

THE UNION SEMINARY REVIEW

VOL. XXX.

JULY, 1919.

No. 4.

A REVIEW OF THE NEW ORLEANS ASSEMBLY, 1919.

BY REV. WALTER L. LINGLE, D. D., *Editor.*

It was my privilege to be present at the opening of the Assembly and to attend all of its sessions except those held on the last day. Since the Assembly dissolved I have read with care the reports given of the work of the Assembly in all of our Church papers. It is not my purpose in this article to set down in chronological order all that the Assembly did. The reader is referred to the Church papers and the minutes of the Assembly for that. I wish the rather to pass under review the most important acts of the Assembly and to make such comments as may seem pertinent. I shall try to speak with fairness and yet with the utmost frankness. It is probably too much to hope that all my readers will agree with all that I may say, as the Assembly itself was much divided on a number of the most important questions.

FEDERAL UNION.

The question that aroused largest interest in the Assembly was that of Federal Union with other Presbyterian Churches. That question was uppermost in the minds of many commissioners when they voted for moderator on Thursday afternoon, May 15th, and continued to be so until it was voted on about 4 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, May 21st. However, this was not the deciding factor in the election of the moderator. The man who nominated Dr. Fraser for moderator

RELIGION IN RUSSIA, PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE.*

BY PROF. THOMAS CARY JOHNSON,
Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

We shall treat, first, of The Russian Orthodox Church; second, of The Schismatics and Sects; third, of The Christian Churches of Alien Creeds in Russia; and, fourth, of The Non-Christian Cults in Russia.

FIRST, OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.

In dealing with the Russian Orthodox Church we shall consider, first, its origin and growth; second, its doctrinal teaching; third, its form of government; fourth, its worship; and, fifth, its life.

(1) *The Origin and Growth of the Russian Orthodox Church.*

We shall sketch this subject: (a) in its origin and growth to the Mongol invasion; (b) in its growth under Mongol rule; (c) from the fall of the Mongols to Peter the Great; (d) from Peter the Great to the Revolution; (e) and its present condition.

(a) Its Origin and Growth to the Mongol Invasion.

The existence of a form of Christianity in Russia as early as the tenth century is shown by the treaty between the Greeks and the Varyags of Kief made in 944. A few years later Olga, widow of Igor, embraced Christianity. In 988, Vladimir, who had become the sole monarch of the empire, demanded in marriage the Greek princess Anna (a sister of the emperors Basil

* This article is based on the following works:

Anatole Leroy—Beaulieu: *The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians.*

Robert Wilton: *Russia's Agony.*

Schaff: *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. IV, ff.

Use was made also of *Universal Church Histories*, recent *Encyclopedia*, and newspaper articles

and Constantine), sent an army to the Crimea to support his demand, obtained the princess, and, at the same time, adopted the religion of the Greek Church, which he established in Russia. He zealously opposed idolatry, and built churches and schools, to his death in 1015. He and his successors, like the Merovingians in France, used force as well as persuasion for the establishment and the advancement of the adopted religion. At Kief they threw the idols into the river, and drove the people in throngs to be baptized. At Novgorod and elsewhere they used similar measures. At length toward the end of the twelfth century Russia was considered "a Christian country." Many of the bishops and most of the metropolitans, up to the time of the Mongol invasion, were Greeks and brought with them a certain degree of culture, but the unsettled condition of the country, its petty wars between the principalities, into which it was divided after the death of Vladimir, was unfavorable to the cultivation of learning. The Churchmen expended their efforts largely in polemics against the Latins, in ascetic writings, and in monkish legends. The center of religious life and culture was the Eremitic monastery at Kief. It exerted a measure of influence over the more cultured classes of Russia, but left the great masses untouched, which were pagan at bottom and wholly unlettered.

(b) Under the Overlordship of the Mongols, 1238-1462.

The Mongol invasion was a hard blow to the Church, resulting in the slaughter of many of the leading bishops. The Mongol rule, however, once it was established, granted religious toleration to the Russian Church, did not disturb the worship, laws, judgments, or property of the Church, exempted the clergy from taxation and allowed them to exercise jurisdiction over their people in civil and criminal matters. During this period Christianity of the Greek Orthodox type, somewhat Russianized, obtained a more general hold on the Russian people. The communal type of monasticism was adopted and monasteries, though unfederated, were multiplied. Russian bishops were more frequently elevated to the metropolitan chair.

Meanwhile the grand dukes of Moscow, while acknowledging the suzerainty of the Mongol rulers, were showing themselves the most powerful of the native rulers of Russia; and were using the metropolitans to unite Russia under them. At the same time, taking advantage of the troubles and weakness of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, these dukes of Moscow were particularly instrumental in winning at the fall of Constantinople in 1453 the right of the Russian Church to choose and consecrate its own Metropolitan. The Patriarch still retained, for some decades indeed, the right to ratify the selection by the Russian Church; but he was stripped of appointing power. It is a matter of regret, however, that the Russian Church had only changed masters, that the civil ruler at Moscow had come not only to be regarded as the great member of the Church, but to a degree its master.

(c) From the Fall of the Mongol Power in Russia to the Time of Peter the Great, 1462-1721.

In this period certain sects were suppressed or driven to cover, efforts were made to preserve the earlier traditional teachings, to magnify the differences between the Greek and the Roman Churches, to improve the service books of the Church, and to perfect the Slavic version of the Scriptures. As a shield against Rome on the one hand and Protestantism on the other, the Orthodox Confession of Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kief, was drawn up about 1640—a confession which was afterwards subscribed to by the four Eastern Patriarchs.

Meantime the Russian Patriarchate had been instituted in 1589, and the requirement that the appointment to that dignity should be confirmed by the Patriarch of Constantinople had been abrogated about 1650. The most powerful of the Russian Patriarchs was Nikon, 1605-1681. He was made Metropolitan of Novrogod in 1647, and Patriarch of Moscow in 1657. He was a man of great practical ability and exercised great power over State and Church. He reformed the liturgy. Originally adapted from the Greek Church, and simply translated into Old Russian, the original translation was imperfect. In the

course of time a great many additional deviations had crept in through the carelessness of copyists, or by their arbitrary changes. Nikon had the ancient forms restored; he brought by this enlightened course a storm of indignation against himself which swept him into deposition. The Russian people relied on the very words that they were accustomed to—as if they were so many fetishes—so many objects of wonder-working power.

Raskol, dissent from the State Church, arose on account of these ritual changes brought about by the great patriarch. At the same time, hatred of the contemporary growth of serfdom, of the increase of luxury, and of the introduction of Polish modes of life, and, a little later, of the innovations of Peter the Great, tended to swell the stream of dissent.

(d) From Peter the Great to the Revolution of March, 1917.

Peter the Great substituted for the rule of the Patriarch of Moscow that of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg over which the influence of the Tsar was to be supreme (1725). He thus made the Tsar the head of the Church as well as of the State. He placed the property of the monasteries which had now come to be vast in the custody of a department created for the purpose. Because the several monasteries were unfederated and unconnected, they were impotent to resist his demands.

Subsequent Tsars have exercised an inconsistent rule over the Church. Alexander I made great efforts to educate and elevate his people. He suffered the Bible to be distributed under the auspices of the Bible Society of London; but this undertaking was stopped by a churchly reaction in the beginning of the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855). Although Alexander II (1855-1881) was conservative in temper, the condition of the lower clergy was improved, the cloisters reformed, missions to Mohammedans and heathen begun, and the serfs emancipated (1861). Between 1865 and 1875 he suffered a socialistic party to grow up, out of which came the terrorists in 1875, a body which aimed at the destruction of all authority in Church or

State, and to which he fell a victim in 1881. Subsequent rulers pursued the same general policy down to March, 1917.

(e) *Its Present Condition, The Church of Russia in the Revolution.*

It was made free. It at once proceeded to re-establish the Patriarchate of Moscow as its constitutional head on earth; but has suffered in property and morale in the universal upheaval by which Russia has been visited.

(2) *The Doctrine of the Orthodox Church.*

This may be best brought out by comparing it with the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. It holds, for the most part, the same body of doctrine held by the Roman Catholic Church. These churches hold in common the Nicene Creed (with the exception of the Filioque clause), and all the doctrinal decrees of the seven œcumenical councils, from 325-787, including the worship of painted images. They agree in most of the post-œcumenical, or mediæval doctrines against which the Reformation protested, namely, the authority of ecclesiastical tradition as a joint rule of faith with the holy Scriptures; the worship of the Virgin Mary, of the Saints, their pictures (not statues); and relics; justification by faith and good works, as joint conditions; the merit of good works, especially voluntary celibacy and poverty; the seven sacraments (with minor differences as to confirmation, and extreme unction or Chrism); baptismal regeneration and the necessity of water baptism for salvation; transsubstantiation and the adoration of the elements; the sacrifice of the mass for the living and the dead; priestly absolution by divine authority; three orders of the ministry, and the necessity of the priestly hierarchy up to the patriarchial dignity; and a vast number of rites and ceremonies.

In the doctrine of purgatory, the Russian Church is less explicit, yet agrees with the Roman in teaching a middle state of purification, and the efficacy of prayers and masses for the dead. It does not define the dogma of transsubstantiation so clearly. It favors the free circulation of its authorized version

of the Scriptures, but teaches that private judgment is not to be exercised in its interpretation.

The Russian Orthodox Church differs from the Roman Catholic Church in certain points of doctrines:

1. It teaches that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, the Roman Catholic that he proceeds from the Father and the Son (since the time of Augustine).

2. It denies the universal authority and infallibility of the Pope, and teaches that he can be no more than a great Patriarch.

3. It denies the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary (affirmed by the Roman Catholic Church since the year 1854).

4. It teaches the propriety of the marriage for the lower clergy, holding indeed that celibacy is holier than marriage, but that it is inexpedient to require universal celibacy of the clergy.*

These differences of dogma are perhaps due to the fact that the peoples of Eastern Europe and Western Asia were less inclined to logical deductions and abstractions and to vigorous mental effort. They were wanting in the freshness of life, vigor and enterprise of the peoples of Western Europe.

(3) *Its Form of Government, the Polity of the Russian Orthodox Church.*

The government of the Church is not autocratic but synodal. No prelate in that Church has the right to speak in the name of the whole Church. Only an œcumenical council could do this. The Holy Synod, which obtained from Peter the Great's time to the Revolution, could speak with authority only on a limited number of topics—such as “church discipline, or church tradition, the instruction at the Seminaries, the investigation of popular superstitions, religious observances and spiritual censure.”

The Russian Church, however, was a very centralized body. When there was a vacancy in the bishopric of any of the sixty

Compare Schaff: Vol. IV, p. 306.

dioceses, then the Holy Synod nominated three candidates from which the Emperor appointed one to fill the vacancy. These bishops were supported in part also by subsidies granted by the Holy Synod; hence they were dependent on the Synod and the Emperor.

The bishops, because of the high honor in which the celibate is held, were chosen from the monks, or from such of the lower clergy as had lost their wives.

These bishops were not only subject to the Holy Synod, but were severally assisted by diocesan councils of which they were little more than the presidents and executive officers. These councils cut pretty much the similar figures in their respective dioceses as the Holy Synod cut for the Church as a whole. The cases subject to them were matters of ecclesiastical discipline, and matters pertaining to marriage and divorce.

The Russian civil government always had a representative in the Holy Synod and a representative in each diocesan council, the logical thing in a State church. His business was to see that the church, the "handmaid of the State, furthered the State's interest."

(4) *The Worship of the Russian Orthodox Church.*

Of all the churches of Christendom the Russian Church is, perhaps, the most devoted to forms. It is devoted to the forms of the Greek Church of the fourth and fifth centuries. Her oriental spirit, ages of ignorance and low average of culture account in part for this reverence for rite. The average Russian peasant can neither be born, married nor die, except with rites civil or religious. He exercises almost every member of his body in worship. Indeed, his worship is made up, for the most part, of lighting candles, crossing himself, kneeling, repeating over and over again the same formula, following with his eyes the acts of the priests, listening to the majestic intoning, feasting on the beauty of the service and the splendor of the singing. Much is made of singing in the worship of the church. The finest voices in the ranks of candidates for orders are discovered and pressed into the diaconate, and often kept there that the service may be enriched. I myself have

never been impressed with any other voices as I was with the voices of the deacons I heard in a Russian chapel in Geneva. Their deep, rich, mellow, melting tones awakened in me a sense of the beauty of sound, the like to which I had been a stranger before. After an interval of nearly a quarter of a century that sense recurs, and those voices remain for me the standard with which I am forced to compare all other beautiful voices, and in comparison with which every other voice I have ever heard has seemed inferior.

But the whole ancient ceremonial of the Greek rite is carried out with a more imposing dignity than it ever was amongst any other people.

In order to repress superstition the Russian Church has forbidden the use of plastic images; but the grimy Byzantine paintings receive an homage not inferior to that bestowed by the Roman Catholic devotee upon the plastic madonnas of France and Italy. These painted images are, in cases, invested with all the wonder-working powers ever alleged in the west of any image of the plastic sort.

The Russian Church takes note in her worship of a vast number of fast days. These fast days amount to one-third of all the days in the year. Her feast days are as numerous as Sundays; and many of them are preceded by a vigil and are followed by an idle tomorrow. In Protestant countries men have about 310 days in which to labor in each year. In Russia they have 250. Hence in part the economic inferiority of that country. Hence, in part, also the very imperfect Sabbath observances.

These feast days, being sacred to the memory of Saints, the Russian people have been unwilling to change from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar, lest the Saints should be cheated. This on the side.

Reverence for relics and love of pilgrimages have always been characteristic of Russian Christianity. To have visited the Holy Land, to have lighted a candle at the Holy Sepulcher, to have brought back a bottle of water from the Jordan was for a villager to have won a much coveted distinction in all the

circle of his acquaintances. No other country, in modern times, has sent so many pilgrims to the Holy Land as Russia.

(5) *Life of the Russian Orthodox Church.*

Monasticism, of a simple, archaic kind, like the monasticism of the Greek Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, has had a large place. Men became hermits, and later cenobites, not to study nor to do any kind of labor, but to live for the good of their souls and to do penance for the sins of the world. The prevailing rule for the monastic life in Russia is that of St. Basil.

The monasteries of Russia have formed no great federations, but they have been bound together by reverence for the same past. Incidentally they have served as the shelter of letters, founded schools, hospitals and homes for the destitute, and as pioneers in civilization in many Russian wildernesses. During conflicts with the Tartars, the Lithuanians and the Poles some of these monasteries were the main bulwarks of the Russian nationality. Throughout the history of the Church these same monasteries incidentally have furnished most of the learned leaders of the Church—the most of her bishops. In more recent years monasticism has fallen into relative decay and been deprived of much of its at one time vast wealth. The spread of Raskol drew from them many of the most earnest spirits. The Holy Synod has held the monasteries in restrictions unfavorable to a flourishing life. The secular power made it a special object to reduce them “as the strongholds of the old ideas.” Laws were made forbidding a man to take the veil before the age of thirty, and a woman before the age of forty, in order that no one might retire from the world before having discharged his obligation to the State. They were forbidden to write books. Towards the close of the last century there were about 550 convents, containing about 11,000 men and about 18,000 women.

Amongst the monks, however, there are aspiring men, who are monks that they may become bishops and leaders of the Church. Until very recently the ecclesiastical schools were

exclusively under the control of the monks, who spared no pains to attract and keep promising young men. Once they had them, they pushed them rapidly through the offices of rectorship, and soon made them bishops. They became masters of the monks and of the secular, or married, clergy.

The monks without marked capacity lead a monotonous existence, filled out with a round of minute duties. They must keep their monasteries in good condition, attend their church services, and chant the long service of the Greek rite.

In addition to these monastics, there are semi-monastic bands of women—some of them living in communities banded together for their own edification; some to do charitable work in behalf of the poor and the suffering.

The secular clergy have founded a sort of hereditary corporation consecrated to service at the altar. It is an estate of the empire, an outcome of serfdom and the social order generally. The serf being united to the soil could not enter the ranks of the ministry without defrauding his lord. The noble holder of serfs could not enter the ministry—could not unless he renounced his serfs and his class privileges. Under such conditions the secular clergy could be recruited only out of itself. There had to be a class attached to the altar as there was one attached to the glebe. Hence the sons of priests were brought up in the Seminaries, and church positions were reserved for seminarists. As custom made marriage necessary for the priest, wives had to be provided for them, and their daughters had to be looked after. So the daughters of priests were set apart for the young clerics. They could only marry out of the sacerdotal class by special permission. Thus the Russian clergy was forced to become a caste. In compensation for this curtailment of individual liberty it was exempted from military service, from personal taxes, from corporeal punishment.

Shortly after the abolition of serfdom, the church was by law thrown open to all classes, and all careers were thrown open to the children of the clergy, but custom so far has continued for the most part to maintain the caste.

Heredity did not stop at the priestly office; deacons, sacristans, beadles, bell-ringers, were so many separate castes. The priest and the deacons could cross indeed, but the deacon with a fine bass voice was kept a deacon always, and if his children had good voices they were practically shut up to alliances with the children of other deacons.

There were special schools for the clergy, the parish and district schools, Seminaries, and theological academies. The lower clergy stop with the elementary schools, the priests mostly graduate from the academies.

Many of the children of the clergy prepare themselves in these later days for the vocation of teaching in these schools, or in a general way for some other career, as law, or medicine. Many of these sons and daughters of the priests, embittered by the caste restrictions under which they have been brought up, and receiving a raw welcome when they have attempted to cultivate other walks of life, have become restive agitators—some of them Nihilists.

The main plague of the Russian clergy is poverty. To live at all and keep alive wife and children, the average rural priest must himself cultivate, or have cultivated, the fifteen acres of land put at his disposal, and charge fees for all his ministrations—even for confession and communion. They charge for marrying, for baptism, burying. They become mercenary and sordid. Taking advantage of the superstitions of the people, priests receive pay for blessing the people's crops, receive pay for prayers said into a cap which is to be emptied on the head of a woman in parturition. On many other occasions the priests obtrude their services upon their parishioners and must be paid for it.

The Russian priests have done little preaching. "The Russians do not tolerate sermons in their churches, because they wish to listen only to the Word of God, free from human subtlety," said one of them. At the time of Peter the Great the reading of select works of the fathers between the services was recommended. These works were mostly unintelligible to the hearers. In a word, the Orthodox Russian has for centuries

had no religious instructions at all, except in the higher church spheres (by bishops and archimandrites).

Perhaps it should be said that in the very recent past priests have preached against Nihilism.

Like priest, like people. Naturally the masses of Orthodox Russian peasants are both very ignorant and immoral; and, naturally, the more cultured of the higher classes are infidel. "According to the census of 1897 (published in 1905) seventy per cent. of the entire population of the empire (129,000,000) belonged to the National Church (87,000,000)."

SECOND, OF THE SCHISMATICS AND SECTS.

(1) *The Schismatics, or Raskolniki, and Their Divisions.*

The Russian word Raskol, "cleft," means separatist, schismatic, dissenter. It designates those and their descendants who have separated from the Russian Orthodox Church. Cyril and Methodius in the ninth century translated the Bible into the Slavic. The ritual books were translated somewhat later. Owing to lack of knowledge on the part of the translators and transcribers, these Church books were full of mistakes. Again, up to the seventeenth century the parishioners usually elected their priests, and the people had much influence in the administration of church affairs. The patriarch Nikon (1652-58), a man of learning and of imperious will, undertook to revise the ritual books, and to vest the power of appointing priests and administering church affairs exclusively in the bishops. Supported by the Tsar, he succeeded in his reforms; but many priests and parishes refused either to accept the revised books, or to submit to the supreme authority of the bishops and patriarch. Thus the great schism took place. Opposition to the establishment of serfdom and to civil changes in the time of Peter the Great furthered the schism. His innovations were regarded as a sign of the end of the world. He was looked on by many as an Antichrist.

At first the Schismatics differed from the established church, in rites rather than in principles. They called themselves "Old

Believers" in distinction from the Nikonians, or "New Believers." They used the unrevised service books, crossed themselves with two fingers and not with three, they repeated hallelujah only twice; they used seven and not five altar-breads in the Eucharistic service; they used the eight-point cross only; during divine service they turned from left to left, according to the sun, and not from right to left; they attended their own churches only, and regarded all others as impure; they said Isoos, instead of Iisoos; they shaved not their beards, being afraid of spoiling God's image; they never used tobacco; and they never practiced vaccination. In the course of time they have divided many times among themselves, and some of them have greatly modified their religious views.

Russian dissent sprang on occasion thus, of changes in Church ritual and in civil government. It sprang out of the conservatism in regard to ritual forms and to civil government. The forms were corrupt, but the people loved them.

The Schismatics split early into two main branches: The *Popofstsy*, and the *Bezpopofstsy*, or the *Priestly* and the *Priestless*. This division was due to the fact that the bishops to a man had gone with the "New Believers"—The Nikonians—the State Church. Many priests were found amongst the dissenters at first, but when they died there were no bishops to ordain successors. Priests could only be had by taking men who had been ordained as priests in the State Church, and had left it to serve the Schismatics. Of many of these new coming priests suspicion was entertained that they had come for the sake of the loaves and fishes.

The *Popofstsy* were the "Old Believers" who received and used these renegade priests, after they had made them go through a humiliating abjuration of their former adherence to the State Church. After nearly two centuries, they succeeded in establishing through the services of a Bosnian bishop a hierarchy of their own. Many of this branch of "Old Believers" were won back to the State Church in 1800 when permission was given for priests to officiate according to the rite as employed before the time of Nikon's changes. So that at the out-

break of the Revolution Priestly "Old Believers" numbered scarcely a million, counting all their subdivisions.

The *Bezpopoftsy*, who number between two and three millions, are much more radical and have split into many minor sects. When all the priests ordained before the time of Nikon had died, these sectaries would not receive the renegade priests, as did the *Popoftsy*. They declared that the time of Antichrist had come, in which all sacraments except baptism were abrogated. Instead of ordained priests they had only elders and readers, who expounded the Scripture, heard confessions, and baptized, the mode of baptism proving the occasion of many divisions. They observe the fasts of the Russian Church, venerate the pictures of the saints, venerate the relics, eschew sugar, tobacco and certain sorts of food. After the time of Peter the Great they were granted a degree of toleration, so that, in 1738, some of them were willing, for political reasons, to include intercession for the Tsar and his family. This caused a split into the subsect of "Philippians" and "Feodosians," so-called after their leaders, the latter being ready to intercede for the Tsar, and the former unwilling to do it.

The most difficult problem from all the Priestless "Old Believers" was that of marriage. They held that the priest alone can unite two persons in marriage. They went to pieces on the subject. The more practical retained the conjugal relation as a social convention. The more logical erected celibacy into a universal obligation. The majority of the Priestless theologians counted marriage an apostasy, taught that concubinage was preferable to it; that an occasional debauch was still more to be preferred. Kovylin declares: "Better live with a beast than a pretty girl; better have secret commerce with many women than cohabit with one openly."

These teachers felt a horror at their own conclusions. In the effort to justify them they taught that Christ had forsaken the Church. That the end of the world was at hand, that Satan was reigning.

The belief in the reign of Antichrist led many peasants into the maddest freaks. Contact with a world ruled by him was

to be gotten free of at all costs. Some killed their babies that they might be sent thus to heaven and escape the hell here on earth, some strangled the aged and weak. Some sought personal release by suicide, by the knife, by fire, by starvation, et cetera.

The *Philippians*, the more extreme of the Priestless "Old Believers," became the source of a sub-sect, the Pilgrims—tramps—who forsook their homes and families, rejected legal marriage, which the State was forcing upon them, ate no food from the vessels of strangers. A sub-sect of these Pilgrims intentionally postponed their wandering until toward the end of their lives. For this they were the less revered by the Pilgrims of the other branches.

The extremest branch of the Priestless "Old Believers" is that of the Non-prayers. They regard all prayers as an affront to the Holy Ghost, and reduced their creed to three points: The New Testament is a book of allegories, prayer is spiritual only, a pure life is to be lived. They are rationalists out and out.

There have been literally scores of sub-sects of Priestless "Old Believers"—perhaps hundreds.

As to the internal organization of these sects—it has been loose. The members have been bound together more by a common regard for peculiarities of belief and practice and common hardship than by any other one tie. The larger sects have found centers in monasteries which they have founded; for amongst them, as in the State Church, monasticism is influential. The Priestly branch of the "Old Believers" have been bound together, further—some of them by recognition of their new hierarchy (of Austrian source) and adherence to an encyclical letter (of 1863); some by recognition of that hierarchy and rejection of the Encyclical of 1863; and some of them by their determination to get along with renegade priests of the National Church.

The Raskol has, notwithstanding the extremes noticed, strengthened the moral character of a considerable proportion of the dissenters. They stood for what they believed. That stand strengthened the moral fibre. A certain proportion of

them was provoked to read and study. Hence it is that amongst these Raskolniki are some of Russia's most intelligent, prosperous and best citizens. Though opposed by the State throughout their history, the more prominent sects won by degrees a limited toleration. In the Revolution they have shared in the general license.

(2) *Of the Sects Which Did Not Spring From the Great Raskol of the Seventeenth Century.*

(a) Of these may be mentioned, first, the Khlysty, or "Flagellants." They are not separated externally from the Orthodox Church; they frequently appear to be zealous members of it. They teach, however, that God, in 1645, descended on Mount Gorodin, took up his abode in the peasant Daniel Philippov, who chose, as his son, another peasant Ivan Suslov, who chose a mother of God and twelve apostles. Suslov is said to have been twice crucified, to have risen, shown himself to his disciples, and lived till 1716. Since that time the Khlysty have had many Christs. Each member of the sect is expected to endeavor to become a "Christ," or a "Mother of God," by crucifixion of the flesh and prayer. They hold that the essential baptism is that of the spirit, they celebrate the Eucharist with Easter altar-bread and water blessed at Epiphany. Dancing and singing form the principal parts of their worship; they circle around with frantic gestures, the men in the inner rings and the women on the outer, uttering at length incoherent phrases, until utterly exhausted.

The "Jumpers" are regarded by some as a branch of the Khlysty, and are represented as given to obscene practices, holding that every sentiment and every appetite felt in the act of worship is an inspiration of God and is to be gratified, that even incest at such times is not wrong.

(b) The Skoptzi, "Self-castrators," sprang from the Khlysty, about 1770. In opposition to the licentiousness of some of the Khlysty, their founder stressed Matt. 19:12, 18:8, 9. The women of the sect usually have their breasts cut off. They carry on active propagan^da. They make many unwilling con-

verts, very much as ship-masters were once wont to get men to serve on their voyages. The government has tried to suppress them, but they are supposed to number between two and three thousand. These eunuchs are much sought after as bank cashiers.

(c) The Molokans and Dukhobors are sects of a different sort. They are distinguished from the bulk of the Russian people mainly by their contempt for traditional forms of worship. They embody the reactions of reason against the orthodox formalizing of the old faith. They reject the sacraments, scorn ceremonial, a special priesthood and the veneration of icons, and maintain that the only worship of God is in spirit, and that man's heart is the sole temple of God. They demand baptism by the spirit instead of baptism by water; confession to the brethren instead of confession to a priest; and feeding upon Christ's words instead of upon the Eucharist.

The Molokans, or "Milk Drinkers," are mentioned as early as 1765. They claim that the Bible is their sole foundation, but explain it allegorically. Their doctrines are vague and much diversity prevails among them. They do not eat pork. Their congregations meet in private houses, have each an elder and two assistants marked for uprightness. Their worship consists of prayer, singing hymns, reading the Bible and conversing on religious subjects. The English Quakers about 1817 or 1818 found many points of likeness between the Molokans and themselves. In regard to taxes, oaths and military service they seem much alike.

The Dukhobors, while like the Molokans in the respects indicated, allow, on the other hand, only a secondary place to the Bible. They give a wide place to tradition, call man the "living book," teach internal revelation, hold that the Divine Word speaks in every man, and that the internal Word is the eternal Christ. They reject most dogmas, or interpret them allegorically, e. g., the Trinity and Incarnation. They are untutored Hegelians. They deny original sin, but trace an original stain to the soul's fall in a pre-historic state. Some of them identify God with man, make the trinity to be mem-

ory, reason, will; deny eternal life, Paradise and Hell. They wander away from Christianity and make Christ only a virtuous man.

There are many minor, mystic and rationalistic sects, which we will not name.

(d) "The most important of the Russian sects," is that of the Stundists, who arose about 1864, at first in Southern Russia. They originated from devotional "hours," held in the German colony of Rohrbach and visited by Russians. The pious Swabians admitted these Russian visitors into the society of the "friends of God," but exhorted them to remain in the Orthodox Church. The visitors, however, imbibed the Protestant spirit, and seceded from the Church. Their Russian leader adopted Mennonite views, and enjoined a second baptism. Shortly after a second leader arose, denied the necessity of second baptism and rejected certain rites retained by the Russian Baptists. They reformed worship; they confined divine service mostly to singing Psalms and reading the Bible. Any one may comment on the sacred text as the spirit moves him. Hence polemical discussions frequently occur in their meetings. They use the local dialect in their meetings which is conducive to the spread of the sect. Having great contempt for externalities the Orthodox populace was easily excited against them as blasphemers of the Virgin and the saints. While obedient towards civil authorities—good taxpayers, noted for probity, temperance and industry, they utterly refuse all the services of the Orthodox clergy. They hold learning in high esteem. Basing religion on the Bible alone, they are all anxious to be able to read it that they may understand it for themselves. Their growth has been phenomenal. Rationalism, however, develops among them; and the tendency to split. One of their sub-sects, the Malovantzi, are said to resemble the Khlysty.

The teachings of the rationalistic mystic Sutayef deserves mention, because of his own simple and in the main lovable character, and because he was the religious teacher of Tolstoi. He reduces religion to charity.

Russia has a soil fertile of religious vagaries. The people are so ignorant, eighty per cent. being illiterate, so superstitious, so gullible, that the most extravagant tenets can be lodged in many minds. One can easily believe that more than two hundred sub-sects sprang from the seventeenth century Raskol.

The number of Russian Schismatics and Sectarrians may be conjectured to be approximately 8,000,000.

THIRD, THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF ALIEN CREEDS IN RUSSIA.

These are: (1) The Armenian Gregorians, 1,179,241 strong.

The Tsar subordinated this Church to his own rule, got its chief bishop—Catholicos—into his power; and appointed his successors in that high see from one of two candidates nominated by the diocese. He also appointed a synod of bishops and archimandrites at his side. In short, he conformed it largely to the polity of the Russian Church.

(2) The Armenian Catholics, 38,840.

(3) The Roman Catholics claim 11,468,000 in Russia, chiefly in Russian Poland. This Church has lived under varying persecutions.

(4) There were 5,943,332 Lutherans—799,748 in the Consistorial district of St. Petersburg; 454,912 in Moscow; 659,291 in Courland; 1,156,083 in Livonia; 2,620,891 in Finland; 327,845 in Poland in 1897. These churches had received various degrees of toleration up to the time of the Revolution.

(5) The Reformed Church in Russia consists of two considerable bodies—the Synod of Lithuania and the Consistory of Warsaw, and nine other communities controlled by independent "Reformed Sessions." Their powers are limited to marriage, the examination and ordination of pastors, the discipline of their clergy, and the presentation of candidates for approval to the minister of the interior for appointment, under whose jurisdiction they stand. They number about 85,400. They have received freer toleration than that allowed the other creeds mentioned.

(6) There are 66,564 Mennonites.

(7) There are 38,139 Baptists.

(8) Church of England, 4,183.

(9) Other Christians, 3,952.

These statistics are according to the census of 1897, published in 1905.

The larger of the Protestant bodies mentioned are bodies of whose lands Russia had made conquest. The Tsar's government would have converted them to the National Church; but that was not easily done. Accordingly toleration to such a degree as seemed wisest was granted in one decade, advanced or limited in the next decade, according to exigency, or opportunity.

The general characteristics of these several bodies as being well known are omitted in this paper.

FOURTH, THE NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS OF RUSSIA.

(1) These were in 1897:

(a) The Mohammedans, 13,906,972.

(b) The Jews, 5,215,805.

(c) Budhists, 433,863.

(d) Other Non-Christians, 300,000.

(2) Russia has shown herself more friendly toward the Mohammedan than toward the Jew. The government and the Orthodox Church have tried, but with indifferent success, to convert all these cults, Jews, Mohammedans, Budhists and the unnamed heathen. Their success has not been marked. Russia has, perforce, granted partial and limited toleration to all; but she has restricted, in the extreme, the civil rights of the Jew, prevented any but exceptional cases from residing in the interior, prohibited them to buy land, or lease it, to reside in rural districts, restricted them as to school privileges, and in a thousand ways dealt harshly and unwisely with the Jew.

From this review it must appear that Russia is in sad need of New Testament Christianity. Seventy per cent. of her people are in the Russian Orthodox Church; but for the most

part they are as full of superstition, idolatry and formalism as if they had never heard of Christ. Among the Separatists from the Orthodox Church are some worthy people—some very unworthy people—but the most of them are sorely in need of a living apprehension of Christ so far as one can see. The Mohammedans and Jews are far from Christ and hard to reach with the gospel. The Evangelical Churches on the ground are not aggressive, the Stundist excepted. They have lived long under the inhibition to make converts from the State religion.

The present religious condition is a chaos, and a chaos not of unorganized clean elements, but of the morally unclean and ugly, in considerable part. This review has incidentally shown the excess of the Revolution as in character that which was to be expected.

The future of Russian religion depends under God on how the Christian people of the rest of the world, and particularly of America, behave with regard to it now.

A rare opportunity for the extension of the true religion in Russia is now presented. Russia is in her childhood. The evangelist who would live the gospel and teach it faithfully would find a ready hearing, and by the blessing of Christ reap many souls for him.

This opportunity may be let slip, and false philosophies embraced by the rising intelligence of the Russian people, and the time required to disciple her indefinitely prolonged.

Let us hope and labor and pray that God send His Word, vivify it by the spirit of creative grace, and make of that vast people a people whose God is the Lord.