at some time in the troubled years preceding the *Unia*, probably in the 1580's, transformed themselves into "corporations for the defense of the faith," whereupon they received ecclesiastical confirmation. The brotherhoods of Vilna and Lvov had their "statues" approved by Patriarch Jeremiah in 1586,[39] and then, unexpectedly, received royal charters.[40] In internal affairs the brotherhoods were autonomous. Some also enjoyed the status of *stauropegia*: that is, they were exempt from the jurisdiction of the local bishop, which in effect placed them directly under the rule of the patriarch of Constantinople. The first brotherhood to receive such status was Lvov, followed by Vilna, Lutsk, Slutsk, and Kiev, and still later by Mogilev. For a while the Lvov brotherhood even had the patriarch's authority to supervise the actions of their local bishop, including the right to judge him as a court of final instance. Any decision of guilt rendered by the brotherhood bore the automatic anathema of the four eastern patriarchs. This unusual arrangement can only be explained by the abnormality of the situation, wherein the least dependable element in the West Russian Church was the hierarchy. Still, to grant such power to lay bodies was a daring venture. No doubt this unprecedented growth of lay power, in all likelihood with concomitant abuses, was a strong factor inclining some bishops towards Rome, in the belief that Rome might succeed in restoring proper authority. The conflict and

estrangement engendered between hierarchy and laity in the aftermath of the *Unia* bred an unhealthy atmosphere deeply affecting the religious consciousness of both. Indeed, no period in the life of the West Russian Church was more trying than that between the Council of Brest and the "restoration" of the Orthodox hierarchy by Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem in 1620, by which time the Orthodox episcopate was almost extinct.[41] The misunderstandings and clashes of these years between brotherhoods and local Church authorities were so numerous and serious that even the re-establishment of a canonical hierarchy could not soon restore order to the Church. And the continuance of troubles was merely further assured when the Polish state stubbornly refused to recognize this new hierarchy.

The restoration of a canonical hierarchy was preceded by extended negotiations between Patriarch Theophanes IV and various circles in West Russia, where he stayed for two years. He then went to Moscow, where he had occasion to discuss the situation with the highest authorities there, patriarch Filaret and Tsar Mikhail.[42] On his way home to Jerusalem, Theophanes again visited Poland. His contacts this time included the Cossacks, then led by Hetman Peter Konashevich-Sagadaichny, an alumnus of the Ostrog school, one of the founders of the Kiev brotherhood school, and a genuinely cultured man.[43] In moves that were hardly unpremeditated, Theophanes on two occasions arranged to consecrate bishops, creating in all six new hierarchs, among them the metropolitan of Kiev. Several of the new bishops were known for their learning: Iov Boretskii, former headmaster of the schools at Lvov and Kiev, now made metropolitan of Kiev;[44] Meletii Smotritskii, an alumnus of the Vilna Academy, who also had attended several German universities;[45] and Ezekiel Kurtsevich, son of a princely family and for a time a student at the University of Padua.[46] In spite of such qualifications, the new Orthodox hierarchs found themselves at once engaged in a bitter struggle for authority. The Uniate Church and the Polish state both contested the consecrations, claiming the Theophanes was an intruder, imposter and even a Turkish spy. Only in 1632, just after the death of King Sigismund III, was the Orthodox hierarchy able to gain from his successor, King Wladyslaw IV, the recognition of law.[47] But even then their difficulties were not entirely at an end.

The troubles with the Polish state were not the only ones the Orthodox believers faced. In general it was an untimely season, an age of internecine strife and conflict, an era of wars and uprisings. To be constructive in such conditions was not easy. It was difficult to organize systematic religious activity and to create a regular school system. It was even harder to preserve some form of calmness and clarity of thought, so indispensable to the life of the mind. Nevertheless, quite a bit was accomplished, although it is still not possible to assess its full significance.

In the field of education the brotherhoods took the lead. They organized schools, set up publishing centers and printed books. The

early brotherhood schools — like the school at Ostrog — were planned on the Greek pattern. After all, the Greek population in the cities of South Russia and Moldavia was at this time quite sizeable, with the whole region serving as a major area of the Greek diaspora.[48] Contact with Constantinople was frequent and regular. Greek influence could be felt in everything, and it did not begin to fade until the end of the seventeenth century. The brotherhood school at Lvov was founded by an émigré prelate, Arsenius, archbishop of Elassona and a former student of Patriarch Jeremiah.[49] Here, after 1586, the Greek language became a salient if not the principle feature in the curriculum. Inevitably some of the nomenclature became Greek. Teachers, for example, were referred to as *didascals*, and students called *spudei*. In 1591 Arsenius compiled a Greek grammar, which he published in Greek and Slavonic. Based mainly on the noted grammar of Constantine Lascaris,[50] it also drew on the manuals of Melanchthon,[51] Martin (Kraus) Crusius,[52] and Clénard of Louvain.[53] At his brotherhood school in Lvov, as also in Vilna and Lutsk, it was not unusual for the students to learn to speak Greek fluently. Nor was there a shortage of available Greek literature. The catalogues of the brotherhood libraries list whole editions of the classics — Aristotle, Thucydides, and the like. Preachers would quote from the Greek text of the Scriptures in their sermons. Everywhere Greek titles were the fashion for books and pamphlets, and in general the literary language of West Russia at that time was saturated with Greek terminology. Apparently the whole spirit of teaching as well as the ethos was Hellenic. It is also true that Latin was from the beginning a part of the curriculum at the brotherhood schools. But on the whole "Latin learning" was viewed as an unnecessary frill, or even a dangerous "sophistry." Zakharii Kopystenskii's comment was fairly typical: "The Latinizers study syllogisms and arguments, train themselves for disputes, and then attempt to out-debate each other. But Greeks and Orthodox Slavs keep the true faith and invoke their proofs from Holy Writ."

By 1615, in the same year that the famous Kiev brotherhood was founded, a colony of learned monks was in residence in the Kievan Monastery of the Caves, gathered there chiefly from Lvov by the new archimandrite and abbot Elisei Pletenetskii.[54] In 1617 the Balaban printing press[55] was brought from Striatin to the monastery, where it was put to immediate use. The chief publications were liturgical books and the writings of the Fathers, but other works and authors also merit mention. First of all there is the valuable *Slavonic-Ukrainian Lexicon* [*Leksikon Slaveno-Rossiskii i imen tolkovanie*] compiled by Pamvo (Pamfil) Berynda, a Moldavian, and printed in 1627.[56] Of the original works of the Kiev scholars, the most interesting and significant is the *Book of Defense of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Ecumenical Church* [*Palinodiia*] of Zakharii Kopystenskii, who in 1624 succeeded Pleteneskii as abbot of the Monastery of the Caves. It was composed in reply to the Uniate book, *Defense of the Unity of the Church* [*Obrono*

jednosci cerkiewney, (Vilna, 1617)] by Leo Krevsa.[57] Kopystenskii sought in his study to elucidate the eastern understanding of the unity of the Church and with great artistry substantiated his argument by the scriptures and the Fathers. From his *Palinodiia* and other writings it is clear that Kopystenskii was a man of broad erudition. He knew the Fathers and was acquainted with Byzantine historians and canonists, as well as modern books on the East (e.g., Crusius' *Turko-Graeciae*) and had also read some Latin books (e.g., *De republica ecclesiastica* by Marco Antonio de Dominis and *De Papa Romano* by Lubbertus). Kopystenskii — like Maxim the Greek before him — quietly and soberly rejected western scholasticism. It is plain that Kopystenskii knew his material and had worked through it on his own. he was neither an imitator, nor simply a factologist, but a creative scholar in the Byzantine mold. His *Palinodiia*, the task of many years, is still a model of lucidity. Unfortunately, it was not published in his day and in fact not until the nineteenth century. Kopystenskii died soon after its completion. His successor at the Monastery of the Caves, Peter Mogila, was a man of quite different temperament and persuasion. he could have had no sympathy for Kopystenskii's book, for it was too direct and outspoken.

Still another name to be added to the list of early Kievan scholars whose writings were significant is that of Lavrentii (Tustanovskii) Zizani (d. after 1627). Before coming to Kiev, he had taught in Lvov and Brest, and had published a Slavonic grammar and lexis in Vilna in 1596. Once in Kiev, Zizani turned his talents as a Greek expert to the translation of St. Andrew of Crete's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*[58]and to the supervision of an edition of St. John Chrysostom's homilies. But Zizani's main work remains his *Catechism* [*Katekhizis*]. When completed, the book was sent to Moscow for publication. There it ran into difficulties. First it had to be translated from the "Lithuanian dialect" — as Muscovites denoted the literary language of West Russia — into Church Slavonic. But the translation was poorly done. In addition, authorities at Moscow detected grave doctrinal errors in the book. Zizani, it seems, held a number of peculiar opinions in all probability derived from his foreign sources: Protestant and Roman Catholic. He himself escaped condemnation, but the printed version of his *Catechism* was withdrawn from circulation and was burned in 1627. However, copies in manuscript form did survive and received wide dissemination and popularity. In the course of the eighteenth century the book was thrice reprinted by the Old Believers of Grodno. Zizani, like Berynda, Kopystenskii and most of the early Kiev scholars, worked primarily in Greek and Slavonic sources, and the writings of these learned monks reflect an authentic cultural inspiration. But even as they labored a new tide was rising in that same Kievan milieu.

As the seventeenth century unfolded, Kiev began to feel the impact of "Latin learning" more and more. New generations were of necessity

turning to western books and with increasing frequency attending Jesuit schools, where, as if inexorably, they became imbued with the Latin pattern of study. Even Elisei Pletenetskii, in his effort to counteract the Uniate initiative of Metropolitan Veliamin Rutskii,[59] seems to have had a western model in mind when he sought to create an "Orthodox order." Under his direction, communal life at the Monastery of the Caves was restored, but on the rule of St. Basil rather than the more common Studite Rule.[60] A "Latin motif" can also be noted in some of the books published at that time by certain members of the circle at the Monastery of the Caves. On occasion this bias filtered in through tainted Greek sources; at other times it entered directly from Latin literature. Tarasii Zemka, composer of laudatory verses and the learned editor of Kievan liturgical books,[61] made considerable use of the celebrated work of Gabriel Severus on the sacraments, which had appeared in Venice in 1600.[62] Severus' book was permeated by Latin influence, if only in the phraseology which Zemka liberally adopted. (For example, where Severus used "*metaousiosis*," or the Greek equivalent of "transubstantiation," Zemka employed the Slavonic "*prelozhenie suchchestv*" ["the metastasis of substances"]). The influence of Latin thought is even more pronounced in Kirill Trankvillion-Stavrovetskii.[63] His book *Mirror of Theology* [*Zertsalo bogosloviia*], published at the Pochaev Monastery in 1618, can be regarded as the first attempt by a Kiev scholar at a theological system. A subsequent study, *Commentaries on the Gospel* [*Uchitel'noe Evangelie*, printed in 1618], is similarly concerned with doctrine. Both works reflect Thomism, and even something of Platonism. In Kiev and Moscow they were censured for "heretical errors" [*ereticheskie sostavy*] and sentenced to destruction. But official rejection did not hinder their spread in manuscripts or mitigate their broad acceptance in the south as well as in the Russian north. Even so, disappointed that his books were repudiated by his ecclesiastical superiors, Stavrovetskii went over to the *Unia*.

Yet another figure in whom a Thomist influence can be seen is Kassian Sakovich (c. 1578-1674), headmaster of the Kiev brotherhood school from 1620-1624. It is most transparent in his *On the Soul* [*O dushe*], printed in Cracow in 1625. From Kiev, Sakovich went to Lublin, where he established contact with the Dominicans and attended theological classes. He later continued this study in Cracow. And Sakovich, too, finally joined the *Unia*, after which he launched a virulent polemic against the Orthodox Church. In this manner, then, in the second and third decades of the seventeenth century the Roman Catholic style of theology began to penetrate into the Kievan scholarly community. The next decade, the 1630's, saw Roman Catholic domination. The shift occurred simultaneously with a change of administration at the Kiev Monastery of the Caves, when Peter Mogila became abbot.

Uniatism

The *Unia* was less an act of religious choice than cultural and political self-determination. Neither reasons of faith or doctrine were fundamental to the secession of the bishops. The early Uniates were quite sincere in contending that "they did not change the faith." They felt they were only transferring jurisdictions and seem really to have believed that the "Latin faith" and the "Greek faith" were identical. This aspect received considerable stress in their pamphlet literature, for example, in the *Unia*, or in *Harmony, or the Concordance of the Most Holy Church of Rome*,[64] or in *A Selection of Principal Articles* [*Unia, albo vyklad predneishikh ar"tikulov*], published anonymously, but reputedly the work of Hypatius Pociej.[65] Many were equally convinced that under "Roman obedience" they could still by Orthodox. Greek Uniates, too, felt this was and made the most striking attempts to argue the case. In particular this was so for Peter Arcudius (1562-1633) in his *De concordia Ecclesiae occidentalis in septem sacramentorum administratione libri septem* (Paris, 1619).[66] Even more notable was Leo Allatius (1586-1669) in his *De Ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis parpetua consensione libri tres* (Coloniae, 1648).[67] Such a notion led to the stipulation in the final agreement that the Uniate Church was not to be merged with the Roman Catholic Church but would retain its own hierarchical independence and ritual. It was a clause acceptable even to a man like Ostrozhskii. He ended an opponent of the *Unia*, not because he perceived it to be a betrayal of faith, but because he knew the action was taken in an unlawful manner and therefore could have neither authority nor relevance for the whole Church.

Those who first turned to Uniatism seem to have been tempted by "undisturbed peace" under Roman obedience, which by implication meant the protection of Polish law. They also hoped to liberate themselves from the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople, long under the control of the Infidel Turk. Other early Uniates were more drawn to the splendors of western civilization and wished to partake in its riches. There was also a certain disenchantment with the East. One of the founders of the *Unia*, Hypatius Pociej, who became the second Uniate metropolitan, declared in a letter to the Patriarch of Alexandria, Meletius Pigas: "You cannot be sure of attaining eternal life by heading for the Greek shore. The Greeks distort the Gospel. They malign and betray the Patristic heritage. Saintliness is debased, and everything has come apart or fallen into discord in the Turkish captivity . . . Calvin sits in Alexandria, instead of Athanasius, Luther in Constantinople, and Zwingli in Jerusalem." (Presumably Pociej was referring to Cyris Lucaris and to Pigas himself, both of whom had Protestant leanings.)[68] And so Pociej chose Rome. No longer was the "wellspring of truth" [*studenets pravdy*] in the East; only in the West could a pure faith and a stable order be found.

As early as 1577, Peter Skarga[69] had pointed not to doctrinal differences but to the "Greek apostasy" and to the "backwardness of Slavic culture." "With the Slavonic tongue one cannot be a scholar. It has neither grammar nor rhetoric, nor can it be given any. Because of this language the Orthodox have no schools beyond the elementary which teach reading and writing. Hence their general ignorance and confusion." His judgment is harsh and wrong, though the narrow-mindedness it expresses is fairly typical of the time. However true it may be that the Polish language was still not mature enough to serve as a vehicle of learning, the same cannot be said of Church Slavonic. Skarga was unaware of the difference, or he chose to ignore it. as he assessed the situation, the only remedy for the ignorance of the Slavs was the adoption of Latin culture. His attack did not go unanswered. Orthodox defenders such as Zakharii Kopystenskii would reply that the Slavonic tongue is kin to the language and culture of Greece, "and therefore, it is a safer and surer thing to make translations from the Greek and to write philosophy and theology in Slavonic than it is to use Latin, which is an impoverished tongue, too inadequate and too insufficient for lofty and involved theological matters."[70] Kopystenskii exaggerates as much as Skarga, only with the obverse. But the distinction they point to is a valid one.

From the outset, then, Uniatism was posed and perceived as a question of cultural determination. For *Unia* implied, regardless of all assurances or guarantees that the rites and customs of the East would be preserved, an inclusion or integration into western culture, or as the Germans say, a western *Kulturraum*. To state it badly, *Unia* meant religio-cultural westernization. It could only be resisted and overcome by steadfast allegiance to the Greek tradition. This was fully comprehended by those who rose to the defense of the Orthodox Church toward the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. It is enough to mention the eloquent vindication made by Gerasim Smotritskii in his *Key to the Kingdom of Heaven* [*Kliuch tsarstva nebesnago*, 1584], and by Zakharii Kopystenskii in his *Palinodiia* several decades later. Their concern was also shared by the founders of the brotherhood school in Kiev:

> We have founded by the grace of God this school for Orthodox children, and have provided it at great sacrifice with teachers fo the Slavono-Russian and Helleno-Greek languages, as well as of other subjects, in order that they not drink from the alien spring, and, having imbibed the fatal poison of the schism of the West, be inclined to join forces with the dark and dismal Romans.

The only cultural concession of the Orthodox loyalists was the supplementation of Church Slavonic with the local vernacular, the *russkii dialekt*. With the passage of time this dialect came into

increasing literary use because the common people understood it much better than Church Slavonic. It also came into occasional use in the spoken liturgy, or so it seems form the Lenten Triodion which was printed in Kiev in 1627.[71] Thus, as the *Unia* and its inherent westernization spread, a concerted effort arose in Poland to defend Orthodoxy. The issue now at hand was whether, confronted by this expanding western *Kulturraum*, a Slavono-Hellenic school and culture could survive. In the 1620's it was already an urgent issue; in the 1630's it became a burning one.

Metropolitan Peter Mogila of Kiev

In the person of Peter Mogila (1596-1647) there is something enigmatic and strange. Was he a sincere champion of Orthodoxy or a manipulative hierarch of genius? It is hard to judge. Whatever the case, that he played a decisive role in the life of the West Russian Church, and indirectly in the later life of the whole Russian Church, is indisputable. He was the most able and powerful Church leader in Poland and Lithuania in the whole seventeenth century. And it is appropriate that an entire era in the history of the West Russian Church bears his name: the Mogila epoch. Son of a hospodar of Moldavia [*voevodich zemel' moldavskikh*],[72] Mogila seems to have had an appetite and talent for power from birth. Even on the throne of the Kievan metropolia he proved more a sovereign than a pastor. Educated in the West, or, more exactly, in Poland and in a Polish fashion, Peter Mogila became in taste and habit a sophisticated and lifelong westerner. Apparently he studied at the celebrated Academy of Zamosc, founded in 1594 by Jan Zamoyski, the Grand Chancellor of Poland.[73] He seems later to have spent a short while in Holland. Upon the death of his father, Ieremia Mogila, he was taken as the ward of Chancellor Stanislaw Zolkiewski[74] and afterwards of Hetman Chodkiewicz.[75] In general, Mogila was closely linked to Polish aristocratic society through family and friends in his youth. And in the future the sympathy and succor of Polish magnates would assure his vocational success.

In 1627, at just thirty years of age, Peter Mogila was elected archimandrite of the Monastery of the Caves. He probably aspired to this when he took monastic vows and first entered the monastery. Certainly when the post became vacant his candidacy was promoted by the Polish government. Once head of the monastery, Mogila set his own course, which sharply contrasted with that of his predecessor. This was most evident in the field of education. At the monastery Mogila decided to launch a Latin-Polish school, inevitably if not intentionally opposed to and in competition with Kiev's Slavono-Hellenic brotherhood school. His decision created great tension bordering on a riot in the city. In the words of a contemporary, Gavriil Dometskoi,[76] "There was great indignation among the uneducated monks and Cossacks: 'Why, as we were gaining salvation, do you start up this

Polish and Latin school, never before in existence?' Only with great difficulty were they dissuaded from beating Peter Mogila and his teaching staff to death."[77] But Mogila was no man to be frightened. he emerged unscathed and soon after triumphed. The brotherhood had no choice but to accept him as "an elder brother, a protector and patron of this holy brotherhood, the monastery and the schools." Pressing his advantage, Mogila first took over the administration of the brotherhood school and then combined it with his own school at the monastery to form a "collegium" on the Latin-Polish pattern. This new institution was housed in the Brotherhood monastery. its curriculum and organization were modelled on the lines of Jesuit schools in the country, and all new teachers were recruited from graduates of Polish schools. Isaia Trofimovich Kozlovskii, the first rector of the Kievan collegium,[78] and Silvestr Kossov, the first prefect, received their education in Vilna, at the Jesuit college in Lublin, and at the Zamosc Academy. It seems that for a while they also studied at the Imperial Academy of Vienna. At the same time that he was engaged in organizing the new school at Kiev, Mogila set about to form a school in Vinnitsa in the same manner.[79] There is reason to believe that Mogila had plans for spreading a network of Latin-Polish schools across the region for the Orthodox, as well as for creating something like a monastic teaching order, all under the Kiev collegium.[80]

Mogila was an avid and resolute westernizer. His aim was to forge the heterogeneous peoples of the western regions into a single religious psychology and inspiration, into a common culture. Attending all his plans and endeavors, for the most part only the symptom of a clash between two opposed religious cultural orientations (Latin-Polish and Helleno-Slavonic), was an intense, if submerged struggle. Mogila was not alone in his projects. His numerous allies included the whole of the younger generation, which, having passed through Polish schools, had come to regard the Latin West rather than the Slavonic-Hellenic East as its spiritual home. in a sense, this was natural and logical. Silvestr Kossov was eloquent and direct on the issue. We need Latin, he would say, so that no one can call us "stupid Rus" [*glupaia Rus'*]. To study Greek is reasonable, if one studies it in Greece, not in Poland. Here no one can succeed without Latin — in court, at meetings, or anywhere for that matter. There is no need to remind us of Greek. We honor it. But *Graeca ad chorum, Latina ad forum.* Kossov's argument has logic. But the root of the matter was deeper. On one level it was a linguistic problem, but on a more profound level it was an issue of cultural setting and tradition.

For those opposed to the pressures imposed by Mogila's followers for a Latin education there were good reasons to suspect that this was Uniatism. Were not the Orthodox partisans of a Latin orientation time and again in conference or negotiation with active Uniates, anticipating a compromise to which both sides could wholeheartedly adhere? Did they not more than once discuss a proposal to join all Orthodox

increasing literary use because the common people understood it much better than Church Slavonic. It also came into occasional use in the spoken liturgy, or so it seems form the Lenten Triodion which was printed in Kiev in 1627.[71] Thus, as the *Unia* and its inherent westernization spread, a concerted effort arose in Poland to defend Orthodoxy. The issue now at hand was whether, confronted by this expanding western *Kulturraum*, a Slavono-Hellenic school and culture could survive. In the 1620's it was already an urgent issue; in the 1630's it became a burning one.

Metropolitan Peter Mogila of Kiev

In the person of Peter Mogila (1596-1647) there is something enigmatic and strange. Was he a sincere champion of Orthodoxy or a manipulative hierarch of genius? It is hard to judge. Whatever the case, that he played a decisive role in the life of the West Russian Church, and indirectly in the later life of the whole Russian Church, is indisputable. He was the most able and powerful Church leader in Poland and Lithuania in the whole seventeenth century. And it is appropriate that an entire era in the history of the West Russian Church bears his name: the Mogila epoch. Son of a hospodar of Moldavia [*voevodich zemel' moldavskikh*],[72] Mogila seems to have had an appetite and talent for power from birth. Even on the throne of the Kievan metropolia he proved more a sovereign than a pastor. Educated in the West, or, more exactly, in Poland and in a Polish fashion, Peter Mogila became in taste and habit a sophisticated and lifelong westerner. Apparently he studied at the celebrated Academy of Zamosc, founded in 1594 by Jan Zamoyski, the Grand Chancellor of Poland.[73] He seems later to have spent a short while in Holland. Upon the death of his father, Ieremia Mogila, he was taken as the ward of Chancellor Stanislaw Zolkiewski[74] and afterwards of Hetman Chodkiewicz.[75] In general, Mogila was closely linked to Polish aristocratic society through family and friends in his youth. And in the future the sympathy and succor of Polish magnates would assure his vocational success.

In 1627, at just thirty years of age, Peter Mogila was elected archimandrite of the Monastery of the Caves. He probably aspired to this when he took monastic vows and first entered the monastery. Certainly when the post became vacant his candidacy was promoted by the Polish government. Once head of the monastery, Mogila set his own course, which sharply contrasted with that of his predecessor. This was most evident in the field of education. At the monastery Mogila decided to launch a Latin-Polish school, inevitably if not intentionally opposed to and in competition with Kiev's Slavono-Hellenic brotherhood school. His decision created great tension bordering on a riot in the city. In the words of a contemporary, Gavriil Dometskoi,[76] "There was great indignation among the uneducated monks and Cossacks: 'Why, as we were gaining salvation, do you start up this

Polish and Latin school, never before in existence?' Only with great difficulty were they dissuaded from beating Peter Mogila and his teaching staff to death."[77] But Mogila was no man to be frightened. he emerged unscathed and soon after triumphed. The brotherhood had no choice but to accept him as "an elder brother, a protector and patron of this holy brotherhood, the monastery and the schools." Pressing his advantage, Mogila first took over the administration of the brotherhood school and then combined it with his own school at the monastery to form a "collegium" on the Latin-Polish pattern. This new institution was housed in the Brotherhood monastery. its curriculum and organization were modelled on the lines of Jesuit schools in the country, and all new teachers were recruited from graduates of Polish schools. Isaia Trofimovich Kozlovskii, the first rector of the Kievan collegium,[78] and Silvestr Kossov, the first prefect, received their education in Vilna, at the Jesuit college in Lublin, and at the Zamosc Academy. It seems that for a while they also studied at the Imperial Academy of Vienna. At the same time that he was engaged in organizing the new school at Kiev, Mogila set about to form a school in Vinnitsa in the same manner.[79] There is reason to believe that Mogila had plans for spreading a network of Latin-Polish schools across the region for the Orthodox, as well as for creating something like a monastic teaching order, all under the Kiev collegium.[80]

Mogila was an avid and resolute westernizer. His aim was to forge the heterogeneous peoples of the western regions into a single religious psychology and inspiration, into a common culture. Attending all his plans and endeavors, for the most part only the symptom of a clash between two opposed religious cultural orientations (Latin-Polish and Helleno-Slavonic), was an intense, if submerged struggle. Mogila was not alone in his projects. His numerous allies included the whole of the younger generation, which, having passed through Polish schools, had come to regard the Latin West rather than the Slavonic-Hellenic East as its spiritual home. in a sense, this was natural and logical. Silvestr Kossov was eloquent and direct on the issue. We need Latin, he would say, so that no one can call us "stupid Rus" [*glupaia Rus'*]. To study Greek is reasonable, if one studies it in Greece, not in Poland. Here no one can succeed without Latin — in court, at meetings, or anywhere for that matter. There is no need to remind us of Greek. We honor it. But *Graeca ad chorum, Latina ad forum.* Kossov's argument has logic. But the root of the matter was deeper. On one level it was a linguistic problem, but on a more profound level it was an issue of cultural setting and tradition.

For those opposed to the pressures imposed by Mogila's followers for a Latin education there were good reasons to suspect that this was Uniatism. Were not the Orthodox partisans of a Latin orientation time and again in conference or negotiation with active Uniates, anticipating a compromise to which both sides could wholeheartedly adhere? Did they not more than once discuss a proposal to join all Orthodox

believers in the region, Uniates alike, under the authority of a special West Russian patriarch, simultaneously in communion with Rome and Constantinople? And was not Mogila himself always promoted for this august office by the Uniate side of the talks? This was, of course, hardly without his knowledge. Rutskii, the Uniate metropolitan, did not doubt for a moment that Mogila was "inclined to the *Unia*." It is certainly significant that Mogila never voiced doctrinal objections to Rome. In dogma, he was privately, so to speak, already at one with the Holy See. He was quite ready to accept what he found in Roman books as traditional and "Orthodox." That is why in theology and in worship Mogila could freely adopt Latin material. The problem for him, the only problem, was jurisdiction. And in the solution of this problem his outlook and temperament dictated that practical concerns would be decisive: ecclesiastical and political "tranquility" [*uspokoenie*], "prosperity" [*blagosostoianie*], "good order" [*blagoustroistvo*]. For in the practical realm everything is relative. Things can be arranged and agreed upon. The task is one for ecclesiastical tacticians.

An early and revealing episode in Mogila's career was his friendship with one of the new bishops, Meletii Smotritskii, consecrated by Patriarch Theophanes precisely at the time of his "eastern peregrinations." Smotritskii was a learned man. Because of his Slavic grammar, published in Vilna in 1619, he occupies a place in the history of general culture. It was a remarkable achievement for its time. It can even be argued that Smotritskii was — to borrow Joseph Dobrovskii's[81] phrase "*princeps Grammaticorum Slavicorum.*" When he wrote this text, he was still of a Greek orientation. In it he sought to apply the rules of Greek grammar to the Slavonic tongue.[82] As an ecclesiastic, too, Smotritskii began in the Slavonic-Hellenic camp where he was a vigorous opponent of the *Unia*. It is enough to point to his *Lamentation* [*Threnos*] written in 1610, which describes the sufferings of the oppressed and persecuted Orthodox flock with a skillful combination of passion and rigor. It is likely that this and similar writings led to his selection in 1620 as bishop of Polotsk. Here he ran into difficulties. First there was conflict with Iosafat Kuntsevish, Uniate bishop of Polotsk;[83] then he was troubled by doctrinal disagreements among Orthodox polemists as well as abuses in the activity of the brotherhoods. Doubts arose, so Smotritskii decided on a trip to the Near East. At Kiev, on his way to Constantinople, he visited the metropolitan and received encouragement and blessing in his plan to ask the patriarch to cancel the "stauropegia" of the brotherhoods. Smotritskii succeeded in doing so, but the rest of his eastern journey proved a disappointment. This was especially so of his meeting with Cyril Lucaris, whose *Catechism* Smotritskii read while in Constantinople and who not only failed to calm his doubts but heightened them all the more. By the end of his journey Smotritskii had decided to seek some rapprochement with the Uniates. Back in Kiev he shared certain of these ideas with Mogila and Metropolitan Iov,[84] who

were apparently sympathetic. After all, negotiations between the Orthodox and the Uniates, in which both seem somehow to have been involved, had been in progress since the Uniate proposal in 1623 for a joint conference to seek out agreement. Somewhat later, with apparent confidence, Smotritskii sent to Mogila and the metropolitan the manuscript of his *Apology* [*Apologia peregrynacyi do krajów wshodnich* (Derman, 1628)]. It contained a full and vigorous presentation of his new views, and provoked no opposition. By this time, it seems since 1627, Smotritskii had gone over to the *Unia*, though secretly, in order, as he put it, that "*pallio schismatis latens*," he might better promote the Uniate cause among the Orthodox. However, his clandestine labors did not escape the attention of Isaia Kopinskii, bishop of Peremyshl and future metropolitan.[85]

In the spring of 1628 Smotritskii formulated a six point memorandum, wherein, after noting the differences between Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy, he insisted that they were not of sufficient magnitude or of such a character as to justify division, and submitted this to a conference of Orthodox bishops at Grodko, in Volynia. Once again, it seems, no open objection to his views was voiced. Hence a joint meeting with the Uniates was scheduled for the autumn of 1629. Well before, however, at a plenary council of Orthodox bishops and clergy in August 1628, opponents of Smotritskii's ideas stepped forth in force. He was compelled to recant his *Apology*, which was condemned as heretical and then publicly burned. Within weeks, however, Smotritskii had withdrawn his disavowal by means of a protestation, and embarked on a polemical exchange with his accusors by means of various pamphlets. Leading the opposition were members of the older Orthodox generation, among whom suspicions arose about Mogila and the metropolitan, since neither had called for a recantation or condemned its withdrawal. They could hardly have done so. Smotritskii's increasing empathy with the *Unia* had been of interest to Mogila for some time, and there were reasons for Smotritskii to suspect that his *Unia* plans would have the sympathy and cooperation not only of Mogila but of the metropolitan as well. What disagreement there was between Mogila and Smotritskii was not about ends but means. And the entire episode was all the more confused by an external pressure, referred to in Uniate literature as "the fear of the Cossacks."

Peter Mogila's election as metropolitan of Kiev also transpired under peculiar circumstances. With the death of King Sigismund III in April 1632, the Orthodox seized the occasion of the election of a new king to wrest from the Polish electoral Diet certain "points of pacification for the Greek religion" [*Punkty uspokoeniia religii grecheskoi*], among them legalization of the Orthodox Church. As expected, the consent of King-elect Wladyslaw IV rapidly followed. Despite a subsequent whittling down of the "points of 1632," in practice, the victory remained. Though its phrasing was patently ambiguous, of particular importance was the right of the Orthodox to fill their vacated sees,

including that of Kiev. In fact the sees had all been occupied since 1620 through the consecrations performed without announcement or publicity by Patriarch Theophanes. The consecrations were done at night in an unlighted sanctuary, as if by stealth, so as not to cause any disturbance. These consecrations, of course, had never received official recognition, but the Polish state seems to have come to terms with the *fait accompli*, if only because it could hardly avoid dealing with the new bishops. Now in 1632, with the new legal concession, it would be reasonable to expect that what was *de facto* would be made *de jure*. But nothing of this sort occurred. The Orthodox themselves, strangely enough, made no attempt to take advantage of the new law by applying for royal confirmation of their active hierarchy. It was decided instead that all the bishops should retire and their bishoprics be turned over to new elects. This was not done because the episcopal occupants were in any way considered to be "illegal," that is, in office without the confirmation of the Crown, nor because the Church judged them to be of questionable merit. Indeed, they could be credited with having restored both order and canonical prestige to the Church in a time of real and present danger. It was simply that, although the old bishops may have played a preponderant role in the protracted struggle with the state in order to obtain recognition, the victory itself was the work of younger figures. As partisans of a new and opposing ecclesiastical-political orientation, the younger group had little interest in strengthening the hierarchical authority of their antagonists by a formal legalization. Consequently, what on the basis of the "points of 1632" had been touted as a "restitution" of the Orthodox hierarchy, was in reality an annulment of the existing hierarchy, established years earlier by Patriarch Theophanes. New bishops were now hastily and uncanonically chosen by the Orthodox delegates to the Diet rather than by local diocesan conventions and immediately confirmed by the King. It was in this way that Peter Mogila, aristocrat and Polonophile, was elected metropolitan of Kiev.

Mogila did not expect a peaceful reception in Kiev in his new capacity, even though he had many sympathizers there. Kiev already had a metropolitan, Isaia Kopinskii, consecrated in 1620 in Peremyshl by Theophanes and then transferred to Kiev in 1631 at the death of Iov Boretskii. What is more, Kopinskii had already clashed with Mogila over the establishment of a Latin collegium in Kiev as well as in connection with the Smotritskii affair. This is why Mogila's consecration took place not in the city of his new see as was the rule and custom, but in Lvov, at the hands of Ieremia Tisarovskii, the local bishop,[86] two bishops of Theophanes' consecration, and an émigré Greek bishop. These clashes also explain why he sought patriarchal confirmation from Cyril Lucaris, who was once again on the ecumenical throne, Mogila received this and more. He was also bestowed with that title "Exarch of the Throne of the Holy Apostolic See of Constantinople." Fortified now with a consecration of double

authority, and in the dual role of lawful metropolitan and patriarchal exarch, Mogila returned to Kiev. Even so, he was not able to avoid a grievous struggle with his "demoted" predecessor and finally had to resort to the secular authorities to secure Kopinskii's forcible removal.[87] Nor did this solve the conflict once and for all. The clash between Mogila and Kopinskii was not simply a competition for position or power. It was a collision of deep-rooted convictions about the fundamental problem of ecclesiastical orientation, in both its political and cultural dimensions.

Isaia Kopinskii was a man of simple and strong faith, somewhat on the order of Ivan Vishenskii.[88] Immersed as he was in the traditions of eastern theology and ascetics, he viewed "external wisdom" with skepticism and even antagonism.

> The reasoning of this world is one thing, the reasoning of the spirit another. all the saints studied the spiritual reasoning coming from the Holy Spirit, and like the sun, they have illuminated the world. But now one acquires his power of reasoning not from the Holy Spirit, but from Aristotle, Plato, Cicero, and other pagan philosophers. And therefore, people are utterly blinded by falsehood and seduced from right understanding. The saints learned of Christ's commandments and of his works in the spirit. But these people learn mere words and speech, and therefore all their wisdom is on their tongues and darkness and gloom abide in their souls.

Kopinskii said this of the Latins, but it could have been even more easily directed at Mogila and the Orthodox of the new orientation. Kopinskii's *Spiritual Alphabet*, subtitled *Ladder for the Spiritual Life in God* [*Alfavit dukhovnyi. Lestnitsa dukhovnago po Boze zhitel'stva*] offers a significant and symptomatic contrast to Mogila's *Orthodox Confession* [*Pravoslavnoe Ispovedanie*].[89] Their antithesis of outlook and spirit is the main source for the struggle for power between the two men. Of course there was also a difference in political orientation: Isaia Kopinskii looked to the Orthodox state of Muscovy, while Peter Mogila sought help from the Catholic Kingdom of Poland. In their clash the Polish state had no reason to support Kopinskii and every reason to patronize Mogila. Faced with vigorous protests form Rome, the Polish Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the Uniates, King Wladyslaw IV was obliged if only for *raisons d'état* to hold to his commitment made in the *Pacta conventa* of 1632, although he did find it necessary to make certain concessions to the Uniates at the expense of the new rights of the Orthodox. Wladyslaw hoped, it seems, that over the course of time the western orientation of his new Orthodox leaders might mitigate Orthodox-Uniate tension and even promote the cause of Catholic unity in the realm. It should be noted that within a few years a plan of a "universal union" [*universal'naia unia*] did come forth, and at the center of negotiations there stood Orthodox of the new orientation,

most notably Peter Mogila as well as Prince Afanasii Puzina who in the elections of 1632 had been chosen bishop of Lutsk.[90]

Once ensconced as metropolitan, Mogila set out with new zeal to implement his ecclesiastical and cultural designs. His best results came in the field of education, especially (since he was most gifted as an organizer) in consolidating and extending the school system he began when abbot of the Monastery of the Caves. Of great importance also was his publication work, in particular his compilation of the *Orthodox Confession* and resumption of the printing of liturgical materials. Most critical for the future were Mogila's efforts to revise and reform the liturgies. First there was the Lithos [Rock], published in 1644 under the pseudonym of Evsevii Pimen. It was intended as a defense of the Eastern rite and Orthodox liturgy against the attacks of Kassian Sakovich, who had gone over to Latinism,[91] but much if not most of the large body of liturgical material in the *Lithos* came from the Latin sources. In 1646 there appeared the famous *Evkhologion* or *Trebnik* [*Prayer Book*].[92] This consisted of a comprehensive collection of rites, offices, and occasional prayers, accompanied by "prefaces" and "explanatory rubrics," which were accompanied by explanatory articles usually taken "*z lacinskiey agendy*," that is, from the Roman *Ritual* of Pope Paul V.[93] Many of the rites in the Trebnik had been reshaped, usually by replacing traditional prayers with prayers translated from the Latin. There has been no comprehensive study of Mogila's *Trebnik*, but those portions which have been analyzed betray an unmistakable dependency on the Latin sources, and from time to time a deliberate deviation from the Greek pattern (e.g., in the forms for the dedication and consecration of churches, in the blessing of bells, in the rite of "viaticum,"[94] in the *ordo commendationis ad animae*).[95] No doubt some of the changes were inconsequential. What cannot be dismissed, however, is the close attention given to Latin rites and regulations and the open disregard of the Greek tradition. Moreover, a number of the rites and offices printed in the *Trebnik* were totally innovative for Orthodox liturgies. Finally, some of the changes introduced by Mogila bore theological implications of importance, as for example, the shift from the declarative to the imperative form of absolution in the sacrament of penance. Indeed, as a whole the theology of the sacraments articulated in Mogila's liturgical "prefaces" was decidedly western. what resulted from the *Trebnik*, then was a radical and thorough "Latinization" of the Eastern rite. This did not escape the notice of contemporaries, especially the Uniates, but also the Orthodox of Moscow, who regarded books of "Lithuanian print," including the Kiev editions of Mogila, with suspicion and apprehension, Ironically, because of the liturgical work of Mogila and his co-laborers, the Orthodox in Poland experienced a "Latinization of rites" earlier than did the Uniates, In fairness it should be noted that Mogila was not the first of the Orthodox in Kiev to borrow from Latin liturgical sources. Iov Boretskii took steps in this direction, as for example, in the lenten rite

of "Passias."[96] Nor was Mogila the originator of that process of cultural absorption of Latin liturgical ideas and motifs. Others preceded him. Still in this trend toward the "Latinization" of the liturgy Mogila stands well to the fore because he promoted it on a larger scale and more systematically than anyone else.

To interpret the reign of Peter Mogila with precision is difficult. It has been argued that Mogila sought to create an "occidental Orthodoxy" and thereby to disentangle Orthodoxy from its "obsolete" oriental setting. The notion is plausible. But however Mogila's motives are interpreted, his legacy is an ambiguous one. On the one hand, he was a great man who accomplished a great deal. And in his own way he was even devout. Under his guidance and rule the Orthodox Church in West Russia emerged from that state of disorientation and disorganization wherein it had languished ever since the catastrophe at Brest. On the other hand, the Church he led out of this ordeal was not the same. Change ran deep. There was a new and alien spirit, the Latin spirit in everything. Thus, Mogila's legacy also includes a drastic "Romanization" of the Orthodox Church. He brought Orthodoxy to what might be called a Latin "pseudomorphosis." True, he found the Church in ruins and had to rebuild, but he built a foreign edifice on the ruins. He founded a Roman Catholic school in the Church, and for generations the Orthodox clergy was raised in a Roman Catholic spirit and taught theology in Latin. He "Romanized" the liturgies and thereby "Latinized" the mentality and psychology, the very soul of the Orthodox people. Mogila's "internal toxin," so to speak, was far more dangerous than the *Unia*. The *Unia* could be resisted, and had been resisted, especially when there were efforts to enforce it. But Mogila's "crypto-Romanism" entered silently and imperceptibly, with almost no resistance. Of course, it has of course often been said that Mogila's "accretions" were only external, involving form not substance. This ignores the truth that form shapes substance, and if an unsuitable form does not distort substance, it prevents its natural growth. This is the meaning of "pseudomorphosis." Assuming a Roman garb was an alien act for Orthodoxy. And the paradoxical character of the whole situation was only increased when, along with the steady "Latinization" of the inner life of the Church, its canonical autonomy was steadfastly maintained.

While striving to keep the Orthodox Church in Poland independent, Mogila and his confrères of the new orientation kept to their plans for a "universal union." as early as 1636, a joint conference was sought between Uniates and Orthodox to consider a proposal for an autonomous West Russian patriarchate. Rome was even assured that the scheme would attract many Orthodox, including perhaps the metropolitan. But for some reason the conference never materialized. Yet another project was advanced in 1643, this time in a special memorandum submitted by Peter Mogila. It is known to us only in the paraphrase of Ingoli, secretary to the Office of Propaganda.[97] Mogila's

memorandum apparently consisted of a lengthy discussion of the divergences between the two churches, the conditions he believed necessary for reunion, and an outline of the means to achieve them. Mogila did not see any insurmountable differences of doctrine. *Filioque* and *per filium* varied only in the phrasing. What divergence there was on purgatory was even less consequential, since the Orthodox did in some form acknowledge it. In ritual, too, agreement on all points was readily possible. The only serious difficulty was papal supremacy. Even if this were to be accepted by the Orthodox, Mogila stipulated, the eastern churches must still be allowed the principle of autocephalous patriarchates. it appears Mogila was willing to limit the "reunion" to Poland: he did not mention Muscovy, or the Greeks bound in Turkish captivity. Nor did he seek a merger: *l'unione et non l'unité*. For even under the supremacy of the Pope the Orthodox were to retain their constitution, The metropolitan was still to be elected by the bishops, and although it would be expected that he take an oath of allegiance to the Pope, his election would not require papal confirmation. In the event that the ecumenical patriarchate should unite with Rome, its jurisdiction in Poland was to be restored. The last section of Mogila's memorandum set out the means by which the new plan of union should be examined and deliberated. First it should be submitted to local and provincial diets for their discussion. Next, a conference ought to be arranged between the Uniates and the Orthodox without, however, any reference to a perspective union. The findings obtained at these preliminary meetings should then be submitted to the general Diet of the realm. However elaborate, as with the project of 1636, nothing came of Mogila's reunion memorandum of 1643. And a few years later he died (1647).

Peter Mogila's attitude to the problems of the Roman Catholic Church was clear and simple. He did not see any real difference between Orthodoxy and Rome. He was convinced of the importance of canonical independence, but perceived no threat from inner "Latinization." Indeed, he welcomed it and promoted it in some respect for the very sake of securing the Church's external independence. Since Mogila sought to accomplish this within an undivided "universe of culture," the paradox was only further heightened. Under such conditions, Orthodoxy lost its inner independence as well as its measuring rod of self-examination. Without thought or scrutiny, as if by habit, western criteria of evaluation were adopted. At the same time links with the traditions and methods of the East were broken. But was not the cost too high? Could the Orthodox in Poland truly afford to isolate themselves from Constantinople and Moscow? Was not the Scope of vision impractically narrow? Did not the rupture with the eastern part result in the grafting on of an alien and artificial tradition which would inevitably block the path of creative development? It would be unfair to place all blame for this on Mogila. The process of "Latinization" began long before he came on the scene. He was less the pioneer of a new

path than an articulator of his time. Yet Peter Mogila contributed more than any other, as organizer, educator, liturgical reformer, and inspirer of the *Orthodox Confession*, to the entrenchment of "crypto-Romanism" in the life of the West Russian Church. From here it was transported to Moscow in the seventeenth century by Kievan scholars and in the eighteenth century by bishops of western origin and training.

The Orthodox Confession

The *Orthodox Confession* is the most significant and expressive document of the Mogila era. Its importance is not limited to the history of the West Russian Church, since it became a confession of faith for the Eastern Church (though only after a struggle, and its authoritative character is still open to question). Who the author or the editor of the *Confession* really was remains uncertain. It is usually attributed to Peter Mogila or Isaia Kozlovskii.[98] More than likely it was a collective work, with Mogila and various members of his circle sharing in the composition. The exact purpose of the *Confession* also remains unclear. Originally conceived as a "catechism," and often called one, it seems to have been intended as a clarification of the Orthodox faith in relation to the Protestants. In fact, it is now widely assumed that Mogila's *Confession* was prepared as a rejoinder to the *Confession* of Cyril Lucaris, which appeared in 1633 and whose pro-Calvinist leanings stirred disquietude and confusion in the whole Orthodox world. In 1638 — after certain collusion and pressure from Rome — both Lucaris and his *Confession* were condemned by a synod in Constantinople.[99] These events may explain why the Greek Church was drawn to Mogila's *Confession* when it came out and, after it was editted by Syrigos,[100] conferred the Church's authority on it.

The first public appearance of the *Orthodox Confession* came in 1640, when Peter Mogila submitted it to a Church council in Kiev for discussion and endorsement. Its original title, *Exposition of the Faith of the Orthodox Church in Little Russia*, indicates the limited scope intended for the document. Primarily aimed at theologians and those who were concerned with theology, the *Confession* was composed in Latin. The council in Kiev criticized the draft at a number of points. divergent views were voice about the origin of the soul and its destiny after death, particularly in regard to purgatory and "an earthly paradise."[101] Here Mogila had argued for creationism[102] as well as for the existence of purgatory. The council in Kiev also engaged in an extended discussion as to when the actual metastasis of the elements occurs in the eucharistic liturgy. Before it concluded, the council introduced certain amendments into the *Confession*. The document was again subjected to open discussion in 1642 at what has been referred to as a council, but what was in fact a conference in Iasi apparently convened on the initiative of Mogila's friend, the Moldavian prince, Basil, surnamed Lupul, the Wolf.[103] In attendance were two

representatives of the ecumenical patriarchate, both sent from Constantinople with the title of exarch, Meletios Syrigos, one of the most remarkable Greek theologians of the seventeenth century, and Porphyrius, metropolitan of Nicea,[104] as well as several Moldavian bishops, including Metropolitan Varlaam,[105] and three delegates from Kiev — Isaia Kozlovskii, Ignatii Oksenovich,[106] and Ioasaf Kononovich.[107] Meletios Syrigos took the leading role. Syrigos raised a number of objections to the *Confession*, and when translating it into Greek introduced various amendments. Most of his changes were actually stylistic. He chose, for example, to eliminate certain Scriptural quotations used in the draft. Mogila had followed the Latin Vulgate, which meant that some of his citations were either not in the Septuagint or were so differently phrased that to retain them would have made the *Confession* highly inappropriate for Orthodox believers.

Mogila was not satisfied with the Confession as amended by Syrigos. He decided not to print it, and in its place he published a Ukrainian Church Slavonic translation and a Polish version, the so-called *Brief Catechism* [*Malyi Katekhizis*, 1645][108] in Kiev. Only a few of the changes proposed by Syrigos for the *Confession* were adopted in the *Brief Catechism.* Moreover, it was intended for a different audience, "for the instruction of young people," ["*dla cwiczenia Mlodzi*"], which is why it was first composed in colloquial language. In 1649 Mogila's *Brief Catechism* was translated from the Ukrainian Church Slavonic into "Slavonic-Russian" and published in Moscow. In the meantime, the history of Syrigos' revised Greek version of the *Orthodox Confession* began a new chapter. In 1643 it was officially endorsed by the four eastern patriarches. However, since the Greek Church showed little interest in publishing it, the first Greek edition appeared only in 1695. From this latter edition, a Slavonic-Russian translation was made published in 1696 at the request of Metropolitan Varlaam Iasinskii of Kiev[109] with the blessing of patriarch Adrian.[110] This was almost a half century after the *Brief Catechism* had been published in Moscow.[111]

Mogila's *Confession*, in complete contrast to Lucaris' Protestant oriented *Confession*, was patently compiled from Latin sources. As the plan of the book betrays, its arrangement was also on the Latin pattern. It was divided according to the so-called "three theological virtues," Faith, Hope, and Charity. Belief was elucidated through an interpretation of the Creed. Ethics were expounded by means of commentaries on the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes and Decalogue. Of course the compilers had more than one Latin paradigm before them. The most obvious source was the *Catechismus Romanus*,[112] which first appeared in Greek translation in 1582. Others seem to have been the *Opus Catechisticum, sive Summa doctrinae christinanae* of Peter Canisius, S.J.,[113] the *Compendium doctinae christianae* (Dillingen, 1560) by the Dominican Petrus de Soto,[114] and the *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos* (Rome, 1581-93) of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621).[115] To cite

further Latin sources is unnecessary. The main point is that taken as a whole the *Orthodox Confession* is little more than a compilation or adaptation of Latin material, presented in a Latin style. Indeed, Mogila's *Confession* can justly be categorized as one of the many anti-Protestant expositions which appeared throughout Europe during the Counter Reformation or Baroque era. Certainly the *Confession* was more closely linked to the Roman Catholic literature of its day than to either traditional or contemporary spiritual life in the Eastern Church.

It is true that in Mogila's *Confession* key Roman doctrines, including the primacy of the Pope, are repudiated. Nevertheless, much of the substance and the whole of the style remain Roman, and not even Syrigos' editing at Iasi could alter that fact. After all, as was customary for Greeks in the seventeenth century, Syrigos had gone to a Latin school. He attended Padua, where he became an adherent of Bellarmine, or, as his contemporaries said of him, "*omnino Bellarminum spirare videtur*." This is not said to argue that the teaching of the Orthodox Confession was in error at certain points. It was not so much the doctrine, but the manner of presentation that was, so to speak, erroneous, particularly the choice of language and the tendency to employ any and all Roman weapons against the Protestants even when not consonant in full or in part with Orthodox presuppositions. And it is here that the chief danger of Mogila's Latin "pseudomorphosis" or "crypto-Romanism," in spite of its general faithfulness to Orthodox forms, was for a long time to bar the way to any spontaneous and genuine theological development in the East.

It is instructive from this same point of view to compare the *Orthodox Confession* with the theological works of Silvestr Kossov, Mogila's follower and successor as metropolitan of Kiev. His *Exegesis* [*Ekzegezis*] published in 1635 sought to vindicate the new Latin schools which Mogila organized for the Orthodox. His *Instruction, or Science of the Seven Sacraments* [*Didaskalia albo nauka o sedmi sakramentakh*, 1637] was an attempt to answer the charges of Protestantism leveled against him by his Roman opponents. Kossov, it is important to note, chose to respond to these critics in the language of Latin theology. This is particularly evident in that portion of his book devoted to the sacraments, which closely follows the well-known treatise of Peter Arcudius.[116] Latin terminology abounds in his work: "transubstantiation," the distinction between "form" and "matter," the "words of institution" as the "form" of the sacrament of the Eucharist, "contrition" as the "matter" of Penance, and others. Since Liturgical practice organically follows liturgical theology, it became necessary for the Orthodox of the new orientation to make alterations in the rites. Peter Mogila's *Trebnik* permanently established a number of those changes which had developed in practice as well. It also introduced certain new ones. For example, in the sacrament of Confession the formula for absolution was changed from the impersonal "your sins are forgiven you" [*grekhi tvoi otpushchaiutsia*] to the personal "and I,

unworthy priest" [*i az, nedostoinyi ierei*]. It is also at this time that the sacrament of anointing of the sick [*euchelation*] came to be interpreted as *ultima unction*, and to be used as a form of *viaticum*, whereas previously the eastern tradition had always regarded it as a sacrament of healing.[117] With the next generation in Kiev, Latin influences on religious thought and practice were to intensify and expand in a more systematic manner.

The Kiev Academy

During the lifetime of Peter Mogila, the Kiev collegium was still not a theological school. The charter, granted on 18 March 1635, by King Wladyslaw IV, made it a condition that teaching in the collegia should be limited to philosophy ("*ut humaniora non ultra Dialecticam et Logicam doceant*"). Only towards the end of the seventeenth century, with the introduction of a special "theological class" into the curriculum, was theology taught as a separate discipline. Some problems of theology, however, were treated in philosophy courses. At the Kiev collegium the general plan of education was adopted from the Jesuit school system. This included the curriculum even down to the level of textbooks. The texts began with Alvarius' grammar[118] and ended with Aristotle and Aquinas. Also similar to the Jesuit collegia and academies in Poland were the organization of school life, the teaching methods and the discipline. The language of instruction was Latin, and of all other subjects offered Greek was given lowest priority. Thus in practically every respect the Kiev collegium represents a radical break with the traditions of earlier schools in West Russia. Though it does seem that the school furnished an adequate preparation for life in Poland, its students were hardly initiated into the heritage of the Orthodox East. Scholasticism was the focus of teaching. And it was not simply the ideas of individual scholastic that were expounded and assimilated, but the very spirit of scholasticism. Of course this was not the scholasticism of the Middle Ages. It was rather the neo-scholasticism or pseudo-scholasticism of the Council of Trent.[119] It was the Baroque theology of the Counter-Reformation Age. This does not mean that the intellectual horizon of a seventeenth century scholar in Kiev was narrow. His erudition could be quite extensive. Students of that era read a great deal. But usually their reading was in a limited sphere. The Baroque age was, after all, an intellectually arid era, a period of self-contained erudition, an epoch of imitation. In the life of the mind it was not a creative age.

The middle of the seventeenth century was a difficult and troubled time for the Ukraine. "The Kiev collegium," to quote Lazar Baranovich,[120] Archbishop of Chernigov, "shrank in stature, and became like a small Zacchaeus." Not until the 1670's, under the rectorship of Varlaam Iasinskii (later metropolitan of Kiev) was the beleaguered and desolate school restored. During this troubled period it

was not unusual, it was in fact almost customary, for students to go abroad to be trained. Varlaam himself had studied in Elbing an in Olomouc, and had done some work at the academy in Cracow. His colleagues in the Kiev collegium were educated either at the Jesuit Academy in Engelstadt or at the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome. Even after the collegium regained its strength, this custom did not entirely end. It is known that many of those who taught there at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century had formally repudiated Orthodoxy and passed under "Roman obedience" in their student days. No doubt this was facilitated, even necessitated, by the requirement then in effect that admission to the Jesuit schools be conditional upon conversion to Rome, or at least acceptance of the *Unia*. Stefan Iavorskii, bishop and patriarchal *locum tenens* under Peter the Great, is a prominent example.[121] Hence the comment of a newly arrived Jesuit observer in Moscow generally about Russia and particularly about the Brotherhood Monastery in Kiev, where the collegium was located: "There are many Uniate monks, or monks who are close to the *Unia*, and even more who hold the highest opinion of us . . . In Kiev, there is an entire monastery made up of Uniates."[122] His remark lends credence to a sharp attack on the Kiev scholars leveled by Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem:[123]

> In that land, called the land of the Cossacks, there are many who have been taught by the Latins in Rome and in Poland, who thereafter have become abbots and archimandrites, and who in their monasteries publicly read unseemly sophistries and wear Jesuit rosaries around their neck . . . Let it be decreed that upon the death of these archimandrites and priests, no one who goes to a Popish place for study shall be appointed archimandrite, abbot, or bishop.

In later years Dositheus became especially alarmed at Stefan Iavorskii, then *locum tenens* of the patriarchal see of Moscow. He charged him with Latinism and demanded the immediate withdrawal of all Iavorskii's claims to the Moscow patriarchate. Dositheus, it should be noted, was equally strident with like-minded Greek candidates, declaring that "no Greek, nor anyone brought up in Latin and Polish lands and trained in their schools should be chosen patriarch of Moscow." Because, he warned, "they are associated with the Latins and accept their various manners and dogmas."

What the "manners" and "dogmas" are to which Dositheus refers can be ascertained by examining the lectures and lesson plans as well as other writings of various instructors at the Kiev collegium spanning the last half of the seventeenth century. Key examples will suffice. Ioanniki Goliatovskii (d. 1688), rector from 1658 to 1662, was a preacher, polemist, and prolific writer. He acknowledged quite openly that he adapted Latin sources to his purpose. In 1659, for a new edition of *Key*

to Understanding [*Kliuch razumeniia*], one of his many sermon collections, he appended *A Brief Guide or the Composition of Sermons* [*Nauka korotkaia albo sposob zlozhenia kazania*]. For later editions he enlarged it. Like most of Goliatovskii's work, the *Brief Guide* is characterized by a decadent classicism. There is in his choice and elucidation of texts and subjects — weighted as they are with what he called "themes and narrations" — a forced and pompous rhetorical symbolism. Here is how he rendered advice: "read books about beasts, birds, reptiles, fish, trees, herbs, stones and various waters which are to be found in the seas, rivers and springs, observe their nature, properties and distinctive features, notice all this and use it in the speech which you wish to make." Of course all public discourse in his day suffered from bizarre analogies and an overabundance of illustration. Even before the oratorical style of Kiev had reached this kind of extreme, Meletii Smotritskii ridiculed the habit Orthodox preachers had for imitating Latin-Polish homiletics. "One enters the pulpit with Ossorius,"[124] another with Fabricius,[125] and a third with Skarga,"[126] he said, referring to the fashionable Polish preachers of the day. He could also have named Tomasz Mlodzianowski,[127] a sixteenth century preacher of wide acclaim, who was the most imitated and grotesque of all. None of this was really genuine preaching. It was much more an exercise in rhetorics quite suited to the prevailing taste. Still, even while engaged in such verbal excesses, Goliatovskii and others like him staunchly opposed Jesuit polemists, and at length refuted their views on papal authority, the *Filioque*, and various other issues. But Goliatovskii's cast of mind, as well as his theological and semantic style of argument, remained thoroughly Roman.

The tenor of strained artificiality is even stronger in the writings of Lazar Baranovich, who was rector at the Kiev collegium from 1650 to 1658 and then archbishop of Chernigov.[128] A brave opponent of Jesuit propaganda, he did not hesitate to take on subjects of the greatest controversy, as is evident in his *New Measure of the Old Faith* [*Nowa miara starey Wiary*, 1676]. But once again the manner of expression and the mode of thought are typical of Polish Baroque. Baranovich even wrote in Polish, filling his works with fables, "an abundance of witticisms and puns," jests, "conceits and verbal gems." "In those days," of course, as has been noted, "it was considered appropriate to mix sacred traditions of the Church with mythological tales." Yet another Kievan scholar of this variety was Antonii Radivillovskii.[129] All of his homilies [*prediki*] and sermons [*kazaniia*] were modelled on Latin examples. And his book, *The Garden of Mary, Mother of God* [*Ogorodok Marii Bogoroditsy*, 1676] well illustrates the highly allegorical and rhetorical Latin style exercised on Marian themes common to that era.

Of a somewhat different mold than these Kievan scholars was Adam Zernikav of Chernigov. he deserves mention because of his special place in the ranks of religious leaders at the time in the south of

Russia. Born in Königsberg, and trained in protestant schools, Zernikav came to Orthodoxy through scholarly study of the early Christian tradition.[130] After a long period in the West, primarily in study at Oxford and London, he turned up in Chernigov. There he made his mark as the author of the treatise, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, which after its belated publication in Leipzig in 1774-1776 by Samuil Mislavskii, Metropolitan of Kiev,[131] gained him wide renown. It appears to have been Zernikav's only work, but it is the work of a lifetime. There is manifested in it an enormous erudition and a great gift for theological analysis. To this day Zernikav's work remains a skillful compilation of valuable materials, one of the most comprehensive studies on the subject ever made. It still deserves to be read.

The two most outstanding examples of Kievan learning in the late seventeenth century were Saint Dimitrii (Tuptalo, 1651-1709) and Stefan Iavorskii, though to be sure their religious importance is not confined to the history of Kievan theology. Each played a large part in the history of Great Russian theology. Nevertheless, both figures are quite representative of the later years of the Mogila epoch. Dimitrii, who became bishop of Rostov after his move to the north, is famous for his work in the field of hagiography. Here his main work was his book of saints' lives, *The Reading Compendium* (*Chet'i Minei*, 1689-1705). Based for the most part on western sources, the bulk of the work is taken from the renowned seven volume collection of Laurentius Surius,[132] *Vitae sanctorum Orientis et Occidentis*, (1563-1586, itself actually a reworking into Latin of Symeon Metaphrastes' work on the lives of saints).[133] Dimitrii also utilized various of the volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*, which had by his time appeared in the Bollandists' edition,[134] as well as Skarga's personal collectoin of hagiographies, *Lives of the Saints* (*Zywoty swetych*, 1576) which, judging from the large number of translations that circulated in manuscript form, must have been popular among the Orthodox for a long time. Skarga's style and language left a deep imprint on the work of St. Dimitrii. Greek and Old Church Slavonic material, however, are hardly present at all, and there is scarcely a trace of the diction and idiom of the East. St. Dimitrii's sermons were also of a western character, especially those of the early years. The same is true of his morality plays, written in Rostov for school performances, and patterned as they were after the popular Jesuit dramas of the time. The catalogue of Dimitrii's private library which has been preserved tells a similar story: Aquinas, Cornelius á Lapide,[135] Canisius, Martin Becan,[136] the sermons of Mlodzianowski, numerous books on history, the *Acta Sanctorum*, a number of the Fathers in western edition, and publications from Kiev and others of the cities in the south. On the whole it was a library appropriate to an erudite Latin. True, in his spiritual life, St. Dimitrii was not confined to the narrow mold of a Latin world, but as a thinker and writer he was never able to free himself from the mental habits and forms of theological pseudo-Classicism acquired when at school in

Kiev. Nor did he wish to do so, insisting with obstinacy on their sacred character. And in the north, in Russia, where he settled, he never came to understand its distinctive religious ethos and the circumstances that shaped it. To cite but one example: Dimitrii understood the Old Believer movement as no more than the blindness of an ignorant populace.[137]

A somewhat younger man than St. Dimitrii was Stefan Iavorskii (1658-1722), who came to prominence in the north only during the reign of Peter the Great. Nevertheless he was a typical representative of the Kievan cultural; "pseudomorphosis," that "Romanized" Orthodoxy of the Mogila epoch. Iavorskii studied under the Jesuits in Lvov and Lublin, and afterwards in Poznan and Vilna. During these years he was doubtlessly under "Roman obedience." On his return to South Russia, he rejoined the Orthodox Church, took monastic vows in Kiev, and received an appointment to teach at the collegium, where he later became prefect and then rector. Iavorskii was a gifted preacher, delivering his sermons with passion and authority. In spite of his simple and direct intent to teach and persuade, his style was that same pseudo-Classicism, replete with rhetorical circumlocution. Still, Iavorskii was a man of religious conviction, and he always had something to say. His main theological work, *Rock of Faith* [*Kamen' very*] was a polemical treatise against Protestantism.[138] Written in Latin, even though he had left Kiev, it was less an original work than an adaptation or even abridgement of a highly select body of Latin books. His main source was Bellarmine's *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos* from which Iavorskii repeated entire sections or paragraphs, often word for word. Another basic source was Martin Becan's *Opera* (1649). Though a valuable refutation of Protestantism, Iavorskii's *Rock of Faith* was hardly an exposition of Orthodox theology, although unfortunately it has too often been understood as such. A second book of Iavorskii's, *Signs of the Coming of the Antichrist* [*Znameniia prishestviia Antikhristova*, 1703], was also more or less a literal rendering of a Latin work, in this case the treatise *De Antichristo libro XI* (Rome, 1604) by the Spanish Dominican Tomás Malvenda.[139]

With the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Mogilan epoch reached a climax, when the school and culture Mogila had established at Kiev came to its fruition. In theology and in other fields as well the period during the rule of the hetman Mazepa (1687-1709) represents the height of what may be termed the Ukrainian Baroque.[140] For a time the Kievan academy (promoted to the rank of "Academy" in 1701) was even referred to semi-officially as the "*Academia Mogiliano-Mazepiana.*" But its climax was also the end. The flowering was also an epilogue. Probably the most representative figure of this final chapter in the Mogila era in Kievan intellectual history was Ioasaf Krokovskii (d. 1718), reformer, or even second founder, of the Kievan school. For a time he served as its rector and later he became metropolitan of Kiev.

More than any other figure he seems to have exhibited in religious activity and intellectual outlook all the ambiguities and contradictions of Kiev's cultural "pseudomorphosis." Educated at the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome, Krokovskii for the rest of his life was to retain the theological set of mind, religious convictions, and devotional habits he acquired there. At Kiev, he taught theology according to Aquinas and centered his devotional life — as was characteristic of the Baroque era — on the praise of the Blessed Virgin of the Immaculate Conception. It was under his rectorship that the student "congregations" of the Kiev Academy known as Marian Sodalities arose, in which members had to dedicate their lives "to the Virgin Mary, conceived without original sin" ("*Virgini Mariae sine labe originali conceptae*") and take an oath to preach and defend against heretics that "Mary was not only without actual sin, venal or mortal, but also free from original sin," although adding that "those who regard her as conceived in original sin are not to be classed as heretics."[141] Krokovskii's acceptance of the Immaculate Conception and his propagation of the doctrine at Kiev was no more than the consolidation of a tradition that for some time in the seventeenth century had been forming among various representatives of Kievan theology, including St. Dimitrii of Rostov. And in this realm, too, it was but an imitation or borrowing from Roman thought and practice. The growing idea of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary was intellectually linked with an evolving trend in the interpretation of Original Sin, but, more profoundly, it was rooted in a specific psychology and attitude developing historically within the bosom of the western Baroque. The veneration of Panagia and Theotokos by the Orthodox is by no means the same.[142] It is grounded in a spiritual soil of an altogether different kind.

Although the Ukrainian Baroque came to an end during the early eighteenth century, its traces have not fully vanished. Perhaps its most enduring legacy is a certain lack of sobriety, an excess of emotionalism or heady exaltation present in Ukrainian spirituality and religious thought. It could be classified as a particular form of religious romanticism. Historically this found partial expression in numerous devout and edifying books, mostly half-borrowed, which at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries were coming out in Kiev, Chernigov and other cities of South Russia. Interesting parallels to these literary documents can be found in the religious painting and ecclesiastical architecture of the time.[143]

The "Pseudomorphosis" of Orthodox Thought

From the cultural and historical points of view, Kievan learning was not a mere passing episode but an event of unquestionable significance. This was the first outright encounter with the West. One might even have called it a free encounter had it not ended in captivity, or more

Kiev. Nor did he wish to do so, insisting with obstinacy on their sacred character. And in the north, in Russia, where he settled, he never came to understand its distinctive religious ethos and the circumstances that shaped it. To cite but one example: Dimitrii understood the Old Believer movement as no more than the blindness of an ignorant populace.[137]

A somewhat younger man than St. Dimitrii was Stefan Iavorskii (1658-1722), who came to prominence in the north only during the reign of Peter the Great. Nevertheless he was a typical representative of the Kievan cultural; "pseudomorphosis," that "Romanized" Orthodoxy of the Mogila epoch. Iavorskii studied under the Jesuits in Lvov and Lublin, and afterwards in Poznan and Vilna. During these years he was doubtlessly under "Roman obedience." On his return to South Russia, he rejoined the Orthodox Church, took monastic vows in Kiev, and received an appointment to teach at the collegium, where he later became prefect and then rector. Iavorskii was a gifted preacher, delivering his sermons with passion and authority. In spite of his simple and direct intent to teach and persuade, his style was that same pseudo-Classicism, replete with rhetorical circumlocution. Still, Iavorskii was a man of religious conviction, and he always had something to say. His main theological work, *Rock of Faith* [*Kamen' very*] was a polemical treatise against Protestantism.[138] Written in Latin, even though he had left Kiev, it was less an original work than an adaptation or even abridgement of a highly select body of Latin books. His main source was Bellarmine's *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus hujus temporis haereticos* from which Iavorskii repeated entire sections or paragraphs, often word for word. Another basic source was Martin Becan's *Opera* (1649). Though a valuable refutation of Protestantism, Iavorskii's *Rock of Faith* was hardly an exposition of Orthodox theology, although unfortunately it has too often been understood as such. A second book of Iavorskii's, *Signs of the Coming of the Antichrist* [*Znameniia prishestviia Antikhristova*, 1703], was also more or less a literal rendering of a Latin work, in this case the treatise *De Antichristo libro XI* (Rome, 1604) by the Spanish Dominican Tomás Malvenda.[139]

With the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Mogilan epoch reached a climax, when the school and culture Mogila had established at Kiev came to its fruition. In theology and in other fields as well the period during the rule of the hetman Mazepa (1687-1709) represents the height of what may be termed the Ukrainian Baroque.[140] For a time the Kievan academy (promoted to the rank of "Academy" in 1701) was even referred to semi-officially as the "*Academia Mogiliano-Mazepiana.*" But its climax was also the end. The flowering was also an epilogue. Probably the most representative figure of this final chapter in the Mogila era in Kievan intellectual history was Ioasaf Krokovskii (d. 1718), reformer, or even second founder, of the Kievan school. For a time he served as its rector and later he became metropolitan of Kiev.

More than any other figure he seems to have exhibited in religious activity and intellectual outlook all the ambiguities and contradictions of Kiev's cultural "pseudomorphosis." Educated at the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome, Krokovskii for the rest of his life was to retain the theological set of mind, religious convictions, and devotional habits he acquired there. At Kiev, he taught theology according to Aquinas and centered his devotional life — as was characteristic of the Baroque era — on the praise of the Blessed Virgin of the Immaculate Conception. It was under his rectorship that the student "congregations" of the Kiev Academy known as Marian Sodalities arose, in which members had to dedicate their lives "to the Virgin Mary, conceived without original sin" ("*Virgini Mariae sine labe originali conceptae*") and take an oath to preach and defend against heretics that "Mary was not only without actual sin, venal or mortal, but also free from original sin," although adding that "those who regard her as conceived in original sin are not to be classed as heretics."[141] Krokovskii's acceptance of the Immaculate Conception and his propagation of the doctrine at Kiev was no more than the consolidation of a tradition that for some time in the seventeenth century had been forming among various representatives of Kievan theology, including St. Dimitrii of Rostov. And in this realm, too, it was but an imitation or borrowing from Roman thought and practice. The growing idea of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary was intellectually linked with an evolving trend in the interpretation of Original Sin, but, more profoundly, it was rooted in a specific psychology and attitude developing historically within the bosom of the western Baroque. The veneration of Panagia and Theotokos by the Orthodox is by no means the same.[142] It is grounded in a spiritual soil of an altogether different kind.

Although the Ukrainian Baroque came to an end during the early eighteenth century, its traces have not fully vanished. Perhaps its most enduring legacy is a certain lack of sobriety, an excess of emotionalism or heady exaltation present in Ukrainian spirituality and religious thought. It could be classified as a particular form of religious romanticism. Historically this found partial expression in numerous devout and edifying books, mostly half-borrowed, which at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries were coming out in Kiev, Chernigov and other cities of South Russia. Interesting parallels to these literary documents can be found in the religious painting and ecclesiastical architecture of the time.[143]

The "Pseudomorphosis" of Orthodox Thought

From the cultural and historical points of view, Kievan learning was not a mere passing episode but an event of unquestionable significance. This was the first outright encounter with the West. One might even have called it a free encounter had it not ended in captivity, or more

precisely, surrender. But for this reason, there could be no creative use made of the encounter. A scholastic tradition was developed and a school begun, yet no spiritually creative movement resulted. Instead there emerged an imitative and provincial scholasticism, in its literal sense a *theologica scholastica* or "school theology." This signified a new stage in religious and cultural consciousness. But in the process theology was torn from its living roots. A malignant schism set in between life and thought. Certainly the horizon of the Kievan erudites was wide enough. Contact with Europe was lively, with word of current searching and trends in the West easily reaching Kiev. Still, the aura of doom hovered over the entire movement, for it comprised a "pseudomorphism" of Russia's religious consciousness, a "pseudomorphosis" of Orthodox thought.

[1]Ostrozhskii's brother-in-law was John Christopher Tarnowski, with whom Peter Skarga lived for two years. Ostrozhskii's daughter married Jan Kiszka, the leading Socinian noble in Lithuania. For a genealogy of the Ostrozshskii family see J. Wolff, *Kniaziowie litewsko-ruscy* (Warsaw, 1895).

[2]"*Vindiciae pro Unitariorum in Polonia Religionis Libertate, ab Equite Polone conscriptae.*" in Christopher Sandius, *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*, (Freistadii-Amsterdam, 1684). [Author's Note.]

[3]Motivila (also spelled Motowilo or Motowillo), an obscure unitarian, probably a Lithuanian, appears to have been a millenarian. The only information about him seems to come from a letter written by Prince Kurbskii in 1578. His book was never published.

[4]Peter Skarga (1536-1612) was the most influential Polish Jesuit of his time. He began his career as the chancellor of the Catholic archdiocese of Lvov, where he made early contacts with Ostrozhskii. After he entered the Jesuit order, he helped found schools in Jaroslaw and Vilna and, when the college at Vilna became the first Jesuit university in 1578, Skarga was its first rector. His celebrated book, actually written three years before it was published, dealt with the Greek Church in the tradition of the Council of Florence. Its main arguments for union were that the Byzantine emperor and patriarch had originally accepted the Union of Florence, thus restoring the unity of the whole church under the Pope which had existed several centuries earlier, and that the contemporary Greek patriarch was under the humiliating domination of the Turks and was elected and deposed contrary to canon law. The book was reprinted in 1590 with a dedication to King Sigismund III, at whose court Skarga had been official preacher since 1588. In the preface to the second edition Skarga complained that wealthy Orthodox nobles (i.e. Ostrozhskii) were buying up all the copies of the first edition and burning them, and he urged the king to step up negotiations with the pro-union bishops. Skarga was the king's representative and chief Catholic theologian at the Synod of Brest in 1596 when the union was formally ratified, and worked tirelessly until his death in 1612 to promote the Catholic cause both among the Orthodox and the Protestants. See J. Tretiak, *Skarga w dziejach i leiteraturze Unii brzeskie* (Cracow, 1912).

[5]Curiously, the first edition of Skarga's book itself is dedicated to Ostrozhskii, and in the Preface the author refers to conversations they had earlier on the subject. [Author's note.]

[6]The Arians were followers of the early 4th century Alexandrian presbyter Arius (d. 336) who taught that the only true God is God the Father, and that Christ was not truly divine, i.e. there "was when He was not." Condemned at the First Ecumenical Council at Nicaea in 325, the Arian heresy was rather widespread and provoked a bitter controversy throughout the Church in the 4th century, a controversy which

raged until the Second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople in 381. The term "Arian" was therefore applied to various Anti-Trinitarian or Unitarian sects which arose during the Protestant Reformation.

[7]Photinus of Sirmium was condemned in 345 as a modalist, or one who held that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are just three different expressions or operations of one God.

[8]Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch from 260 to 268, professed a heretical theology stressing the unity of God to the point of modalism, and the humanity of Christ to the point of adoptionism (the belief that Jesus was an ordinary man whom God chose to be Christ).

[9]Antonio Possevino (1534-1611), a staunch opponent of the Protestant Reformation, became a Jesuit in 1559. Possevino, successful in preaching against the Reformation in France (1562-1572), became a special legate of Pope Gregory XIII in 1577. His assignment was to bring King John III of Sweden to Catholicism. (King John actually converted but quickly lapsed when the Pope refused to consider certain reforms: a vernacular liturgy, marriage of the clergy and communion under "both species.") His next papal assignment was to Ivan the Terrible who had asked for papal mediation after his loss to Poland. In 1581 he arrived in Russia and negotiated an armistice. His attempts to work out a reunion of the Church failed and he returned to Rome in 1582. He then served as papal *nuncio* to Poland with instructions to continue to work for reunion. When Ivan the Terrible died in 1584, contact with the papacy was broken off. from 1587 to 1591 Possevino was professor of theology at the University of Padua. Among his writings he left his invaluable *Moscovia* (Vilna, 1586). See S. Polcin, S.J. *"Une tentative d'Union au XVI siècle: La mission réligieuse du Père Antoine Possevin S.J. en Moscovie (1581-1582)," Orientalia Christiana Analecta,* CL (Rome, 1957) and O. Halecki, "Possevino's Last Statement on Polish-Russian Relations," *Orientalia Christiana Periodico,* XIX (1953).

[10]Alberto Bolognetti was the papal *nuncio* to Poland from 1581 until his death in 1585.

[11]Adam Pociej (d. 1613), an influential nobleman and the castellane of Brest, grew up as a Calvinist and only later joined the Orthodox Church. He took the monastic name Hypatius and became bishop of Brest and Vladimir in 1593. Shortly afterward, at a secret meeting at Torczyn in 1594, he declared himself in favor of union with Rome and began to work closely with another bishop, Terletskii, in promoting the union among the rest of the Orthodox clergy in Lithuania. On June 1, 1595 he signed a formal message to King Sigismund III announcing that he and several other bishops were ready to enter into communion with Rome, and in the fall of that year he travelled to Rome with Terletskii to present the union to Pope Clement VIII. In 1599 he was elevated to Uniate metropolitan of Kiev. A biography of Pociej by I. Savicky appears in *Jubilejna kniha v 300-litni rokovini smerti Mitropolita Jpatiya Potiya* (Lvov, 1914), pp. 1-133.

[12]The *Confessio Sandomiriensis* was the product of a synod held in 1570 as a project of Protestant unification. The *Confessio* remained, however, the creed of only the Calvinists and the Czech (Bohemian) Brethren. The synod also drew up the so-called *Consensus Sondomiriensis*, which was a pledge to struggle against both Anti-Trinitarians and Roman Catholics.

[13]Ostrozhskii's letter to the Synod of Torun inviting the Protestants to join the opposition to the Union of Brest, also spoke even of an armed uprising. His letter is in *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, XIX, 642-654

[14]Incidentally, in the time of Sigismund II Augustus (1548-1572) negotiations with "those of different faiths" were part of the liberal Catholic program. [Author's note.]

[15]For Turnovskii's description of his journey to Sandomierz in 1570 see K.E.J. Joerensen *Ökumenische Bestrebungen unter den polnischen Protestanten* (Copenhagen, 1942), 261.

[16]The Utraquists were a conservative religious group in Bohemia which split with the Roman Church over the issue of communion in both species. They were recognized by the Council of Basel (see below, note 18) but relations with Rome fell apart when the Pope refused to recognize their candidate for their bishop. In 1451 they sent a representative to Constantinople to discuss union with the Greek Church, but as the patriarchal throne was vacant the project was confined to the exchange of friendly messages and was forgotten when the city fell to the Turks two years later. Meanwhile the more radical descendants of the Hussites were gaining strength in Bohemia and when Luther appeared on the scene the members of the Utraquist Church either went over to the Reformation or were reabsorbed into the Catholic Church. Their Bible, published at Venice in 1506, was based on Hus' Bible, which was itself a revision of a vernacular version supposedly the work of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

[17]Meletius Pigas (d. 1601) was quite active in opposing attempts at union with the Roman Catholic Church both in Lithuania and on the island of Chios. The basic work on him remains I. Malishevskii *Aleksandriiskii Patriarkh Meletii Pigas i ego uchastvie v delakh russkoi tservki* (Kiev, 1872), 2 vols.

[18]The Council of Constance, the 16th general council of the Catholic Church, met from 5 November 1414 to 22 April 1418. It had three purposes: 1) to resolve the "Western schism," brought on by the simultaneous claims to the papacy of Gregory XII and anti-popes John XXII and Benedict XIII; 2) to condemn the heresies of John Wycliffe and Jan Hus (Hus was burned at the stake there in 1415); 3) to initiate reforms strengthening the power of councils at the expense of the papacy. See L.R. Loomis, tr., *The Council of Constance*, ed. J.M. Mundy and K.M. Woody (New York, 1961).

The Council of Basel was convened in 1631 to correct various monetary abuses among the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Pope Eugene IV moved it to Ferrara in 1437 but the conciliarist party at the council rebelled, deposing the Pope and sending their own fleet to Constantinople to get the Greeks' participation in a project of union. The Greeks, however, chose to go with the papal fleet to the Council of Ferrara-Florence, and the representatives at the Council of Basel finally recognized the reigning Pope Nicholas V and disbanded in 1449.

[19]Marco Antonio de Dominis' book was published in 1617 and asserted that the Pope was only *primus inter pares* [first among equals] with no jurisdiction over other bishops.

[20]Bronski was twice sent as ambassador to the Khan of Crimea. These visits inspired his valuable *Desciptio Tataria* (Colloniae Agripp, 1585). [Author's note] There is a Russian edition of this book, "Opisanie Kryma," in *Zapiski Odesskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei* (Odessa,1867), vol. IV.

[21]Casimir Nesetskii's celebrated *Book of Heraldry* [*Gerbovnik*] mentions Bronski in flattering terms. [Author's note.]

[22]The *Apokrisis* is known to have existed in at least two versions, the original Polish and an adaption for West Russia. Bronski later went over to the *Unia*. [Author's note.]

[23]The *Institutiones Christianiae*, the famous compendium of Calvinist theology, was first printed at Basel in 1536 and revised and expanded until Calvin's death in 1559. See J. Calvin *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, translated by F.L. Battles and edited by J.T. McNeill (Philadelphia, 1960), 2 vols.

[24]Sigrandus Lubbertus (1556-1625), a strict Calvinist and follower of Beza, was a prolific writer who struggled against Catholics and Socinians.

[25]Meletii Smotritskii (1578-1633) was educated both at the Orthodox school of Ostrog and the Jesuit college at Vilna. He was made Orthodox bishop of Polotsk in 1620 but was so severely persecuted by the Polish authorities that he was forced to take refuge with the Ukranian Cossacks until he finally went over to the *Unia* in 1627. In the book cited here he deplored the current state of the Orthodox Church caused by the desertion of almost all the wealhty and influential Orthodox nobles. Smotritskii also published a grammar of Church Slavonic in 1619.

[26]Zizani's treatise was included in a collection known as the *Kirillova kniga* (1644), which was quite popular in the 17th century in Moscow, where, of course, it was not known that the arguments originated at the brotherhood schools in Lvov (where he was later rector) and Vilna. A vigorous opponent of the union, he published a book entitled *The Roman Church* in 1596, for which he was condemned at the Pro-Union synod of Brest that same year. In 1599, at the instigation of the Uniate bishop Pociej, he was banished from Vilna by King Sigismund III's order, and his subsequent fate is unknown.

[27]Vladimir Peretts (1870-1936) was a noted Russian literary historian.

[28]The *Octoechos*, or "book of eight tones," contains eight sets of special hymns used in a weekly cycle in the services of the Orthodox Church.

[29]The *Horologion* is a service book containing the offices of the Hours, Typical Psalms and the readers' and singers' parts of various other services.

[30]Vishenskii's writings have been reproduced in *Akty iuzhnoi i zapadnoi Rossii* (St. Petersburg, 1865), II, 205-207.

[31]Metropolitan Makarii (1816-1882) was a distinguished 19th century Russian historian and theologian, and was made metropolitan of Moscow in 1879. His main work is a thirteen volume *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1889-1903).

[32]On Pociej, see above, note 11. Kirill Terletskii (d. 1607) was the Orthodox bishop of Lutsk. When Patiarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople passed through West Russia (see below), he appointed Terletskii his exarch and instructed him to call regular synods of the local episcopate. Terletskii, however, used these synods to make arrangements for the union with Rome, beginning with a meeting in Brest in 1590, just one year after Jeremiah's visit.

[33]Nicephorus was Patriarch Jeremiah's vicar when the latter died in 1594, and had managed to maintain some measure of authority in the anarchy that followed in Constantinople. He was imprisoned as a spy (at the request of the Polish government) on his way through Wallachia, but Ostrozhskii managed to secure his release so he could preside over the Orthodox council. There was some question as to whether he had the power to do so, as the patriarchal see in Constantinople was vacant at the time. Cyril Lucaris, however, Patriarch Pigas' representative, who was certainly aware of the situation in Constantinople, deferred to him, and Pigas himself confirmed his decisions a year later. Early in 1598 Nicephorus was arrested by the Polish police as a Turkish spy and executed.

[34]Luke of Belgrade had as one of his goals financial support.

[35]Gedeon Balaban (d. 1607), the bishop of Lvov, was actually one of the first Orthodox bishops in West Russia to come out in favor of the union, signing pro-union declarations in Brest in 1590 and in Sokal in 1594. His name also appears on the June 1595 declaration that Pociej and Terletskii brought to Rome. By this time, however, he had renounced the idea of union and in July of that year he filed a formal protest in a local court charging that he had signed a blank piece of paper on which Terletskii was supposed to list complaints against the Polish governments oppression of the Orthodox Church. Thereafter he was a leading opponent of the Uniate Church and was named Meletius Pigas' exarch in 1597.

[36]Mikhail Kopystenskii (d. 1610) was the bishop of Peremyshl, and was also an early supporter of the union who later became a leader of the Orthodox opposition.

[37]He was actually a subject of the Ottoman empire, with which Poland had been on bad terms for some time. [Author's note.]

[38]The Black Sea steppes had been left desolate from the Tatar devastations of the 13th and 14th centuries and it was to this region, beyond the control of governments, noblemen and landlords, that downtrodden peasants began to migrate in the late 15th century to carve a free life for themselves. These people, known as "Cossacks", were forced to organize into armed bands to defend their freedom against roving Tatar groups, and grew in strength and numbers throughout the 16th century. In the 1550's they built a fortress in the Zaporozhian ("below the rapids") region of the lower Dnieper River which became an early center of their military activity. Soon they became a potent military force, gaining mastery of the steppes against the Tatars and Turks, and a potent social force as well, setting up camps on noble estates in Lithuania and attracting the oppressed peasantry to their numbers. The Polish-Lithuanian government continually tried to subdue them, either by direct military action which met with some successes but never resulted in their ultimate submission, or by enlisting the Polish government was never able to keep their promises to pay the Cossacks and respect their freedom. Because these Zaporozhian Cossacks were occasionally in the service of the kings of Poland they called themselves "Knights," and because of the democratic social organization of their group they termed their army as a whole a "fellowship." For a good general account of the rise and the activities of the Cossacks see M. Hrushevskii, *A History of the Ukraine* (New Haven. 1941), pp. 144-461.

[39]Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople (d. 1594) passed through West Russia in 1586 on his way to Moscow, where he came to seek funds and ended up establishing the Moscow patriarchate, and again in 1588-89 on his return trip. The Polish authorities were unusually friendly to him, probably because they felt he himself was inclined towards union, but also because the papal *nuncio* Belognetti and the Jesuit Possevino had earlier concocted a scheme to have Jeremiah move his see to either Kiev, Lvov or Vilna, where he would be under Roman influence. For the Catholic attitude to Jeremiah's journey see O. Halecki, *From Florence to Brest* (1439-1596), pp. 213-235.

[40]*Korolevskie privilei.* The Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a loose confederation of "lands," and it was customary for the Grand Prince to guarantee the far reaching autonomy of these smaller principalities by privilei, or special "charters." This practice was then extended to the brotherhoods.

[41]Theophanes was also on his way to Moscow to seek funds when he was asked by the Orthodox clergy in Kiev to consecrate a metropolitan and five other bishops for them. This time the Catholic authorities were extremely hostile, but the Orthodox Cossacks had achieved virtual mastery over the Kievan region and gave Theophanes their protection and a military escort in and out of the country.

[42]Filaret was Patriarch of Moscow from 1619 to 1633 and his son, Mikhail Romanov (1613-1645) was the first tsar of the Romanov dynasty, which lasted until 1917. Together they restored order in Russia after the "Time of Troubles."

[43]Sagadaichny (d. 1622) had distinguished himself in leading sea raids against the Turks, sacking the suburbs of Constantinople on a number of occasions. He also led an expedition into Muscovy in 1618 which almost succeeded in taking Moscow itself. Through his military endeavors and also his diplomacy — keeping the Polish army at bay by agreeing to give into their demands but stalling until the government needed his help — he was able to achieve Cossack mastery of the Ukraine. a firm Orthodox Christian and supporter of the Orthodox schools and the Kievan brotherhood, Sagadaichny's protection against the hostile Polish-Catholic authorities was invaluable for the revival of the Orthodox Church in West Russia.

[44]Iov Boretskii (d. 1631) was an expert in Greek and Latin, as well as in the Church Fathers. Among his more noted works were *Anthologion* (a translation of Greek liturgical texts), and *Apolliia apologia Meletiia Smotritskago* (Kiev, 1628).

[45]See above, note 25.

[46]Kurtsevich (d. 1626) was consecrated bishop of Vladimir in Volynia. After he was made bishop, the Polish authorities, who did not recognize any of these consecrations, threatened to imprison him, and Kurtsevich was forced to flee to Muscovy, where he spent the last year of his life as the archbishop of Suzdal'.

[47]The Orthodox representatives at the electoral diet in 1632 were strong enough to force Sigismund's son, Wladyslaw IV (1632-1648), to recognize the Orthodox metropolitanate of Kiev and four other episcopal sees, and to divide the church properties and monasteries between the Orthodox and the Uniates.

[48]The Greek colony Nezhin, in the district of Chernigov, actually dates from this period. [Author's note.]

[49]In later years Arsenius moved to Muscovy, receiving a bishopric first in Tver' and then in Suzdal'. [Author's note.] Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople had been deposed by the Turks in 1585, and his rival, Theoleptus II, who held the patriarchal throne from 1585 until Jeremiah's return to the patriarchate in 1586, had sent two emissaries to Moscow to solicit funds to satisfy the ever-present demands of the Turks. Arsenius was one of these emissaries. On his return trip he was informed that Theoleptus was out of power and he decided to remain in Lvov, where Jeremiah stopped on his way to Moscow. After conferring with him on the situation in Muscovy, Jeremiah decided to bring his former pupil along with him, and thus Arsenius made a second journey before moving there for good. He wrote an account of his travels in Greek, which was published with a Latin translation in Paris in 1749.

[50]Constantine Lascaris (1434-1501) was a member of a former Byzantine imperial family. When Constantinople fell to the Turks in 1453 Lascaris fled to Italy, where he taught Greek at schools in Milan, Rome and Naples. His grammar, the *Erotomata or Grammatica Graeca sive compendium octo orationis partium*, published in 1476, was the first book ever printed in the Greek language and was highly influential among European humanists.

[51]Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560), the great reformer who led the Protestant movement in Germany after the death of his friend Martin Luther, was the principal author of the Augsburg Confession. One of the leading European humanists and among the first to promote the study of Greek, he received the title "Preceptor of Germany" for his role in education. Melanchthon's *Institutiones Graeca Grammatica* was published in 1519.

[52]Martin (Kraus) Crusius, a professor of Greek at Tübingen around 1555, was one of the very few scholars to take an interest in the contemporary Greek theologians and clergy. See his *Germanograecia* (Basel, 1585), and his *Turco-Graeciae, libri octo* (Basel, 1584).

[53]Clénard (or Clenardus, 1495-1542) wrote both Greek and Hebrew grammars, which served as standard texts in many universities.

[54]Pletenetskii (c. 1550-1624), a minor Galician noble, became abbot of the Monastery of the Caves [*Pecherskaia Lavra*] in 1599, and spent his first fifteen years there putting the monastery on solid ground both spiritually and financially. Then, with the indispensable aid of the Cossacks under his like-minded friend Hetman Sagadaichny (see note 43), he was able to begin a great cultural revival in Kiev, the influence of which was felt for centuries in Ukrainian history.

[55]This was the press which Ivan Fedorov had left in arrears when he died in Lvov. It was redeemed from local Jewish merchants by Bishop Gedeon Balaban and put to use by the Lvov brotherhood. (Fedorov had set up the first printing press in

Moscow in 1564 but was soon driven out by a superstitious mob aroused by the professional manuscript copiers. He then went to Zadlubov in Lithuania, where he printed the Gospels in 1568 and, when his patron lost interest in the project, moved on to establish the first press in Lvov in 1573. Later he went to Ostrog to work for Prince Konstantin where he printed the Ostrog Bible in 1580. After that he tried to start his own establishment back in Lvov but died there in 1583.)

[56]Pamvo Berynda (d. 1632), poet, translator, printer and a former member of the brotherhood in Lvov, was brought to Kiev in 1615 by Pletenetskii.

[57]Leo Krevsa was Uniate archbishop of Smolensk from 1625 to 1639.

[58]St. Andrew of Crete (c. 660-740) is known in the Orthodox Church primarily for his "Great Canon" read during the Lenten fast. His works are in *Patrologia Graeca* 97, pp. 805-1443.

[59]Veliamin Rutskii, the Uniate metropolitan of Ostrog, viewed Ostrozhskii's plan as an effort to counterbalance the Uniate College of St. Athanasius founded in Rome in 1576 by the Jesuit Antonio Possevino. The purpose of this school was to educate Greeks and Slavs of th Eastern rite. [Author's note.] Rutskii (1574-1637) succeeded Hypatius Pociej as Uniate metropolitan of Kiev in 1613. He worked unsuccessfully against the activities of the Orthodox Brotherhood of Kiev and organized the Uniate monasteries under his control into a regular order under the rule of St. Basil.

[60]The word "Order" is not an eastern term. Though Orthodox, St. Basil's communal rule is designed more for an outward, militant organization; the Studite rule is aimed at inward, solitary piety. [Author's note.] St. Basil never composed a formal rule in the western sense of the word. His *Asceticon*, a series of questions and answers on monasticism, expressed his idea of monasticism as a communal life with emphasis on charity and liturgical prayer, as opposed to the life of the anchorite, when St. Theodore took over the Studion monastery, he added to the communal organization there Palestinian traditions of continual, ascetic prayer, and it is this tradition of monastic life which spread to Mt. Athos and subsequently to Russia.

[61]Tarasii Zemka (d. 1632) was a noted preacher and hieromonk of the Monastery of the Caves. He edited a *Triodion* (a service book containing hymns and prayers for Great Lent) which was published at Kiev in 1627.

[62]Gabriel Severus (d. 1616) was the metropolitan of Philadelphia and the head of the Greek church in Venice. He had studied at the University of Padua and his *Brief Tract on the Holy Sacraments* made free of use of Latin scholastic arguments to combat the protestants.

[63]Kirill Trankvillion-Stavrovetskii (d. after 1646) had taught Greek at the brotherhood school in Lvov before coming to the Monastery of the Caves, and later was archimandrite at the Assumption Monastery in Chernigov. His *Uchitel'noe Evangelie* was actually reprinted in 1668 and again in 1696.

[64]See above, note 11.

[65]*Harmonia, albo concordantia viary, sakramentow y ceremoniy Cerkvi S. Oriantalniey z Kosciolem s. Rzymskim* (Vilna, 1608). [Author's note.]

[66]For a time Arcudius was active in Poland. [Author's note.] Peter Arcudius, a Greek native of the island of Corfu, was the first graduate of the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome. He went from Rome to Poland in order to promote the *Unia* by attempting to convince the Orthodox that their rite would suffer no alteration after the union. See E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellenique du XVII siècle* (Paris, 1895), III, pp. 209-232

[67]Leo Allatius was another graduate of the College of St. Athanasius. In his later years he collected Greek and Syrian manuscripts for Pope Gregory XV's Eastern Library in the Vatican.

[68]Meletius Pigas had studied in Augsburg. [Author's note.]

[69]See above, note 4.

[70]From the Foreword to his translation of Chrysostom's Homilies on St. Paul, *Besed Ioanna Zlatousta na poslanie Ap. Pavla* (Kiev, 1623). [Author's note.]

[71]This practice was also followed by Peter Mogila [Author's note.] .

[72]"Hospodar" was an honorary title given to governors in Moldavia appointed by the Ottoman Porte.

[73]Jan Zamoyski (d. 1605) was the most powerful and influential statesman in Poland, and the chief negotiator between the pro-union bishops of West Russia and the Polish crown in the early discussions which led to the Union of Brest. On the history of the Zamosc Academy, to which many young Orthodox nobles were sent, see J.K. Kochanowski, *Dzieje Akademii Zamojskiej* (Cracow, 1899-1900).

[74]Stanislaw Zolkiewski was the illustrious commander-in-chief of the Polish armies in the late 16th and early 17th centuries who devastated the Cossack forces around the turn of the century and led a highly successful expedition into Muscovy in 1610, capturing the boyar Tsar Vasilii Shuiskii. He died in 1620 fighting the Turks.

[75]John Charles Chodkiewicz, of the family which had earlier given Ivan Fedorov refuge, commanded the Lithuanian armies in the war with Sweden (1601-1606), suppressed the rebellious Polish gentry in 1606, invaded Muscovy with Zolkiewski in 1610, and also died in battle against the Turks in 1621.

[76]Gavril Dometskio was educated at the Kiev Academy and died in Kiev before 1725, but his role in Russian Church history was played out in Muscovy. As abbot of the Danilovskii monastery in Moscow and later as archimandrite in the Simonovskii monastery he became thoroughly embroiled in the late 17th century controversies between the Graeco-Slavonic and Latin parties, siding with Medvedev's western leaning faction (these controversies are discussed in the next chapter, section V). Dometskoi was also involved in similar controversies in Novgorod. Cf. *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'* (Moscow, 1914), IV, pp. 36-37.

[77]As quoted by Silvestr Kossov. [Author's note.] Silvestr Kossov (d. 1657) was a student at the Kiev Academy whom Peter Mogila sent to Polish colleges as well, he also taught in the Kiev Academy before becoming bishop of Mstislavl. On Mogila's death in 1647 Kossov succeeded him as metropolitan of Kiev. His works were written in both Russian and Polish.

[78]Isaia Kozlovskii (d. 1651), who taught for a while at the brotherhood school in Lvov, was brought to Kiev by Mogila in 1631. He soon became abbot of the Pustino-Nikolaevskii Monastery in Kiev and assisted Mogila in his educational activities throughout West Russia.

[79]It was later transferred to the Goshchi or Hoszczy monastery in Volynia. [Author's note.]

[80]Cf. the Polish order of the Piarists, "*Ordo Piarum Scholarum.*" [Author's note.] The "Order of the Poor Clerics Regular of the Mother of God of the Pious Schools" was established in Rome in 1597 by Joseph Calasanctius (1556-1648). Its purpose was to provide a free Catholic education for children, and the order spread rapidly enough for the Piarists to found their own colleges.

[81]Joseph Dobrovskii (1753-1829) was a Bohemian Jesuit and philologist who did extensive studies on Slavic languages. Among his important works are *Scriptore rerum bohemicarum* (Prague, 1783-4); *Cyrillus und Methodius, der Slawen Apostel* (Prague, 1823); and *Institutiones Linguae Slavonicae dialicti veteris* (Vienna, 1822).

[82]Smotritskii's grammar of Church Slavonic, modelled after Lascaris' Greek grammar, also served as a model for a succession of Russian grammars, including that of Lomonosov. See E.S. Prokoshina, *Meletii Smotritskii* (Minsk, 1966). The

complete title of Smotritskii's grammar is *Grammatika slavenskaia pravilnoe sintagma po tshchaniem mnogogreshnago mnikha Meletiia Smotritskago* (Vilna, 1619).

[83]Iosafat Kuntsevich (1580-1623) organized the Uniate Basilian order of monks along with Veliamin Rutskii. Kuntsevich was murdered in an anti-union riot in Vitebsk in 1623, and is a saint of the Western Church.

[84]Iov Boretskii, see above note 44.

[85]Isaia Kopinskii (d. 1640) had taught in the Ostrog school before becoming a monk in Kiev, where he distinguished himself by reorganizing several monastic communities. In 1620 he was consecrated bishop of Peremyshl by Patriarch Theophanes, but being unable to take possession of his see because of Polish harassment, he withdrew to Smolensk and directed his diocese from there. On the death of Iov Boretskii in 1631 Kopinskii became metropolitan of Kiev. Soon afterwards, however, with the legalization of the Orthodox Church in 1632, Peter Mogila also claimed the see of Kiev, and with the help of the Polish police he imprisoned Kopinskii in the Mikhailovskii monastery. Kopinskii was given the direction of this monastery in 1634 when he promised not to act against Mogila, but he left Kiev in 1635 and spent the rest of his days in obscurity in various monasteries in Muscovy. See below.

[86]Ieremia Tisarovskii (d. 1641) was a member of the Orthodox gentry. On the death of Gedeon Balaban in 1607 Tisarovskii was able to succeed him as Orhodox bishop of Lvov by promising to join the *Unia*. However, once he was made bishop he reneged on his promise, and after Mikhail Kopystenskii's death in 1610 he was the sole Orthodox bishop in all West Russia until Theophanes' consecrations in 1620. Finally, probably because he was willing to participate in Mogila's consecration, Tisarovskii was confirmed in his see in 1632 by the Polish government.

[87]Polish police arrested him and put him in prison. [Author's note.]

[88]See above, section on Konstantin Ostrozhskii.

[89]For an analysis of Mogila's *Confession* see the following section.

[90]Afanasii (d. 1650) was himself a former Uniate. He is the author of a description of the Lutsk sobor of 1633, in Silvestr Kossov's *Didaskalia* (1638).

[91]Sakovich, former rector of the brotherhood school in Kiev (see above, section on "Brotherhoods"), had not only gone over to the *Unia*, but at the end of his life had become a firm Western Catholic, polemicizing against both Orthodox and Uniates.

[92]Attributed to Mogila but probably, like his *Confession*, a composite work. [Author's note.]

[93]In his reform work it seems that Mogila utilized a Croatian translation of the Roman *Ritual* made by the Dalmatian Jesuit Kasic and published in 1637. It is likely that the whole liturgical project of Peter Mogila was in some manner connected with the Illyrain Uniate movement, from whose circles there later appeared the enigmatic pan-Slav missionary Jurai Krizanic. [Author's note.] Bartol Kasic (1575-1650) also composed a Croatian grammar for students in Rome. Jurai Krizanic (1617-1683) was educated in Jesuit circles in Rome. In 1647 he was sent on an unsuccessful mission to convert the Russians to Catholicism, after which he returned to Rome and wrote several treatises on the Russians and the Orthodox Church. Then, in 1659, Krizanic left for the Ukraine with no official permission and travelled *incognito* on to Moscow, where he worked as a translator at the tsar's court. he was discovered in 1661 and exiled to Siberia, where he wrote a grammar for a proposed pan-Slavic language and an appeal to the tsar to unite all Slavic peoples in a common struggle against the Germans. In 1676 Krizanic was released and returned to Poland, where he served as a chaplain in the Polish army until his death in the Turkish siege of Vienna.

[94]The *viaticum*, Latin for "provision for a journey," is the eucharist given to the dying, more commonly known as "last rites."

[95]The Ordo *commendationis ad animae exitum de corpore*, or "Office of prayers for the separation of soul and body," are read over the body of the deceased immediately after a person dies.

[96]The rite of *Passias* is an evening service celebrated during great Lent which contains a Gospel reading pertaining to Christ's passion.

[97]The Office of Propaganda [*Propaganda Fide*] was founded during the pontificate of Gregory XV (1621-1623) as a central organization for the direction of all missionary work in the Roman Church. Ingoli (1578-1649), a priest from Ravenna, was its first secretary.

[98]See above, note 78.

[99]As early as 1628 from West Russia, Smotritskii, in his *Apologia*, had questioned the views of Lucaris, with which he had become acquainted through the *Katekhizis* and personal conversation. [Author's note.]

[100]Meletius Syrigos (d. 1667), a philosophy professor in Constantinople, exarch of the ecumenical patriarch and religious adviser to the Moldavian Prince Basil Lupul (see note 104), was one of the most learned men of his time. There is a biography of him by a contemporary, Patriarch Dositheus (see below, note 124), in E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellenique du XVII siècle* (Paris, 1894), II. pp. 470-472. See also J. Pargoire, "Meletios Syrigos, sa vie et ses oeuvres, *Echos d' Orient* (Constantinople, 1909), vol. XII, nos. 74, 76, 78 and 79. On his editing of Mogila's *Confession*, see below

[101]Mogila apparently accepted the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immediate entry into Paradise of the souls of the saints.

[102]Creationism is the belief that the soul is created by God and infused into the fetus at the moment of conception.

[103]Basil Lupul, ruler of Moldavia from 1634 to 1653, was responsible for a broad cultural revival in his homeland, founding many schools, including an academy at Iasi where he also established a printing press. An extremely wealthy man, he personally financed the operations of the patriarchate of Constantinople and presided over the council at Iasi in the ancient manner of the Byzantine emperors. See S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 341-343.

[104]Porphyrius (d. 1652) was sent to this assembly by Patriarch Parthenius I, who held the see of Constantinople from 1638 to 1642, and Meletius Syrigos was sent by the new patriarch, Parthenius II.

[105]Metropolitan Varlaam (c. 1590-1657) was the head of the Orthodox Church in Moldavia and the executor of the educational and publishing projects financed by Basil Lupul.

[106]Oksenovich (d. 1650) was a professor and rector of the Kiev collegium, and a noted preacher. Shortly before his death he was elected bishop of Mstislavl.

[107]Kononovich (d. 1653) served as the head of several monasteries in Kiev before becoming bishop of Mogilev in 1650.

[108]The full title was *Zebranie Krotkiey nauki o artykulach wiary prawoslawno Katholichiey chrzescianskiey*. [Author's note.]

[109]Varlaam Iasinskii lived at a time when the Ukraine was politically divided between Poland and Russia, and the clergy was divided between allegiance to the Patriarch of Constantinople and submission to the Patriarch of Moscow. Varlaam himself, who was educated at the Kiev collegium and also at the Catholic Academy of Cracow, and served as rector of of the Kiev collegium and abbot of the Monastery of the Caves. wanted to remain under the Ecumenical patriarch. Therefore, when the Patriarch of Moscow offered to consecrate him metropolitan of

Kiev in 1686, Varlaam refused to go to Moscow for his elevation and likewise refused to recognize Metropolitan Gedeon, who was consecrated in his place. However, after the Patriarch of Constantinople ceded the jurisdiction of Kiev to Moscow in 1687, Varlaam finally agreed to succeed Gedeon and was consecrated metropolitan of Kiev, Galicia, and all Little-Russia in 1690 in Moscow.

[110]Adrian (1690-1700) was the last Patriarch of Moscow before Tsar Peter's restructuring of the Russian Orthodox Church (see Chapter IV). Already old and feeble when he became patriarch, Adrian was able to accomplish little more than strengthening Peter's resolve to do away with the patriarchate by interceding on behalf of the *streltsy* who revolted in 1698.

[111]Cf. A.S. Zernova, *Knigi Kirillovskoi pechati izdannye v Moskve v XVI-XVIII vekakh* (Moscow, 1958), no. 215, 69. A comprehensive work giving the full text can be found in A. Malvy and M. Viller, *La Confession orthodox de Pierre Moghila, Orientalia Christiana* (Rome, 1927), X, 39.

[112]The *Catechismus Romanus*, or *Catechismus ex decretis Concilii tridentini ad parochos*, first appeared in 1566 and was a product of the decree of the Council of Trent (see note 120) that Catholic doctrine be clarified and defined in the face of the spread of Protestant heresies. Intended primarily as a reference book for Catholic pastors, it proved immensely popular and was almost immediately translated into all major European languages.

[113]Peter Canisius (1521-1597) was the first Jesuit to engage himself in scholarly activities. he worked mainly on behalf of the Counter-Reformation in Germany, where he helped set up several Jesuit colleges.

[114]Petrus (or Pedro) De Soto (1500-1563) entered into Spain the Order of Friars Preachers. As a student, his main interest was patrology and the councils of the Church. In 1542 Charles V of Spain made him his adviser and confessor. He restored and held the chair of theology (1549-1553) at the University of Dillingen. De Soto was later appointed Pope Pius IV's theologian at the Council of Trent. He died while attending the council. He authored several theological works. See A. Turon, *Histoire des hommes illustrés de l'ordre de Saint Dominique*, 6 v. (Paris, 1743-1749), vol. 4, pp. 216-230.

[115]Bellarmine also worded on the commission which produced the Sixtus-Clementine Vulgate. His *Disputationes*, a synthesis of both Catholic and Protestant theology, was written while Bellarmine was teaching at a school for missionaries in Rome.

[116]See above, note 66.

[117]The sacrament of anointing the sick, or "the oil of prayer," has two functions: bodily healing, and forgiveness of sins. It is not an Orthodox belief, however, that anointment always results in a recovery of health. In the Roman Catholic Church *ultima unctio*, or "extreme unction," is intended only for the dying; Orthodox unction can be administered to any who are sick. See Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (Baltimore, 1967), p. 303.

[118]The Portugese Jesuit Emmanuel Alvarius published a grammar in 1572 under the title *De institutione grammatica libri tres* (the three books being *Etymology*, *Syntax* and *Prosody*). The grammar gained wide acceptance in Europe and a revised edition appeared in 1583.

[119]The council of Trent, the 19th ecumenical council of the Roman Catholic Church, was held in 25 sessions from 1545 to 1563. Its purpose was to reform the church for a struggle against the Protestant Reformation and to clarify what is essential and what is subject to discussion in Catholic doctrine. Among the Catholic teachings which stem from this council are the authority of tradition next to Scripture, the authenticity of the Vulgate, the doctrine of justification and the numbering of seven sacraments. Among the ecclesiastical reforms produced by this council are stipulations that a bishop reside in his diocese and the promotion of

education by increasing the number of seminaries and the production of a general catechism (the *Catechismus Romanus*). There is a critical text of the decrees of the council in G. Alberigo, *Conciliorum oeucumenicorum decreta* (New York, 1962), pp. 633-775.

[120]Lazar Baranovich (c. 1620-1693), poet, preacher, publisher and anti-Catholic polemist, had himself been rector of the Kievan college from 1650 to 1658. He became archbishop of Chernigov in 1657 and simultaneously supported political union with Russia and ecclesiastical independence from the Moscow patriarchate.

[121]In his Uniate days, Iavorskii was known as Stanislaus. [Author's note.] On Iavorskii, see below in this section.

[122]"*Sunt multi monachi vel uniti, vel unioni proximi, plurimi de rebus nostris optime sentientes . . . Kyoviae Unum totum monasterium est unitorum.*" From a letter written in 1699 by a Jesuit, Father Emilian, who was in Moscow at the time. [Author's note.]

[123]Dositheus was patriarch of Jerusalem from 1669 to 1707, and during his long tenure he proved himself to be the most influential and respected figure in the entire Orthodox world. As a scholar he was known for his *History of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem* (Bucharest, 1715), Which was actually a history of the entire Orthodox Church, as well as numerous editions of the Church Fathers, with which he was thoroughly familiar. As a polemist his chief work was the *Enchiridion against the Errors of Calvinism* (Bucharest, 1690). Although he also guarded carefully against Catholic influences in the Church, his opposition to the Protestants led him into the support of Mogila's *Confession*, for which he wrote a foreword in the Greek edition of 1699. Dositheus produced his own *Confession* (actually authored by four contemporary prelates, with the final editing done by Dositheus) which was approved by a synod in Jerusalem in 1672 and published a few years later at the famous press which he himself financed at Iasi. This *Confession* was, on the whole, free of the obvious Latin influences in Mogila's statement, and only resorted to Catholic terminology when defending the Orthodox doctrine of the Eucharist against the Protestants. See S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, pp. 347-353.

[124]Ossorius, bishop Jerónimo Osório, professor at the University of Coimbra. Author of several works, including biblical commentaries, was known as the "Portuguese Cicero." His "*Postilla*" was recommended to the clergy of Poland by two Synods of Vilno (1602 and 1613). [Fr. Janusz A. Ihnatowicz].

[125]This is most probably a reference to Piotr Fabricius (1552-1622), whose original Polish name was Kowalski. A Jesuit (from 1570), he was a popular preacher and respected theologian. In 1608 he became the first native born provincial of Polish Jesuits. He translated *The Imitation of Christ* by Thomas à Kempis, as well as some works by Robert Bellarmine. There was another well known Fabricius, Walenty, also a Jesuit (1563-1626), at one time a very popular preacher in Krakow. [Fr. Janusz A. Ihnatowicz].

[126]See above, note 4.

[127]Tomasz Mlodzianowski was a famous Jesuit theologian, canonist and preacher of the seventeenth century (1622-1686). He was widely travelled, including missionary work in Turkey (Smyrna) and Persia and the author of more than thirty Latin and Polish works. His sermons of high sermons of high religious and literary quality put him on a level with Skarga. [Fr. Janusz A. Ihnatowicz].

[128]See note 121.

[129]Radivillovskii (d. before 1700) had been an archdeacon at the cathedral in Chernigov and abbot of the Pustino-Nikolaevskii Monastery in Kiev before coming to the Monastery of the Caves.

[130]He was frequently paired with Zernikav because of the assumption that he, too, was born in Königsberg. He was professor of philosophy at the Kiev collegium

and later became archimandrite of the Monastery of the Caves. He also authored the *Opus totius philosophiae* (1645-47, extant only in manuscript form). It has, however, recently been argued that Gizel was a Ruthenian.

[131]Samuil Mislavskii (1731-1796) was an instructor and rector of the Kiev collegium who became metropolitan of Kiev in 1783. He compiled a Latin grammar in 1765 which was long considered the best in the Russian language, and was known as a devoted follower of the Enlightenment ideals popular during the reign of Catherine the Great (1762-1796). Under their sway he reformed the curriculum of the academy to include such subjects as mathematics and geography.

[132]Laurentius Surius (1522-1578), a Carthusian monk at Cologne, was one of the few western scholars to concern himself with spiritual works in the Counter-Reformational period.

[133]The *Menologion*, a collection of the lives of 148 saints arranged according to the Church calendar. St. Symeon Metaphrastes (c. 900-984) was also known for his spiritual poems, sermons and letters.

[134]The Bollandists are members of a Jesuit society organized in the 17th century by Jean Bolland for the scholarly study and publication of lives of saints.

[135]Cornelius à Lapide (van der Steen, 1568-1637) was a professor of exegesis at Louvain and Rome. His commentaries on the Bible, with their abundant quotations from the Father, were highly popular in Roman Catholic theological circles. See T.W. Mossman, *The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide* (London, 1881).

[136]Martin Becan (1563-1624) was a Jesuit theologian and polemist. His chief works were *Summa theologiae scholasticae* (Mainz, 1612), 4 vol., and *Controversia anglicana de potestate regis et pontificis* (Mainz, 1612), in which he defended the morality of assassinating a king.

[137]See his polemical *Inquiry into the schismatic faith in Brynsk* [*Rozysk o raskol'nich'ei brynskoi vere*, 1709]. [Author's note.]

[138]Iavorskii's *Kamen' very* was completed in 1718, but was not published until 1728, after his death. There is a three volume edition of the book published in Moscow in 1841-42.

[139]Tomás Malvenda (1566-1628) was a Spanish theologian and Hebrew scholar who, in addition to his treatise on the Antichrist, worked on corrections of liturgical texts for Pope Clement VIII and helped compile an Index for the Spanish Inquisition.

[140]By the time Ivan Stepanovich Mazepa became hetman of the Ukraine east of the Dnieper River that title signified little more than a military governor of a vassal state of Russia. During his rule Mazepa proved himself completely incapable of checking the gradual enserfment of the peasants and the creation of a new noble class of Cossack officers who took over the titles and privileges formerly held by their Polish masters which the Cossacks had fought against for over two centuries. Meanwhile, as a military leader Mazepa was compelled to lead his forces wherever Tsar Peter the Great ordered, fighting with Russia against the Turks and Tatars from 1695 to 1699 and afterwards against the Swedes. Finally, when Sweden invaded the Ukraine in 1708 Mazepa deserted Tsar Peter's troops, suffered defeat with the Swedes at the battle of Poltava in 1709, and died in the fall of that year. Mazepa's only real achievement, and a noteworthy one, was his patronage of Ukrainian religious and cultural life. He used the great wealth acquired from his office to finance churches, monasteries and schools, rebuilding the Monastery of the Caves in Kiev and erecting new facilities for the Kiev Academy.

[141]As a point of fact, in the Roman Church at that time the teaching of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary was not a dogma, but an opinion of private piety sponsored by the Jesuits and Franciscans, while resisted by the Dominicans. [Author's note.]

[142]In the Orthodox Church "*Panagia*" ["All-holy"] refers not to Mary's sinlessness in a juridical sense, but to her perfect obedience in accepting the Word of God, for which she is glorified and able to intercede for us. "*Theotokos*" ["Mother of God"] is actually a Christological term, related to the teaching that the two natures of Christ are united in one person, whom Mary gave birth to, and was confirmed by the Third Ecumenical Council at Ephesus in 431. On the Orthodox Church's veneration of Mary see the articles by Father Florovsky and Vladimir Losskii in E.L. Mascall, ed., *The Mother of God* (London, 1949).

[143]Religious architecture was especially abundant, since Mazepa was an ardent builder. [Author's note.]

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX ECUMENISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

I

The early decades of the XIXth century were marked by an unusual spiritual unrest in Europe. It was a period of great historical shifts and tensions, catastrophes and commotions. The memories of the French Revolution were still quite fresh. The Napoleonic wars turned all of Europe into an armed camp, and even a battlefield. The very rhythm of events was feverish. Apocalyptic forebodings and apprehensions were widespread. Napoleon's defeat in Russia was interpreted by not a few as "the Judgement of God on the icy fields," or simply as an eschatological victory over the Beast. There was a growing urge for spiritual unity. Theocratic utopianism was just in the air. In the turbulent atmosphere of those stormy years many were led to the conviction that the whole political and social life of nations had to be radically rebuilt on a strictly Christian foundation. At that time many utopian plans were laid, of which the most conspicuous was the famous *Holy Alliance* (1815). Contracted by three monarches — one a Roman Catholic (Austria), another a Lutheran (Prussia), and the third an Eastern Orthodox (Russia) — it was an act of a utopian ecumenism, in which political scheming and apocalyptic dreams were ominously mingled. It was an attempt to re-enact the unity of Christendom. There was but one Christian Nation, of which the nations are the branches; and the true Sovereign of all Christian people was Jesus Christ himself, "no other than He to Whom belongeth might." The Kingdom of God has already been inaugurated, God himself ruling through His anointed. The idea of Divine Providence assumed a rather magical glow at that time. "And then the true New Year will come." As a political venture, the *Holy Alliance* was a complete failure, a dreamy fiction, even a humbug. Yet, it was a symptomatic venture. It was a scheme of Christian unity. But it was to be a "Unity without Union," and not a "Reunion of Churches," but rather a federation of all Christians into one "holy nation" across the denominational boundaries, regardless of all confessional allegiances. Confessional divergences were simply disregarded or ignored, or else disavowed as irrelevant. History became, as it were, transparent, and one could, by faith and hope, discern the signs of the approaching Eschatological Age. The Kingdom of the Spirit will soon be manifested.

Initiative of the *Holy Alliance* was taken by the Russian Emperor, Alexander I, but inspiration came to him from the German pietistic and mystical circles (Jung Stilling, Franz Baader, Mme. Krudener). The Emperor himself was quite convinced of his theocratic vocation. He felt himself called upon to assume religious leadership in his country and to

bring together all denominations. Alexander was well read in the mystical and pietistic literature of the West and had personal links with various mystical and revivalist groups. He was especially attracted by the doctrine of the Inner Light. He wanted to propagate pure and "Inner Christianity" in his country. A special ministry was created in 1817, the "Ministry of Spiritual Affairs and National Instruction," and it immediately became the central office of utopian propaganda under the leadership of Prince Alexander N. Golitsin. Another center of this utopian ecumenism was the Russian Bible Society, inaugurated by an imperial rescript in December 1812, immediately after Napoleon's retreat from Russia, and finally reorganized on a national scale in 1814. Many local branches were established throughout the Empire. Prince Golitsin was the president, and prelates of different Churches were invited to act as vice-presidents or directors: Eastern Orthodox, Armenian, and even the Roman Catholic and Uniate Metropolitans. All had to cooperate in the propagation of the Bible as the only source and only authority of true Christianity. The Russian society was in standing cooperation with the *British and Foreign Bible Society*, and some representatives of the latter were always on the Russian committee. The main purpose of the Bible Society was, as in Britain, "to bring into greater use" the Word of God, so that everyone could experience its saving impact and meet God, "as His Holy Scriptures reveal Him." The unbreakable rule of the Society was to publish the Sacred Books "without any notes or explanations," in order not to contaminate the Divine Word by human opinions and not to compromise its universal significance by partial interpretations. Behind this rule was the theory of "mute signs" and "the living Teacher, dwelling in the hearts."

The immediate objective of the Society was to publish and to distribute Bible translations in all languages spoken in the Russian Empire, including Modern Russian. In the first ten years over 700,000 copies were distributed, in 43 languages or dialects. Along with the distribution of the Scriptures, a mystical ideology was also propagated, an ecumenism of the heart. The positive results of this endeavor should not be overlooked; especially important was the initiative of the translation of the Bible into Modern Russian, taken by the Society with the formal consent of the Holy Synod. Unfortunately, the new ideology was often enforced upon believers by administrative pressure, and no criticism of the doctrines of "Inner Christianity" was permitted. This policy could not fail to provoke a vigorous resistance in wider circles. Many felt that the Bible Society was propagating, as it were, a "new faith" and tended to become a "new Church," above and across the existing ones. "Non-theological factors" of the resistance cannot be denied. Yet, essentially it was in an instinctive self-defense on the part of the historic Churches against the sweeping enthusiasm of the "spirituals." Ultimately, the Bible Society was disbanded by order of the Government in 1826 and its activities cancelled. The Russian

translation of the Bible was to be completed only fifty years later, and this time by the authority of the Church itself.

The whole episode was an important essay in ecumenism. It was an encounter of people of various backgrounds. They had to face the problem of division. Unfortunately, the problem was badly presented. The emphasis was shifted from doctrine to "piety." Instead of facing the existing differences and discussing the controversial points, people were invited to disregard them altogether and to seek communion instantly in mystical exercises. Doctrinal problems were simply disregarded or silenced. There was an obvious "awakening of the heart" at that time, but no "awakening of the mind." *Pectus est quod facit theologum*: this was the motto of the time. In any case, it was a narrow approach. One did not have to be rationalist to feel compelled to vindicate the rights and claims of reason in theology. In any case, doctrinal problems existed. "Inner Christianity" was a doctrine itself, and a very particular doctrine indeed. It must be added that the whole process was closely watched by a competent Roman Catholic observer, who happened to be present. He was the famous Joseph De Maistre, at that time Sardinian Royal ambassador at St. Petersburg. His *Soirées de St. Petersburg* are, in fact, based on his Russian impressions and on conversations he had with the Russians. His interpretation is especially interesting because he was originally initiated in a similar mystical experience and never abandoned the basic presuppositions of his "theosophic" youth. His ultramontane solution of the ecumenical problems was, in fact, a duplicate of the utopian ecumenism of the "spirituals." Both left their stamp on the further development of ecumenical thinking in Russia.[1]

II

In the *Conversation of a Seeker and a Believer concerning the Truth of the Eastern Greco-Russian Church,* by Metropolitan Filaret of Moscow, we find an opinion worth considering on the basic ecumenical question by one who had been through the experiences of the "revivalist" age, and yet was deeply rooted in the catholic tradition. The immediate purpose of this "dialogue" was to give guidance to those Russians who were troubled by Roman Catholic propaganda at that time (the work was first published in 1832). But Filaret sets forth the problem of Church unity in all its breadth. He begins with the definition of the Church as the Body of Christ. The full measure and inner composition of the Body is known to Christ alone, who is its Head, its principle of life and ruling wisdom. The "visible Church," the Church in history, is but an external manifestation of the glorious "Church invisible," which cannot be "seen" distinctly, but only discerned and apprehended by faith. The visible Church includes the "infirm" members, also. The main criterion here is that of the Christological belief. "Mark you, I do not presume to call false any church, believing that *Jesus is Christ.* The Christian Church can only

be either *purely true*, confessing the true and saving Divine teaching without the false admixture and pernicious opinions of men, *or not purely true*, mixing with the true and saving teaching of faith in Christ the false and pernicious opinions of men." Christendom is visibly divided. The Church of Rome deviated from the teaching of the early Church Universal; yet it is still united with the rest of Christendom in its Christological faith. Authority in the Church belongs to the common consent of the Church Universal, based on the Word of God. Ultimately, separated from the Church are only those who do not confess that Jesus is Son of God, God Incarnate, and Redeemer. The Eastern Church has ever been faithful to the original deposit of faith; it has kept the pure doctrine. In this sense, it is the only true Church.

But Filaret would not "judge" or condemn the other Christian bodies (he had in view, above all, the "Western Church," i.e., Rome). Even the "impure" churches somehow belong to the mystery of Christian Unity. The ultimate judgment belongs to the Head of the Church. The destiny of Christendom is one, and in the history of schisms and divisions one may recognize the secret action of Divine Providence, which heals the wounds and chastises the deviations, that ultimately it may bring the glorious Body of Christ to unity and perfection. "You expect now that I should give judgment concerning the other half of the present Christianity, but I just simply look upon them; in part I see how the Head and Lord of the Church heals many deep wounds of the old serpent in all the parts and limbs of his body, applying now gentle, now strong remedies, even fire and iron, in order to soften hardness, to draw out poison, to clean the wounds, to separate our malignant growths, to restore spirit and life in the half-dead and numbed structures. In such wise I attest my faith that in the end the power of God patently will triumph over human weakness, good over evil, unity over division, life over death." Obviously, Filaret was much ahead of his time, not only in the East; and yet to some extent his ideas served as a basis for the reunion of the Uniates in Western Russia (1839).

On the other hand, Filaret's outline was clearly incomplete. He only spoke of one aspect of unity, namely of unity in doctrine. He did not say much of the Church order. And probably Vladimir Soloviev was right in his critical remarks: "The breath and conciliatory nature of this view cannot conceal its essential defects. The principle of unity and universality in the Church only extends, it would seem, to the common ground of Christian faith, namely the dogma of the Incarnation The Universal Church is reduced to a logical concept. Its parts are real, but the whole is nothing but a subjective abstraction." This is, of course, an exaggeration. The Church Universal was for Filaret not "a logical concept," but a mystery, the Body of Christ in its historical manifestation. What is true, however, is that the "sacramental aspect" of the Church was not sufficiently emphasized; and for that reason, the relationship between the "invisible" unity of the Church and its

historical state at present, "the Church in its divided and fragmentary condition," was not clearly explained.

Filaret was probably the greatest theologian of the Russian Church in modern times, and his influence on the life and theological thinking in Russia was enormous. He was a great scholar, Biblical and Patristic, and a man of a sensitive heart, warm piety and mystical insight. In addition he was a master of speech, a great preacher. Yet Filaret did his studying at a time when Russian theological schools were dominated by Protestant textbooks and the influence of Protestant phraseology can easily be detected in his writings. He was well read in the mystical literature of all ages and of different denominations, and was invariably impressed by "warm piety" wherever he might find it. All these influences enlarged his theological vision, and he was fully aware of the unity of Christendom, and of Christian destiny. With all this he was truly traditional, and the real masters of his thoughts were the Holy Fathers of the Church. Filaret had a strong anti-Roman bias and was an avowed enemy of "scholasticism." In later years, he had several occasions to express himself on certain particular ecumenical topics (mainly in connection with Anglican-Orthodox relations; see below). He was regarded as the chief theological expert in the Russian Church of his day. He was a living link between several generations: Born in 1782, he died in 1867, and was Metropolitan of Moscow for 47 years (from 1821), active and fresh until the day of his death.[2]

III

The second quarter of the XIXth century was a time of theological revival in many countries. Interest was centered precisely on ecclesiology. It was, in a certain sense, a true *rediscovery of the Church,* as being an organic and concrete reality, with special stress on her historic continuity, perpetuity, and essential unity. The famous book by John Adam Moehler (1796-1838), Professor of Church History on the Catholic Faculty of Tubingen (and later at Munich), *Die Einheit in der Kirche, oder das Prinzip des Katholicismus* (1825), must be mentioned first of all in this connection. It was a great ecumenical book, although its ecumenical implications were not obvious at first glance, and its immediate sequel, Moehler's *Symbolik* (1832), led the author into vigorous polemics with the Protestants. In any case, Moehler's conception of Church Unity meant a move from a "static" to a "dynamic," or even "prophetic," interpretation. The Church was shown to be more than an "institution," but rather a living organism, and its institutional aspect was described as a spontaneous manifestation of its inner being. Tradition itself was interpreted as a factor of growth and life, and Moehler's appeal to Christian Antiquity was by no means just an archaeological concern. The "past" was still alive, as the vital power and spiritual leaven, as "the depth of the present."[3] It may be argued whether Moehler's conception had any direct influence on the

formation of the Tractarian theology of the Church. Yet a "palpable convergence of views" between the Early Tractarians and the Catholic School of Tubingen cannot be denied, even if it can be explained by a parallel development of the same fundamental presuppositions.[4]

At about the same time, Alexis S. Khomiakov (1804-1860) in Russia was very close to Moehler in his treatment of ecclesiological doctrine, and was probably well acquainted with his writings, even if he arrived at his conclusions by an independent study of the Fathers.[5] In all these cases there was a renewed interest in Christian antiquity, but it was regarded as a source of inspiration, rather than as an established pattern to be reinforced. What actually was rediscovered was the vision of an organic continuity in the Church, both structural and dynamic. Or perhaps one should say it was a rediscovery of the *sacred character* of the historical process in the Church. The identity of Christian belief had to be warranted by a universal consent through the ages. But it was no longer just a formal identity of doctrine, regarded in itself as a set of propositions, but rather a perpetuity of the living Church, which professes beliefs and teaches doctrines out of its unchangeable vision and experience. The Church itself now becomes the main subject of theological study. The most spectacular episode in this ecclesiological revival was, no doubt, the Oxford Movement in the Church of England (and its ramifications in the other branches of the Anglican Communion). Its main concern was the vindication of the "Catholic" character of the Anglican Church. The Church of England had to be regarded as the "Catholic Church in England." Then it was inevitable to ask an "ecumenical" question: what was the relation of this local or territorial "Catholic" Church to all other "Catholic Churches" in various parts of the world? The answer currently given to this question is commonly known as "the branch theory" of the Church. It is very difficult to find out by whom this imagery of the "branches" was first used in this connection,[6] but it does not particularly matter. There was already a suggestion behind the famous phrase of Lancelot Andrewes: *Pro Ecclesia Catholica: Orientali, Occidentali, Brittanica.* Apparently Newman used it in the same sense at an early date: "We are the English Catholics; abroad are the Roman Catholics, some of whom are also among ourselves; elsewhere are the Greek Catholics."[7]

Much later, many years after this "conversion," Newman interpreted "the formal teaching of Anglicanism" ("this is what we held and professed in Oxford forty years ago") in the following way (written in 1882): at present, the Church existed in three branches, "or rather in a triple presence," — the Latin, the Greek and the Anglican — "these three being one and the same Church," except for some secondary, fortuitous and local variations, even if they are rather important. "And, whereas the whole Church in its fullness was at once and severally Anglican, Greek and Latin, so in turn each one of those three was the whole Church; whence it followed that, whenever any one of the three was present, the other two, by the nature of the case, were absent, and

historical state at present, "the Church in its divided and fragmentary condition," was not clearly explained.

Filaret was probably the greatest theologian of the Russian Church in modern times, and his influence on the life and theological thinking in Russia was enormous. He was a great scholar, Biblical and Patristic, and a man of a sensitive heart, warm piety and mystical insight. In addition he was a master of speech, a great preacher. Yet Filaret did his studying at a time when Russian theological schools were dominated by Protestant textbooks and the influence of Protestant phraseology can easily be detected in his writings. He was well read in the mystical literature of all ages and of different denominations, and was invariably impressed by "warm piety" wherever he might find it. All these influences enlarged his theological vision, and he was fully aware of the unity of Christendom, and of Christian destiny. With all this he was truly traditional, and the real masters of his thoughts were the Holy Fathers of the Church. Filaret had a strong anti-Roman bias and was an avowed enemy of "scholasticism." In later years, he had several occasions to express himself on certain particular ecumenical topics (mainly in connection with Anglican-Orthodox relations; see below). He was regarded as the chief theological expert in the Russian Church of his day. He was a living link between several generations: Born in 1782, he died in 1867, and was Metropolitan of Moscow for 47 years (from 1821), active and fresh until the day of his death.[2]

III

The second quarter of the XIXth century was a time of theological revival in many countries. Interest was centered precisely on ecclesiology. It was, in a certain sense, a true *rediscovery of the Church,* as being an organic and concrete reality, with special stress on her historic continuity, perpetuity, and essential unity. The famous book by John Adam Moehler (1796-1838), Professor of Church History on the Catholic Faculty of Tubingen (and later at Munich), *Die Einheit in der Kirche, oder das Prinzip des Katholicismus* (1825), must be mentioned first of all in this connection. It was a great ecumenical book, although its ecumenical implications were not obvious at first glance, and its immediate sequel, Moehler's *Symbolik* (1832), led the author into vigorous polemics with the Protestants. In any case, Moehler's conception of Church Unity meant a move from a "static" to a "dynamic," or even "prophetic," interpretation. The Church was shown to be more than an "institution," but rather a living organism, and its institutional aspect was described as a spontaneous manifestation of its inner being. Tradition itself was interpreted as a factor of growth and life, and Moehler's appeal to Christian Antiquity was by no means just an archaeological concern. The "past" was still alive, as the vital power and spiritual leaven, as "the depth of the present."[3] It may be argued whether Moehler's conception had any direct influence on the

formation of the Tractarian theology of the Church. Yet a "palpable convergence of views" between the Early Tractarians and the Catholic School of Tubingen cannot be denied, even if it can be explained by a parallel development of the same fundamental presuppositions.[4]

At about the same time, Alexis S. Khomiakov (1804-1860) in Russia was very close to Moehler in his treatment of ecclesiological doctrine, and was probably well acquainted with his writings, even if he arrived at his conclusions by an independent study of the Fathers.[5] In all these cases there was a renewed interest in Christian antiquity, but it was regarded as a source of inspiration, rather than as an established pattern to be reinforced. What actually was rediscovered was the vision of an organic continuity in the Church, both structural and dynamic. Or perhaps one should say it was a rediscovery of the *sacred character* of the historical process in the Church. The identity of Christian belief had to be warranted by a universal consent through the ages. But it was no longer just a formal identity of doctrine, regarded in itself as a set of propositions, but rather a perpetuity of the living Church, which professes beliefs and teaches doctrines out of its unchangeable vision and experience. The Church itself now becomes the main subject of theological study. The most spectacular episode in this ecclesiological revival was, no doubt, the Oxford Movement in the Church of England (and its ramifications in the other branches of the Anglican Communion). Its main concern was the vindication of the "Catholic" character of the Anglican Church. The Church of England had to be regarded as the "Catholic Church in England." Then it was inevitable to ask an "ecumenical" question: what was the relation of this local or territorial "Catholic" Church to all other "Catholic Churches" in various parts of the world? The answer currently given to this question is commonly known as "the branch theory" of the Church. It is very difficult to find out by whom this imagery of the "branches" was first used in this connection,[6] but it does not particularly matter. There was already a suggestion behind the famous phrase of Lancelot Andrewes: *Pro Ecclesia Catholica: Orientali, Occidentali, Brittanica.* Apparently Newman used it in the same sense at an early date: "We are the English Catholics; abroad are the Roman Catholics, some of whom are also among ourselves; elsewhere are the Greek Catholics."[7]

Much later, many years after this "conversion," Newman interpreted "the formal teaching of Anglicanism" ("this is what we held and professed in Oxford forty years ago") in the following way (written in 1882): at present, the Church existed in three branches, "or rather in a triple presence," — the Latin, the Greek and the Anglican — "these three being one and the same Church," except for some secondary, fortuitous and local variations, even if they are rather important. "And, whereas the whole Church in its fullness was at once and severally Anglican, Greek and Latin, so in turn each one of those three was the whole Church; whence it followed that, whenever any one of the three was present, the other two, by the nature of the case, were absent, and

therefore the three could not have direct relations with each other, as if they were three substantive bodies, there being no real difference between them except the external accident of place. Moreover, since there could be no more than one of the three on a given territory, it followed that Christians generally, wherever they were, were bound to recognize and be recognized by the Church in that place: when in Rome, they ceased to belong to the Anglican Church, as Anglican; and when in Moscow, they ignored Rome as Rome. Lastly, not to acknowledge this inevitable outcome of the initial idea of the Church, viz., that it was both everywhere and one, was bad logic, and to act in opposition to it was nothing short of setting up altar against altar, that is, the hideous sin of schism, and sacrilege."[8] This theory amounted to the contention that, strictly speaking, the Church *was not divided* at all, and only *visible* communication (or "communion") had been broken, and therefore the problem of "reunion" consisted in the restoration of the suspended "inter-communion," or in the mutual recognition of the separated branches of the Catholic Church. This point of view was strongly and persistently held by William Palmer, of Worcester College at Oxford, in his book, which can be regarded as the first systematic presentation of Tractarian ecclesiology: *A Treatise on the Church of Christ: designed chiefly for the use of students of Theology* (first published in 1838; 2nd ed. 1839; 3rd ed. 1842; 2 vols.). In the author's opinion, "external communion" did not belong to the essence of the Church, and consequently the Church was still One, although the visible unity of the body had been lost.

It should not be forgotten that this theory was only concerned with the "Catholic Churches", and non-Episcopal denominations were not regarded as "churches" in any proper sense of the term. It should be noted again that, according to this theory or interpretation, a very wide variety, and even a serious divergence, of doctrinal views and practices was compatible with essential unity. In other words, the main emphasis was on the reality of the Church, and not so much on the Doctrine as such.[9] Practically, this interpretation of Church unity has ever since remained, on the Anglican side, the basic presupposition of all negotiations between the Anglican Communion and the Orthodox Churches of the East. And it was precisely at this point that a major misunderstanding between the Churches was bound to arise, even if the Orthodox would not openly and formally question the initial assumption of the Anglicans on all occasions. In any case, the former would always insist upon an identity of doctrine and make the "reality" of the Church itself dependent upon the purity and completeness of the Faith. It may even be argued that the basic obstacle for the *rapprochement* between the Anglicans and the Churches of the East lay in the field of Ecclesiology. Eastern theologians would repeatedly insist that the Orthodox Church is the *only* true Church, and all other Christian bodies are but "schisms," i.e. that the unity of Christendom has been essentially broken. This claim of the Orthodox could be

variously phrased and qualified, but, in one form or another, it would unfailingly be made on all occasions.

IV

The Early Tractarians were not especially interested in the contemporary Churches of the East. Of course, all of them, and especially Newman and Pusey, were deeply interested in the Greek Fathers as authoritative witnesses and interpreters of the Apostolic and Catholic Faith. The "Tracts for the Times" were full of Patristic references and quotations, and the *Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the division of the East and West* was one of the main enterprises of the Tractarians. Yet, the Early Tractarians would not identify the "Church of the Fathers" with the contemporary "Churches of the East." In spite of theoretical recognition, the Christian East was not yet recognized as an integral part of Christendom in practice. It was still felt to comprise rather a "strange world." The prevailing impression in the Anglican circles was that the Churches in the East were decadent, backward, ignorant or somnolent, and "corrupt"; even the Tractarians were not free from this prejudice. "Some Early Tractarian writings suggest complete indifference (to the Eastern Church), and seem content to take into account only Rome and the Church of England. And besides poverty of allusion, there are instances of insufficient familiarity with the subject" (P. E. Shaw).[10] More information became available in the forties, but interest was growing rather slowly.

It was disappointment in the West, i.e. Rome, which diverted attention to the East. As early as 1840, Pusey raised the question.

> It will come as a painful question to many, and to some be a difficulty as to our Church (as they come to see the perfect unity of Antiquity), why are we in communion with no other Church except our own sisters or daughters? — We cannot have communion with Rome; why should we not with the *Orthodox* Greek Church? Would they reject us, or must we keep aloof? Certainly one should have thought that those who have not conformed with Rome would, practically, be glad to be strengthened by intercourse with us, and countenanced by us. One should have hoped that they would have been glad to be reunited with a large Christian Church exterior to themselves, provided we need not insist upon their adopting the *Filioque*.[11]

In the following year, Pusey repeated the same question in his "Open Letter" to Dr. Jelf: "Why should we. . .direct our eyes to the Western Church alone, which, even if united in itself would yet remain sadly maimed, and sadly short of the Oneness she had in her best days, if she continued severed from the Eastern?"[12]

Pusey was probably impressed by contacts recently established with the Greek Church (to which he also alluded in his "Letter" to the Archbishop of Canterbury) in connection with the proposal of erecting an Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem (jointly with the Church of Prussia).[13] In the fall of 1839, the Rev. George Tomlinson, at that time Secretary of S.P.C.K. (and later first Bishop of Gibraltar), was sent to the East, primarily in order to ascertain the needs of the Greek Church in the field of religious literature. He was given commendatory letters, written in ancient Greek and addressed to "the Bishops of the Holy Eastern Church," by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London. He called on the Patriarch of Constantinople and explained to him the character of the English Church, stressing its Catholic character and its friendly disposition "toward the Mother Church of the East." He wanted to stress especially that the Anglican Church, as such, had no missionary objective in the Levant, but was interested only in fraternal intercourse with the Eastern Church.[14] The same attitude was taken by the American Episcopalian representative at Constantinople, The Rev. Horatio Southgate (later Bishop), acting head of the "Mission" of the Protestant Episcopal Church to the East. He was closely following the official instruction given him by the Presiding Bishop, Alexander V. Griswold: "Our great desire is to commence and to promote a friendly intercourse between the two branches of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church." Bishop Griswold himself was a man of strong "evangelical" convictions, but his directives were colored by another conception of Ecumenical relationship.[15]

Pusey seemed to be justified in his conclusion. "This reopened intercourse with the East," he wrote to the Archbishop, "*is a crisis in the history of our Church.* It is a wave which may carry us onward, or, if we miss it, it may bruise us sorely and fall on us, instead of landing us on the shore. The union or disunion of the Church for centuries may depend upon the wisdom with which this providential opening is employed."[16] The question of the Eastern Church, in any case, had been brought to the fore. In this perspective, "the Palmer episode," i.e. William Palmer's (of Magdalen College, Oxford) visits to Russia in 1840 and 1841, and his protracted conversations (oral and epistolary) with the Orthodox authorities and scholars, appears to be much more than an eccentric personal venture or just a detached "episode," as much as it has been colored by the individual character of the man and his private convictions and manners. One should not forget that Palmer vigorously intervened in the debate about the Jerusalem Bishopric and took an anti-Protestant position.[17] His visit to Russia was, as it were, an experimental test of the ecumenical validity of the general Tractarian conception of the Church Universal.

V

William Palmer (1811-1879) has been described by one of his friends as an "ecclesiastical Don Quixote" (Canon F. Meyrick). He was also called the Ulysses of the Tractarian Movement. He was an ecumenical traveller indeed. Palmer was a man of unusual abilities: he had wide and profound learning, a powerful intellect — though rather inflexible and obstinate — steadfastness of purpose, unbending sincerity and strong will. His main weakness was precisely his organic inability to compromise or to adjust himself to the circumstances — "his inability to reconcile himself to the conditions of imperfect humanity and human institutions," as Canon Meyrick put it — which made him ultimately a champion of forlorn hopes. He had a very solid classical background — having commenced Greek at the age of six (and Latin at five), and he was already using the Greek Testament as a boy of nine. It provided an early preparation for his later study of the Christian East. A graduate of Eton and Magdalen College at Oxford, where he obtained first class in Classics, Palmer was for some years a classical tutor at Durham, and subsequently returned to Oxford as a Fellow of his own college.

His interest in the East was probably first aroused by his contact with a Nestorian Christian, who happened to be on a visit to England (in 1837). In 1839, during the visit of the Russian Heir Apparent to Oxford, Palmer presented him a memorandum (approved by the old Dr. Routh), suggesting that a Russian ecclesiastic should be sent to Oxford (to reside at Magdalen) in order to examine the doctrines of the Anglican Church, and asking for protection in the case of his own visit to Russia with a similar purpose. He actually went to Russia i . the following year and was given a letter of introduction by the President of Magdalen, in spite of the strong objection raised by certain Fellows of the college "against this Society's giving any encouragement to the idea of intercommunion with the *idolatrous* Greek Church." Curiously enough, the man who raised the objection went over to Rome in the next year (R. W. Sibthrop).[18] The letter was in Latin, on parchment, and sealed. It was stated that Palmer was going to Russia in order to study doctrines and rites of the Church, and to learn Russian. Then followed an unexpected clause. "Further, I ask, and even adjure in the name of Christ, all the most holy Archbishops and Bishops, and especially the Synod itself, that they examine him as to the orthodoxy of his faith with a charitable mind, and, if they find in him all that is necessary to the integrity of the true and saving faith, then that they will also admit him to communion in the Sacraments."

Palmer was instructed to conform with all injunctions of the Russian bishops, while in Russia, provided he would not contradict the faith and teaching of the British Church. The document was probably composed by Palmer himself, but Dr. Routh consented to issue it in his own name, although he anticipated that Palmer's request could not be granted: "for a separation there unhappily is." Archbishop Howley of

Canterbury declined to be implicated in the venture in any way, although he was rather interested in its prospects. As should have been expected, Palmer's hope was frustrated. His claim to be a member of the Catholic Church was met with astonishment. Was not the Church of England, after all, a "Protestant" body? As Newman put it at that time, "the Russians will not believe him against the evidence of all the English they ever saw before."[19] In 1838 and 1839 Palmer wrote (in Latin) an Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles, in which he endeavored to interpret them in a Catholic sense, anticipating in a certain sense what Newman was going to do in his famous Tract XC (published in February 1841), although Newman himself read Palmer's essay after his own had been published. Palmer's "Introduction" was printed privately and apparently was not widely circulated. Now he offered it to the Russian authorities as a basis for doctrinal discussion. He felt that he himself could agree with the Eastern doctrine on all essential issues, except the teaching about the procession of the Holy Spirit, on which he still held the Western view. Not everything in Palmer's explanations was satisfactory to the Russians. They were insistent on complete conformity in all doctrines, and would not consent to confine the "agreement" to those doctrines which were formally stated in the period before the separation of the East and West. The main interlocutor of Palmer was the Archpriest Basil Koutnevick, the Chaplain General of the Army and Navy, and Member of the Holy Synod. He was ready to admit that doctrinal differences between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches, if properly interpreted, were rather slight. Nevertheless, in his opinion, the Anglican Church was a separate communion. His conception of the Church was, more or less, the same as that of Metropolitan Filaret. The Eastern Church was the only true and orthodox Church; all other communions have deviated from the truth. Yet "Christ is the center of all" and Christian life was possible in the separated bodies also.

For Palmer it was "*amabilis sane sententia, sed perniciosissima doctrina*," which could only encourage relativism, indifference, and even unbelief. For him, no real "sanctity" was possible in heretical or sectarian bodies. Moreover, he could not equate the Eastern Church with the Church Universal. In any case, she did not act as a Universal Body, and was too tolerant. Russians, on the other hand, were staggered "at the idea of one visible Church being made up of three communions, differing in doctrine and rites, and two of them at least condemning and anathematizing the others," as Palmer himself stated. In Palmer's opinion, Russian theologians and prelates were not clear at all on the definition of the visible Catholic Church, "but were either vaguely liberal, or narrowly Greek." One should keep in mind that when Palmer visited Russia it was a time of theological transition, or of a "Struggle for Theology." A great variety of opinion could be found among theologians. They were in search of a new theological synthesis. This

was probably a common feature of the epoch, a revival of search after the decline of the Enlightment.[20]

It was recently stated by a competent Roman Catholic scholar that in the forties there was no Catholic theology, but only some edifying Apologetics.[21] It does not mean, however, that there was doctrinal confusion. In his "*Notes*," Palmer gives an interesting picture of the Russian Church. There he met many people with whom he could discuss problems as he could have at home, at Oxford or elsewhere, although his errand seemed to his Russian friends rather bizarre. Finally, he had an interview with Metropolitan Filaret. The latter could not accept Palmer's initial assumption that unity of the Church could be preserved even when there was no longer unity in doctrine. "The Church should be perfectly one in belief," Filaret contended. Distinction between essential "dogmas" and secondary "opinions" was for him precarious and difficult to draw. In fact, the invocation of saints, prayer for the departed, the use of ikons, etc. were as essential for the Orthodox as they were a stumbling block, at that time, even for the Anglo-Catholics. "Your language," Filaret told Palmer, "suits the fourth century well enough, but is out of place in the present state of the world. . . now at any rate there is division." It was almost the same as what Palmer was told at Oxford by Dr. Routh: "a separation there unhappily is." And therefore it was impossible to act as if there were no division or separation. Moreover, it was impossible to act in a particular case before the question of relationship between the two Churches, the Anglican and Orthodox, had been settled in a general form. Again, it was by no means clear to what extent Palmer could be regarded as an authentic interpreter of the official teaching and position of the Anglican Church. In fact, he was speaking only for one particular trend in the Church. Palmer failed to obtain an official letter of introduction from the Archbishop of Canterbury, because the latter would not associate himself with the interpretation of the Thirty-Nine Article which Palmer elaborated in his Latin thesis.

In brief, Russian authorities refused to regard Palmer's membership in the Church of England as a sufficient reason for claiming a communicant status in the Orthodox Church, and could not negotiate reunion with a private individual, who had no credentials from his own Church. Yet there was full willingness on the Russian side to inaugurate some sort of negotiations. Palmer visited Russia again in 1842, and this time he was supplied with an episcopal recommendation, which he obtained from Bishop M. H. T. Luscombe, residing in Paris as supervisor of the Anglican chaplancies on the Continent. He had no title and could not be regarded as a diocesan bishop. He was consecrated by the Scottish bishops, but even the Episcopal Church in Scotland would not regard him as a regular member of the Scottish episcopate. There was another, though accidental, complication. Palmer was very much upset by the fact that one Russian lady had been received in the Church of England. It contradicted his theory. Anglicans should not

"convert" the Orthodox, but could admit them to communion precisely on the basis of their being Orthodox. It was a situation similar to Palmer's own, but in reversal. Palmer succeeded in imposing this interpretation on Bishop Luscombe, but failed to convince the lady. Finally he decided to refer the whole case to the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Russian Synod once more refused to negotiate on Palmer's terms, but welcomed the desire to enter into communion with the Orthodox Church. Identity of belief was stressed as an indispensable prerequisite of communion, and a reference was made to the answer given by the Eastern Patriarchs to the Non-Jurors in 1723. Palmer persisted and and presented a new petition to the Synod, asking that a confessor should be appointed to examine his beliefs and show his errors. Fr. Koutnevitch was appointed and made it clear that, in his opinion, certain of the Thirty-Nine Articles were obviously not in agreement with the Orthodox doctrine. Palmer, on the other hand, offered his own reconciliatory explanation of the articles in question. Koutnevitch replied that even Bishop Luscombe, under whose sponsorship Palmer came to Russia this time, was interpreting them in a quite unorthodox way in his recently published book: *The Church of Rome Compared with the Bible, the Fathers of the Church, and the Church of England* (1839).

Palmer still wondered when the Church of England separated from the Eastern Church. The answer was — in 1054. Palmer was prepared to anathematize most of the points indicated by Fr. Koutnevitch, but persisted in denying that they could be found explicitly or implicitly in the Articles. Now, he had to prove that this contention of his would be endorsed by the Church. The first thing Palmer did was to gather evidence "from Scottish and Anglican authorities," exhibiting conformity with Orthodox doctrine. For that purpose Palmer republished, in 1846, Blackmore's translation of the "longer Russian Catechism" (by Filaret; English translation first published in 1845, Aberdeen, under the title *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, with a valuable introduction), with an Appendix of his own: "consisting of notes to the foregoing Catechism, with extracts from public documents of the Scottish and Anglican Churches, and from the writings of some of their most celebrated Divines; designed to show that there is in the Anglican Communion generally, and more particularly and preeminently in the Scottish Church, an element of Orthodoxy, capable, by a synodal act, of declaring unity and identity with the Eastern Catholic Church." The title of the book was: *A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East* (Aberdeen, A. Brown & Co., 1846; the name of the author was not given). A Greek version of the book was published by Palmer in Athens in 1851. The dedication of the book was phrased: "To the Most Reverend the Primus, and to the Bishops, Clergy and Laity generally, of the Scottish Church. . .as to the only existing representative of that Catholic remnant which in the reign of Peter the

First held a correspondence with the Eastern Patriarchs, and with the Russian Synod" — this phrasing was significant. It was a betrayal of the author's diffidence in the Church of England. It also betrayed his indebtedness to the Non-Jurors.

Palmer still had hopes. The Anglican Church always had "a Catholic school" or party, along with the Puritan one. Was it impossible to hope that this school should prevail and succeed in purging out "the remaining leaven of Calvinism?" Then "the communion with the East" would be reopened to Anglicans. In Palmer's opinion, the Scottish Church was exceptionally qualified for leadership in this endeavor. It had never descended to the level of the English Church which had been overruled by the civil authority. If there was no "actual agreement" between the Anglican and Eastern doctrines, it was possible to prove that on every point "an Anglican doctrine similar to the Eastern" really did exist. It might ultimately become the "formal doctrine" of the Church. Palmer then commended the "Russian Catechism" to the consideration of the Scottish Church as a document, which could "be read and used not merely as an Eastern or Russian document, but equally as our own." If only this sound doctrine, which, as Palmer contended, was held by many leading teachers of the Anglican (especially Scottish) Church, could be "synodically asserted" in the name of the whole Church, communion with the East would be secured. It was on the basis of this conviction that Palmer made his formal "Appeal" to the Scottish Church, first to "the Presbyters of the united Dioceses of St. Andrews, Dunkell and Dumblane," and finally to the Episcopal Synod.

His "appeal" included two points: the right of "passive communion" in other Catholic bodies and the "orthodox" interpretation of the Articles. Of course, it was quite unrealistic to expect that Scottish bishops could accept Palmer's proposal, which would amount to a disavowal of the current Anglican trend of thought and might split the Anglican Communion. It is significant, however, that Palmer's "appeal" was favorably received in the Diocese of St. Andrewes and could be published with an "advertisement" by Bishop P. Torry (*quoad* the importance of the subject). There was a considerable body of agreement behind Palmer's appeal. His book was warmly appraised by people like J. M. Neale. In the latter's opinion, it was a "very remarkable book" and he regretted that it was not given much more attention. "It will probably stand in the future history of our Churches as the most remarkable event that has occurred since the disruption of the Non-Jurors."[22] Palmer's "appeal" was declined by the bishops. It came as a shock to him. He was disoriented for a time, and then decided to seek admission in the Orthodox Church, as he became quite certain by that time that she kept and was faithfully keeping the pure Apostolic doctrine. He still had certain scruples. In this connection his new book was of importance: *Dissertations on Subjects relating to the "Orthodox" or "Eastern-Catholic" Communion* (London, 1853; cf. the Greek

version, Athens, 1852). An unexpected difficulty confused his plans. His baptism had been contested by the Greeks, whereas in Russia it was formally recognized as valid. He could not reconcile himself with such a flagrant dissension within the same Communion on a matter of primary importance. On the other hand, he could not continue outside of the visible communion of the Catholic Church. Finally, he joined the Church of Rome. He made it clear, however, that it was but an act of obedience, and, as to his private judgment, he was assenting to Greek rather than to Latin Theology, even on the points controversial between Rome and the East, including the doctrine of the Church itself. Even after his "conversion," he was deeply interested in the Orthodox Church. He spent years working on a monumental book on Patriarch Nikon, which was finally published in six volumes: *The Patriarch and The Tsar (London*, 1871-1876). He was wrestling here with a general problem, which had already been suggested by his Anglican experience: the relationship between the Church and the State. He was a strong defendant of Church supremacy and independence.[23]

VI

In his conversations with the Russian ecclesiastical authorities, Palmer was mainly concerned with those particular points of doctrine on which disagreement was alleged to exist between the two Churches. It was chiefly these points which he covered once more in his *Dissertations*. He had, however, an opportunity to discuss the basic doctrine of the Church and its impact on the problem of Christian unity with a man who had no official position in the Russian Church, but who was to exercise an enormous influence on the ways of Russian theology for years to come: A. S. Khomiakov, who was a layman. Khomiakov wanted to restate the Orthodox tradition in a new idiom, which would be at the same time modern and tradition, i.e. in conformity with the teaching of the Fathers and with the continuous experience of the living Church. He wanted to liberate Russian theology, first of all, from the bondage of Western Scholasticism, which had been cultivated for a long time in the schools. Accordingly, he began with the doctrine of the Church itself. It was only on this point that he succeeded in formulating his belief, in a brief but almost "catechetical" pamphlet: "The Church Is One."[24] He gives no definition, but rather describes the mystery. The Church is for him just "a unity of the grace of God, living in a multitude of rational creatures, submitting themselves willingly to grace." Yet, the mystery is fully expressed in the "visible," i.e., the historical, Church. The "One Church" for Khomiakov was essentially identical with the Orthodox Church. It was not just one of the many existing "communions," but precisely *the* Church. In his view, "Western Communions" did not belong to the Church and were in fact the "schisms" themselves Communions had actually been broken. There was a division not only on an historical

plane, but also in the very ontology of Christian life. Some links obviously still existed, but they were of such a nature that no theological analysis could adequately grasp them: that is, in relation to the "One Church," other communions were "united to her by ties which God has not willed to reveal to her." Theologians could wrestle only with the problem of schism: *the* Church and the [separate] "communions"[25] whose ties "God has not willed to reveal to her."

The Church on earth cannot pass an ultimate judgment on those who do not belong to its fold. It is impossible to state to what extent errors may deprive individuals of salvation. The real question is, however, in regard to the identity of the Church itself. What is essential here is, first of all, "a complete harmony or a perfect unity of Doctrine." For Khomiakov, it was not just an agreement but rather an inner unanimity, a "common life" in the Catholic Church; there can be only "Unity." This "Unity" has been broken: the West separated itself from the unity, i.e., acted as a self-contained entity. It was a violation of Christian love, a substitution of the particular for the universal. Unity can be restored only by the return of those who went their own way, instead of abiding in it originally. This was just the opposite of what Palmer contended. Thus, discussion was brought sharply to focus on this issue. "The Church cannot be a harmony of discords; it cannot be a numerical sum of Orthodox, Latins, and Protestants. It is nothing if it is not perfect inward harmony of creed and outward harmony of expression." Khomiakov believed that "Sacraments were performed only in the bosom of the true Church" and could not be separated from that "Unity" in faith and grace, which was, by his interpretation, the very being of the Church. It did not matter in which way the Orthodox Church received those who would decide to join it. The rites may vary, but in any case some "renovation" of the rites conferred outside of the Orthodox Church "was virtually contained in the rite or fact of reconciliation."

This was written before Palmer had to face the fact of divergent practice in the matter of reconciliation in his own case. When it happened, Khomiakov expressed his disagreement with the Greek practice, but would not exaggerate the importance of the difference. For him, in any case, there had to be some act of first incorporation into the Church. At this point he obviously diverged not only from the current practice, but also from the teaching of the Russian Church and was nearer to the modern Greek interpretation, although he did not mention the concept of "*oeconomia*." Probably he wanted to dissociate himself from the current Roman doctrine (which goes back to St. Augustine), which would allow, under certain condition, the existence of "valid" Sacraments also outside the visible and canonical boundaries of the (Roman) Church. From his point of view, it was a sheer legalism. For Khomiakov, the Church was real precisely as an actual communion in the Truth and in Grace, belonging together inseparately. Those who do not share in this communion are not in the Church. The reality of the

Church is indivisible. It was at this point that the first editor of Khomiakov's letters to Palmer (in Russian), Fr. Alexander M. Ivantzov-Platonov (Professor of Church History at the University of Moscow), found it necessary to add a critical footnote. On the whole, he shared Khomiakov's interpretation of the Church, but he was not prepared to deny the presence of Sacramental grace in separated communions. Ivantzov did his studying at the Moscow Academy, and was probably influenced by the ideas of Filaret. There was an obvious difference between the two interpretations: Filaret's conception was wider and more comprehensive; Khomiakov's was more cautious and reserved. Both interpretations still co-exist in the Orthodox Church, with resulting differences of approach to the main Ecumenical problem.[26]

VII

Palmer's approach to the Russian Church was a private and personal move. Yet it did not fail to arouse an interest in the Anglican Church among the Russians. At his first departure from Russia in 1842, he was told by the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, Count Pratassov, that a new chaplain was to be appointed to the Russian Church in London, who might be able to learn the language and study Anglican divinity. It was precisely what Palmer wanted at that time. Accordingly, the Rev. Eugene Popoff, a graduate of St. Petersburg Theological Academy, was transferred in the next year from Copenhagen to London, where he was to serve for many years, until his death in 1875. Fr. Popoff sent periodic reports to the Holy Synod concerning ecclesiastical affairs in England, and he established close links with the leading churchmen in the country, including Pusey and Newman. Unfortunately, only parts of these reports were published many years after the author's death, and only in Russian. Fr. Popoff had hopes in the beginning, but changed his attitude in the later years.[27]

Certain links were established between Oxford and Moscow, and theological professors and students in Moscow used to collate Greek manuscripts of the Fathers for the *Library of the Fathers*. Nor were the books on Anglicanism which Palmer brought to Russia and presented to the Academy in St. Petersburg left without use. One of the students was advised to write his Master's thesis on Anglicanism compared with Orthodoxy, apparently on the basis of material supplied by Palmer.[28] In both Russia and Great Britain there were groups earnestly interested in the *rapprochement* of the respective Churches. John Mason Neale, by his historical studies and translations of the Eastern liturgical texts, did more than anyone for furthering this idea.

In 1851, under the influence of the famous Gorham case, there was an attempt to approach the Church of Russia in order to secure recognition of a group of Anglicans considering secession from the Established Church. A number of pamphlets were circulated for this purpose and

subscriptions were invited to a "Memorial" to be presented to the Holy Synod of Russia. The initiative seems to have been taken by somebody in Scotland. Although it was not an "ecumenical move" in the proper sense, some points in the project were of importance. The basis of reunion should include recognition of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, the Russian Catechism as an outline of doctrine, and the repudiation of Lutheran or Calvinist leanings. Connection with the Russian Church was only expected to be temporary. Rites and devotional forms had to be kept, and the English language used. The Synod was asked to investigate the problem of Anglican Orders and, in the case of a positive decision (which was expected), to confirm the respective clergy in their pastoral commissions. It is difficult to identify the promoters of the scheme. There were obviously only a few. But it was an attempt on the side of those whose confidence in the established Church had been shaken by the decision of the Gorham case to find a solution to their conscientious objection in a manner less radical than just "secession" to Roman obedience. The scheme failed, and it is not clear whether the "Memorial" was presented at all. In any event this was proof of increasing concern in certain quarters for a more intimate connection with the Orthodox East.[29]

The "Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom" was founded in 1857 with the intention of uniting "in a bond of intercessory prayer" Roman Catholics, Greeks and Anglicans. The membership was impressive, and some Orthodox were included in it. But the whole scheme collapsed in 1869, after the formal prohibition of participation by Rome. An Orthodox essay "by a Priest of the Archdiocese of Constantinople" was included in the volume published in connection with this venture by the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L. with an introduction by Pusey.[30] Russia's defeat in the Crimean war could not fail to cool its ecclesiastical intercourse with the Anglicans. Yet, the "Eastern Church Association" was created in 1863, on the initiative of John Mason Neale and two Orthodox priests were on the list of its standing committee from the beginning: Fr. Popov and the Greek Archimandrite, Constantine Stratoulias. The leading Anglican members were: Neale, George Williams, and H. P. Liddon. Pusey, as Liddon says, "took great interest in the foundation of the E. C. Association."[31] Williams was also keenly interested in the venture. He spent several years in Jerusalem as chaplain to the Anglican bishop there. His well-known book on the Non-Jurors in their relations with the East, in which all documents concerning this important episode of ecumenical relations were published (in English) for the first time, was undoubtedly related to the new ecumenical endeavor.[32] Neale never had an opportunity to visit the Eastern countries. But Liddon went to Russia in 1867 (together with C. L. Dodgson, i.e., "Lewis Caroll"), had an interview with Filaret (shortly before the latter's death in the same year), and was deeply impressed by all he saw in Russia. A "sense of God's presence — of the supernatural — seems to me to penetrate

Russian life more completely than that of any of the Western nations."[33] The Primus of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness, Robert Eden, visited Russia in 1866 and had a talk with Metropolitan Filaret, also. His concern was solely with "Intercommunion" as distinguished from, or even opposed to, "Reunion." It was the old idea that the One Church still continues in the divided "communions." There should be a restoration of that "Intercommunion" which existed "between members of independent Churches in the early days of Christianity." Prejudices should be removed, and some mutual understanding between bishops of the different Churches established. Nothing else was envisaged.[34] It should be emphasized that interest in the East was clearly connected with a defensive position regarding Rome, which was quite natural in the days when the Roman Church, only recently re-established in England, was making steady progress. The first stimulus for this renewed and revived interest in the East, however, came from the United States. Initiative in the negotiations was taken by some members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.

VIII

The purchase of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands from Russia by the United States and the transfer of the Russian episcopal see from Sitka to San Fransisco (1861) brought the Anglican Church in the United States into direct contact with the Church of Russia. It is curious to find that when a considerable number of Anglicans established themselves there in the middle of the of the century in connection with the gold rush in California, the question was raised whether they might not appeal to the Russian bishop in the area, rather than to the remote Anglican bishops in the Eastern Sates, for aid and authority, and call themselves the Church of California. However, it seems to have been just a passing idea of a few clergymen, and no action was taken in this direction. A regular Anglican diocese was established in 1857.[35] On the other hand, some others viewed the new situation with apprehension. At the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 1862, one of the deputies, Dr. Thrall, raised this question. Russians in the West had no organized bishopric at that time. The prospective establishment of an Orthodox bishopric might bring the two Churches into conflict, in respect to jurisdiction. It seemed desirable to nominate a special committee of inquiry and correspondence, to present to the Orthodox authorities the Protestant Episcopal Church's claim to be a part of the Church Catholic, and therefore to be qualified to assume care of the Russians in the Pacific area. While the House of Deputies was prepared to adopt the proposed phrasing, the House of Bishops changed the terms of reference. A commission was appointed with limited authority: "to consider the expediency of communication with the Russo-Greek Church, to collect information on the subject" and to report to the next

General Convention. A resolution to this effect was passed by a majority vote (11 against 8). Obviously, there was some uncertainty as to the timeliness of the venture.[36] This commission was known as the "Russo-Greek Committee."

The decision of the American Convention was almost immediately followed by some steps in England. It seems that the main promoters of the cause were the Rev. Dr. John Freeman Young in America (later Bishop of Florida) and George Williams in England. The formation of the "Eastern Church Association" was probably connected with the American initiative too. In any case, in 1863 a petition was presented to the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, requesting the Archbishop to appoint a committee which might communicate with the "Russo-Greek Committee" in America concerning the question of intercommunion. The petition was presented to the House by the Bishop of Oxford (Samuel Wilberforce), and a corresponding motion adopted. The English committee was not authorized to enter into direct intercourse with the authorities of the Eastern Church but merely kept in touch with the Americans. The American delegates stopped in England on their way to the East (Dr. Young and the Hon. Mr. Ruggles) and conferred with the British. Some special consultations were held with the Russian experts, Fr. Popov and Fr. Joseph Vassiliev (the Russian chaplain in Paris, who was invited especially for this purpose). The problem under discussion was that of intercommunion, i.e., mutual recognition of both Churches, including the recognition of Anglican Orders by the Orthodox. The general feeling was that the Anglican Church in America was better equipped for the purpose; there was more inner agreement (probably it was an exaggerated estimate, as the Church was involved in an inner debate on "tractarian" principles), more flexibility, and less inhibition by historical commitments. Therefore it could more easily make those adjustments (or "concessions") which might be required by the Orthodox. The situation in England was rather tense and bishops had to exercise extreme caution. It was clear that the Eastern Church would be unable to enter into any formal communion with the Anglicans unless certain changes were made in Anglican formularies, etc. The Church of England was hardly in the position to do so. Americans were expected to go ahead and create a precedent.[37] Dr. Young visited Russia in 1864 and was received by the Metropolitans of St. Petersburg (Isidor) and Moscow. He also visited the Moscow Ecclesiastical Academy (in the Monastery of St. Sergius), having there a theological discussion on the problem of reunion. He brought with him commendatory letters from several bishops in America. The Russian Synod was not prepared, however, to take any formal steps, but recommended further study of a rather informal nature. Filaret was favorably disposed, but anticipated misunderstandings among the laity; bishops and the more learned members would understand the problem, but (as Young recorded his words) "the difficulty will be with the people." It was a pertinent

remark: in Filaret's opinion, "Reunion," or *rapprochement*, could obviously be enacted by an act of hierarchy, but presupposed also the participation of the body of believers. He had some difficulty concerning the validity of Anglican orders (Parker's consecration, etc.). Finally, he suggested five points for further study. They were as follows: (1) The Thirty-Nine Articles and their doctrinal position; (2) the *Filioque* clause and its place in the Creed; (3) Apostolic Succession; (4) Holy Tradition; and (5) the Doctrine of Sacraments, especially the Eucharistic doctrine.

It was decided that an interchange of theological *memoranda* should be arranged between the Russian and Anglican commissions. Dr. Stubbs was invited to present a statement on the problem of succession, John M. Neale on the *Filioque* clause, etc. At the same time, the common interests of Russia and America in the Pacific area were stressed, including the missionary endeavors of both nations. At this point American delegates favored a plan to establish a Russian bishopric at San Fransisco and also a Russian parish in New York (the latter was opened in 1870, but closed in 1883). A long report on these negotiations was presented by the Russo-Greek Committee to the General Convention in 1865. It was decided to extend the Commission and empower it to correspond with the authorities of all Eastern Churches, and to secure further information. It was clearly asserted, however, that the Church was not prepared for any other type of negotiations.[38]

The problem was brought to the fore once more in 1868. Several diocesan conventions suggested a revision of the Nicene Creed, i.e., in fact, the removal of the *Filioque* clause from the Creed. Action to this effect was found inexpedient and was indefinitely postponed. It should be mentioned at this point that the problem of the *Filioque* clause was seriously discussed in the Anglican theological press in the sixties. An unsigned article appeared on "The *Filioque* Controversy" in *The Christian Remembrancer*, in October, 1864. As it coincides almost completely, as far as the evidence and comments are concerned, with the "dissertation" on the same subject in J. M. Neale's *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (Part I, General Introduction, v. 2, London, 1850, p. 1095-1168), one may plausibly guess that it was also written by Neale. The main conclusion of both the article and the earlier "dissertation" was that the clause was undoubtedly an "accretion." Three practical attitudes were envisaged: (a) to strike the clause out; (b) to retain it, but express regret at its addition, suggesting that it should be interpreted as concerning the *temporal* mission only; or (c) to offer a suitable commentary on the doctrine concerned. The first solution seemed to be practically (first of all, psychologically) impossible; in America, perhaps, it might have been much easier, especially because the Athanasian Creed was not yet commonly used in this branch of the Anglican Communion. But the choice had to be between the second and third solutions. Bishop Pearson was quoted in the conclusion: "The

schism between the Greek and Latin Churches was begun and continued: never to be ended, till those words, the *Filioque*, be taken out of the Creed."[39] Even Pusey, who was himself in full agreement with the clause and by no means prepared to "strike it out" (see the following section), felt himself compelled to emphasize that the English Church "had no share" in the addition and therefore was in a position to ask that it be allowed "to continue to use the formula, which, without any act of our own, has been the expression of our faith immemorially."[40]

A comprehensive report on the negotiations was presented to the General Convention. The prospect seemed to be rather bright, and no insuperable barriers were discovered. The main problem was that of Orders. It was suggested that the Russian Synod might be willing to send delegates to investigate the problem. Intercommunion had to be interpreted, as stated by the theological commission of the Canterbury Convocation in 1867, as "mutual acknowledgement that all Churches which are one in the possession of a true episcopate, one in sacraments, and one in their creed, and are, by this union in their common Lord, bound to receive one another to full communion in prayers and sacraments as members of the same household of Faith." The authority of the Russo-Greek Committee was then extended to a new period.[41] In the meantime, the Archbishop of Canterbury approached the Ecumenical Patriarch requesting him, in compliance with the recommendation of the Committee on Intercommunion of the Convocation, to allow Anglicans dying in the East to be buried in the Orthodox cemeteries and to be given religious funerals by the Orthodox clergy. A copy of the *Common Prayer Book* in Greek translation was appended to the letter. The Archbishop's request was granted by the Patriarch (Gregory VI), but at the same time he raised certain difficulties about the Thirty-Nine Articles.[42]

The most interesting episode in the story of the negotiations at that time was connected with the visits of the Archbishop of Cyclades, Alexander Lycurgos, to England in 1869 and 1870. A few years later he was to play a prominent role at the Reunion Conferences at Bonn. In 1869, he came to England to consecrate the new Greek Church at Liverpool, and was congenially entertained by the English prelates, as well as by some distinguished laymen, such as Gladstone and others. George Williams acted as his guide and interpreter. Archbishop Lycurgos' personal theological position was rather comprehensive (scholarly background being German), and in his early years as Professor at the University of Athens he had some difficulties because of his broad opinions. During his stay in England, a conference was organized at Ely, at which all points of agreement and disagreement between the two Communions were systematically surveyed, the Bishop of Ely being the main Anglican speaker (assisted by Williams and Cann F. Meyrick). The only position over which no reconciliation

could be reached was precisely concerning the *Filioque* clause. The Archbishop insisted on its unconditional removal.

Then followed some other controversial topics: the number and form of the Sacraments, the doctrine of the Eucharist, the position of the priesthood and the second marriage of the bishops, invocation of the saints, prayers for the departed, the use of ikons and the connected question of the authority of the Seventh Ecumenical Council. A certain measure of understanding was reached, but the Archbishop staunchly defended the Orthodox point of view. He concluded, however, that the English Church was "a sound Catholic Church, very like our own," and that "by friendly discussion, union between the two Churches may be brought about." There was no discussion of Doctrine or Orders, and no attempt was made to clarify the conception of the prospective "union," or mutual recognition. The Archbishop favorably reported on his visit and negotiations to the Synod of Greece.[43] The American General Convention in 1871 took cognizance of these new developments and decided to continue the activities of the Russo-Greek Committee.[44] For the last time, the problem of Intercommunion with the Eastern Church came before the American Convention in 1874. By that time some contacts were also established with lesser Eastern Churches: the Armenian and Coptic. The general feeling was that further negotiations should be conducted directly by the hierarchy of the two Churches, and therefore the Russo-Greek Committee was discontinued.[45] The 1873 Convocation of Canterbury was presented with several suggestions concerning the interpretation of the *Filioque* clause, with reference to the proposal of the Royal Commissioners of 1689. No action was taken by the Convocation, either in 1873 or later.[46] At that time, the question of the "Old Catholics" came to the fore in ecumenical discussions and the negotiations between the Anglican communion and the Eastern Churches temporarily lost their importance. Political troubles in the East in the late seventies also contributed to this decrease in activity.

IX

The secession of a substantial "Old Catholic" group from Rome, after the Vatican Council (1870), challenged the Orthodox Church to form an opinion as to the nature and ecclesiastical status of the new body and as to the attitude it should take with regard to this "non-conforming" Catholic minority in the West. The Vatican Council was preceded by a long period of inner struggle and conflict within the Roman Church, between the "Ultramontane" and more moderate or "liberal" sections or trends. The non-Roman Christians in various countries watched this struggle with keen interest, anxiety and apprehension, sympathy and expectation. The "non-theological factors" played a prominent role in the development of the ecclesiastical conflict. Ecclesiological attitudes had an immediate impact on the ordering of civil society. The

prospective proclamation of Papal infallibility was felt to be a threat to both the sovereignty of the national states and the general cause of freedom. The actual promulgation of the "new dogma" led to the desperate and protracted political *Kulturkampf* in Germany, which had its reflections in other European countries as well. Already in an earlier period the new growth of Papal absolutism had compelled some more liberal Catholics in Germany (and elsewhere) to look in the direction of the Orthodox East. In this connection the name of Franz Baader must be mentioned once more. His interest in the Eastern Church began early. In the thirties he had to reconsider the whole problem afresh, in the context of a growing resistance to the Ultramontane trend of thought and practice. "Catholicism" had been disrupted since the split between the East and the West, and it was in the East that the true Catholic position had been retained and continued. The Eastern Church therefore had much to contribute to the prospective reintegraion of Christian existence. Baader summarized his ideas in the book: *Der Morgenlandische und der Abendlandische Katholizismus mehr in seinem innern wesentlichen als in sienem ausserlichen Verhaltnisse dargestellt* (Stuttgart, 1841; written in 1840). This book has been recently described as "the greatest ecumenical writing of the XIXth century" (E. Benz). It would be difficult, however, to determine to what extent it actually exercised direct influence on wider circles.[47]

In the years immediately preceding the Vatican Council there was increasing unrest among the Roman clergy, especially in France. In 1861, a learned French priest, Abbé Guettée, whose *History of the Church in France* was put on the *Index*, joined the Orthodox Church in Paris and was attached to the Russian Embassy chapel. In cooperation with the Russian chaplain, Fr. Joseph Vassiliev, who was himself engaged in the literary struggle with the French Ultramontanes, Guettée founded a magazine dedicated to the cause of Reform and Reunion, *Union Chrétienne*, which for many years had quite a wide circulation in the West. It was, in fact, one of the earliest Ecumenical publications. In the beginning, Guettée was interested in Anglican cooperation, but later became bitterly hostile to them. He regarded the "return" to the faith and practice of the Early Church and reunion with the East as the only way out of the Roman impasse. In a sense, it was an anticipation of the later "Old Catholic" movement. Eugene Michaud, later editor of the famous *Revue Internationale de Théologie* (still continued as the *Internazionale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*), was for a time associated with Guettee, and it was probably from him that he inherited his sympathy for the Eastern Church.[48]

Another name must be mentioned in this connection. That is, Dr. Joseph J. Overbeck who published in the sixties a number of booklets and pamphlets, in German, Latin and English, advocating not only a "return" to Orthodoxy, but also a re-establishment of the Orthodox Church in the West. Overbeck (1821-1905) was originally a Roman Catholic priest and for a time Private Docent on the Theological

Faculty at Bonn. During that period he had some connections with Dollinger. He left the Church and migrated to England, where he stayed the rest of his life. In 1865, he joined the Russian community in London as a layman. But he had a larger plan in mind. He anticipated the secession of a considerable number of clergy and laymen from the Roman authority in the near future, and was eagerly concerned with the problem of restoring "Orthodox Catholicism" in the West. He regarded reunion with the East as the only practical solution, yet wanted to preserve the Western rite and all those Western habits and traditions which might be compatible with the faith and canons of the Orthodox East. In fact, it was an ambitious project of "Orthodoxy of the Western Rite," somewhat parallel to the "Catholicism of the Eastern Rite."

A formal appeal was presented to the Russian Synod (and probably to the Ecumenical Patriarchate) in 1869; and in 1870 and 1871 Overbeck visited Russia. A provisional draft of the proposed rite was prepared by Overbeck, based mainly on the Roman Missal, with certain insertions from the Mozarabic rite. Fr. Eugene Popov heartily commended the project to the Russian Synod. In principle, the Holy Synod was prepared to approve the plan, but a final decision was postponed in connection with the further development of the Old Catholic movement. The Synod was anxious to ascertain whether there were a sufficient number of people in the West to join the project in question. The scheme was forwarded to the Ecumenical Patriarch in the same year (or in 1872), but it was only in 1881 (and after Overbeck's personal visit to the Phanar) that action was taken. A committee was appointed to examine the project. It reported favorably in 1882 and the Patriarch gave his provisional approval, provided that the other Churches would concur. It seems that a protest was made by the Synod of the Church of Greece. The whole project came to nothing and was formally abandoned by the Russian Synod in 1884, upon the advice of the new Russian chaplain in London, Fr. Eugene Smirnov. There was an obvious utopian element in the scheme, and it failed to attract any appreciable number of adherents. And yet it was not just a fantastic dream. The question raised by Overbeck was pertinent, even if his own answer to it was confusedly conceived. And the vision of Overbeck was probably greater than his personal interpretation. It was a vision of an *Urkatholizismus*, restored in the West with the help of, and in communion with, the Catholic Orthodox Church of the East, which had never been involved in the variations of the West. Overbeck differed from the main Old Catholic movement chiefly in his emphatic stress on the need for a restored communion with the East in order to make the return to a pre-Roman Catholicism real. It was unrealistic to disregard the fact of an age-long separation. This was the main contention of his brief Latin tract: *Libellus Invitatorius ad Clerum Laicosque Romano-Catholicos qui antiquam Occidentis Ecclesiam ad pristinam puritatem et gloriam restauratam videre cupiunt* (Halle, 1871). His magazine, *The Orthodox Catholic Review*, begun in 1867,

cannot be ignored by historians of the idea of "Catholic Reunion." Overbeck's project was utterly resented by the Anglican partisans of intercommunion with the East. It was denounced (by the Chairman of the Intercommunion Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, Dr. Frazer) as "a schismatic proceeding, and a mere copying of the uncatholic and uncanonical aggressions of the Church of Rome." It was described as an attempt to set up "a new Church" with the express object of proselytizing "within the jurisdiction of the Anglican Episcopate." On the other hand, Overbeck was suspected by those who could not separate Catholic Orthodoxy from the *Eastern* rite. This was the case with a group of English converts to Orthodoxy led by Fr. Timothy Hatherly who was received in the Orthodox Church in London in 1856 — by (*re*)-baptism and ordained to the Orthodox priesthood at Constantinople in 1871. He had a small community at Woolverhampton. His missionary zeal was denounced to the Patriarch of Constantinople and he was formally prohibited by the Patriarchate "to proselytize a single member of the Anglican Church," as it would undermine the wider scheme of ecclesiastical reunion. It was a result of the formal intervention of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the Phanar. It seems that this disavowal of Hatherly's intentions was the cause of his joining the Russian Church. He had no sympathy for Overbeck's plan. He simply wanted an Eastern Orthodoxy, only probably with the use of English. In Russia, Overbeck's project was heartily supported by the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, Count Dmitrii A. Tolstoi, a staunch opponent of all Roman Claims and the author of a book on *Roman Catholicism in Russia* (English edition, with preface by the Bishop of Moray, etc., 2 vols., London, 1874). Tolstoi's interest and sympathy were probably determined by rather "non-theological" considerations. So also was the support of the Old Catholic Church in Germany by the Governments of Prussia and some other lands. The whole scheme can be fully understood only in the context of the intricate historical situation in Europe in the years preceding and following the Vatican Council. The ecclesiastical question could not be separated from the political, and the "Vatican dogma" itself had obvious "political" implications.[49]

X

The hope of Reunion was clearly expressed in the Munich Whitsunday Manifesto of the German "Old Catholic" group (in the process of formation), June 1871, and reunion with the "Greek-Oriental and Russian Church" was mentioned in the program of the (first) Catholic Congress, held at Munich in September of the same year (para. 3). The purpose, and the guiding principle, of the new movement was to "reform" the Church in the spirit of the Early Church. An Orthodox visitor was present at the Congress, Professor J. Ossinin of the Theological Academy at St. Petersburg who was to play a

prominent role in the later negotiations between the Orthodox and Old Catholics. The following Orthodox visitors also attended the Congresses at Cologne (1872), Kronstanz (1873), and Freiburg i/Br. (1874): Fr. John Janysheff, at that time Rector of the Theological Academy at Petersburg; Colonel (later General) Alexander Kireev; and some others from Greece, including Professor Zikos Rhossis of Athens, as a "semi-official" representative of the Holy Synod of the Hellenic Church. A special Commission on Reunion had been set up by the Second Catholic Congress at Cologne, which was empowered to establish contacts with existing agencies for reunion and to study the situation in the Churches. It included leading theologians of the Old Catholic group: von Dollinger, Friedrich, Langen, Michaud, von Schulte. In his lectures on Reunion, delivered at Munich in January and February of 1872, von Dollinger laid special stress on the patristic and traditional character of the Eastern Church. "In general, the Eastern Church has remained where it was when the two halves of Christendom were still in communion." Even in the XIXth century the sense of unity was not yet lost. Separation was stiffened when the West advanced in its independent development, culminating in the Counter-Reformation. (The Dollinger "Lectures" were published first in a German periodical, *Die Allgemeine Zeitung*, and immediately translated into English by H. N. Oxenham, *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches*, London and New York, 1872; separate German edition only in 1888, Nordlingen). Anglicans, both in England and in the United States, were keenly interested in the new movement on the Continent from the very beginning, the "Anglo-Continental Society" being the main agency of study and contact (Edward Harold Browne, Bishop of Ely, President, and Canon F. Meyrick, Secretary).

In Russia the cause of the Old Catholics was sponsored and promoted by a group of clergy and intellectuals, united in the "Society of the Friends of Religious Instruction," St. Petersburg Branch, under the presidency of the Grand Duke Constantine (brother of the Emperor, Alexander II). Russian visitors at the Old Catholic conferences were members and delegates of this Society, and not official representatives of the Church. A special commission to carry on negotiations with the Orthodox was appointed at the Third Old Catholic Congress at Konstanz, under the chairmanship of Professor J. Langen. This commission immediately established a very close contact with the Russian group. The main problem under discussion was that of a doctrinal agreement. An "Exposition of the principal differences in the dogmas and liturgy which distinguish the Western Church from the Eastern Orthodox" was prepared by the Russian Society and submitted to the Old Catholic Commission, early in 1874. It was vividly discussed by correspondence. Finally, a Reunion Conference was convened at Bonn, in September 1874. It was an informal Conference of theologians, not a formal meeting of official delegates. The historical significance of this Conference was that for the first time theologians of

the two traditions met for a frank and impartial conference on the basic tenets of the Catholic faith. An historical method was adopted, and the "canon" of Vincent of Lérins was used as a criterion: *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*

There was some ambiguity about that criterion. Anglican representatives insisted that conversation should be restricted to the doctrine and practice of the Church of the first six centuries, "and no documents of later date can be taken into consideration," as Canon Meyrick put it in one of his letters to Dollinger. Did not this contention imply an essentially static conception of the Church and Tradition? Should "universal" be reduced to "ancient"? Was not the "living voice" of the Church left out, and an academic research substituted for a spiritual search for truth? Was the truth to be found only in the ancient texts, and not in the living experience of the Church? The first point of divergence was once more the *Filioque* clause. After a long debate it was agreed that the clause was inserted unlawfully and that it was highly desirable to find a way in which the original form of the Creed could be restored, without compromising the essential truth expressed in the article (the final draft was suggested by the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Browne, formerly of Ely). Discussion of the doctrine itself was postponed, and a special theological commission appointed to prepare a report.

On the whole, the findings of the Bonn Conference were received with satisfaction and hope. The Second Conference met, at Bonn again, in 1875, and the membership was much larger. There were about 65 Anglican representatives. The Orthodox group was also much larger and more representative, including delegates officially appointed by the Ecumenical Patriarch, the Church of Romania, the Church of Greece, the Metropolitan of Belgrade, et. al. The main problem was that of reconciliation between the Western and the Eastern doctrines of the Holy Spirit. After a protracted and rather strained debate, the Conference finally agreed on a common statement based on the teaching of St. John of Damascus which could be regarded as a fair summary of the doctrine commonly held by the East and the West in the age of Ecumenical Councils. St. John was always regarded as an authority in the West, while at the same time he was an exponent of the Greek tradition. Some other questions were raised and discussed, but no decisions taken. Orthodox delegates hesitated to commit themselves to any statement on the validity of the Anglican Orders. On the other hand, they could not agree that invocation of the saints should be regarded as an optional practice and left to the private discretion of individual believers or communities. Anglicans, however, were most apprehensive at this point. The general feeling was that the Conference succeeded in providing a basis for agreement on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Unfortunately, this proved to be an unwarranted optimism. It is true that Old Catholics were fully satisfied by the Bonn theses on this topic. Professor Langen summarized once more the whole discussion in his

prominent role in the later negotiations between the Orthodox and Old Catholics. The following Orthodox visitors also attended the Congresses at Cologne (1872), Kronstanz (1873), and Freiburg i/Br. (1874): Fr. John Janysheff, at that time Rector of the Theological Academy at Petersburg; Colonel (later General) Alexander Kireev; and some others from Greece, including Professor Zikos Rhossis of Athens, as a "semi-official" representative of the Holy Synod of the Hellenic Church. A special Commission on Reunion had been set up by the Second Catholic Congress at Cologne, which was empowered to establish contacts with existing agencies for reunion and to study the situation in the Churches. It included leading theologians of the Old Catholic group: von Dollinger, Friedrich, Langen, Michaud, von Schulte. In his lectures on Reunion, delivered at Munich in January and February of 1872, von Dollinger laid special stress on the patristic and traditional character of the Eastern Church. "In general, the Eastern Church has remained where it was when the two halves of Christendom were still in communion." Even in the XIXth century the sense of unity was not yet lost. Separation was stiffened when the West advanced in its independent development, culminating in the Counter-Reformation. (The Dollinger "Lectures" were published first in a German periodical, *Die Allgemeine Zeitung*, and immediately translated into English by H. N. Oxenham, *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches*, London and New York, 1872; separate German edition only in 1888, Nordlingen). Anglicans, both in England and in the United States, were keenly interested in the new movement on the Continent from the very beginning, the "Anglo-Continental Society" being the main agency of study and contact (Edward Harold Browne, Bishop of Ely, President, and Canon F. Meyrick, Secretary).

In Russia the cause of the Old Catholics was sponsored and promoted by a group of clergy and intellectuals, united in the "Society of the Friends of Religious Instruction," St. Petersburg Branch, under the presidency of the Grand Duke Constantine (brother of the Emperor, Alexander II). Russian visitors at the Old Catholic conferences were members and delegates of this Society, and not official representatives of the Church. A special commission to carry on negotiations with the Orthodox was appointed at the Third Old Catholic Congress at Konstanz, under the chairmanship of Professor J. Langen. This commission immediately established a very close contact with the Russian group. The main problem under discussion was that of a doctrinal agreement. An "Exposition of the principal differences in the dogmas and liturgy which distinguish the Western Church from the Eastern Orthodox" was prepared by the Russian Society and submitted to the Old Catholic Commission, early in 1874. It was vividly discussed by correspondence. Finally, a Reunion Conference was convened at Bonn, in September 1874. It was an informal Conference of theologians, not a formal meeting of official delegates. The historical significance of this Conference was that for the first time theologians of

the two traditions met for a frank and impartial conference on the basic tenets of the Catholic faith. An historical method was adopted, and the "canon" of Vincent of Lérins was used as a criterion: *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*

There was some ambiguity about that criterion. Anglican representatives insisted that conversation should be restricted to the doctrine and practice of the Church of the first six centuries, "and no documents of later date can be taken into consideration," as Canon Meyrick put it in one of his letters to Dollinger. Did not this contention imply an essentially static conception of the Church and Tradition? Should "universal" be reduced to "ancient"? Was not the "living voice" of the Church left out, and an academic research substituted for a spiritual search for truth? Was the truth to be found only in the ancient texts, and not in the living experience of the Church? The first point of divergence was once more the *Filioque* clause. After a long debate it was agreed that the clause was inserted unlawfully and that it was highly desirable to find a way in which the original form of the Creed could be restored, without compromising the essential truth expressed in the article (the final draft was suggested by the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Browne, formerly of Ely). Discussion of the doctrine itself was postponed, and a special theological commission appointed to prepare a report.

On the whole, the findings of the Bonn Conference were received with satisfaction and hope. The Second Conference met, at Bonn again, in 1875, and the membership was much larger. There were about 65 Anglican representatives. The Orthodox group was also much larger and more representative, including delegates officially appointed by the Ecumenical Patriarch, the Church of Romania, the Church of Greece, the Metropolitan of Belgrade, et. al. The main problem was that of reconciliation between the Western and the Eastern doctrines of the Holy Spirit. After a protracted and rather strained debate, the Conference finally agreed on a common statement based on the teaching of St. John of Damascus which could be regarded as a fair summary of the doctrine commonly held by the East and the West in the age of Ecumenical Councils. St. John was always regarded as an authority in the West, while at the same time he was an exponent of the Greek tradition. Some other questions were raised and discussed, but no decisions taken. Orthodox delegates hesitated to commit themselves to any statement on the validity of the Anglican Orders. On the other hand, they could not agree that invocation of the saints should be regarded as an optional practice and left to the private discretion of individual believers or communities. Anglicans, however, were most apprehensive at this point. The general feeling was that the Conference succeeded in providing a basis for agreement on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Unfortunately, this proved to be an unwarranted optimism. It is true that Old Catholics were fully satisfied by the Bonn theses on this topic. Professor Langen summarized once more the whole discussion in his

book *Die Trinitarische Lehrdifferenz zwischen der abendlandischen und der morgenlandischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1876). On the Russian side, similar statements were made by S. Kokhomsky (*The Teaching of the Early Church on the Procession of the Holy Ghost*, St. Petersburg, 1875; and N. M. Bogorodsky *The Teaching of St. John of Damascus on the Procession of the Holy Ghost*, St. Petersburg, 1879; in Russian).

There was agreement between the Orthodox and Old Catholics. But among Anglicans there was a sharp division. Some Anglican delegates at Bonn were quite prepared to omit the *Filioque* clause from the Creed, and it was stated that in America an action to this effect was formally requested by 56 diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Some others, however, were staunchly in favor of retaining it, and were unable to go further than some kind of explanation concerning the insertion of the clause, etc. After the Conference the latter position was forcefully defended by Pusey. In general, he had his own misgivings with regard to the Old Catholic move, and he was at that time especially disappointed by what he felt to be the "impracticable attitude of the Russian Church" (as Liddon puts it). As early as 1872, he wrote to Williams: "I think that we are doing mischief to our own people by accustoming them to the idea of abandoning the *Filioque*, and to the Russians by inflating them." He wanted to keep the Western position intact and even impose it upon the East. Just before Second Conference at Bonn, he instructed Liddon: "I do not see any occasion for any formula in which the Greeks and we should agree. We are content to let them alone . . . We ask nothing of them, in case of reunion, but to go on as we are." When he learned that the Eastern Church Association was petitioning the Convocation to take the Bonn resolution in consideration, he immediately intervened with a letter to the *Times* containing a warning about "the aggressive line" taken by Russian ecclesiastics and an argument against communion with the Eastern Church, "not knowing what consequences it would involve as to ourselves."

The House of Bishops of the Convocation of Canterbury approved the Bonn statement, as did the Committee of the Lower House. It was expected that the Lambeth Conference of 1878 might remove the clause. For Pusey it was an imminent disaster. He summarized his objections in a long tract: *On the clause, "And the Son," in regard to the Eastern Church and the Bonn Conference. A letter to the Rev. H. P. Liddon, D.D.* (Oxford, 1876). "The loss of the 'and the Son' would to our untheological English mind involve the loss of the doctrine of the Trinity," he contended. He contested the authority of St. John of Damascus, "a writer who was, I conclude, unacquainted with the early Greek Fathers, whose language he rejects, and who certainly knew nothing of our Latin Fathers." One gets the impression that Pusey was afraid of anything which could be interpreted as a "concession" to the East. Or, as Canon Meyrick, one of the Bonn delegates, put it, he was

too much interested in the links with Rome (he corresponded with Newman on the topic), and wanted to avoid anything that could widen the chasm between England and Rome. Under these circumstances the Old Catholics felt it would be unwise to hold a new Conference, which had been provisionally scheduled for 1876.

The other unfavorable factor was that Dr. Overbeck (who was at Bonn himself) succeeded in creating some embarrassment among the Orthodox. He contended that there was no real unity among the Old Catholics and no learning toward Orthodoxy (see his book: *Die Bonner Unionskonferenzen, oder Altkatholizismus und Anglicanismus in ihrem Verhältnis zur Orthodoxie, Ein Appellation an die Patriarchen und heiligen Synoden der Orthodoxen Katholischen Kirche* (Halle, 1876). Overbeck was still much concerned with his own scheme of an "Orthodoxy of the Western rite" and did not sympathize with any other proposed manner of Catholic reconciliation. An important point was involved here. Some Orthodox favored an immediate recognition of, and intercommunion with, the Old Catholics as an ecclesiastical body which had preserved the Apostolic Succession and professed *de facto* the Orthodox doctrine on all essential points, and therefore was already (*de facto*) a unit of the Orthodox Church, i.e., as it were, a faithful Orthodox "remnant" in the West, even if it had been temporarily involved in the Roman schism. There was, therefore, no need for any special act of reunion. All that was needed was that the existing unity should be acknowledge and attested. This point of view was represented among the Russians by A. A. Kireev, Fr. Janyshev and Professor Ossinin. On the other side, it could be argued that, even after their secession from Vatican Rome, the Old Catholics were still in schism, simply because Rome had been in schism for centuries, and separation from Rome in the XIXth century did not necessarily mean a true "return" to the undivided Church of the early centuries. Accordingly, more guarantee was needed and a special act of reconciliation was inevitable. Unfortunately, the doctrine of the Church was never discussed at this period of the negotiations, and the meaning of "reunion" was not properly clarified. Political complications in the late seventies (the growing tension between England and Russia centered precisely around the "Eastern question") made theological cooperation between the Anglicans and Orthodox impossible for a while. Contact between the Orthodox and the Old Catholics was also lost.[50] It was renewed only after a long interval, after the formation of the Old Catholic Union (1889) and the Second International Old Catholic Congress in Lucerne (1892). A new link between the Orthodox and Old Catholic theologians was established by cooperation in the newly created periodical: *Revue International de Théologie* (since 1893).

In 1892 the Russian Synod appointed a special committee under the chairmanship of Anthony (Vadkovsky), at that time Archbishop of Finland (later Metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Presiding Member of the Synod). By the end of the year this committee was ready with a

report, which was approved by the Synod and communicated to the Eastern Patriarchs. Conclusions were generally in favor of recognition. This was also the tenor of the book, *Old Catholicism*, by V. Kerensky, later Professor at the theological Academy of Kazan (in Russian, Kazan, 1894). In Greece there was a sharp division of opinion: Archbishop Nicephoros Kalogeras of Patras and Professor Diomedes Kyriakos, of the University of Athens, defended the Old Catholic cause, whereas two other Professors, Zikos Rhossis and Mesoloras, opposed it violently. Patriarch Anthimos of Constantinople, replying to the Reunion Encyclical of Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis*, in 1895, cited Old Catholics as defenders of the true faith in the West. In the meantime, the Third International Congress of Old Catholics at Rotterdam, in 1894, appointed its own commission to examine the Russian report. Three points were singled out for further study: the *Filioque* clause; the doctrine of transubstantiation; and the validity of Dutch orders. This time there was division among the Russian theologians: two Kazan Professors, Gusew and Kerensky, found the Old Catholic interpretation of the points under discussion evasive and discordant with the Orthodox position; Janyshev and Kireev, on the contrary, were perfectly satisfied with them. A vigorous polemic ensued.

The most important contribution to the discussion was an essay by Professor V. V. Bolotov, eminent professor of Church History at the Academy of St. Petersburg: "Thesen über das *Filioque*" (published in German translation, by Kireev, without the name of the author, in the *Revue Internationale*, in 1898). Bolotov suggested a strict distinction between (1) dogmas, (2) "*Theologoumena*" and (3) theological opinions. He described "*Theologoumenon*" as a theological opinion held by those ancient teachers who had recognized authority in the undivided Church and are regarded as "Doctors of the Church." All "*Theologoumena*" should be regarded as permissible, as long as no binding dogmatic authority is claimed for them. Consequently, the *Filioque*, for which the authority of St. Augustine can be quoted, is a permissible theological opinion, provided it is not regarded as a *credendum de fide*. On the other hand, Bolotov contended that the *Filioque* was not the main reason for the split between the East and the West. He concluded, that the *Filioque*, as a private theological opinion, should not be regarded as an *impedimentum dirimens* to the restoration of intercommunion between the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches. It should be added that the Credal clause was omitted by the Old Catholics in Holland and Switzerland (and put in parentheses in the liturgical books in Germany and Austria, to be ultimately omitted also). That is to say that it was excluded from the formal profession of faith.

At this point in the negotiations the doctrine of the Church was mentioned for the first time, to the effect that "Old Catholic" should be regarded as a schism and could be received into communion with the Orthodox Church only on the basis of a formal acceptance of the full

theological system of the contemporary Church. This thesis was first substantiated in 1898 by Fr. Alexis Maltzev, the Russian chaplain at Berlin and a distinguished liturgiologist, and then developed by Bishop Sergius (Stragorodsky), Rector of the Theological Academy of St. Petersburg (later the second Patriarch of Moscow, after the Russian Revolution). This contention was strongly opposed by another Russian theologian, Fr. Paul Svetlov, Professor of Religion in the University of Kiev. He probably went too far. His definition of the Church was too vague and all-inclusive. In his opinion, the Church was "an invisible or spiritual unity of believers, scattered in all Christian Churches," ultimately embracing all who would describe themselves as Christians. After all, all Christian denominations coincide in the essential. Differences are not essential and are usually exaggerated. The Orthodox Church is no more than a part of the Church Universal, of which the Old Catholic Church, in its own right, is another part. This radicalism could not commend itself to the ecclesiastical authorities. Nevertheless, theological conversation was continued, until the outbreak of World War I, and Orthodox visitors and observers attended all Old Catholic Congresses. But no actions were taken.[51]

XI

Friendly contacts between Anglican and Eastern Orthodox hierarchs and individuals, especially in the East, were quite numerous in the seventies and nineties. They were openly motivated by certain "non-theological" considerations, and did not perceptibly promote the cause of reunion or *rapprochement*. In 1888, the Third Lambeth Conference adopted an important resolution (17): "This Conference, rejoicing in the friendly communications which have passed between the Archbishops of Canterbury, and other Anglican Bishops, and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and other Eastern Patriarchs and Bishops, desires to express its hope that the barriers to fuller communion may be, in course of time, removed by further intercourse and extended enlightenment." It seems, however, that the "barriers" were felt to be formidable, if not insuperable. The Sub-Committee of the Conference had to mention once again not only the *Filioque* clause, but the Eastern insistence on trine immersion at Baptism, and an inadequate rite of Confirmation. "It would be difficult for us to enter into more intimate relations with that Church so long as it retains the use of ikons, the invocation of the Saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin," even if the Greeks disclaim the sin of idolatry.[52]

In the same year, in connection with the celebration of the Nine Hundredth Anniversary of the Conversion of Russia, Archbishop Edward Benson of Canterbury decided to send an official letter of congratulations and good wishes to the Metropolitan of Kiev. In the letter he referred to common foes of the Russian and Anglican Churches, obviously meaning Rome, and to the unity in the Faith of

the Gospel, as expounded by the Ecumenical Councils of the Undivided Church. This move was suggested to the Archbishop by a group of churchmen interested in Oriental Christendom, and probably the East's antagonism towards Roman claims commended its Church to the Archbishop. In his reply, Metropolitan Platon unexpectedly raised the question of a formal reunion. "If you also, as appears from your letter, desire that we may be one with you in the bonds of the Gospel, I beg you to communicate to me distinctly and definitely upon what conditions you consider the union of you and our Churches would be possible." The aged Metropolitan wrote on his own behalf, and yet it is improbable that he would have raised such an important problem, without the advice of people in authority. It is true, however, that Metropolitan Platon had a rather broad view of the Church's unity and on one occasion publicly stated that "the walls of partition did not reach Heaven." Archbishop Benson replied in the name of the Bishops of England and made two points. "First and above all, the drawing together of the hearts of the individuals composing the two Churches which would fain 'be at one together'. Secondly, a more or less formal acceptance of each other's position with toleration for any point of difference: non-interference with each other upon any such point." The first point amounted to the authorization of intercommunion, and in the second recognition of the Anglican Orders was implied. No action was taken by the Russian Church on this proposal. From the Orthodox point of view, of course, the real problem was not that of mutual "toleration" or "non-interference," but that of *agreement*.[53]

Nevertheless, in the next decade official contacts between the Church of England and the Church of Russia were strengthened and multiplied. Bishop Creighton of Peterborough (later of London) attended the Coronation of Emperor Nicolas II in 1896, as an official envoy of the Church of England, and Archbishop Maclagan of York visited Russia in the following year. Both prelates were accompanied by Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, a layman of wide erudition and profound piety, very well acquainted with Russian history and life. The English bishops were given a hearty welcome by the Church authorities, but no official negotiations were initiated and there was no discussion on Faith and Order. In 1898, Archbishop Anthony (Vadkovsky) of Finland went to England to represent the Russian Church at the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria. These visits belong rather to the history of attempts to promote "the friendship between nations through Churches" than to the history of Christian Reunion. Queen Victoria is reported to have said that the drawing together of the two Churches was "the only sure way" for bringing together the two nations. One should not forget, however, that the official policy of Great Britain at that time was not in favor of Russia, and therefore all these ecclesiastical overtures surely were not directly inspired by politicians.

There was, however, one feature in the general situation which could not fail to bring the Church of England a bit closer together precisely at

this moment. Discussion of the Anglican Orders in Rome in the middle nineties and the final repudiation of their validity by the Pope in 1896 (the Bull "*Apostolicae curae*") were followed in Russia with keen interest, and the "*Responsio*" of the English Archbishops was accepted with satisfaction. Copies of this "Response" were officially communicated to all Russian bishops (and probably to all Orthodox bishops in various countries of the East). It is interesting to observe that the reply of Roman Catholic bishops in England to the epistle of the Anglican Archbishops was also forwarded officially to all Orthodox bishops by Cardinal Vaughan, with a covering letter, in which the Cardinal expressed his awareness that the Orthodox were as solicitous in guarding the true doctrine of Priesthood and Sacraments as the Church of Rome. One gets an impression that both partners in the dispute were seriously interested in the stand which the Orthodox Church would take in the controversy. In any case, she did not join Rome in its blunt rejection of Anglican Orders as "utterly null and void," indicating thereby that a favorable solution of the problem, from the Orthodox point of view, was not excluded. It was quite natural that at this very moment an inquiry into the Validity of Anglican Orders should be initiated in Russia, if in an unofficial way. "An Enquiry into the Hierarchy of the Anglican Episcopal Church" was published (in Russian) by Professor V. A. Sokolov, of Moscow Theological Academy. It included a critical analysis of the Papal Bull, and the author concluded with the suggestion that Anglican Orders could be recognized by the Orthodox. Professor Sokolov was awarded a D.D. degree for his thesis and was confirmed by the Holy Synod, though the Synod made it clear that an approval of a theological thesis did not necessarily imply an endorsement of the author's conclusions. Both tracts were translated into English and published by the Church Historical Society (presided over at that time by Bishop Creighton).

By the end of the century, the Church of England was once more involved in a controversy over "Ritualism," and the time was not favorable for negotiations with the East.[54] Nevertheless, the Fourth Lambeth Conference (1897) reconfirmed the desire to establish closer relations with the Churches of the East, and empowered the two English Archbishops together with the Bishop of London to act as a Committee for that purpose, with the right of cooption. It was desirable to ascertain to what extent the interest in and desire for a *rapprochement* with the Anglican Communion, expressed by not a few individuals among the Orthodox Prelates, was actually shared by the ruling authorities of the Orthodox Churches themselves.[55] In 1898, Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury went to the East and visited the Ecumenical Patriarch (Constantine V). "Friendly relationship" [*epikoinenia*] between the two Communions was initiated, and a direct correspondence between the Phanar and Lambeth Palace established. A special commission was created at Constantinople in order to survey the doctrinal position of the Anglican Church, and an Anglican

representative, Archdeacon Dowling, was invited to participate. An explanatory pamphlet was published by Bishop Wordsworth, with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1900, and immediately translated into Russian and Greek: *Some points in the Teaching of the Church of England, set forth for the information of Orthodox Christians of the East in the form of an answer to questions* (S.P.C.K., London, 1900; 2nd edition, in Greek and English, 1901). It was a semi-official statement.[56]

In 1902, the new Ecumenical Patriarch, Joachim III, formally invited all autocephalous Orthodox Churches to express their opinions on relations with other Christian bodies. The Russian Synod replied with an elaborate epistle. The Synod was inclined to consider the baptism conferred outside of the Orthodox Church as valid, respecting the sincerity of belief in the Holy Trinity, and to consider the Apostolic Succession in the Latin Church as preserved. With regard to the Anglican Church, the Synod felt that, first of all, "it was indispensable that the desire for union with the Eastern Orthodox Church should become the sincere desire not only of a certain fraction of Anglicanism, but of the whole Anglican community, that the other purely Calvinistic current which in essence rejects the Church, as we understand her, and whose attitude towards Orthodoxy is one of particular intolerance, should be absorbed in the above-mentioned pure current, and should lose its perceptible, if we may not say exclusive, influence upon the Church policy and in general upon the whole Church life of this Confession which, in the main, is exempt from enmity towards us." All charity should be extended to the Anglicans "but at the same time a firm profession of the truth of our Ecumenical Church as the one guardian of the inheritance of Christ and the once saving ark of Divine grace" should also be included. The language was rather stern and harsh, but sufficiently justified by what the Orthodox could infer from events which took place in England in the years immediately preceding, as Birkbeck (who translated the "Epistle" for *The Guardian*) commented.[57] In the same year, obviously at the invitation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Chrestos Androutsos, the distinguished Professor of Dogmatics in the University of Athens, published his great essay on "The Validity of English Ordinations, from an Orthodox-Catholic point of view" (1903; English translation, 1909).

He made two preliminary points. First, Intercommunion cannot be separated from Dogmatic Union. Secondly, it was impossible to discuss the Validity of Orders of any body separated from the true Church, and not statement can be made on them. Consequently, the only question that could be profitably discussed by Orthodox theologians was a practical one: what attitude should the Orthodox Church adopt in the case of reception of individual Anglican clerics in the Church? The external, i.e. ritual, aspect of the Anglican Ordinations could be regarded as adequate. There was, however, some uncertainty as to the purpose of these rites, since the Anglican doctrine of Ministry seemed to be rather

ambiguous, if judged by Orthodox standards. Yet, on the condition that this ambiguity be removed by a formal declaration of the Church, there was a possibility of accepting the Orders of those Anglican priests who were ready to join the Orthodox Church as valid. The prerequisite of such an action was that the Church of England should accept, in a formal way, the doctrine of the ancient Church "as a sure foundation and as an unquestionable principle," and make it clear that "Articles of faith" have authority and should be held only insofar as they actually agree with the ancient doctrines. No doubt, it was a document of momentous importance. As a matter of fact, it has been ever since, and still is, the basis of the ecumenical policy of the Greek Church. There are good reasons to believe that "Professor Androutsos was speaking as the mouthpiece of the then Ecumenical Patriarch," and his essay was a kind of invitation extended to the Anglican Church.[58] The underlying idea was in no sense new. It had already been expressed in a more theological manner by Khomiakov. There was no question of reunion in any proper sense of the word. There was no invitation to a corporate "healing of the schism" either. The problem was shifted from the place of theology to that of canon law, or pastoral discretion. What was new was the use of new terminology. For the first time, the conception of "economy" was applied to ecumenical relations. This conception has never been properly defined or elaborated. Its meaning was nevertheless quite clear: instead of a principal solution some occasional practical arrangements were substituted.

The theological problem was left unsolved, or rather its existence was simply denied. It was assumed that that Orthodox Church simply could not say anything about the ecclesiastical status of the separated bodies, as they had none. At this point there was an obvious difference between the Greek approach and that of the Russian Church. It has been suggested that "Russian theologians retained more traces of the influences of those scholastic methods which infiltrated the Eastern Orthodox Churches in the seventeenth century," and moved "in a world apart from the main tradition."[59] It should not be forgotten, however, that "infiltrations" are found precisely in the Greek documents (such as "*Confessio Dosithei*" or the "*Orthodox Confession*" of Peter Mogila, which was carefully edited by Greek theologians), and Russian theology of the XIXth century strongly resisted these "scholastic methods" — in any case so did Metropolitan Filaret. But Russian theologians would not dispense with the theological, i.e. ecclesiological, problem as such, as difficult and, in the last resort, "antinomical" as it might be. The problem of Unity was for them essentially a theological, and not a canonical problem. No action was taken in the Anglican Church at the time with regard to the Androutsos "invitation." "The chill which fell on the few workers for reunion, left after the Bonn blunder and fiasco, was still prevalent."[60] A petition to remove the *Filioque* clause from the Creed was presented through Bishop Wordsworth to the Convocation of Canterbury in 1902, and the Nicene Churchmen Union

requested the same in 1904.[61] The Fifth Lambeth Conference (1908) requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a permanent Committee to deal with the relations of the Anglican Communion and the Orthodox East (which was actually done) and suggested that certain forms of Intercommunion could be enacted at once (e.g., in the cases of emergency).[62] No action was taken. A new stimulus was given from the United States, where the Orthodox Church (at that time under the jurisdiction of the Russian Synod) had been for a considerable time on friendly terms with the Episcopal Church.

Bishop Grafton, of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, U.S.A., decided to visit Russia and to raise with the Holy Synod some basic theological questions concerning reunion and recognition. Bishop Grafton (1830-1912) was a staunch "high-churchman" and a "ritualist." In his early years he spent five years in England, was closely associated with Dr. Pusey and Fr. Benson, and for a time worked at St. Peter's, London Docks, and at Shoreditch Hospital. He was one of the first members of the Community at Cowley (S.S.J.E.), and was active in the organization of the American branch of this Society. Grafton's visit to Russia was his personal move; he had no formal commission from his Church, though he was given an official letter of introduction by the Presiding Bishop (Dr. Th. M. Clark, Bishop of Rhode Island). Bishop Grafton was accompanied on his trip by Mr. Birkbeck. He presented to Metropolitan Anthony (Vadkovsky), the Presiding Member of the Synod at the time, a memorandum explaining the Catholic character of Anglican beliefs and orders, and had several conversations with theologians, including the great Fr. John of Kronstadt and General Kireev. It was on the basis of materials presented by Bishop Grafton that some years later Professor Kerensky could state a far-reaching agreement in doctrine between the Anglican and the Orthodox Churches.[63]

In 1904, Archbishop Tikhon of North America, later the first Patriarch of Moscow after the restoration of the Russian Patriarchate in 1917, formally requested the Holy Synod to make an official statement on the procedure to be used in the case of the reception of Anglican clerics in the Orthodox Church (a question similar to that discussed by Androutsos). In particular, he wanted to know whether it was permissible to allow them to continue the use of the Common Prayer Book for services. A special Commission was appointed by the Holy Synod which presented a detailed Report, analyzing the offices of the C.P.B. The conclusion was that the offices were rather "colorless and indefinite" with regard to their doctrinal content, and therefore, in case they should be used "in Orthodox parishes, composed of former Anglicans," certain corrections and additions must be made in the text, in order to bring it into agreement with Orthodox doctrine. This adaptation, however, was left to the local authorities of the Church in America. Concerning the reception of Anglican clergy, the Commission recommended, "pending a final judgment" of the Church,

"a new conditional ordination."[64] In spite of the obvious failure of these official and semi-official neogtiations, friendly intercourse between the Churches continued. "The Eastern Church Association" in England was reorganized in 1893 and was quite active in the late nineties. Dr. A. C. Headlam, the future Bishop of Gloucester and prominent leader in the later "Faith and Order Movement," Dr. Popham Blyth, Bishop in Jerusalem, and a group of distinguished laymen, such as W. J. Birkbeck, Athelstan Riley, et. al. were at that time promoters of the cause of *rapprochement.*

In 1906, a new Society was inaugurated, by joint initiative of Orthodox and Anglican groups, "The Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union," and its American Branch was organized in 1908. The Union had its own periodical, *Eirene* (1908-1914). For a short period before the outbreak of World War I the new "Union" was very active in various fields. A special Committee was created, under the chairmanship of Bishop Blyth, to organize the training of Orthodox clergy for work in the English-speaking colonies in Anglican theological schools. The project was preliminarily approved by the Ecumenical Patriarch and Metropolitan of Athens. Some links were established with the Orthodox Mission in Japan. In Russia the new venture was supported by Archbishop Agathangel, at that time of Riga, later of Jaroslavl. The American Branch was also very active. Once more the problem of a partial Intercommunion had been raised, i.e., of Anglican ministration to the Orthodox in the absence of the Orthodox clergy, and vice versa. Some local Orthodox bishops were willing to agree to that proposal, and it was done by Bishop Raphael of Brooklyn, N.Y., the Syrian suffragan of the (Russian) Archbishop of North America, in 1910; he repudiated his own action in 1911 and withdrew from the "Union."[65] In 1912 a Russian "Society of the Friends of the Anglican Church" was inaugurated in St. Petersburg. The first President was Eulogius, at that time Archbishop of Volynia and Member of the Governamental Duma, and later Metropolitan of the Russian Church in Western Europe and Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarch. He was succeeded by Sergius, Archbishop of Finland, and later Patriarch of Moscow. The Statutes of the Society were approved by the Holy Synod. A Branch of the Society was organized in the U.S.A.

By invitation of this Society, a group of Anglican bishops and clergy joined the Parliamentary delegation of Great Britain to Russia (the "Speaker's delegation") in 1912. Four bishops participated (Eden of Wakefield, Robertson of Exeter, Williams of Bangor, and Bernard of Ossory). Two series of lectures (on the "Life of the Anglican Church") were organized, at St. Petersburg and Moscow, delivered by Dr. Walter H. Frere, C.R., the future Bishop of Truro and the first President of the Fellowship of St. Sergius and St. Alban, and by Fr. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E. Fr. Puller's lectures were published (in English and Russian) — *The Continuity of the Church of England* (Longmans, 1912). It was an impressive vindication of the Catholic claims of the Anglican

Communion. During his visit, Fr. Puller had several theological conversations with the Orthodox, of which he speaks in the Preface to his book. The question of the *Filioque* had been surveyed once more, with the result that on this point there was in principle no disagreement between the two Churches. Puller attributed this "change of attitude" on the Russian side "to the influence of the great Russian theologian, Bolotov." The World War interrupted the work of the Society. It should be mentioned that in 1914 two British organizations, "The Eastern Church Association" and "The Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union," were fused together, under then name of "The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association" (which still continues). Even on the eve of the Revolution the Russian Society was meeting, and at the last meeting in 1917 Archbishop Sergius "delivered a most beautiful address on the similarity and differences in the course of history, between the Eastern and Anglican Churches, and on the promising aspects of the Anglican Church." It must be added that the great All-Russian Church Council of 1917-1918, in its very last meeting (September 20, 1918), passed the following resolution, upon the proposal of the Section on the Union of the Christian Churches (Archbishop Eudokim, of North America, chairman): "The Sacred Council of the Orthodox Russian Church, gladly seeing the sincere efforts of the Old Catholics and Anglicans towards union with the Orthodox Church on the foundation of the doctrine and tradition of the Ancient Catholic Church, bestows its benediction on the labors and efforts of those who are seeking the way towards union with the above-named friendly Churches. The Council authorizes the Sacred Synod to organize a Permanent Commission with departments in Russia and abroad for the further study of Old Catholic and Anglican obstacles in the way of union, and for the furtherance, as much as possible, of the speedy attainment of the final aim." No Commission could be organized in Russia at that time, but the work of Russian theologians in Western Europe in the ecumenical field was in line with the desire and commendation of the Council.[66]

XII

Negotiations with the Old Catholics and Anglicans revealed a serious divergence of opinions among the Orthodox theologians themselves, and these internal polemics were sometimes very heated. On the other hand, discussions were often confined to one form or another of ecclesiastical agreement. There was no deeper experience of unity, and both sides were mainly engaged in the defence of their respective historical traditions, Western or Eastern, in spite of all persistent references to the "Undivided Church." The spiritual and psychological barriers between the East and the West were not yet broken, and for that reason very few indeed were prepared to go beyond mere schemes and projects. Christian unity implies two things: unity in faith or doctrine,

and unity in the life of the Church, i.e., in sacraments and worship. In the first period of the Ecumenical conversation between the East and the West, attention was given mainly to the first aspect, which led to the disappointing discovery that there was a difference indeed, and a difference of such character as to make agreement hardly possible. The *Filioque*, the doctrine of the Eucharist, the invocation of saints, Mariology, prayers for the departed, — on all these points no concession could be made by the Orthodox, although a clear distinction had to be made between a binding doctrine and a theological interpretation. This distinction is not easy to make in practice. Unnecessary impediments were sometimes created by intransigence on either side. Nevertheless, the real difficulty was rooted in the basic fact that the Orthodox East abides by tradition and retains the whole Patristic deposit. The recovery of this Patristic Tradition in the West would have helped mutual understanding.

In the later period of discussion, the whole ecclesiological problem was brought to the fore. The main issue was: what was the Church Universal? and in what sense do "schisms" belong to the Church? Various answers were given, or often simply taken for granted in advance. Unity of belief does not by itself constitute the corporate reality of the Church, since the Church is a Divine institution. The "Branch-theory" of the Church was obviously unacceptable to the Orthodox. In any case, it minimizes the tragedy of disruption. Again, a schism is not just a human separation: it violates the basic structure of Christian existence. The only alternative available for Orthodox theologians seemed to be this: either separated bodies did not belong to the Church at all, and therefore were, not only historically but also spiritually, outside of it; or they were still, in a certain sense and under special conditions, related to the Church existentially. The latter conception is characteristic of Roman Catholicism, and goes back to St. Augustine; for that very reason many Orthodox would hesitate to accept it. It was, however, held by many Russian theologians (Filaret, Kireev and Svetlov), if not quite in the same sense. Accordingly, the Sacraments were not necessarily reiterated for the non-Orthodox, in the case of conversion, but were understood as having some real charismatic significance even outside of the strict canonical boundaries of the Church. This has been the common practice of the Russian Church in the last centuries. On the other hand, this practice could be interpreted in the light of the theory of "*Economy*," which is characteristic of modern Greek theology; in this case, the fact of non-reiteration would not imply any recognition of these non-Orthodox ministrations, and should be interpreted simply as a pastoral dispensation. This point of view had already been represented in Russia by Khomiakov, and in recent times was elaborated with daring radicalism by the late Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky). He had an occasion to express this view in an ecumenical context, when he was invited to participate in the "Conference on Faith and Order," in 1914. The delegation of the

Planning Committee in the U.S., appointed in 1914, could not go because of the war but invitations were sent to all Orthodox Churches. In Russia, they were favorably received in high ecclesiastical quarters and some epistolary contacts were established.

Anthony, at that time Archbishop of Kharkov and a permanent Member of the Holy Synod, replied to the invitation with a long letter, in which he frankly stated his point of view. There was no spiritual reality, "no Grace," outside the Orthodox Church. All talks about "validity" are just "talmudist sophistries." What is outside of the Orthodox Church is just "this World, foreign to Christ's redemption and possessed by the Devil." It makes no difference, Anthony argued, whether the non-Orthodox have or do not have "right beliefs." Purity of doctrine would not incorporate them in the Church. What is of importance is only the actual membership in the Orthodox Church, which is not compromised by doctrinal ignorance or moral frailty. "Doctrinal agreement" by itself means little. Membership in the Body is the only thing that counts. But, in spite of this global exclusion of all non-Orthodox from Christendom, Anthony was wholeheartedly in favor of Orthodox participation in the proposed "Conference on Faith and Order." "Indeed, we are not going to con-celebrate there, but shall have to search together for a true teaching on the controversial points of faith." An exchange of letters with Robert Gardiner, the secretary of the organizing commission, followed, in which the whole problem was thoroughly discussed. Another Russian theologian, Hilarion (Troitsky), at that time Professor of the Moscow Theological Academy, and later Archbishop of Krutity, published an "open letter" to Robert Gardiner, "The Unity of the Church and the Universal Christian Conference," in which he developed the same radical conception: Separation is infinitely more important than Dissent. This interpretation of unity and schism was by no means commonly accepted, and was exposed to serious objections. In any case, there was no unanimity among Orthodox theologians on this basic problem of "ecumenical theology." The documents just quoted belong to the later period, and, strictly speaking, are outside the scope of the present survey. Yet they summarize authentically the view which has been held and promoted by not a few in the course XIXth century ecumenical negotiations.[67]

This survey would be incomplete, if we omitted the name of Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900). Soloviev was never interested in the ecumenical problem, insofar as it concerned the search for unity between the Orthodox and the world of the Reformation. His attitude towards the Reformation and Protestantism always tended to be negative, even if in his later years he would speak occasionally of a "super-confessional" Christianity, and a "Religion of the Holy Spirit." He was openly hostile to the Old Catholic Movement. Nevertheless his contribution to the discussion on Christian unity was momentous. "The broken Unity" of Christendom, "the Great Controversy," i.e., the "Separation of the Churches," was in his opinion the main fact and the

main tragedy of Christian existence. The reunion of Christendom was, for him, therefore, not merely one special and particular problem of theology and of Christian action, but precisely *the* problem of Christian life and history. Soloviev was mainly concerned with the question of reconciliation between the East and Rome, and in a sense he was pleading for a very particular kind of "Unia." In fact, he simply did not believe that "Churches" were separated. There was an historical estrangement, an external break, but, in an ultimate sense, there was still One, (mystically) Undivided Catholic Church.

Soloviev's practical plans were utterly utopian. He dreamed of an alliance between a supreme pontiff and an universal emperor, i.e., between Rome and the Russian Empire. He was much less interested in the theological reintegration of the separated traditions. His ecclesiological thought was strongly influenced by Roman theology. He was ready to vindicate the whole doctrinal growth of Roman doctrine, by means of an elaborate doctrine of dogmatic development. His schemes of union were violently criticized by Russian theologians; there was much substance and justice in these criticisms. But critics should not have missed the very point which Soloviev was trying to establish, even if in an unfortunate manner. He was right in his basic vision: the Church is essentially One, and therefore cannot be divided. Either Rome is no Church at all, or Rome and the East are somehow but One Church, and separation exists only on the historical surface. This thesis can be interpreted in a limited sense, i.e., as including only Rome and Eastern Orthodoxy. But it could be reinterpreted in a wider sense, and, in that case, we would have an important and truly ecumenical plea. The merit of Soloviev was precisely that he tried to clarify the presuppositions that underlay the Catholic doctrine of the Church. His negative attitude toward Protestantism was to a great extent the result of the limitations of his age: he had in view chiefly the liberal Protestantism of the XIXth century, characterized by an etiolated doctrine and a complete lack of any Church consciousness. His ultimate "Ecumenical" vision, so vividly presented in his "Story of the Antichrist," included the whole of Christendom, and fullness of Christian tradition: the spiritual insight of the Orthodox East, the authority of Rome, and the intellectual honesty of Protestantism. But this unity transcends history.[68] The true legacy of Soloviev is not his "Romanism," and of course not his utopian, theocratic dream, but his acute sense of Christian unity, of the common history and destiny of Christendom, his firm conviction that Christianity is the Church. It was a true ecumenical vision, as fantastic and dreamy, offensive and repelling, as his union plans and invectives had been. Soloviev's was the challenge. An earnest endeavor at an inclusive Catholic reintegration would be the answer. It would take us beyond all schemes of agreement. The issues which have been discussed time and again in the abortive ecumenical negotiations of the last centuries, and of the preceding ones, are still burning. It is necessary to realize the nature and the scope of

those questions which the Orthodox were bound to have asked, and are going to ask again and again, in order to understand and interpret the meaning of the ecumenical encounter between the Orthodox East and the West at large.

[1]Cf. the whole chapter on this period in my book, *The Ways of Russian Theology* in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky. The Act of the Holy Alliance* (the French text) in Martens, *Nouveau Recueil de Traités et Conventions conclus par la Russie avec les Puissances étrangères* (St. Petersburg, II), p. 656-658. On the Holy Alliance itself see: E. Muhlenbeck, *Études sur les Origines de la Sainte Alliance* (Paris, 1888); E. Godlewski, "Cesarz Aleksander I jako mistyk," (Krakow, 1926; originally in Przegad Powszechny, v. 166, 1925, and 170, 1926); W. Naf, *Zur Geschichte der Heiligen Allianz* (Bern, 1928; *Berner Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Geschichte*, I); Franz Buchler, *Die geistigen Wurzeln der Heiligen Allianz* (Freiburg i/Br., 1929); Hildegard Schaeder, *Die dritte Koalition und die Heilige Allianz*, 1934 (*Ost-Europaische Forschungen*, N. F. 16). Important material is to be found in the "notes et commentaires" of Eugene Susini, in his recent publication of the *Lettres Inédites de Franz von Baader*, v. I (Paris, 1942); vols. II & III (Wien, 1951). The memorandum of Baader presented to three monarchs, *Über das durch die französische Revolution herbeigeführte Bedürfnis einer neuen und innigeren Verbindung der Religion mit der Politik* (1815; dedicated to Prince Golitsin), in his *Sämtliche Werke*, Bd. VI, and in Baader's *Anthology*, published by J. Sauter, *Herdflamme*, Bd. 14 (Jena, 1925). On Baader see especially E. Benz, "Die abendländische Sendung der östlich-orthodoxen Kirche," in *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur*. Abhandlungen des Geistes — und Sozialwissenschaftichen Klasse (Jahrgang, 1950, Nr. 8). On Jung Stilling see Benz, "Das Reich Gottes im Osten," in *Evangelium und Osten*, VII. 12 (1934), and VIII. 4 (1935), and "Jung Stilling in Marburg," in *Marburger Vorträge*, 3 (Marburg, 1949). For a wider background see Jakob Baxa, *Einführung in die romantische Staatswissenschaft* (2nd ed., Jena, 1931) (*Die Herdflamme*, Erganzungsband 4). On the Russian Bible Society: A. N. Pypin, *Religious Movements under Alexander I* (2nd ed., Petrograd, 1916), and I. A. Chistovich, *History of the Russian Translation of the Bible* (2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1899 — first published in 1873), — both books in Russian; rich documentation. Some material is available in J. Owen, *The History of the Origin and First Ten Years of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (3 vols., 1816 a. 1820); E. Henderson, *Bible Researches and Travels in Russia* (London, 1826); Robert Pinkerton, *Russia, or Miscellaneous Observations on the Past and Present State of this Country and its Inhabitants (London, 1833)*; J. Paterson, *The Book for every Land. Reminiscences of Labour and Adventure in the Work for Bible Circulation in the North of Europe and in Russia* (edited with a prefatory memoir by W. L. Alexander, 1858). On the Emperor Alexander's links with the Society of Friends see J. Cunningham, *The Quakers (London, 1868); and especially Memoirs of the Life and Gospel Labours of Stephen Grellet*, ed. by Benjamin Seebohm (Philadelphia, 1862), v. I, p. 293, 313, 315 f., 386-478 Cf. Peter v. Gotze, *Fürst Alexander Nikolajewitsch Golitsin und seine Zeit* (Leipzig, 1882). Further bibliography in Benz, *Die Sendung*, 846-848. On De Maistre see Georges Goyau, "La Pensée religieuse de Joseph de Maistre," in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1921), and separately; M. Jugie, *J. de Maistre et l'Église Greco-Russe* (Paris, 1922); Émile Dermenghem, *Joseph de Maistre Mystique*, Nouvella edition, La Colombe (Paris, 1946). Cf. *Quatre chapitres inédits sur la Russie par le comte Joseph de Maistre*, publiés par son fils, le comte Rodolphe de Maistre (Paris, 1859); "Un écrit inédit de J. de Maistre," in *Études*, v. 73 (1897); Wilhelm Schwarz, *Die Heilige Allianz* (Stuttgart, 1935); Robert Triomphe, *Joseph De Maistre* (Geneva, 1968).

[2]Filaret's *Conversation* was never translated into any Western language. In Russian it has been republished many times, slightly revised by the author

himself; in the later editions (after his death), the concluding part of the treatise, dealing with the "ecumenical" question, was usually omitted. In this chapter, the 2nd edition has been used, Moscow, 1833. As early as 1811, Filaret wrote an "Exposition of the Differences between the Eastern and Western Churches, concerning the Teaching of Faith," probably for Empress Elizabeth of Russia. In the original it was published only in 1870, *Readings in the Moscow Imperial Society of Russian History and Antiquities*, 1870, I; but in English translation (from the manuscript supplied by Filaret himself), it had appeared in 1833, in Pinkerton's *Russia* etc., pp. 39-54; German translation (extracts) in the review of Pinkerton's book, *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* (published by Hengstenberg), Bd. XV., 1834, Nrs. 71-73, 77-79 etc. On Filaret, see my *Ways*, pp. 166-184 and *passim* (Bibliography). Cf. A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (1861); new edition in Everyman's Library, p. 377: "Filaret, the venerable Metropolitan of Moscow, represents, in some measures at least, the effect of that vast wave of reactionary feeling which we sometimes associate exclusively with England, even with Oxford, and a few well-known names in Oxford, but which really has passed over the whole of Europe. . . The gentle and saint-like representative in Russia of opinion and practices which in England are too near ourselves to be described more closely." Cf. Stanley's article in *Macmillan's Magazine*, February, 1868. Stanley, "Filaret in 1857": see *The Life and Correspondence of A. P. Stanley*, by Rowland E. Prothero, v. I, New York, 1894, pp. 527-530. On Filaret see also: *Memoirs of Stephen Grellet*, I, 395 f., 414, 421 (personal impressions); and *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the Years 1840, 1841*, by William Palmer, selected and arranged by Cardinal Newman, London, 1882, *passim*. Only some sermons of Filaret are available in English, but probably his sermons were his major theological contribution: *Select Sermons of the late Metropolitan of Moscow Filaret*, translated from the Russian, London, Joseph Masters, 1873 (translated by E. Th. Tiutchev); cf. *Choix de Sermons et Discours de S. Em. Mgr. Filarète*, traduits du Russe par A. Serpinet, 3 vols., Paris, 1866.See Soloviev's critical comments in his *La Russie et L'Église Universelle* (Paris, 1886; English translation, *Russia and the Universal Church*, London, The Centenary Press, 1948, pp. 54-55. In this connection, one should mention another interesting attempt to interpret the relation between the Eastern and Western (Roman) Churches: *Considerations sur la doctrine et l'Éspirit de l'Église Orthodoxe*, par Alexandre Stourdza, Stuttgart, Cotta (1816); German translation by A. von Kotzebue, Leipzig, 1817. Stourdza (1791-1854) was deeply involved in the mystical movements of the first decades of the century, and his book betrays the influence of Baader et al., although he was a conservative Orthodox. His point of view is close to that of Filaret. It has recently been suggested that unless the "Considerations" of Stourdza had been published, the famous book by Joseph De Maistre, *Du Pape*, would probably not have been written at all; Susini, III, p. 92; cf. Camille Latreille, *Joseph de Maistre et la Papauté*, Paris, Hachette (1906). On Stourdza see Susini, III, 82 ff., and Benz, *Die Sendung*, p. 785 ff. Stourdza's book is reprinted (in French, as it was written) in his *Oeuvres Posthumes*, t. IV., Paris (1860).

[3]Moehler's book on Unity was recently republished by E. J. Vierneisel, Mainz (1925); *Deutsche Klassiker der Katholischer Theologie aus Neuerer Zeit*, Matthias Gruenewald Verlag; French translation by Dom A. Lilienfeld, O.S.B., Paris (1938); (*Unam Sanctam*, Les Éditions du Cerf). On Moehler see the centenary volume: *L'Église est Une, Hommage à Moehler*, ed. by Pierre Chaillet, Bloud & Gay, Paris (1939); the same in German; K. Eschweiler, J. A. *Moehlers Kirchenbegriff*, Braunsberg (1930); G. R. Geiselmann, "Geist des Christentums und Katholicismus: J. A. Moehler und die Entwicklung seines Kirchenbegriffs" in *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Bd. 112 (1931); and especially Geiselmann's later publication, J. A. Moehler: *Die Einheit der Kirche und die Wiedervereinigung der Konfessionen*, Wien (1940). In English: Sergei Bolshakoff, *The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in*

the Works of Khomiakov and Moehler, S.P.C.K., London (1946). On the gerneral background see Georges Goyau, *L' Allemagne Religieuse*, v. II, Paris (1905), and especially E. Vermeil, *Jean Adam Moehler et l'école catholique de Tubingue*, Paris (1913). Moehler's *Symbolik* has been translated into English by James Burton Robertson: *Symbolism; or Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, as Evidenced by their Symbolical Writtings*, 2 vols., London (1843).

[4]Cf. Yngve Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival*, London (1925), p. 329. On Moehler's influence in the Tractarian Movement see H. Boehmer, "Die Kirche Englands und der Protestantismus," in the *Neue Kirchlische Zeitschrift* (1916). Convergence between Moehler and Newman was strongly stressed by Jean Guitton, *La Philosophie de Newman. Essai sur l'idée de development*, Boivin & Co., Paris (1933), p. 48, 118 n. 3. 129. Newman actually mentions Moehler (and De Maistre) in the Introduction of his treatise on "The Development of Christian Doctrine": New edition, by F. C. Harold, Longmans (1949), p. 28. It would be interesting to compare Newman's *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (first published in 1833) and Moehler's *Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit, besonders im Kampfe mit dem Arianismus* (2 Bde, 1827); cf. Guitton, p. 221. Moehler's influence on Newman and the "British Critic" was censured by some Tractarians as "romanizing": the principle of "development" seemed to contradict the appeal to "antiquity." See W. Palmer (of Worcester College, Oxford), *A Narrative of Events, Connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times* (1843); New edition, with an Introduction and Supplement extending to the Present Time, London (1883), p. 151 f., 166 f.; cf. Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, 3rd ed., v. II, p. 443 f.

[5]Ks. A. Pawlowski, *Idea Kosciola wujeciu rosyjskiej teologji i historiosofji*, Warsaw (1935), p. 89 f., 229 f., admits a direct influence, and probably he is right. It is denied by others: A. Gratieux, *A. S. Khomiakov et le Mouvement Slavophile*, v. II, Paris, 1939, p. 105, n. I; P. Baron, "*Un théologien laic Russe au XIX-e siècle. A. S. Khomiakov (1804-1860). Son Ecclesiologie: Exposé et Critique*," Rome (1940), pp. 58-60 (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 127); Bolshakov, pp. 216-262. Cf. also S. Tyskiewicz, S.J., "La theologoie moehlerienne de l'Unité et les théologien pravoslaves," in *L'Église est Une*, p. 270 ff.; P. Yves Congar, "La pensée de Moehler et l'eccléliologie Orthodoxe," in *Irenikon* (1935).

[6]Dr. Darwell Stone, a man of enormous erudition in all fields of Church History, "was once heard to remark that he did not know of its ancestry." Upon the strong recommendation of Lord Halifax he would not use it himself. See F. L. Cross, *Darwell Stone. Churchman and Counsellor*, Dacre Press, Westminster (1943), p. 55, n. 3. Cf. T. A. Lacey, "The Unity of the Church as treated by English Theologians," London, S.P.C.K. (1898) (*Tracts of the Church Historical Society*, XXXV).

[7]Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, v. III, "Submissions to Church Authority," November 29, 1829; New edition, Rivingtons, London, 1885, p. 191 f.

[8]Newman's "Prefatory Notice" to W. Palmer (of Magdalen College, Oxford), *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church*, p. v-vii.

[9]Pusey makes the same point in his "Eirenikon." "Suspension of intercommunion" does not estrange the separated Churches from Unity; "The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity." In "Eirenikon," in a Letter to the author of *The Christian Year*; first published in 1865; reprinted, 1866, p. 248 ff. Cf. A. S. Duncan Jones, "The Oecumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement," in *Northern Catholicism: Centenary Studies in the Oxford and Parallel Movements*, ed. by N. P. Williams and Charles Harris, S.P.C.K., London (1933), p. 446 ff.; H. Brandreth, *The Ecumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement*, S.P.C.K., London (1947); P. E. Shaw, *The Early Tractarians and The Eastern Church*, Morehouse, Milwaukee & Mowbray, London (1830).

[10]*The Early Tractarians*, 76; cf. the whole chapter, "The Early Tractarians and Reunion," p. 59 ff.

[11]Pusey to Rev. R. Harrison, Feb. 21, 1840, in *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, by H. P. Liddon, v. II, London (1893), pp. 148-149.

[12]*The Articles Treated in Tract XC Reconsidered, and Their Interpretation Vindicated, in a Letter to the Rev. R. M. Jelf, D.D.*, Oxford (1841), pp. 184-185.

[13]On the Jerusalem Bishophric see first of all W. H. Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishophric*, London (1883); all official documents in the Appendix; cf. Shaw, *The Early Tractarians*, chap. IV, p. 101 ff. See a new presentation of the whole story by Kurt Schmidt-Clausen, *Vorweggenomme Einheit. Die Gründung des Bistums Jerusalem im Jahre 1841* (Berlin and Hamburg, 1965).

[14]George Tomlinson, *Report of a Journey to the Levant, Addressed to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, President of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, s.d. (1841?); cf. J. Beaven, *On Intercourse between the Church of England and the Churches of the East, and on the Ecclesiastical Condition of the English Abroad*, London (1840); see Shaw, 142 ff. and the other book by the same author, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*. 1820-1870. Chicago, Ill. (1937), p. 41 ff.

[15]The whole story in Shaw, *American Contacts*, p. 35 ff. The American "Mission" seems to have been originally conceived as a "mission" in a narrow sense, but actually "was operated in support of Tractarian theology" (51), and this attitude involved Southgate in a bitter conflict with the other ("Protestant") missionary agencies in the East, creating a disappointment in certain quarters in The States. It is interesting to compare this Episcopal "mission" with an earlier one, the "Greek Mission" in Athens, instituted in 1830. The missionary, Dr. Hill, was very cautious in his action, but even in the official instruction given by Bishop Griswold it was assumed that the Greek Church somehow "departed from the purity and simplicity of primitive times and scriptural example" (first published in S. D. Denison, *A History of the Foreign Missionary Work of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, v. I, New York, 1871, p. 142-144). Dr. Hill himself was quite emphatic on this point. He wrote in 1839: "The primary object of the Church in its Mission to the Greeks should never be lost sight of, viz., the spiritual renovation of our Mother Church." His purpose was, in his own words (1844), "to impart to the people religious knowledge, the effect of which, when widely disseminated, must be *a reformation of the whole system* within their Churches," (Quoted by Dr. Wallace E. Robbins, in his chapter, "The Mission to Greece," in the *History of The Theological Seminary in Virginia and its Historical Background*, ed. by the Rev. Wm. A. R. Goodwin, Rochester, N.Y.. s.d. (1924), v. II, p. 260. The heroic struggle of the Greeks for their national independence in the early decades of the XIXth century inspired much sympathy in the Anglo-Saxon world, and "Philhellenism" was widespread in those years. But Greece, and the rest of the Levant, were regarded mainly as a "mission field," and missionaries were sent there with the prospect of contributing to the revival and reformation of the Church of the country. This attitude could not fail to provoke resistance on the side of the Church and people, and a strong feeling against the "proselytism," which still colors the Greek reaction to all "ecumenical" ventures. The early decades of the Greek independence were marked by a strong conflict between the "liberal" (Westernizing) and "traditional" trends within the Church of Greece itself. See P. E. Shaw, "American Contact," and E. R. Hardy, Jr., "The Greek Mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church," 1828-1899, in the *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, September (1941), p. 183-201. Cf. also *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des gegenwärtigen Geistes und Zustandes der Griechischen Kirche in Griechenland und in der Turkei*, gesammelt von J. Wenger, Berlin (1839); some documents in translation in the Appendix. For general background J. N. Karmiris, *Orthodoxy and Protestantism* (in Greek), p. 277 ff. (Bibliography) and

Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *History of the Church of Greece* (in Greek), v. I, Athens (1920).

[16]Pusey, *A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, on Some Circumstances connected with the Present Crisis in the English Church*, Oxford (1842), p. 118; for background see Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, II, p. 272 ff.

[17]Shaw, *The Early Tractarians*, p. 119 ff.

[18]Palmer's *Notes*, p. 11 f. On Sibthorpes. R. D. Middleton, *Magdalen Studies*, S.P.C.K. London (1936). It is interesting to discover that the editors of *The Christian Remembrance* already in 1841 prefaced the sermon of Filaret in Moscow on Christmas day, which they published in translation, with a general note on the Greek Church of the following content. The Greek Church was at once better and worse than the Church of Rome: better as it was not formally committed to any objectionable doctrinal innovations, worse "as being more sunk in superstition and carnality," and therefore offering less hope "that it should be quickened anew unto spirituality." Such was "the general feeling of thoughtful Churchmen," it was stated, and the editors concluded: "we fear, however, that it has too much foundation in truth" (July, 1841, p. 51). E. D. Clarke, a renowned Cambridge scientist and traveller, who brought from the East the famous "Codex Clarkianus" of Plato, simply described ikons as idols: "the myriads of idol painting dispersed throughout the Empire . . . each of them will afford the reader a very accurate idea of a Russian Bogh." A plate appended to the text and representing several ikons was inscribed: "Barbarous Idols of the Greek Church in Russia." — *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Part the first: Russia, Tartary, and Turkey* (Cambridge, 1810), p. 25 and Plate opposite p. 26.

[19]Letter to Frederick Rogers (Lord Blachford), quoted by Maisie Ward, *Young Mr. Newman*, Sheed & Ward (New York, 1948), p. 379.

[20]See my book, *The Ways of Russian Theology*, ch. V, "The Struggle for Theology.".

[21]Louis Bouyer, *Newman: Sa Vie, Sa Spiritualité*. — Les Editions du Cerf (Paris, 1952), p. 315: "Vers les années 1845, il faut dire qu'il n'y avait plus de théologie catholique. Le foi du charbonnier, reposant sur des apologetiques delirants ou des systematisations fantaisistes, c'est presque tout ce qu'on peut trouver sous ce nom." Cf. R. Aubert, "Le Pontificat de Pie IX," in *Histoire de l'Église*, ed. by Fliche et Jarry, v. XXI, Bloud & Gay (Paris, 1952), ch. VIII, "Les sciences ecclésiastiques jusqu'au Concile de Vatican," p. 184 ff.

[22]J. M. Neale, *Life and Times of Patrick Torry, D.D.* (1856), p. 224 f.

[23]Palmer's *Notes of a Visit* (already quoted); *An Appeal to the Scottish Bishops and Clergy, and generally to the Church of their Communion* (Edinburgh, 1849); published without the name of the author; gives the full story of Palmer's negotiations in Russia up to the date of publication; Roundell Palmer, Earl of Selborne, *Memorials*, Part I, Family and Personal, 1766-1865, vols. 1 & 2 (London, 1896); Part II, Personal and Political, v. 1 (1898); by a brother of W. Palmer; *Russia and the English Church, etc.*, ed. by W. J. Birkbeck, London, 1895 (see below); Fr. Basile Fortunatov, "Reminiscences of W. Palmer," in *Doukhovnaia Beseda* (1867; in Russian); contains some unpublished letters by Palmer; A. Mouraviev, "Profession de foi de Palmer," in *Question religieuse d'Orient et d'Occident*, v. III (Paris); Frederick Meyrick, *Memories of Life at Oxford, and Experiences in Italy, Greece, Turkey, Germany, Spain and Elsewhere* (New York, 1905), p. 79 f. (M. went with Palmer to Greece); R. D. Middleton, *Magdalen Studies*, S.P.C.K. (1936), chap. on Palmer, pp. 99-114; cf. Shaw, *The Early Tractarians*, chap. on the Palmer Episode, pp. 150-176 (and bibiliography); Bolshakov, *op. cit.*, 77 ff. (incomplete); S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J., "Un épisode du mouvement d'Oxford: La mission de William Palmer," in *Études*, v. 136 (1913). It is very probable that a review of Mouraviev's *History of the Church of Russia*

(translated by Blackmore, Oxford, 1842) in *The Christian Remembrancer* (October, 1845), pp. 241-331, was by Palmer: the Nikon episode is singled out and discussed at great length. In any case, it could be written only by a person very well acquainted with the subject.

[24]First published only in 1864, in Russian, in *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie [The Orthodox Review]*, and again in the 2nd volume of Khomiakov's *Works* (Prague, 1867). English translation, by an unknown person (Brussels, 1864); another translation by W. J. Birkbeck, in his *Russia and the English Church*, ch. XXIII, p. 192 ff. New edition, S.P.C.K. (1948). Two German translations should be mentioned: by Baroness v. Rahden (Berlin, 1870), and in the anthology, *Östliches Christentum*, ed. by Hans Ehrenberg and N. v. Bubnoff, v. II (München, 1923).

[25]See Khomiakov: *L'Église Latine et Protestantisme au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient* (Lausanne et Vevey, 1872). Several articles; written in French by the author and published originally in various periodicals.

[26]Khomiakov's letters to Palmer were first published in Russian, in *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie* (1896), with notes by Fr. A. M. Ivantzov-Platonov. The full text in English in Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church* (London, 1895), and in Russian in the *Collected Works* of Khomiakov, v. II, 4th ed. (Moscow, 1900). His essay on the Church, "The Church Is One," first published in Russian in *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie* (1864), and again in the *Collected Works*, v. II (Prague, 1867). English translation in Birkbeck, ch. XXIII; an earlier translation by an unknown author (Brussels, 1864); there is a new edition of B.'s translation, S.P.C.K. (1948). Two German translations should be mentioned: by Baroness v. Rahden (Berlin, 1870), and in the anthology, "*Östliches Christentum*," ed. by Hans Ehrenberg und N. v. Bubnoff, v. II (München, 1923). Khomiakov's articles on the Western Communions, written in French and published in various periodicals, were republished under the title: *L'Église Latine et Protestantisme au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient* (Lausanne et Vevey, 1872). On Khomiakov, see the literature given in n. 24.

[27]"Letters" of the V. Rev. E. J. Popov on the Religious Movements in England are published by L. Brodsky in *Kristianskoe Chtenie [The Christian Lecture]*, 1904, April, May, June, and 1905, June, July, September (they cover the period from 1842 to 1862); cf. also "Materials concerning the question of the Anglican Church," consisting of notes and letters of Fr. Popov and Fr. Joseph Vassiliev, Russian Chaplain in Paris (1863-1865), in the same magazine, 1897, July and August. Fr. Popov was closely associated with J. M. Neale.

[28]The student was later Russian chaplain in Stuttgart, Fr. J. J. Bazarov; see his "Memoirs," in *Russkaia Starina [The Russian Old Age]* (1901), February, pp. 300-301.

[29]The story in the text is told on the basis of Fr. Eugene Popov's letters to the Chief Procurator, Count Pratasov, *Kristianskoe Chtenie* (1904), May and June. Several "Tracts on Christian Unity" seem to have been published in 1849, up to 1853; see also *Reunion with the Eastern Church: A Few Words in Defence of the Memorial addressed to the Russian Synod* (London, 1851); private edition; not available to the author.

[30]"The true basis of Re-Union," *Essays on the Reunion of Christendom*, by Members of the Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Anglican Communions, edited by the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L. (London, 1867), pp. 290-296. "The Editor was assisted by an Orthodox layman and an Eastern Ecclesiastic in preparing this statement for the press."

[31]Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, v. IV, p. 134, n. 3.

[32]See W. R. Churton, "The Rev. George Williams and his part in the Reunion Movement, in *Revue Internationale de Théologie* (1895), v. III, 3 and 4, pp. 538-552 and pp. 690-702. Williams' book appeared in 1868 (see above).

[33]John Octavius Johnson, *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon* (London, 1904), p. 100 f. To W. Bright he wrote about the services: "there was an aroma of the fourth century about the whole." The New Testament was widely circulated among the people. Liddon's interest in *rapprochment* was stimulated by his apprehension in view of an alarming growth of unbelief in Europe. It may be noted that Filaret in his talk with Liddon strongly criticized Newman's essay on "Development."

[34]See Bp. Eden's preface to the English translation of *Romanism in Russia*, by D. Tolstoy (London, 1874), v. I, p. viii-ix; also, R. Eden, *Impressions of a recent Visit to Russia, A Letter on Intercommunion with the Eastern Orthodox Church* (London, 1867).

[35]Dr. J. L. Ver Mehr, Rector of the first formally organized Episcopalian parish at San Francisco, Grace Church (1850-1853), relates in his *Autobiography* the following conversation with another Anglican minister in the area, the Rev. Flavel S. Mines: "'The Russo-Greek Church,' said he, 'is perhaps nearer to the true organization of the Catholic Church than any. How would it do to get Episcopacy from them?' . . . 'At any rate,' said I, 'we ought to call a convention of what there are of clergy and responsible laity in California and organize. We then may call a bishop, whether from the East or from the West'." Quoted in William Stevens Perry, Bishop of Iowa, *The History of the American Episcopal Church 1587-1883*, v. II (Boston, 1885), p. 314, n. 2. As Bishop W. I. Kip, the first bishop in California, stated, "the early founders of the Church on this coast had no idea of uniting with the General Church in the East." They wanted "the Church in California." A convention was held in 1850, and Bishop Horatio Southgate, early missionary in the Levant, was invited to become the bishop. He declined the offer, and not until 1853 was a missionary bishop appointed by the General Convention (to become a regular Diocesan in 1857). Quoted in Perry, pp. 314-315. Cf. *An Outline History of The Episcopal Church*, by the Rt. Rev. Frank E. Wilson, D.D., Bishop of Eau Claire, 1929-1944. Revised by the Rev. Edward R. Hardy, Jr., PH.D.; Morehouse-Gorham Co. (New York, 1949, p. 46).

[36]*Journal of the Procedings of the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the P.E.C. in the U.S.A.* (1862), p. 100 f., 161 f.

[37]See "Report of the Russo-Greek Committee" in the *Journal of the Proceedings in 1865* (Boston, 1865), Appendix D, pp. 325-342; cf. letters of Popov in *Kristianskoe Chtenie* (August, 1897).

[38]Russian material on this episode: letters of various persons to Filaret, in *Letters of the Clerical and Lay Persons to the Metropolitan Filaret of Moscow, 1812-1867*, ed. by A. N. Lvov (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 192 f., 342 f., 349 f., 623 f.; Filaret's *Memorandum* in the *Collection of Comments and Replies*, v. V, p. 537 ff.; his statement on Anglican Orders in *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie (The Orthodox Review)* (1866). See also *Journal of the Proceedings in 1865*, pp. 107, 117, 127, 203.

[39]Oxford edition of Pearson, 1797, is quoted in *The Christian Remembrancer*, p. 502: "Exposition of the Creed," Article VIII, note r, v. II, 407. In the Bohn's Library edition it is note I on p. 494 (actually on p. 495). In fact, Pearson felt that both sides in the controversy were guilty of intransigency: the addition was unlawful, but the doctrine was not heretical, as the Greeks contended.

[40]Pusey, *Eirenikon*, p. 248 ff. Cf. the unsigned review of *Eirenikon* in *The Christian Remembrancer* (January, 1866). The clause has been "insensibly and unintentionally" circulated in the whole of the Western Church. There is no real heresy in it. The English Church had nothing to do with the Great Schism of the East and West. The clause therefore should not be an impediment or obstacle for the restoration of intercommunion, which is the only real problem.

[41]*Journal*, 1868 (Hartford, 1869), pp. 148, 169, 256, 258 f., 276, 421 f., 484 f.

[42]*Journal*, 1871, Report of the Joint Committee, p. 564 ff. Cf. Karmiris, *Orthodoxy etc.*, p. 332 f. (references to the literature in Greek). The late Archbishop Germanos

regarded this action as "the first step towards the *rapprochment* of the Churches in a purely Ecclesiastical matter." — "Progress towards the Reunion of the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches," in *The Christian East*, v. X, No. 1 (1929), p. 23.

[43]"Abstract of a Conference" at Ely was appended to the report of the Russo-Greek Committee in 1871, *Journal*, 1871 (Hartford, 1872), p. 577 ff.; cf. p. 571 f. Report of Archbishop Lycurgos in Greek in the *Evangelikos Kyrux*, v. 2 (1870) and with English translation, separately (London, 1876); cf. review in the *Church Quarterly Review*, v. III, pp. 64-94; G. Williams, *A Collection of Documents relating Chiefly to the Visit of Alexander, Archbishop of Syros and Tenos to England in 1870* (London, 1876); Skene, *Life of Alexander Lycurgos* etc.; D. Balanos, "Archbishop A. Lykurgos," in *Theologia*, v. I (1923), pp. 180-194 (in Greek); cf. Karmiris, p. 337 f.

[44]*Journal*, 1871, pp. 197, 350 f., 335; Report of the Committee, p. 565 ff.

[45]*Journal*, 1874, Appendix X, p. 540 ff. Cf. reports of Bishop Bedell on his negotiations with the "Oriental Churches," printed for the Joint Committee, 1875-1879.

[46]Cf. Report of the Joint Committee, *Journal*, 1874, p. 548 ff.

[47]Baader's book reprinted in his *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by F. Hoffmann, Bd. X, s. 89-259. His other writings related to the same problem are collected in vols. V and X of the same edition. Important material is also scattered in his correspondence, partly in v. XVI of the *Sämtliche Werke*, but especially in the *Lettres inédits*, recently published by E. Susini, v. I (Paris, 1942); vols. II and III (Vienna, 1951); important notes and commentaries. Cf. Benz, *Die abendländische Sendung* (bibliography); Ernst Gaugler, *Franz von Baaders Kampf gegen die Alleinherrschaft des Papstes in der katholischen Kirche*, in I.K.Z. (1917), No. 3.

[48]Dr. W. Guettée, *Souvenirs d'un prêtre romain devenu prêter orthodoxe* (Paris, 1889); cf. Meyrick, *Memories*, pp. 181-182; Vassiliev, *Letters from Paris* (1846-1867), ed. by A. I. Brodsky (Petrograd, 1915; in Russian); S. Soushkov, "Obituary of Guettée," *Tserkovny Vestnik, (The Ecclesiastical Messenger)* (1890), Nr. 22 and 23. Vassiliev's *Open Letter to the Bishop of Nantes* and the following discussion — two pamphlets in French (Paris, 1861); also his "Open Letter to Guizot." Cf. A. Kireev, "Der Oberpriester Joseph Wassilieff," in *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, IV, 4 (1896); also some excerpts from his "Correspondence with Bp. Jacqmet" and a brief note by Michaud. See also Jean-Remy Palanque, *Catholiques liberaux et Gallicans en France face au Concile du Vatican* (Aix-en-Provence, 1962); and Raoul Dederen, *Un reformateur catholique au XIXe siècle, Eugéne Michaud, 1839-1917* (Geneva, 1963).

[49]Overbeck's "Obituary," by Fr. E. Smirnov, in *Tserkovnye Vedomosti* (1905), No. 50 (in Russian); some additional biographical data were communicated by Canon Edward Every, Jerusalem, who had at his disposal the unpublished correspondence of Overbeck with various persons. The more important writings of Overbeck (his articles in *The Orthodox Catholic Review* not included) are as follows: *Die Orthodoxe Katholische Anschauung im Gegensatz zum Papstthum und Jesuitismus, sowie zum Protestantismus* (Halle, 1865); *Die Providentielle Stellung des Orthodoxen Russland und sein Beruf zur Wiederherstellung der Rechtsgläubigen Katholischen Kirche des Abendlandes* (Halle, 1869); *Die Rechtgläubige Katholische Kirche. Ein Protest gegen die päpstliche Kirche und eine Aufforderung zur Grundung katholischer Nationalkirchen* (Halle, 1869); *Die einzig sichere Ausweg für die liberalien Mitglieder der Römisch-katholischen Kirche* (Halle, 1870); *Die Wiedervereinigung der Morgenländischen und Abendländischen Kirchen* (Halle, 1873); *Die Bonner Unions-Conferenzen* (Halle, 1876); in English: *Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism, A word about Intercommunion between the English and Orthodox Churches* (London, 1866); *The Bonn Conference* 1873 and 1876. Anglican objections — in the report of the Russo-Greek Committee, *Journal*

(1874), p. 553 ff. The text of the Patriarchal prohibition is given in full (in translation, the Greek text in the "Neologos"). The basic biography of Overbeck is by Wilhelm Kahle, *Westliche Orthodoxie. Leben und Ziele Julian Joseph Overbecks* (Leiden-Köln, 1968).

[50]Brief survey and analysis: Dr. Steinwachs, "Die Unionsbestrebungen im Altkatholizismus," in the *International Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1911), Hf. 2 and 4. For the early period of the Movement one should consult the minutes ("Verhandlungen") of the Congresses and information in the *Deutscher Merkur. Bericht über die Unions-Konferenzen* 1874 and 1875, ed. by Dr. H. Reusch (Bonn, 1874, 1875); English translations — *Reunion Conference at Bonn*, 1874, Rivingtons (London, 1874); *Report of the Union Conferences*, translated by The Rev. S. Buel, with a Preface by The Rev. R. J. Nevin (New York, 1876). "Theses" of Bonn repeated in the Appendix to the *Report of the Doctrinal Commission* (appointed by the Lambeth Conference of 1930), 1930. Cf. an unsigned article "The Reunion Conferences at Bonn," in the *Church Quarterly Review*, v. I (1875-76), pp. 383-407; "The Filioque Controversy and the Easterns," *ibid.*, v. III (1877-78), pp. 421-465 (in connection with the books by Pusey and Swete). There was a French edition of the *Process-Verbaux* of the meetings of the Russian Society of Friends, etc. ("Societé des Amis de l'instruction religieuse"), several issues (Brusells, 1872 ff). Important information is to be found in Meyrick's *Memories of Life*, p. 259 ff. Meyrick was deeply impressed by the Russian delegates at Bonn: astonishing command of languages and a surprising erudition, equal to that of Döllinger. Cf. *Correspondence between Members of the Anglo-Continental Society and (1) Old Catholics, (2) Oriental Churchmen*, ed. by the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, Rivingtons (London, 1874). Cf. reports to the Synod of Athens by Professor Rhossis (1876) and Professor Damalas (1875) — in Greek. On Pusey's position see Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, v. IV, p. 292 ff. Pusey contended that the *Filioque* could be found in Epiphanius and St. Cyril of Alexandria; see in the Preface the *Commentary of the Gospel according to St. John* by St. Cyril (in the *Library of the Fathers*), edited by Philip E. Pusey — a large part of it written by E. B. Pusey (Liddon, p. 432). Cf. E. Michaud, "L'état de la question du Filioque après la Conference de Bonn de 1875," in *Revue International*, III, 1 (1895); Kireev and Meyrick, *ibid.*; Kireev, "Erklarungen von Professor Ossinin in München und Bonn" (1871 und 1875), *ibid.*, IV, 2 (1896), pp. 489-501; J. Ossinin, *An Eastern View of the Second Conference at Bonn*, English translation (Boston, 1876); "Briefe von Döllinger, Reinkens, Weber, v. Schulte and General Kirejew," ed. by D. N. Jakschitsch, in *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, XIX, 1 a. 2 (1929). "Quelques lettres du General Kireev au Professeur Michaud sur l'Ancien-Catholicisme" (1893); cf. J. H. Morgan, "Early Orthodox—Old Catholic Relations," General Kireev and Professor Michaud, in *Church Quarterly Review*, (1951). See an interesting open letter by Ivan Aksakov to Döllinger in the very beginning of the Old Catholic Movement — "Brief an Döllinger von Einem Laien der Russischen Orthodox Kirche aus Moskau" (Berlin, 1872), p. 39: it is not enough to denounce the Vatican Council, as innovations do not begin only in 1870 — the "*Filioque*," Tridentinum; is a Catholic remnant possible, as an ecclesiological formation?

[51]Brief survey in the article of Steinwachs (see n. 50). One can follow the course of negotiations and discussions in the articles and chronicle of the *Revue Internationale* (1893-1910) and *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (since 1911). Summary of Kerensky by Kireev, R.I.Th., III (1895), 2. Bishop Sergius, "Qu'est-ce qui nous separé des anciens-catholiques," *ibid.*, XII, 1 (1904), pp. 159-190. Extracts from the articles by Svetlov: "Zur Frage der Wiedervereinigung der Kirchen und zur Lehre von der Kirche," *ibid.*, XIII, 2 a. 3 (1905); cf. his Russian book, *The Christian Doctrine*, v. I, Kiev (1910), p. 208 ff. "Theses" of Bolotov (unsigned) — R.I.Th., VI, 4 (1898), pp. 681-712 (Russian text — from the manuscript — in *Khristianskoe Chtenie* (1913, May); cf. A. I. Brilliantov, "Bolotov's Works concerning the Question of the Filioque and Polemics against his 'Theses' in

Russian literature,"*ibid.* (April). On Kireev: Olga Novikoff, *Le General Alexandre Kireev et l'ancien-catholicisme* (Bern 1911). "Materials on the History of the Old Catholic Problem in Russia" (Letters of Janyshev to Kireev and of Kireev to Archbishop Nikolai — one time in America — with notes by Professor J. P. Sokolov), in *Khristianskoe Chtenie* (1911, May, June, and November). Bibliographical survey of the literature on Old Catholicism in Russian in an article by A. Triumphov, in *Strannik [The Pilgrim]* (1913, July-August). See an interesting letter of Professor Kyriakos to Michaud, in R.I.Th., XIII, 4 (1905), in which he describes the situation in Greece and states his own point of view: "selon moi, vous n'avez pas besoin d'être reconnus comme Église Orthodoxe par aucune autre Église: vous êtes orthodoxes *ipso facto*." He adds that the same will be true of the Anglican Church, when it repudiates the Articles (p. 720). But the majority were of another opinion, as was Patriarch Joachim III. An earlier Encyclical by Patriarch Anthimos in translation in R.I.Th., IV, 1 (1896); cf. the letter of the Patriarch to Professor Michaud, *ibid.*, IV, 2. Cf. on Janyshev and his participation in the conversations with Old Catholics the article by Professor J. P. Sokolov, in *Khristianskoe Chtenie* (1911, February).

[52]Resolution and relevant passages from the Lambeth reports collected in *The Christian East*, XI, 2 (Summer 1930). "Previous Lambeth Conferences and the Orthodox East," pp. 73-76 (based on *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, London, S.P.CK.).

[53]The whole story is told by W. J. Birkbeck: *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*, Containing Essays and Articles by the late W. J. Birkbeck, collected and edited by Athelstan Riley (London & New York, 1917), Chapter I; cf. also *Life and Letters of W. J. Birkbeck*, by his wife, with a preface by Viscount Halifax (Longmans, 1922); cf. *The Life of Edward White Benson, Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury*, by his son, A. C. Benson of Eton College, v. II (London, 1899), p. 155 ff. (based on information supplied by Mr. Riley).

[54]See *Birkbeck and the Russian Church* for facts. Cf. *Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton*, D.D., Oxon. and Cam., *Sometime Bishop of London*, by his wife, 2 vols. (London, 1905). In English: *One Chapter from an Enquiry into the Hierarchy of the Anglican Episcopal Church*, by Sokolov (The Church Printing Co., London); *The Question of Anglican Orders, in Respect of the "Vindication" of the Papal Decision* by A. Bulgakoff, Church Historical Society, S.P.C.K. (London, 1899; translated by Birkbeck).

[55]*Previous Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 76-79.

[56]*Life of Bishop John Wordsworth*, by E. W. Watson (Longmans, 1915), pp. 217 ff., 339 ff. On his return to England, Bp. Wordsworth delivered a lecture at the summer school of Clergy at Oxford, 27 July 1898, which was then published: "The Church of England and the Eastern Patriachates" (Oxford, Parker, 1898), p. 38.

[57]The Russian Synodal "Epistle" was first published in English translation in *The Guardian*, 28 August and 2 September 1903, and is reprinted in *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*, ch. XX, pp. 247-257; Birkbeck's comments in the following chapter, 258 ff.

[58]J. A. Douglas, *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox, Especially in regard to Anglican Orders* (London, 1921), p. 17.

[59]Douglas, p. 66 f. The recent summary of the doctrine of "Economy" is by Professor H. S. Alivisators: *Economy according to the Canon Law of the Orthodox Church* (Athens, 1949; in Greek); some "extracts" from this book in Engish in *Dispensation in Practice and Theory*. S.P.C.K. (1944), p. 27 ff. More comprehensive is the monograph by Jeronymus I. Kotsonis (one time Archbishop of Athens), *The Problem of "Ecclesiastical Economia"* (Athens, 1957; in Greek; a French translation exists).

[60]Douglas, pp. 16-17.

[61]Quoted in *Revue Internationale*, X, 2 (1902); *The Guardian* (November 16, 1904).

[62]*Previous Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 79-81.

[63]*The Works of Rt. Rev. Charles C. Grafton*, ed. by B. Talbot Rogers (Longmans, 1914): v. VI, "Fond du Lac Tracts," VI, "The Reunion of Orthodox and Anglican Churches," p. 326 ff.; v. IV, "A Journey Godward" (a kind of autobiography), on Pusey, etc., p. 407 ff.; on the Russian visit, 252 ff; letters to Metropolitan Anthony, 259-270. Cf. B. Talbot Rogers, "Bishop Grafton and the Eastern Orthodox Church," in *Int. Kirchl. Zeitschrift* (1916), 3, and note by R. K. (Keussen) in the same issue, pp. 350-351.

[64]The "Report" was published in the *Alcuin Club Tracts*, by W. J. Barnes and W. H. Frere, with valuable notes by the latter (Mowbray's, 1917), and once more in *The Orthodox Catholic Review*, v. I, Nr. 6 (June, 1927, Brooklyn, N.Y.).

[65]A. C. Headlam, *Teaching of the Russian Church*, Rivingstons (London, 1897); "Eastern Church Assocation," *Annual Reports*, 1893-1910; *Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Union*, Reports of 1906-1914, Berryman (London); *American Branch*, Reports, 1908-1914 (The Kane Press, New York); *Society of the Friends of Reunion between the Eastern Orthodox and Anglican Churches*. Materials and Reports, 1906-1910 (St. Petersburg, 1912; in Russian). See also Karmiris, 344 ff. On Birkbeck see the "Obituary" by Professor Glubokovsky in *The Constructive Review*, V, 3 (1917), pp. 568-592. In an earlier issue of the same magazine there was an instructive article by Archbishop Platon, of North America, "Admitting All Impossibilities, Nevertheless Unity is Possible," I, 3 (September, 1913).

[66]*The Anglican and Eastern Churches. A Historical Record, 1914-1921* (London, S.P.C.K., 1921), esp. p. 27 ff., including a survey by Dr. S. Runkevitch: "The Russian Church in the Years 1915-1918"; Resolution of the Council, pp. 43-44. Cf. excerpts from letters by Fr. Puller, in the *Report* of the A.E.O.C.U., American Branch (1912), pp. 63-67. In connection with the conversations at St. Petersburg in 1912, see an article on the Anglican Ordinations by Professor I. P. Sokolov, in *Khristanskoe Chtenie* (February, 1913).

[67]"Correspondence of Archbishop Anthony with the Representatives of the Episcopal Church in America," in *Vera i Razum* [*Faith and Reason*] (1915 and 1916, in Russian translation from the French; Original letters are not among the papers of Gardiner, kept now in General Theological Seminary, New York). Cf. R. Gardiner, "Les Églises orientales et la *World Conference*," *Int. Kirchl. Zeitschrift* (1919), 3, pp. 234-253; Archimandrite Hiïarion, "The Unity of the Church etc.," in *Bogoslovsky Vestnik* [*The Theological Messenger*] (January, 1917), pp. 3-60. Cf. S. Troitsky, "The World Conference on Faith and Order," in *Tserkovnyie Vedomosti* (1915), Nr. 14 and 15 (a letter of Gardiner to the author is given here in Russian translation — from French).

[68]Soloviev: *La Russie et l'Église Universelle* (Paris, A. Savine, 1889); English translation, *Russia and the Universal Church* (London, Centenary Press, 1948); the book was originally written in French. No less important are various writings of Soloviev in the eighties, especially the Preface to *The History and the Future of Theocracy*, dealing with the idea of "Dogmatic development" (In his *Complete Works* — in Russian — vols. III and IV). Cf. *Monarchia Sancti Petri. Die Kirchliche Monarchie des heiligen Petrus als freie und universelle Theokratie im Lichte der Weisheit. Aus den Hauptwerken von Wladimir Solojew, systematisch gesammelt, übersetzt und erklärt von L. Kobilinski-Ellis* (Mainz-Wiesbaden, 1929); also Bernhard Schultze, *Russische Denker* (Herder: Wien, 1950). On Soloviev: D. Stremooukhoff, "Vladimir Soloviev et son Oeuvre Messianique" (Paris, 1935); *Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strassbourg*, Fasc. 69, with an abundant bibiliography [English translation by Büchervertriebsanstalt]; Ludolf Muller, *Solovjev und der Protestantismus* (Herder, Freiburg, 1951), with a "Nachwort" by Dr. Wl. Szylkarski, from a Roman Catholic point of view; cf.

Muller's *Offener Brief an Herrn Szylkarski, als Erwiderung auf sein Nachwort zu meinem Buche* (Mimeogramm).

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX IN NORTH AMERICA

The Orthodox Church in North America began as a mission in evangelism.

Alaska and the Aleutian Islands were formally annexed to the Russian Empire in 1766. In 1793, at the request of Russian traders and settlers in those parts, the Russian Holy Synod sent a regular mission, composed of monks of the famous Valaamo Monastery, on Lake Ladoga, to evangelize the natives in those remote Russian possessions.

The first Orthodox Church, consecrated in the name of the Holy Resurrection, was erected in 1794, on Kodiak Island in the Aleutians. The mission was very active and successful, and about 12,000 natives were converted and baptized during the first two years. In 1799 the first missionary bishop was consecrated for Alaska. Unfortunately, he never reached Alaskan shores, as the vessel on which he was crossing from Siberia was lost in a stormy sea. In the meantime, the administration of the Aleutian Islands and Alaska was transferred to the newly formed "Russian-American Company," and the new regime of colonial exploitation was not favorable to missionary endeavor.

The greatest missionary of this early period was Father Herman, whose life exemplified the highest forms of Christian charity and devotion. He himself lived in a sylvan retreat on Spruce Island, just opposite Kodiak, but he was earnestly concerned with the spiritual needs of the native Christians. He taught them the Holy Scriptures and helped them in many ways.

The new period in the life of the Alaskan Mission began in 1824 with the arrival of an outstanding missionary leader, Father John Veniaminov (1797-1879), then a parish priest in Irkutsk. He was a missionary by vocation, with deep devotional insight, wide vision, unfailing energy, and a true evangelistic devotion, never deterred from service to his flock by any hardships or tensions. In addition, he was a gifted linguist. He learned local dialects, of which he composed first grammars, and started translations of both the New Testament and the basic liturgical books into the dialects of the natives. It was in the Aleutians that he composed his catechism, "An Indication of the Way to the Kingdom of Heaven."

In 1840 Father Veniaminov was appointed as a diocesan bishop to Alaska and after his monastic profession, was renamed Innokentii of Irkutsk. Under his administration the mission was reorganized into a regular diocese, which also included Kamchatka. A missionary seminary was established in Sitka to train native candidates for ministry in their own country, and a great number of churches and chapels were built in this vast area.

Bishop Innokentii was never interested in numbers or in any other spectacular effects, but solely in evangelism and solid instruction of the

neophytes. Unfortunately, after a few years the diocesan residence was transferred to Kamchatka and a suffragan bishop sent to Alaska. Bishop Innokentii was later made Archbishop of Irkutsk and finally, in 1867, Metropolitan of Moscow. He always remained deeply interested in missionary work, and became the first president of the Imperial Missionary Society. The missionary work so gloriously started in Alaska was reduced considerably after Alaska and the Aleutians were sold to the United States in 1867. The rights and privileges of the Orthodox Church were duly recognized in the bill of sale, and the missionary work continued and continues up to now. But the original impetus was lost and never recovered.

In 1872 the episcopal see was moved from Sitka to San Francisco. At that time there was already a considerable number of Orthodox emigrants on American territory, mainly in California. The number of emigrants from different Orthodox countries, chiefly the Slavic ones, steadily increased between 1870 and 1900.

One of the most important features of the history of the Orthodox Church in America was the reconversion of Slavic Uniats to the Orthodox faith. A large number of Uniats (Catholics of the Eastern Rite, under Roman obedience) came to America from Austria-Hungary. They settled chiefly in Pennsylvania, mostly in the mining districts of that state but also in the seaboard industrial centers. They were put under the jurisdiction of the local Roman Catholic bishops, who were of the Latin rite and had little understanding of the particular privileges of the Eastern-Rite Uniats. Tensions with the Latin hierarchy increased, and a large proportion of the Uniat parishes finally went back to the Orthodox Church. The first Uniat parish which left Rome was that of Minneapolis, Minnesota in 1891. This process still continues. Thus, many Russian parishes in the United States and Canada have a Uniat background. A large proportion of the Russian Orthodox believers in America are emigrants, not from Imperial Russia but from the Slavic provinces of the former Austrian Empire, especially Galicia and Carpathian Russia.

In the seventies there were but scattered groups of the Orthodox in America. An attempt to start an Orthodox parish in New York City at that time had but little success, and the parish was discontinued after a few years as the number of Orthodox was small and unstable. The first Russian parish in New York City was established in 1870, and the first rector was Father Nicholas Bjerring, a converted Roman Catholic priest, former professor at one of the Catholic seminaries in Maryland. He conducted services in both Slavonic and English, and while occupying this position made a number of translations of liturgical books. He started the first Orthodox periodical in English. *The Oriental Church Magazine*, but its circulation does not seem to have been considerable at any time, and it did not last long.

In the nineties the situation was radically changed. It is significant that systematic translations of all the basic liturgical books of the

Orthodox Church appeared at that time. Nicholas Orlov, professor of Russian at King's College, London, at the suggestion of Bishop Nicholas (Zirov) of North America and with the approval of his successor, Bishop Tikhon, the future Patriarch of Russia, was the translator. As the center of the Orthodox population shifted to the East, the residence of the bishop was transferred in 1905 to New York, where a new cathedral was erected. Under the administration of Bishop Tikhon (1898-1907), the Church grew steadily. A missionary school was opened in Minneapolis in 1898, and in 1905 it was reorganized into a regular seminary, in accordance with the Russian pattern, with a somewhat simplified curriculum. A monastery was founded at South Canaan, Pennsylvania, in 1906 and dedicated to St. Tikhon of Zadonsk, one of the greatest Russian saints of modern times. The missionary work in Alaska was resumed and greatly expanded. This normal growth of the Orthodox Church in America was gravely affected by the Russian Revolution.

Up to the Russian Revolution there was but one canonically organized Orthodox Church in North America, the Russian Archdiocese, a direct continuation of the early mission. The Archbishop was appointed by the Holy Synod of the Russian Church in St. Petersburg. But the constituency of the Church was multi-national and therefore also multi-lingual. The nunber of Greek-speaking parishes was in the beginning comparatively small, but there were many Serbian and Syrian communities (Arabic-speaking, from Syria, Lebanon, and elsewhere).

The first Greek Church in the United States was the Holy Trinity Church at New Orleans, Louisiana, consecrated in 1860. Greek emigration to America rapidly increased in the first decades of this century. Under the administration of Archbishop Tikhon, Syrian Orthodox parishes were organized into a special unit, and a special bishop was put in charge as a suffragan to the ruling Archbishop, but with wider rights over his flock. The problem was more general, however, and in 1906 Archbishop Tikhon submitted a comprehensive plan of reorganization. The diocese of North America had to be transformed, he felt, into an Exarchate with a special constitution and a certain autonomy. The plan implied the formation of several national bishoprics (Alaskan, Syrian, Serbian, and Greek) under the presidency of the Russian Archbishop. This plan was never formally discussed, but was highly symptomatic and significant as a frank acknowledgment of the intrinsic problem.

It was not without difficulties and tensions that the present independent national Orthodox churches in North America were canonically established. All of them remain in canonical obedience to the churches in the "old countries," with the notable exception of the Russian Church in North America, which is not under the administrative authority of the Moscow Patriarchate, at least *de facto*, owing not only to the intricate general situation, which compelled it for

more than two decades to function autonomously and makes administrative subordination to the authorities in the Soviet Union inadvisable, but also to the increasing "Americanization" of the oldest Orthodox Church on the American continent.

The first effort to organize the Greek churches in America into a special diocese was made in 1918 by Bishop Alexander of Rodostolos, sent for this purpose by the Synod of Greece. The Ecumenical Patriarchate, however, claimed jurisdiction over the whole Diaspora; that is, all Greek communities outside of Orthodox countries, and accordingly a Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America was canonically established by the action of the Ecumenical Patriarch and his Synod in 1922. The real founder of the Hellenic Church in America was Archbishop Athenagoras, who was the Ecumenical Patriarch since 1950. Under his wise and creative administration the Greek Church was fully organized, new communities established, and many churches built. A theological seminary was first established at Pomfret, Connecticut, later transferred to Brookline, Massachusetts, and greatly expanded. An "Academy of St. Basil" was established at Garrison, New York, as a school for girls. The present Archbishop of the Greek Church is continuing the work initiated by his predecessors with great energy and consecration. Biennial Conventions of the Greek Church, which are held in various local centers and in which all clergy and the lay representatives participate, are a mighty instrument of consolidating, expanding and deepening the unity of the Church.

The Syrian Orthodox (Antiochian) Archdiocese was formally created in 1930. With the encouragement of Archbishop Antony Bashir, the Syrian Church in America makes a valiant effort to combine old traditions with the requirements of the new situation. Arabic is kept as the language of worship, but English is extensively used also to meet the needs of the younger generation in the Church, which is more adjusted to the American conditions of life than to those in the "old country." English translations of the liturgical books are sponsored by the Syrian Archdiocese which, under the guidance of Archbishop Antony, developes extensive publishing activity.

The Serbian diocese in America was formally established in 1920, and the first bishop appointed in 1926. The administrative center of this diocese is at St. Sava's Monastery, Libertyville, Illinois. A Roumanian Episcopate was organized at approximately the same time, and a Bulgarian one a bit later. To this list of National Churches one should add Albanian communities and several Ukrainian ones. Thus at present the Orthodox Church in America exists as a group of several national organizations, each of them pursuing its separate way.

It is difficult to accurately estimate the actual size of the Orthodox Church in North America and all its national branches. Various figures are given, and on the whole the total membership exceeds two million believers. The Greek Archdiocese administers 348 regular parishes, the Russian Metropolitan District numbers over 300 parishes in the United

States and Canada, to which 12 parishes in Latin America should be added. The other branches are smaller, but there are obvious signs of growth and expansion.

The most significant new factor in the situation is the increasing proportion of American-born members of various churches, who inevitably take more part in the life of the country to which they belong by birth and in which they receive education and intend to work and serve. While retaining its distinctive features and *ethos*, the Orthodox Church in America is becoming increasingly integrated into the total stream and structure of American life.

One important phenomenon is the growth of lay organizations, which are not quite accurately described as "youth" movements because their upper age-limit is rather indefinite. The oldest is the Federated Russian Orthodox Clubs (F.R.O.C.), with chapters over the whole territory of the U.S. and an extensive program of cultural and philanthropic work. The Greek Orthodox Youth of America (G.O.Y.A.) is a very vigorous and steadily growing organization with an extensive program. The same is true of the Syrian organization (S.O.Y.A.) and of several others.

The number of students in colleges and universities who belong to the Orthodox Church is also growing, and this leads to the formation of special Orthodox "Clubs" or fellowships on many campuses.

It should be added that several of the Orthodox Churches in America participated in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the following five are now members of the National Council: the Greek, the Roumanian, the Russian, the Syrian Antiochian, and the Ukrainian. (There is one Orthodox among the Vice-Presidents at large.) Several of them also take part in the World Council of Churches.

PART THREE: TWENTIETH CENTURY ECUMENISM

MY PERSONAL PARTICIPATION IN THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

In 1926 the late Nikolai Berdiaev invited me to join in the ecumenical conversations he started at that time in Paris. The group included representatives of several Churches: Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Protestant. Various basic questions, mainly of a theological and philosophical nature, were taken up and discussed. Discussion was usually on a high level. The most active participants in the discussion were Jacques Maritain, Gabriel Marcel, Marc Boegner, Winifred Monod, and Sergei Bulgakov, to name but a few. Occasionally Père Lebreton, Étienne Gilson, and Edouard Leroy would also take part in the conversation. It was at once an encounter and a confrontation. The confrontation was often rather sharp and heated, but always in the spirit of mutual respect and confidence. It was my first ecumenical experience. These meetings taught me to appreciate the value and the potential of ecumenical dialogue, across the boundaries of denominational and cultural commitments. These meetings continued for two years. Then a smaller group, consisting only of Catholics and Orthodox, continued to meet privately at the home of Berdiaev for some years.

My second ecumenical experience was of a different character. It was connected with the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius in England. The Fellowship began in the late 20's as a small and informal group under the auspicies of the British Student Christian Movement. It consisted mainly of students in universities and theological colleges, with a number of senior advisers, of whom the most outstanding in the early period were Bishops Charles Bore and Walter Frere of the Church of England and Father Sergei Bulgakov of the Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris. The first aim and purpose of the organization was to bring together younger members of the two Churches, Anglican and Orthodox, for mutual acquaintance and joint discussion of various problems of common concern. A number of members of other Churches were in attendance from the very beginning. Over the course of time it became customary to have some Roman Catholic guests present, among them such as the two Benedictines, Dom Bede Winslow of St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate and Dom Clement Lialine of Amay and Chevetogne in Belgium. Special emphasis was placed on the exchange of devotional experiences. Participation in the work of the Fellowship provided ample opportunity to observe the life of the Anglican Communion, both on the parish level and on the level of theological research and training. It was again a kind of dialogue and confrontation, informal and unofficial, an exchange of views and problems, a sharing of experiences.

Both of these early ecumenical involvements of mine were of informal character. By the nature of the circumstances there was no room for making decisions. It was a great advantage that the dialogue could be free and intimate, that one could be sincere and outspoken. We could meet each other in complete Christian freedom. This did not exclude controversy, but even the controversy was dominated by the conviction that "divided Christians" still do "belong together" and dwell under the mighty challenge of the call to unity. This dialogue has helped me to discover both the common ground of the universal Christian commitment and the depth of the actual estrangement and tension. It was at this point that I became inwardly compelled to develop a sense of "ecumenical patience."

In 1937 for the first time I had occasion to participate in a larger and more official ecumenical gathering — the Second World Conference on Faith and Order in Edinburgh. It was still primarily a dialogue and a confrontation of different traditions and communions in the search for agreement and disagreement, but this time on a wider, more comprehensive and semi-official scale. The participants were delegates of their respective Churches, though without any authority to make decisions. Crucial questions were raised in the discussion, including the problem of ministry and sacraments. Precisely at this point the ultimate divergence was disclosed, and it inevitably had to be openly admitted that there was no chance of agreement. In my opinion, this was the greatest positive achievement of the Edinburgh Conference. The whole ecumenical problem appeared in its complexity and paradoxical tension: the strong urge for Christian unity and the impasse of factual diversity and divergence.

It was at that time that I was called to participate closely in ecumenical work at the top level as a member of the small Committee of Fourteen, which had been set with the task of preparing the foundation of the World Council of Churches. This Committee was then enlarged and became the "Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches in the process of formation." It continued its work until the First Assembly of the Council in Amsterdam in 1948, when the Council was officially inaugurated. For the long period up to the Third Assembly of the World Council in New Delhi in 1961, I was deeply involved in various forms of ecumenical activity — in study groups, in editorial committees, at the Ecumenical Institute, and indeed in large gatherings such as Assemblies (in Amsterdam, Evanston, New Delhi) and World Conferences on Faith and Order (in Lund and Montreal). It was an enriching and welcome experience. My personal concern, however, was always with dialogue and confrontation. The theological discussion was properly focused on the process of ecumenical cooperation, new vistas have been discovered and new awareness acquired. But the crucial problem remains the same. The ultimate goal of the ecumenical endeavor has been more accurately formulated or articulated, the basic difficulties have been more

courageously ascertained and acknowledged. And this is indeed a major achievement. On the other hand, it was becoming increasingly evident that in "divided Christendom" there was actually no real agreement concerning the basic issue — the very "nature" or true character of the unity which Christians are bound and called to seek. It may be contended that "divided Christians" are not yet ready for true unity, and probably are not willing or prepared to proceed. It may be suggested that the historic "Ecumenical Movement," as it had been promoted first by the endeavors of "Faith and Order" and "Life and Work" and then institutionalized in the World Council of Churches, had reached its critical peak or climax.

The task is of enormous complexity, although the promise is still great. Disagreements are manifold, inveterate, radical. And there is no room for compromise. This must be faced frankly and courageously, without reticence or evasion, but rather with confidence and trust. The actual division is profound. Short cuts and easy ways must be avoided. One must be bold enough to meet the challenge of the Christian tragedy. The inner challenge, growing up among the various constituents of the World Council, in which the Protestants and the Orthodox are paradoxically joined in a common endeavor and search, has been increased by the growing impact of the "ecumenical awakening" in the Roman Catholic Church. The perspectives of ecumenical endeavor are drastically widened. One may react to this impact of "Roman Ecumenism" in various ways: with hope, with indifference, with suspicion, with apprehension, with fear. But it is difficult to ignore the challenge. The very concept of "Ecumenism" changes its character and scope.

It is still possible to evade the challenge or to postpone the crisis. It is possible to reduce "Christian unity" to the dimensions of "cooperation" in practical matters. In Stockholm in 1925 it was declared that "doctrine divides and service unites." Indeed, cooperation and solidarity in practical matters is in a sense also a contribution to Christian unity, if only to a certain extent and only in the case when the secondary or subsidiary character of such a contribution is honestly acknowledged. In fact, this "cooperation" may easily become an impediment, an obstacle or an evasive substitute for the true search for unity. The root of disunity is much deeper than historical estrangement or mutual isolation. It is of a religious and doctrinal character. Effective cooperation of "divided Christians" on social issues or in the field of "international affairs," without any deeper urge for ultimate "union" in One Church, can but obscure or even distort the vision of true "Christian Unity," which is unity in faith and order, the unity of the Church and in the Church.

One of my basic convictions, which gradually grew out of my ecumenical experience and committed meditation on all the issues involved, is that the "*Ecumenism in space*" which has been practiced in the current endeavors is insufficient and should be supplemented by

what I came to describe as "*Ecumenism in time.*" The ecumenical experience itself has shown that encounter or confrontation of the divided Christian groups or communions, in their present state and form, cannot break through the deadlock of denominational diversity and of all sorts of isolationist prejudices unless the perspective is enlarged to include the whole scope of the Christian historical tradition. In fact, "modern" Christians have become so excessively "over-modernized" in their attitudes and orientation as to lose access to the very foundations of Christian faith and reality which came to seem "archaic" to them. One has to recover the true historical perspective, not to be paralyzingly imprisoned in detached "modernity." In any case, the major task of Christians in their existential situation today is still in the field of theology, of "faith and order," not in the "practical field and probably not even in the "pastoral" field, if pastoral concerns are detached from or even opposed to theology. The only effective way of ecumenical "action" today is still the way of theological study, dialogue, confrontation. It is, of course, not a smooth way. Indeed, it is a stony way, strewn with terrible stumbling blocks, which for centuries accumulated in the period when "unhappy divisions" had full sway. In my opinion, it is the right way precisely because it is so arduous. The task is to remove the stumbling blocks, not just to ignore or evade them.

Moreover, is it not obvious that a great change has taken place in recent years in the ecumenical situation, that a very real change has been brought about precisely by the devout work of dedicated theologians? The new, more adequate and more existential understanding of the Word of God, of the Holy Scripture, is the fruit of devout biblical scholarship. Church historians, in spite of their continuing disagreement on many crucial points of interpretation, have drawn for us a new picture of the "*common* history" of "*divided* Christendom." Patristic scholars have demostrated the perennial value of the ancient Tradition, which is existentially valid and challenging no less now than in the past. Liturgiologists have quickened the understanding of devotional values, and even the historical soundings in this field have enriched the inner life of contemporary worshippers and believers. In brief, if we now find ourselves in a changed and renewed world, as we actually do, and are better equipped for grasping ecumenical problems, it is due chiefly to the indefatigable labor of those who concentrated their efforts in the field of theological research and meditation. Moreover, fruitful ecumenical cooperation had been achieved now primarily in the field of theological research, not only in the areas of technical studies, but also in the areas of intensive doctrinal interpretation. A truly ecumencial dialogue is going on with unusual impetus and energy. Indeed, one must be cautious in the evaluation of the immediate impact of this work on the total situation in the churches. The average churchman, in all denominations, is still hardly aware of either ecumenical problems or ecumenical progress. Again, the very growth

and partial success of ecumenical comprehensiveness inevitably produces counteraction and the increase of denominational rigidity in various circles. In many quarters there is a tendency to eliminate, at least in practice, the Eastern Orthodox from the ecumenical dialogue and to reduce this to a "Catholic-Protestant encounter" under various pretexts. On the other hand, there is obvious anxiety in some quarters about Roman Catholic participation in the ecumenical dialogue. And the majority is probably simply indifferent to the ecumencial issue, in all its forms.

Personally, I am not looking forward to any spectacular events in the ecumenical field in the near future. Nor am I interested in the official negotiations concerning unity or reunion. There is much work to be done on a more intimate level and in an informal way. And this work must be done. There is urgency and there is promise. But advancement is in the hands of the Lord.

ORTHODOX PARTICIPATION IN THE AMSTERDAM ASSEMBLY

The 1948 Amsterdam Congress was the constituting assembly of what is called the Ecumenical Council of Churches. It marked an end and a beginning at the same time: the *end* of a long preparation, much longer than one would have thought and further complicated by the vicissitudes of our troubled times; a *beginning* because it was there that a new organ was created for Ecumenical awareness and actions. The meaning of the Congress of Amsterdam can only be revealed in this historical perspective: it is a stage, a moment within a procedure which has not yet ended.

Let us turn away from the history prior to the Ecumenical Council. The decision to create it was taken at the Congresses of Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937 and confirmed at a special conference which met in Utrecht in May of 1938. There a provisional "Constitution" for the Council was drawn up and approved, and it was confirmed and put into action in Amsterdam after minor amendments.

It is important to note that the new organization is one that offers advice, not an organ of the government, since it has no canonical or other mandates but that of consultation. Sections 3 (Functions) and 4 (Authority) of the "Constitution" state this absolutely unequivocally.

Thus the founding idea and objective are perfectly clear. The Council is a body of consultation and collaboration; it is a place for the exchange of ideas and for group discussion over controversial issues and burning news of general interest.

The Ecumenical Council must therefore be described and evaluated in *dynamic* rather than *static* categories, as a process rather than an institution. Such an interpretation of the Constitution is deliberately stressed in a special resolution of the Congress of Amsterdam (which ultimately only repeats a clause presented by the provisional Committee in *Buck Hill Falls* in April of 1947). The Ecumenical Council categorically denies any claims to being or becoming a super-ecclesiastical organization as well as exercising any power over member Churches. Of course the Council may speak in the name of Churches, but only when it is specially ordered to do so. At any rate — and this has been proved in practice — the Council only receives a certain text draft or statement and *passes them on* for examination by Churches in order that they may reach useful conclusions on it; it is again the Churches which ought to eventually take "corresponding" measures and action at their own responsibility and authority (*commended to the Churches for their serious consideration and approprate action*).

Therefore the work of the Council is preliminary and inceptive in nature, both in idea and intention; it does not anticipate nor predetermine the final outcome of the issue. It is always only a

beginning, a proposition, an initiative, an invitation. Thus for example, the full and true meaning of what might be a better name for resolutions, "reports," "findings" and "statements" of Amsterdam will only be revealed in the echo given to these by the Churches themselves and the measures taken by them. At present these "declarations" imply a question or a call more than anything else; it is difficult to render the English word *challenge* exactly; since the "declarations" are inevitably brief, they need to be further expounded and interpreted.

In any case the "Constitution" of the Council is not a theological document; it is, so to speak, only a by-law. As for the reports of the Amsterdam Commissions they are ultimately only a program for further discussion, a sort of *Terms of Discussion*. Naturally they demand and instigate a theological interpretation, and their authors certainly had well-defined theological and denominational premises; but once again each of these had their very own. The meaning of the Amsterdam conclusions will undoubtedly include the different ways of each Church according to their denominational premises and standards (and by what is meant by *background*, a difficult word to translate). Obviously not everyone will read the same meaning in every text. Ecumenical meetings and documents are always crossroads where many roads cross; they remain a skein of tangled yarn. Crossed paths and mixtures are much more complicated than one would think at first. The clashes of ideas produced in Ecumenical meetings allow an understanding of this complexity created by life, in a better way than other simpler (although simplistic) means. It could also be explained thus: Ecumenical collaboration and declarations do not implicate or obligate anyone, at least not in any absolute, definitive form.

All this is of course my personal opinion and impression, it emerges from my understanding and attitude concerning the matter. In another denominational context, others will no doubt express themselves differently or even say something else. Nor will I go to the very bottom of my thoughts, given the little time and space I have here, and also because I am aware of the schematic nature of my subject.

In Amsterdam the Orthodox representatives were fewer than expected. From the eighty-five seats estimated by the Utrecht constitution, only twenty-five were filled. No more than two local Churches had named their official delegates: the Ecumenical Patriarchate (Constantinople and the diaspora of Central and Western Europe as well as America) and the Church of the Greek Kingdom; also the representatives of the Romanian diocese in the United States. Other Middle Eastern Churches had first declared their adhesion to the Ecumenical Council, but did not send delegates to Amsterdam for different reasons, although they did not withdraw their consent. The Moscow Patriarchate turned down the invitation. The issue of participation in the Ecumenical Movement in general and in Amsterdam in particular was discussed last July in Moscow at the conference of the heads and representatives of Orthodox autocephalous Churches; the resolution concerning the non-

participation has been signed by the representatives of Russian, Georgian, Serbian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Polish and Albanian Churches, as well as by the Patriarchate of Antioch (the delegates of Antioch also represented the Patriarchate of Alexandria).

The purpose here is not to analyze and judge the Moscow resolution (it was accompanied by other resolutions which regarded the Anglican hierarchy and the Vatican as well as a call to Christians in the entire world);[1] this is a special topic which is not organically linked to the Amsterdam conference itself. Yet there is one important point to be noted. The resolution seems to have been uttered conditionally: the Ecumenical Movement is condemned "in its present path," and therefore the possibility of a revision of position and a proceeding agreement is not excluded. Some Ecumenical communities have adopted this interpretation. But a close reading leads to a clear rejection of such an optimistic version: by "present path" what is understood is precisely the organization of the Ecumenical Council. The Moscow resolution must therefore be considered as definitive.

This is an important fact: the Moscow resolution takes away the possibility of working for and participating in the Ecumenical Movement from most local Orthodox Churches for a long time. And it brings a new division into the Orthodox world, according to whether or not one takes part in the Ecumenical Movement.

It can be asked whether Orthodox participation in general is not thus devalued and does not in this way lose its "representative" meaning and character. Can the few local Churches represent the whole Orthodox world?

The question seems justified, but in fact there is an imaginary difficulty here, especially if one bears in mind the point of view formulated above. Under the circumstances, what could "representative" really mean? It is wise to remember now that from the beginning, i. e. from the time of the Utrecht Constitution, Orthodox representation in the Ecumenical Council was formulated globally without a definitive distribution of places among different Churches; the Russian Church could not be counted then for obvious reasons (at that time, invitations were in general addressed first to the "Churches" which had already participated in the *Faith and Constitution* and *Life and Action* Movements). In other words it was the representation of Orthodox "denomination" that was in mind rather than that of different Churches. It was important to let Orthodoxy be heard and not local interests and points of view. In a certain sense this was a tacit acknowledgement of the particular and extraordinary position of Orthodoxy within the Ecumenical Movement. From the beginning, an exception was made for the Orthodox concerning the general principle of *territorial* representation in favor of the *denominational* principle (or method). Moscow took this as lack of attention or a sign of mistrust. In fact it meant the exact opposite. The unity of the Orthodox point of view seemed so clear that it over-shadowed territorial distribution. Each and

every local Church was meant to be able to sufficiently represent Orthodoxy. Lutheran Churches, for instance, had insisted that the same non-territorial principle be applied to them since their aim was not to support local claims but to adequately express the denominational principle.

Naturally the territorial criteria should not be altogether rejected or forgotten. Yet when it is over-stressed in Orthodoxy it only implies an unhealthy particularism and a weakening of the universalist consciousness. At any rate the restriction and decrease in Orthodox representation cannot impede the first and immediate objective: the true and exact testimony of Orthodoxy itself before the non-Orthodox world. Territorial completeness is not absolutely necessary in this. Few but faithful testifiers of Orthodox awareness and tradition stand as firm on this as they would if they were many or united, provided that they speak about Orthodoxy and not fall into "local tradition Protestantism" (the expression comes from Vladimir Soloviev and regards the schism among those of the old faith in Russia). St. Ireneus of Lyon states it clearly: "The strength of Tradition is one." The basic criterion is the immutability of Apostolic Tradition not the empirical agreement of a territorial majority. Of course it is not possible to not lament the exit made by several Churches (many or few) from Ecumenical dialogue; it is a true and painful loss or at minimum a gap. But those who do take part in this dialogue do not lose the right or duty of fulfilling their mission, which does not turn more difficult in principle either.

Everything depends on the way in which Orthodox vocation is understood in Ecumenical work and on what is expected from it. What ought to prevail are true competence, Orthodox authenticity, the representation of the basis of faith and not of local interests. Nevertheless some fears are legitimate here. The provincialist and "local Tradition" temptation is nagging and still strong. But it can be overcome by the stirring up of the spirit of universality and by the test of awareness which takes the constant consciousness of the Church as its aim, rather than by the agreement of local provincialisms.

Regarding this, Orthodox representation in Amsterdam has perhaps not been sufficiently active or aggressive. Perhaps the Orthodox voice did not raise with enough insistence, force and frequency, but the few number of Orthodox people was not entirely futile. A large delegation may have been silent as well, for various reasons. What matters right now is not numbers but firmness, resolution, zeal and depth, all of which call for the strength and purity of faith much more than they depend on geographic and ethnic conditions. And, like all other Ecumenical meetings, Amsterdam is only the beginning of a discussion, not its ending. The questions are asked; the answers will be given not so much by the participants in the congress as the Churches, their pastors and the faithful. The success or the failure depend on this. Local interests ought to simply withdraw to the background when the points in discussion are the very foundations of Christian hope and

faith. Obviously the background is not negligible either, but what is secondary should not be put first.

On the practical level the absence of certain countries and nations is more than just a geographical gap; it is an essential limiting of the field of action (which does not necessarily imply the field of vision or the horizon). At the same time it is clear that it is produced first and foremost by disagreement regarding principles, not by territorial lacks. The "Iron Curtain" itself is woven with principles, with the occasional material of ideas, of convictions, of counter-convictions (and perhaps even prejudices). These are the occasional obstacles which the Ecumenical Movement ought inevitably to be aware of.

No participant in an Ecumenical Congress could offer a complete account of it. The plenary and public meetings are not the place for the real work; that is done instead in the sections and the commissions; and no one is blessed with the ability to be in two places at once. In the official reports the section meetings are rarely, if at all, spoken of. Therefore the picture is incomplete and especially poor in colors. The resolutions and reports are quoted, but the very process of the common work or of spoken reasoning often escapes inside the fire of discussions and is forgotten, whereas it is there that the whole force and vitality are concentrated. Only the living texture makes the conclusion of the conversation intelligible to the end or, better still, uncovers its true sense.

As for the generalities of the conference, I think that I cannot add anything further to the accounts already published or to be published by specialized reviews. I am forced to limit myself to the only section in which I participated. I will comment on the others perhaps at another time.

For the outside world the greatest interest lies perhaps in discussions on "disorder in society" or "international disorder" or perhaps "the Christian attitude towards Jews." I do not wish to deny that or the unquestionable sharpness of these problems. And yet, for those questions addressed to the Ecumenical Movement, it is the discussion of the fundamental and theological question on the Church — "Universal Church in the design of God" — which takes on the utmost importance.

I will not paraphrase the report of this section which has already been published. It ought to be sufficient for me to recall that the definitive write-up of the report given to the public is the result of a lengthy exchange of views in the section itself, in the preparatory commission and in a special commission for the write-up. It is the tenth draft (and I am not even sure that I have seen all the intermediary documents). This written work has not been a simple writing exercise, but a common theological reflection (especially in the commission for the write-up).

First a question of methodology came up: could and should one keep to the Ecumenical manner which had become customary, which is to mark the points of agreement and disagreement between the

denominations in the questions of detail? Or would such a method impede a precise diagnosis and lead to a deformation of perspective? A considerable number defended the approved method, but all the same another one managed to take its place. The record of a profound disagreement can be seen at the heart of the report, not in the questions of detail or a question taken separately but in the whole body of the theological doctrine.

In this way the entire document acquires a new sincerity and depth; this was maintained in spite of the attempts to veil it by phraseology. It would certainly have been possible to say more and to say it more clearly. It is not very probable however that all could have been done together. Precision in formulation is especially difficult in our day when many "Protestant" theologians openly confess to "catholic" views and return to the tradition of the Holy Fathers and to the direct meaning of the Word of God. Clarity of terminology suffers from it (in particular in English). Finally, in spite of resistance from different sides, the two terms were kept, only between quotation marks and accompanied by notes.

The fundamental reason for the disagreement is expressed in the most direct fashion: it is the apostolic succession (in its complete meaning and understanding). Once again it is not a particular question; it is the incompatibility of two complete manners to understand Christianity and the Church. The whole is explained irenically and without veils. Such a perspective allows for agreements and meeting points to be placed where they should. The disagreements are briefly and honestly enumerated within the well-outlined sphere of agreement. But it is perhaps only a competent theologian who could immediately discover the wealth of meaning of these brief formulations. In any case this convergence of views in separated denominational traditions is characteristic of our era. It goes without saying that the language of the report is not always familiar for a "Catholic" theologian.

From the whole body a sufficiently balanced program emerges which allows further discussion and search for truth. "Even though we may not be able to arrive at a perfect agreement (*fully meet*), Our Lord will not allow us to turn away from one another." This sentence is quite like its similar one in the general message of the Amsterdam conference: "We plan to stay together," expresses a deep awareness of a mutual link, of common Christian responsibility and of solidarity under the common sign of faith in Christ, Lord Incarnate and Savior of the world, and all this in spite of a "very deep" difference. Here it is not at all a matter of wanting to smooth over divergences. In this sense Amsterdam is a great step forward compared to Edinburgh and especially Lausanne. Amsterdam gives more because it claims less. A clear awareness of a limit which cannot be exceeded, an almost tragic awareness, has been added now. It no longer allows any room for a utopian hope of the setting aside of unsolvable questions, or of posing questions which for centuries have separated denominations, third zone affairs (such as was

the case at Edinburgh in the sections of studies on grace). Let us hope that the theological commission of the department of *Faith and Constitution* will prepare its monumental collection on the Church in the spirit of Amsterdam rather than that of Edinburgh which is already outdated.

The qualities of the Amsterdam report on the Church are not surprising; they emerge from the high and unquestionable authority of the members of the editing company which is responsible for it; I will mention some of the names: Karl Barth, A. Nygren, Donald M. Bailie (St. Andrews), Hans Lilje, A. M. Ramsay, E. Schlink (Heidelberg), Clarence T. Craig (Yale), Olivier Tomkins, secretary. The definitive text was somewhat abridged.

It is perhaps irrelevant here to state the omissions, but it would not be so to note that in the debates and discussions, it was underlined more than once (not only from the "Catholic" side) that the very name of the Council of Churches is contradictory. The Church does not take a plural unless what is understood by it are only the local cells of a single Body, all in perfect and organic unison. Separate "denominations" therefore have no right to call themselves "Churches." "The very designation of the Ecumenical Council of Churches implies a situation that should not be; we agree to call our denominations 'Church' in a manner which the New Testament would never have allowed." It could be regretted that this thought remains unarticulated in the final text of the report, but it must be borne in mind that it was not forgotten when it was being elaborated.

The report of the youth delegation on this same theme also deserves special attention. It is relatively short and fragmented; yet it creates an impact due to its thought-out character. It has a different plan. It states clearly that the nature of the Church can only be understood in a Christocentric fashion, based on the relationships with its Head. It expresses the desire to reach a greater doctrinal unity. In conclusion it clearly wishes for the broadening of Ecumenical frameworks.

The absence of the Roman Catholic Church reduces the impact of Ecumenism. "The non-participation of this Church in the assembly of the Ecumenical Council gives us reasons to humiliate ourselves when we speak of the World Council as being Ecumenical"; and immediately further: "it was said that if the Ecumenical Movement is a *great new fact* in the history of the Church, the Holy Spirit will raise a prophetic voice which will show how to include the Roman Catholic Church in the Movement in the same way as other Churches with faith in Christ." The attitude of the Roman Church toward the Ecumenical Movement deserves separate study. For many delegates, although not for all, the message of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Utrecht and of Catholic Bishops of Holland has been a reassuring gauge of fraternal communion and memory.

It is not appropriate for an Orthodox to give his opinion on the abstention of the Roman Catholic Church from Ecumenical activity.

But it is impossible to not bring attention to the fact that its participation would greatly facilitate those who are Orthodox in their task which is testifying for the Catholic truth. On the other hand it is also true that this collaboration would greatly complicate Ecumenical communion, give rise to new difficulties (or more exactly it would ordain those which are already acknowledged) and it would perhaps be a burden too heavy to bear for certain members of the Ecumenical community.

NOTE. It is not possible in a short and hastily written article to say everything and to express oneself with the utmost exactitude. A series of minor Ecumenical meetings took place after the Amsterdam Congress; among others that of the Committee for the continuation of *Faith and Constitution* which has now become the theological commission of the Ecumenical Council. It is too early to speak of that at present before the publication of the official report. Yet it is possible to mention the theological collections which were drawn up according to a very long plan in the process of preparation: the "Church," (in four volumes), the "Forms of Cult," and "Intercommunion"; they themselves must prepare a new conference on *Faith and Constitution* based on the models of Lausanne and Edinburgh; it is planned for 1952.

The next meeting of the Ecumenical Council with a renewed body of delegates will take place in 1953, probably on the American continent.

Once again I must mention that I am far from being in full agreement with all the contents of the reports and resolutions of Amsterdam; I would have expressed many things differently, cutting here and adding there, without forgetting that these are Ecumenical documents and not declarations of Orthodox faith. It would be premature and utopian to ask for Orthodoxy, dogmatic expression and a full-proof theological language from statements coming from a divided Christianity.

Translated from the French by
Leyla Rouhi

[1]This is a curious fact. On top of the text of the Call published in the special number of the *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow*, there is another coming no doubt from a well-informed source. It has been published (it is not known why) in the French translation in the *Synodicon* of the Church of the Assumption next to the Saint-Geneviève du Bois Cemetery, Register I (September, 1948), an edition which belongs to a group of clergymen from the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Moscow. This same text was passed around at the Amsterdam Congress. In it there are many lines on the Ecumenical Movement to reject it in the most cutting and categorical terms. The origin and authority of this text are subject to questioning; yet their content not only falls in with the official resolution but also with the reports which served as their basis.

OXFORD AND CHICHESTER (1949)

Memories of Amsterdam are still vivid and fresh. Nevertheless, one must look ahead and forward. The full meaning and impact of Amsterdam have not yet been discovered and explored. The constituent churches of the World Council have not yet adequately responded to the challenge of Amsterdam. Indeed, great was this challenge. Amsterdam has created new difficulties and tensions and has put forward new problems and riddles. The Amsterdam decision "to stay together" was a glorious decision, but an adventurous and risky one. One must frankly admit that it proves difficult and even painful for the members of a divided Christendom to dwell together.

It is obviously impossible to summarize briefly all the proceedings of the various ecumenical gatherings held this summer at Oxford and Chichester. The present sketch is not meant to be a report, nor does it claim to be impersonal. Impersonal thinking is usually unreal. One can only speak his own mind. And after all, would self-imposed reticence not be rather a handicap to a true ecumenical advance? For we must first advance in mutual understanding. Surely, in the Ecumenical Movement we need not so much draft impersonal statements, in which the life of discussion and the very tensions of life would simply fade away, as to enlarge our vision and rebuild our minds and hearts.

The Meaning of "Ecumenical"

What is the full and true meaning of the "ecumenical" claim? What is the scope of the ecumenical venture? What is the alleged *oikoumene* in actuality and what ought it to be? As a matter of fact, most of the constituent bodies of the World Council are Protestant churches: Old Catholics, Anglicans and Eastern Orthodox are but a minority. The Protestant mentality prevails. Can we acquiesce in this situation? Or must we not have the courage to acknowledge it as a serious limitation, as an imminent danger, subversive of the whole ecumenical enterprise? This question is possibly rather offensive to many. The problem is possibly too delicate to be discussed publicly. But it cannot and should not be evaded. As a Protestant organization, the World Council will simply fail and cease to be what it claims to be, what it was meant to be. Yet I fear that there is no true agreement precisely on this very point in ecumenical quarters, and even less in the constituent churches.

Dr. Visser 't Hooft reminded us of this problem and tension in his opening secretarial report to the Central Committee. In his opinion, contacts and deliberations with the Roman Catholic Church did belong organically to the very scope of the ecumenical endeavor, unpromising and ambiguous though they may be. Even more suggestive in his report was the whole section on the Orthodox Churches. He was

seriously concerned with the fullest possible participation of these Churches in the life and work of the World Council. He felt that the Council had to be persistently reminded of the faith and heritage of the Eastern Churches — first and foremost of their existence, may I add, for this fact is too often subconsciously overlooked in certain quarters. Dr. Visser 't Hooft did not shrink from mentioning a major difficulty implied by this participation. His statement is to be quoted as it stands.

> The situation is further conplicated by the ecclesiological issue, of whether the World Council has room for a Church which considers itself as "holding the whole truth and as being the only true Church on earth." This issue has been particularly discussed within the Church of Greece, and different answers have been given to it. In regard to the fundamental ecclesiological issue, the Council can state clearly and unambiguously that it has *not* prejudged the question of the nature of the Church. It is definitely possible for a Church which considers itself the true Church to enter into the Council. Nothing in the official documents contains the slightest suggestion that the Council takes its stand on an ecclesiology according to which each Church is to think of itself as one of the many equally true churches. Ecumenism does not mean ecclesiological relativism or syncretism. The very essence of the ecumenical movement lies in the fact that it invites Churches, many of which are as yet unable to regard each other as branches of the same tree, to enter into fraternal conversation and cooperation with each other so that they may come to know one another and, if the Lord wills, advance to a broader manifestation of unity in Him. In this respect the situation of the Orthodox Churches is not fundamentally different from that of many other Churches in our movement. It is useful, however, that our Orthodox brethren remind us of this deep spiritual tension in our undertaking, which we dare not forget or minimize if we want truly to stay together.

It was an admirable and truly ecumenical statement. Dr. Visser 't Hooft was obviously thinking first and foremost of all the recent discussions on World Council membership which were held in Greece. But the extremes meet. And one must recognize that similar doubts and misgivings are brought forward in some Protestant quarters as well; and that Orthodox claims, or "Orthodox intentions," were recently contested and repudiated as utterly anti-"ecumenical."

"Deepest Difference"

The same problem was raised again by Dr. C. H. Dodd in his provocative and outspoken letter, which was read and discussed at the Faith and Order meeting. This letter will probably be published in full later on. It is an important document and needs serious consideration.

Dr. Dodd refers to the report of the Amsterdam Section I. In this report the "deepest difference" was alleged to exist between the "Catholic" and "Protestant" positions. Yet in the opinion of Dr. Dodd, the report strikingly failed to define or locate this difference. And Dr. Dodd suspected that representatives of different traditions were deliberately avoiding agreement. "I have an uneasy suspicion," Dr. Dodd says

> that when long and patient discussion brings us within sight of a measure of agreement, there are some of us who take fright at the danger that our "distinctive witness" may prove less distinctive than we thought, and we want to change the subject, and say, "Ah, but here is something very important which we are sure you don't believe." And if we face the alarming prospect of failing to find any clearly definable fundamental difference between the "Catholic" and "Protestant" positions, we have to persuade ourselves that our system of beliefs — whatever it may be — has such deep, delicate, secret springs that the whole system must be different: even if the statements we are prepared to put forth on the respective sides appear to the casual observer as alike as two peas, we are sure they can't be. If I, being a "Protestant," say "two and two makes four," and the "Catholic" says the same, we are sure there is a catch somewhere."

In another passage Dr. Dodd says: "we are bound to ask, more seriously than we generally do, whether in the end we care more about saving the face of our own denomination than about the *Una Sancta*."

Intuition, Not Logic

There is undoubtedly deepest truth in these challenging statements of Professor Dodd. First, there is an inherent tension between "denominationalism" and "ecumenism" in our minds and hearts. "Denominations" must die into the fullness of the Church. And the true "ecumenical" synthesis is not simply a summary of the existing "denominations" and their distinctive "contributions." Secondly, and this is perhaps the very heart of the paradox — is not what Dr. Dodd has to say but a peculiar way of restating the very same enigmatic "deepest difference" which Section I of Amsterdam fails to define? Of course, there are many historical and psychological habits and prejudices which inhibit our agreement. These must be cleared away. But, is this dim feeling that there must be "somewhere" a true "difference," even if one is utterly incapable of identifying it clearly and distinctly — is this intimate and sure feeling simply a prejudice, an illusion, an instance of self-deception? This is precisely what is paradoxical about the whole situation. *There is* the "deepest disagreement," and everyone is aware of the fact. *But* our logic, or our language, fails to help us. It has been already recognized, in the Amsterdam Section I, that disagreements cut

across the historical "denominations." The conventional and "denominational" manner of stating differences is antiquated and inadequate, and as long as we persist in using an obsolete idiom of the out-of-date schools, we put ourselves in a ridiculous position. "Catholics" and "Protestants" simply *know* that they disagree, and therefore they distrust agreements, obvious and compelling as the latter may seem to themselves, not to mention to "a casual observer." They trust their own intuition or insight much more than their logic. And I believe that they are right and justified in doing so. Inner conviction prevails, in spite of all intellectual arguments. The "deepest difference" is obvious to spiritual sight, though it cannot yet be theologically articulated and identified. We must continually clarify our intuition in sincere self-criticism and self-examination, and perhaps the "deepest difference" will finally cease to be unknown, as it certainly is now to a great extent. The next step, however, will be to make the ultimate choice. Dr. Dodd's letter is an admirable reminder of this ultimate issue.

To speak so much and so persistently of difficulties and tensions is not to indulge in hopeless pessimism. Just the opposite is true. In the growing realization of difficulties lies the greatest ecumenical promise.

The Next World Council Assembly

The major theme of all the ecumenical deliberations this summer was the preparation for the next Assembly of the World Council. It is to meet in 1953, probably in the U.S.A. It was decided to have a World Conference on Faith and Order in the preceding year, 1952, at Lund, Sweden, in order to make possible the discussion of findings before the Assembly. The exact program of neither conference has yet been established. But the conferences will obviously have to deal first with the reports of various study commissions, which are already at work. There are three theological committees working under the Faith and Order Commission. Samples of their work and findings were submitted to the plenary commission this year. The first deals with the doctrine of the Church, the second with the ways of worship, and the third with the whole problem of inter-communion. The Study Department Commission of the WCC is responsible for another broad field of inquiry and research. Again, there are three main topics under discussion: First, the Bible and the Church's message to the world, an ecumenical symposium on the Biblical authority of the Church's message concerning social and political problems which may be published next summer; second, the evangelization of man in modern mass society; and third, the problem of "Christian action in society." Under the last heading there are in fact two problems: the Christian conception of a "normal" society on the one hand; and the Christian doctrine of work on the other. The Joint Commission of the Churches on International Affairs has its own extensive program of study. This study and research will absorb most of the ecumenical energy and

attention in the near future. The real ecumenical work is usually done in these very study groups and small committees of experts. One has to attend these study groups in order to get true insight into the progress of ecumenical cooperation.

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

The Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches will meet from August 15 to 31, 1954, on the campus of Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. The First Assembly, at which the World Council was formally constituted, met in 1948 in Amsterdam, Holland.

According to its Constitution, the World Council of Churches is "a fellowship of Churches which accepts our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior." Formal acceptance of this *basis* is an absolute prerequisite for membership in the Council. Members of the Council are Churches, not individuals.

The main authority in the Council is the Assembly, which meets every five years. The Assembly is composed of *official* representatives of the participating Churches, appointed directly by them. Seats in the Assembly are allocated in such a manner as to secure adequate and proportionate representation of all denominational traditions and all geographical areas. At present, there are four hundred and fifty seats, of which eighty-five are allocated to the Orthodox Churches throughout the world to be distributed "in such a manner as they may decide." Delegates appointed to the Assembly function in their representative capacity for the whole period between Assemblies, taking part in various committees and commissions which may be established by the Assembly. In the interim between Assemblies, the work is carried on by a Central Committee, which meets at least once each year. Members of this Committee are elected by the Assembly from among the delegates, and in such a manner as to preserve the same proportionate representation of territories and traditions. At present, out of eighty-five vacancies within the Central Committee, seventeen are allocated to the Orthodox.

A number of special commissions are established under the authority of the Central Committee to direct work and research in various fields of interest and concern. Of these commissions the most important are the commission on Faith and Order (which was elected at the special Conference on Faith and Order held at Lund, Sweden in 1952) and the Study Department Commission which is responsible for all the research projects of the Council, including the ideological preparation of the Assemblies. When people, who are not delegates to the Assembly, are invited to membership in the commissions because of their personal competence in a particular field, their names must be submitted to their respective churches for approval.

The purpose of all these arrangements is to ensure the truly representative character of the work of the Council at all levels. At the same time, according to the Constitution the Council is no more than a consultative body and has no "legislative" authority whatsoever. As it

is emphatically stated in the Constitution, "the World Council shall not legislate for the Churches." The Council cannot make any decision that would be binding on the participant Churches. All findings and suggestions approved or received at the Assemblies or by the Central Committee are to be referred to the participant Churches for their consideration, and every Church is perfectly free to determine its own attitude and policy. This general principle was clearly affirmed and elaborated in the important memorandum on "the Ecclesiological Significance of the World Council of Churches," which was accepted by the Central Committee at its meeting in Toronto, Canada in 1950.

The Council is not "a Church" and consequently has no doctrines of its own, and especially no particular doctrine on the Church. Every participant church is free to keep and profess its own beliefs and convictions and to follow its own way. In particular, as it was plainly stated at Toronto, "membership in the Council does not imply that each Church must regard the other member Churches as churches in the true and full sense of the word." Membership in the Council, therefore, does not force any Church to commit itself to anything which may be incompatible with its distinctive tenets.

The main purpose of the Council is to bring the various "Churches" together for conference and discussion, and eventually for common action, if and when the Churches themselves find it advisable. There is, however, a basic assumption which makes the existence and functioning of the World Council possible and meaningful: it is the conviction that a common profession of faith in Jesus Christ as God and Savior constitutes an objective link between those who share this belief and keeps them together in a fellowship of common obedience and hope. The executive function is entrusted to the Secretariat, which is divided into sections and departments and is subordinate to the Central Committee, and ultimately to the Assembly.

It is clearly impossible to give a complete picture of the manifold activities and concerns of the Council in a brief article. Nor is it possible to survey in full all the ramifications of its work. It is necessary, however, to stress with full vigor that the World Council is primarily concerned with the problems of the Church. The starting point of all deliberations and endeavors is the belief in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church — however differently and variously this belief may be interpreted by the participating "Churches." In other words, the World Council is ultimately concerned with the restoration of Christian Unity in history.

The Council is not committed to any particular plan or design. On the contrary, it encourages inquiry into disagreements. In this connection, the report of the first section of the Amsterdam Assembly is significant. The main emphasis of the report was on the "deepest difference" which had been discovered among the representatives of the various Churches. It was plainly admitted that there are two different conceptions of Christian life and faith which are in a sense inconsistent

and incompatible with each other. These two conceptions may be loosely described as "catholic" (in a wide sense) and "protestant" (or "evangelical"). This finding may seem disappointing. But it is this very tension which gives life and meaning to the ecumenical dialogue. Christendom is sorely divided in mind and in practice. On the other hand, Unity is the basic aim and promise of Christianity. It is therefore imperative to work towards Unity. It is perfectly true that no satisfactory solution of the existing tension has been found; that is, no solution which would command common assent. At every step of the ecumenical discussion one discovers the same "deepest difference." One may even question whether Christian Unity can be restored at all within the limits of history.

And yet one cannot and should not lightly dismiss the courageous conviction which has been voiced so strongly by, among others, the late Metropolitan Platon of the Russian Orthodox Church in America. "*Even given all the impossibilities, Unity is nonetheless still possible.*" This was the heading of his stimulating article, published as early as 1913 in *The Constructive Quarterly*. Metropolitan Platon was fully aware of the practical impasse and the paradoxical character of the whole situation. Of course, an Orthodox is bound to regard all those who diverge from Orthodox standards as heterodox. However, the Metropolitan continues, "at the same time I know that they are Christians, that they believe in Christ, in my Christ." The time may come, and Metropolitan Platon believed it would, when all will be of the same faith. Is this just a utopian dream? In any case, it is God's purpose in history that all be one. "There is reason for great rejoicing in the fact that at present, in the midst of many Christian denominations, there arise clear voices speaking for the union of the churches, and that the question is discussed openly, though only sporadically and without any plan. But at the same time that which only recently was unthinkable has now become a reality." This was written years ago, when the modern "ecumenical Movement" was in its infancy.

The purpose of the World Council is to conduct the discussion of Christian Unity more systematically and persistently. Whatever the outcome may be — and God's guidance should not be disregarded — one must say of the present discussion that "that which only recently was unthinkable has now become reality." One may speak of a "rediscovery of the Church" in the wider circles of the divided Christians. A new climate has been created. The possibility of ecumenical discussion is itself an achievement. It is important to mention that the Roman Catholic Church, which does not take part in the ecumenical dialogue, does follow it with keen interest and even sympathy, even if it recommends utter caution and discretion in the matter. Should Orthodox simply disregard what has been described by many competent observers as one of the most significant events in recent times?

As a matter of fact, the Orthodox Churches, or at least their outstanding leaders, looked favorably upon the plan for convening a "Conference on Faith and Order" when it was first articulated as early as 1914. In reply to the invitation to participate in such a conference which was issued by an initiative committee in the United States, Metropolitan Anthony, then Archbishop of Kharkov and earlier of Volynia, wrote a long letter expressing his conviction that the Orthodox Church was *the* Church; that is, *the only* Church, and bluntly declining to recognize any non-Orthodox as Christians. At the same time, Metropolitan Anthony was willing to accept the invitation and to recommend that the Holy Synod appoint delegates. His correspondent, the late Dr. Robert Gardiner, was astonished by what seemed to him to be inconsistent reasoning. Metropolitan Anthony then replied with his usual precision: "Indeed, there we are not going to concelebrate, but shall rather have to search together for true teachings on the controversial points of faith."

At present there is no reason why the Orthodox should not follow the advice of the late Metropolitan. The interesting correspondence of Archbishop Anthony with the representatives of the Episcopal Church in America was published in full, in Russian translation from the French, in the periodical *Vera i Razum* [Faith and Reason] in 1915 and 1916.

It was only after World War I that the plan of the Conference could be substantiated and the First World Conference on Faith and Order could take place at Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1927. An impressive Orthodox delegation was present, including a number of distinguished bishops and theologians such as the then present Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church in America, Michael; the late Metropolitans Germanos of Thyateira and Eulogius; Professor Nicholas Glubokovsky, formerly of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy and then of the University of Sofia, Bulgaria; the Metropolitan Dionisy, of the Orthodox Church in Poland; Bishop Irenaeus of Novy Sad. It is true that this delegation had to take exception at many crucial points and to make a special declaration of general disagreement. Yet this very declaration was concluded by a clear affirmation that the Orthodox should continue their participation in the discussion. "Declaring that in the future we shall not cease to devote ourselves to labor for the closer contact of the churches, we add that we shall pray to God incessantly, so that by the operation of His Holy Spirit He will remove all existing hindrances and will guide us to that unity for which the Founder and Ruler of the Church prayed to His heavenly Father." The full information on the Orthodox participation at the Lausanne Conference may be found in its *Proceedings*, Faith and Order, edited by H. N. Bate, Canon of Carlisle (New York 1928).

Accordingly, an Orthodox delegation attended the Second World Conference of Faith and Order, held at Edinburgh in 1937. A special declaration was again made, in order to elucidate all the points upon

which the Orthodox were at variance with the Protestants. It should be added that at all the major ecumenical gatherings in the period between the two World Wars the Orthodox participated, and that all Orthodox Churches, with the sole exception of the Church in Russia, were represented. The same Orthodox Churches officially accepted the invitation issued in 1939 to join the World Council of Churches, which had been in "the process of formation." Four Orthodox members were on the Provisional Committee, which was entrusted with the realization of the Council.

It is therefore obvious that Orthodox participation in the various ecumenical activities was in no sense a private initiative of individuals, but was rather openly sponsored and encouraged by the lawful authorities of all Orthodox Churches. After the Second World War, Orthodox participation was reduced since the Churches "behind the Iron Curtain" were not able to continue. At the Conference of the Heads and Representatives of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches, held in Moscow in July 1948, the Ecumenical Movement was condemned — chiefly for "non-theological reasons" — in spite of the opposition of a considerable number of delegates. Accordingly, the Church of Greece, the Ecumenical Patriarchate (including the Russian Exarchate in Western Europe), and probably the Churches of Alexandria and Cyprus, are the only ones able to be present now. This reduces the Orthodox representation numerically, and increases the burden of the delegates as well as their responsibility.

It must be kept in mind that the World Council of Churches is concerned not only with problems of doctrine but also with problems of a more general and practical character which may be summarized under the heading of Christian Action. It includes first of all a serious concern for society and for the impact of Christian beliefs and conviction on social life in general, including the international situation. At this point, Christian cooperation does not involve any further "dogmatic agreement" beyond that which is implied in the "basis."

It is perfectly true that the whole "Ecumenical Movement" and all its concrete embodiments were initiated by the "Protestants" and that Protestants are in a numerical majority there. It is also true that the cooperation of Orthodox with Protestants implies certain psychological and other difficulties and misunderstandings. But these difficulties are in any case mutual. It is difficult to say who is more embarrassed, the Orthodox by the "Protestant" environment or the Protestants by the presence of the Orthodox. It is this mutual "embarrassment" which gives life and meaning to this "ecumenical" dialogue.

> All local Churches do indeed have their particular contributions. But the Eastern Church is in an unparalleled position to contribute something more and something different. The witness of the Eastern Church is namely to the common background of ecumenical Christianity, because she stands not so much for a

> local tradition of her own but rather for the common heritage of the Church Universal. Her voice is not merely a voice of the Christian East, but a voice of Christian antiquity. (Georges Florovsky, *Theology Today*, April 1950).

In this connection it is interesting to quote a Roman Catholic appraisal of Orthodox participation in the Ecumenical Movement:

> The voice of Orthodoxy is heard indeed, but it is not strong enough to be able really to influence the tone, the attitude, the spirit of the World Council . . . Truth, however, is not a matter of a majority of votes. It is the concern of the World Council that the Catholic witness shall also be heard. As things are, Orthodoxy is not repressed by its restricted numerical strength, but continues in an admirable and patient manner to give its specific testimony. It is convinced that Truth has the last word, that the Holy Spirit is still able to work miracles and, finally, that the whole of Christendom can be converted to the acceptance of true Orthodox faith and to the restoration of full sacramental communion with the ony true Orthodox Church. Its ecumenical way of thinking implies that it considers such a miracle to be the only real and effective solution to the ecumenical problems.[1]

It remains only to add that, according to the Orthodox way of thinking, this "miracle" should be prepared by persistent witness to the Truth and that there is no room for quietist delay. It is the urgent duty of the Orthodox to strengthen their voice and witness in the ecumenical dialogue, not merely by adding numbers but primarily by putting new spiritual energy into their witness.

The real handicap for the Orthodox in the World Council is not their numerical minority, but rather the indifference of Orthodox society. Many Orthodox simply do not know that they are the keepers and stewards of the glorious Truth.

It is of interest to add that the need for joint witness and concerted action in the Ecumenical Movement inspired one of the most valuable efforts to bring the Orthodox together. In 1936, a conference of Orthodox theologians was convened at Athens, Greece, to discuss an impressive series of problems, more or less the same as those which are being discussed at the ecumenical meetings. The conference was reserved for professors of graduate schools of Orthodox theology in Europe. Eight Orthodox Faculties were represented: Athens, Sofia, Belgrade, Cernouti, Cisinau, Bucharest, Warsaw, and the Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris. It was openly stated that the Orthodox should unite in order to bear witness with an undivided voice and conviction in the divided world. It was then expected that future conferences of Orthodox theologians could become a permanent and

periodic institution. The Second World War frustrated this hope, but the problem remains.

The main theme of the Evanston Assembly is The Christian Hope, or rather, Christ — The Hope of the World. Six subsidiary topics are offered for discussion: (1) Our Unity in Christ and Our Disunity as Churches; (2) Evangelism — The Mission of the Church to Those Outside Her Life; (3) The Responsible Society in a World Perspective; (4) Christians in the Struggle for World Community; (5) The Church amid Racial and Ethnic Tensions; (6) The Christian in His Vocation.

In an introductory article there is no room for any detailed discussion of these topics. The reader should turn to the literature produced in preparation for the Assembly. But it is clear that the Orthodox have their own distinctive contribution to make in the discussion of all these urgent questions which have enormous relevance to the present situation.

The Russian Orthodox Church in America only joined the World Council in 1952.

It will be for the first time that her delegates will participate in the work of an Ecumenical Assembly. For them, the task is new. But it is important to remember that Orthodox participation in the Ecumenical Movement has a long history and is not just hazardous improvisation.

The official delegates of the Russian Orthodox Church of America, appointed by the Ruling Primate, Metropolitan Leonty are: 1) The Rt. Rev. John, Bishop of San Francisco; 2) The Rt. Rev. Georges Florovsky, D.D.; 3) The Rev. Vladimir S. Borichevsky; 4) Ivan M. Czap, Esquire.

There will be a delegation from the Orthodox Church of Greece; from the Ecumenical Patriarchate (which will also include the Greek Archdiocese of America, as well as the Russia Exarchate in Western Europe); from the Orthodox Church of Cyprus; from the Romanian Orthodox Episcopate in the U.S.A.; and probably from the Patriarchate of Alexandria.

One of the six joint presidents of the World Council is an Orthodox — Metropolitan Athanagoras, the Archbishop of Thyateira, residing in London, England.

The V. Rev. Alexander Schmemann will attend as a "consultant," by appointment of the Central Committee of the World Council.

One should pray that all the Orthodox delegates to Evanston may be given wisdom and courage to bear witness to the Orthodox tradition with the firmness and humility which are expected from the servants of Divine Truth.

[1] Dr. W. H. Van De Pol, *The Christian Dilemma. The Catholic Church: Reformation*, 1952. English translation, p. 259. (Dr. Van De Pol is Professor at the Roman Catholic Nijmegen University, Holland).

EVANSTON 1954

The Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches was an impressive gathering indeed. 502 delegates attended, representing 132 "member-churches" of the Council in 42 countries. To this one had to add 499 "accredited visitors" from the same churches, 145 "consultants," 96 "youth consultants," 31 "fraternal delegates" from various "ecumenical organizations, and 25 "observers," representing churches which are not officially in the World Council. This yields a total number of 1298 "official participants" from 179 churches in 54 countries. Thousands of guests and visitors attended open plenary sessions. "The Festival of Faith," held in Chicago at Soldier's Field under the auspices of the Council, was attended by not less than 100,000 visitors. All this was impressive and spectacular enough. The true importance of the Assembly obviously did not lie in numbers. Still, numbers do have a certain significance. On the whole, it was an impressive demonstration of the vitality of Christian tradition in the present world. It was highly significant that such a large conference could meet in the name of Christ, to acknowledge Him as "God and Savior" and to proclaim that He was the only Hope of the world. The "unhappy divisions" among Christians did not prevent the "divided Christians" from meeting in His name. There is surely some unitive power in common allegiance to the same Lord.

The program of the Assembly was heavy and overloaded. In addition to the "main theme" of the Christian Hope, there were six "subsidiary topics," and each of them was important enough to deserve a special conference. It was difficult, if not downright impossible, to adequately digest all the reports and memoranda that we submitted to the Assembly. The daily schedule for 17 days was overcrowded and little space was left for "quiet time." It was quite impossible to get a comprehensive view of the Assembly. Personal impressions are especially subjective. On the whole, it was an unforgettable experience. On the one hand, of course, the Assembly was yet another impressive "exhibition of Christian disruption." The absence of the Roman Church was an additional hint to the divided state of Christendom. On the other hand, it was remarkable that in spite of the disruption "ecumenical dialogue" was still possible. The Orthodox (or "Catholics," to use this word in a broad sense) are always a kind of peculiar "minority" at ecumenical meetings. They are never fully "at home" among the "Protestants." It was perhaps the greatest achievement of the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council in 1948 that the existence of this "tension" (or of "our greatest difference," as it was phrased then) was openly acknowledged. At Evanston it became quite clear that this very "tension" constitutes the very core of the Ecumenical problem. This was especially obvious in Section I, discussing the report on

"Faith and Order," and again in the plenary session, when the report of the section had been submitted. Attention to this basic and radical tension within the Council itself was called in one of the introductory speeches on behalf of the preparatory commission. At the Assembly the Orthodox were obliged to dissociate themselves from the report of the section and to make a statement of their own. The same had to be done with the report of the Advisory Commission on the main theme. What is important, however, is that this "tension," which in no case should be minimized, did not disrupt the ecumenical "fellowship." It is probably no more than a "fellowship of searching" or a fellowship in discussion even though the common allegiance to Christ naturally constitutes a deeper bond, despite the various interpretations. It is a sign of Christian maturity that one learns to listen to dissentient voices. There was probably more readiness to listen at Evanston than ever before. The Orthodox, of course, do not believe that Christian Unity can ever be achieved by negotiations and adjustments. They can only bear witness to the Tradition as it has been preserved through the ages in an interrupted continuity of Faith and Order. And it is in this capacity of Apostolic witnesses that they come to the Ecumenical meetings. The real work, however, is not done at the large assemblies, as important as they may be. The real work is done in small groups, in preparatory commissions, in study groups. And it is there that "dialogue" can be especially fruitful.

There are now several theological commissions working under the auspices of the World Council. A commission on "Christ and the Church" was established at Lund by the Third World Conference on Faith and Order in 1952. For technical reasons it was divided into two sections, European and American. The first meeting of the American section, in which some members of the European section participated, was held immediately before the Assembly, at Evanston also. It was decided to initiate a wide program of studies embracing the whole tradition of the Church from the Scriptures to modern times. The commission will meet again in 1955.

We are now living in an age of obvious theological revival, of intensive theological searching and study in all churches. Ecumenical discussion is a part of this revival. Many traditional values have been recovered in recent years. The theological climate is changing. It would not be an exaggeration to say that there is a growing understanding of the "catholic" tradition and values in all parts or sections of "Divided Christendom." The Roman Church is watching this process with unfailing attention. The Orthodox have every reason to do the same. They have a witness to bear. Another commission was established to study the problems of Worship. At the meeting of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council in Chicago, immediately after the Assembly it was decided to appoint a new theological commission on "Tradition and our traditions." The commission would study the whole complex of problems and issues which the concept of "Tradition"

EVANSTON 1954

The Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches was an impressive gathering indeed. 502 delegates attended, representing 132 "member-churches" of the Council in 42 countries. To this one had to add 499 "accredited visitors" from the same churches, 145 "consultants," 96 "youth consultants," 31 "fraternal delegates" from various "ecumenical organizations, and 25 "observers," representing churches which are not officially in the World Council. This yields a total number of 1298 "official participants" from 179 churches in 54 countries. Thousands of guests and visitors attended open plenary sessions. "The Festival of Faith," held in Chicago at Soldier's Field under the auspices of the Council, was attended by not less than 100,000 visitors. All this was impressive and spectacular enough. The true importance of the Assembly obviously did not lie in numbers. Still, numbers do have a certain significance. On the whole, it was an impressive demonstration of the vitality of Christian tradition in the present world. It was highly significant that such a large conference could meet in the name of Christ, to acknowledge Him as "God and Savior" and to proclaim that He was the only Hope of the world. The "unhappy divisions" among Christians did not prevent the "divided Christians" from meeting in His name. There is surely some unitive power in common allegiance to the same Lord.

The program of the Assembly was heavy and overloaded. In addition to the "main theme" of the Christian Hope, there were six "subsidiary topics," and each of them was important enough to deserve a special conference. It was difficult, if not downright impossible, to adequately digest all the reports and memoranda that we submitted to the Assembly. The daily schedule for 17 days was overcrowded and little space was left for "quiet time." It was quite impossible to get a comprehensive view of the Assembly. Personal impressions are especially subjective. On the whole, it was an unforgettable experience. On the one hand, of course, the Assembly was yet another impressive "exhibition of Christian disruption." The absence of the Roman Church was an additional hint to the divided state of Christendom. On the other hand, it was remarkable that in spite of the disruption "ecumenical dialogue" was still possible. The Orthodox (or "Catholics," to use this word in a broad sense) are always a kind of peculiar "minority" at ecumenical meetings. They are never fully "at home" among the "Protestants." It was perhaps the greatest achievement of the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council in 1948 that the existence of this "tension" (or of "our greatest difference," as it was phrased then) was openly acknowledged. At Evanston it became quite clear that this very "tension" constitutes the very core of the Ecumenical problem. This was especially obvious in Section I, discussing the report on

"Faith and Order," and again in the plenary session, when the report of the section had been submitted. Attention to this basic and radical tension within the Council itself was called in one of the introductory speeches on behalf of the preparatory commission. At the Assembly the Orthodox were obliged to dissociate themselves from the report of the section and to make a statement of their own. The same had to be done with the report of the Advisory Commission on the main theme. What is important, however, is that this "tension," which in no case should be minimized, did not disrupt the ecumenical "fellowship." It is probably no more than a "fellowship of searching" or a fellowship in discussion even though the common allegiance to Christ naturally constitutes a deeper bond, despite the various interpretations. It is a sign of Christian maturity that one learns to listen to dissentient voices. There was probably more readiness to listen at Evanston than ever before. The Orthodox, of course, do not believe that Christian Unity can ever be achieved by negotiations and adjustments. They can only bear witness to the Tradition as it has been preserved through the ages in an interrupted continuity of Faith and Order. And it is in this capacity of Apostolic witnesses that they come to the Ecumenical meetings. The real work, however, is not done at the large assemblies, as important as they may be. The real work is done in small groups, in preparatory commissions, in study groups. And it is there that "dialogue" can be especially fruitful.

There are now several theological commissions working under the auspices of the World Council. A commission on "Christ and the Church" was established at Lund by the Third World Conference on Faith and Order in 1952. For technical reasons it was divided into two sections, European and American. The first meeting of the American section, in which some members of the European section participated, was held immediately before the Assembly, at Evanston also. It was decided to initiate a wide program of studies embracing the whole tradition of the Church from the Scriptures to modern times. The commission will meet again in 1955.

We are now living in an age of obvious theological revival, of intensive theological searching and study in all churches. Ecumenical discussion is a part of this revival. Many traditional values have been recovered in recent years. The theological climate is changing. It would not be an exaggeration to say that there is a growing understanding of the "catholic" tradition and values in all parts or sections of "Divided Christendom." The Roman Church is watching this process with unfailing attention. The Orthodox have every reason to do the same. They have a witness to bear. Another commission was established to study the problems of Worship. At the meeting of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council in Chicago, immediately after the Assembly it was decided to appoint a new theological commission on "Tradition and our traditions." The commission would study the whole complex of problems and issues which the concept of "Tradition"

embraces. This commission will also work in two sections. The American section will meet this Christmas to plan its program of research. For the Orthodox, this topic is probably of special interest.

It is only fair to say that "mutual understanding" has been steadily growing in the course of ecumenical dialogue during the last decades. "Disagreements" were not resolved, and probably will not be resolved in the near future. The cultivation of the soil, however, can never be dispensed with. The Ecumenical Movement is obviously still "in the process of formation," and this process is inevitably slow. Nevertheless, there is a movement. The dialogue must be extended to the churches themselves. More attention must be given to the causes of "dis-union" and to the nature of the "Unity" which was the original will of Christ for His Church. The Ecumenical Movement depends in its growth upon the awakening of larger masses of Christians to the responsibilities of the Christian calling. The future is in the hands of the Lord.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT SINCE 1927

The Ecumenical Movement is an antinomical venture. Its ultimate aim and purpose is Christian Unity. But its starting point is Christian Disunity. There is an "ecumenical" problem precisely because Christendom is divided, and Christians are not in agreement with each other. Of course, "Unity" is not just a pious aspiration, or simply a distant "ideal." There is some "unity" even in the midst of the "unhappy divisions." In some sense, all Christians belong together. All Christians are, in some sense, "united" — united in and through their common allegiance to the same Lord, Christ Jesus, and in and through their common obedience to the same Word of God. By its Constitution the World Council of Churches is "a fellowship of Churches which accepts our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior."

Yet it would not be too strong to say it is an uneasy fellowship. Paradoxically enough, this common allegiance to Christ does not actually unite the "divided Christians." After all, they are still "divided"; and the strain of this division is quite real. If there is "unity," it is a hidden unity; or at least, this "unity" is sorely compromised and obscured by manifold and various "schisms." It is precisely this "state of schism" which constitutes the major riddle and problem of Christian existence, and its major predicament. There should be no "division" among Christians, because Christ himself is never divided. And his Church is essentially One, and simply cannot be divided either. In actuality, however, there are many "Churches," and they are neither truly "united" nor in "communion" with each other. "Unity" and "schism" are strangely intermingled in Christian life.

Before Evanston

The World Conferences of Faith and Order were initiated precisely to explore this paradoxical and enigmatic field and to offer, in light of the available information, some suggestions for practical steps towards an ultimate restoration of Christian Unity. The first two Conferences, Lausanne 1927 and Edinburgh 1937, were unable to come to any practical decisions. A comprehensive survey of the field was made. Existing "agreements" and "disagreements" between the "Churches," i.e. actually "denominations," were duly and faithfully registered, and a study of the Roman Catholic positions was conducted. The main conclusion of the Edinburgh Conference, however, was that a thorough study of the doctrines of the Church should be undertaken. A special study commission was established under the chairmanship of Dr. Newton R. Flew (Wesley House, Cambridge). The work of this commission was hindered and delayed by the war. Only in 1952 could it

submit its report with some source material to the Third World Conference of Faith and Order, which met in Lund, Sweden, in August 1952.

The Faith and Order organization had since been integrated into the newly formed World Council of Churches. The First Assembly of the World Council in Amsterdam, 1948, had to deal with the unfinished theological business of Edinburgh. Section I of the Amsterdam Assembly adopted the report of its drafting committee, in which some important points were sharply made. It was quite obvious that in the field of Ecclesiology there was an unresolved tension between two different schools of thought (it was suggested that there were, in fact, three distinctive trends). These two trends could not be adequately labeled, but for practical purposes were described as "catholic" and "evangelical." It was further discovered that this tension cut across the historical boundaries of denominations, and again was not restricted to the Ecclesiological field alone.

These findings of Amsterdam were carefully scrutinized at Lund. A new method was suggested. Instead of continuing a survey of "agreements" and "disagreements," it was decided to initiate a systematic exploration of the Ecclesiological doctrine on the basis of Scriptural evidence and in light of the living tradition of different "Churches." It was decided that this new study had to be pursued in the perspective of Christology and in connection with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. A new theological commission was appointed, which had to work in two sections, one in Europe (under the chairmanship of Bishop Anders Nygren of Lund, Sweden), and the other in America (under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert Calhoun of Yale Divinity School). The title of the Commission was "On Christ and the Church."

The first meeting of the American section, with the participation of some individual members of the European group, took place at Evanston in August, a few days before the General Assembly of the World Council. It was a fruitful and promising meeting, a kind of theological gathering. It would be almost impossible to summarize the lively discussion which went on for several days. The commission agreed on a comprehensive program of study. Various topics were assigned to individual members. And it is expected that the American section will meet again next June to discuss the prospective papers.

On the other hand, Lund decided that the Evanston Assembly had to continue the discussion of the Faith and Order issues. In Lund, the theme for discussion was formulated as follows: *"Our Oneness in Christ and Our Disunity as Churches."* In fact, this was precisely the main "ecumenical" problem that was offered for discussion — or should we say, the main *ecumenical paradox*? The very fact of the World Council testifies to the existence of a certain unity, and yet the "churches" are separated from each other. What is the actual meaning of this paradoxical situation, and what can be done for the situation in the "churches"?

The Evanston Statement

Two documents were submitted to the Evanston Assembly by the Working Committee of the Faith and Order Commission: on the one hand, a "factual survey" prepared by Dr. Robert Nelson, the secretary of the commission; on the other, a draft of the "working paper" to be used as the starting point for the discussion in the Faith and Order Section of the Assembly. Both documents were prepared much in advance and submitted for criticism to the Working Committee at its meeting in Bossey, Switzerland, in August 1953. The factual survey was printed some months before the Assembly and is easily obtainable (see *The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church,* New York: Harper, 1954). It is a fair and comprehensive statement on the existing situation in the "Churches."

The "working paper" proved to be a controversial document. It was vigorously debated by the Working Committee which was unable to adopt any definite text. The minutes of the Bossey meeting were published (Faith and Order Commission Papers No. 17), and there is no need to retell the story. The tension was precisely the same as at Amsterdam. The new complication was that the conflicting trends were unequally represented in both the constituency of the World Council and the composition of its commissions. Thus, the unfortunate problem of a prospective "majority vote" had to be faced quite seriously. It was obvious that in questions of belief and conviction there was no place for a "majority vote." And on the other hand, it was hardly possible to contend that "Protestants" are a "Christian majority," even though they were possibly the predominant group in the Ecumenical Movement. All attempts to produce an agreed-upon statement on behalf of the Working Committee and for the use of Assembly Section I finally failed, and the resulting paper was still rather one-sided. At the Assembly the topic for discussion was presented by three speakers, Bishop Nygren, Dr. Florovsky and Dr. Devadutt. In a sense it was a fair representation of the three main trends in the Ecumenical fellowship: Historical Protestantism, "Catholicism" and Free Church.

The "working paper" itself was a lengthy document. It is impossible to paraphrase it briefly, especially because the final draft was a drastic condensation of the original text so that almost every sentence was important. In brief, the main contention of the document was that the Church of Christ, being inseparable from her Head and Lord, was one and therefore could not be divided, and that thus some "action of faith "could and should be considered in order to demonstrate the basic unity in spite of all the existing disagreements. No practical proposal was included, but the general leaning of the document was definitely "evangelical."

There was not adequate time for discussion in Section I. The section could meet for only three days. It was a comparatively large group (up to 100). In addition, a time limit had to be imposed on the speeches.

Nevertheless, discussion was helpful and instructive. Of course, theological issues can never be properly and satisfactorily discussed in large meetings. In any case, the Section was not expected to decide anything. It only had to present to the Assembly a document, which had to be forwarded to the "Churches" for their consideration. The most important part of the Ecumenical "conversation" is precisely the replies of the "Churches." Unfortunately, only a few replies were received even to the Lund reports. It is rather difficult to say to what extent the new line of approach to the problem "Unity-Disunity" may command approval or satisfaction of the various denominations.

The Eastern Orthodox Position

Again, the Evanston Statement on Faith and Order is confined to certain general points and burning issues which are entirely relevant for a comprehensive "decision." The whole question of Ministry and Orders, for example, is not addressed at all. One should look forward to the new material which is to be supplied by the theological commission on "Christ and the Church." The delegates of the Eastern Orthodox Churches felt constrained to dissociate themselves from the Section report and to make some comment on its main points. A special statement to this effect was read to the plenary session by Archbishop Michael, the primate of the Greek Church in North and South America. The document was prepared by a special drafting committee (Dr. Florovsky, Convener). For many "Protestants" it was an embarrassing statement. There was an unusual terminology, radical claims, etc. In fact, the spirit of the statement was reconciliatory, but in the "catholic" sense of "reconciliation." The "Catholic-minded" Christians, including the Orthodox, were generally ready to welcome the first, truly theological section of the Section I Report, but were unable to accept the rest of the document concerning the practical steps. Their reason was that the second part of the Report did not follow logically from the first, i.e. from the basic theological presuppositions.

This was the main point. It is of decisive importance whether the obvious fact of a basic divergence of convictions within the World Council constituency will be taken quite seriously. There is an inner tension in the Council because there is an inner tension in the Christian Commonwealth. And *this* tension is probably *the* main "Ecumenical problem." This fact had been courageously recognized at Amsterdam. Its character and implications should be carefully studied and diagnosed. One cannot avoid argument at the present. One should have patience. There are still some unexplored avenues in the Ecumenical areas.

In this connection it will not be out of place to report on the new decision taken by the Faith and Order Commission at its post-Evanston sessions at McCormick Seminary in early September. On the initiative of Professor Albert C. Outler (Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Texas, formerly at Yale) and Dr.

Georges Florovsky, it was decided to inaugurate a new theological commission to discuss the problem of "*Tradition and our traditions.*" This proposal had already been made at Lund in 1952 by the same persons, but the decision had been postponed. This time the commission was instituted. It too will work in two sections: the chairman of the European section is Professor Skydsgaard (Copenhagen, Denmark); the chairman of the American section is Professor Outler and vice-chairman Dr. Florovsky. The Commission is expected to meet this year in late December. It is hoped that in a wider historical perspective and against the background of common beliefs and convictions it will be possible to discover a new common ground for fruitful Ecumenical conversation on the matter of Faith and Order.

ON THE UPCOMING COUNCIL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Vatican Council, 1869-1870, was the last "ecumenical council," according to the enumeration of the Roman Catholic Church. Formally, the Vatican Council was never closed. The activities of the council were merely temporarily interrupted due to pressure from outside circumstances which, it seemed at the time, threatened the freedom of council activities and even the freedom of the Church itself — namely, the occupation of the Vatican and of the city of Rome itself by the troops of nationalist Italy. The possibility of reopening under more favorable conditions, however, was tacitly assumed. Therefore, the council was not formally dismissed. In the past, there were instances of protracted interruptions in the activities of councils. It suffices to recall the ten-year interruption in the work of the Council of Trent from 1552 to 1562. Those times were troubled and uneasy, and it was difficult to foresee whether the council would reconvene. Of course, it has been almost one hundred years since the Vatican Council. In its composition, of course, it was a completely different council. And this was not the only respect in which it was different. Nonetheless, in a sense, any new council is inevitably a continuation of the Vatican Council, regardless of whether or not this is formally stipulated.

The Vatican Council disbanded without completing its program. In the apt words of one contemporary Church historian: strictly speaking, the Vatican Council had hardly begun. Only a small part of the intended program was completed. The greater part of the materials prepared for council discussion were untouched: fifty-one topics in all. Many documents were not even handed out to the members of the council. And even in the case of the "dogmatic constitution of the Church," only one section was examined and adopted — one which had been rather awkwardly removed from its general context, dealing with papal primacy and infallibility, the illustrious "Vatican Dogma." In essence, the "Vatican Dogma" is only a fragment of an unfinished whole, and this greatly complicates understanding it. The authority of the Supreme Pontiff of Rome at that time received strict "dogmatic" formulation. Papal primacy and infallibility is now not only historical and canonical fact, but an "article of faith" in the Roman Church. But the very "dogma of the Church" remained, and still remains, unclearly and indistinctly formulated. Some Roman theologians even state directly that Church doctrine is still in the most elementary, "pre-theological" stage of discovery and development. The Church still has not been defined. Theological equilibrium in Roman Church doctrine was seriously disrupted by the hasty and possibly premature adoption of the "Vatican Dogma."

The upcoming council will inevitably return to the topics of the Vatican. The topic of the Church will undoubtedly be central in its program. Indeed, the council was convened under the auspices of Christian and Church unity. First and foremost, it remains for the Church to render an authentic interpretation of the "Vatican Dogma," in the broad sense of teachings on the Church. In this context, one believes, this very "Vatican Dogma" will look and sound new. The "theological climate" has changed significantly — in the Roman Catholic Church and in the entire Christian world — since the times of Pius the Ninth. It is to be hoped that it will now be unnecessary to hurry, as seemed necessary during the years of the Vatican Council — albeit not to all concerned, by any means. The Vatican Council was planned in an atmosphere of theological confusion and backwardness, of political fear. The topics are the same, as are the problems. But they are now being raised even more sharply and pointedly, and their inner complexity has become even more obvious in light of new experience, both historical and theological, than it was in the middle of the last century. It suffices to recall the renaissance of Thomism, "Modernism," the contemporary liturgical movement and the intense work that has been accomplished in all areas of theological knowledge at the heart of the Catholic Church.

Planning the council will obviously require no small amount of time. It would be difficult to believe that the council could meet earlier than in three or even four years. Rushing the plans could unfavorably reflect on the success of the council. The character of the council will depend to a great extent on the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of its planning. Participants in the council should thoroughly prepare their areas of responsibility. It is still unknown how the pre-council work will be formulated. A significant part of the work will probably be done by the Roman "congregations," according to affiliation. But one must hope that wider groups of competent theologians will also be drawn into pre-council planning. It is, of course, impossible to incorporate serious theological work into a broad, truly "ecumenical" or world-wide scope in a short period of time. The Roman Church is presently undergoing a period of unquestionable theological and liturgical growth. But this new movement, a symptom and guarantee of living creation, is still far short of enveloping the entire Church, and has still not penetrated into all layers of its structure. The planning of the council should be theologically impartial and "nonsectarian" — which unfortunately cannot be said of the planning for the Vatican Council. The pre-council work should be put on the level of contemporary theological thought in the Roman Catholic Church itself. All the diversity and effort of contemporary theological thought and spiritual experience, even beyond the boundaries of the Roman Church, should be wisely and sensitively taken into account when planning the stages of the council. As this takes place, a lack of conformity within the Church itself may be discovered. This discordance need not be prevented

ON THE UPCOMING COUNCIL OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Vatican Council, 1869-1870, was the last "ecumenical council," according to the enumeration of the Roman Catholic Church. Formally, the Vatican Council was never closed. The activities of the council were merely temporarily interrupted due to pressure from outside circumstances which, it seemed at the time, threatened the freedom of council activities and even the freedom of the Church itself — namely, the occupation of the Vatican and of the city of Rome itself by the troops of nationalist Italy. The possibility of reopening under more favorable conditions, however, was tacitly assumed. Therefore, the council was not formally dismissed. In the past, there were instances of protracted interruptions in the activities of councils. It suffices to recall the ten-year interruption in the work of the Council of Trent from 1552 to 1562. Those times were troubled and uneasy, and it was difficult to foresee whether the council would reconvene. Of course, it has been almost one hundred years since the Vatican Council. In its composition, of course, it was a completely different council. And this was not the only respect in which it was different. Nonetheless, in a sense, any new council is inevitably a continuation of the Vatican Council, regardless of whether or not this is formally stipulated.

The Vatican Council disbanded without completing its program. In the apt words of one contemporary Church historian: strictly speaking, the Vatican Council had hardly begun. Only a small part of the intended program was completed. The greater part of the materials prepared for council discussion were untouched: fifty-one topics in all. Many documents were not even handed out to the members of the council. And even in the case of the "dogmatic constitution of the Church," only one section was examined and adopted — one which had been rather awkwardly removed from its general context, dealing with papal primacy and infallibility, the illustrious "Vatican Dogma." In essence, the "Vatican Dogma" is only a fragment of an unfinished whole, and this greatly complicates understanding it. The authority of the Supreme Pontiff of Rome at that time received strict "dogmatic" formulation. Papal primacy and infallibility is now not only historical and canonical fact, but an "article of faith" in the Roman Church. But the very "dogma of the Church" remained, and still remains, unclearly and indistinctly formulated. Some Roman theologians even state directly that Church doctrine is still in the most elementary, "pre-theological" stage of discovery and development. The Church still has not been defined. Theological equilibrium in Roman Church doctrine was seriously disrupted by the hasty and possibly premature adoption of the "Vatican Dogma."

The upcoming council will inevitably return to the topics of the Vatican. The topic of the Church will undoubtedly be central in its program. Indeed, the council was convened under the auspices of Christian and Church unity. First and foremost, it remains for the Church to render an authentic interpretation of the "Vatican Dogma," in the broad sense of teachings on the Church. In this context, one believes, this very "Vatican Dogma" will look and sound new. The "theological climate" has changed significantly — in the Roman Catholic Church and in the entire Christian world — since the times of Pius the Ninth. It is to be hoped that it will now be unnecessary to hurry, as seemed necessary during the years of the Vatican Council — albeit not to all concerned, by any means. The Vatican Council was planned in an atmosphere of theological confusion and backwardness, of political fear. The topics are the same, as are the problems. But they are now being raised even more sharply and pointedly, and their inner complexity has become even more obvious in light of new experience, both historical and theological, than it was in the middle of the last century. It suffices to recall the renaissance of Thomism, "Modernism," the contemporary liturgical movement and the intense work that has been accomplished in all areas of theological knowledge at the heart of the Catholic Church.

Planning the council will obviously require no small amount of time. It would be difficult to believe that the council could meet earlier than in three or even four years. Rushing the plans could unfavorably reflect on the success of the council. The character of the council will depend to a great extent on the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of its planning. Participants in the council should thoroughly prepare their areas of responsibility. It is still unknown how the pre-council work will be formulated. A significant part of the work will probably be done by the Roman "congregations," according to affiliation. But one must hope that wider groups of competent theologians will also be drawn into pre-council planning. It is, of course, impossible to incorporate serious theological work into a broad, truly "ecumenical" or world-wide scope in a short period of time. The Roman Church is presently undergoing a period of unquestionable theological and liturgical growth. But this new movement, a symptom and guarantee of living creation, is still far short of enveloping the entire Church, and has still not penetrated into all layers of its structure. The planning of the council should be theologically impartial and "nonsectarian" — which unfortunately cannot be said of the planning for the Vatican Council. The pre-council work should be put on the level of contemporary theological thought in the Roman Catholic Church itself. All the diversity and effort of contemporary theological thought and spiritual experience, even beyond the boundaries of the Roman Church, should be wisely and sensitively taken into account when planning the stages of the council. As this takes place, a lack of conformity within the Church itself may be discovered. This discordance need not be prevented

in advance. Discord is often inspired by sincere fervor, as was the case at the Vatican Council. Discipline does not rule out theological freedom even when it limits it, and it should never suppress disbelief or nonbelief, as was the case in the "Modernist" period. In particular, it is to be hoped that the planning adequately reflects the accomplishments of contemporary Biblical and Church-historical scholarship within the Roman Church itself. The council should not "lag behind" in its exegesis, nor in its understanding of Church History. The testament of the Holy Fathers should be given a more significant place in dogmatic argumentation than has often been the case since the time of the Scholastics. The problem of the tradition should be discussed in all its depth, and this could require extended commentary on the edicts of the Tridentine Council. To do this, one needs great spiritual tenacity, humility and sobriety.

A certain amount of publicity can only be useful for the planning of the council. The council topics should undergo free discussion in the theological press. The entire Church should be involved in and dedicated to the problematic of the council. All members of the Church should explore their faith consciously and responsibly — and of course, with allegiance to Church traditions and in obedience to lawful pastoral authority. The *consensus fidelium* only strengthens the faith and the Church. And the council itself should be provided with that inner freedom and spiritual tranquility, the inadequacy and even lack of which many visible and valiant participants in the Vatican Council bitterly complained of, with more than adequate cause. "I learn from my mistakes."

In the preliminary stage of pre-council work, time can also be found for "counseling" with "dissidents" and "schismatics," especially in light of the fact that the "ecumenical topic" will undoubtedly occupy a significant portion of the council program. Nonetheless, such "counseling" can be effective only if it is done in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. "Divided brothers" (or prodigal sons) do not find it easy to meet and discuss, "without rancor and passion," the very facts of the division, its causes and motives. This is possible only at the highest levels of humility, obedience before the Truth, and love. Otherwise, the exchange of opinions can easily degenerate into not only debates about faith but into fruitless logomachy, and this will lead to great alienation and mutual bitterness. The discipline required for ecumenical intercourse is still completely undeveloped, and even the very problem of such a discipline is still far from being recognized by everyone. On the other hand, the idea of "ecumenical counseling" is much less of a novelty than would seem to be the case. Theological exchange of opinions has been occurring on various official levels for many years between Roman and Protestant theologians and Church officials in certain European countries, especially in West Germany, and the accomplishments of this "counseling" are extremely significant and obvious. It is equally obvious that inner success in this case depends

namely upon mutual trust, spiritual earnestness and the consciousness of responsibility before God. On the other hand, one obviously must not expect from this "ecumenical counseling" that which simply cannot happen. The "equality of rights" or "equal worth" of all the participating "creeds" — that is, of "all the heresies" — is a morbid dream, dangerous and completely futile. And this kind of "ecumenical reverie" can only harm the "ecumenical issue."

Orthodox theologians can, of course, take part in such preliminary "pre-council counseling" with the notification and agreement of Church officials, but only as observers. In any case, at the present time there is neither ground nor place for a "union council" [unionalnyi sobor]. Inviting the bishops of the "schismatic churches" — "schismatic," of course, from the Roman point of view — to the council of the Roman Church, even as simple "observers," can only damage the rapprochement of East and West. It will only remind us of the regrettable precedent of the Florentine Council and will have the same consequences, or possibly even worse ones. A formal "meeting" of the Churches should be preceded by a long "molecular" preparation on various levels of Church life and practice. At the present time, neither the East nor the West is spiritually prepared for such a "formal" meeting.

At the present time, the Orthodox must first pose and discuss the basic question in all its tragic complexity, *for themselves*. What actually occurred in 1054 or even earlier, or perhaps only later? What is the essence of the "schism"? Will this schism be named "Byzantine" or "Roman"? What is the "Roman" Church from the point of view of Orthodox ecclesiology? Has the "Roman" Church retained its "Orthodoxy" — that is, its "correct faith" — or has it fallen hopelessly into heresy? One must begin with this very question. It is sufficiently obvious that there is no harmony among the Orthodox, and the question is posed completely candidly and frankly. Roman theory is simpler, and seemingly more consistent. From the point of view of Roman canonical law, the Orthodox Church is a Church, albeit also "schismatic" and "not completely true": its sacraments are performed, the Orthodox clergy has not only "character" but to a certain extent even "jurisdiction." From the Roman point of view, therefore, one may pose the question of "Union" (Uniia) — that is, of the reunification of the alienated "parts" of the Single Church, indivisible in its essence. Many Orthodox theologians are ready to accept this formulation of the question (albeit not always consistently), and emphasize only the fact that it was the Roman Church which fell into the schism. Nonetheless, in both word and deed the "religiousness" of Roman Catholicism is not infrequently denied from the Orthodox side. If "Catholics" becoming Orthodox must be baptized, this denies the "religiousness" of Rome. The "gracelessness" of everything Roman is taken by many to be self-evident, and all the facts of "spiritual life" in the West are unreservedly attributed to Satan's promptings or to spiritual illness and "charms" —

in advance. Discord is often inspired by sincere fervor, as was the case at the Vatican Council. Discipline does not rule out theological freedom even when it limits it, and it should never suppress disbelief or nonbelief, as was the case in the "Modernist" period. In particular, it is to be hoped that the planning adequately reflects the accomplishments of contemporary Biblical and Church-historical scholarship within the Roman Church itself. The council should not "lag behind" in its exegesis, nor in its understanding of Church History. The testament of the Holy Fathers should be given a more significant place in dogmatic argumentation than has often been the case since the time of the Scholastics. The problem of the tradition should be discussed in all its depth, and this could require extended commentary on the edicts of the Tridentine Council. To do this, one needs great spiritual tenacity, humility and sobriety.

A certain amount of publicity can only be useful for the planning of the council. The council topics should undergo free discussion in the theological press. The entire Church should be involved in and dedicated to the problematic of the council. All members of the Church should explore their faith consciously and responsibly — and of course, with allegiance to Church traditions and in obedience to lawful pastoral authority. The *consensus fidelium* only strengthens the faith and the Church. And the council itself should be provided with that inner freedom and spiritual tranquility, the inadequacy and even lack of which many visible and valiant participants in the Vatican Council bitterly complained of, with more than adequate cause. "I learn from my mistakes."

In the preliminary stage of pre-council work, time can also be found for "counseling" with "dissidents" and "schismatics," especially in light of the fact that the "ecumenical topic" will undoubtedly occupy a significant portion of the council program. Nonetheless, such "counseling" can be effective only if it is done in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. "Divided brothers" (or prodigal sons) do not find it easy to meet and discuss, "without rancor and passion," the very facts of the division, its causes and motives. This is possible only at the highest levels of humility, obedience before the Truth, and love. Otherwise, the exchange of opinions can easily degenerate into not only debates about faith but into fruitless logomachy, and this will lead to great alienation and mutual bitterness. The discipline required for ecumenical intercourse is still completely undeveloped, and even the very problem of such a discipline is still far from being recognized by everyone. On the other hand, the idea of "ecumenical counseling" is much less of a novelty than would seem to be the case. Theological exchange of opinions has been occurring on various official levels for many years between Roman and Protestant theologians and Church officials in certain European countries, especially in West Germany, and the accomplishments of this "counseling" are extremely significant and obvious. It is equally obvious that inner success in this case depends

namely upon mutual trust, spiritual earnestness and the consciousness of responsibility before God. On the other hand, one obviously must not expect from this "ecumenical counseling" that which simply cannot happen. The "equality of rights" or "equal worth" of all the participating "creeds" — that is, of "all the heresies" — is a morbid dream, dangerous and completely futile. And this kind of "ecumenical reverie" can only harm the "ecumenical issue."

Orthodox theologians can, of course, take part in such preliminary "pre-council counseling" with the notification and agreement of Church officials, but only as observers. In any case, at the present time there is neither ground nor place for a "union council" [unionalnyi sobor]. Inviting the bishops of the "schismatic churches" — "schismatic," of course, from the Roman point of view — to the council of the Roman Church, even as simple "observers," can only damage the rapprochement of East and West. It will only remind us of the regrettable precedent of the Florentine Council and will have the same consequences, or possibly even worse ones. A formal "meeting" of the Churches should be preceded by a long "molecular" preparation on various levels of Church life and practice. At the present time, neither the East nor the West is spiritually prepared for such a "formal" meeting.

At the present time, the Orthodox must first pose and discuss the basic question in all its tragic complexity, *for themselves*. What actually occurred in 1054 or even earlier, or perhaps only later? What is the essence of the "schism"? Will this schism be named "Byzantine" or "Roman"? What is the "Roman" Church from the point of view of Orthodox ecclesiology? Has the "Roman" Church retained its "Orthodoxy" — that is, its "correct faith" — or has it fallen hopelessly into heresy? One must begin with this very question. It is sufficiently obvious that there is no harmony among the Orthodox, and the question is posed completely candidly and frankly. Roman theory is simpler, and seemingly more consistent. From the point of view of Roman canonical law, the Orthodox Church is a Church, albeit also "schismatic" and "not completely true": its sacraments are performed, the Orthodox clergy has not only "character" but to a certain extent even "jurisdiction." From the Roman point of view, therefore, one may pose the question of "Union" (Uniia) — that is, of the reunification of the alienated "parts" of the Single Church, indivisible in its essence. Many Orthodox theologians are ready to accept this formulation of the question (albeit not always consistently), and emphasize only the fact that it was the Roman Church which fell into the schism. Nonetheless, in both word and deed the "religiousness" of Roman Catholicism is not infrequently denied from the Orthodox side. If "Catholics" becoming Orthodox must be baptized, this denies the "religiousness" of Rome. The "gracelessness" of everything Roman is taken by many to be self-evident, and all the facts of "spiritual life" in the West are unreservedly attributed to Satan's promptings or to spiritual illness and "charms" —

St. Francis of Assisi, Joan of Arc, Theresa of Spain. And it is true that even St. Augustine, despite the warning of the Holy Patriarch Photius, is often crossed off the Orthodox calendar in view of his "heresy." The fact of this sharp theological dissent among the Orthodox cannot be ignored. In this case, it is hardly advisable to plead freedom of theological opinion. The theory of Church "economy" helps very little in this case. Rather, it clouds and confuses the theological problem. Before discussing the issue of the advisability of "meeting" with the Roman Catholics for purposes of international peace and cooperation, Orthodox theologians and Church officials in Orthodox Churches should openly and candidly pose the question of the very nature of the "Roman Church" and the "Roman schism." And this will require the development of Church doctrines, in all their entirety and complexity.

Be that as it may, the calling of a new "General Council," even if only within the Roman Church, is undoubtedly a new and significant ecumenical fact, a great and important ecumenical event, whatever its immediate and direct consequences may be. And as such, it requires great attention on the part of Orthodox theologians.

Translated from the Russian by
Linda Morris

SOME CONTRIBUTORS TO 20th CENTURY ECUMENICAL THOUGHT

Père Le Guillou

Père M. J. Le Guillou, O.P. has recently suggested that various forms of ecumenical "confrontation" may be conveniently classified under the following five headings: (1) controversy; (2) concordance; (3) critical history: (4) symbolics; (5) Ecumenics.[1] In his new book Mgr. Gustave Thils offers another scheme: (1) confrontation by what he calls — *oppositions massives*, a suitable term to denote the very spirit of controversy as such; (2) search for common foundations — *le fonds commun*, which may be common background or common ground, or both; (3) the method of "radical intuitions" — in the sense of detecting the deepest "roots" or underlying principles of particular systems and trends; and finally (4) "existential confrontation."[2] These two schemes overlap considerably, but the emphasis is not quite the same in both cases. The title of the essay of Père Le Guillou suggests that there was a gradual move "from controversy to ecumenical dialogue." This is obviously true on the whole. It seems, however, that the various approaches used in dealing with ecumenical matters are fixed attitudes rather than successive stages of development. All different matters may be employed at the same time. Indeed, "controversy" has not yet ceased in spite of the conspicuous growth of a new "ecumenical spirit," and may burst out again with renewed vigor or be deliberately rekindled. Actually, "controversy" is still going on in the guise of a "cold war" or an "armed neutrality." The method of "radical intuitions" is basically no more than a subtle and refined form of "controversy," and works to the same effect — "massive opposition." "Existential confrontation" is perhaps a recent discovery. Yet even "controversial engagements" have an obvious "existential" character, and a very definite *Sitz im Leben* ["place in life"]. The spirit of controversy is still conspicuously active in the "ecumenical dialogue."

It may be reasonably contended that controversies in the past very often had as their immediate objective the maintenance of the *status quo*; that is, radical discrimination. In many instances the main purpose of controversy was to protect the faithful and to denounce error rather than to convert dissenters. There was a tendency to think in sharp and rigid antitheses which, by their intrinsic nature, would not admit of any reconciliation: an absolute disjunction — *sic* or *non*. The ultimate aim was just refutation, pure and simple. And the list of dissensions was often deliberately inflated. In this connection Père Le Guillou quotes Joseph de Maîstre, and concludes: "The very logic of this kind of controversy was to develop and to justify opposition for its own sake."[3] In this situation, of course, there was no room for encounter or for any

exchange of views, but only for combat and condemnation. Now, this method of "total refutation" is still widely employed. "Controversy" as such, for its own sake, is, of course, a false manner of confrontation. And it is in fact a sterile method. No religious problem has ever been solved simply by debate or fight. The "wars of religion" led nowhere and only bred passion and distrust. On the other hand, controversy cannot be easily avoided in the midst of actual contradictions, in the divided state of Christendom. The "suggestion of heresy" is, indeed, an unhealthy and uncharitable endeavor. Yet "heresies" do exist. "Oppositions" are not simply invented by controversialists — they are a brutal fact of life. Christendom is split and divided. There are "major differences" in belief and commitment, and they separate and estrange Christians from one another. The method of "radical intuitions" only makes their disagreements more radical and burning, by focusing attention on the essentials, on the deepest roots. In this respect, paradoxically, John Adam Moehler was much more radical than Cardinal Bellarmine. There was in Moehler a radical discrimination between the Church and the Reformation. The method of "concordances," and the "care for equivalents" — *le souci des equivalences*, in the phrase of Mgr. Thils,[4] do not resolve the ultimate tension. This tension cannot be resolved by any kind of dialectics or in any dialectical synthesis. In most cases there is no *via media*.

The real deficiency of the controversial method is the lack of Christian perspective. The method of "radical intuitions" may be vitiated by the same default. The question may be put in this form: Has Christian unity been broken so radically that no meeting ground remains? Indeed, what is this meeting ground, if any? It must be accurately circumscribed. Excessive "eirenism" can be no less damaging for the cause of reconciliation and misleading than rigid segregation. Indeed, there is still some "visible unity of Christians," even in the present state of disruption.[5] Christendom is sorely and spectacularly divided. It is disunited to such an extent that often "communication" and even "understanding" become hardly possible at all. One rather gets an impression of "massive opposition." Here lies the essence, the heart of the problem, the sting of the "ecumenical paradox." One may be tempted to overemphasize the aspect of unity and to take away the edge of the paradox, just as one may be tempted to exaggerate the depth of the discord. To keep the delicate balance of the paradox is not an easy task. Moreover, one should not be too quick to identify "Christendom" as a historic aggregate of separated "denominations" with the "Church." Indeed, the basic problem of disunity and reunion is an ecclesiological problem, in the strictest sense. It would be in vain to claim that there is no "major disagreement" between the "divided "Christians" concerning the nature and constitution of the Church. In fact, in the contemporary ecumenical vocabulary the word "Church" has become the most abused and ambiguous term.

The unity of the Christian mind had long been broken before communion was broken. The Schism was first consummated in the mind before it was manifested in action. The universe of discourse was first reduced and then split. "Catholicity" of mind has been sorely defeated by the spirit of local loyalty and allegiance. This was the root of the great Oriental schisms in the fifth and sixth centuries. This was the root of the major schism, of the "separation" between the East and the West. Indeed, the break was never complete. The common ground has never been lost. But its existence was overlooked and forgotten. It would be quite out of place now to attempt any thorough analysis of the gradual process of mutual estrangement which finally led to the break of communion between Byzantium and Rome. The problem is highly controversial, and it is not easy to achieve agreement in the interpretation of this tragic story. In the present context it suffices to emphasize but one aspect of the total process: the disintegration of the Christian tradition. The Greek East overlooked and then ignored, the rise of Latin theology. The West never thoroughly knew the Greek Fathers. The common language in theology was gradually lost. The habit of dwelling in different mental worlds gradually grew. There was indeed little "care for equivalents," and little care for accurate rendering of others' thoughts. Of course, this is a simplified version of the whole story. There were notable exceptions in all ages. It is still very hard to recover a common idiom even in our time. It is even harder to recover the vision of common Christian history. In the West one can now write a history of the Church universal without mentioning the Eastern Churches except casually and sporadically.[6] This attitude, however, can be formally justified by the assumption that, strictly speaking, since the Schism with Rome there actually was no "Church" in the East, but only scattered Christians.[7] Of course, this contention may be dismissed as a polemical exaggeration, and many Catholic theologians and historians would wish to soften it or to at least qualify it carefully. Yet the prejudice is widely spread and actually does control the ecumenical vision in many quarters. Christian universality is readily interpreted as universality of the West. Again, there are notable exceptions.

Toynbee

There is undoubtedly a major doctrinal disagreement between the Roman West and the Orthodox East. And this basic disagreement must be faced in its proper perspective. But, in fact, this theological and ecclesiological disagreement is sorely entangled in a broader cultural and political tension between East and West. Arnold Toynbee only stated plainly the common prejudice of the West when he contended in his *Study of History* that "society of Western Christianity" was a "self-explanatory" realm. "Eastern Christian society" was a world apart, and also "self-explanatory." Accordingly, they had their separate histories. Thus there was no room for a common history of Christendom.

Toynbee is not a theologian, and his historical interpretation is open to doubts and objections. But his voice is highly significant — Toynbee only voiced the common bias of the West. Curiously enough, Toynbee is not as original as is often supposed. A very similar theory of various closed – and "self-explanatory" — worlds was presented by a Russian writer, Nikolai Danilevsky, in his book *Russia and Europe*, which had already appeared in 1871. Vladimir Soloviev already demonstrated that this theory was actually derived from a German source: a German "Manual of Universal History" by Heinrich Rückert (*Lehrbuch der Weltgeschichte*, 1857). Soloviev vigorously attacked this theory as incompatible with the Christian understanding of history. Moreover, the theory of independent "Christian societies" is a historical fiction, a sinful and dangerous fiction. Christendom is indeed divided. Yet the divided parts still belong together, since they are just "parts" and "fragments." Accordingly, they are intelligible only when taken together, in the context and against the background of the original Christian unity which had been broken. The recovery of the comprehensive Christian vision, of common Christian perspective, is by no means an easy task after so many centuries of estrangement and tension. But it is an impending task. The inveterate illusion of self-sufficiency must be broken down. It is an absolute prerequisite of any genuine ecumenical encounter.

Lev Karsavin

The problem of Christian unity and disunity is a permanent problem in and for the Church. But at certain periods of history this problem assumes especial urgency, not only on the theological level but as a burning issue of Christian existence. This is obviously true of our own time, difficult as it may be to clearly detect when "our own time" actually began. In any case, the problem has been conscientiously taken up and searchingly discussed by Russian churchmen and theologians since World War I. Emigration to the West made the meeting with the West unavoidable, much as many would have wanted to remain in their habitual mental world.

The method of "radical intuitions" has been widely used in order to detect and identify the "ethos" of Western Christianity: it has often been assumed, rather uncritically and summarily, that there was a single and unique "ethos" of the West, much as "the West" has been split by the Reformation. It was a dangerous assumption; the maturation of the "Crisis of Reformation" could be sorely obscured by such an approach, and cultural analysis could easily be substituted for genuine theological analysis.

The most spectacular use of this method may be found in the various writings of Lev Karsavin, and especially in his ambitious essay, *The Lessons of the Repudiated Faith*, which has never been translated into any Western language and therefore has not been given sufficient

attention in ecumenical literature. Karsavin was a brilliant historian, especially competent in the field of medieval studies. He had particular skill in speculation and literary art, and his historical imagery was always impressive. But he could never escape the dangers of excessive constructivism. In the particular essay just mentioned he attempted to derive the entire system of Roman Catholicism, directly and one-sidedly, from one particular doctrine, the doctrine of *Filioque*, which he regarded as vicious heresy. In fact, his interpretation of Roman Catholicism changed over the course of his life, and it so happened that when dying in a Soviet concentration camp, he had to receive the last sacrament from the hands of a Roman priest of the Eastern rite. It is irrelevant in the present context to follow his arguments in detail. What is relevant is the method and the implicit assumption of "massive opposition" between East and West. There is an even deeper implication in the method itself: there is no desire for "comprehension"; one enjoys distinctions, antitheses, confrontations. Karsavin had a perfect command of historic material and an unusual skill in grasping inner connections in thought and life. But one cannot get rid of the impression that all his images are overdone. We get a brilliant construction of systems, and yet do we really grasp the "existential" dimension of faith and life? In any case, especially because Karsavin persistently assumes that there is absolute coherence and consistency in all systems, one always moves within the dimensions of systems. What is especially important to note now is that Karsavin rehabilitated the method of "radical intuitions" by exhibiting such a brilliant specimen of its application.[8]

Vladimir Lossky

Karsavin's influence was strongly felt in the writings of the late Vladimir N. Lossky who was at one time, in the twenties, very close to Karsavin. There is the same basic assumption that East and West are in permanent opposition to each other, the same skill in presenting the inner cohesion of ideas within each particular system, the same conviction that *Filioque* is the root of the whole trouble. All this is done by Lossky with much more sobriety and caution, with more reverence and devotion, with more precision, and with a much more adequate and existential knowledge of the Eastern tradition. The strongest point of Lossky was his insistence that doctrine and spirituality were intimately correlated. In his last years Lossky was deeply engaged in the ecumenical dialogue, mainly within the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius.[9]

The search for the distinctive "ethos" of particular churches and denominations is an integral and indispensible part of ecumenical endeavor, especially if it is conducted with adequate discretion and precision, and in an openly historical perspective. One cannot, however, ignore its inherent divisive aspect. Something else is needed to ascertain the limits of discrimination and distinction. Confrontation in theology

is fruitful only if there is hope of reconciliation. Otherwise it would inevitably end in conflict and segregation. Indeed, there is an opposite danger — to reduce the tension, to ignore its existential roots. There is a greater danger — to suggest that because of the utter improbability that historic splits can be ever healed on the ecclesiological level, one may seek unity in another dimension, in which actual theological tensions become quite irrelevant.[10]

Father Sergei Bulgakov

At this point Father Sergei Bulgakov must be quoted. He summarized his ecumenical vision in a brief programmatic article published in full only in Russian: "At Jacob's Well."[11] His main contention is well expressed by the subtitle: "On the Actual Unity of the Divided Church in Faith, Prayer, and Sacraments." The Church is still one, in spite of all the divisions on the historic surface by the ill and disruptive will of men. To this divisive will a unitive effort must be opposed. In fact, divided Christians can already meet conscientiously in common prayer. All reverent readers of the Word of God can already experience their common membership in the One Church, the Church of the Gospel. There is a growing mystical and ideological intercommunication between Christians in the field of theology and religious thought. There is already unity and agreement, although it is not fixed by any conciliatory formulas. By its very nature this unity escapes all strictures and canonical ruling. It is a spiritual unity. There is also considerable agreement in doctrine. Concerning the sacraments, Father Bulgakov contends that in spite of all the canonical regulations there is "an invisible communion, as it were, *ex opere operato*." Indeed, this communion is handicapped by the loss of Apostolic succession in Protestant denominations, and it must be restored. But on the whole, sacraments can be valid even outside "the ecclesiological organization." Moreover, "doctrinal agreement" is not for him an indispensable prerequisite of sacramental communion. It is for that reason that Father Bulgakov at one time projected a "partial intercommunion" within the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, provided that dispensation was given by the proper ecclesiastical authorities in the two churches. His proposal, however, met with strong opposition in the Fellowship itself.[12] Father Bulgakov himself quoted Vladimir Soloviev's conception. Only there is much more wishful thinking in it than in the daring utopias of Soloviev, and much more naïveté and impatience. Bulgakov's ecclesiological conception is vague: it is vitiated by a kind of historic docetism.[13]

[1]M. J. Le Guillou, "Des controversies au dialogue oecuménique," in *Istina* (1958), I, pp. 65-112.

[2]Gustave Thils, "La 'Théologie Oecuménique.' Notion — Formes — Démarches" (*Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovanensium*, vol. XVI), (Louvain, 1961), pp. 15-46.

[3]Le Guillou, p. 74.

[4]Thils, pp. 32-35.

[5]See, for instance, the recent article of Frère Max Thurian, "The Visible Unity of Christians," in *The Ecumenical Review*, vol. XIII. 3 (April, 1961), pp. 313-334.

[6]See, for instance, the standard manual by Joseph Lortz, *Geschichte der Kirche*; the 20th edition appeared in 1959.

[7]See, for example, Wilhelm de Vries, S.J., "Die Haltung des heiligen Stuhles gegenüber der getrennten Hierarchie im Nahen Osten zur Zeit der Unionen," in *Zeitschrift für die katholische Theologie*, Bd. 80 (1958), ss. 378-409.

[8]On Karsavin see Bernhard Schultz, *Russische Denker* (Wien, 1950), ss. 405-419. The article, "Uroki trechennoi very" [The Lessons of the Repudiated Faith] was published in the *Evraziskii Vremennik*, vol. IV (Berlin 1925), pp. 82-154; cf. also Karsavin's article "Der Geist des Russischen Christentums," in *Östliches Christentum, Dokumente*, published by Nicolai v. Bubnoff und Hans Ehrenberg, Bd. II (München, 1925), ss. 307-377. Karsavin was a prolific writer in the twenties, mainly in Russian. See also Dr. Erich Franz Sommer, "Vom Leben und Sterben eines russischen Metaphysikers. Ein verspäteter Nachruf auf Leo Karsavin" (12.7.1952), in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, vol. XXIV (Roma, 1958), pp. 131-141.

[9]See especially his *Essai sur le théologie mystique de l'Église d'Orient* (Paris, 1944); English translation — *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London, 1957); cf. the exchange of views concerning *Filioque* between Fr. Vladimir Rodzianko and Lossky (in Russian) in the *Messager de l'Exarchat du Patriarche Russe en Europe Occidentale*, Nrs. 24 (1955) and 25 (1957). See also "Memorial Vladimir Lossky, 1903-1958" — *Messager*, Nrs. 30-31 (1959).

[10]See, for instance, *Vision and Acton*, by L. A. Zander (London, 1952), and my extensive review of this book in *The Christian East*, N.S., vol. II, Nrs. 3/4, 1953, pp. 112-120 and also in *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*.

[11]First published in the symposium: *The Christian Reunion. The Ecumenical Problem in the Orthodox Understanding* (YMCA-Press: Paris, 1933), pp. 9-32 (in Russian); there is an abridged English version, in *The Journal of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius*, Nr. 22 (December 1933), pp. 7-17.

[12]Cf. articles by E. Lampert in *Sobornost*, N.S. Nrs. 21, 22, 23 (1940 and 1941). Some time the whole story must be told in full.

[13]Cf. also articles by the late A. V. Kartashev: "The Ways of Unity" (in the symposium *Russia and the Latin World* (Berlin, 1923), pp. 141-151); "The Reunion of Churches in the Light of History" (in the symposium *The Christian Reunion*, pp. 82-120); both articles in Russian.