FATHER SERGIUS BULGAKOV

1871 - 1944

A collection of articles by Fr. Bulgakov for the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius and now reproduced by the Fellowship to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the death of this great Ecumenist.

The Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius
St. Basil's House, 52 Ladbroke Grove,
London W.11. Tel: 727 - 7713.

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

	page
BY JACOB'S WELL, December 1933	1.
ON PRAYER TO THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH, March 1934	12.
THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL, September 1934	16.
WAYS TO CHURCH REUNION, June 1935	22.
SPIRITUAL INTERCOMMUNION, December 1935	29.
FREEDOM OF THOUGHT IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH, June 1936	33.
THE INCARNATION AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH, June 1938	38.
THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY, September 1939	41.
HOC SIGNO VINCES, November 1939	46.

Acknowledgment.

-oOo-

INTRODUCTION

FATHER SERGIUS BULGAKOV is one of the most outstanding theologians of the Russian Church. His life and thought reflect the troubled destiny of his people, for he travelled - as did many of his contemporaries - a long journey from atheism and marxism to priesthood and the full commitment to the Orthodox faith.

He was born on June 16th 1871 in Central Russia. His father was a priest and for six generations his family had provided the Russian Church with devout clerics. Sergy was reared in the colourful tradition of Eastern Orthodoxy, but at the age of 14 he lost his faith and was captured, as many young Russians of that period were, by the spirit of revolutionary nihilism. For the next 18 years he identified himself with political radicalism and atheism, becoming one of the leading marxist economists in Russia.

Sergy studied in Moscow, Berlin, Paris and London and in 1896 he published his first major work, "The role of Market in Capitalist production". In 1901 he was elected to the Chair of Political Economy in Kiev. In 1906 he was transferred to Moscow University where he remained until 1918. During this period he took an active part in the movement of Religious Renaissance which started among Russian intellectuals, gradually moving from Marxism to critical idealism and from there to Orthodox Christianity.

In 1909 in the company of N. Berdyaev, P. Struve, S. Frank and others, he published a symposium called 'Signposts' in which with truly prophetic insight he predicted the rise of totalitarianism, should the Marxists' victory occur in Russia.

Sergy was ordained in 1918, and had to leave Moscow under the threat of impending arrest. Until 1923 he lived and taught in the Crimea and on the 1st of January 1923 he was expelled from Russia by the Soviet government.

From 1925 until his death on June 12th, 1944, he was the Dean of the Russian Theological Institute in Paris, and Professor of Dogmatics. During these years he published 12 volumes of his theological works : he was an original thinker and some of his theological ideas were contested by other theologians. He took an important part in the activities of the Russian Student Movement in Exile and was the leader of the Orthodox in the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. He participated also in the Ecumenical Movement, attending the Conferences in Lausanne (1926) and in Oxford and Edinburgh (1937), and contributing to the work of many committees and publications of the Faith and Order Movement.

Father Bulgakov was a man dedicated to the Church; he regarded his priesthood as the most significant among his manifold activities. One of his main characteristics was

the continuity of his development. He knew how to learn from his past experiences. He retained from the time of his materialism - a sense of the sacredness of matter; from his Marxism - the realisation of the importance of economics; from his atheism - respect for critical reason; and from his revolutionary past - his love for freedom.

He was deeply rooted in the soil of Russian Orthodoxy, but he was a truly ecumenically-minded Christian who realised the common destiny of all Christians and their guilt for divisions, in which the East and the West each had their own share. In 1933 he had advocated - with daring foresight - intercommunion between those Eastern and Western Christians who enjoyed agreement in essentials of faith, for he believed that the hardness of heart is no less an obstacle to reconciliation than the defects in doctrinal formulations, and that Eucharistic Fellowship is the cure for the former.

Father Bulgakov's works are at present forbidden by the Communists inside his own country, but they are bound the influence the Russian Christians when they regain their freedom.

NICOLAS ZERNOV

Oxford
September 1969

-oOo-

BY JACOB'S WELL

(John iv.23)

(On the Actual Unity of the Divided Church in Faith, Prayer and Sacraments)

THE language of the New Testament frequently contains the expressions "the church" and "the churches". On the one hand there is the mystical unity of the Church as the Body of Christ, on the other hand there are the specific local communities in which such life was realised. We still use the same terms, not only in the above-mentioned sense, but also in that of different Christian confessions. We must admit that such a use of the word "churches" often shocks us, for in our own minds, for example, we often think that actually there exists only one Church, namely the Orthodox Church- whereas all that stands outside Orthodoxy is not the Church. But the evidence of the use of language cannot be explained away by mere civility or hypocrisy for it contains a concept of a sort of these "non-churches" belonging to "the Church". For actually these churches are distinct to us from the non-Christian world. Already in the Gospel narrative we trace this relativeness in connection with the idea of the Church. Our Lord, Who came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it, belonged Himself to the Jewish Church. He was a faithful Israelite carrying out its precepts, and this in spite of all its exclusiveness. And yet we get a solemn witness about the Church Universal in our Lord's conversation with the Samaritan woman by Jacob's Well. We are equally struck here both by the very fact of this conversation (which so astonished the disciples) taking place, and by the universal "good news" of Our Lord's message : "Believe me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father.... The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth : for such doth the Father seek to be His worshippers" (John iv. 21,23). And He then reveals to her, a Samaritan, that He is the Christ.

ALL the events in the life of Our Lord have not only a temporary but also an eternal significance, and this is also true of this conversation with the Samaritan woman. For even at the present time we find that we stand by Jacob's Well and also ask Jesus Christ as to where and how we must worship the Lord. And even now, we, who are the "Jews" know what we worship "for salvation is from the Jews" ("nulla salus extra ecclesiam"). And in our day also Our Lord reveals Himself to the Samaritan woman and calls on all to worship in spirit and in truth. The harsh, unbending, unrelenting institutionalism of the one saving Church conflicts here with a service in the Spirit, which "bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth" (John iii.8). There exists between the Church and the churches not only a relationship

of mutual exclusion, but also one of concordance. This unity is simultaneously something already given and something we must attain to. No single historical church can so confine its attention to itself alone as to ignore the Christian world beyond its own limits. Even heresies and schisms are manifestations taking place only within the life of the Church - for pagans and men of other faiths are not heretics and schismatics to us. One can picture differently the ways to Church Unity, but its very existence already assumes the fact of actual unity. The Church is one, as life in Christ by the Holy Spirit is one. Only participation in this unity can be of varying degrees and depths.

THEREFORE, quite naturally, there are two aspects in the relation of Orthodoxy to non-Orthodoxy : a repulsion in the struggle of truth with an incomplete truth, and a mutual attraction of Church love. History and a mournful realism apprehend more of the former aspect of this relationship, for the spirit of schism and division is not only a characteristic of "heretics" and "schismatics". The will for division is the evil genius which first split up the West and the East, and which ever since pursues its devastating work further and further.

BUT can the realisation of the truth of our Church be silenced even for a moment, or, conversely, can we ever fail to be aware of the untruth of those who think differently ? Might not such an attitude result in the sin of lack of faith, which seeks to avoid confessing its own truth, and perhaps suffering for it ? And so, in repulsion and attraction, unity and division, we see a peculiar dialectic of Church life, which comprises the thesis and the antithesis, we observe that the greater the exertion of the one, the acuter the other. The way of "oecumenical" Church life, which strives for Church unity, is simultaneously associated both with a fuller realisation of confessional differences and a growing consciousness of unity. But although there seems to be no escape from this antimony, the Spirit of God actually transcends it through a new kind of synthesis that is brought about, not by means of a new agreement or compromise, but by a new inspiration. The distinction between various confessions lies first of all in dogmatic divergencies, and then in the religious and practical discrepancies which result from them. These are on the surface and are apparent to all. But that which constitutes Church unity, that which is already given, and the striving towards unity, which actually exists as the basis of unity, this is hidden in the very depths. Meanwhile this task is both a duty of Church love and of practical utility. One must realise and express the positive spiritual basis of Christian "oecumenism", not only as an idea, but as an actuality already existing by grace. We experience it as a breathing of God's Spirit in grace, as a revelation of Pentecost, when people begin to understand one another in spite of the diversity of tongues.

LET us try to express quite concisely this positive basis of unity, which actually exists even now in the Christian world.

I. PRAYER

THE division which occurred in the Church, whatever its origin, was associated with a separation in prayer and remains as an unhealed wound in the Body of the Church. Such is the logic of our frail nature, which cannot contain the entire truth, but only parts of it. Dissociation in prayer, having once arisen, strives to become permanent, lasting and constant. We are now faced by the strange and provoking sight of Christians praying to God and their Saviour Our Lord Jesus Christ in separate communities. Moreover, this division is enforced in the rules of the Church, which arose, it is true, in the fourth and fifth centuries, but which retain even now the force of actual law. They have not been cancelled formally, although life itself cancels them. The general purpose of these rules in the first place was of course to banish "indifference" by applying protective measures, which were then in accord with the acute struggle with heresy. But measures of defence lose their significance when there is no attacking party - and we see this state of affairs in a whole range of interconfessional relationships in our own time. We are bound to recognize not only that which separates us, but also that which remains common to us all, notwithstanding all divisions. The ability to distinguish in life all that constitutes the common heritage of the whole Christian world is the great achievement (only possible through grace) of contemporary "oecumenism", viz., the movement striving for Church Unity. An encounter between Christians of different confessions, as Christians, is a great joy which is bestowed on us in our time by the Holy Spirit and a new revelation of the universal Pentecost. Nothing is easier than to criticise this "pan-Christianity" by pointing out that there can exist no "Christianity in general", but only the one true Church in its indestructible concreteness and wholeness. This is true, no doubt, in the sense that the fulness of worship in an ordained and divinely inspired cult can only exist in unanimity. But even so there still remains Christianity as such, as faith in Our Lord, love for Him, and worship directed to Him, and this Christianity endures not only in Orthodoxy, but as something common to all confessions. We are particularly clear about this and aware of it in missionary work where Christians are compelled, when confronted with pagans, to get a fuller and deeper consciousness of their own Christianity. The united prayer of Christians, belonging to different confessions, in churches and outside them, is becoming a more and more usual occurence at the present time. This new practice is not merely a liberty which is quite out of place where strict discipline is exercised, but a common Christian achievement, a capacity for uniting in that which is an actual reality. A time will dawn when the Orthodox Church will define certain rules for this practice and will give the required direction. Meanwhile all this is done in a groping manner, as circumstances demand. The united common prayer can be based

dogmatically on the fact that the Name of our Lord is hallowed and called on by all Christians. Christ is present in His Name to each one who prays thus, "for where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii.20), and in truth, all Christians who call on Christ's Name in prayer are already actually one with Christ. When we lift our eyes to heaven, earthly barriers cease to exist for us.

BUT is this actually so ? Do not these barriers remain even in our union in prayer ? Yes, in a certain sense they remain. For we cannot unite in everything with our brethren in prayer. For example, we cannot pray together to the Blessed Virgin and to the saints with Protestants. We can find differences in worship even with Roman Catholics, although these differences may not be so essential. But are we not compelled to be silent about these differences, and if so, is this not treason to Orthodoxy ? We must not close our eyes to the fact that such dangers, generally speaking, do exist. The position of Orthodoxy in its relation to the Protestant world is especially unfavourable in this case, precisely because Orthodoxy for the sake of communion in prayer is forced to adapt itself by, as it were, minimising itself, thereby losing some of its fulness. Of course, if this is done out of love for the sake of Church "economy" it is allowable, for it is then regarded as a sacrifice of love, in accordance with the Apostle Paul's principle of being "all things to all men". Our brethren, however, should realize that this is only a sacrifice of love and a condescension to their weakness, not a denial of our own faith.

HOWEVER, in our communion in worship with the non-Orthodox we must "know our measure", so that no distortions or poverty result in our own prayer life. But there is also a positive side to this communion in prayer. We are wont to pride ourselves on our liturgical wealth, as compared to the "severe and simple" rite of the Protestants. And yet we must not close our eyes to the fact that in actual practice we are far from realising to the full this wealth of ours, so that in some instances it lies upon us as a dead weight of custom. Protestantism, in spite of all its liturgical poverty, knows a living extempore prayer, in which the human soul in a child-like way turns directly to the Heavenly Father. This is the advantage of Protestantism, though it is associated with liturgical poverty.

2. THE WORD OF GOD

THE Holy Gospels are the common property of the entire Christian world. Through the Gospels Christ Himself directly speaks to the human soul. The soul listens to Him and adores him in worship. Generally in our attitude to the non-Orthodox we do not sufficiently appraise this power of the Gospels. The four

Gospels give us a marvellous image of our Saviour, drawn by the Spirit of God - a veritable ikon in words. When the Eternal Book is perused not only by the mind but also with the heart, when the soul "bows down over the Gospels" - then the Sacrament of the Word, born in that soul, is celebrated. This direct impact of the Word of God (efficacitas verbi) addressed to every single soul, people are inclined to minimize, stressing in an exaggerated way the significance of Holy Tradition for its correct understanding. In practice, the significance of Holy Tradition for a living response to the Word of God, should not be exaggerated. It has more bearing on theology and on certain disputed questions of a dogmatic nature. One might add here that the importance of tradition does not in any way exclude, but actually presupposes a direct response to the Word of God, which has its life in the Church - both in its 'soborny' consciousness (Tradition) and in personal interpretation. And what is especially important is the fact that nothing can replace our personal life with the Gospel (the same applies to the whole Bible). We should be ready to admit the fact that among Orthodox nations the personal reading of the Word of God is considerably less widespread than it is among Protestants, though to a certain extent this is partly replaced by its use in Divine worship. The Bible and the Gospels are common Christian property and the entire Christian world without distinction of confession bends in prayer over the Gospels. It may be urged that a true understanding of the Gospels is only given in the Church. This is, of course, the case in one sense, but yet sincere and devout readers of the Gospels through this alone are already within the Church, that is in the one and Evangelical Church.

3. THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

A Christian who lives in the Church, necessarily has also his personal life in Christ, which is simultaneously both personal and "of the Church". Dogma and dogmatic peculiarities cannot fail to be reflected in this personal experience. But in the absence of Christological differences, there is a very wide field of common Christian faith, even where dogmatic divergencies actually do exist. For can one say that "Christ is divided" for a contemporary Orthodox, Roman Catholic, or believing Protestant ? In their love to our Lord and their striving towards Him all Christians are one. This is why the language of mystics and their experience is common to all and comprehensible to all. We find that spiritual life, in which the Divine reality is tasted, united Christians to a far greater extent than does dogmatic perception. When we sense these tremulous contacts our souls respond to them independently of confessional relationships. It may be that this is the most important result of the inter-relation of various confessions, which though not reflected in formulae and resolutions represent a spiritual reality. During the Lausanne Conference this feeling of

a kind of common spiritual experience of unity in Christ was remarkably strong. It became clear to all that something had happened above and beyond anything written down in the reports and minutes. On the other hand, apart from this kind of experience as such, there cannot be any Christian unity for this can only be realised through Christian inspiration in a new vision of Pentecost, for which we aspire and which, in part, we already obtain. This unity in Christ, established by the similarity of Christian experience, is a kind of spiritual communion of all in the one Christ, established long before actual communion from the same chalice can take place. This de facto similarity in the experience of the Christian world, in spite of all its multiplicity, is insufficiently realised. Unfortunately we tend to stress our dogmatic disagreements much more than our common Christian heritage. A mystical inter-communion has always existed among Christians, and in our days more so than previously. Mutual fellowship between the representatives of theological thought, an interchange of ideas, scientific and theological research, a kind of life in common "over the Gospel" - all this tends to make the existing division between Christian confessions already to a certain extent unreal. Symbolic theology is also tending more and more to become "comparative" instead of being "denunciatory". This is even more evident when we come to mystical, pastoral, and ascetic works, and especially to the lives of saints. With what attention and devotion the Western world (for example Anglicanism) gazes at the images of Russian saints, or, conversely, with what interest we ourselves regard the images of the Western saints, such as St. Genevieve, St. Francis of Assisi, and others. And we ought to cultivate deliberately this spiritual interpenetration which is naturally increasing more and more. In this way we shall appropriate to ourselves the gifts which have been bestowed on others, and through comparison we shall come to know our own nature more fully and deeply.

THUS there exists even now a certain spiritual unity within the Christian world, although this is not expressed in any formulae. But we should add to this mystical, adogmatic, unity of the Christian world the reality of its dogmatic oneness. Owing to a certain onesidedness Christians of various confessions are acutely sensitive to their dogmatic difference, while they do not feel their mutual agreement in the same way. The definition "heretic", which is really only applicable to certain features of a world outlook, is extended to the entire man, who is completely anathematized for a particular heresy. This was so throughout the course of Christian history. But it would be absolutely inconsistent for us to adopt such language today. For it is time at last to admit and say openly that there exist no heretics in the general sense of the term, but only in a special and particular sense... Such an interpretation, among many others, can be given to the words of the Apostle Paul : "For there must be also heresies among you" (I Cor.xi.19). Of course, in itself, a special heresy

stands also for a common affliction, which is detrimental to the spiritual life without however destroying it. And it is perhaps difficult and impossible for us really to define the extent of this damage during the epoch when the particular dogmatic division arose. We must not also lose sight of the fact that in addition to heresies of the mind there exist heresies of life, consisting not only in sinfulness, but also in a deficiency of life, or onesidedness. One can, while remaining an Orthodox, actually tend towards Monophysitism in practice, either by leaning towards docetic spiritualism or Manicheism, or towards Nestorianism by separating the two natures in Christ, which leads in practice to the "secularisation" of culture. And perhaps in this sense it will be found that all are heretics in various ways. Yet it by no means follows from this that Orthodoxy and the Orthodox do not exist. It only shows that heresy, as such, impairs though it does not destroy life in Christ and in His Church. The notion of a heresy as of a division, only exists within the limits of the Church and not outside it, and it implies a defectiveness in Church life. It is therefore a mistake to interpret dogmatic anathematizing as a spiritual death-warrant or a complete severing from the Church. As a measure of discipline an anathema is a spiritual death-warrant for a particular Church community, for it represents a separation from the fellowship of the Church. But this disciplinary measure cannot and must not be extended to the whole life of the Church, for even the heretics remain in the Church, and it is not given to us to know to what degree they are condemned because of their heresy.

FROM this it follows that if heresy is only partial damage we must take into account in dealing with heresies, not only that which is heretical, but also that which is Orthodox in them. For example, through having an incorrect doctrine on the Filioque do Roman Catholics cease to believe in the Redemptive work of our Lord, or in the Sacraments of the Church ? And although this seems obvious, yet all Christians must realise not only their divisions, but also their agreement. Our Creed, the Nicene Creed (it is true, in its defective form owing to the Filioque), together with the ancient Apostolic and Anthanasian Creeds, constitute the general confession of Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism, and we must never lose sight of this basis of our dogmatic unity.

4. THE SACRAMENTS

AT the present time it is in the Sacraments that the Christian confessions are most effectively separated from one another. Sacramental fellowship is still only a remote aim, which still remains unaccomplished in the relationships between Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism. In the relation between

Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism on the one hand, and Protestantism on the other, the main barrier is the absence of valid orders and postolic succession. This barrier does not arise between the first two confessions. Now in the vast majority of Christian confessions Sacraments are recognised, in spite of all diversity of the theological teaching associated with them. What attitude ought we to adopt towards the efficacy of these Sacraments, and in what measure can this or that theological interpretation, associated with them, be considered as decisive ? Although the latter can effect the efficacy of sacraments (only, however, from the side of ex opere operantis, and not of ex opere operato), nevertheless, given the existence of a common faith, say in the Eucharist, the significance of doctrinal diversity in the realm of Eucharistic theology may be greatly exaggerated.

WE ought to insist first of all, as a general principle, on the efficacy of the sacraments in various Church communities. But can we adopt such a principle as our guiding line ? Or are sacraments, generally speaking, ineffective beyond the canonical limits of a Church organisation, to be regarded only as devout customs, or according to the blasphemous opinion of some as "sacraments of the demons"? The last opinion is the child of confessional fanaticism which can never be confirmed by theological arguments, and is on the contrary in direct contradiction to the true mind of the Church. One might also add that a mere recognition of the power of the sacraments outside Orthodoxy is insufficient, for such a reduction of the question merely to that of their subjective effectiveness (ex opere operantis) evades a direct answer to the question as to their objective value (ex opere operato). It undoubtedly holds that, in the absence of canonical Church fellowship, the sacraments celebrated outside the canonical limits of a given Church organisation canonically and practically, as it were, cease to exist. But does this canonical ineffectiveness (nonefficacitas) imply their mystical invalidity (nonvaliditas) ? Does it mean that on being separated canonically and in a certain measure dogmatically also, we find that we are separated from our mysterious unity and fellowship in Christ and in the gifts of the Holy Spirit ? Has Christ been really divided in us, or are the non-Orthodox thereby no longer "in Christ" being estranged from His Body ? One ought to think deeply before answering this question, which is perhaps the most essential for us in our relations with the non-Orthodox. It falls into two questions : viz., the significance of canonical divisions, and of dogmatic divisions, in relation to effectiveness of sacraments.

THE first question is answered by stating that canonical divisions ('raskol') only prevent the possibility of a direct and unmediated communion in the sacraments and do not destroy their efficacy. The invisible fellowship therefore of those who have been separated is not broken. This constitutes great joy and consolation when we are faced with the sad and sinful fact of canonical divisions in the Church. We ought to consider that although we are canonically divided from the Roman Catholic Church, we never ceased to remain with it in an invisible sacramental communion (ex opere operato, so to speak). Generally speaking if one wanted to be consistent in denying the efficacy of the sacraments on a canonical basis one could only do it by accepting the Roman Catholic teaching on the supremacy of the Pope and obedience to his jurisdiction as an essential condition of belonging to the Church. However, such a deduction is not made even by the Roman Church, which admits the effectiveness of sacraments in Orthodoxy. The Romanising tendency in Orthodoxy sometimes goes further than Rome in this direction, conditioning the effectiveness of the sacrament by canonical stipulations, though theologically, such a point of view cannot be supported. Conversely one could say that the divided parts of the Church, at least where Apostolic succession exists, are in an invisible, mysterious communion with one another through visible sacraments, although these are mutually inaccessible.

NOW let us consider to what extent a digression from dogmatic teaching can destroy the efficacy of the sacrament. We ought to mention here, first of all, the cases where the damage affects not separate sacraments, but their celebrants. We speak here of Protestantism, where, through the destruction of a rightly ordained preisthood through grace, the question of the actual efficacy of the sacrament is raised in spite of its full recognition in principle. Can one speak of "sacraments" in Protestantism ? Fortunately there are grounds for answering this question not only in the negative. The basis of the answer lies in the fact that the Church recognises the efficacy of Protestant baptism, which is evident from the fact that it does not re-baptise Protestants who join it. This admission is of extraordinary significance. It testifies to the fact that at least as regards the Sacrament of spiritual birth in the Church we abide in fellowship with Protestants as Christians and members of the one Body of Christ. Baptism also contains within itself the general possibility of a mysterious life in the Church- in this sense it is the potential of all further sacraments. In Protestantism they have a partical existence, both because of the diminution of the number of Sacraments and especially through the absence of priesthood. But even so does this allow us to draw any conclusion as to the complete inefficacy of sacramental life in Protestantism, in particular, for example, as regards Holy Communion ? Strictly speaking we have no right to come to such a conclusion, and not only because of the subjective basis pointed out by Bishop Theophanes, but also because of the objective principle of a sacrament according to which the sacrament belongs to the entire Church, although it is realised through the priesthood by virtue of its inevitable participation. There is no such priesthood in Protestantism, but the people of the Church, the

"royal priesthood", remains there also, and the potential power of Holy Baptism is fulfilled and revealed there in other ways, in certain devout rites and prayers instead of in effective sacraments. But if these are ineffective can we say that they are nothing ? One cannot say this, for the priesthood is not a magical apparatus for the celebration of the sacraments, but a ministration of the Church which exists in the Church and for the Church. Therefore we ought to interpret Theophanes' expression "according to their faith it shall be given them" in the sense that Our Lord does not deprive this flock of His grace, although it has been separated from the fulness of Church life. Nevertheless we can speak of communion in sacraments (apart from Baptism) in relation to Protestants only in the general and indefinite sense of their participation in the life of the Church through grace, but of nothing beyond this. A more direct and true communion in sacraments with the Protestant world is hindered by the absence of a rightly ordained priesthood : this is the threshold over which Protestantism must pass, the re-establishment of an Apostolically ordained hierarchy.

THESE barriers do not exist, however, for those sections of the divided Church which have retained this succession and have therefore a correctly ordained priesthood. Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism belong to this category, together with the ancient Eastern Churches (as well as the Episcopal Church in Protestantism and Anglicanism, in particular in the case of a positive solution of the question of Anglican ordination). The priesthood of Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy are mutually uncanonical owing to the existing schism, but this does not prevent their mutually recognizing each other. The following conclusion of the utmost importance follows from this : Churches which have preserved their priesthood, although they happen to be separated, are not actually divided in their sacramental life. Strictly speaking a reunion of the Church is not even necessary here, although generally this is hardly realized. The Churches which have preserved such a unity in sacraments are now divided canonically in the sense of jurisdiction, and, dogmatically, through a whole range of differences- but these are powerless to destroy the efficacy of the sacraments.

WHAT is required for a complete reunion, and where do we start ? The predominant formula runs : sacramental fellowship must be preceded by a preliminary dogmatic agreement. But is this apparent axiom so indisputable as it appears ? Here on one scale of the balance we have a difference in certain Christian dogmas and theological opinions, and an estrangement which has been formed through centuries on the other we have the unity of sacramental life. May it not be that a unity in the sacrament will be the only way towards overcoming this difference ? Why should we not seek to surmount a heresy in teaching through superseding a heresy of life such as division ? May it not be that Christians sin now by not heeding the common Eucharistic call ? And if this is so, then for Orthodoxy and Rome there still remains a way to their reunion on the basis of a fellowship in sacraments.

BUT of course the Holy Spirit alone can make it clear that reunion is not far away, but already exists as a fact which only needs to be realised. But it must be realized sincerely and honestly for the sole purpose of expressing our brotherhood in the Lord. And the way towards the reunion of East and West does not lie through tournaments between the theologicans of the East and of the West, but through a reunion before the Altar. The priesthood of the East and of the West must realise itself as one priesthood, celebrating the one Eucharist, and, if the minds of the priests could become aflame with this idea, all barriers would fall. For in response to this, dogmatic unity will be achieved, or rather a mutual understanding of one another in our distinctive features. "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas".

A realization of our unity as of something given and at the same time of our disunity as a fact which we cannot ignore, is present as a vital antithesis in the soul of the modern Christian. This antimony cannot leave him in peace. He cannot remain indifferent to it, for he must seek its resolution. The Oecumenical movement of today is the expression of this search.

First appeared in the Journal of the Fellowship, No. 22 December 1933

ON PRAYER TO THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE HOLY ORTHODOX CHURCH

A fundamental distinction exists between prayer to the Holy Spirit and that to the Father and to the Son. In praying to the Father we always turn to Him directly : "Our Father" - "Abba, Father!" In praying to the Son we also invoke Him directly: "O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God". While there exist vast numbers of Church prayers addressed to the Father and to the Son, only in very exceptional and specific instances do we turn with a direct prayer to the Holy Spirit. Such, for example, is the prayer "O King of Heaven" (an analysis of which will be given later). But at the same time we find that we pray to the Father and to the Son perhaps predominantly for the bestowal of the gift of the Holy Spirit.

WE therefore find that we do not as a rule pray to the Holy Spirit Himself, but rather about Him, and about His descent upon us. We should mention from among such prayers, as a particularly striking example, the liturgical prayer of the epiclesis in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostum. At first the priest prays in secret: "We beseech and implore Thee, and offer our supplications unto Thee, that Thou wilt send Thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts here spread forth". Then the following troparion of the Third Hour is recited thrice: "O Lord, Who at the third hour didst send down upon Thy apostles the Holy Spirit, take not the Same from us, O Merciful One, but renew us also who now pray to Thee." Further there follows a separate blessing of the bread and of the wine, and then a blessing is bestowed on them in common with the words, "Changing them by Thy Holy Spirit". In the litany which immediately follows after the consecration of the holy gifts we ask that Our God, Who loveth mankind, will accept them upon His holy and most heavenly and supersensual altar, for an odour of spiritual fragrance, and will send down on us in return His Divine Grace and the Gift of the Holy Spirit.

THIS absence of special prayers addressed directly to the Holy Spirit, notwithstanding the general liturgical richness of the Eastern Church and the abundance of prayers asking for the bestowal of the gift of the Holy Spirit, is still further emphasised by the following remarkable liturgical fact. The Orthodox Church, as contrasted with the Western Church , calls the second day of Pentecost (which is called the Feast of the Holy Trinity and is commemorated by the Western Church only on the following Sunday) the Feast of the Holy Spirit. This is in practice the one and only special day of the Third Hypostasis and it represents a sort of extension of Pentecost. But this Festival of the Holy Spirit is not designated by any special rite apart from the special Canon read at Vespers. Here we simply see a repetition of the service of Pentecost without any special prayers to the Holy Spirit. (See note I)

THERE is yet another remarkable feature in this service. At Vespers on the Day of Pentecost three long prayers are solemnly read while all kneel, but not a single one of them contains a direct invocation of the Holy Spirit, but only of God the Father and God the Son. This expressive secrecy of the Church clearly witnesses to the fact that in this age, in the Kingdom of Grace, the

the personal hypostatic face of the Holy Spirit has not as yet, been revealed to us, but will be disclosed in the Kingdom of Glory that is still to come. And when we pray to God, our very prayer itself is the activity of the Holy Spirit within us, for : "God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father" (Gal. iv.6).

IN the light of this absence of any direct devotional invocations of the Holy Ghost even greater significance is acquired in Orthodoxy by one prayer, which is in fact the only prayer directly addressed to Him, namely the "O King of Heaven". This is equally important both by reason of the extent to which it is used in the worship of the Church, and because of the value of its dogmatic content. As regards the first, this prayer, with the exception of the Lord's Prayer, is the most used, and is therefore the most important of all Orthodox prayers. It might also be added that the absence of other prayers to the Holy Spirit creates quite a special background for it, serving the more to emphasise its significance. (See note 2.) It is included at the beginning of the set morning and evening prayers, and in a wide range of the offices of the Church - the Hours, Vespers, special services, etc., It also forms a part of our Office of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. It appears to inspire through the Holy Spirit every kind of devotion and prayer. Still greater importance is attached to this prayer when it is secretly recited by the priest before the beginning of the Liturgy, when the Holy Spirit is invoked for the celebration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and blood. Actually, this invocation amounts to a sort of anterior epiclesis, although this latter, in its fully developed form, actually occupies a place after the recitation of the words of institution in the Liturgy of the Faithful.. Incidentally the peculiar importance of this prayer is indirectly confirmed, not only by its use, but similarly by its exclusion from the usual cycle of Church prayers at definite times, namely during Easter Week and the following weeks preceding Pentecost. At these periods the Church stops addressing this prayer to the Holy Spirit. In actual practice it is then replaced by the Easter troparion, "Christ is risen from the dead...." both at the beginning of the various offices and at the Liturgy. This substitution obviously implies some kind of equivalence between the Easter hymn and the prayer to the Holy Spirit. This seems to witness to the fact that during Easter Week and the days that follow it, that is after Christ's Resurrection, we have been actually transferred from the Kingdom of Grace to the Kingdom of Glory in which all is directly permeated by the Holy Spirit, so that no special invocation is any longer necessary for God is all in all. The absence of this prayer during the ten days between Ascension and Pentecost bears quite a different character. During these days it represents a privation, a sort of fast in prayer, required as a preparation for the coming down of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and so the singing of "O Heavenly King" at Pentecost (at matins and vespers) resounds with inexpressable solemnity and fervour. From this day on again this prayer occupies its usual place in the devotional life of the Church.

WE will now give first of all the full text of this prayer. It is this : "O King of Heaven, Thou Comforter, Spirit of Truth, Who are everywhere and fillest all things, Store of good gifts and giver of Live, come and abide in us, cleanse us from all evil and save our souls, O gracious Lord".

THE first part of this prayer, the invocation ("O King of Heaven, Thou Comforter, Spirit of Truth...") contains some dogmatic teaching about the Third Hypostasis as the True God ("the King of Heaven"). The Comforter in the capacity of His hypostatic Love between the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit through Whom is ultimately fulfilled and disclosed the spirituality of the Divine Tri-hypostatic Spirit, is the Spirit of Truth in relationship to the Second Hypostasis, Who is the Word and the Truth. But simultaneously with this all these definitions which apply in the first instance to the Holy Trinity in itself, are also applied to the world, for to the world also the Holy Spirit is God, the Heavenly King, the Comforter, and the Spirit of Truth sent by the Father through the Son.

THE second part of the prayer, "Who art everywhere and fillest all things, Store of all good gifts and Giver of Life..." witnesses more precisely to the activity of the Holy Spirit in the world. Firstly, to His omnipresence: God is omnipresent, but each one of the Divine Hypostases possesses a special image of this super-special presence. The Father is the primary will power in the creation of the world; the Son is its ideal basis or foundation ("without Him was not anything made"); the Holy Spirit is the active, all penetrating and "all-fulfilling" power. He is also the "Giver of Life"- and yet the Triune God is Himself Life Eternal, the Creator and Giver of Life. While the Third Hypostasis, as the fulfilling One, is the Life of the Life within the Holy Trinity, similarly He is also the special power of life within every creature. "Through the Holy Spirit is every soul quickened" says a hymn of the Church. All reality with its life belongs to the Holy Spirit, for He is the effective power. While life as such is the greatest blessing. It is "the store of all good gifts", which includes not only the natural gift of life, but also the gifts of Grace bestowed on us by the Holy Spirit and which represent the power of life.

THIS part of the prayer describes, one might say, the objective activity of the Holy Spirit in the world, and His presence in it, while the concluding section deals with the subjective - namely with the human response to Him and His acceptance, and with personal salvation ("come and abide in us, and cleanse us from all evil, and save our souls...."). If the Christian life consists "in acquiring the Holy Spirit" according to the words of St. Seraphim, and if at the same time Grace never forces any one, then human striving and effort are also required for the acceptance of this grace and primarily this must find expression in prayer. "Come, and abide in us," implies prayer for an active response to the Holy Spirit, and an invocation of him for inspiration fulfilled in human creativity. The fire of the Holy Spirit burns up our sinful nature and purifies us from all sin. Therefore the petition for the abiding of the Holy Spirit within us inherently includes another petition - "Cleanse us from all evil" - for the purification from sin. Therefore such an abiding in the Holy Spirit is salvation. This petition is the last one in the prayer. It is inclusive and is in effect a sort of summing up of the whole.

ACCORDINGLY this prayer to the Holy Spirit has both a dogmatic and a religious and practical content. It is generally used at the begiming of any good work such as, lessons, lectures, public meetings, etc. Let us,

however, repeat once again that only in this one exceptional prayer do we invoke the Holy Spirit directly, while generally we pray to the Father and to the Son, asking them to bestow the Holy Spirit on us. The very presence of such prayer to the Father and the Son within us is itself a manifestation of the Holy Spirit, Who fulfills in us His divine inspiration, and at the same time takes our human inspiration and lifts it to the "divine-human" level.

Notes.

1. The Service of Pentecost itself does not contain any special prayers or hymns invoking the Holy Spirit directly, but only hymns addressed to the Holy Trinity, which however do contain, among other things, an invocation of the Holy Spirit. Here is an example :

> "Come, O ye people, let us worship the Godhead in three Persons, the Son in the Father with the Holy Spirit. For the Father, begat the Son, before time was, and He is co-eternal and is equally enthroned: and the Holy Spirit was in the Father, and was glorified together with the Son, one Might, one Essence, one Godhead. Adoring the same let us say : O Holy God, Who by the Son didst make all things through the co-operation of the Holy Spirit: -O Holy Mighty One, through Whom we have known the Father, and through Whom the Holy Spirit came into the world: O Holy Immortal One, the Spirit of Comfort, Who proceedest from the Father, and resteth in the Son: O Holy Trinity, glory to Thee."

2. In this sense it may be said that there exists a great difference between the use made of this Orthodox prayer : "O King of Heaven" and the corresponding Catholic Hymn : "Veni Creator Spiritus", its analogue. The Catholic hymn has a definitely limited use in the Church, being used at the Festival of Pentecost, at Confirmation, and the Ordination of priests and bishops - (this last applies also to the Anglican rite of ordination). But in the everyday prayer life this hymn is not used.

First appeared in The Journal of the Fellowship, No. 23, March, 1934.

THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL

The conception of the Universal Church is equivalent to that of the Catholic Church, understood in its basic significance as the wholeness of life - to kath' holon of ancient philosophy. In this sense it primarily determines not a quantitiave universality, but a special quality of life, its mystical depth. The Church is the Body of Christ, which is quickened by the Holy Spirit, and inclusion in the Universal Church implies, above all else, a life in Christ ("it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me," Gal.ii.20) which is fulfilled by the Holy Spirit ("the Spirit of God dwells in us", Rom.viii,9). This nature of the universal Church expresses its eternal essence in God, for eternal existence in heaven is characteristic of the Church. It is by force of this that it exists on earth within time. "The world has been created," according to the expression of an ancient writer (Hermas) "for the sake of the Church".

EVERYONE who dwells in the Church is in communion with this life eternal, of which Our Lord speaks in His High-Priestly prayer: "And this is life eternal that they might know Thee the only true God and Jesus Christ Whom Thou has sent" (John xvii.3). This life eternal may be experienced by a hermit in a desert in the same measure as it is accessible to a member of a vast Church community, as an inner content of the Church experience. It represents the statistics of Church life, for which neither time nor development exist. It remains in its indisputability for all time in the existence of the Church, it is given as its very basis. This foundation is the proclamation of the Word, Who accepted human nature and made it His body, and the descent of the Holy Spirit into the world, which has made us His Temple. This descent of the Second and Third Hypostases into the world implies a union of the Creator with the creature, a deification of human nature, heaven itself descended to earth. This inclusion of the human race in the life of the God-man Himself through the Incarnation, effected by the Holy Spirit in the power of Pentecost, constitutes the Church, as life eternal revealed in time - an accomplishment of divine-humanity. This fulfilment is a mystery and similarly a sacrament of the Church, which lies at the basis of its sacramental life, and is the very principle of all sacramentalism. As such it is characterised by the uninterruptibility and oneness of this life, in which the human and created nature acquires divine holiness.

FOR this reason the Universal Church is not only one and holy but also Apostolic, remaining unchangeable and self-sufficient in its hidden life, starting from its origin in the times of the Apostles. The apostolicity of the Church which characterises it signifies primarily that all the gifts which were received from Our Lord by the Apostles, and from the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, remain with it through every

epoch of its life. The so-called Apostolic Succession consists in this (although the usual sense ascribed to it is that of the succession of the hierarchy through the laying on of hands). Apostolic Succession, which is therefore nothing else but a holy tradition of the Church, embraces in itself all the fulness of a life in Truth - i.e., the true teaching contained in the Word of God and in Holy Tradition, together with the fulness of the sacramental gifts of grace. The last is transferred through the uninterruptibility of the Apostolic hierarchy. It would be a mistake, however, to confine the significance of Apostolic Succession to the existence of a succession of the hierarchy alone, basing it only on a correct laying on of hands. From the beginning the Church exists not merely as an organisation but also as an organism, which possesses various organs, but lives one common life (in"sobornost"). And even the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost affected not only the twelve Apostles, but also those "others" who were gathered in the Upper Room (as we see when we compare with Acts. i.4,16- ii.1). That is, it affected the Church in all its fulness of hierarchial degrees - of bishops, priests and laity (for the laity also constitute a special sacred order in the Church which does not embrace any within its fold who are not ordained). Apostolic Succession was not personal, for not a single one of the Apostles (in spite of the Vatican interpretation as regards the Apostle Peter) passed on his apostolicity, in so far as it expressed a personal gift and ministry, to his successors. This was not even necessary as all the epochs in the life of the Apostolic Church are of equal Apostolic value. It stands for a unity and continuity in the life of the Church in all that is eternal and full of grace in it. - the principle which can be shortly described as sacramentalism.

THE sacraments are given to the whole Church, to the Universal Church, but they are realized only for every separate personality. They are complete and absolute, cannot be diminished or augmented, cannot become more or less, in the true Universal Church. Certainly the efficacy or validity of Sacraments may be impaired by heresy or schism and enfeebled or even destroyed through an interruption of Apostolic succession in the laying on of hands, but the Church Universal exists through the universality of its sacraments even in divided Christianity. In this sense it can be admitted that the Universal Church exists for us not only in our own Church, but even outside it, in the whole of Christianity. The sacramental life which is bestowed on the entire Church Universal, but exists only for the individual contains a kind of antinomy. The sacraments are a call to universality (according to the literal sense of the Greek word liturgy (leitourgia - common work). Although actually every one separately enters into communion with Our Lord in the Sacrament of Holy Communion, he does, however, approach the Cup in unity with the entire Church and cannot remain indifferent to him who approaches by his side, his friends, neighbours, brothers - and even wider than this - to the whole of Christian mankind. This apparent contradiction testifies to the fact that the life of the Church includes within itself not eternity alone, but also time, not only the static element, but also the dynamic one, not only the mystical givenness, but also development.

THIS view of the Church corresponds with the basic Christological dogma (of the IVth Oecumenical Council at Chalcedon), which has a direct bearing on the dogma of the Church - viz. that In Christ two natures are perfectly united: the divine, which is characterized by eternity, and the human, which lives and develops within time,; including history in its existence.

BUT if this is so we are bound to admit that the life of the Church which is mystically of equal value from beginning to end, is, at any given moment incomplete, is subject to development, fruition, fulfilment. In other words the gifts of Pentecost, which were outpoured on the Church in the descent of the Holy Spirit, have not as yet been accepted by it in all their fulness. The Church itself in the divine side of its existence is Pentecost in the sense that the Holy Spirit, which descended from on high, abides in it. But on its human side it has not as yet been fulfilled, so that it is still an extended Pentecost, in so much as it is not ready yet for the acceptance of all the gifts so as to abide in power, and in so far as that which shall be said at the end of time : "the marriage of the Lamb is to come, and His wife hath made herself ready" (Rev. xix.7) has yet to be spoken. The Church in history can attain to its fulness and fulfilment only along the path of great tribulation, the tragedy of world history, in a struggle of the Kingdom of God with that of the beast and of the false prophet, as it is described in the Book of Revelation. We may insist on the basis of condusive evidence that historically Pentecost has not taken place because the history of the Church has not been fulfilled. Primarily, moreover, it is directed to the Church Universal, and not to some definite race, as has been symbolically shown in the miracle of Pentecost when the Babylonian confusion of tongues was overcome. Our Lord sent His Apostles to preach to all nations (Math. xxviii.19) and to every creature (Mk. xvi.15).

BUT even until now the vast majority of mankind lives unilluminated by the light of the Gospel, and this call and this gift of Pentecost remains unaccepted. Moreover what is incomparably worse than this is the fact that the Christian world itself is divided into parts which compete with one another, and in face of this deplorable spirit the sorrowful question of the Apostle Paul is again raised - "Is Christ divided?" (ICor.i 13). We are forced to seek for the one Church of Christ beyond or deeper than the visible divisions, while the divided Church stands powerless before the onslaught of the godless world and of satanic forces. Meanwhile, the gift of unity, of special communion of grace in the Holy Spirit, koinonia, (II Cor.xiii.14) was a gift obvious to all, characteristic of the early Christian community with its true "communism" of life in grace, in Christ, a satanic caricature of which we now behold in godless communism. This radiant union in Christ resounds with particularly heavenly music in the Acts of the Apostles. "All with one accord in one place" (ii.1), "they continued steadfastly in the apostles doctrine and fellowship"(ii.42), "and all that believed were together and had all things common and sold their possessions and parted them to all men as every man had need" (ii.45).

SUCH is the image of the Universal Church directly after Pentecost - it is both an example and a prophecy. The fiery tongues of Pentecost were divided and came to rest on each one of those present separately conveying to him his special gift, for gifts vary although the Spirit remains the same (I. Cor. xii.4). But there also exists a multi-unity, the sum of all these gifts, which is acquired in its integrity or in its parts only by the Universal Church in its unity and fulness, but of course only in the measure to which these gifts have been realised. Pentecost was accomplished once in all its exhaustive fulness, for the Holy Spirit descended from heaven to earth, but Pentecost goes on within time in its human aspect. And even in the sacrament of Chrism (Confirmation), which, as it were, represents a personal Pentecost in the individual the tongues of fire divide even now and even unto eternity. For the power of the Holy Spirit is outpoured in the Church both in its multi-unity and in its increase (Eph.iv.16), and we must therefore say that Pentecost which even now goes on has not up till now been completely fulfilled for the Church.

IT is generally thought that the need for prophecy and the gift of prophecy was an attribute of the Old Testament Church alone, for the content of prophecy was and should be the coming Incarnation. But the New Testament Church similarly needs prophecy and therefore recognizes it not only in particular gifts of prophecy as one of the gifts of the Spirit (I Cor. xii, 10) and not only in the New Testament book of prophecy of the Apocalypse of St. John, but in all its looking towards the future, which will be proclaimed by the Holy Spirit (John xvi. 13). This is the revelation about the effectiveness of the Holy Spirit in the Church of Christ and in the Church universal. It is significant that the Apostle Peter in his speech after the descent of the Holy Spirit applies Joel's prophecy also to Pentecost. This prophecy in brief contains the apocalypse both of history and of "eschatology." In its fulness this prophecy exceeds that which took place on the very day of Pentecost, when the beginning and the foundation for such fulfilment was laid, and witnesses to the future (Acts. ii. 17-21). In particular, however, we see that a gift of unanimous prophesying in Christ's Church is especially emphasised here: "I will pour out My Spirit in these days, and they shall prophesy". Prophecy is here introduced into the heart of the Church's life and only from this does the Apostle Paul's request: "Quench not the Spirit, despise not prophesying" (Thess. v.20) derive its full power. All that is worth while and all that is responsible is always difficult and dangerous, and the call to prophecy was frequently abused and even compromised even from the earliest Christian times (beginning with Montanism). This, however, must not prevent us from hearing this call. We must not stifle it for it is included in Pentecost.

THE human side of the Church, as has been said, has its history, its development, and fulfilment. "The Church militant" is simultaneously the Kingdom of God, in so far as it is "with us" as our hidden life in Christ. At the same time it is not the Kingdom of God as yet, for it has not yet come. Christ is coming to reign,

but has not been enthroned yet in this world (I Cor. xv. 25, 28). His enthronement must take place in history.

CHRISTIAN history, as its content is disclosed in the Book of Revelation, represents the tragedy of a struggle of the Church with the Beast and with false prophets, in which prior to the dawning of the eschatological end the Church will attain victory (so far as it can be attained in the world), so that Christ's millenium with His saints will be brought about. But the end does not come in an arbitrary way as a deus ex machina, but in the fulfilment of times and measures. History is a domain of human creativity, while creativity cannot exist without prophecy, viz. a consciousness of creative aims, a striving towards the future, which is in a sense a synonym of creativity so that an extinction of the creative spirit implies the destruction of creativity.

HOW does this creative awareness arise in man ? It comes by feeling the reality in all that exists, its instability, and its incessant urge in the very depth of life. Prophecy is an answer given by the grace of the Holy Spirit to the question of life, it is a word of the Present about the Future, which the Present actually pre-contains, and consequently it is a call, a daring, a creative thought. Every historical epoch has its own peculiar tasks and its particular prophecy. Our epoch also has them - it is impossible for it not to have them, and it dare not be without them. One can even say that we are overburdened by their weight. Let us remind ourselves of these aims, for they are near to us and can be understood without many words.

THE first cause of our suffering is the division of the Christian world; it calls us to prophesy the Union of all. The preaching of the Gospel to all nations is associated with this. The second cause of our pain is "world godlessness", the principle which tramples upon all that is holy, not only in Soviet Russia but in all the world. It calls to prophesying about a new power in Christianity to preach the Gospel, which will overcome the "support of all evil that is against God". The third cause of our suffering is godlessness of life, so-called secularisation. It calls us to seek the Kingdom of God in our prophecy, to bring it about in the life of this world. We are confronted by the social problem, by the problem of war and peace, the inter-relationship between the state and the individual, the problems of philosophy and science - by all the vast elemental forces in the life of the world, which must be delivered from the power of the Beast and of the false prophet and subjected to Christ. And following on this, new, ultimate, and creative aims will arise on the horizon of history.

BUT all this should be creatively and prophetically experienced and the fullness of this experience is contained in the Universal Church

in its dynamic and history.

MANY of us feel the fulness of the Church in its static sense, we consider that the only duty a Christian has is to preserve this fulness. This pious conservatism turns with suspicion to everything that is new. But according to the Gospel one can only conserve by creative expansion- Church statics are dynamic when immersed in history. The face of eternity is seen in time in which the eternal life of the Church is accomplished. The Church Universal combines within itself both this fulness of eternity, and the integrity of time - the present which preserves the past and conceives the future, and the future itself which is the disclosing of the past and a fulfilment of the present. The Holy Spirit Himself grants to His Church this future and illuminates its paths.

First appeared in the Journal of the Fellowship, No. 25 September 1934.

WAYS TO CHURCH REUNION

(This sketch develops certain ideas, already expressed in an article "By Jacob's Well" (John iv.23), Journal, No. 22 Dec. 1933).

AS long as divided Christianity is merely concerned with a preliminary discussion of the whole problem of Reunion, the real practical difficulties which obstruct the way are not perceived. But whenever a practical approach is made to this problem difficulties emerge which are insuperable. They will remain insurmountable as long as the main postulates of the whole problem are not radically reconsidered in an attempt to liberate them from a mistaken hierarchical and dogmatic maximalism, which so frequently dominates this whole realm. These obstacles to Reunion emerge, firstly, in the sphere of theological doctrine, in so far as this tends to regard itself as compulsory dogma- and, secondly, as a result of hierarchical centralism, which identifies the body of the Church with the central organ of the hierarchy. Such an approach to the problem is, in its very essence, Roman. It cannot be justified outside the limits of the Roman Catholic Church and, in our opinion, even in that communion it can be considerably moderated. Such an approach to the problem is illustrated by the Forentine Unia (1430). The more important hierarchs of the East and of the West with the Pope and the Patriarch investigated all the dogmatic differences which then existed, and after achieving (apparent) agreement, recognized the highest hierarchical organ in the person of the Pope. The agreement was then sealed by Communion from the same Cup. The Union was proclaimed by a corresponding edict (a Papal Bull and an Order of the Emperor) to the whole Christian people, who in the East, however, simply refused to accept it. From the Roman Catholic point of view the procedure was more or less congruous, for every Reunion in the Roman Church can only be interpreted dogmatically as an absorption through submission to Papal authority. From the Orthodox and generally speaking the non-Roman Catholic point of view, however, such a conception does not correspond to a true understanding of the Church, where the hierarchy does not command, but merely gives expression to the 'soborny' consciousness of the Church.

NEVERTHELESS, even up to the present day, the whole course of Church Reunion (in particular the relations between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches) still follows this same path. Here also it is taken for granted that Reunion may be accomplished by an agreement achieved merely between the higher organs of the hierarchy, without any active participation of the people of the Church. Such an approach is no less utopian than it was in the fifteenth century.

ON the other hand it is not only a complete agreement in dogma which is sought, but agreement also in dogmatic doctrine. This, as a

matter of fact, does not even exist within the limits of the same Church. Whenever theological thought develops with intensity different theological movements are bound to emerge. This happened at the height of the Patristic age (e.g. in Alexandria and Antioch). In practice even within the fold of the Roman Church there is no dogmatic unanimity, althouth this may be disguised by an iron discipline and the enforced silence of the dissentients. This fact is unexpectedly observed here and there. In our search for dogmatic unity, therefore, it is necessary to fix a dogmatic minimum, which comprises an essential condition for Church Reunion. This should not only be done according to external factors (viz. the dogmas of the ancient undivided Church), but also according to their inner significance for Church Reunion. But then the question arises, how can we separate this living minimum for the maximum, which can only be attained to in some distant future, and is this the last and not the first step along the path of Reunion ? All dogma is characterised by the fact that it is not only a norm of teaching, but a basis of life, not only theoretical doctrine, but a quality of religious life. It is from this living power of the dogma that we should proceed in our definition of the required dogmatic minimum at the beginning of Reunion. The life of Grace which flows in the Church in its Sacraments, pre-eminently in Baptism and the Divine Eucharist, represents the universal and basic fact that fulfills and sums up the dogmatic teaching of the Church. The division of the Churches not only gives rise to the spirit of heresy (airesis) - which stands for discord and one-sidedness of teaching, but similarly to a heresy of life, which results in the fact that the Christian world in a light-hearted and painless way reconciles itself to a separation before the Holy Chalice. Somehow or other it has become a self-evident fact (which one should note here has never been proved by anyone) that dogmatic agreement is the prius , and the eucharistic, the posterius, a sort of result of the first. The call to unity which springs from the Eucharistic Chalice itself, remains unheeded. In spite of this, actually, the divided Churches are united by the oneness of the Chalice, which cannot become a reality to them. This constitutes the paradox of Church divisions. The efficacy of the Sacraments is mutually recognised by the divided Churches, at least by Orthodoxy and Rome (for the moment I put aside the question of Anglicanism). The Sacrament of the Eucharist is also regarded as effective : it is valid, but not effective beyond the limits of one's own Church for the members of the divided Churches. Of course if we absolutely deny the validity of the sacraments outside a particular confession (as is the case still with certain Orthodox theologians who are of this opinion, viz, the Metropolitan Anthony and others) then the very question of any union in the Sacraments falls to the ground. But if we recognize the validity of the Sacrament, which is in fact, the case both with the Roman and the Orthodox Churches, then the question arises, may not this efficacy of the Sacrament become real in actual Intercommunion; and, if so, what can this Intercomunion represent both dogmatically and canonically ? Here, of course, it is no longer a question of complete unanimity on all the dogmatic points, in all their local and historical peculiarities, but precisely in the dogmas without

the recognition of which the Sacrament of the Eucharist cannot be contemplated.

IT is not difficult to make clear the primary assumptions on which the Sacrament of the Eucharist is based. Firstly we must recognize the real (and not the symbolically-significatory or the subjectively-reminiscent) character of the Sacrament. In it we have the praesentia realis, the true Body and Blood of Christ through the changing of the bread and wine. One may add here that the actual theory of the change - "transubstantiation" or any other - does not constitute a dogmatic postulate for the efficacy of the Sacrament. This is obvious from the fact that the early Church throughout the first 1,000 years of its existence had no Eucharistic doctrine at all. But belief in the actual change, or the praesentia realis - without which the Sacrament loses all meaning and power - already takes for granted faith in Christ as the Son of God and the God-man. In other words, it comprises all the Christology of the Church, and further, as a necessary link, also the doctrine of the Trinity. (It is completely incompatible of course with any liberalism or unitarianism which deny both).

BUT such a condition de facto implies the acceptance of all the Seven Oecumenical Councils in their fundamental Christological definitions, outside which there can be no question of a true Christian faith. (Of course the same is not true of some of their special definitions, which have no dogmatic significance, but only canonical value. The Seventh Oecumenical Council we can also view as a Christological one, because of its insistence on the divine-human nature in Christ.) The demand for an acceptance of the deliberations of the Seven Oecumenical Councils is usually founded on the fact that their definitions stand for a common confession of the one faith of the ancient Church. The Eucharistic foundation in our opinion is more essential than this chronological basis, because apart from the Christology of the Church, there can be no true Eucharist.

ANOTHER dogmatic-canonical postulate of the truth of the Eucharist is the efficacy of the celebrators as of the hierarchy of the 'apostolic succession' - in other words the existence of the Sacrament of Holy Orders. The apostolic succession of the Church is a tradition of the Church which has been voluntarily broken by Protestantism. As a result of this Eucharistic life within Protestantism has been destined to diminution and to a certain weakening, if not to direct ineffectiveness. The Eastern and the Western Churches were never divided in their recognition of the necessity of the hierarchy, and even now the hierarchy of the divided Church is mutually recognized. The Anglican hierarchy occupies here a special place for its destinies were involved in the general turmoil of the Reformation, as a result of which its

validity came to be questioned. However, the Anglican hierarchy, which is not recognized by Rome, finds growing recognition by the Eastern Churches - at least in so far as its hierarchy is concerned, and consequently the Eucharist which it celebrates.

THE laying on of hands by the bishop is absolutely essential for the validity of the Eucharist, and consequently the Eucharist celebrated by pastors, who have not received an episcopal laying on of hands, is not a true Church Eucharist (even if we do not deny its possessing a certain kind of Eucharistic significance, a more precise definition of which is outside our immediate scope). Therefor if Protestantism really wants to enter into the bosom of the United Church, it must overcome the results of the Reformation at this point, and re-establish within itself the sacramental priesthood of "apostolic succession". It must do this in the name of tradition namely also of Church love, so as not to separate itself in such an essential fact from the whole of the Christian world. (I am not speaking of sects here which are born of a spirit of sectarian particularism, for historical Protestantism does not desire to be a sect, but it becomes a sect in so far as it persists in rejecting the episcopal laying on of hands).

AS things stand, three branches of historical Christianity fit into the scheme we have outlined - Orthodoxy, Roman-Catholicism, and Anglicanism (assuming that we recognize the validity of Anglican orders), and have a dogmatic and sacramental possibility of uniting before the Holy Chalice. Let us, however, consider the dogmatic and canonical difficulties which stand in the way.

THERE is no doubt that in the course of ages quite a number of dogmatic differences have emerged between the Western and the Eastern Church, although all these are not of equal significance. There are the questions of Filioque, of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, of Purgatory, of the Pope, and all the other dogmatic definitions of a doctrinal nature which have come to be accepted by the Catholic West (and following in its steps, to some extent, by Orthodoxy), in its struggle with the Reformation. In this Roman Catholicism is distinguished by the greatest dogmatic maximum in so far as it attempts to transform every thesis of theological doctrine into dogma (an example of which may be seen in the Council of Trent). In such a method all doctrinal postulates acquire equal significance. One should learn to abandon such dogmatic prejudice when striving towards Reunion, if one ceases to interpret it, of course, as absorption of individual Christians either by the Orthodox or the Roman Catholic Church. In the general context of dogmatic differences which exist between the Churches, we must learn to discern the essentially important dogmatic teaching which finds its expression in Eucharistic dogma, and contrast

it with other dogmatic assumptions which should be set aside as calling for further consideration and elaboration as theologumena. And we must also have faith that a union in Eucharstic love before the Holy Chalice will give us greater power to overcome them, than tournaments between theolgians which will never result in complete union, for the "human", the all too human, always dominates them.

IT is also unfortunate for the Church that from the most ancient times it has acquired the method of stating dogma in the form of anathemas against those who think differently, whilst a hasty anathema always represents an unnecessary further obstacle to discussion. The idea of a dogmatic agreement in necessariis for the purpose of Eucharistic union, which precedes complete dogmatic agreement instead of succeeding it, does not by any means imply dogmatic indifference. But in the question of dogmatics a certain hierarchy of order should be maintained, by virtue of which things should be put in their proper places. One cannot, for instance, assign to the doctrine of transubstantiation the same compulsory significance as to the Christological and Trinitarian dogma. (The same remark would be true of the majority of the definitions of Trent, which so obviously bear the imprint of Medieval Western Scholasticism.) We have a whole series of dogmatic definitions which really possess only the significance of theological doctrine. They are valuable in their intention, but certainly not in the form of their expression. In relation to these, for the time being, the principle of in dubiis libertas should be applied.

BUT we may find that some may argue that the drawing of such distinction between dogmas, their classification as Eucharistic and non-Eucharistic, the more important and the less important, would serve to undermine the infallibility and self-sufficiency of the Church (infallibilitas or indefectibilitas), in which all is equally important and valuable, by introducing an intolerable relativity. Such an objection is based on an abstract Roman interpretation of infallibilitas in the sense that the Church is complete or self-sufficient. In this sense with a divinely inspired infallibility it meets the needs of its dogmatic consciousness in every epoch. Thus Early Christianity, notwithstanding all its dogmatic simplicity and the fact that dogma had not been expressed, was no less indefectibilis than the later dogmatic epochs, each of which has its own particular style. This style is comprised not only of the postulates which are of abiding value (such as Christology) even when they are expressed in the dogmatic language of a particular epoch, but also of those propositions which minister par excellence to the specific requirements of that age. Revelation, generally speaking, is concrete and historical, but it certainly does not represent a mechanical dictation of infallible truths, nor a sort of automatic script. Therefore it is absurd to accept an abstract equipollence of all the parts of dogmatic teaching in accordance with a formal stamp of "infallibility", because the former is conveyes to us "at sundry times, and in divers manners" (Heb, i.i.).

In Roman-Catholicism the main barrier to the establishment of such a preliminary dogmatic minimum - the Eucharistic dogma in the extended sense - is represented by the Vatican dogma of Papal infallibility. This dogma in itself constitutes a sort of dogmatic microcosm of Roman Catholicism, a criterion for all Roman dogmatics, which attributes its own peculiar significance to any dogmatic definition. In practice this dogma constitutes the main barrier to Reunion, for it turns Reunion into a simple absorption by the Roman Church. Its rejection makes reunion with Rome impossible, while its unreserved and unconditional acceptance is impossible for the non-Roman Catholic. Therefore the destinies of Reunion with Rome depend on how far the Roman Church would wish it and would find it possible to consider its Vatican dogma among those which should be subjected to a soborny investigation as regards its relationship to the whole of the Universal Church, even on the condition of its preservation within the limits of the local Western Roman Church. In relationships between Orthodox and the Anglicans, of course, this Vatican barrier is non-existent.

THERE still remains one other point, namely, that of the canonical nature of any Reunion achieved through Eucharistic fellowship. There is a firm conviction that Reunion can only be the act of higher ecclesiastical authority. Possibly this may be true as regards complete reunion of entire Church bodies, a reunion which is as yet outside historical reality. Even so, such a Reunion from above, a so-called diplomatic Reunion, would have to acquire sanction from the body of Church people, which may even refuse to accept it. Generally speaking, the above point of view can only be applied logically to the Roman-Catholic Church, in which one can say that the voice of the Pope is the voice of the Church; but otherwise such a theory is quite out of place both for the Orthodox and the Anglican hierarchy. Within the same Church we find different sections and people, who even differ from one another dogmatically (as in the Anglican "comprehensiveness"). Even to a greater extent is this true of theological thought and cultural level. To expect, therefore, complete uniformity before Reunion is possible would be completely fruitless and unnecessary. Why cannot separate parts or groups belonging to the different Church bodies - Orthodox Roman Catholic, Anglican - unite in Intercommunion, if this actually expresses their true dogmatic and Church relationship ?

ONE more objection might be raised here which has become stereotyped in the course of centuries and has turned into a real dogmatic superstition - viz., that Eucharistic fellowship with the non-Orthodox impairs the priesthood and Sacraments of the entire Church, if any members of that Church enter into such communion. This would be even more true in a case of communion say with the Anglo-Catholics, for through them the Orthodox would enter into Intercommunion with the Evangelicals and the Modernists, in so far as all the members of the Anglican Church are in communion with one another. Therefore, it is

argued, such intercommunion would be impossible for the Orthodox. We feel that such prejudice is exaggerated if not absolutely incorrect. Actually the entire Christian world in a certain sense is in communion in so far as this concerns the Sacrament of baptism, which is recognised by all. Nevertheless, through this its priesthood is not impaired. One must interpret the power of preisthood in a much deeper and bolder way, so as not to be able to fear its being impaired through Eucharistic intercommunion with those of the non-Orthodox who can truly participate in it sacramentally. Therefore group or partial intercommunion does not threaten the integrity of priesthood in the participants, as it never impaired the priesthood of the Orthodox, who remained in intercommunion with Roman Catholics for a long time after the schism of 1054. But this type of communion can only be canonically justified through the consent and blessing of the appropriate ruling bishop, for the fulness of the Sacraments is concentrated in the bishop, and no priest can celebrate the Sacraments who has severed the link with his bishop. Actually the Church is a union of bishoprics, but every "cell", that is diocese, lives also with its own special life, though in contact with the others. Consequently, it is all a question of fact. Will a diocese be found in which the corresponding groups of persons could enter into Eucharistic Communion, within the realm of Orthodoxy and Anglicanism, and also of Roman Catholicism ? It is a question of the limits of Church centralism. Do the bishops form independent centres, though ones which are co-ordinated with one another ? Or, is there only one centre, the episcopus episcoporum, the Pope, who may be one person, or a collective ? (The last two alternatives are the same for our particular problem). A partial, or local union of different Church bodies in the Eucharist, their organic merging, might serve as a mystical and religious foundation for the Reunion of the Churches, which is vainly expected along the paths of canonical and dogmatic Church diplomacy alone. Meanwhile it is important to make a beginning with Church Reunion in those points where it is possible, and so ultimately to carry the problem forward beyond the existing deadlock which our sinful fear and indifference has produced.

First appeared in "Sobornost" No. 2 (New Series), June 1935

SPIRITUAL INTERCOMMUNION

My Dear Father Gillett,

WILL you allow me to express my heartfelt appreciation of your article on Intercommunion in the September number of Sobornost ? In this article you elucidate both your own attitude to this burning issue in present day Christianity and to its particular application in the life of our Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius.

ABOUT three years ago on my own personal responsibility and in obedience to an inner commanding voice, I raised this issue of Intercommunion at our First Fellowship Conference (the Seventh Anglo-Russian Conference). I put this problem to our general consciousness as one which inevitably emerges from our common fellowship in prayer, on which we had already embarked. The question raised met with response and its consideration evoked searching and responsible thought, which was evident in a series of private discussions in Russian and English groups, and at subsequent Conferences. Opinion was sharply divided, but I would say that, on the whole, conviction prevailed (a conviction which sprang not so much from the voice of a loving heart, as from the arguments of "sober" reason!) that the time was not yet ripe for my suggestion. Nevertheless, it was admitted that it deserved consideration, further investigation, and study. It was actually agreed that "further steps should be taken not only to increase the element of common prayer, but also to elucidate the theology implicit in it."

MY present letter is a step in this direction. It would have been extremely lamentable if the only result of all this discussion of my "proposal" had led to its rejection, to its being interpreted as a hasty and rash step which was, perhaps, according to its very nature un-Catholic (not of the Church) though indeed the latter opinion did find direct and indirect expression in discussion.

THROUGH God's mercy, however, all this discussion resulted in a quickening and a deepening of our understanding to an awareness of the miracle which the Spirit of God is working in us through our life of fellowship. This is undoubtedly one of the positive results. We may even find that this achievement will be of greater importance and value than any actual acceptance of my original "proposal". At our last Conference when my "proposal" was once again rejected, the Senior Group without any hesitation adopted a resolution which to my mind is really more significant than the "proposal" itself. This resolution was suggested by you, was readily welcomed by the senior members of the Conference, and was included in the general resolutions carried by the Conference. It was not expressed directly, but as a general postulate. This has now received further development in your letter, especially in its application to one particular question. The idea is that though we are deprived of communio in sacris, we are, nevertheless, already in a state of Spiritual Communion (or Intercommunion).

IF WE accept this sincerely and logically, it not only serves to illuminate with a true light our Eucharistic fellowship, established within our own Fellowship and even outside it (when Orthodox services and even the Divine Liturgy are celebrated in Anglican Churches and for Anglican congregations, which is already a form of co-celebration), but at the same time expresses a much more general principle than actual Intercommunion in a special, limited, and small group. You have admirably developed this idea in its particular form of application and I am in complete sympathy with you when you say, "My own tentative suggestion was that our liturgiologists should draw up some form of Penitential Service to be conducted jointly by Orthodox and Anglican officials and attended by members of both Communions". It follows, of course, that we should not delay on both sides the liturgical working out of this idea.

THE principle of Spiritual Intercommunion which has now been born in our fellowship and which gives expression to its nature is certainly novel from a dogmatic point of view. It originates at this particular "historical hour" in the development of the "Oecumenical" Movement. It represents an inevitable attempt to appraise the worth of a new religious experience closely associated with this movement. In this experience confessional limitations are overcome in spite of the walls which separate the confessions from one another. One feels and discerns a true life, a "standing before the face of God", a unity in Christ, which simply cannot be overcome by confessional division.

I SHOULD now like to make a brief sketch of the dogmatic issue involved. What is it that is implied by "Spiritual Intercommunion" outside the limits of a particular confession ? (in this case, Orthodoxy-Catholicism-Anglicanism). It is obvious of course that within each one of these confessions such Eucharistic fellowship takes place. What are the conditions which make such Intercommunion possible and what are the circumstances which exclude such a possibility ?

ON more than one occasion already, I have been led to express the general opinion that the one common Eucharistic Cup, the Eucharistic Christ Himself, actively unites confessions which are at present in a state of division. The only way of evading such a conclusion is by denying the efficacy of this Cup outside the limits of our own confession, and indeed even now one meets such a point of view in certain circles. But contemporary dogmatic consciousness can no longer defend this attitude, especially in view of the fact of oecumenical fellowship. (Such a statement would be true even to a greater extent for our Fellowship. If we actually admit the former view, how can we possibly interpret our common prayer and our attendance at the Orthodox Liturgy and at the Anglican Mass ?).

WE must, nevertheless, strictly distinguish here between the objectively possible and the objectively impossible - even though the latter may be subjectively desirable. We should, for instance, clearly

differentiate between spiritual fellowship through our faith in Christ and our love of Him ("when two or three are gathered together in My name there am I in the midst of them") and Eucharistic fellowship (even when this is spiritual). The first kind of spiritual fellowship takes place within the whole of the Oecumenical movement. For Protestant denominations this is frequently combined with Intercommunion in which, however, members of Episcopal Churches who remain true to their own life in Christ, cannot, and should not participate. Eucharistic fellowship takes for granted the existence of those conditions which are essential for a full and valid celebration of the Divine Eucharist. We shall not discuss what our Protestant brethren have in their Communion. With them also we are in a kind of spiritual fellowship, but in our eyes their Eucharist is not the same Eucharist which was appointed by Our Lord for the purpose of a full and complete union with Him, and through Him between ourselves. The so-called "Apostolic Succession" combined with a faith in the true Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, represents an objective condition, independent of our will, for making Eucharistic fellowship possible or impossible.

IN the relationships between the Eastern and the Roman Churches there exists no doubt as to the validity of one another's Eucharistic fellowship. In relation to Anglicanism the practicability of such Eucharistic fellowship presupposes a sincere recognition of the validity of Anglican orders, and therefore the efficacy of the Sacrament celebrated by the Anglican priesthood. The Roman Church denies this validity. One of the great achievements of our Fellowship lies in the fact that the Orthodox members of the Fellowship have actually recognized the validity of Anglican orders not only in theory but in actual life.* The importance and the novelty of this principle of Spiritual Intercommunion is expressed by the fact that in our own particular case the actual Eucharistic unity which exists in theory is transferred from theory to real life. It is actualized in life, in conditions of mutual love and dogmatic unanimity which exist among the members of our Fellowship. Such an experience opens up unlimited possibilities for Eucharistic fellowship of a similar nature : we are now only canonically divided when we partake of the One Cup, but actually we are one in the Body and Blood of Christ. Our consciousness of this fact and our actual experience are further developed and strengthened along parallel lines, on the one hand, by canonical rapprochement, Church diplomacy, and official dogmatic agreement, by a new canonical legalism; on the other hand, by the actual realization of that without which any hierarchical agreement alone would be powerless and would remain suspended in mid-air.

OUR union with Roman Catholics in a spiritual Eucharistic fellowship has been so far thwarted by the spirit of proselytism and imperialism which characterizes the Roman Church. Meanwhile, such fellowship between Catholics and Orthodox at least would seem easy and natural. Actually at the present time our Anglo-Russian Fellowship along the paths of its own development provides us with an experience of the possibility and inevitability of such Eucharistic fellowship.

This is another contribution and represents a further achievement which our Fellowship makes to the whole Oecumenical Movement. We are confronted with a unique instance of Eucharistic education in a spirit of unity within the limits of a comparatively small (though clearly defined) group of members who belong to two Churches which even now lead a separate life. What we actually observe is already an accomplished fact, so that this achievement can be never taken from us. It represents an anticipated spiritual basis and a primary condition for full and actual Intercommunion (de facto).

MY "proposal" was an intuition and a first step - perhaps indeed it was a premature beginning, and it has been given to Fr. Gillet to express it adequately. We must dogmatically deepen and develop further the implications and the significance of the whole idea. If on the other hand we are convinced that such Eucharistic unity does not exist between us; if our experience of Spiritual Intercommunion does not support this conviction, then intercommunion can never be established by any form of dogmatic agreement, even though there be canonical and dogmatic agreement, and unanimity, for ex nihilo nil fit!

Yours sincerely,
SERGIUS BULGAKOV

---

* When the idea of a "sacramental blessing" was included in my "proposal" one of its indirect aims was the object of expressing, expounding and making real this validity. Though in this instance it would have only applied to a particular case there is no doubt that this would have had also a general significance.

First appeared in Sobornost, No. 4 (New Series) December 1935.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

(Report of address given at Fellowship Conference, held near Paris in January 1936).

I do not wish to consider the actual question of my own particular case. I will only try to explain to you the general principles of freedom within the Orthodox Church. Can freedom of thought exist in a Church which has obligatory dogmatic formulae ? Is there not a contradiction between free seeking for truth and the revealed dogma dispensed by the Church ? I am convinced that no such contradiction exists. The dogmatic teaching of the Church must become real in the personal thought and experience of everybody, for dogma does not only represent an abstract doctrinal statement: it is primarily a fact of our inner, mystical life- apart from that it is dead. But this personal experience is impossible without freedom of thought, and freedom of the spirit. We have to comprehend dogma within the general context of our thinking, of our ideology, of our spiritual life, of our scientific development.

OF course the doctrines of the Church have an eternal divine content, but this eternal content is given to us in the Divine-human process of development. The human process gives us different possibilities of dogmatic resolution, while it confronts us with different tasks. For instance, we have been talking a great deal of the secularisation of culture and so on. These are questions which are put before us, and we have to answer them theologically. They can find an answer in no other way. If we observe the history of the development of the Church we see that while in a sense the recognition of dogmatic truth is general, this does not in any way mean that this unity involves the same level of understanding, or that everywhere the same content is put into dogmatic formulae. There were in fact no Christian formulae up to the epoch of the Oecumenical Councils. Now we have them.

OF course the real content of these formulae is supplied by the true depth of the mystical life of the Church, and this dogmatic life of the Church goes on constantly. It would be one of the worst of errors to think that the dogmatic life of the Church ended with the Seventh Oecumenical Council, that an Eighth Oecumenical Council is now an impossibility, or that even the hope that such a Council will take place is a heresy - as is actually thought by many Orthodox people. I should say that it is in fact a heresy of opinion to regard every new idea in the dogmatic realm as a heresy. On the contrary, one cannot avoid putting new questions and giving new answers as life goes on. This freedom is of course limited, determined by the dogmas which exist already, though these dogmas in themselves are not dogmatic laws, but really an expression of our own mystical life within the Church. - It is of course impossible

to be a Christian if you do not believe in the Godhead of our Saviour in the Trinity, in the Holy Eucharist. But from this comes an inner life which grows up and develops in our own thought and consciousness. We therefore conclude that dogmatic development itself requires freedom of thought.

BUT the Church is not a philosophical or scientific society the members of which are free in the conclusions to which they come. The Church is an hierarchically organized society and the hierarchy has a definite place in the life of the Church possessing certain duties, privileges and rights. How then, can we define the competence of the hierarchy in the dogmatic realm ?
There are two opposite opinions as regards this :

1. The Roman Catholic View - the Church has an external organ of infallibility, which is the infallible Roman Pope, so that every question which arises in the Roman Church must be submitted to the Roman See and is finally settled there. In practice it is true that since the Vatican Council there has not been a single case when the Pope has spoken ex cathedra. On the contrary he quite obviously avoids speaking in this way. In the case of Modernism the Pope made a definite dogmatic pronouncement but it was not ex cathedra. Of course within the Roman Catholic Church there is a very developed dogmatic life going on, and there are different schools of thought, which are sometimes even opposed to one another in certain things. Even in the Roman Church the necessity of a measure of freedom for dogmatic research is recognised.
2. The purely individualistic view : According to this everybody has a right to his own opinion. This individualistic conception of freedom of thought leaves out of account ehe whole corporate life, the practice of sobornost and the organic unity of the Church.

In this sense we ask what kind of exterior authority in the question of dogma have we in Orthodoxy ? What are the duties and privileges of the hierarchy in the Orthodox Church ?

WE must not deny that it has a very important responsibility and duty as guardian of the Church s thought. The hierarchy is responsible for the dogmas formulated and accepted by the Church for the deposit of faith which is to be maintained intact. Further the hierarchy has the privilege of being the mouth-piece of the Church wherever truth has to be proclaimed. But does this trust include any kind of infallible authority ? Have we in the Orthodox Church any external organ for proclaiming ecclesiastical truth ? Many among us, and

particularly many representatives of the hierarchy in our Church, have been sadly influenced by Romanizing tendencies, so that they actually regard themselves as so many Popes, or as a sort of collective Pope. This is a sin in Orthodoxy and constitutes a real temptation to many. The Orthodox Church has no external dogmatic authorities.

BUT what about the Oecumenical Councils are they not the ultimate authority ? To which we must reply both "Yes" and "No". The history of the Oecumenical Councils is well known. Their authority is quite other than that of an infallible Pope. As a rule each new Oecumenical Council is the origin of new dogmatic disputes. The actual definitions of the Oecumenical Councils are recognized as true, we know now that this is so, in that the Holy Spirit acted through them. But we must remember that the problem of false Oecumenical Councils was by no means as easy as it appears to us now. The Council of Florence, for example, was never recognized as an Oecumenical Council. Even an Oecumenical Council is not an external organ for proclaiming the truth of the Church. It is the best place for finding a common opinion, but it is not a "collective Pope" No such exterior organ can exist in the Church.

HOW then are new dogmas revealed in the Church ? It is a long process. Take for example the question of the hesychasts. Two Councils took one line and two another. The whole discussion lasted for ten years. St. Gregory of Palama was excommunicated, anathematized and imprisoned for two years, and then the next Council recognized his teaching as true. Ten years after his death he was canonized as a saint of the Greek Church. If Gregory of Palama had been obedient to the second Council he would have ended his days as a heretic. There are many instances like this in the history of the Church. This means that in questions of dogma the canonical authorities preserve their right to impose measures of a disciplinary character, but these measures must not prevent us from proclaiming what we regard as the truth.

IN itself the idea of not having any exterior authority to decide is a very difficult one. But when we say that we believe in the Church we imply that we believe in the visible and the invisible Church and in the Holy Spirit Who saves His Church from error, but how, and where, and in what way, the decision will become obvious no one can tell, and only the inner conviction of one's own conscience can witness. Of course tragic conflicts are inevitable.

ST. ATHANASIUS was persecuted because he was Orthodox. The same happened with St. Gregory of Palama. We are bound to conclude, therefore, that we in the Orthodox Church need most of all a wise freedom of thought, so long as this freedom does not distort the dogmatic truth of the Church

I WOULD here like to add a few words about the corresponding principle in the Anglican Church. You, in your Church, practise what is called "comprehension". This is a very ambiguous a very dangerous and difficult thing. Of course I should not like to appropriate this principle in its Anglican form, and should not care to see within the Orthodox Church theologians who deny the Holy Trinity, or the Holy Eucharist and so on. But the principle in itself is good so far as it represents a measure of toleration of different tendencies of dogmatic thought. Such comprehensiveness always exists in the Church in varying degrees, and this was especially true in the life of the Church at the time of the Oecumenical Councils. We see, for instance, two schools of theology -- that of Alexandria and that of Antioch side by side. When the representatives of these schools met in the third century they anathematized one another yet the principle of comprehension remained victorious and both schools were united in the formula of the Fourth (Chalcedonian) Council.

I THINK that generally speaking the Anglican and the Orthodox Church share one idea of dogmatic development and of dogmatic freedom. But there is an historial difference. Our Orthodox Church - and this is especially true of the Russian Orthodox Church - has never been sufficiently educated for freedom, which remains the greatest privilege of the English nation. The principle of freedom of thought is applied, in East and West, in very different ways.

I READ recently Professor N P Williams' book, The Doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin. Original Sin raises some of the most difficult problems of dogmatics. We have a very definite dogma of Original Sin, but no theology of Original Sin. Our customary way to explain Original Sin is as an inherited infirmity. Every theologian tries to elaborate his own dogmatic explicitation. I can imagine that you might be surprised if members of the Anglican Church were to accuse Professor Williams of heresy.

WE have therefore to help one another mutually. We must help one another to evaluate and to appreciate the principle of the freedom of thought, but in doing so we must remain faithful to the dogmatic teaching of the Church. This is not easy, but it is the necessary way of dogmatic development. Otherwise we either become freethinkers or legalists who prefer that dogmatic thought should completely perish.

MY own conviction is that there is no more spiritually important realm than that of dogmatic theology. In a sense it is axiomatic and revealed, but in another sense reason remains free in this dogmatic life, and it is one's greatest joy to feel how in one's heart the life and

and sense of dogma grows and develops. I feel that if we have to struggle for freedom of thought it is not a struggle of "liberalism" or one of personal pride, it is a struggle for ecclesiastical truth (for truth within the Church). It is ultimately a struggle for Christ and His Church. Let me end with the words of the Apostle Paul :

> "Stand fast therefore in the liberty by which Christ made us free, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage".

First appeared in "Sobornost" No. 6 (New Series) June 1936

THE INCARNATION AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH (I)

IN the Report of the Doctrinal Commission it is asserted "that the Virgin Birth possesses its traditional importance for Christians" and that "belief in the Word made flesh is integrally bound up with belief in the Birgin Birth and that this will be increasingly recognised". There is however along with this another opinion "that a full belief in the historical Incarnation... took place under the normal conditions of human generation." (2) In the judgement of the Commission both views are compatible with the acceptance "of the reality of our Lord's Incarnation, which is the central truth of the Christian faith" (p.83). The Orthodox Church, like the Roman Catholic, entirely denies this compatibility, professing in the Nicene Creed the Incarnation from the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary.

THE distinctive note of these judgements in the Reports consists in the absence of a definite Christology. The Incarnation is considered as a "historical event", which can have "particular modes"; furthermore, an "alternative formula of Christian faith" turns out to be possible. In this way the Virgin Birth, and equally a "normal conception of the seed of Joseph and Mary," have only the significance of an instrumental detail in the Incarnation. This is of course an entirely different view from that according to which the Incarnation is "the dispensation of the mystery which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God" (Eph.iii 9), "in the fulness of time" (Gal.iv,4),; long preparing in the Old Testament Church, and which is factually manifest in the spiritual genealogy of the Blessed Mother of God. The theory of the birth of Jesus from Joseph and Mary would be called by some "nestorianism" (which, according to Professor Goudge, "in all its forms is fatal to the Gospel- it is not a theory about the Incarnation, but a denial of it"). However, even "Nestorianism" is in any case a definite Christological doctrine, which has its strong and weak sides. But the simple assertion of the birth of the Word from Joseph and Mary is not only the absence of Christology but a complete denial of it. The sole logical consequence of this would be merely the Jesuanismus of the Liberal Protestant school of Harnack and Ritschl, which sees in the God-man only the Rabbi Jesus of Nazareth. Christ, as the New Adam, is not merely one among many representatives of humanity, but the All-man, restoring in Himself the humanity born of the Old Adam, as free from original sin and offering us redemption. Can a normal human conception (i.e., conception in the physiological, not the philosophical sense - Editor) become the conception of God, or a "Nestorian Christotokos" be the Theotokos ? Furthermore, the conception of Christ is the act of the descent of the Holy Ghost at the Annunciation (which is, of course, likewise made void by rationalism). But can such a descent hallow a sinful human conception ? And whence do we gather that

this sinful conception (P.. li,7), which appears in the world only after the Fall (Gen. iii,16), is actually normal for a manhood uninjured by sin ? On the contrary, is not precisely the Virgin Birth normal for it ?

THE faith must be taken as a whole. In its fulness is implied also belief in the Mother of God as the "Second Eve". To her belongs that fulness of original holy humanity by accepting which the Logos, being perfect God, became also "perfect" man. She is this humanity of Christ, but as having in herself her own hypostasis. The relationship of Mother and Son is not only a transitional and accidental link set up by the birth of Christ (in which case we could admit of other subsequent births by the agency of Joseph), but it is an abiding link, admitting of neither division nor confusion similar to the indivisible and inconfusible hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ. Hence there is revealed the plenitude of the Church's Mariology, the crown of which is reached in the glorification of the Theotokos. Christ and Mary are depicted together in the icon of the Theotokos and Child, which is in essence an icon of the Divine Humanity, of the divin4Incarnation.

THE Incarnation is realised in its fulness not only as the "coming from heaven" of the Son of God, but also as the sending down into the world of the Holy Ghost for the Incarnation of the Word through His (the Holy Ghost's) overshadowing of the Mother of God, who is revealed as the human temple of the Holy Ghost. But how is it possible, in accepting the Virgin Birth, to limit its force only to the birth of God and to forget her who served in this mystery ? Strangely enough people remember the Apostles and honour the followers of Christ, but forget or deny her whom "all generations call blessed". In such a maimed Christology the absence of a clearly conceived anthropology is striking. This latter contains the sufficient foundation for the Incarnation in its teaching about the image of God in man, eternally predestined for divinisation to become "god by grace". The taking of "perfect" manhood by the Son of God is not the arbitrary, and, as it were, violent act of a deus ex machina, but it corresponds to the hidden call of human nature, which speaks by the mouth of the Virgin Mary : "Behold the handmaid of the Lord". Therefore it is inaccurate to say that in the Incarnation, "God acted through Christ and He still acts through Christ" (p.74). God acts in Christ not "through" human nature but in unconfused and inseparable union with it, according to the dogmas of the Fourth and Sixth Oecumenical Councils, in the one two-natured life of the one hypostasis.

THOSE who deny the Virgin Birth do so chiefly from the standpoint of Biblical "Higher Criticism", but also from "biological,

psychological and theological objections". From the standpoint, however, of Biblical criticism there has come as yet no decisive conclusion, in the judgment of responsible investigators, (3), and to reject on these grounds alone the direct tradition of the Church, which has for long years glorified the Theotokos, is entirely beside the point and "uncritical". As for the various other objections, one must say in reply to this question that here we have not only an instance of a reduced faith but also an error in objecto or a gnoseological misunderstanding. Can one on such a basis accept the Incarnation, when this latter entirely exceeds the measure of created nature and its laws ? Can it be proved altogether rationally ? Can it be located within the framework of the causal connection of the phenomena of this world without rending that connection asunder ? And why, while confessing the Incarnation, do we hesitate to accept the Virgin Birth, which is in so great a degree a dogmatic postulate of the Faith ? Are not those rationalists more logical who with their critical shears trim off a "scientific-historical" picture of Jesus by excluding from the Gospel everything that is not compatible with their rationalistic world-view (miracles, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and so on) ? To accept the fundamental miracle of all - the Incarnation - but to stop half-way by denying from a rationalistic standpointthe Virgin Birth, indicated inly the inconsistency of a half-faith. One must recognise theological-dogmatic postulates, which have in themselves a different demonstrability and evidentiality from the scientific-rational one derived from "science", and one should not measure the truth of the Faith by a yardstick of reason which is not applicable to this problem. It goes without saying that we do not belittle the rights of science and the duty of scientific responsibility; we are only putting things in their right places and critically distinguishing the various aspects of problematics.

THE Incamation is the joint divine revelation of the Son and the Holy Spirit, sent into the world by the Father : Logos-Spirit, and the taking of manhood by God is the meeting and union of God and man : Jesus-Mary, and we believe in them with one Faith, that same Faith which includes in itself the whole conjunction of Christian dogmas from the first to the last.

Notes: (1) "Doctrine in the Church of England pp.81-83.

(2) The omitted words are "is more consistent with the supposition that our Lord's birth" - Editor.

(3) Cf. e.g. V. Taylor 'The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth' Oxford 1928.

First appeared as a Letter to the Editor in Sobornost, No. 14 (new Series) June, 1938.

THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY

A Paper by the Very Rev. S. Bulgakov read in his absence at the Fellowship Conference, 1939.

THIS is the first time that I am unable to attend the Fellowship Conference, but I am present with you in spirit. I send my love and greetings to all friends and members, both English and Russian, to our President the Bishop of Derby, to the members of the Executive, to members and visitors from other countries and of other denominations. May God bless your labours!

I HAVE been asked to give a brief summary of the main points of my paper. I can only do it in a most imperfect way. My chief contention is that prophecy is an act of religious life, a personal meeting with God, which does, may, and ought to take place in the life of everyone, according to one's measure and capacity. For as Moses said to Israel "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His spirit upon them!" (Numbers, xi,29).

OUR life calls for a prophetic response to it. We may heed its call or not. It may ask great things of us or small, as the case may be. God calls His elect to receive His great revelation and declare His will, but it is given to those little ones too to feel the touch of His hand.

IF I were capable of it at the present moment, my first task on returning to your midst would be to tell you of what I have lived through and what has been revealed to me during the terrible, and at the same time wonderful, days of my illness, on the brink of death. God in His mercy has brought me back to life in this world and given me new opportunities of meeting my brethren. To make my experiences a part of my life and thought, to declare unto others what God has shown me, will be a hard and responsible task for me in days to come. Such a task inevitably is one of the forms of prophetic revelation about life, whatever its content, and however powerless my stumbling words may be. Everyone of us inevitably has to follow his own path to a prophetic revelation about life and death. Everyone is sooner or later bidden to receive the last revelation about death, and to meet his God - whether it be at the very end or in the pathways of life. I should like to tell you of the feeling of life and death opening out on either side of the dividing line between them - but that is unutterable.

BUT even on this side of the line, in our earthly life, we have sufficient evidence that man does meet God and hear His voice, and

this is the basis of prophecy. Revelation itself tells us that this is so. Leaving aside the Old Testament I will confine myself to the New. In the New Testament, prophecy is not a general gift bestowed through the laying on of the Apostles' hands. Like other gifts, it is something special, possessed by certain persons and not by others. "Are all apostles ? are all prophets ? are all teachers ?" (I Cor. xii, 29). "He gave some apostles; and some prophets, and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers" (Hebrews iv.II). Prophetic ministry is set apart as relating to the knowledge of the future (for instance Acts xi, 28; xxi, 4; xxix,II), especially to the revelation of "things that must shortly come to pass" (Rev. i,I), and also to special courage in preaching, (e.g. turning to preach to the Gentiles in Acts xiii, 46) or in probing and inquiring, as St. Paul did, about the fate of Israel (Rom. ix,II). But alongside this special prophetic ministry Holy Writ mentions universal prophesying concerning which it is said : "Desire spiritual gifts, but rather that you may prophesy" (I Cor.xiv.I., cp. v.39). St. Paul foresees the eventuality of all prophesying (v.24) and says, "Ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted"(v.3I).

PROPHESYING is thus made as it were a part of church services, in the same way as the sermon of modern times, though evidently it is not connected with any special consecration but it a general charismatic gift in all its power and at the same time in all its vagueness. That gift is the power of Pentecost, according to the interpretation given by St. Peter to the prophecy of Joel : "And it shall come to pass in the last days I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh : and your sons and daughters shall prophesy and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit and they shall prophesy " (Acts ii, I7, I8; Joel ii, 28, 29). (The words of Moses quoted above - Numbers xi, 29 - may also be recalled in this connection).

ACCORDING to this text the gift of prophecy contains the very power of Pentecost. The reference is not to the particular gift of prophetic ministry alongside of other gifts and ministries, but to the universal and essential gift of Pentecost. Those who received that gift appeared to the outsiders to be beside themselves or possessed : "These men are full of new wine" (Acts ii, I3). The gift of prophecy makes a man as it were a stranger to himself, living a life not his own and yet experiencing that life as though it were his own. It is both going out of oneself, being beside oneself, ecstacy, and receiving into oneself a new principle of life. In other words, prophecy is the meeting and the union of the human spirit with another principle, the divine. (There may also be false prophecy, or the meeting with the spirit of delusion, but anyway it is a meeting).

PROPHESYING is therefore an active state of the spirit in which it reaches forward to meet a higher principle, so that it may identify itself with it and be fertilised by it. In this sense, it is the highest creative state of the spirit. It is what we call inspiration, its joy and delight. In the words of Pushkin, "Without the divine, without inspiration life is sad and empty". The subject or content of prophecy has no decisive significance for its nature; the Old Testament prophets prophesied about various matters. What is essential to prophecy is a creative and inspired attitude to life, a realisation of life's tasks and possibilities, spiritual activity and the recognition that the historical process is creative. The gift of prophecy as a Pentecostal gift means that the Christian man makes history through prophetic inspiration and is responsible for it. According to this interpretation, Pentecost is the universal consecration to prophecy for which everyone receives his special gift in the Sacrament of Confirmation - "the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit" - and in this sense no one in the Church is deprived of the gracious gift. The gifts may differ but the prophetic spirit in them remains unchanged as a special quality of those gifts. And it is precisely in this qualitative sense that St. Paul says : "There are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations but it is the same God which worketh all in all" (I. Cor.xii, 4,5,6.). In explanation of this general thought the apostle goes on to enumerate the different gifts : "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal; for to one is given the Spirit the word of wisdom (philosophy), to another the word of knowledge (science) by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy (evidently in the special sense of the word : Editor); to another discerning of spirits; to another diverse kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will" (I Cor.xii.7-11). This passage indicates the multiplicity of the gifts of one and the same Spirit and His presence in every one of them. It is essential however to distinguish, and even to contrast, prophecy as the general gift of the Holy Spirit finding expression in the capacity to receive revelation, and prophecy as actual revelation itself. Prophecy means therefore the general spirit-bearing quality of Christian humanity after Pentecost, capable in its human inspiration as creatures to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit and be inspired by it. Human inspiration thus becomes divinely-human . The difference of gifts indicates the many aspects of prophetic inspiration, among which prophetic ministry is singled out as a creative reaching out to the future : "He will show you things to come" (John xvi, 3). It is the deification of the human spirit from within, through the union in it of the created and the uncreated elements. This must of course on no account be taken to mean that after Pentecost all human inspiration is, as a matter of course, prophetic and divinely-human.

Just the contrary. It is the highest and final task which is set before us, but at the same time the possibility of carrying it out is inwardly given us through Pentecost. In it the Holy Spirit descended upon men without depriving them of human freedom or of their own human inspiration. Prophecy in general is creativeness winged with daring and fired with inspiration. As such it is turned towards the future, not, however, apart from or without regard to the present, but through the present, which is pregnant with the future. Recall to what extent the thought of the Old Testament prophets is both turned towards their present environment and saturated with history; it cannot indeed by understood without a special historical commentary. It was essentially historical, but it started with a living sense of the needs and problems of their own day. In other words the true subject of prophecy is history understood in its inner content as apocalypse or even as eschatology, i.e., as something which lies beyond the limits of history. History as apocalypse is "the last time" which is included in supertime in eschatology. That is the true object of prophetic contemplation, but the sands of time must not simply run out - there must be creative achievement.

IT is of the nature of prophecy both to see into the future and to fathom divine things, to know God. Revelation about God was given through the prophets and crystallised into dogma - into doctrines about God. Dogmatic revelations were given to mankind both in the Old and in the New Testament through prophets - Moses, David, Solomon, the minor prophets, apostles and teachers, down to our own day. What is the common feature of their prophetic ministry ? How is the divine truth revealed and announced to these elect of God ? Are they merely a passive instrument, through which the divine words are, as it were, dictated ? Or does the revelation preserve throughout its divinely-human character, so that the human searching and questioning receives a divine answer : "Seek and ye shall find" ? Of course the last alternative is the true one. Revelation is given not to a cold heart and an unbeeding intellect but to the fiery Elijah questioning God about the remnant of the righteous, to the fervent Paul tormented by the mystery of the rejection and the salvation of Israel, to the suffering Job crying before heaven of his torments. It is given to the seer Daniel who made penitence for the sins of his people and with much lamentation questioned the Lord. If this was the case with great prophets and spiritual leaders, surely it must be the same with those little ones, even if in an immeasurably smaller degree ? Insistent and searching thought invariably precedes the illumination of reason which contains the grain of revelation. This is prophecy as dogmatic creativeness and revelation.

BUT even this divine illumination of reason cannot and must not be the limit of prophetic knowledge. We are called upon to acquire a deeper and clearer understanding of the revelation that has been

received in the past or given anew. In other words, prophecy includes - not for all, but for the chosen - the labour of expressing and formulating theologically that which has been revealed. That is to say, it also embraces theology, not so much as intellectual study but as intellectual intuition. This is how it was in Jewish theology, in the Talmud, and it remains so in our New Testament theology.

WE must neither exaggerate nor belittle the prophetic element in theology. Without it theology loses its inspirational power and becomes abstract scholasticism. Of course, theology is not infallible, but even when it follows false issues it preserves its inspirational, and therefore prophetic, character. Old Testament piety knew of prophetic schools, "a company of prophets", in union with whom a particular individual like Saul also prophesies and is "turned into another man" (I Sam. x,6). Are not our theological schools akin to these prophetic schools, in so far as theyrise to the heights of their vocation ? Should not they too seek that "the Spirit of God should come upon them ?" (v.IO). And does not the same thing apply to the theological fellowship which at the present day takes place through various conferences so near to our hearts ? Recall our liturgical fellowship which has now become habitual to us, and is as it were taken by us for granted. Those mutual liturgical contacts during the conferences were to us like a fiery stream of unexpected revelations. And in the course of our work does not our theological fellowship prove to be a source of new inspirations, and indeed of revelations ? Are not new prophetic schools arising before our eyes ? They can have this character, however, on one condition only : they must breathe the spirit of inspiring quest and of believing love. To some people such communion appears doubtful and even dangerous, as a betrayal of the purity of one's own confession. They do not need prophetic schools but are content with self-sufficient scholasticism. But we who have breathed the air of gracious communion have need of the prophetic spirit which bloweth where it listeth. Religious experience precedes dogmatic formulation and prepares the ground for it. It calls us to a new understanding of the universal truth. It promises us not new dogmas but a new knowledge of them in which we shall be "turned into another man", like King Saul in a company of prophets.

First appeared in print in Sobornost, No. 19 (New Series) September 1939.

HOC SIGNO VINCES

Paris
23 November 1939

An open letter to the members of the Fellowship of SS. Alban & St. Sergius

DEAR BROTHERS,

IN THESE dreadful days of divine judgment, we want to meet and to feel one another present in spirit, so as to face it together, shoulder to shoulder, and give an answer concerning the hope that is in us.

THE death-knell is sounding over the world today. The peoples are hearing the call of eternity, in face of the destruction of so much that, not so long ago, appeared indestructible. History is showing that tragical aspect of it which was prophetically set forth in the Revelation of St. John the Divine, and, in the idyllic days of progress, had been forgotten again. And what answer have we to offer to God at this sound of the Trumpet, the Trump of the Archangel, what have we wherewith to go forth at midnight to meet the Bridegroom, what word will be heard on our lips in the face of death ? Is it to be the terrified cry : "Save us, we perish" ? But "Where is your faith?" is the Lord's reply (Luke viii, 25). Whatever the horror we have to face, let there be no fright. Even if to many it brings their personal end, which in any case must come sooner or later to all, still that is not yet the end of all earthly existence, but only the last phase of an historical epoch in the pangs of new birth. History is not yet ripe for its end, it has not yet come to its fulness, and the times and the seasons of that it is not given to us to know. We have, however, been told, not of the end, but of what comes before it : "Ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars : see that ye be not troubled : for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet" (Matthew xxiv.6). Contemporary happenings bear the stamp, not only of the inevitability, but also of the finitude, proper to history. We remain still inside history, and must discern the event in its data and its order. Our historical house is on fire, but it still stands. And it has known many firest in the past, just as we Russians have already had to endure the fall of our dwelling, and witness its ruin, and still history has pursued its course. Even if the present barbarian advance were not to be stemmed, still that would not mean the end of Europe, but only one of the periodical conflagrations of Europe. The European constellation is not extinct, even if it changes its shape. The peoples of Europe, like individual persons, lie in the power of the destiny which is now drawing them, until the fire dies down, and all its fuel is spent. But even under the destiny of war, man retains his manhood, his spiritual personality and his creative freedom. Within the military conflict and parallel to it, there is going on a spiritual conflict; on the anvil of history a new self-determination of Europe is being hammered out, and its new soul is being born, the secret and unseen fruit of the European

catastrophe. What kind of fruit will this be ? Will is prove a further relapse of the world into heathendom and savagery, its final unchristening, or, on the contrary, its new spiritual birth as the triumph of Christianity ? No one is called on to answer this question but those who themselves are taking their part in the process of history. But one thing is certain : in the happenings of the present moment, judgment is being wrought upon the European world of the last few decades, and its doom is determined. Once more there is set before it the free creative choice;

. "I HAVE set before you life and death, blessing and cursing" (Deut.xxx.19). The salvation of Europe, and, with it, of the whole Christian world, nay, more, of all mankind as yet unchristian, or even anti-christian, can come about only through its conformation anew to Christ. And, according to prophecy, its core is contained in the spiritual destinies of Israel.

CHRIST comes closer to the human heart in time of trial than in time of prosperity. He is with us always, "even unto the end of the world" (Matthew xxciii, 20), but His nearness is felt on the bed of suffering or in the field of battle more than in cloistered peace. He himself testified to the fact of His abiding with the hungry and the thirsty, the sick and the imprisoned (Matthew xxv.); can it be that He abandons the slain and the tortured, the wounded, the sick and the starving now ? Does He not still, together with his spotless Mother, compassionate afflicted humanity upon the battle-fields ? There is here a mystery of faith, revealed to the human heart, and testified, as any such insight is, in spiritual contemplation. War, like any other tribulation, deepens, as well as hardens, man. It sets him before the face of God and of eternity, shifting attention from the horizontal to the vertical dimension of history. Though even now man remains sick, in his freedom not to attend to the revelation of eternity, but to press on in the paths of secularism and nihilism, shutting his heart to the call of the other world, yet now Christ is knocking at the human heart anew. History finds out each man in his own situation, and confronts each with an explicit demand. We, as members of a fellowship of Church union, now ask ourselves whether we are actually fighting or not, how we can take part as soldiers of Christ in this spiritually creative self-determination. Can we say that the moment has come to break off our work on the ground that it has become out of place and untimely, as a work of peace, in time of war ?

OR, on the contrary, are we summoned to a new mobilisation, as it were, for the spiritual conflict, so as not merely to keep, but to add to, those spiritual treasures which have been entrusted to us with the sense of our responsibility for our recognised unity in the Church ? We have had many joyful revelations of this in the past, and is it only now, in face of a great upheaval, that the right hand of the Lord grows weak ? Not even the wartime alienation

of peoples, which sets them on the field of battle at antagonists, is capable of annulling that union in Christ which He Himself bestows on them that call upon Him, even though that too is now impeded of its visible manifestation. Warfare is earthly and temporal, union unlimited and eternal. And this union becomes still more obligatory where there is no outward opposition or antagonism to hinder it. If it is possible, even while men are waging war, for them to glance up, and to lift up their hearts, to heaven, then even in wartime Church union is being accomplished. It is only necessary to strive to remember this one fact, that it is not accomplished without our concourse, but by our efforts, our freedom and creativeness. We who are members of a society for Church Union are called to its work, not temporarily, nor for a season, but for ever. We have bound ourselves by a vow and given, as it were, a spiritual military oath, and we cannot relinquish our duty. God grant that we may not be found spiritually off our guard even by a European war, but that even this may prove a way to the fulfilment of the Church. Our understanding must be deepened, and our task enlarged at the; same time. And it needs saying that, whatever other conquest a soul may pray for at this time, it also desires victory in the further widening and deepening of the links between our several churches, and especially with those members of the Roman Catholic Church who are friendly towards us. We are well aware in what degree this depends neither upon us nor upon them, and with what difficulty the conception of unity which is still dominant in that church will yield the ascendancy. But let us be patient in what does depend on us, what we can do, keeping our station, each for his own part, before the one Altar of the one Christ. God grant that, before the face of Christ suffering on our behalf on the field of battle, an awareness of this eucharistic union may penetrate our hearts. In a divided Christendom we are primarily aware of ourselves as members of the distinct confessions, but in Christ we discover ourselves in that unity to which he calls us : "That they all may be one" (John xvii, 21). Let this be the only victory we seek in the conflict of confessions.

THE ways of providence are past finding out, and they confront us with new tasks and new achievements, but let our will be inexpugnable. God can work miracles, and we will hope for a divine miracle, the miracle of Christian union. In answer to the black magic and the signs of anti-Christ, let the sign of Christ's cross shine out before us : thereby shalt thou win the day, Hoc Signo vinces.

First appeared in Sobornost, No. 21 (New Series) May, 1940.

Acknowledgment

THE FELLOWSHIP OF ST. ALBAN AND ST. SERGIUS ACKNOWLEDGE WITH MUCH GRATITUDE THE GENEROSITY OF I B M (UNITED KINGDOM) LIMITED FOR THE LOAN OF AN

I B M Model D Executive Typewriter

AND FOR THE KIND CO-OPERATION AND ADVICE RECEIVED FROM THEIR STAFF.

The type-face chosen for these Lectures is "Mid-Century"