

“ But the prayers are our affair. I beg of you, whoever you may be . . . Catholic, Protestant, Jew, Moslem . . . to join in the four-word aspiration whose repetition will one day make this people free :

‘ Spasitiel Mira, Spasi Rossion.’
‘ Saviour of the World, save Russia.’ ”

At some deep level, deeper than the pain of dereliction among the dispossessed, but as high and exalted as the Cross, is the meeting place where unity can be established across the new divisions of bureaucracy and absentee charity, amid the false relationships between man and man which entangle us. It is only on that framework, or the framework of that unity that the unity of Christendom can begin to arise. But, from the holy common people of God that demands prayer, fasting and penance. Prayer, fasting and penance is their mystical filling up of the restoration of man by Christ, yet more wonderful than the first creation in His image which nothing can finally mar.

PAUL BURROUGH

LOOKING UNTO THE CRUCIFIED LORD

. . . . lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.

I Corinthians 1. 17.

It is already twelve years since the appearance of the book which I wish to take as the starting-point of these considerations; however, this work has not received the attention it deserves from the Orthodox, and from those interested in Orthodoxy. I mean Professor Grondijs's book on the iconography, in the Byzantine Church, of the lifeless Christ on the Cross¹. Although the book is primarily an iconographical study, it opens large perspectives into the realms of liturgy and devotion; it also demonstrates how false and superficial are a number of oft-repeated assertions which have been propagated as Orthodoxy during the last thirty years, in the West; and it provides all Christians with a salutary impetus to return to the essential truths of the apostolic and catholic faith.

In tracing the historical development of the icon of the Crucified, Grondijs demolishes one of the pseudo-orthodox myths: that Byzantium, even in depicting Golgotha, was careful to keep the triumphant aspect of God, as the conqueror of death and wearer of the royal robe, upright upon the Cross; whilst the Latins, on the contrary, were devoted to a tortured Christ in agony, the extreme expression of this type being the hideous deformity of the Spanish Christ. It is true that Byzantine icono-

¹ *L'Iconographie byzantine du Crucifié mort sur la croix*. Bibliotheca Byzantina Bruccellensis, vol. I, 1941, with plates. L. H. Grondijs, who is professor of Byzantine culture at the University of Utrecht, is also the author of the following notable works: *De Sophia-Gedachte in het Russisch Christendom*, Amsterdam, 1932; *De Iconographie van den Duppelen Logos*, Amsterdam, 1934; *Asketen, Hellonen, Barbaren*, the Hague, 1935.

graphy before the eleventh century represents Christ as living and triumphant; but exactly the same thing is true, at the same period, of the Latin west. It is towards the middle of the eleventh century that Christ is first depicted dead upon the Cross. But this departure from previous tradition was made by the Byzantine iconographers (at St. Luke in Phocis, Daphni, etc.), and not by those of the West. Moreover, it was the Latins who criticised the realism and anthropomorphism of these representations. Cardinal Humbert, papal legate at Constantinople in 1054, wrote to the Byzantines: “ How do you come to fasten to Christ's Cross the picture of a dying man? ”¹ It is clear that the representation of Christ as dead or dying was the result, among the Byzantines, of long meditation on the Passion of our Lord. The next step was to depict the blood, or, to be more exact, the fountain of blood flowing from the wounded side of Jesus. Here again the Byzantine artists take the initiative (Daphni, Chemokmedi, Qaranleg Kilsse, St. Mark's in Venice, Greek Gospel No. 7 in Paris, Greek psalter No. 19352 in the British Museum, etc.). The fountain of blood from the wounded side was to become a very important theme of Christian devotion; in the 11th and 12th centuries the Latins move gradually from the contemplation of the side pierced by the spear to that of the Heart wounded with love; and hence it may be said that the cult of the Sacred Heart, in which so many Orthodox see a Latin aberration, is partly based on Byzantine iconography and the dominant interests of the devotion which it expressed.² Until about the middle of the XIIIth century, then, it was Byzantine and not Latin iconography which laid stress on the physical sufferings of Christ. The only Western pictures of this period showing Christ as *dead* on the Cross are copies of Byzantine pictures. It is not until the great Franciscan movement that a new image of the crucified Lord in His anguished humanity takes possession of the West. S. Francis of Assisi, who by means of the Stigmata was made into a living crucifix, clung to the realistic contemplation of Jesus crucified. Many orthodox assert, with an air of finality, that the phenomenon of stigmatisation is entirely foreign to Eastern piety. But what do they make of the curious case of Abba Makarios in the IVth century? He was visited by a cherub, who took the measure of his chest, and said: “ thou shalt be crucified with Christ and bear Him company on the Cross ”; thereupon the cherub “ crucified him on the earth ”.³ Even if this is only a legend, neverthe-

¹ A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, Paderborn, 1930, II, p. 152.

² Without going so far as Fr. Salaville, who finds all the elements of the Roman devotion to the Heart of Jesus in the work of Nicolas Cabasilas, we can admit that what Nicolas has to say about the “ blessed Heart ” of the Saviour and its part in the economy of redemption contains the fundamental principles of this devotion. See Lot-Borodine, *Le Cœur théandrique et son symbolisme dans l'oeuvre de Nicolas Cabasilas, XIV^e siècle*, in *Irenikon*, vol. XIII, pp. 652-673.

³ *Vie de Makarios de Skete*, in the *Annales du Musée Guimet* vol. 25, p. 119.

less we have here, in the context of the desert Fathers, a current of ideas very close to that which finds expression in the stigmatisation of Francis on Mount Alverna.

The Byzantine iconography of the wounded side of our Lord leads Grondijs to study the eucharistic sacrifice according to the Byzantine rite. The use of the *zeon*, or hot water, which the priest mingles with the consecrated wine in the chalice, is closely linked with the piercing of Christ's side. The *zeon* (about which there is an extensive literature) represents both the life-giving warmth of the Holy Spirit and the warmth of the blood flowing from the side of Jesus. These are not two, but one. The Byzantines can depict Christ as *dead* on the Cross without casting doubt upon his victory, because the blood which gushes from his side is still warm, still the blood of a living man, and through the operation of the Holy Spirit, is still life-giving. The communicants, partaking of the chalice which the *zeon* has made warm, drink the blood of the living Christ. After a mystical manner they drink of the blood mingled with water which flowed from the wounded side. The Byzantine liturgical commentators, Cabasilas, Simeon of Thessalonika, Balsamon, lay stress on the fact that this episode of the Passion becomes a present reality, and that the communicants apply their lips to the wound of Christ, drink from this wound itself. Thus Andrew of Crete: "Drink the blood which flowed from the side of the Divine Victim".¹ And Theodore the Studite: "I hymn the Crucifixion and the spear-wound in the side of the divine Saviour. Thence, O Christ, I take each day the elixir of immortality, the wine of sanctification".² And John Chrysostom: "The divine Lamb is slain for you . . . the blood from His spotless side has poured into the chalice . . . and we cannot have our part in the saving Blood unless we touch with our lips the divine and immaculate side".³ And "When we drink his living Blood, which is still hot, and with it the water which flowed from his side, we are washed from all sin and filled with the Spirit, who Himself is warm".⁴

It will be observed how much these passages emphasize the themes of immolation, of the cleansing Blood, and of the pardon obtained for us by the Cross. The same themes are recalled, not only by the words of the Liturgy (which it is unnecessary to quote here) but also by the symbolism, both of the holy things (the prothesis, the altar-tomb, the antimension on which is depicted the death of Christ with the instruments of the Passion, and the icon of the Crucified dominating the altar), and of the actions (the mystical immolation at the *proskomidia* before the

¹ Third canticle, canon of the 4th series for Holy Week.

² Studite *Triodion*, first Wednesday in Lent.

³ Migne, P. G., XLIX, c. 345.

⁴ *Dialexis* against Humbert of Sylva Candida.

Liturgy, the fraction of the 'lamb' before the Communion, and the immersion of the fragments of bread in the chalice). It is true that the Liturgy shows forth Christ in other aspects besides the sacrificial one, but all these aspects are bound up with the sacrifice which constitutes the very heart of the eucharistic oblation; thus the priest, in commemoration of Bethlehem, sets the asterisk or 'star' over the 'lamb' which has already been pierced with the lance—showing in this way that the Child born in the manger is a victim. It is good to remember these things, for the orthodox faithful too often forget that to come to the Liturgy is to take part in the sacrifice of the Cross; too often, moreover, recent writers on orthodoxy, wishing to establish an altogether false antithesis between the Byzantine liturgy and the Latin mass, have underlined the non-sacrificial aspects of the liturgy to such an extent as to obscure its principal meaning. Grondijs writes admirably on this point: "Although modifications do appear as required by the evolution of dogma and the introduction of new ritual practices, one central idea remains unchangeable: that of Christ as priest and victim. However much the liturgy might be enriched with elements taken from the image of the Christ of Bethlehem, of the miraculous Healer, of the risen and glorified Lord, of the Judge at the Last Day, the believer would never cease to identify the central and supreme action of the mystery with the unfolding of the drama of the Passion upon the bloodstained wood of the Cross".¹

From this point Grondijs passes on to make some more general, and very true, remarks about the place of Christ's Passion in Byzantine piety. To those who assert that to concentrate thought upon the Passion is an unorthodox practice, a mediæval or even (crowning horror!) post-Tridentine, Latin deviation, I would commend these few lines: "The anchorites of the Rumanian communities and of Valaamo told me more than once that they must take care not to allow the image of the Christ-child or of the King of glory to appear during their meditation; and that they must admit none but that of Christ on the Cross".² The attitude of these monks shows some exaggeration, but it is very instructive in correcting the erroneous opinion which tends to minimise the rôle of the Cross in Orthodoxy. Finally Grondijs shews acute perception when he writes: "Modern theosophy—especially among the Russians like Khomiakov, Soloviev, Leontiev, Bulgakov, and Bulgarians like Zankov—stresses above all the gentle and pleasant tendencies of the liturgy of eastern Christendom, the brotherhood of all men, the bond of fellowship between all living creatures, the liberating forces of history, the sunlit order of a universe from which

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 64

² *Ibid.*, p. 76.

all shadows are to fade away. After reading such things, one might almost forget that in the older Eastern liturgies, in which the religious life of the various communities reached its highest point, and to this day in the Liturgy of S. John Chrysostom, attention is directed first of all to the crucifixion, and only afterwards to the resurrection".¹

Hitherto I have followed Grondijs more or less closely, and with considerable latitude. Now, closing his book, I should like to follow it up with some thoughts of my own. I want to register alarm at 'Orthodoxy up-to-date', this 'orthodoxy' which is brilliant and attractive, literary and philosophical rather than loyal to the Councils and the Fathers, and in face of which I can only say with Mary at the sepulchre: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him".² The members of our Fellowship must realise beyond all doubt that this 'orthodoxy' is not Orthodoxy. I will try to explain in what respects these modern interpretations are defective.

First of all, many orthodox, and particularly young orthodox, have lost any solid awareness of original sin and its consequences. Let no one say that original sin is a Latin, Augustinian conception, far removed from even the vocabulary of the Greek fathers. Using a variety of names—original stain, corruption, fall, heritage of misery, curse, debt of human kind—the Greek fathers, from Irenæus to John Damascene, unanimously admitted that in Adam the human race established itself in sin and misery, and in the need of salvation. This doctrine was codified by the first canon of the Council of Ephesus, in 431, and is found already fully developed in S. Paul. It is not possible to define the precise nature of Adam's sin; it was certainly a free disobedience, a decision of the human will setting itself up in independence of the divine will, a separation of man from God. Along with the heritage of human nature, Adam's posterity have inherited the effects of the fall; through no fault of their own, the children of Adam are lacking in those gifts which their first parent lost and consequently could not hand down to them; more than this, they have received a human nature which is wounded and enfeebled by what the Latins call 'concupiscence' and the Greeks 'desire'. Baptism itself, which restores us to union with God, does not destroy concupiscence, *i.e.*, the disordered, immoderate attraction of the human will to transient good. Concupiscence is not sin, but it leads man into sin. It is the historical index of the Fall, and its principle of propagation. The primal sin 'unleashed'

¹ Ibid, p. 52. The author evidently takes the word 'theosophy' in the Christian sense which Soloviev gave it, not in the modern occultist sense. I think it is a mistake to mention Bulgakov here. He had a deep awareness of the immolated Lamb. Other names could be substituted for his.

² S. John xx, 13.

concupiscence. The Fathers stress all the wretchedness of this situation.¹ Orthodox young people hear many impressive discourses on man as 'the image of God', and on the beauty of human nature. It is right that these two affirmations should be made. Only it is not made sufficiently clear that the image of God, and human nature, have been distorted; that even baptism itself does not restore the harmony and balance which man enjoyed before the fall; and that we must not apply to our own nature, as it at present exists, expressions which were true of Adam as he came forth from the hands of God. Our young orthodox live in a world where people speak of 'legitimate self-expression' instead of concupiscence; they read works from the pens of 'orthodox' writers in praise of free 'creativity' and 'passion'; obedience to the Father, which for Jesus was the all-important thing, is hardly mentioned, or is treated as an inferior kind of religion.² The first need of modern orthodox youth is to become fully aware, not only of the greatness, but also of the misery of human nature, of the effects of sin, of the fact of concupiscence; our young people need to learn, by the painful way of personal experience, the meaning of repentance, of the humble return of the Prodigal Son; they must renounce all pride, return to the way of spiritual childhood, and cry from a broken heart to the Deliverer who alone can succour.

Because of the weakened belief in original sin (where this belief has not practically disappeared), there has been a blurring of the precise understanding of the mystery of Redemption. Much is said about the Trinity, the Incarnation, Transfiguration, deification—quite rightly so, and it would not be possible to say too much on these themes. But rare are the Orthodox for whom

¹ There is not space to give here all the relevant references. It will be enough to mention that, of the Greek fathers, Origen, Methodius of Olympus, Irenæus, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Julian of Halicarnassus and Severus of Antioch all wrote unambiguously on these questions, as did also Maximus the Confessor, John Damascene, and George Scholarios in the Byzantine middle ages. Scholarios gives an admirable definition of original sin, calling it "the first and common sin, that committed by the first men, and justly laid to the charge of all their posterity" (Homily 23 on the Annunciation, ed. Petit). Dositheus and Moghila in their confessions of faith, the theological views of Pigas and Bulgaris, and in modern times of Mesoloras and Androutsos, all agree in asserting on the one hand man's loss of initial righteousness (original sin) and on the other his positive inclination to evil (concupiscence).

² The following extracts from Berdyaev show the degree to which the scriptural and patristic conception of the divine transcendence and the absolute helplessness of the creature in relation to the Creator has become foreign to one variety of modern 'orthodoxy': "The theological doctrine that God created man for His own glory and praise is degrading to man . . . no power is inherent in God . . . He is not the cause of anything . . . The revelation of God is not a transcendent event . . . nor is it an illumination from without" (*Slavery and Freedom*, pp. 39, 82, 83; *Freedom and the Spirit*, p. 88). The same writer, rejecting the traditional notion of creation, postulates as the foundation of the universe a primordial void, the *Ungrund*, which precedes both Creator and creation, and remains impenetrable to God Himself. As I shall mention Berdyaev more than once, I wish to say how much I respect certain aspects of his character and work; but I could never see in him either a 'prophet' or an authentic interpreter of Christianity.

Jesus Christ crucified occupies the central place given to him by St. Paul. How many of them could say exactly what they mean when they say, in the words of the Nicene Creed, that Christ was "crucified for us"? This should not surprise us, for we find that even among the Orthodox hierarchy and theologians there has intruded a conception of the Atonement, derived from liberal protestantism, according to which the Cross obtains salvation not by the sacrifice of a divine victim, but by the influence of a sublime example.¹ The orthodox doctrine of atonement is not a crude and brutal conception of vengeance or chastisement; but it includes in their full force the ideas of the substitution of the paschal lamb for the sinner, expiation, reparation, satisfaction (each of these ideas filling up what is lacking in that which precedes it). The Passion, which is the fruit of God's utter love, comprises an infinity of suffering; but beyond this material suffering, it establishes at the heart of the mystery the adoration and obedience which this suffering express. Some orthodox are quite mistaken in opposing the 'juridical' and 'penal' Latin concept of salvation to the Greek. For all the brightness of their foreground, the Greek fathers have quite as realistic a concept of salvation.² It is important to hold a truly Orthodox doctrine of Redemption. But the most important thing is that this doctrine should not remain a dead letter, and that throughout our lives we should be possessed and overwhelmed by the words which Pascal attributes to Jesus: "This drop of blood I shed for thee".

An insufficiently realistic conception of the Redemption leads to a general neglect of the centrality of the Cross in the worship and in the daily life of the Orthodox. There are Orthodox who go about announcing gaily—just as there are 'Westerners' who repeat what they say without checking the facts—that the Roman Church preaches chiefly the Passion and the Orthodox Church preaches chiefly the Resurrection. This is a mistake which will not survive a careful examination of the

¹ Metropolitan Antony (Khrapovitsky) of Kiev (d. 1936), who is hailed by the largest group of Russian Orthodox émigrés as the champion of 'true' Orthodoxy, admitted into his catechism and his book on the dogma of the atonement a 'moral' interpretation of the Cross, which tends to destroy the objective reality of the divine sacrifice. This theologian saw orthodoxy through Dostoevsky rather than through the Fathers.

² It is noteworthy that Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa, among others, applied the Pauline categories of expiatory sacrifice to the death of Christ—and these are Fathers who laid great stress on the divinisation of human nature by the Logos. Origen, the 'idealist', wrote long commentaries on the Bible passages about the Suffering Servant, the slain Lamb and the Blood of Jesus. Those who speak of the 'juridical' latin concept of the Atonement should realise that long before St. Anselm, a genuine Oriental, Theodore Abu Qurrah, bishop of Harran in Mesopotamia at the beginning of the ninth century, upheld the most juridical theory of the Redemption that it is possible to imagine.

sources.¹ Moreover, the practical consequences of this mistaken attitude are deplorable. There is a desire to obtain, like the hesychasts, the vision of the "uncreated light", or feel, like Serafim of Sarov, the "warmth of the Holy Spirit"² or to dwell in the sweetness of Easter-night, without the prerequisite sacrifice of self-will to the will of God. We forget that Good Friday is the necessary precursor of Easter, and that although the Apostles were admitted into the joy of their Lord without having undergone his Passion, this was in order that the power of the Resurrection might enable them later, each in his own hour, to face martyrdom. We forget that for man on this earth, the glory of the Transfiguration is an exceptional grace and a momentary consolation, and that our normal state as Christians is to be following after Jesus, carrying our cross, which is a sharing in His Cross. But who ever mentions this sharing in Christ's cross to our young Orthodox? Does anyone tell them that, being members of Christ, crucified with Him, they may be partners in His work of redemption? Does anyone expound to them the wonderful word of S. Paul: "I . . . fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake"³ If we had a deep awareness of the significance of the bleeding body of the immolated Christ, this bleeding body would form a barrier between ourselves and all the desires and pleasures which are only of this world. One who believes that Jesus died for him, and who 'lays hold on' this salvation cannot live like those who are completely unaware of it.⁴

¹ The worship of the Cross (and therefore meditation on it) is more developed in the Byzantine than in the Latin rite: e.g., three yearly feasts of the Cross, its daily mention in the sixth and ninth Hours, its mention, twice a week, in the dismissal blessings, the kissing of the cross after the Liturgy, the hymns of the *Oktoekos* and the *Parakletike*, the texts of Passion week. "Grant me to cling to thy side" sings Romanus the Hymnographer. We appropriate "the holy wounds, the bruises and the death of Christ", writes Cabasilas. Notice, even in the rites of marriage, the invocation of the martyrs and the crown which means, not joy, but martyrdom.

² Emphasis is often laid on the 'pentecostal' aspect of Serafim's sanctity, and on the fact that he addressed those who came to speak with him as 'my joy'. But we must not forget that he laid terrible austerities upon himself, that he often wore a heavy iron cross on his back, that every Friday he read the office of the Cross, and that among his sayings have been preserved these: "Plead with the Lord with tears, that He visit thee. . . . All the saints have wept, all their lives". We must also remember that Tikhon Zadonsky, that other great Russian saint, had a vivid and almost palpable awareness of the Crucifixion.

³ Colossians i, 24.

⁴ "Were you there when they crucified my Lord?" as one of the most touching negro spirituals has it. I earnestly recommend Orthodox who are in contact with England to ponder over the hymn "When I survey the wondrous Cross".

Among young Orthodox in the West, it is fashionable to take an interest in mysticism; but very little is said of asceticism. It is in matters concerning sex relations that the deplorable collapse of the orthodox conscience is most clearly apparent. The teaching of the Fathers on sex life, on continence, marriage and divorce, is generally disregarded by the faithful, sometimes even attacked by 'orthodox' writers.¹ The great doctrine of the nuptial relationship of the soul with Christ, which is so integral

¹ It is of paramount importance to be accurately informed as to the scriptural and patristic tradition in these matters. Four points will suffice to summarise it. First, sex itself, as created by God, is wholly good. Secondly, since the Fall it seldom happens that sex is used as it should be, under the divine guidance and control; it is closely allied to concupiscence (though it is not the same thing) and operates as the means whereby concupiscence is passed on. Owing to the force of desire, sexual activity involves, for most of mankind, a great overthrow, an overturning, an inner catastrophe, a predominance of the flesh over the logos. Thirdly the object of the sex instinct, according to the will of God, is marriage. This ought to be a common sexual and spiritual life in Christ, a copy, to some extent, of the Incarnation. Such is the lofty ideal set forth by St. Paul. The primary aim of this marriage in Christ is the procreation of children for the kingdom of God; this aim excludes contraception, the elimination of the unfit, and the sacrifice of the unborn child's life to spare the mother. In the divine intention the marriage tie cannot be broken without very grave sin. The Orthodox Church, as the words of her ritual demonstrate, looks upon second or third marriage as a concession to human frailty, and does not rejoice to celebrate either. It is obvious that the majority of so-called 'Christian' marriages, founded on concupiscence, are far removed from the true Christian idea of marriage. Fourthly, the Orthodox Church, in agreement with the Church of Rome, esteems virginity, and continence for Christ's sake, more highly than marriage. The Church repeats St. Paul's words on this subject (1 Cor. vii, 28, 32, 38), and first of all the words of the Saviour himself about those who have made themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake: "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it" (Matt. xix, 12). From the time of the condemnation of Jovinian's heresies, in the fourth century, the Church declared herself against the opinion which holds that continence and marriage are two vocations of equal value. On this point the Orthodox Church is in irreconcilable opposition to Luther, Calvin and Cranmer. It is true that perfection consists neither in continence nor in marriage, and the mother of a family may be much more perfect than a monk. But, given the fact of concupiscence, the Church considers that as a means towards perfection, continence is usually the more certain way. All this is foolishness to the modern and 'progressive' mind—the foolishness, indeed, of the Cross. Now let us see what Berdyaev has to say about the patristic (and Pauline) conception of marriage: "It is remarkable that the Christian writers and Fathers of the Church failed to observe the phenomenon of love and said nothing interesting about its meaning... the treatise of St. Augustine is so bourgeois and conventional in spirit that it scarcely bears reading... the prohibition of divorce is based upon a legalistic interpretation of Christianity... The doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage and the prohibition of divorce are social conventions which have no relation to the inner life of personality... Christian theology which reflects the herd mind denies love and ignores it" (*The Destiny of Man*, pp. 295, 297, 305). There are two conceptions of love, between which the choice lies: one is found in the legend of Tristan and Isolde and the other in the Epistle to the Ephesians. 'Romantic' love, which Berdyaev praises and which bears fruit unto death, is the terrible union of the Prince of this world with the tempted soul, a parody of the union between the Saviour and the redeemed soul. This illusory union is exactly described in the 38th of the *Odes of Solomon*: "They resemble the Beloved and his Bride, and they lead astray and corrupt the world; and they invite many to the banquet and give them to drink of the wine of their intoxication".

to Christian virginity, is unknown, or even sometimes derided.¹ Implicitly, and even explicitly, a kind of primacy is claimed for Eros over what is called 'legalism'; passion, the 'erotic ecstasy', is its own justification.

It was not in this sense that the Fathers spoke. Ignatius of Antioch wrote to the Romans: "My Eros is crucified". Whether he meant by this that he had nailed the desires of his own flesh to the Saviour's cross, or that Jesus crucified was his highest love, in either case he was proclaiming that in the Christian life there is no place for Eros unless it be crucified. The crucifixion of Eros: here is a subject which I should like to suggest for the Fellowship's conferences. The words of Ignatius, moreover, are a summary of a sentence of St. Paul which the Orthodox Church could only relinquish on pain of ceasing to be Orthodox: "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified".²

ARCHIMANDRITE LEV

¹ It is often asserted that nuptial symbolism is peculiar to the Latins and alien to the spirit of Orthodoxy. But this symbolism (apart from Hosea and Paul) began in the East, with Origen's homilies on the Song of Songs. Every night the Orthodox Church sings: "The Bridegroom comes... let Christ grant entrance into the nuptial chamber". St. Macrina is introduced into it by the divine Husband (Troparian). The highest expression of this idea is to be found in these words of the *Banquet of the Ten Virgins* by Methodius of Olympus: "leaving marriage and the beds of mortals and my golden home for thee, O King, I have come in undefiled robes in order that I might enter within thy happy bridal chamber. I keep myself pure for thee, O Bridegroom, and holding a torch I go to meet thee." This admirable hymn is thus commented upon by Berdyaev: "The treatise of St. Methodius of Pathara (*sic*), *The Feast of the Ten Virgins*, is pitiful in its banality" (*Destiny of Man*, p. 295). There is a link between the Cross and those who embrace virginity or continence. Continence ought not to be a negation or privation, but a positive gift, a willing immolation and offering, a betrothal with Christ. Methodius writes: "The virgins bind themselves to a kind of perpetual martyrdom". If they break their vow, they become adulterous towards Jesus. See G. Chavasse's excellent study, *The Bride of Christ. An Enquiry into the Nuptial Element in Early Christianity*, 1939).

² 1 Cor. ii, 2.

REVIEWS

THE REINTEGRATION OF THE CHURCH*

There are very few Anglicans born this side 1900 who do not in some way associate the name of Nicolas Zernov with the very beginnings of their interest in the Eastern Orthodox Church. We may be exasperated: we may deplore a good half of what he says as misleading: we may think it vitally important that he should be followed up by other exponents of Orthodoxy, and that the Fellowship should not be too closely identified with his statements and policies. But in devoted labour, and as a propagandist, we must recognize that he has been unequalled. And our debt of gratitude and of affection remains. Those of us who for many years have been concerned to see that other views are given

* *The Reintegration of the Church*, by Nicolas Zernov (S.C.M. Press, 7/6).