

98 Dollars 1903.



**"Russian Orthodox
American Messenger".**

NOVEMBER & DECEMBER SUPPLEMENT

1902.

ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ КЪ ЖУРНАЛУ

**"АМЕРИКАНСКИЙ ПРАВОСЛАВНЫЙ
ВЪОТБИИЪ."**

NEW YORK.

**"RUSSIAN ORTHODOX
AMERICAN MESSENGER".**



RUSSIAN EDITION	— —	\$2.00 A. YEAR
ENGLISH SUPPLEMENTS	— MONTHLY	1.50 „
RUSSIAN EDITION AND SUPPLEMENTS		3.00 „

ADDRESS:

REV. A. HOTOVITZKY, Editor

15 E. 97th St.,

New York City.



AN ADDRESS

made by Very Reverend Bishop Tikhon on the occasion of the dedication of the Russian Orthodox Church in New York.

I greet you, Russian Orthodox people, on the solemn occasion of the dedication of your church. The present day is as joyous for us, as once was the day for Israel, when, in the reign of Solomon, the temple of the Lord was erected instead of the tabernacle.

Truly enough, until now in New York we had but a tabernacle. Like the tabernacle carried from one town to another, our church also was moved from one place to another. And like David being sorry that he dwelt in a house of cedar but the

ark of God dwelt within curtains (II Samuel 7. 2) we also many a time were sorry that our church was small, poor and uncomfortable. Today we put an end to regrets of this kind, the Lord took notice of our heartfelt longings, that, in this great city, there should be erected a church worthy of the Russian nation and answering to the greatness of the Orthodox faith.

It is true that in wealth our new church is inferior to many churches of the great Russian land, but, for a compensation, She, like the temple of Solomon, has a missionary importance: we trust that people of alien creeds will also hear of it, and will come to it and pray, lifting their arms towards Our Lord!

And so let us thank the Lord, who should Himself so gracious to us, in moving good Russian people to sacrifice, that this church should be erected, and in consecrating it to day with the grace of His Holy Spirit.

Now if so be ye have lasted that the Lord is gracious (I Peter 2, 3), having helped you to erect this stately stone building, you also brethren, in the words of St. Peter the Apostle, *as lively stones are built up a spiritual house* (2, 5), that is to say you compose a church community, as firm and

as lasting as this church of years. Up to this day, so long as you had no regular church here, so long as you had but a temporary place for it, it seemed both to foreigners and to yourselves that possibly the work of the Orthodox Church in this country was also but temporary. But now that you have a regular church, these apprehensions are dissipated. *I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it* (Matthew 16, 18), and so *I am with you always, even unto the end of the world, amen* (28, 20).

We believe and trust that these promises of Christ have reference to our work here as well and so do come to this church without fear, but gather around it daringly and form one unanimous family, tied with the bonds of faith and love.

You know that at home in Russia church and parish are intimately related to each other. Let it be the same way amongst you. Love your church and visit it often. Of old Russian people always were known for their piety and their love for the holy Churches of God: holy Russia is built on churches and is beautified by them. Unfortunately, there are Russians, who, once they got abroad, begin, through lack of moral courage, to be ashamed to preserve

the good customs of the religion of their fathers, and think that by giving them up they will secure the respect of the foreigners. This is a bitter and a sad error: no one respects renegates! Needless to say, that it was about these that our Lord spoke: *Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels* (Mark 8, 38).

You should act differently: stand by the Orthodox faith, preserve the tradition of your fathers, and love the church of the Lord.

Gathering around the temple, build out of yourselves a *spiritual house* (I Peter 2, 5), so that to be able to give yourselves, your souls and your life to the service of God. Do not forget that both your church and church community have a missionary importance: *you are a chosen generation, a peculiar people* (I Peter 2, 9), so that you may announce to the foreigners around you the wondrous light of Orthodoxy.

In one of the beautiful prayers, which were said at the consecration of this holy edifice, we pray the Lord that the erected church should serve *for the guidance of our*

lives, for the fulfilment of righteous living and for the realization of all truths.

And so I think it timely, at the dedication of your church, to implore you in the words of St. Peter, which can closely be applied to you also. *Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which was against the soul, but lead a righteous life so that the followers of different creeds all around you should glorify God and your church by your good works, which they shall behold. For so is the will of God that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. As free and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God, obey all authorities, honour all men, love the brotherhood, fear God. And above all things have fervent charity among yourselves: for charity shall cover the multitude of sins. Finally, be you all of one mind, having compassion one of another. love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous. And when you minister to each other, minister in the ability which God giveth, that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.*

BISHOP TIKHON.

New York ¹⁰/₂₃ November 1902.

ALASKA.

By Father Sebastian, a citizen of the United States.

Since this country was ceded to the United States by Russia in 1867 for a very little consideration much developement, comparatively speaking, has marked its impress on the vast territory. Alaska is a great region of land, with tremendous mountains and voluminous lakes and rivers covering nearly all there is of what we call the North in our Western Hemisphere. Mt. St. Elias which I have seen for two whole days while sailing along the coast was once thought to be the highest in North America. But now it has been found that another mountain, in the heart of the country and about one thousand miles away from Mt. St. Elias, is much larger and higher than this one. It is Mt. McKinley, named in honor of our late martyred President.

This Summer I spent a few days less than three months in Alaska and it was my privilege to make three thousand miles of sea coast up there. I covered the

same course on my return voyage — this afforded me six thousand miles of sight seeing and experience in Alaska alone for this summer. In the eighties I lived in Alaska for more than three years. Together with Colonell Ball and Governor Swineford we citizens of Sitka sent forth the first number of the first newspaper in Alaska— this was in 1885. Now there are at least nine papers in the country. Three thousand miles of sea coast is something big, indeed. Yet, you must remember that this is something less than half of Alaska's navigable coast. As the vessel sails along, one sees numerous bays, really as beautiful as can be conceived by a dreamer, grand sounds capable of harboring large fleets. And the archipelagoes of Alaska -- I think there are more of them, but surely, they are as picturesque as any in the world.

In one part of this immense country, just around the entrance of Cook's Inlet, within a radius of two hundred miles, there are now three active volcanoes: Cherno-bouri, or St. Augustine, Illiamna, and the Redoubt. Kenai is a village forty miles distant from the last named volcano. During last July I spent two weeks in this village and noticed that, when the wind blew for a considerable time from the S.

ALASKA.

By Father Sebastian, a citizen of the United States.

Since this country was ceded to the United States by Russia in 1867 for a very little consideration much developement, comparatively speaking, has marked its impress on the vast territory. Alaska is a great region of land, with tremendous mountains and voluminous lakes and rivers covering nearly all there is of what we call the North in our Western Hemisphere. Mt. St. Elias which I have seen for two whole days while sailing along the coast was once thought to be the highest in North America. But now it has been found that another mountain, in the heart of the country and about one thousand miles away from Mt. St. Elias, is much larger and higher than this one. It is Mt. McKinley, named in honor of our late martyred President.

This Summer I spent a few days less than three months in Alaska and it was my privilege to make three thousand miles of sea coast up there. I covered the

same course on my return voyage — this afforded me six thousand miles of sight seeing and experience in Alaska alone for this summer. In the eighties I lived in Alaska for more than three years. Together with Colonell Ball and Governor Swineford we citizens of Sitka sent forth the first number of the first newspaper in Alaska—this was in 1885. Now there are at least nine papers in the country. Three thousand miles of sea coast is something big, indeed. Yet, you must remember that this is something less than half of Alaska's navigable coast. As the vessel sails along, one sees numerous bays, really as beautiful as can be conceived by a dreamer, grand sounds capable of harboring large fleets. And the archipelagoes of Alaska -- I think there are more of them, but surely, they are as picturesque as any in the world.

In one part of this immense country, just around the entrance of Cook's Inlet, within a radius of two hundred miles, there are now three active volcanoes: Chernobouri, or St. Augustine, Illiamna, and the Redoubt. Kenai is a village forty miles distant from the last named volcano. During last July I spent two weeks in this village and noticed that, when the wind blew for a considerable time from the S.

W. it sprinkled fine ashes brought forty miles from the burning and smoking Redoubt.

I know very little of inland Alaska, I speak more about that coast country with which I am acquainted. There are many miles of rich timber land, some of which, by order of President Roosevelt, has been reserved for the Government. Alaska is rich in gold, copper, coal, oil and some stones which are not very precious. Many millions of dollars worth of gold ore has been taken out of the country during the last four years. It is the immense quantity the superior quality, and the different species of Alaska's fish, furs, and game — that make the country a rich field of operation for aggressive Corporations.

There is a law regulating the fisheries of Alaska. But the country is so large, the fisheries are very numerous, and the revenue cutters, well I think there are only two for the whole year, beside which there are no officers, except an occasional inspector, to guard at other times, while trespassers are many. The traps obstruct the streams in season and out of season. There is danger that certain species of fish and the best kind of fish, will become extinct. Even now in some parts of Alaska the in-

habitants, which rely upon fish, suffer want in the Winter. The cannaries of Alaska import Chinese labor. It is true that they can not rely upon native hands altogether. But the question naturally arises that, if the white American is the superior guardian of the country and its inhabitants, why not exercise proper jurisdiction, open government industrial schools in Alaska, where the Alaskan will be at home, but not export their children to Pennsylvania and to other places as is now being practiced. While the United States government in Alaska upholds sectarian industrial schools it gambles with the honorable principle of America's unique manhood. The Alaskan native must have his freedom of the air, the woods, and the water. It is too soon, and he never will be able to discipline himself down to the level of the sickly, yellow chinese, who for twelve and more hours in the filthiest manner cook and can salmon for the delicate table of civilization. The Alaskan also needs his time for putting in his Winter supply. It is the duty of the superior white man to be indeed a guardian for his lesser brother. The average Alaskan is not lazy, he will work, and he desires to better his condition; yet he enjoys his individual freedom,

and does not readily submit to direct pressure. The child of the native soil has rights, which must be considered, especially in his native home. He may not fully realize his rights, but why not assist him? Why not be a friend to the weaker one? The vulgar mind is sometimes heard to say: it does not pay to waste means and time with an ungrateful people, especially as they are dying off. I desire to answer this vulgar mind with some facts: 1) no time has yet been wasted on the inhabitants of Alaska, and they are not quite so grateful as highly cultured christians of ages, and 2) as to means -- U. S. official statistics show that more than the sum paid by our Government to Russia for the territory has been already delivered into the Treasury at Washington, and all this money has come out of Alaska and its natives; 3) in some parts of Alaska it is true the natives are dying out rapidly, but there are parts of Alaska where the natives, notwithstanding the odds against them, are holding their own. The creoles or people of mixed blood are, on the contrary, increasing in all parts of Alaska. I think it would be a good plan if the Government would keep stores of salt in several parts of the country, and distribute it, if needs be, gratis,

among the people. I noticed that salt was sold to the natives in several places of Alaska at too high a price. Many are unable to obtain it, and the result is they dry their fish in the air and eat it without salt! Without such a necessary staple as salt is the human body becomes susceptible to all forms of disease. The natives should be taught to build separated smoke houses for drying their fish. Separated smoke houses should be built for the poor by the Government. Salt, smoked fish, and potatoes will be of more Christian charitable service to the Alaskan Indian than grammar schools and government inspections combined. Fire and smoke is the best disinfectant for the damp soil and moldy villages. I have been told that the Government made provision for supplying each town in Alaska with sufficient virus for vaccinations, but when some of our priests and school teachers applied for it, none was to be had.

A large area of land in Alaska is good agricultural country, especially the Southern portion. Grain does not well, but in the Cook's Inlet country certain kinds have matured. As yet experiments have not been fully carried out. For stock raising there are thousands of miles of hay country, and

the grasses in Alaska are very luxuriant. Professor Georgeson of the Agricultural Department in Sitka received the best samples of various table vegetables of Alaska from Cook's Inlet, and they were raised in the gardens of our missionary — the Rev. John Bortnovsky. I was in Cook's Inlet during July. The mushroom season is the month of August. Notwithstanding this, during my stay there, five different mushrooms were gathered and I was entertained for several days with five different dishes of delicious mushrooms. I am told they have nine different kinds of them during the entire season. In the town of St. Paul on Kodiak Island the Rev. Tikhon Shalamoff has domesticated the wild goose, and now this fowl in large numbers walks about the village together with chickens, etc. The tamed wild goose is much nicer eating than the usual domestic goose.

The principle cities of Alaska are Circle City, Eagle City, Nome, Juneau, Skagway, Valdez, Sitka, Sunrise, St. Michaels, Unalaska, Kodiak.

The majority of Alaskans are christianized. Our own Church has been organized in Alaska for nearly 110 years. Since the country has been occupied by the United States the Roman Catholics, Episcopal-

ians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, and several other missionaries have come to spread Cristianity.

The native population are divided into the tribes of: Thlinket, Chugach, Aglimut, Kenai, Aleut, Esquimou, and one or two inland tribes, usually named after some large river in their own tongue. At the present time there are in all about 15,000 Indians in Alaska. There are about eight thousand half breeds; and about 10,000 whites, making the total population of Alaska about 33,000.

The public school system has been considerably extended throughout Alaska during the last decade. In a few instances popular suspicion has hindered the progress of American education in Alaska. The cause of suspicion was the fact that most officers and teachers of the department were Baptists, Methodists, but principally Presbyterian Missionaries. Nowadays there are very few people that remember the educational work done in Alaska during the Russian regime. Justice must be done to Alaska likewise in the past representatives of its government and its people. Beside the usual parochial schools in most of the villages, there were the following, institutions at Sitka — the old capital: an indu-

strial and nautical school for young men, an institute of art and practical knowledge for young women, a theological seminary for future pastors, and a parochial school for every body.

The Russians of Alaska in early days had some land grants in California, and they occupied the whole of what is now known as Sonoma county. From here they shipped wheat and fruit to Alaska. The fine quality of fruit which took a prize in the worlds Fair at Chicago in 1893 came from Sonoma and it was planted by the Russians -- the seeds having been brought across Siberia from the Caucasian country and else where.

Long before any one dreamed of a city of San Francisco, there in San Francisco Bay in the little town of Saucelito flourished an iron foundry and machine shops. Here in Saucelito the Russians built the first steamer that ever steamed to the North on the Pacific Ocean. The engineer that brought the first steamer to Alaska is still living, now an old cripple of more than ninety years. He is an Alaskan creole and lives with a son in Seldovia, Alaska. The majority of workmen, men as well as officers, were left with a pension to live on when the old Russian American Fur Com-

pany turned its accounts over to the Alaska Commercial Company. Strange to say, this old creole, however, was overlooked and was left without a pension. At present there are old citizens of Alaska: Stofeeff, Checheneff, N. Pauloff, P. Pauloff, Fomin, Petelin, most of whom faithfully served the Company for over thirty years, and yet they are left without a pension or any aid. We do not question into the workings or intentions of any Company, but as citizens of a free and civilized country we deem it to be our direct duty to call attention to forgetfulness, in order that good may be done by correcting that which may not be exact. It is a very unpleasant and painful duty to bring forward the following example of misdirected benevolence. Seldom was a citizen of San Francisco more honored than the late Louis Sloss, for many years the senior member of the Alaska Commercial Co. When this rich gentleman died, he left several thousand dollars to be divided among three orphan asylums of San Francisco, but he did not mention the poor and the sick in far off Alaska, in St. Paul and St. George Islands, in Ounalaska, Belkovsky, and the Yukon, from which places he obtained his wealth, and indirectly through the influence of the Russian

priests of those places during the last thirty five years, who must now look to the Holy Synod in Russia and to a foreign government for daily bread in their old age.

There is still another misapplied privilege to which attention should be called to. I am aware that the officers of both Navy and Army are cultured gentlemen of principle, but whether the officers of the Revenue Marine Service are trained in honorable ideals of justice and politeness. I am not aware. At any rate I have seen two young officers of the latter service abruptly walk into the private homes in Alaska (it matters not how humble the appearance of the house may be) with out knocking and with out an invitation, seeking for Alaskan curiosities in an impertinent and most curious a manner. Especiall in the distant Aleutian Islands the simple inhabitants have often been dazed into speechlessness by the golden braid, and gave up their wares for little or nothing. Celebrated Attu baskets, which in our cities sell for one to two hundred dollars a piece have more than once been taken out of the hands of a maiden, who received in return one dollar and some times less!

To the lover of nature a voyage to Alaska is to be recommended. Transferring to the Alaskan steamer at Seattle, Wash., you leave the Sound and steer for the North, to pass through an inland route of grand scenery. The waters in these passages, between the numerous islands and the main land, are very calm and clear. This inland passage is as long as the route from Puget Sound to the celebrated Muir Glacier a few miles from the city of Juneau. The banks on either side are high and rocky; stupendous cliffs are alive with the water fowl and its young; yonder, an eagle is perched on a somber crag; here, a deer right opposite is looking straight at you from a grassy plateau. You are charmed at every glance. At this edge of the brink the large trunk of an ancient forest giant, felled in the glory of his power by the Winter's storm, and completely overgrown with velvety moss, will arrest your gaze. In another nook, secluded, you observe the many colored pebbles on a sparkling beach.

On Douglas Island one may see the largest mining mill in the World. In South-eastern Alaska there are many mineral springs, both hot and cold.

On entering the old Russian Capital — Sitka — the first building which attracts

attention is the Cathedral of St. Michael's. The clock in the tower of this old church was made and put in its present position by Innocentius—the first Bishop in Alaska.

San Francisco, California
November 4th 1902.



Listening to our own interior life, we must not be inattentive in looking to the many surrounding sorrows, which come from poverty, or from the just visitation of God. They ought to move some people towards patience, others towards reforming their character, others again towards charity; and the ones who consecrated themselves to God ought to be only the stronger moved by them towards increasing their prayers for the forgiveness of our sins and human ignorance.

For some people it would be well if they tempered their sadness by some light-heartedness. For others it would be well if their light-heartedness was tempered with some sadness, coming from love and humility. There are people, for whom the invisible does not exist; an unprofitable keeping away from the inevitable. Also there are people, who so to speak have broken into the spiritual world, or think that they have, trying to keep it open.

Is this necessary? Is this in order? Would not it be more modest to remain in expectation and hope before the closed gate, waiting that He, *who has the key of David*, should open it?

What separates us from the Old Catholics?

The answer of the Rotterdam commission the article under the title „Another attempt to explain“, and especially the last congress at Bönne give us the chance and the material to form an idea of the Old Catholicism, and in particular of the possibility of a union between the Old Catholics and the Orthodox Church.

As is well known, this question has a history of its own.

At first, the Old Catholicism won a great interest and almost an universal sympathy in the East. Truly enough, there always were opposing voices, and, on the other hand, in the very Sympathy there was much that was superficial, merely Anti-Roman and polemical. However, the general tone was for the Old Catholics; the Orthodox Community was earnestly glad of their courage and cherished the hope of a union with them. Such was the attitude taken towards the Old Catholics not only by the foremost representatives of our clerical school, which, in Russia, is not considered to be the expression of the church opinion, not only by the leaders of our

high life, who live with the interests and thoughts of the west; but sympathy towards the Old Catholicism was shown even by the Greek Church, this hereditary warden of the Orthodox life and thought in the church. The cause of the Old Catholics was almost an universal cause of the church and their congresses were events of general church significance. The thing went so far, that Greek ecclesiastics appeared at these congresses, and in their number the late Archbishop Nicephorus Calogeras, this zealous and rigorous preserver of churchianity. Not so in later days.

The almost total absence of the representatives of the Eastern Church was very noticeable at the last Congress in Bonne. And the proceedings of this congress failed to excite the same interest and sympathy in society as of yore. The place of sympathy was taken by indifference. The advocates of the Old Catholic cause grew rarer in the East. And in the meanwhile the opposing tendency had time to get formed and grow strong. People of avowed Latin leaning, in our country with their unaccountable sympathies for Rome, were not the only ones who stood against the Old Catholics. At present even the people, who are entirely free from Roman sympathies,

are not for them either. And quite lately, if we are to believe the newspapers, His Holiness the Patriarch III, whom all the East is in the habit of considering its spiritual leader and a true representative of the Orthodox consciousness. After so many long years of ecclesiastic research, of mutual study and exchange of opinions, such a result can not be but very depressing. And against one's will one questions in his heart: ought not we to consider the whole Old Catholic cause as lost, ought not we to give up the idea of a union with the Old Catholics, leaving them to follow their own way, together with the Anglicans and other protestants?

Fortunately it would be too hasty to come to such a sad conclusion, and we need not give up hope. Quite the contrary, we have now reached the critical moment, when our zeal and our prayers are especially needed, that the cause of the Old Catholics should enter the right path and end in the triumph of truth. It seems to me that all the apparent obstacles, with which all the interested parties were heretofore engrossed, are being gradually dispersed now, leaving, at the same time, in evidence the one real obstacle, the fund-

amental question, on the answer to which everything will depend.

I.

The discussions and polemics with the Old Catholics can ultimately be reduced to the following three points: 1) the *Filioque* 2) the transsubstantiation, and 3) validity of the Old Catholic hierarchy. Without touching upon the third point, which has a purely canonical interest, we shall linger on the first two.

In regard to these points, we have a very suggestive precedent in the ancient church history. Readmitting into its pole some infirm dissenters of the Doukhobor type, the church granted to them the right not to give to the Holy Spirit the name of God, if they firmly and unreservedly confessed Its equality and consubstantiality with the Father and the Son. Needless to say, this was not done through indifference towards faith (analogous to the English latitudinarism), neither was it done because the church authority did not at the time, possess the Œcumenical definition of the Holy Spirit, which was well capable of silencing any private opinion. In its condescension the church was moved by its full confidence in the convert's being enti-

rely agreed with the church as to the belief, but owing to the propaganda of the heretics and their constant intercourse with them, being in the habit of associating with the word „God” an idea somewhat different from the idea of the Orthodox. And so it was a psychological impossibility for them to give the Holy Spirit the same of God, though they undoubtedly believed in Its divinity.

Something similar may take place concerning the Filioque and the transsubstantiation. Both we and the Old Catholics necessarily must keep in our minds the thousand years old difference in culture and in mental life, which overshadows the church dissent. Many words and terms in use amongst both sides, in reality have a totally different meaning for each of them, a meaning which may be extremely valuable for one side, yet altogether not acceptable for the other. If we have no doubts as to the identity of our faith, we certainly ought to stop quarreling over words and expressions, mutually granting the right to every man to use the form of expression which he is in the habit of using.

In this wise, we deny the Filioque, yet stand for the Monarchy of the Holy Trinity, which is essentially necessary for

the truth of the Divine unity. For us, or rather for the Greek mind admitting that the Son is the original cause of the Holy spirit would mean admitting the two first causes in Divinity,— in other words something, which is both a psychological and a logical impossibility. In order to shield this truth against Romanism, the Greeks would rather add to the Creeds the word "*alone*" *from the Father*, so that their belief should be expressed as strictly and as doubtlessly as possible and that the very possibility of false interpretation should be eliminated.

In the meanwhile the Old Catholics have passed through quite a different schooling and evolved a different manner of thought concerning Divinity; consequently for them saying that the Son and the Holy Spirit are altogether independent in their pre-eternal origin, not being so to speak in touch with each other, would mean upsetting the very Monarchy of the Holy Trinity, for sake of which the East is ever ready to fight. Every man keeps to his own point of view, looking only through his own peculiarly tinted spectacles and can not understand the peculiar point of view and way of thinking of the other side. Or rather he can, but only at the

coast of the greatest self-sacrifice and labor. Consequently if we become convinced, above any doubt, that in abolishing the Filioque from their creed the Old Catholics go through more than a mere formality, wishing to smooth down a canonical unevenness, but actually believe in the consubstantial Holy Trinity in as an orthodox a way as the Holy Church; we, certainly, may dispense with demanding from the Old Catholics that they should sign their names under the formula „*alone*” from the *Father*, but, on the contrary, that we may even grant them their Filioque exactly in the firm belief, that the latter is necessary for the Western mind in order to express the same thought, which we wish to put forward by our formula „*alone*” from the *Father*.

To my mind, it is not with a dogma or with a private opinion that we are here concerned, not even with the possibility that, having agreed as to that which is fundamental and strictly defined by the Councils, we should feel at liberty to think whatever we chose concerning the rest, so long as we can find a few official references to the patristic literature. Acting this way one can go much too far. And such a lack of precision would point to the absence of

faith, to the loss of truth, which for the church would mean total ruin. But in our disputes with the Old Catholics, as it seems to me, we are merely concerned with the different modes of expression of the one Orthodox faith. Taking into consideration the peculiarities of the mental life of our western brother, we grant to him the right to express our faith in his own way, expecting that he, in his turn, should be just as lenient to us, with our peculiarities and infirmities. But I repeat once more, it is perfectly necessary, that we should be altogether sure, that these different forms of expression contain the same Orthodox faith.

As to the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist we believe that the bread and wine cease to be ordinary bread and wine, after the consecration, but are for ever transformed in a mysterious and spiritual way the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, though the matter in them remains material and is subject to all the usual laws of matter, that is it can be destroyed, burned etc. Partaking of the bread and wine we believe that we partake of the true body and of the true blood of the Lord, becoming at one with Him and so partaking of His Martyrdom and His re-

surrection. In what way this mystery is accomplished no one can explain, it is needless to say; but we believe that this mystery does take place with regard to the bread and wine and not with regard to the soul of the communicant alone, and, moreover, we do not accept the phantastic supposition Luther's that in this the omnipresent Lord Jesus Christ becomes, so to speak, localised in the piece of bread. It is exactly this idea of the objective significance of the sacrament that our church tries to bring forward in accepting from the west the ready made term of „transsubstantiation”, in an especial opposition to the subjective, in other words the visionary and phantastic communion of the Protestants and to the Lutheran *ubiquitas*. Needless to say, in so doing we see absolutely nothing Aristoteleon in the term „transsubstantiation”, and accept in Eucharist no horrors of the Roman materialism, for the simple reason, that we had nothing to do with the history of the origin of this term. In taking the bread and wine, we believe that we partake of the body and blood of Christ, but how this takes place we do not know. In biting the bread with our teeth, we would not say that we are biting the body of Christ and that this body is in

our teeth; and in feeling in our mouths the warm wine, we would never dream of thinking, that this is the warmth of the blood of the Lord. It is not for nothing that before the Communion, in order of the liturgy, the deacon says to the priest: „break the holy bread, master”, though the mysterious transformation had already taken place. The transsubstantiation takes place spiritually, the body and blood of Christ remain spiritual phenomena and feed us spiritually, but they have a real existence, quite outside our personal attitude towards the elements of the sacrament. Consequently, the mystery is a mystery for us as well, we can not see through it and the mode of its manifestation is beyond our understanding.

The Old Catholics doubt the legality of the very term „transsubstantiation”. „The churches of the East and West, they say, were united before the word „transsubstantiation” „existed”, and „in the ritual manuals of the Russian church this word is not to be found”. But it is as true that the word „consubstantial” is not to be found either in the scripture, or in the ecclesiastic traditions, yet it has grown to be the obligatory formula of an Orthodox dogma, as soon as it became apparent that

it was necessary to express this dogma with a precision, which would not admit of false interpretation. In the same way, fearing the subjectivism in the understanding of the mystery of the Eucharist, we make it both our right and our duty to adopt for the expression of our faith a term, which though it be new, points to the objective significance of the sacrament in a more definite way, than any of the old ones.

Yet in standing with all our might for the Orthodox doctrine of the objective significance of the sacrament of Eucharist and in holding to the term of „transsubstantiation” in our disputes with the Old Catholics we must take into consideration the peculiar and altogether especial light in which the term of „transsubstantiation” is seen in the West. If for us it is an accidental and but a conventional term, with which philologically we associate hardly anything of any importance; if for us it is but the exterior sign of the sacrament, for the Westerners it is a perfectly definite and especially well chosen expression of a certain philosophic idea concerning the relation between the essential and the accidental. Importing this term into theology, the West meant to explain the very mode

of the accomplishment of the sacrament, it meant to mane the unconceivable truth both conceivable and imaginable, it meant to ascribe the definiteness of the phenomena of the sensual world to a spiritual phenomena and in so doing the West descended into coarse materialism, which is simply stifling for the religious feeling of man, who was not trained in it. Let us recall the country priest, in one of Khomiakoff's articles, who said that the arguments about communion in the Roman doctrine gave you the impression as if the „flesh” and not the body of Christ was meant. Being familiar with the literal meaning of „transsubstantiation” and having been brought up in its literal application to theology, with all the consequences of each an application, the Old Catholics find it psychologically impossible to get reconciled to this term and to accept it, in spite of all their readiness to believe in the Orthodox way. It is our duty, in this case, not to demand from them that, which is beyond their power.

But, on the other hand, the Old Catholics ought to make allowances for us, knowing in what sense and why we keep to the word transsubstantiation. They

ought not to send objections to our address, which are applicable to the Roman Church, but ought to try express their own teaching concerning the objectivity of the sacrament as clearly and as definitely as they could. They ought not to be so very much concerned about expounding their doctrine of the Eucharist only in such words, which were in use in the days of the undivided Church: in the mouth of the man of the XXth century these words may mean something quite different. But what they ought to be concerned about is that their understanding of the sacrament should not be the least particle different from the ancient Orthodox teaching, and also, as a second issue, that their unanimity with the Orthodox church and their difference from Protestantism should be made as clear as possible.

Unfortunately, this definiteness is lacking in the II Part of the „Answer of Rotterdam commission”. The first clause of this Part says: „The ancient church believed that the bread and wine, after the consecration took place, are no ordinary bread and wine but that”... they are transformed and so on, we would be glad to continue in the Orthodox way, but the Old Catholics

write: „that he, who eats the consecrated bread and drinks the consecrated wine, truly and actually partakes of the body and the blood of Jesus Christ, of His Martyrdom and His sacrifice”.

This change of the subject of the sentence is extremely unexpected and astonishing for the Orthodox: it would almost seem, as if in this clause the idea of the personal, the subjective significance of the sacrament was especially brought forward. If there happens to be a communicant, he will partake of Christ; if there happens to be none, it is as if the sacrament did not take place. True enough, further the Old Catholics say: „Consequently, it (the Church) believed, that in the consecrated bread and wine Jesus Christ is present truly, actually, essentially, spiritually (pneumatikos), mystically (mystikos), mysteriously (sacramentaliter), but not materially, not bodily”. This presence of Christ can hardly satisfy us. Could not Luther as well say all of this, or almost all of this? In any case, the wording of the Old Catholics does not express the Œcumenical faith; not even in that degree in which it is expressed by our own insufficiently definite term of „transmutation”.

The second clause of II Part only increases our perplexity. In it the Old Catholics put the following series of questions. In what way Jesus Christ is present truly, actually, essentially, spiritually, mystically and mysteriously in ordinary bread and wine? In what way the consecrated bread and the consecrated wine are no longer ordinary wine? In what way he, who partakes of the consecrated bread and drinks of the consecrated cup, becomes a partakes of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, of His passion and sacrifice? And the answer is: „these questions are not made clear in the Scriptures”. For us, with our Orthodox bringing up, it is impossible to understand this endeavour to avoid mentioning in the same sentence the words „bread and wine”, on the one hand, and „body and blood”, on the other. For the Old Catholics, the bread and wine are no ordinary bread and wine, for in them Jesus Christ is present, but the body and blood of Christ are mentioned by them only when they mention the communicant. As a justification, the Old Catholics put forward their fear of lifting up the veil of the sacrament, in order to secure it against profanation and materialising. But of this, as it was shown above, we are afraid no less than they, and

the way we use these terms — we are very far from any intention of explaining anything by our „transmutation” or „transsubstantiation”. Yet we hold to this formula, because it is the best adapted to clearly repudiate the Protestant subjectivism, against which we are most anxious to shield ourselves.

Our insistence in this case most not astonish the Old Catholics: they ought to know that here the most important and the most essential to the church life is concerned. Strictly speaking, the Eucharist means everything for church life. For it alone makes of the church union something quite apart, something which can not be compared with other human unions, imparting to the church communion the character and properties of a phenomena which is truly spiritual, unearthly and eternal. The unity of faith, of ritual, the unanimity in some charitable undertaking are, certainly, necessary for the church, yet it is not the essence as yet, it is not the church communion. That sort of union is in no way different from usual human unions, formed, for instance, for the purposes of some science or art, in which people meet in some one common point, yet each live a separate life, never passing beyond the

limits of earth. It is only when people approach together the Holy Sacrament, that the church communion begins, for in it becoming actual members of the body of Christ, people enter into their spiritual oneness. But if Eucharist is understood differently, if its mysterious significance is put aside and it is transformed into a mere rite, very significant and improving, perhaps, but still merely a rite, — it is really not worth our while to lose time in argument. A communion, which is not a church communion and is no way distinguishable from any other worldly union, being as devoid of anything spiritual and superhuman, could as well take place outside the church, if anybody is sufficiently interested in it. But if we wish for a church communion, and not the usual „knowing men after the flesh” (2, Corinthians, V, 16). first of all we must reach a perfect clearness in the question of the Eucharist.

And so, the Old Catholics do not want to relieve the mind of the East as to their having no leaning towards Protestantism and repudiating the subjectivism, and this in a document, in which they give an answer to the direct question of the East concerning this point. We do not believe them when they say, that they adhere to the

exact church teaching, and I personally think, that at any rate those amongst the Old Catholics who really do practice Old Catholicism, as for instance the priest, do reason concerning the Eucharist in a truly Orthodox way; yet undoubtedly their formula is not sufficient.

And so, let the Old Catholics but convince us, that they believe in the Eucharist and the Holy Trinity in the Orthodox way and then neither the *Filioque*, nor the absence of the term of „transsubstantiation” could possibly prevent us from being at one with them.

II.

But when these obstacles are done with, the question of our union with the Old Catholics is by no means solved. Quite the contrary, it is only then that it arises before us to its full height and, having done with surfaces, we then come to the true obstacle.

The thing that divides East and West the most is their idea of the church, more exactly the understanding of the church, that is to say not so much the dogmatic definition of the church, as the practical everyday attitude towards the church, in its present condition. This attitude always

has the greatest importance in the religious life, because in its resides the practically realised and so perfectly clear idea the man has of his faith, in other words it is the authentic point of view, from which the man lives. This was the chief interior cause of the dissent of the west from the Œcumenical church, this also was the cause of the stability of this dissent, of the barreners of all attempts of union? In this also consists the chief obstacle, which the Old Catholics have to overcome on their way to the union with the church.

The article „Another attempt^a to an explanation” confirms my idea.

In their note to the third thesis of prof. Gousseff (Church Herald Nr. 32) the Old Catholics write: the error of prof. Gousseff „has its root in the perverse idea of the church, in the faulse idea of the church, as such”. In what then consists this false understanding. In this, that „Gousseff sees the church of Christ, that is the *una, sancta, catholica et apostolica ecclesia* of the Nicean Creed, in the local (Eastern) churches. This understanding, boldly conclude the Old Catholics, is not warranted”, after which they give further expression to their own idea of a church (notes

to 3, 4 and 5 theses, „The Church Herald NN 32 and 33).

According to the idea of the Old Catholics, the one holy catholic and apostolic church does not exist in the practical way that is in the shape of a „united church organisation”, and that the „one flock under the One Pastor” is not to be found on this earth. When „all the Orthodox of this earth”, who are at present scattered in various local churches, are „gathered into a single church organisation”, when they are united in an exterior way as well, only then, according to the demand of the apostle, „a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that should be holy and without a blemish „shall he reestablished on earth (Ephesians V, 27). But at present there exist only local churches, who can only pretend to a more or less approximate nearness to the ideal of a church, but which none of them constitute in particular the church universal.

„Yet the universal church of Christ must exist somewhere on earth, because the Lord Himself endowed it with *indestructibility* until His second advent. Then where is it to be found? Where else can it be found, ask the Old Catholics, but *within various local churches?* And within the-

se churches who is to belong to it? Who is to be its living member? We (Old Catholics) answer: all, who preserve, with all faithfulness, the treasures left by Christ to His own, in accordance with the confession and practice of the church of the seven Œcumenical Councils, and who do their best as far as they can to keep these treasures from all distortion. Though they are scattered in many local churches, it is to them that refer the words of the apostle: one body and one spirit etc". What then is this undiscoverable yet necessarily existing one holy catholic and apostolic church, in which we profess our belief as clearly as our belief into the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost? „The one undivided church of Christ, that is the church of the Nicæan Creed, can by no means be limited to a certain number of the existing local churches, but consists of the *totality* (Totalitat) of all the Orthodox of the earth. Everybody, who numbers himself in this church, who, consequently, professes the heritage of faith (depositum), which comes from Christ, without harming it by adding to it or detracting from it, is a member of this church, no matter to what local church of the East or West he belongs *exteriorly*".

And it is this totality of the Orthodox of this earth, which is entrusted with the heritage of Christ. This is the keeper of the authentic church tradition, having the right to make authoritative definitions of the authentic church doctrine, which is obligatory for all Christians. „If all the legitimate representatives of all these Orthodox believers were possibly gathered into one assemblage — which at present is not possible through the fault of man, and who knows how long yet it will remain impossible —, such an assemblage would once more actually represent a truly Œcumenical Council, and if dogmatic definitions were made by it in a legitimate way, it would have the right and the power to proclaim them to the faithful, with the words of the apostolic council: it is the will of the Holy Spirit and ours”.

An Œcumenical Council of this kind is not possible at present, because „the unity of the church has been broken in two, through the fault of man, — the Eastern and the Western Church”. „Both the latter have equally become *local churches*”... „and neither of them can in justice pretend to the supreme title of the *undivided church of Christ*”, neither of them can call an Œcumenical Council, and consequently can

not claim to be infallible. They both have gone through a development proper to each, into which along of that, which is good, „these could also steal much that was erroneous, distorted and useless, which the respective church could have abolished with much profit and the earlier the better”.

This self improvement of the Eastern and the Western church is accomplished gradually through the doctrine and the order of the given church coming nearer to the doctrine and the order of the church universal. The Œcumenical decrees of the first eight centuries serve both for a witness and an authoritative expounder of this doctrine and order, and later on they are reinforced by the general literary and lithurgic heritage of the undivided church. Only that which was believed always, everywhere and by everybody may be accepted as an authentically ecclesiastic tradition of Christ, obligatory for all dogmas. Everything else ought to be either abolished, or else retained as merely a private opinion, which, not being a part of the revealeth truth, can not be obligatory for everybody. The Old Catholics do not explain in this article the way of establishing this authentic tradition of the church of Christ; but it is evident that it can be

established only through the usual way of studying the remaining monuments and documents of the ancient life of the church. And the given local church becomes a „Christian church” only in so far as it improves itself, keeping fully, without any additions or abolitions, the universal heritage within itself.

The last conclusion drawn from all this is as follows: „as the church universal, in its capacity of infallible teacher and lawgiver, continues to live in every local church”, but does not exist separately as the one church organization; as it does not exist of whole communities or even of people in their totality, but merely of separate individuals, — it stands to reason that there can be no such thing as secession of a local church from the church universal, neither can there be any going back into it, in the sense we understand the matter. If the local church happens to have a hierarchy; consecrated in the legitimate way; if it administers the church sacrament in a regular and legal way, — it has but to abolish in its teaching all that does not agree with the Œcumenical heritage, and it becomes *eo ipso* an „Orthodox catholic community”, a „purest representative, comparatively speaking, of the

undivided universal church of Christ", and enters into communion with other autonomous communities, which it acknowledges also to be a „comparatively pure representative of the undivided universal church of Christ”.

III.

Such are the basis positions of the Old Catholic understanding of the Church. Can we, the Orthodox, subscribe to them?

In some of them, we cannot subscribe at all, — to others we can subscribe only with substantial reservations.

First of all, when we say: „I believe in one holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church”, in this case, it is true, we unite with the word Church the thought of something divine, not of the earth, but also of something, in the highest sense salutary for us, which exists on the earth in full activity, and not only on the earth in general, but here, amongst us, standing before us in the character of a wholly definite manifestation, full of life, and demanding from us a relation equally real and living. „The Church is a blessing” says St. John Chrysostom, that is, a certain divine element or sphere of life, in which a man must actually participate. The Church is Noah's Ark, in

which everyone must find salvation. Under these circumstances, the salutary character of the Church does not consist in this alone, that one who enters the Church is numbered in a numerical or juridical sense among the saved, but in the fact that in the Church he becomes partaker of that life of Christ through which the whole Church lives. A man's salvation in this way ceases to be merely his private business, accomplished by his personal efforts, in solitude, for himself alone, but becomes a part in a common work, and is accomplished in common by the whole Church. For us, consequently, the apostolic comparison of the Church with the body of Christ has a specially weight and vital import. The Church, as „the fulness of of Him that filleth all in all” (Eph. I, 23), lives united with Christ (V. 32), and „as the one living „body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth”, works out its own salvation, and grows spiritually, „according to the effectual working in the measure of every part” (Ehp. IV, 16). The members of the ecclesiastical body are united among themselves not only by the fact that they all believe in one and the same Jesus Christ, and because each one of them is by faith mystically united with

Christ. They have all, in the fullest sense of the word, a community of life amongst themselves, form a single living union, directly touching each-other, and each one bringing his contribution, in his common salvation, to the common growth of the whole body. Therefore, living in the Church, a member of the Orthodox Church constantly feels himself in living communion with all its members equally, — whether they be on earth or in heaven. For him, the heavenly Church is not at all the last result, if we may so express it, of the warfare of the Church on earth. The heavenly Church is thought of by the Orthodox as constantly present in the earthly, sharing its lot, and waging its spiritual warfare by its side. The saints are the guardians of the Church, its advance company, and direct leaders of the earthly flock. On its side, the earthly Church is not limited, so to speak, to the works of its terrestrial part, but takes an active part in the salvation of the Church beyond the tomb: those on earth pray for the departed, accomplish acts of mercy in their name, and as it were, in common with them, offering a thankoffering for the Saints in the Eucharist. Both halves of the Church, which is divided into the earthly and the heaven-

ly, equally live the same life, and work out of their salvation together.

And naturally the Orthodox can neither acknowledge the Church universal to be but an abstract „totality of the faithful”, to which one can belong only in thought, nor can he imagine that either of the two halves should have a separate destiny of its own, that the heavenly should be for ever victorious in heaven, whereas the earthly, beaten by the enemy, should practically cease to exist, having lost its organisation and been turned into a formless and evasive shadow of the past. Believing that Christ has endowed His Church with the gift of indestructibility and invincibility against the gates of hell, we, the Orthodox, do not ascribe this gift to the heavenly church alone, which as a matter of fact, is out of the reach of all attacks of the enemy. Neither do we accept this gift in the sense of the usual preservation of literary and other memorials of the Church's life, because such a preservation offers nothing unusual, nothing miraculous: it is shared by all religious communities in general, as for instance Buddhism, which is even older than the church in antiquity. We ascribe the gift of indestructibility first of all to the Church

in its earthly manifestation; entering the world in the quality of a „little flock”, the Church continues, contrary to all human reckoning, to preserve itself on earth unchanged, incessantly triumphing over evil and error.

We believe, therefore, that the one-holy, catholic and Apostolic Church of the Nicean—Constantinople Creed at present exists on the earth not only invisibly, „within the different separate churches”, but also visibly; that it has even now a „single ecclesiastical organisation”, that, in other words, at each given moment the universal church „is organised from a certain number of separate local churches”, although, of course, not adhering geographically to any people or country.

2) Further, from our Orthodox point of view, strictly speaking, there can be no talk of the *division* of the Church: a single-living body cannot be divided without ceasing to live. Consequently, we can only speak of the falling away of certain infected members from the body of the Church: this falling away does not impair the church's unity and wholeness, but it does not mean spiritual death for the members that fall away. In this way different heretical communities fell away from the church.

Some of them were great through the number of their members and their geographical extension, especially when compared with the extend of the Church universal at that time. The latter consisted almost wholly of one empire, without Northern Europe, without Russia and other countries, while Nestorianism, for example, extended to India and perhaps to China, and Monophysitism took possession of the whole Orient, with Egypt, Abyssinia and so on. However, after the fall of these mighty, and, ecclesiastically speaking, flourishing branches, the Church continued to be universal, single, Catholic and Apostolic, assembling Œcumenical Councils, and in general enjoying all its rights and powers the same thing happened when Christianity fell apart in two halves: the Eastern and the Western. In this case also the Church was not devided, and did not disappear from the earth, but remained the same universal church, only from it was separated a new branch, this time, perhaps, greater than before. Let us admit that this time the cause was not heresy, but this does not change the reality of the matter: the part which falls away, falls away equally from the life of the Church, whatever the cause of that falling away may be.

And now, which of the two halves of Christendom remained the Church, and which fell away from it? The Old Catholics themselves admit that the development of the Western half of Christendom after the so called division of the churches, was in reality the gradual development of the Popery and of the worldliness not only in the present representatives of its hierarchy (which does not necessarily include the church), but also in its doctrine, its order etc. In other words, this half of it left the East in a direction opposite to truth. Consequently, the church can not be there. Even if we agree that, at this time, the East was immersed in mental stagnation and darkness (though in reality it was not so: let us remember the Renaissance); even if we agree that as a result of inertia and darkness the local Eastern churches accumulated much that was not of order and demanded reparation. But in the East there was no systematical going away from the Ecumenical truth, and no one could accuse the Easterners of this. Consequently, the church universal could be looked for at least with more probability of being found in the East, namely in the existing local churches.

It is true that our Eastern Church both knows itself to be the Church Universal and claims for itself the title of holy, catholic and apostolic. It is true, that in literature, especially in Russian literature and also in the edicts of the church and state, one sometimes sees a slight tendency to represent Orthodoxy as one of the three religions, on the same level with Catholicism and Protestantism, but our church itself does not share this tendency, clearly putting aside everything alien. Our catechisms, whenever they mention the catholic church of today, always mean our church, sometimes directly applying to it the title of „Eastern Catholic”. All our ritual books are also impregnated with the idea of the Eastern church and the church meant in the Creed being identical (in the present time) the Eastern Church being always represented by them as the direct successor and continuation of the church of the first eight centuries. To give an example, we can point to the ritual of Orthodoxy, in which the Church clearly expresses its self-consciousness. Here we pray, not for the re-establishment of the Church, separated and divided amongst many bodies, not for a church which is impalpable and has merely an archæological

import, but for the gift of victory to the living Church, which has hitherto been victorious in the world; we do not pray to be re-united with the rest of the Orthodox in a single organisation, but for the return of those who have gone astray, and for their re-union with us, with our Church as the one holy, Catholic and apostolic Church (not merely to the Greco-Russian Church).

Recognising ourselves as the Church universal, our Eastern Church does not in any degree separate the Latin Church from other unorthodox bodies outside the ranks of the Church, and this not only after the Vatican Council of 1870, when, according to the Old Catholics also, the Latin Church became an unorthodox body: the formal and-external departure of Rome from union with the Church took place at the time of the so-called division of the churches. This is how our Russian Church has always regarded the matter. Let us take, for example, the „Lithurgy, as accepted by the Orthodox Faith” published in the year 1776, that is, in the epoch, when the tendency to represent the Orthodox Church as merely the Greco-Russian confession was specially fashionable. In spite of this, the Manual enjoins the Bishop to say, when

receiving anyone into the Church: "Enter into the Church of God, and through it withdraw from the errors of Papacy (or Lutheranism, or Calvinism), and know thyself to have been freed from the net of death, and everlasting ruin..." and so on. Consequently, in the understanding of the Church, Romanism is placed beyond the Church, on the same level as Lutheranism, Calvinism and other heresies.

The Greek Orient is even stricter towards the Latin rite. The well known rule, not to christen heretics again, if they have the correct form of Christening, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the Greek Church does not understand formally, but substantially, and decides that a man who has a false understanding concerning the Holy Trinity, cannot rightly Christen, though he should repeat the Orthodox formula of the sacrament with literal exactness: for the Sacraments, not the words are essential, but the thought which is united with them. In accordance with this, Armenians, Copts, and Nestorians, as they confess the Catholic faith in the Holy Trinity, are not christened again (and this in spite of the marvellously intense national hostility between the Greeks and the Armenians): but those of the La-

tin rite, who add *Filioque*, must, according to the Greek practise, be accepted through a new baptism. It is another question how far this understanding of the ruling of the Councils is correct, but it is enough to show that the Latin rite is not considered to be within the Church. It is true that we accept the Latin consecration and other sacraments. But we equally accept the consecration of the Nestorians, Armenians and others, who, having been excommunicated by the Œcumenical Council, do not belong to the Church, even according to the external criterion of Catholicism.

For the Old Catholics, this self-consciousness of the Oriental Church appears difficult to grasp. They say: "This is just the same kind of view that the Church of Rome takes of itself, in the West". But the Church of Rome attributes to itself the character of the Church Universal by a direct dogma, looking on all the world as its vast sphere of authority: for it, where Rome is not, there is no Church. But the Oriental Church, while affirming its identity with the Church Universal, strictly speaking, only affirms a historical fact, without giving it any dogmatic infallibility. Today the Eastern Church is contained in the heart of the Church Universal, may yet

fall from it tomorrow, while the Church Universal will still remain on earth, for instance somewhere in Japan or Urmia, and will be equally holy, Catholic and Apostolic, with all its rights and powers.

"If" say the Old Catholics, "this view were correct, then the (Oriental) local churches mentioned, as representing the true Church of Christ, could summon Œcumenical Councils, following the example of the first seven Œcumenical Councils"; but "there is every where a conviction that the truly Œcumenical Councils are seven only, and that, from the time of the division between the East and West, and while it continues, such Councils are in longer possible". This thought of the impossibility, or, to speak more accurately, the extreme difficulty of summoning Œcumenical Councils, I also, to some extent, share; but I think that this is not a dogmatic or canonical difficulty, but one which is simply external and political. An Œcumenical Council is impossible, not for the reason that the Church Universal, leaving out Rome and the West, would not have the power to bear witness to the Truth of Christ to the whole world, but because the outer conditions of the Church's existence make impossible for her such a triumph.

ant external manifestation of her life and her power at the present time we must not forget that the seven Œcumenical Councils took place at a time when the church extensively belonged to the single Roman Byzantine empire. These Councils were thus in reality occurrences in the interior life of the Empire. We need not speak of the conveniences which this circumstance afforded, for summoning Councils, as for instance in the matter of transport, of an already accepted official language for all, and so forth. Besides this, the assembled representatives of the local churches, with the exception of an unimportant minority, were subjects of that same empire and even its dignitaries. The empire, consequently, had all the necessary conditions for guarding against fear of this two authoritative ecclesiastical gathering, and could in every way take part in its activities, identifying its interest with the interests of the church. At the same time, there are at present in existence a number of independent Orthodox Kingdoms, and besides this, a considerable number of the Orthodox are found in Kingdoms which are not Orthodox, or which are of other faiths, and form there separate nations. The interests of these races and nations are not

always identical. An Œcumenical Council, remaining, according to its nature, the same triumphant manifestation of the Church, with its unconditional liberty and its unearthly power, and in addition, in virtue of its outer form and organisation at the present time, being international, would be an assembly above all earthly control. The representatives of local churches assemble on perfectly neutral ground, independent of any Kingdom, and, in virtue of their position, may fail altogether to share the views and calculations, and, in general, the interests, of any given Kingdom or nation. It is easy to understand that a modern kingdom, which considers itself the final arbiter of all its concerns, cannot desire such an international assembly, not subject to its control, the decisions of which (without appeal, we must not forget) may in very important ways touch the interests and even the authority of the kingdom. Kingdoms of other faiths, or even of no faith, might ignore the decisions of an international Orthodox assembly, when this was necessary for them but for an Orthodox Kingdom to do this, would be inconvenient, if it did not wish its local church to be separated from the unity of the Church, to the injury of the kingdom itself. That is

why, at the present time, with many Orthodox Kingdoms, with the internationalism, so to speak, of the Church Universal, a triumphant manifestation by it of its power from which there is no appeal in an Œcumenical Council is as difficult, as nearly impossible, as such a triumphant manifestation would have been in the time of the persecutions, though the external position of the Church was then entirely different. Besides this, at the present time the local churches are so habituated to their contemporary position and to the whole disposition and character of their life, that it would be by no means easy for them to come with that disposition before the court, even the fraternal court of an Œcumenical Council, from which there is no appeal. For this reason the local churches on their part make no special efforts in any degree to weaken the political impossibility of an Œcumenical Council. But in spite of this absence of Œcumenical Councils, the Orthodox Church remains the same Church Universal, the same holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which it was in the first three centuries, when, owing to eternal reasons, it was equally unable to assemble an Œcumenical Council.

3) Disagreeing with the Old Catholics as to the understanding of the idea of church, we can not possibly accept their way of looking at the reunion of the churches. A local church, once it has broken away from its bond with the church universal (it matters not whether it was on account of some heresy or a mere dissent), can reestablish this bond, in the opinion of Orthodoxy, only in case it actually gets converted and joins the church universal, as a church organisation. Let us suppose, that some local church has preserved or gradually recovered all the „essential integral parts of the universal church of the Saviour of the world”, but that it does not want to join the Œcumenical church in fact. In such a case, at best it will be only a more or less exact imitation, a likeness of the Church universal, but not this church itself. The right belief, the administering of sacraments, the hierarchy — all these are but the indications of the church universal, but they do not express the fullness of church life: besides these indications, the church itself remains in the church, the oneness of spiritual life, which constitutes its internal essence. The doctrine and the order can be restored by ordinary human means, but this will not restore the

spiritual life itself, because this life is not of created but of divine origin, having its source in Christ. If spiritual life could be born of itself, if men could begin living this life through their own effort, as soon as they were drawn towards it and instructed, Christ need not have been born and gone through His passion. But having incarnated, having suffered passion death having attained resurrection, He has founded the beginning of a new life in Himself, in His dual nature of Man-God, in which the church has its being. Consequently, a man has to make himself an actual participant of this stream of life, and not merely to reproduce in his arrangements its exterior signs (I John, 1, 1-3).

This, then, is the chief obstacle, which the Old Catholics must remove in the path to reunion: let them strongly accept the thought, that Christ's Church Universal is at the present time by no means merely a subject for scientific investigations into the relief of the past, that the Church, as a living fact, even now exist in the world in the form of a "single Church organisation", and that the Oriental Church *at the present time* represents this organisation. Having firmly siezed this thought, they will find in themselves the courage to follow it in

practise, as they found the courage to leave the Roman Church when they become convinced that that Church was in error. I am of opinion that our Church will readily receive them, and will not begin to count up all their peculiarities in the expression of doctrine (so long as that doctrine is Orthodox), and, even more, in forms and outer organisation. And for the Old Catholics themselves all these peculiarities will then lose the burning interest with which they invest them at present, in their negotiations with us.

SERGIUS, Bishop of Yamburg,

Rector of Theological Academy in S. Petersburg.



Preaching in the Russian Church,

BY A PRIEST OF THE

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.

THIS BOOK,

containing 172 pages of readable matter for both scholar and the commoner, has the following table of contents full of important and varied subjects:

- The Immortality of the Soul.
- The necessity for Divine Revelation, and the Indications of a Revealed Religion.
- The Authenticity and Truthfulness of the Gospel.
- The True Church of Christ.
- The Education of Children.
- Sermon on New Year's Day.
- Thoughts on Fast and Temperance.
- Sermon on the Prodigal.
- " " Orthodox Sunday.
- " " 3rd Sunday, in Great Lent.
- " " 4th " " " "
- Thoughts for Good Friday.
- Sermon on the Impotent.
- " " healing of the Blind.
- " " Ascension.
- Sermon for Trinity Sunday.
- The Condition of Society.
- Sermon to those Preparing for Holy Communion.
- Address for Christmas Day.

Price one dollar.

For the benefit of the Greek-Russian Cathedral.

1715 Powell st.

San Francisco, Cal.

APPLY TO THE

Rev. Clergy of Most Holy Trinity Cathedral.

2/

INDEX.

.....

	PAGE.
I. AN ADDRESS MADE BY VERY REVEREND BISHOP TICHON ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDI- CATION OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN NEW YORK	339
II. ALASKA	344
III. WHAT SEPARATES US FROM THE OLD CATHOLICS?	357

Печатать разрѣшается, Декабрь 1902 г.

Цензоръ, Архимандритъ Рафаилъ.

