

16 March



**"Russian Orthodox  
American Messenger".**

*APRIL & MAY SUPPLEMENT*

1902.

ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ КЪ ЖУРНАЛУ

**„АМЕРИКАНСКІЙ ПРАВОСЛАВНЫЙ  
ВѢСТНИКЪ.“**

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.**



## A voice from America.

One of the most remarkable facts in the history of Christianity, during the last century, is doubtlessly, the portentous movement in the Episcopal church of England and America towards a rapprochement and if possible, a union with the Orthodox church of the East. After a good many years of gradual growth, this movement now has its history, as it has found expression and still finds it not in theological literature alone, but also in a whole series of attempts on the part of both branches of Anglicanism to open direct communications concerning this question of union with the Eastern Orthodox churches. This movement can as yet show no practical palpable results, and the question of the union between the Anglican and Orthodox churches is still merely a question, but time has nevertheless accomplished its

work, and in our days the position of the question is altogether different from the one it had sixty or seventy years ago. In the early days of their intercourse, the two sides knew each other too little, and in the beginning of the forties William Palmer was seriously struck with the idea of proving that Anglicanism is in no way different in its doctrine from Orthodoxy. The further and wider intercourse of later years has naturally made it necessary to make clear all the similarities and dissimilarities between the two creeds, as completely and as minutely as possible, as the similarity of doctrine is the first and most necessary condition of church union. In the sixties and seventies, in the intercourse between the English and the American Episcopal churches and the orthodox churches in Greece and Russia, the idea was frequently expressed and sometimes carried out, that above all the chiefest object of the intercourse should consist in the serious mutual study, which alone could lead to some palpable result; consequently in our days, after frequent researches and conferences, not even the sincerest partisan of the union could by any means claim, that Anglicanism is in no wise different in its doctrine from Orthodoxy. The many years of inter-



course have put forward a whole series of dogmatical points, in which the books and the practices of Anglicanism either distinctly differ from Orthodoxy or which they express without sufficient precision. Hence the undiminished necessity for the partisans of Church union to continue their labours and the comparative study of the doctrines of the Russian and the Anglican churches, so that it would be possible, at last, to make a direct and decisive answer to the question of their union.

In the spring of 1846 Russia was visited by a clergyman of the American Episcopal Church, the Reverend Freeman Young, who was the secretary of the so called Greeco-Russian Committee, organized with the special object of opening friendly relations with the orthodox East. Dr. Young had letters of recommendation for the dignitaries of the Russian church from several American Bishops and, during his stay in Moscow and St. Petersburg, he repeatedly talked over the question of church union with the Metropolitans Isidor and Philaretes. During these conversations the hierarchs of the Russian Church proposed amongst other things, to start a public discussion, in some magazine, of the dogmatic questions on which the Russian and

the American churches disagree. The Metropolitan Philaretos writes, in the account of his first conversation with Young, that they have decided „to ask, on either side, a series of questions which stand in need of clearing, then to write essays on them and mutually to communicate the results. And it was to lie with the recipients to decide which of the articles can be published freely and usefully”. The Metropolitan Isidor developed the idea still further, as it is shown by his own account of his interview with Young. „I proposed to him, he writes, the following way of corresponding with the American clergy. They will have to write articles on questions under discussion and to publish them in the church organ of New York, then they will address the magazine to St. Petersburg to me. Here corresponding articles will be composed and, after being translated into English, they will be sent to the same magazine, through Baron Osten-Sacken, the Russian consul in New York. The publishing should be done with the knowledge and consent of the local Bishops, as our articles also are to be first examined by church authorities”. We do not know the reasons why the idea of our illustrious pastors was not acted upon, to our regret. Judging by some

documents left by the Metropolitan Philaretos, one can conjecture that the undertaking never went further than a few half-hearted individual attempts, but that neither the old nor the new world ever came to witness a collective and systematical discussion of the points of disagreement between the churches.

Almost forty years have gone by since then, but quite recently we were shown an American magazine containing something which reminds one of the idea of Philaretos and Isidor and is to a certain extent its realization. Father Sebastian Dubovich, an Orthodox monk, Servian by birth, who works in San-Francisco, wrote to a learned American theologian the Reverend Francis Hall, inviting him to a public discussion in print of the points of disagreement existing between the Orthodox and the American Churches. This discussion is not conducted in a polemical spirit, being a peacable explanation of debatable doctrines, for the sake of a rapprochement between the churches, and, in the eyes of father Sebastian, the present time is especially propitious for it, so that it will be both pleasing and instructive for his European fathers and brethren. Dr. Hall was very willing to answer the summons and his articles entit-

led „Church and the East” appeared in three numbers of a clerical American magazine „The living Church”, in which he gives explanations to the questions pointed out by father Sebastian....

I. The differences which separate us from the Orthodox Churches of the East are of centuries of growth, and the long mutual isolation which has prevailed makes it exceedingly difficult for us to understand one another. But all thoughtful Churchman must recognize the paramount importance of Catholic reunion; if it can be had without sacrifice of vital principles. And while no marked results can follow single pronouncements of unofficial nature, it is only by such utterances, frequently and frankly made, that we can learn to understand one another and face our differences intelligently.

At this point it seems expedient to say that in making these explanations the writer is not actuated by the slightest uncertainty as to the Catholicity of the Anglican Churches. He is firmly convinced that his own priesthood is the same with that of Father Sebastian, and that his Bishop shares with the Russian Bishop Tikhon the august office of a veritable successor of the blessed Apostles. The Anglicans do not

approach the Easterns as suppliants, or with any feeling of insecurity touching their God-given position and mission; but in recognition of the fact that mutual explanations, calculated to further the interests of Catholic unity, are always called for by the highest charity. We recognize also that our conditions appear peculiar to strangers, and require explanation in order to be estimated rightly by the Easterns.

Before considering the points formulated by Father Sebastian in detail, it seems necessary to make a few prefatory remarks. The writer believes that the peculiar conditions and providential mission of the Anglican Churches not only account for some things which are calculated to puzzle Russian theologians, but that they rob these things of the heretical implications which they appear to bear when viewed from the Russian standpoint—at least so far as the *official* teaching and practice of the Anglican Churches are concerned.

This brings us to a distinction of some importance—that is, between the teaching and practice of a Church in its corporate and formal capacity, and the views and practices which gain currency among its members without constitutional and ecclesiastical warrant. These last are not always



in full agreement, and in no portion of the Catholic Church, East or West, have they always been so. It should be observed in this connection, that erroneous views and practices may come to prevail very widely and be supported by schools and prelates; but so long as they are not sanctioned by any constitutional utterance of the Church, they remain on the level of private views and scholastic opinions.

The Church has received from her great Head, our Lord, the principle that *to root out the tares from the wheat is apt to result in rooting out the wheat as well*; so that nothing but the gravest emergency—such as a formal propagation of subversive heresy—will warrant extreme measures against those who fail through invincible ignorance to rise to the level of Catholic teaching and practice. Such has been the policy of the Anglican Churches since the Reformation, as it is called. It has no doubt been carried too far at times, and is carried too far with reference to certain priests in this Church to-day; but the principle of *not quenching a smoking flax* is of Divine sanction, and the Church is bound to apply it with such wisdom and discrimination as her officers receive the grace to exercise.

Historically, Anglican ecclesiastics have had peculiar reasons since the sixteenth century for exercising a liberal judgment in applying this principle. The revolt of the Teutonic races from Papal corruptions was naturally attended by more or less blind exasperation, which ultimately carried multitudes away from the historic Faith and Order of the Church. Thus arose Protestantism; a reactionary and one-sided system, the outcome of impatient and uncontrollable zeal against evils of which the Russian Church dissapproves as truly as do we. The English Church found herself beset by a seething mass of prejudice against many Catholic ideas and practices, the natural result of Roman corruption. True and holy things were rejected by many because confused with the corrupt caricatures of them which had prevailed.

What was the English Church to do? Was she to deal sternly with this overwhelming crop of tares? Surely she would have been untrue to her Divine Master had she done so. She had to deal with Protestant ideas as the whole Western Church had dealt, in remoter time, with the pagan ideas of the barbarians who overthrew the Roman Empire. She had to *take time* with them, as far as possible, and trust to

the leavening effect of her Apostolic Faith and Order gradually to win back the multitudes in an around her to the ancient paths. It was in such a temper that the more irritating externals and phrases of her inheritance were softened down, although in such wise that nothing vital was repudiated or forbidden. The Thirty-nine Articles were framed, not as precise definition of Confession of Faith, but as an eirenicon intended to quell the storms of controversy, then full of peril and incapable of immediate settlement, by shelving the questions of the hour in general phrases. It was hoped that these Articles could be accepted by the bulk of Englishmen without Catholic doctrine being sacrificed. We do not maintain that the leaders of that day realized to the full this point of view. But God was with the English Church, and guided her into a more consistent and Catholic path than many of her members realized. The Spirit-guided mind of the Church which gains expression in her official transactions is, as a rule, more enlightened than the minds of individual prelates participating. This is to be noticed however, that the prelates who shaped the ecclesiastical legislation of that time *made an appeal to Catholic antiquity the formal rule*

of their actions, even when not realizing individually all that this involved.

Now what has been the result? It has been this. The Protestant element, - so far as it was not too revolutionary in temper to be retained, continued in the form of a school or party within the Church, and has been slowly „leveling up”. This process is not completed yet, but goes steadily on. On the other hand the Conservative element has held its own; and, in spite of the vague and halting nature of the Articles and other Reformation formularies, has grown, especially in our day, into a fuller realization of the ancient principles and practices of the Catholic Church—Romish excrescences being removed. Recovery of this kind is necessarily slow, and is made more so by the ever-present activity of the Romish Church, which cannot but keep alive the blinding prejudices of the sixteenth century.

History justifies our maintaining strenuously that the Anglican Churches are not to be regarded as having abandoned their Catholic heritage, but as *engaged in holy mission*, which involves necessarily the strange diversities of opinion and practice prevailing among their members, if the patient and leavening policy demanded by

circumstances and commended by the Lord Himself is to be followed.

The Church of England did not establish a new religion when she asserted her right to abolish Papal tyranny and corruption; and history does not warrant an assumption that only such truths and practices remained hers as were expressly re-enacted during the Reformation. All that was in force prior to that epoch remained and remains in force to this day, as part of her official position, unless expressly repudiated by her formal or official action.

One thing more should be said before closing these preliminaries. The corporate unity, or intercommunion, between the Churches, lies as a Divinely imposed requirement upon all the members of the Church universal. Nothing should be permitted to interfere with the fulfilment of this requirement except the necessity of maintaining the *essentials* of the Divinely imparted and œcumenically received Faith and Order of the Church. Let it be granted that the Easterns discern many imperfections in the manner in which the Anglican Churches have been discharging their God-given mission of weaning back Protestant souls. These imperfections do not constitute a justification for continued rup-



ture of communion, in the writer's judgment, unless it can be shown that the Anglican Churches are guilty of real apostasy from vital articles and practices of the Catholic religion.

It is perhaps known to Father Sebastian that the conditions prevalent among us, which the writer has been trying to explain, have made certain language and practices of the Easterns assume an appearance and meaning to some of our people of which they cannot approve. Father Sebastian would say, no doubt, that our people misunderstand the East, and regard as superstitious and Romish what is not really so. Let this be granted. Still this misunderstanding is but another illustration of the fact that explanations are needed on both sides. And a charity is required which will patiently take into account the great diversity of our conditions, and consequently the difference in meaning which certain words and actions necessarily assume among us.

We have purposely quoted this part of Dr. Hall's article in an almost literal translation, as in it the author gives his general idea of Anglicanism, which it certainly is very interesting to hear from one of the notable learned representatives of American

clergy. In the Anglican Church system there is a good deal that is indefinite and undefined, or only partially expressed, that can be and often is the subject of various interpretations. This characteristic of Anglicanism, which clearly marks it out in the midst of other Christian creeds very naturally evokes the tendency in its enlightened representatives to account in some way for its origin and, if possible, to find the higher idea, which would justify it. Hence the repeated attempts in the English theological literature to characterize and expound the Anglicanism, as a system, in such a light, which would make everything comprehensible in it, giving it a justification and a meaning. But minor points of Anglicanism provide for contradictory interpretations, and analogously the authors attempting to establish its general characteristics sometimes differ very widely from each other. Reading the arguments of Dr. Hall, we remembered the celebrated address of the late Bishop Mandell Creighton of London, made by him at the end of 1898 to a gathering of the country parsons of his parish. This speech attracted everybody's attention partly because of its contents and partly because the orator enjoyed a wide popularity and an eminent scientific repu-

tation, so that were it not for his premature death he for a certainty would have reached the dignity of the Bishop of Canterbury, becoming in this wise the chief dignitary of his church. The speech of Bishop Creighton also had the characteristics of Anglicanism for its subject. First of all, the speaker outlined three points of view in the matter. According to the first of these points of view the system of the Anglican Church merely is continental protestantism, the complete development of which was delayed by the promptings of political opportunism. According to the second point of view the Anglican church still is the church of the Middle Ages, though somewhat distorted owing to the measures, which were adapted to get rid of the Papal supremacy. But now when Papal supremacy and all its political consequences are dead and gone, a circumspect restoration of some features of the old system is highly desirable, as these features were cast away only for fear of Papism. According to the third point of view, the Anglican church is a compromise between two opposite currents of the religious thought, and analogously to the two political parties of England, which balance each other, there exist two religious par-

ties, to maintain the equilibrium of which lies with the Bishops. Bishop Creighton did not accept any of these points of view and offered to describe Anglicanism in yet another way. In his opinion, the formula which explains the attitude of the Anglican church the best consists in claiming that this church is founded on the principle of an appeal to sound learning. In the XVIth century, the leaders of the Anglican church were confronted with the task of freeing the basis of truth, from the great accumulation of notions around it. And it is exactly to accomplish this task that people have appealed to sound learning, finding it in the Holy Scripture, the works of the Fathers of the church and the practices of the primitive church. In the opinion of Creighton the book of the Common Prayer is wonderfully in keeping with what was the inheritance of the primitive church. This book is remarkably free from a polemical coloring of any sort, tending solely towards establishing truth in its purity and in an adequate measure. The Anglican church puts aside everything that does not bear directly on truth; it avoids establishing definitions of questions, which arise from sheer curiosity; it is not free with its denials of such propositions, the acceptan-

ce and the rejection of which would be equally impossible. This characteristic peculiarity is the pretext of the groundless claim that the Anglican church is a compromise. According to the theory of Bishop Creighton, everything in the Anglican church system which is indefinite or incompletely expressed is so because it ought to be so, because such is the sound doctrine, revealed in the Scripture, in the works of the Fathers of the church and in the practices of the primitive church, and so asking for exact definitions, for strict affirmations or denials of all debatable points would amount to using violence with regard to truth and merely satisfying human curiosity.

Dr. Hall's description of Anglicanism is altogether different. He does not display Bishop Creighton's heated patriotism in his attitude towards his church. Truly enough he admits no doubts as to the catholic dignity of his church or the validity of its apostolic succession, but, at the same time, he is far from taking it for the perfect expression of the sound learning and the complete image of the primitive church. He does not deny that the Anglican church allows the growth of not a few weeds, and that, in the troubled days of Reformation,



its leaders, carried away by the passionate excitement of the strife, did not always distinguish, with due attention, between the things, which are holy and true, and the mere distortions and innovations of Rome, so that along of these distortions they occasionally rejected that, which was possessed of an entirely catholic worth. He maintains that in forming an opinion of Anglicanism one is strictly to distinguish between its church doctrine, expressed in official documents, and the private opinions held by its separate representatives. As to these official documents thanks to a rule of action to which the Anglican church holds and in which the author sees a providential dispensation, these documents are composed in a reconciling spirit to such an extent, that their object is no more the exact definition of the matters of faith, but the pacification of a controversy, with the aid of generalities, on the condition, that nothing essential should be rejected. Hence the author thinks, he is right in claiming, on one hand, that the faith doctrine of modern Anglicanism is not exhausted by what is expressed in its documents, but that it also presupposes everything, which existed before the Reformation, in case it was not repudiated definitely and

clearly. On the other hand, the union of the churches must be concerned only with fundamental principles, with that alone, which has an essential importance. In this way, though acknowledging the existence of some indubitable imperfections in the Anglican church, Dr. Hall merely tries to lessen their origin and existence by the especial task the Anglican church is to accomplish and which is imposed on it by God Himself. And in the opinion of the author, the creed differences between Anglicanism and the Orthodoxy of the East must be considered exactly from this point of view.

In the two following numbers the American theologian endeavours to clear some points mentionned by Father Sebastian, which explanations represent a consecutive application of the fundamental principles, just established by the author in his general remarks.

First of all Father Sebastian points that difference between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy, which consists in the rejection by the latter of the complete number of the seven Œcumenical Councils. Declaring that in this case the matter is concerned only with the seventh Œcumenical Council, namely the second Nicene Council, which

took place in 787, Dr. Hall first of all gives a short exposition of its decree concerning the question of image worship, which, at it is known, consists in discriminating between the ideas of „Latreia“ and „Proskinesis“.

”The Western Council of Frankfort, which met but a few years later, rejected the Council of Nicea, under the impression, based on an imperfect translation, that the *adoration* of images had been commended. In effect, however, it adopted a similar position to that of Nicea, commending the use of images in devotion, as books of the unlearned. The common idea of both Councils seems to have been, that the use of images helps to lift up the imagination to what is represented by them, and that the acts of devotion performed before them are in reality paid to what is figured—not to the images in themselves.

”It must be remembered that these images were not attempts to represent an unrevealed mystery, as was the case with the practices condemned in the second commandment, but were representations of the true Image of God revealed in Christ, and of His saints, the difference in the honor due to these being carefully distinguished.

"The Seventh Council came to be better understood in the West, and was received as œcumenical throughout the Church long before the Reformation epoch. That it was accepted implicitly in the English Church cannot be disputed for a moment. The question to be considered then is, Has this acceptance been reversed since the Reformation?

"This question is not to be answered by appeals to the opinions of individual theological writers. No new religion was established in England in the sixteenth century, nor was any attempt made to define all the principles of the Church *de novo*. Whatever the English Church had been committed to she remained committed to, except in those positions which were altered by her constitutional action. The position here taken is that no action whatever has been adopted by the Anglican Churches, either for or against the Seventh Council, since the Reformation. Consequently the official attitude of these Churches on this point remains what it was prior to the Reformation. This is simply indisputable.

"It must indeed be acknowledged that many of our writers have repudiated the Council referred to. But they have done so under a natural misapprehension, somewhat

parallel to that of the Council of Frankfort, their misapprehension being due to the superstitious practices in the Roman Church, which appeared to be equivalent to adoration of the images themselves, and idolatrous. The Easterns will hardly deny that the honor paid to images has at times degenerated into superstition; and they should be able to appreciate the effect likely to be produced upon the minds of our writers by the contemplation of such abuses in the Roman Church. Papal corruption is practically and inevitably a more pressing nightmare to Anglicans, who have escaped with much difficulty from Papal tyranny, and are still confronted by Papal emissaries, than it is likely to be to the Easterns.

"With the progress of a more enlightened Catholicity among us, this and other questions have been faced more discriminatingly, and the right use of images is rapidly gaining ground. The real teaching of the Seventh Council is becoming better understood. Various Anglican periodicals, including the leading theological review of the Anglican Communion—the *English Church Quarterly Review*—stand for the Seven Councils.

"It must be observed, however, that our people are naturally less demonstrative



than the Easterns. For us to prostrate ourselves, as the Easterns do, would usually mean just what the Seventh Council repudiated—latreia. With us a reverent use of images and pictures as helps in our devotions to Him whom alone we adore—God is all that may be expected, and fulfils the essential principle maintained by the Seventh Council. Surely the Easterns will agree with us that images may not displace God in our worship, and may rightly suffer passing neglect when they do displace Him. The Seventh Council did not honor images in the interests of superstition, but in the interests of the great principle involved in the Incarnation, that material things are capable of holy uses as aids to devotion, and may not be condemned when thus employed.”

To a member of the Orthodox church, it is, of course, very gratifying, if, as Dr. Hall avers, the contemporary Anglican church has really come to an understanding of the true meaning of the teaching of the second Nicene Council, on the worship of images, and has now taken its stand on the side of a recognition of all seven Œcumenical Councils. As regards the view of the same author, that the Anglican church, at the time of the Reformation, did

not express itself either for or against the seventh Council, — with this we are not able entirely to agree. It is true that in the Book of Common Prayer and in the Articles of faith there is no declaration with reference to the number of Œcumenical Councils recognised by the Anglican church; but there is one literary memorial of the period of the Reformation to which are admitted the weight and authority of a symbol of faith, and which is distinctly recognised by the Thirty-fifth Article, — the Book of Homilies, and this work clearly says that only six Œcumenical Councils are recognised and accepted by all\*). Our author is also hardly correct, where he ascribes the rejection of the seventh Œcumenical Council only to „many of our (Anglican) writers”. It is evident that we must give this rejection a much wider meaning. We have within our reach several learned commentaries on the Thirty-Nine Articles. These commentaries were written by well known and authoritative hierarchs and theologians of England and America, and are accepted as guides by their church, they have run into several editions, and

---

\*) Vide Tracts for the Times, No. 90. Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 71, 75. London, 1841.

are used by the clergy and in the theological schools as helps to study, and all of them with one voice affirm that of the\*) Œcumenical Councils the Anglican church recognises only the first six. If the rejection of the seventh council is taught even in the most widely recognised theological treatises, we can hardly recognise it as merely the opinion of individual authors, even though „many” in number...

Before discussing one of the Œcumenical Councils, it appears to us that it would be proper for Father Sebastian and Dr. Hall to take as their basis a thorough elucidation of the question as to what is the general attitude of the Anglican church towards the Œcumenical Councils... In the 21 article of religion, this church declares, that the Œcumenical Councils, being a congregation of people, not all of whom are governed by the spirit and the word of God, can err and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining unto God. Therefore, that which they claim as necessary for salvation, has neither power, nor au-

---

\*) Browne, An exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 483. — London, 1887. Forbes, An explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 300. Maclear and Williams An introduction to the Articles of the Church of England, p. 297, London, 1896.

thority, if it can not be made clear, that it has been derived from the Holy Scripture. It is true that the commentators referred to discuss this Article (Art. 21) in such a way that it almost wholly loses its attractive character for members of the Orthodox Faith; but whether their discussions are in harmony with the true meaning of the Article, and whether, in view of these explanations, the Anglican view really approaches the Orthodox — is still an open question...

"The second point is our supposed failure to accept the Seven Sacraments. Here again the question may be narrowed somewhat. The Anglican Churches have continued to the present day to provide for the administration of six of them—viz., Baptism, Confirmation, the Holy Eucharist, Penance, Holy Order, and Matrimony. Moreover, in each case, the Form provided clearly teaches that these are veritable instruments of Divine grace, which is the meaning of *Sacramentum*, or *mistirion*. No doubt much inadequate theology on this point may be found among us, but this Church, as such, unmistakably imposes six of the œcumenical Sacraments upon her children. There is one difference. She leaves the resort to a priest for Confession

and Absolution to the consciences of her members, laying down no positive rule.

"The question then is narrowed to the Sacrament of Unction. Its use was provided for in the first Reformation Prayer Book of 1549. It was silently ignored in the Second Prayer Book of 1552, but that book took pains to deny that the First Prayer Book contained anything superstitious or ungodly. The result has been that, since 1552, no Form has been provided for the administration of Unction in the Anglican Churches, but the rite has not been condemned or prohibited in any manner. It has continued to be used by a few, and has rapidly gained a wider use in the past generation.

"We regard the loss of express provision for Unction with unqualified regret, and look forward to the time when Catholic feeling will be strong enough to secure its restoration among our official Forms. It is the most extreme instance of the sixteenth century policy described in the writers first article, of waiving the matters which were most irritating to the multitude which was threatening to sweep away everything Catholic.

"This peace-making policy of the English Church moved her to say in her 25th Article of Religion:

„Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly" [*i. e.*, as to their then modes of administration] „of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

"This language is obviously apologetic and eirenical. It cannot be taken as repudiating the lesser Sacraments, for four of them continued to be provided for; but is simply a condemnation of certain Romish corruptions which had grown around their administration, and a reminder that their signs are not defined by Christ, but left to the ordering of the Church.

"To conclude this matter. We acknowledge frankly that the Sacrament of Unction does not have the express provision it should have among us. But we deny that it has been rejected as a means of grace. Accordingly this Church stands committed to some recognition of the Seven Sacraments: That is, to the position that each of them is a true sign and instrument of Divine grace. The value of Unction is com-



ing to be recognized even by some of our more „moderate” Bishops.”

Similarly, Dr. Hall wishes to assure us that the Anglican Church does in fact recognise all seven sacraments. In his opinion, there can be a doubt only in the case of Unction; but its significance also, as a means of divine benediction, is recognised by the Anglican church, while its visible sign, the the ceremony of anointing is neither rejected nor forbidden. — It would be very pleasing if this were so; but, unhappily, we can by no means accept this view as incontestable. It is true that we know that very many Anglicans are to a certain extent inclined to accept seven as the number of the Sacraments, and openly express this view in the press; but this circumstance is far from giving our author the right to say that the whole Anglican church, as a body, takes the same position. The only evidence adduced by our author in confirmation of his view, consists in the fact that all the Orthodox Sacraments are also recognised in the Anglican church as instruments of the divine blessing; but it is not difficult to understand the instability of this position, as soon as we understand that every ceremony and every prayer are likewise instru-

ments of the divine blessing, yet have not the position of sacraments. In considering this position, it is necessary, at the same time to keep in view that in the twenty fifth Article, and in the Catechism, the Anglican church clearly and decisively declares its acceptance of two sacraments only; Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. The Anglican teaching concerning the sacraments of hierarchical order, in the Book of Common Prayer, the Articles of Religion, the Book of Homilies, and the Catechism is set forth in such an obscure and contradictory way, that it serves as a subject for many controversies and different interpretations\*), and for this reason the two daring and superficial solution of this grave question by our author cannot appear convincing to anyone..

"The third point is our failure to accept „the doctrine of the Transubstantiation". This can be discussed briefly. In the first place the difference is one of terms rather than of doctrine, and the term Transubstantiation has never been imposed upon the Church by œcumenical action. It

---

\*) See on this subject, the eleventh chapter of our examination of „The hierarchy of the Anglican Episcopal church", Sergieff Posad, 1897.

has, in fact, a different meaning in different portions of the Church.

"The use of it which has led to its rejection by the Anglican Churches is clearly implied in the 28th Article of Religion, when that Article declares that Transubstantiation „overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament". The popular teaching thus referred to made the word „substance" stand for the physical elements of bread and wine in their entirety, and denied that the consecrated species could in any true sense be called bread and wine. In short, a physical change was taught which made the Eucharistic Sacrament consist of but one part, the Body and Blood of Christ. The senses were supposed to be deceived. It is true that this is not the teaching of Trent, but it was the popular teaching of that time, and the term Transubstantiation could not be accepted so long as it stood for such teaching.

"Moreover, the more refined view put forth by Trent, while free from such crude materialism, depends on the scholastic theory that substance and accidents are different things and separable from each other. In short the decree of Trent is an attempt to explain metaphysically *how* the bread and wine become by consecration the

Body and blood of Christ. The result is that the term stands among us for one of two views—the first materialistic and to be abhorred, the second metaphysical and an attempt to explain what has never been revealed. This being the case, our repudiation of the term does not signify a rejection of the language of Christ and the Catholic Faith, that the consecrated species are truly the Body and Blood of Christ.

"This Church teaches in her Catechism that the „inward part or thing signified” is „The Body and Blood of Christ,” adding that the mode of their personal appropriation is spiritual. When the Sacrament is administered, the Priest is ordered to describe what he administers as „the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ”, and „the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ”. Thus, while much imperfect and Protestant opinion is found among us, this Church agrees with the East in teaching officially that our Lord’s words are to be taken in good faith, and not figuratively. Moreover, the tendency of private opinion amongst us is in the direction of a realization of this doctrine. We agree with St. Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, the two SS. Cyril, and St. John of Damascus, none of whom used the term Transubstantiation.”

Dr. F. Hall concludes his remarks on this subject by a statement concerning the Coronation Oath, recently pronounced by king Edward VII, the text of which called forth, as is well known, a great noise in the press and in society, by its incisive expressions, amongst other things, on Transsubstantiation: The author says that this Oath is exclusively political in its report...

Our author believes that in the question of Transsubstantiation also, the discordance between the Anglican and Orthodox churches consists rather in words than in teaching. In harmony with this view, he seeks to explain that the Anglican church rejects in fact only the term Transsubstantiation, because a materialistic meaning lurks in it, or at least a tendency to explain that which should not be subjected to explanation. But as regards the teaching on the sacrament of the Eucharist, he suggests that the Anglican church adheres to the teaching of the Early Fathers, and is „in harmony with the East”, affirming that the word of the Lord must not be taken in a metaphorical sense, and that the consecrated elements are in very deed the Body and Blood of Christ. At the same time, it is not difficult for us to see that in the

present instance Dr. Hall is by no means distinguished for accuracy. The gist of the matter does not at all lie in the term, but in the nature of the teaching, which is expressed by it, so that if we put the word Transsubstantiation, for example, on one side, and, in our exposition of the Eastern teaching, substituted the word Translation, the real difference between the Anglican and Orthodox teaching would not thereby be evaded. The Orthodox church teaches that in the sacrament of the Eucharist<sup>7</sup> our Lord Jesus Christ is present not symbolically, nor in an image, nor as an accession of benediction, as in the other sacraments, nor as an influence only,... nor by penetration of the bread... but really and truly, so that on the consecration of the bread and wine, the bread is translated, transsubstantiated, transmuted, transformed into the veritable body of the Lord, who was born in Bethlehem of the Holy Virgin, was baptised in the Jordan, suffered, was buried, rose again, ascended, and sits at the right hand of God the Father, whence He shall come in the clouds of heaven; and the wine is transformed and transsubstantiated in to the veritable blood of the Lord, which, at the time of His Passion on the Cross, was shed for the life of the



world... After consecration the bread and wine no longer remain bread and wine, but the veritable body and blood of the Lord, under the appearance and form of bread and wine"\*). This Orthodox teaching of the translation, transsubstantiation, transformation or transmutation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of the Lord, the Anglican church decidedly rejects.

Transsubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstition.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith. (Art. XXVIII).

In conformity with the declaration of belief, and the explanations of those who discuss it, the Anglican church, rejecting Transsubstantiation, puts forward only a teaching concerning the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, yet a presence not corporeal but spiritual\*\*), while if we define this presence exactly, the theological thought of contemporary Anglicanism is sometimes

---

\*) Epistle of the Patriarchs of the Eastern Catholic Church concerning the Orthodox faith. Art. 17.

\*\*\*) Vide e. g. Browne, pp. 677—725; Forbes pp. 498—573; Maclear and Williams pp. 329—346.

so far from the truth, that it manifests an inclination to attribute to it merely a subjective meaning referring to the soul of the believer.\*) In this position of affairs, it is evident that we can by no means affirm that in the question of Transsubstantiation, the difference between the Anglicans and the Orthodox exists rather in words than in teaching.

With reference to Dr. Hall's remarks concerning the Coronation Oath, they have as their aim to show that, from the point of view of religious questions, this document, both in general, and in particular with reference to Transsubstantiation, must not be given any great importance. To what extent the author's view in this regard is justified, we have no need to examine, as soon as we see that on the question of Transsubstantiation the Oath, though perhaps in slightly more incisive terms, expresses in fact the same teaching which is put forth by the Anglican church, in documents which are undoubtedly binding in matters of faith.

---

\*) Readers of the Theological Herald may recall certain interesting views on this subject, in the article of Father Preobrajenski, on „Contemporary Anglicanism”, Feb. 1901.

"The fourth point mentioned by Father Sebastian is that the Anglican Churches allow "too much liberty, or abuse of freedom, in *personal* in interpretation of the Bible". To put our reply briefly, two propositions may be advanced: (a) these Churches do not, in fact, recognize as valid any interpretations of Scripture which conflict with the Faith once for all delivered to the saints; (b) the "abuse of freedom" which Father Sebastian mentions does exist among us in certain limited quarters, but is overlooked rather than sanctioned; and this is a branch of the policy described in our first article, of patient avoidance of quenching a smoking flax.

"There can be no denial of the fact that, in some instances at least, our prelates have been too lax, and have allowed to pass unrebuked, interpretations of Scripture which would subvert the Faith of the Church if they came to control opinion generally. But the general drift of our people towards a fuller and surer hold upon their Catholic heritage — a drift which has been especially pronounced since 1833 shows that this laxity of discipline is not likely to destroy the Catholicity of the Anglican Churches. And the fact remains that these Churches continue to teach in

their official formularies that Catholic Faith which must determine for the faithful the true meaning of Scripture. The Church retains for herself in the 20th Article of Religion "authority in controversies of Faith," while clearly asserting in the same Article the necessary agreement of her teaching with.

"The Easterns will acknowledge, of course, that it has never been the method of the Catholic Church to define the meanings of each text of Scripture; but simply to teach the fundamental doctrines which must be found in Scripture, if it is to be interpreted truly. A certain liberty has ever been given to personal exegesis, subject to this great principle".

J We do not know what it was exactly that led Father Sebastian to point to the point to be excessive liberty, or to the abuse of liberty, in the exegesis of the Holy Scriptures, as one of the existing differences separating Anglicanism from Orthodoxy; but it would seem that in this respect the Anglican church hardly deserves special blame. It does not preach the Protestant principle of the right of private interpretation of the Scriptures; on the contrary, it strongly insists, that for guidance in this case we must turn to the Apostles

and to the apostolic times, expressing themselves in the primitive, universally accepted symbols and in the decisions of the first undisputed (Ecumenical Councils\*). If were theologians who allowed too much liberty in the interpretation of the Scriptures, such a phenomenon is possible not alone in the Anglican church, and we may not make this a cause of direct-reproach to the church, the more so, that this same church has given to the world a whole series of such eminent students and interpreters of the Bible, whose labors are gratefully used by the Orthodox theologians also.

If the question of the relation of Anglicanism to the Holy Scriptures were raised, then, we must believe, it would be much more fitting to point, not to the methods of its interpretation, but to the determination of its significance, as a source of Christian teaching. In the sixth Article of Religion, it declares:

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be relieved as an article of the Faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

---

\*) Vide e. g. The Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 1878 and 1888. Edit. by Davidson, pp. 97, 165, 353. — London 1889. — Cf. Cousin, Bishop of Durham, Teaching, Institutions and Ceremonies of the Anglican Church, Pp. I — 9. Perv. Troitskavo, St. — P. 1868.

The same thought is repeated in the twentieth Article also.

Although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

Insisting in this manner on the exclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures, the Anglican church, in contradistinction to the Orthodox, completely rejects the independent validity of Holy Tradition as source of Christian teaching.

"The next point is that, among us, "the majority refuse spiritual aid unto the faithful departed and spiritual comfort unto the living, in as much as they reject prayers for the dead". The guarded language which Father Sebastian has used is true. The majority of our people do fall short of their obligations, and we cannot truly deny it.

"But the cause of this neglect reduces its significance. This cause is the fact that prayers for the departed had become closely associated, in the Reformation period, with grave errors and abuses, such as the Romish doctrine of purgatory (of material torments for the sins of the faithful departed), the comparatively modern claim of the Pope to grant indulgences from these tor-



ments, and the abuse of solitary masses for the dead, paid for at so much a mass. Those who broke away from the papal see swung to far in their reaction, and overlooked the ancient and salutary doctrine and practice in this matter. But the Anglican Churches have not repudiated prayers for the departed. A trace of them remains in our Liturgy, and the terms of a prayer ordered to be said over the dying, at the instant of their departure, are such as to imply an answer from God after death. This prayer is used to-day with increasing frequency in connection with our Burial Office. There is no question but that the neglect of the departed in our prayers is rapidly being repaired. Our best writers are urging a restoration of the neglected practice. The evil is sure to disappear in time."

Similarly, our author assures us that the rejection of prayers for the dead by the Anglican church was brought about by fortuitous circumstances, and that the time will soon come when the old salutary teaching and practise will be revived. God grant it! To the members of the Orthodox church, such a turn of events will give sincere joy, but without question this reform must be brought about by the autho-

The same thought is repeated in the twentieth Article also.

Although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

Insisting in this manner on the exclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures, the Anglican church, in contradistinction to the Orthodox, completely rejects the independent validity of Holy Tradition as source of Christian teaching.

"The next point is that, among us, "the majority refuse spiritual aid unto the faithful departed and spiritual comfort unto the living, in as much as they reject prayers for the dead". The guarded language which Father Sebastian has used is true. The majority of our people do fall short of their obligations, and we cannot truly deny it.

"But the cause of this neglect reduces its significance. This cause is the fact that prayers for the departed had become closely associated, in the Reformation period, with grave errors and abuses, such as the Romish doctrine of purgatory (of material torments for the sins of the faithful departed), the comparatively modern claim of the Pope to grant indulgences from these tor-

ments, and the abuse of solitary masses for the dead, paid for at so much a mass. Those who broke away from the papal see swung to far in their reaction, and overlooked the ancient and salutary doctrine and practice in this matter. But the Anglican Churches have not repudiated prayers for the departed. A trace of them remains in our Liturgy, and the terms of a prayer ordered to be said over the dying, at the instant of their departure, are such as to imply an answer from God after death. This prayer is used to-day with increasing frequency in connection with our Burial Office. There is no question but that the neglect of the departed in our prayers is rapidly being repaired. Our best writers are urging a restoration of the neglected practice. The evil is sure to disappear in time."

Similarly, our author assures us that the rejection of prayers for the dead by the Anglican church was brought about by fortuitous circumstances, and that the time will soon come when the old salutary teaching and practise will be revived. God grant it! To the members of the Orthodox church, such a turn of events will give sincere joy, but without question this reform must be brought about by the autho-

riety of the church, and must be accompanied by corresponding changes in its books of ritual, in which at the present time we are not quite able to see what our author wishes us to see. In his view, traces of prayer for the dead are preserved in the Anglican liturgy, but these traces we have not been able to find. There is only one liturgical prayer which makes mention of the dead).

And we also bless thy holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseeching the to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.

And the Anglicans, it is quite evident, are praying for themselves in this prayer, and by no means for the dead. -- Our author further lays stress on the expressions of the prayer pronounced over the dead. In the order for Visiting the Sick, in the two prayers preceding the last, we certainly do find something which refers to the matter under discussion.

Forasmuch as in all appearance the time of *his* dissolution draweth near, so fit and prepare *him*, we beseech thee, against the hour of death, that after *his* departure hence in peace, and in thy favour, *his* soul may be received into thine everlasting kingdom.

We humbly commend the soul of this thy servant our dear *brother*, into thy hands, as into the hands of

a faithful Creator, and most merciful Saviour; most humbly beseeching thee, that it may be precious in thy sight. Wash it, we pray thee, in the blood of that immaculate Lamb, that was slain to take away the sins of the world; that whatsoever defilements it may have contracted in the midst of this miserable and naughty world, through the lusts of the flesh, or the wiles of Satan, being purged and done away, it may be presented pure and without spot before thee.

There can be no doubt at all, that the subject of the prayer here is the future judgement of the soul of the man beyond the tomb; but the man over whom the Anglican church thus prays, is still living, and therefore the prayer in question has nothing in common with prayer for the dead, since everyone, of course, can pray and does pray about his own fate beyond the tomb, and the fate of his fellow-creatures. — Our author says that at the present time this prayer is often joined to the order of burial. If this be done, it is, of course true that this prayer then becomes a prayer for the dead, beyond any doubt, but this arrangement must not be an expression of individual initiative, in the case of private persons, but an ordinance of the church. As regards the Anglican order of burial in its present form, the utter absence of the slightest hint of a prayer for the dead person over whom it is celebrated is

in the highest degree a characteristic feature of it. It is quite evident, that, up to the present, the Anglican Church has been unwilling to prescribe prayers for the dead, though in the future it may be willing to do so, since its ritual books do not contain a categorical rejection or prohibition of such prayers, but our magnificent chant "Rest with the saints", as is well known, has long ago been translated into the English language, and has more than once been publicly performed.

"The sixth point is, that "the *majority* have a strong aversion to reverence shown and due the saints glorified". This is partially, although not wholly, true. In one way the Anglicans reverence the memory of the saints, inasmuch as they observe a calendar of saints' days, for which especial Collects, Epistles, and Gospels are provided by the Church in the Holy Eucharist. There is also a day set apart to the honor of "All Saints" — November 1st. This shows that the principle of reverence towards the saints finds express recognition among us.

"But it must be conceded that the principle is not extended as far as it should be. This neglect is connected, no doubt, with revulsion from what has seemed truly idolatrous in the Romish method of the



Invocation of Saints commonly prevalent. When we rejected papal tyranny, the practice prevailed, and using still continues in the Roman Church without rebuke, of using language in these invocations which seemed to put the Blessed Virgin and other saints in the mediatorial position which belongs exclusively to our Blessed Lord. Instances of such language are innumerable, and to be found in almost every Roman manual of devotion. It was, and continues to be, alleged in popular writings that certain saints are more merciful and ready to save than Christ Himself. These idolatrous practices were well-nigh universal.

"Accordingly, without saying anything about more ancient and sounder practice, the English Church condemned this *Romish* practice in her 22nd Article of Religion; and saw fit, for the avoidance of the idolatry, so widely prevalent among the ignorant, to omit every official provision for the invocation of saints. There are times when salutary practices may rightly be abandoned, if they are not essential, and in fact lead to idolatry. It was hardly a matter for blame under the circumstances that invocations should fall into disrepute among us. They are confessedly of post-Apostolic growth, are not taught in Scrip-

ture, and have never been *required* by the Church in her œcumenical capacity.

"The truth that the saints help us by their prayers has never ceased to be believed among us; nor do our best writers deny that to ask the saints for their prayers is lawful, if the saints are not thereby put above the level of creaturehood. We acknowledge also, with the Easterns, that their peculiar sanctity gives the intercessions of the saints much power, although always the power of prayer simply. We do not admit that any saint has the prerogative of exceeding the bounds of creaturely prayer. There are some among us to-day who have revived the practice of the invocation of saints in this non-idolatrous sense.

"These Explanations will make clear the point of view from which the English sovereign speaks of invocation as idolatrous. The reference is to the matter in which it is widely practised in the Roman Church. No other practice than the Romish lay within the observation of those who framed the coronation oath. There was certainly no intention of accusing the Easterns of idolatry."

In his explanations on this point, our author in this way affirms that the Anglican church allows *only* veneration of saints,

but not their invocation in prayer, while as an expression of veneration special days and special services are appointed, and set apart in honor of the saints. Yet these very services in the clearest possible way express the real difference existing in the relations towards the saints of the Orthodox and Anglican churches respectively. In the Book of Common Prayer twenty days of the year are consecrated to the memory of the saints. For each of these days there is a special Collect, in which the name and deeds of the saint who is honored are recalled; but in none of these prayers is there the slightest hint of invocation, that is, of a turning to the saint himself with a petition for his blessed aid and intervention with God for those who are praying. In these prayers, the Anglican church merely calls to mind the saints and their miracles, as examples worthy of imitation; but addresses its petitions only to God and the One Mediator—Christ. The negative attitude of the Anglican church toward the invocation of saints, our author attributes to the abuses of Rome, which have almost become idolatry, which, as it were, held the Anglican church back from any definite ordinances in that direction. Historically, this explanation is perfectly true; but there

can be no doubt, at the same time, that the Anglican church has carried its negation further than was necessary, it did not confine itself merely to refraining from a definite prescription referring to invocation of the saints, but directly and decisively declared against it, in the twenty-second Article.

The Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of images as of Relics, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, both rather repugnant to the Word of God.

In the face of such an incisive declaration and of the absence in the Anglican ritual of even the slightest hint of invocation of the saints, the saying of our author, that the Anglican church never ceased to believe in the blessed aid of the saints, recognised a special power in their intercession, and holds it to be lawful to approach them with prayers, — awakens in us only a hope for the future, but by no means a belief in the present.

"Finally, Father Sebastian says. "Pictures and articles for uplifting and strengthening religion are rejected". So far as pictures are concerned, what has been explained touching images should throw light on our position. They are not rejected, and are used in many of our churches, although

not so abundantly as in the East, nor with such demonstrative acts of reverence as are shown towards them by the Easterns. Were Anglicans to act thus ceremoniously towards them, or towards sacred relics, their actions would signify more than the Easterns mean by their ceremonies. To us prostrations and genuflections signify, or are apt to mean; adoration. *latreia*. The reverent care which we show for sacred pictures, for the graves of our holy departed, and for sacred instruments generally, corresponds, in our less demonstrative manner of showing respect, to the more ceremonious actions of Easterns. To some of our people, who do not realize how different are the customs of remote races, the Eastern methods of showing honor to creaturely persons and things seem sacrilegious. But, in fact, the two Churches—Eastern and Anglican—mean the same thing in principle, although acting very differently. While there are people among us who, by reason of their dread of Rome, have lost much of the instinct of reverence, the majority do reverence sacred buildings and sacred things *in their way* of showing reverence, a way which is naturally much simpler than in the East.”

Similarly, it is our author's opinion that on the question of the invocation of saints, images and holy relics, there is no real difference between the Anglican and Orthodox churches. The Anglicans, he assures us, use holy images with veneration, and honor the tombs of the dead, and in the way in which they show their veneration is markedly different from that of the Orthodox church, this arises not from difference of view on the subject, but from the differing characters of the national temperaments. We do not hold it to be possible to assent to this view. It is one thing to venerate a subject in a general way, but religious honor is quite another thing. We ourselves hold in special honor, for example, the portraits of our emperors, or the tombs of the great hierarchs and heroes of our fatherland, but at the same time this feeling is not at all the same as that with which we bow before holy images, and relics of the saints, and to include these feelings under a single class means to confound things which are far from being the same. The author's reference to the special character of national temperament, does not convince us in the present case. Among the population of England there are millions of Roman Catholics, and



in the way in which they express their veneration for holy images and holy relics we do not see any essential difference between the English and the representatives of other nationalities. Temperament has no force whatever, as soon as one's attitude to a subject is not merely veneration but reverent worship. The Anglican does not adore the things which for us are sacred, if in his profession of faith he declares that the service and prostration to holy images and relics are superstitious nonsense.

"Father Sebastian does not ask for any explanation touching the *Filioque*, but the writer will be pardoned, perhaps, for saying a few words on the subject. All Anglican writers acknowledge that canonically speaking, no provincial Council may revise the action of an Œcumenical Council or insert novel phrases in an Œcumenical Creed. The Westerns therefore acted irregularly when they inserted the *Filioque*. In this they followed the example, however, of the Second Œcumenical Council, which, *when it met*, was merely an Eastern Council, and yet added to the Nicene Symbol without waiting for the consent of the West. Happily in that case the consent was

ultimately given and the Council thus became Œcumenical.

Our situation is this. An addition which was made irregularly in the first instance, has come through centuries of use to be bound up with the maintenance of the true Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ. Its rejection now, unless some adequate substitute were agreed upon, would strengthen very much the Unitarian heresy, existing in England and America, which treats Christ as a mere creature. Obviously the maintenance of the faith is a primary obligation, not to be waived even for the sake of canonical regularity.

"So much for the history of the matter. But the Easterns think that the phrase is inconsistent with the truth that the Father is the sole ultimate source of the Divine procession. Perhaps this would be the case, if Westerns were wont to use such ample modes of expression as the Easterns employ. But rightly understood, all that the phrase actually means for those who have used it is this; that the Son, by reason of His consubstantiality with the Father, cannot be excluded from essential participation in the Father's spiration of the Holy Spirit. We do not mean that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son *in the*

same manner that He proceeds from the Father, as if there were two independent or parallel lines of procession; but that the essence of the Son is involved in the procession. The Father is the ultimate source; but He spirates the Holy Ghost, not in isolation from the Son, but through (dia, para) the Son—the coinherence, perihorisis, of the Son with the Father not being interrupted in relation to the spiration of the Holy Spirit.

„It is to be admitted that the short and blunt *Filioque*, which neglects to specify the *difference in the manner* of the procession from the Father and the Son, might be improved upon. When the glad day of a new œcumenical council arrives, no doubt some ampler phrase can be agreed upon which will satisfy both East and West. Meantime we retain our phrase for a reason which Easterns should respect (that is, lest the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and the perihorisis should seem to be obscured), while in no wise forgetting the sole *principatus* of the Father.’

It is not difficult to see that all our author’s explanations on this point are evidently inclined as far as possible to the dismissal of the addition to the Creed, and

to the teaching of the proceeding of the Holy Spirit, accepted in the West; yet for this very reason they only confirm in all its force the profound difference which exists on the subject in question between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy. What this difference really is, so far as it shows itself in our author's explanations, we hold it to be our duty now to make clear, since to enter into a polemic with him, and to show the truth of the Orthodox teaching is no part of our task.

Recognising the original canonical incorrectness of the addition to the Creed, our author thinks he can defend it by referring to the method of procedure of the *Second* Œcumenical Council; but the Orthodox church clearly remembers that the complete incontestability of the universal Creed was first established only by the seventh rule of the *Third* Œcumenical Council, and therefore what happened in the church before that, that is, the Council of Ephesus, cannot and should not have any bearing upon the question under discussion. — Our author further affirms that the addition „*Filioque*”, received the meaning of a recognition of the divinity of Jèsus Christ, and that to remove it would therefore be to give support to the Unitarian Heresy;

but the Orthodox church does not recognise the famous doctrine that the end justifies the means, and in its view to have recourse to falsehood in defence of truth is inadmissible. — As regards the reality of the teaching of „*Filioque*”, this teaching, in whatever way it may be explained, is so foreign to Orthodoxy, that our author's thought that the new Œcumenical Council which he desires would be able to find a formula to reconcile them, must be recognised as impossible. In the western view, as our author also explains it, the Son, in virtue of His unity of nature with the Father, cannot be shut out from an actual share in the sending forth of the Holy Spirit by the Father, and therefore either works together with the Father in the sending forth of the Holy Spirit, or at any rate — is passively a sharer in that act, forming, as it were, a means through which the Holy Spirit proceeds, on issuing from God the Father. The Orthodox Orient, however, in its representation of the birth and proceeding, takes its start from the idea of *conjunct action*, by which God the Father causes the birth of the Son and the proceeding of the Holy Spirit. This action may be called a birth-giving and forth-sending action. The Son and the Spirit pro-

ceed from the Father unitedly, conjointly, together, the Son is born together with the proceeding of the Spirit, the Spirit proceeds together with the Son being born — inseparably, yet without confusion. Neither the one nor the other in the receiving of being from the Father, and does not condition the being of the other, and therefore there can be no place even for the thought of the co-operation of the in the proceeding forth of the Holy Spirit.\*) — It is impossible to imagine any formula which could reconcile so profound a discrepancy of view, and consequently, while the Anglican church, in its teaching on the Holy Spirit, remains a faithful representative of the West, there is and will remain a substantial difference in dogma between it and the Orthodox church.

In concluding his explanations Dr. Hall expresses a thought which is habitual with Anglican theologians, and which has a very real importance in the discussion of the question of a union of the two churches. Only a universal church, he affirms, is infallible in the profession of the true faith, but separate churches, such as he holds

---

\*) Katanski, On the Proceeding of the Holy Spirit (With reference to the Old Catholic Question). St. P. 1893, pp. 2—4.



his own Anglican church to be, are not free from short comings and errors. At the same time, he does not recognise the universal character significance of the Orthodox Eastern church, placing it on the same level with the other separate Christian churches, and considering it, like them, in like manner not free from shortcomings and errors. It stands to reason that, with such a view, the effort to bring Anglicanism and Orthodoxy together gains a quite unique light, and it is evident that long time shall pass and much labor and explanations shall be needed before this holy cause finds the right path.

In consideration of all this we greet the attempt of Father Sebastian and Dr. Hall to discuss points of disagreement in print with the sincerest sympathy and we most eagerly wish that it find many imitators and reach a wide spread. The more people take part in the discussion, the more complete and comprehensive will be the discussion, owing to the diversity of points of view and grades of information, especially in case if printed articles are helped by the living word, the direct exchange of ideas face to face. This is why we wish to profit by the present occasion in order to draw the attention of those in-

terested in the question of church union to the interesting suggestion made in print by Mr. Vladimir Sokoloff, who spent several years at the service of the Russian Embassy church in London, who devoted considerable labour to the study of Anglicanism and repeatedly informed the Russian readers of the results of his researches and observations in various church publications. The underlying idea of our honored namesake is that our orthodox clergy abroad should be aroused into a more active part in the discussion of international church questions, as these clergy represent a power from which much can be hoped on account of the very circumstances in which they are placed and the conditions of their lives. To be properly guided this power ought to be brought together and unified, and towards this end the author suggests instituting a cathedral of an Orthodox Bishop in some capital of the Western Europe, so that there should be center of orthodoxy amongst the foreign creeds of the West, the head pastor of which should be the chief and the guide of all the activities of the Russian clergy abroad. There should be a magazine published under the auspices of the Bishop's cathedral, whose chief object should be the mutual

study of the orthodox East and the various creeds of the West, the elucidation of the differences between them and the furthering of more desirable relations between them. With the same object, a congress of the Russian clergy abroad should be called under the presidency of this Bishop, in the summer of every year; and any Russian theologian or any representative of a foreign creed should be allowed to take an active part in the debates of the congress, should he desire to do so. And in our opinion, several languages ought to be in use at the congress as well as on the pages of the magazine, so that the free interchange of ideas should become more convenient.

Needless to say, that a more complete working out of this project, in all its details, belongs to the future. But in our opinion, the underlying idea and the main features of this project deserve our most serious attention. As to the Bishop's cathedral abroad, five years ago we gathered from a competent source, that the Holy Synod had its institution in view, marking out a certain candidate for the post. But to our regret, for some reason the idea was given up at the time. God grant that the suggestion of Mr. Vladimir Solovioff

should find sympathy and support in our days, so that the original idea of our great hierarchs Philaretos and Isidor about the conjoint public discussion of the differences in the creeds should, at last, be most exhaustively realized in the proposed magazine and congress.

---

The Rev. F. Hall's explanation concerning the coronation oath (admitted at 133 page):

As for the coronation oath, its significance is purely political. The English King is not the spiritual but the temporal head of the Church, and no act of either King or Parliament can affect the doctrinal position of the Church, unless accepted by Convocation. The oath in question was drawn up by Parliament, without ecclesiastical action, at a time when the political attitude of Rome was a real source of danger to England. Its language implies throughout the popular Romish abuses connected with the phrases employed. In any case, the oath is not an ecclesiastical document at all, and the King's power over the Church does not extend to making or interpreting ecclesiastical formularies. The terms of the oath are distasteful to multitudes of Churchmen today, as unnecessarily harsh and misleading. The American Church is, of course, entirely unaffected.



## A short history of the formal transfer of the Territory of Alaska to the United States of America.

The formal transfer was made at half-past 3 o'clock, October 18th 1867, with appropriate ceremonies previously agreed upon by Captain Pestchouroff and General Lovell N. Rosseau, Commissioners of the part of Russia and the United States respectively. General Jeff. C. Davis has been appointed to the command of the military force of occupation, and the expedition, consisting of the United States ships "Ossipee", "Jamestown" and "Resaca", with the Commissioners on board, together with several transports carrying about 250 soldiers and military supplies, sailed from San Francisco on the 27th of September, and, touching at Victoria for coal, arrived at Sitka on the forenoon of October 18th 1867.

*The following is a part of the Report of the United States Commissioner General Lovell N. Rosseau to the Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.*

"The command of General Davis, about 250 strong in full uniform, armed and handsomely equipped, were landed about o'clock and marched up to the top of the eminence on which stands the Governor's Louse, where the transfer was to be made. At the same time a company of Russian soldiers were marched to the ground and took their place upon the left of the flagstaff, from which the Russian flag was then floating. The command of General Davis was formed under the direction on the right. The United States flag to be raised on the occasion was in care of a color guard a lieutenant, a sergeant, and ten men of General Davis' command. The officers above named, as well as the officers under their command, the Governor, Prince Maksoutoff and his wife, the Princess Maksoutoff, together with many Russian

and American citizens, and some Indians, were present. The formation of the ground, however, was such as to preclude any considerable demonstration.

"It was arranged by Captain Pestchouroff and myself that, in firing the salute on the exchange of flags the United States should lead off, but that there should be alternate guns from the American and Russian batteries, thus giving the flag of each nation a double national salute; the national salute being thus answered the moment it was given. The troops being promptly formed, were, at precisely half-past 3 o'clock, brought to a present arms, the signal was given to the "Ossipee" (Lieutenant Crossman, executive officer of the ship, and for the time in command), which was to fire the salute, and the ceremony was begun by lowering the Russian flag. As it began its descent down the flagstaff the Battery of the "Ossipee", with large nine-inch guns, led off in the salute, peal after peal crashing and re-echoing in the gorges of the surrounding mountains, answered by the Russian water battery (a battery on the wharf), firing alternately. But the ceremony was interrupted by the catching of the Russian flag in the ropes attached to the flagstaff. The soldier who was lowering it continued to pull at it, and tore off the border by which it was attached, leaving the flag entwined tightly around the ropes. The flag-staff was a native pine, perhaps ninety (90) feet in height. - In an instant the Russian Soldiers, taking the different shrouds attached to the flag-staff, attempted to ascend to the flag, which, having been whipped around the ropes by the wind, remained tight and fast. At first, being sailors as well as soldiers, they made rapid progress, but laboring hard, they soon became tired, and when halfway up scarcely moved at all, and finally came to a stanstill. There was a dilemma; and in a moment a "boatswain's chair", so called was made by knotting a rope to make a loop for a man to sit in and be pulled upward, and another Russian soldier was drawn quickly up to the flag. On reach-



ing it he detached it from the ropes, and not hearing the calls from Captain Pestchourog below to bring it down, dropped it below, and its descent it fell on the bayonets of the Russian soldiers.

"The United States flag was then properly attached and began its ascent, hoisted by my private secretary, George Lovell Rosseau, and again the salutes were fired as before, the Russian water battery leading off. The flag was so hoisted that in the instant it reached its place, the report of the last big gun of the "Ossipee" reverberated from the mountains around. The salutes being completed, Captain Pestchoureff stepped up to me and said: General Rosseau, by authority from His Majesty, the Emperor of Russia, I transfer to the United States the Territory of Alaska, and in a few words I acknowledged the acceptance of the transfer, and the ceremony was at an end: Three cheers were then spontaneously given for the United States flag by the American citizens present, although this was no part of the program, and on some accounts I regretted that it occurred".

*Remarks:*

One would naturally ask, why did General Rosseau regretted it?

*An answer by an eye witness;*

Its because he saw all the Russians present were in tears.



*Sayings of Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow.*

Glory to Christ the Lord, who came to us in our humble form to show us an example of humility, He appeared in a cavern, so that we might be contented with a simple cell; in a manger — that we might not demand a soft couch; in swaddling clothes, that we might love plain dress; in the inarticulateness of a babe, that we might be like children in simplicity and gentleness and not indulge our tongues in vain talk. Be you wise in this, and I beg you to pray that I also be wise in this.

Bitter can not sweeten bitter, but only sweet can sweeten. So bitter circumstances can not be sweetened, if you discuss them in bitterness: but gentleness, patience and love can sweeten what comes from a bitter source, and, moreover, they can make sweet the very source of bitterness.

In prayer one must be constant and unshaken by the unforeseen: but also one must be peaceful and humble, not allowing the imagination to grow arrogant.

God demands patience and hope, when bereaving a soul, for trial and purification.

It is sweet, when praying, to bring to mind souls, of whom you know that they look up towards God and come near us through Him; and He alone knows which of the two profits more by the other, he who prays, or he who asks for a prayer.



# 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.*

# I N D E X.

	PAGE.
I. A VOICE FROM AMERICA . . . . .	101
II. A SHORT HISTORY OF THE FORMAL TRANSFER OF ALASKA TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	161
III. SAYINGS OF PHILARET, METROPOLITAN OF MOSCOW	164

---

*Печатать разрешается, Май 1902 г.*  
*Цензоръ, Архимандритъ Рафаиль.*

---