A NEW BOOK

By H. Kontzevitch

Price: $3.00

SCHEMA-ABBESS SOPHIA
& the Catacomb Epistles of
Bishop Damascene. In Russian.

ST. ELIAS PUBLICATIONS
P. O. Box 2641, Forestville, Cal. 95436

THE ORTHODOX WORD

January - February, 1976 Ninety Cents

METROPOLITAN PHILARET
of New York

THE ORTHODOX WORD

A Bimonthly Periodical

OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF
SAINT HERMAN OF ALASKA

Established with the blessing of His Eminence the late *John* (*Maximovitch*), Archbishop of Western America and San Francisco, Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia

PLATINA, CALIFORNIA 96076

1976, Vol. 12, no. 1 (66)
January - February

ISSN 0030-5839

CONTENTS

MICROFILM copies of all back issues and of individual articles are available from Xerox University Microfilms, 300 N. Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI., 48106.

Published bimonthly by The Saint Herman of Alaska Brotherhood. Second-class postage paid at Platina, California. Yearly subscription $5, two years $9, three years $12. Office of Publication: Beegum Gorge Road, Platina, California.

All inquiries should be directed to:
THE ORTHODOX WORD, PLATINA, CALIFORNIA, 96076, U.S.A.

OUR LIVING LINKS
WITH THE HOLY FATHERS

METROPOLITAN PHILARET *of New York*

AMONG THE PRIMATES of the Orthodox Churches today, there is only one from whom is always expected — and not only by members of his own Church, but by very many in a number of other Orthodox Churches as well — the clear voice of Orthodox righteousness and truth and conscience, untainted by political considerations or calculations of any kind. The voice of Metropolitan Philaret of New York, Chief Hierarch of the Russian Church Outside of Russia, is the only fully *Orthodox* voice among all the Orthodox primates. In this he is like to the Holy Fathers of ancient times, who placed purity of Orthodoxy above all else, and he stands in the midst of today's confused religious world as a solitary champion of Orthodoxy in the spirit of the Ecumenical Councils.

The chief heresy of our age, ecumenism, against which the voice of Metr. Philaret has been directed, is by no means an easy one to define or combat. In its "pure" form — the declaration that the Church of Christ does not exist in fact but is only now being formed — it is preached by very few among those who call themselves Orthodox. Most often it is manifested by anti-canonical acts, especially of communion in prayer with heretics, which reveal the absence of an awareness of what the Church of Christ is and what it means to belong to her. But no one anti-canonical act in itself is sufficient to define a heresy;and therefore it is the greatness of Metr. Philaret at this critical hour of the Church's history that, without insisting pharisaically on any one letter of the Church's law, and without twisting to the slightest degree the words of any ecumenist hierarch in order to "prove he's a heretic" — he has grasped the heretical, anti-Orthodox *spirit* behind all the ecumenist acts and pronouncements of our day and boldly warned the Orthodox hierarchs and flock about the present danger of them and their future ruinous outcome. It is most unfortunate that too few

T D

Orthodox Christians today have yet grasped full import of his message to the Orthodox Churches — lack of understanding that has come both from the "left" side and from the "r Right."

On the "left" side Met. Philaret is senselessly regarded as a "fanatic" and is accused of a number of extreme views which he has never expressed or held. His voice of true Orthodox moderation and sobriety is reviled and slandered by those — one must strongly suspect — whose conscience, weakened by compromise and openness to modernist renovationism, is not clean. To such ones the bold voice of Metr. Philaret ruins the harmony and accord by which most of the other Orthodox Churches are proceeding to their dreamed-of "Eighth Ecumenical Council," at which renovationism will become the "canonical" norm and the Unia with Rome and the other Western heresies will become the official "Orthodox" position.

But no less on the "right" side is the position of Metr. Philaret misunderstood and even condemned. There are those who, in their "zeal not according to knowledge" (Rom. 10:2), wish to make everything absolutely "simple" and "black or white." They would wish him and his Synod to declare invalid the Mysteries of new calendarists or Communist-dominated Churches, not realizing that it is not the business of the Synod to make decrees on such a sensitive and complex question, and that the church disturbances of our time are far too deep and complicated to be solved solely by breaking communion or applying anathemas, which — save in the few specific instances where they might be applicable — only make the church disturbances worse. Some few even think to solve the tragic situation of Orthodoxy today with the declaration, "We are the only pure ones left," and then abuse those who take a stand of true Orthodox moderation with a most un-Orthodox mechanistic logic ("If they have grace, why don't you join them or receive communion from them?" At various times the Russian Church Outside of Russia has avoided or discouraged communion with several other Orthodox bodies, and with one in particular (the Moscow Patriarchate) it has no communion at all, on grounds of principle; and separate hierarchs have warned against contact with the "modernist" bodies; but this is not because of any legalistic definition of the lack of grace-giving Sacraments in such bodies, but because of pastoral considerations which are respected and obeyed by all true sons of the Church without any need for a merely "logical" justification.

The Orthodox stand of Metropolitan Philaret is rooted in his experience from childhood of the age-old Orthodox way of life. His family was devout;

his father (Archbishop Dimitry) knew St. John of Kronstadt and in the Diaspora was a hierarch in the Far East. In his formative years in the Far East, Metr Philaret was in contact with holy men: Bishop Jonah, a wonderworker and disciple of Optina Elder Barsanuphius; the clairvoyant elders of the Kazan Monastery in Harbin, Michael and Ignatius (the latter of whom he buried); Abbess Rufina, whose convent was transformed by its numerous miraculously-renewed icons; and he had clearly before him the example of a number of holy hierarchs, including Metropolitan Innocent of Peking, champion of the Old Calendar, the wonderworking bishops of Shanghai, Simon and John (Maximovitch), and Metropolitan Meletius of Harbin. His love for holy men and champions of Orthodoxy in the past is evident in the fact that he took a leading part in the publication of the Lives of "Standers for Orthodox Faith" such as Elders Ambrose and Macarius of Optina, writing in addition an excellent introduction to the Life of Elder Ambrose. In all this, and in his uncompromising stand for true Orthodoxy, he is very like his namesake in 19th-century Russia, Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, the champion of Patristic Orthodoxy against the anti-Orthodox influences coming from the West, and the protector of Optina Monastery and its elders.

For over ten years now the voice of Metropolitan Philaret has resounded unwearyingly in a succession of letters of protest and warning to Orthodox hierarchs, particularly of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and in two "Sorrowful Epistles" addressed to the world-wide Orthodox episcopate. The present letter is a kind of third sorrowful epistle to all the Orthodox bishops, occasioned by the first Orthodox-ecumenist "confession," which makes much more definite the errors which had been perhaps only "tendencies" up to now. It should be noted that, despite the shocking lack of response by Orthodox hierarchs to his earlier "Sorrowful Epistles," the present epistle is still addressed to "the Orthodox hierarchs," "the hierarchs of God," letting them know that it is the least of their brothers who is addressing them, not in order to call them names or make a public spectacle of them, but in order *to call them back to Orthodoxy* before they have departed from it entirely, without any hope of return. It should also be noted that there is no trace whatever of the lightmindedness and mockery which mar some of the otherwise welcome anti-ecumenist writings of our day, especially in the English language. This is a document of the utmost seriousness, a humble yet firm entreaty to abandon a ruinous path of error, a document whose solemn tone exactly matches the gravity of its content, proceeding from the age-old wisdom and experience of Patristic Orthodoxy in standing in the truth and opposing error. May it be read and its message heeded!

"*The* THYATEIRA CONFESSION"

By Metropolitan Philaret

CHIEF HIERARCH OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH OUTSIDE OF RUSSIA

AN APPEAL TO THE PRIMATES OF THE HOLY CHURCHES OF GOD, AND THEIR EMINENCES THE ORTHODOX HIERARCHS*

INSTRUCTING US to preserve firmly in everything the Orthodox Faith which has been commanded us, the Holy Apostle Paul wrote to the Galatians: *But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema* (Gal. 1:8). His disciple Timothy he taught to remain in that in which he had been instructed by him and in that which had been entrusted to him, knowing by whom he had been instructed (II Tim. 3:14). This is a pointer which every Hierarch of the Orthodox Church must follow and to which he is obligated by the oath given by him at his consecration. The Apostle writes that a Hierarch should be one *holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convict the gainsayers* (Titus 1:9).

At the present time of universal wavering, disturbance of minds and corruption, it is especially demanded of us that we should confess the true teaching of the Church no matter what might be the person of those who listen and despite the unbelief which surrounds us. If for the sake of adaptation to the errors of this age we shall be silent about the truth or give a corrupt teaching in the name of pleasing this world, then we would actually be giving to those who seek the truth a stone in place of bread. The higher is the standing of one who acts in this way, the greater the scandal that is produced by him, and the more serious can be the consequences.

For this reason a great sorrow has been evoked in us by the reading of the so-called "Thyateira Confession," which was recently published in Europe with the special blessing and approval of the Holy Synod and the Patriarch of the Church of Constantinople.**

We know that the author of this book, His Eminence Metropolitan Athenagoras of Thyateira, previously has shown himself to be a defender of Orthodox truth, and therefore all the less could we have expected from him such a confession, which is far removed from Orthodoxy. However, if this had been only a personal expression of his, we would not have written about it. We are moved to do this, rather, because on his work there rests the seal of approval of the whole Church of Constantinople in the person of Patriarch Demetrius and his Synod. In a special Patriarchal Protocol addressed to Metropolitan Athenagoras it is stated that his work was examined by a special Synodical Committee. After approval of it by this Committee, the Patriarch, in accordance with the decree of the Synod, gave his blessing for the publication of

---

* Translated from the Russian text in Orthodox Russia, 1976, no. 2, pages 1-3.

** "The Thyateira Confession, or The Faith and Prayer of Orthodox Christians," by His Eminence Athenagoras Kokkinakis, Archbishop of Thyateira and Great Britain. Published with the Blessing and Authorisation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, The Faith Press, 1975.

"this excellent work," as he writes. Therefore, the responsibility for this work is transferred from Metropolitan Athenagoras now to the whole hierarchy of Constantinople.

Our previous "Sorrowful Epistles" have already expressed the grief which takes possession of us when, from the throne of Sts. Proclus, John Chrysostom, Tarasius, Photius, and many other Holy Fathers we hear a teaching which without doubt they would have condemned and given over to anathema.

It is painful to write this. How we would have wished to hear from the throne of the Church of Constantinople, which gave birth to our Russian Church, a message of the Church's righteousness and of confession of the truth in the spirit of her great hierarchs! With what joy we would have accepted such a message and transmitted it for the instruction of our pious flock! But on the contrary, a great grief is evoked in us by the necessity to warn our flock that from this one-time fount of Orthodox confession there now comes forth a message of corruption that causes scandal.

If one turns to the "Thyateira Confession" itself, alas, there are so many internal contradictions and un-Orthodox thoughts there that in order to enumerate them we would have to write a whole book. We presume that there is no need to do this. It is sufficient for us to point out the chief thing, that upon which is built and from whence proceeds the whole of the un-Orthodox thought which is contained in this confession.

Metropolitan Athenagoras in one place (p. 60) writes, with full justification, that Orthodox Christians believe that their Church is the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church and transmits the fullness of Catholic truth. He likewise acknowledges that the other confessions have not preserved this fullness. But later he as it were forgets that if any teaching departs in any respect from the truth, by this very fact it is false. Belonging to a religious communion which confesses such a teaching, people by this are already separated from the one true Church. Metropolitan Athenagoras is ready to acknowledge this with regard to such ancient heretics as the Arians, but when speaking about his contemporaries he does not wish to take their heresy into consideration. And with regard to them he calls us to be guided not by ancient tradition and canons, but by the "new understanding which prevails today among Christians" (p. 12) and by "the signs of our time" (p. 11).

Is this in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Fathers? Let us re call that the first Canon of the Seventh Ecumenical Council gives us a completely different criterion for the direction of our church thought and church

life. "For those who have received the priestly dignity," it is stated there, "the canons and decrees which have been set down serve for witness and guidance." And further: "The Divine canons we accept with pleasure and hold entirely and unwaveringly the decrees of these canons which have been set forth by the all-praised Apostles, the holy trumpets of the Spirit, and by the Six Holy Ecumenical Councils, and by those who have gathered in various places for the publication of such commandments, and by our Holy Fathers. For all of these, being enlightened by one and the same Spirit, have decreed what is profitable."

In defiance of this principle, in the "Thyateira Confession" emphasis is made the whole time on the "new understanding." "Christian people, "it says there, "now visit churches and pray with other Christians of various traditions with whom they were forbidden in the past to associate, for they were called heretics" (p. 12).

But who was it that previously forbade these prayers? Was it not the Sacred Scripture, not the Holy Fathers, not the Ecumenical Councils? And is the matter really one of those who were only *called* heretics and were not such in actual fact? The first Canon of Basil the Great gives a clear definition of the naming of heretics: "They (that is, the Holy Fathers) have called heretics those who have completely broken away and have become aliens in faith itself." Does this really not refer to those Western confessions that have fallen away from the Orthodox Church?

The Holy Apostle Paul instructs us: *A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject* (Tit. 3:10), while the "Thyateira Confession" calls us to a religious coming together and communion in prayer with them.

The 45th Canon of the Holy Apostles commands: "Let a bishop, presbyter, or deacon who has only prayed with heretics be suspended." The 64th Canon of the Apostles and the 33rd Canon of the Council of Laodicea speak of the same thing. The 32nd Canon of the latter prohibits receiving a blessing from heretics. The "Thyateira Confession," on the contrary, calls to prayer together with them and goes so far that it even allows Orthodox Christians both to receive communion from them and to give it to them.

Metropolitan Athenagoras himself gives the information that in the Anglican Confession a large part of the bishops and believers do not acknowledge either the grace of the hierarchy, nor the sanctity of the Ecumenical Councils, nor the transformation of the Gifts at the Liturgy, nor other Mysteries, nor the veneration of holy relics. The author of the "Confession" himself points to those articles of the "Anglican Confession" in which this is expressed. And

yet, disdaining all this, he allows Orthodox Christians to receive communion from Anglicans and Catholics and finds it possible to give them communion in the Orthodox Church.

Upon what is such a practice based? On the teaching of the Holy Fathers? On the canons? No. The only basis for this is the fact that such a lawless thing has already been done and that there exists a "friendship" which has been manifested by the Anglicans for the Orthodox.

However, no matter what position might be occupied by one who allows an act forbidden by the canons, and no matter what kind of friendship might be the cause which has inspired this — this cannot be a justification for a practice condemned by the canons. What answer will be given to the Heavenly Judge by the hierarchs who advise their spiritual children to receive, in place of true communion, that which often the very ones who give it do not acknowledge as the Body and Blood of Christ?

Such a lawless thing proceeds from the completely heretical, Protestant, or — to express oneself in contemporary language — ecumenical teaching of the "Thyateira Confession" regarding the Holy Church. It sees no boundaries in the Church. "The Holy Spirit," we read there, "is active both within the Church and outside the Church. For this reason its limits are ever extended and its bounds are nowhere. The Church has a door but no walls" (p. 77). But if the Spirit of God acts alike both within the Church and outside it, why then was it necessary for the Saviour to come to earth and found it?

The care for the preservation and confession of the authenitc truth, a care which has been handed down to us by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Holy Apostles and Holy Fathers, turns out to be superfluous in this conception. Although the "Confession" does say on page 60 that the Orthodox Church can "rightly claim at this moment of history to be the One Church that Christ the Son of God founded upon earth," it does not see any necessity for the inviolate preservation of her faith, allowing thereby the co-existence of truth and error.

Despite the words of the Apostle, that Christ has presented her to Himself as *a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing* (Eph 5:27), the "Thyateira Confession" presents the Church as uniting in herself both truth and that which it itself acknowledges as apostasy from it, that is, heresy, although the latter expression is not used here. The refutation of such a teaching was clearly expressed in the renowned Epistle of the Eastern Patriarchs on the Orthodox Faith: "We undoubtingly confess, as firm truth, that the Catholic Church cannot err or go astray, and utter falsehood in place of truth: for the Holy Spirit, always active through the Fathers and teachers of the

Church who faithfully serve her, preserves her from every error" (Sect. 12).

Submitting to the new dogma of pleasing the times, the author of the "Thyateira Confession" clearly forgets the instruction of the Saviour that if your brother *neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican* (Matt. 18:17), and the same instruction of the Apostle: *A heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject* (Tit. 3:10).

Therefore, with great sorrow we must acknowledge that in the so-called "Thyateira Confession" there has resounded from Constantinople not the voice of Orthodox truth, but rather the voice of the ever more widespread error of ecumenism.

But what will be done now by those whom *the Holy Spirit hath made overseers, to shepherd the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood* (Acts 20:28)? Will this false teaching, officially proclaimed in the name of the whole Church of Constantinople, remain without protests by the Hierarchs of God? Will there be further, in the expression or St. Gregory the Theologian, the betrayal of truth by silence?

Being the youngest of those who preside over the Churches, we had wished to hear the voices of our elders before speaking out ourselves. But up to now this voice has not been heard. If they have not yet become acquainted with the content of the "Thyateira Confession," we entreat them to read it attentively and not to leave it without condemnation.

It is frightful that there might be referred to us the words of the Lord to the Church of Laodicea: *I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of My mouth* (Apoc. 3:15-16).

We now warn our flock and call out to our fellow brethren, to their faith in the Church, to their awareness of our common responsibility for our flock before the Heavenly Chief Shepherd. We entreat them not to disdain our announcement, lest a manifest mutilation of Orthodox teaching remain without accusation and condemnation. Its broad distribution has moved us to inform the whole Church of our grief. We would wish to hope that our cry will be heard.

President of the Synod of Bishops of the
Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia
† Metropolitan Philaret

December 6|19, 1975
Day of St. Nicholas, Wonderworker
of Myra in Lycia

The Life and Ascetic Labors of Our Father, Elder Paisius, Archimandrite of the Holy Moldavian Monasteries of Niamets and Sekoul. Part Seventeen.

THE LAST YEARS OF THE GREAT ELDER

70A. His Ordination as Archimandrite**

As we thus dwelled in the monastery of Niamets, behold, there arose a frightful storm and mortal fear: again a fierce war broke out between three Empires: the Russian, Austrian, and Turkish. The cities and villages of Moldavia were deserted, for the people all fled into the mountains and forests, wherever they could hide from the Turkish rage. And when, after a little time, the German army came to the foothills of Moldavia and disposed themselves there, all the people returned to their homes. But soon the Turks gathered their forces and drove the Austrians back. The village of Niamets, near the monastery, was occupied by the Turks, who entered it without firing a shot. The Elder and the nobles went to Sekoul, and the other inhabitants of the monastery fled into the forests. This was in the second week of the Great Fast, in the year 1790. Finally, the Austrians again drove back the Turks,* and then the Russian army entered Moldavia, and Prince Potemkin (head of the Russian army) and Archbishop Ambrose,† who was with him, entered the city of Jassy; and immediately the Turkish rage disappeared.

This Archbishop, when he came to Jassy, heard of our blessed Father and his community and had the desire to see him with his own eyes. He expressed this desire to the Higher Authority, and having obtained permission, he came to the monastery of Niamets; and our Elder received him with great honor and reverence. Having rested from the journey and spent two days with our Father in spiritual conversations, on Sunday he served in the Catholicon the Divine Liturgy and raised the Elder to the rank of Archimandrite.

** §68 in the Slavonic original.

* C. I, pp. 130-131 (4 1|2 sentences to here).

† See portrait opposite.

ARCHBISHOP AMBROSE
†1792, September 13

A friend of the pious General Gregory Potemkin, he raised Blessed Paisius to the rank of Archimandrite, buried Potemkin, and himself was buried in Paisius' native Poltava, in the Holy Cross Monastery which was built by Blessed Paisius' godfather.

The Poltava Monastery of the Cross, rebuilt after the battle of Poltava by Paisius' godfather, V. V. Kochubei; the burial place of Archbp. Ambrose

The historic old Church of the Saviour in Poltava, just as it looked during Paisius' childhood; here Tsar Peter prayed after the victory of Poltava (1709)

He remained in the monastery yet two days more, and then, having given peace and blessing to all, he departed rejoicing, being accompanied with great honor and love by the whole community.

The Elder, having received, even if he did not desire it, the rank of Archimandrite, did not receive together with it any thought whatever of the glory of this world, nor did he change in the slightest way his attitude and his humility of wisdom for the pride of life, which thing he whom Christ leaned on accused, saying: *Love not the world, nor the things which are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world is the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, which is not of the Father, but is of the world* (I John 2:15). Our Father, following his Lord in humility of wisdom and in burning love toward Him and his neighbor, and with careful keeping of all His commandments, was unharmed by this rank and honor, but remained just the same as he had been until then, in deed and word and thought; and so he remained even until his death.

71. The gifts of the Elder.

AND SO, him whom God has chosen, the same has He raised to the heights of Divine understanding, and after much labor did He enlighten his mind to the knowledge of all the Divine Scriptures. Likewise, He adorned him with all Divine gifts; and we, who have seen him with our own eyes and heard with our own ears that which was in him, bear true witness of this.

1. In him the *Hypostatic Wisdom,* together with His Unoriginate Father and the Most Holy Spirit, dwelt as in a most pure dwelling; because of this there flowed from his lips a mellifluent fount of Divine teachings, delighting souls and consuming evil passions.

2. In him was a *Divine understanding,* whereby he rightly understood, and firmly defended with all his soul, and kept unharmed as the apple of his eye, the dogmas of our Orthodox Faith, which are the holy Symbol [the Creed]; likewise the traditions, commandments, interdictions and promises of the Gospel; also the canons of the Holy Apostles and all the holy Ecumenical Councils and the great Church teachers and hierarchs, and the interpretations of them; and the teachings and instructions of our holy and God-bearing Fathers.

3. In him was *counsel,* by which he gave instruction rightly and truly, according to the teaching and instruction of our holy and God-bearing Fathers, to all who asked it of him; and those who received it with faith, and walked

in the doing of God's commandments and in his teaching and counsel, prospered in humility and patience and love.

4. In him was *firmness*, by which he remained firm in faith and love and hope in God's Providence in all sorrows and temptations.

5. In him was the *fear of God,* by which he kept God's commandments as the apple of his eye and was ready to lay down his life for the least commandment, teaching us the same.

6. In him was a *fiery love,* by which he loved the Lord with his whole soul from his youth, and which, prospering, became more and more inflamed and was poured out equally on all those near him. Warming everyone with his love and zeal, and being painfully concerned for each, compassionate toward all, he embraced with his soul especially his spiritual children; but he did not turn away any man who came to him and entreated mercy, whether of soul or body, and he sent no one away empty-handed.

7. He always had *peace* with everyone, never being grieved against anyone or disdaining anyone, even if he might suffer from someone; and thus also he taught us about peace.

8. *Longsuffering* in him was joined into one with *meekness*, the two being as it were grown together. Never was there to be seen in him anger or disturbance, even for a transgression of God's commandments, but only meekness and patience: he reproached and forbade with meekness, chastising and instructing with love, showing mercy and longsuffering with hope in the correction of those who sinned.

There was in him a childlike *simplicity and lack of malice;* his mind and understanding were Divine and high, but childlike.

10. His *humility of wisdom* was great, and known to God alone. For our blessed Father imitated our holy and God-bearing Fathers by spiritual struggles and labors which were above nature. Having stood unto blood from his youth against the passions for the love of God, he despised everything which is of this world — family, glory and wealth — according to the words of the Lord, and he did not spare his own soul; but he came to love the narrow and most sorrowful path of the Gospel. Wherefore also the Lord by His grace subjected to him and granted him to trample under his feet anger and lust and all the evil passions of soul and body. And when he had come to a perfect man, He adorned him also with all the above-mentioned spiritual gifts.

Next: The Death of Blessed Paisius.

The Life of Saint Gregory of Tours

By ABBOT ODO

8. He is Healed by St. Martin

AMONG THESE EXEMPLARS in whose midst, as we have just said, Christ shines forth as on mountain peaks, he had noticed the glorious lord Martin, who surpasses the others like an Olympus, and being closer to the fires of the upper air, reflects the stars themselves with greater brilliance: Martin, for whose veneration the whole world rightly conspires, and towards whom Gregory aspired with an ardent desire. Constantly bearing him both in his heart and on his lips, he spread his praises everywhere. But while he applied himself mightily with all the resources of his spirit to the practice of the virtues, his flesh lost its strength, as usually happens. It is the same cause which made Daniel, on arising after having beheld his angel in vision, find his body deprived of strength (Daniel 10:8, 16, 17), and become sick for many days. As for the virtues, Gregory profited, but as for the health of the body, he was weak; and once he found himself fallen prey to a fever and to an eruption of the skin which ended by overwhelming him to such an extent that, being no longer able either to eat or to drink, he lost all hope of preserving his life. One thing only remained to him: the trust which he had placed in Martin had never been shaken. On the contrary, burning with a yet more fervent love, he conceived such a desire for this Martin that, even though his head had scarcely come through the blows of death, he did not hesitate to set out to visit the Saint's tomb; his own people could not dissuade him from this, and he persisted obstinately, for the fever of his body was less strong than the fever of his love. After two or three stopping-places, his weakness increased with the progress of the journey. But even then nothing could restrain his impatience to have recourse to Martin with the same faith, and in the name of the Divine majesty he supplicated those who wished to divert him from this, to present him, whether alive, or in any case dead, before the tomb of the Saint.

What more shall I say? He arrived, as much well as ill, and his faith, justified, obtained the healing which he expected. And not only he, but also one of his clerics named Armentarius, who had been almost at the point of death, owed his own health to the merit of this faith. Gregory, therefore, offering thanks as much for the latter as for himself, returned to his own land satisfied, or rather, consumed more than ever by the love of Martin.*

9. He Works a Miracle, and His Pride is Humbled

ONCE WHEN HE WAS GOING from Burgundy to Auvergne, a violent storm arose above him. The dense air gathered in storm-clouds; the sky began to sparkle with repeated flashes, to resound with vast rumblings of thunder; and everyone felt himself grow pale and dreaded the danger that threatened. But Gregory, with tranquil soul, drew from his breast — for he always carried them around his neck — some relics of saints, which he raised in the direction of the clouds, to which he opposed them with perseverance; and the clouds instantly separated, some to the right and the others to the left, offering to the travellers an undisturbed route. But pride, which is so frequently nourished by virtues, stole into the soul of this young man; he rejoiced within himself and attributed to his own merits that which had just been accorded to his relics.** But what is nearer to presumption than a fall? And in fact, the horse on which he was mounted fell at this very place and threw him down to the ground so severely that, bruised in every part of his body, he could scarcely get up again. Understanding the cause of his misfortune, he took care in future never to let himself be vanquished by the stings of a vain glory, but every time that the Divine virtue acted through him, to ascribe the honor of it not to his own merits, but to the power of the relics which, as we have said, he carried. And if you weigh well this incident, you will see that it is more admirable to have corrected one's pride than to have separated the clouds.

10. The Vision of Light in the Temple of the Mother of God

GREGORY WAS ASSIDUOUS at prayer, especially during the hours of the night consecrated to repose. The feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary arrived. There were relics of Her† in Auvergne, in the village of Marsat. Gregory, who was there at this time, undertook out of duty, following his custom, to go to perform his prayers secretly while everyone else was immersed in sleep, and looking at it from a distance, he saw the oratory shining with a great light. He imagined, therefore, that some fervent ones had preceded him in the celebration of the vigil; nonetheless, astonished to see this great light, he directed himself toward the place from whence it proceeded: all was shrouded in silence.

(*Continued on page* 28)

* *The Miracles of Blessed Martin*, Book I, ch. 32.

** St. Gregory himself expresses this even more humbly: "I boasted before my travelling companions that God had wished to show that my innocence merited this grace" (*The Glory of the Martyrs*, ch. 84).

† Most likely a piece of Her sash or robe; such relics are preserved in Orthodox churches to this day.



A typical peasant hut of ancient Auvergne (see §16)

6th-century reliquary used in Gaul



Archimandrite Constantine
in Jordanville



Cyril Zaitsev in China

WITH THE PASSING of Archimandrite Constantine one may well say that a whole generation has departed. He was perhaps the last of the Russian religious intelligentsia of the first half of the 20th century, and in his faithfulness to Orthodoxy and the profundity of his religious-philosophical thought showed the path the intelligentsia should have taken but, sadly, for the most part did not take. His mature religious philosophy may be considered the Orthodox answer to the heterodoxy of Bulgakov, Berdyaev, and their like; but even more than this, his firm stand in Orthodox truth has given him an influence on and an importance for English-speaking Orthodoxy which as yet has been little appreciated.

Cyril Zaitsev (as he was known in the world) was from a family of converted Jews; and once he became fully aware of the truth of Orthodoxy he manifested himself as *an Israelite indeed* (John1:47), mercilessly opposed to all pretense and lying in spiritual and intellectual life, and unbendingly upright in his confession of the chosenness of the "New Israel," the Orthodox Church.

Archimandrite Constantine

FEARLESS ACCUSER OF PSEUDO-ORTHODOXY

1887 — 1975 (November 13|26)

Cyril manifested himself as rather a "conservative" even in his student days (he studied economics and law at St. Petersburg and then abroad at Heidelberg), taking no part in the radical student movement inspired by the enemies of the Orthodox monarchy. But it was only after he entered government service just before World War I that he came to realize how terribly wrong were those who wished to "reform" Russia. He found the slanderous tales of government corruption, inefficiency, and cynicism to be quite without foundation in the two departments in which he was privileged to work (the Senate, Agriculture); there he found highly qualified personnel with a profound sense of duty and loyalty, as well as a refreshing freedom and personal initiative. "There was a striking contrast" — he wrote much later—"between the grandeur of our historical order of things... and the light-minded dilettantism of our society, which was dreaming — while eating the bread of our still living and mighty 'history' — of new forms of life which doomed to destruction history in its entirety." (Here, of course, he has in mind such philosophies as Marxism, which would destroy the past entirely in order to establish a new "ideal" — whose name is "Gulag.") "Russia was destroyed," he wrote elsewhere, "not because the bureaucracy was bad, not because the Tsar remained autocratic, or because Russia had been 'left behind' in various ways. No, the misfortune was this: that she did not value the values of her past... The chief misfortune was that Russia ceased to value, as the highest value, her own age-old way of life, which had been infused with grace by her standing for many years in church Truth... One may find dark sides in historical Russia in all epochs... but as long as Imperial Russia stood, she not only did not compel one to lie, she rather served truth." (One may compare the state of the USSR today, as described by Solzhenitsyn and others, where lying has become part of daily life for everyone.)

Even before the Revolution, therefore, he had left the "mainstream" of the Russian intelligentsia, which prepared both the Revolution and then — when the Revolution went rather beyond the expectations of the "liberals" — the pseudo-Orthodox "renaissance" that later was to give itself the appropriate name of "Parisian Orthodoxy." The unrepentant intelligentsia, even though it seldom mentioned him by name, never forgave him his "betrayal" of their cause

(for in the "Parisian" view all intellectuals are supposed to be "liberals"), and the "fanatical" Orthodox views of his mature philosophy became for them something of a symbol of all that they hated in the old Russia and in genuine Orthodoxy.

In the Diaspora after the Revolution Cyril Zaitsev spent the '20's and part of the '30's in Western Europe (Prague and Paris), where he became noted as a conservative publicist, working in close co-operation on the journals *Renaissance* (*Vozrozhdeniye*) and *Russia and the Slavs* (*Rossiya i Slavyanstvo*) with their editor, Peter Struve — the Russian translator of the works of Karl Marx who came to see his error and worked after the Revolution for the restoration of the old Russia. These organs of the "struggle for national liberation" were conservative journals of political and literary comment and followed the maturing of P. Struve's own thought, whose last project was the "rehabilitation" of the great Orthodox Tsar Nicholas I, who is so little understood even now in the West precisely because of his Orthodoxy. But Struve never matured sufficiently to place Orthodoxy at the center of his thought, and in this Father Constantine was far to surpass him.

In 1935 he went to the Far East, becoming a professor of the Russian Law Faculty in Harbin and giving lectures on literature and music (being himself an excellent pianist). Thoughts of "national liberation" and a return to the old Russia now had little meaning, and his thought became more and more religious and Orthodox; the center of his philosophy, from "historical Russia," now became, much more profoundly, "Holy Russia." He became an instructor in the Harbin seminary, and in general he found himself far more at home in the simpler, more fervent Orthodox world of the Far-Eastern emigration than among the Russian intelligentsia of Western Europe. In Harbin he became a spiritual friend of Blind Ignatius, the clairvoyant elder, with whom he would sit for hours reading the Lives of Saints and being instructed by his holy conversation, seeing at first hand, in the crowds who flocked to this holy elder, the closeness of the true Orthodox spiritual tradition to the heart of the common people. To this period belongs his first real Orthodox book, *To Understand Orthodoxy* — the testimony of a man who had come to Orthodoxy through the thorny path of the modern intellectual jungle, and now would be content with no diluted or "modernized" Orthodoxy, but only with the true, age-old Orthodoxy by which the whole of Russia had once lived and been great.

When the Communists came to rule in China, Cyril Zaitsev might have been considered to be at the end of his intellectual development and career. He was over sixty years old, and might well have been content to live out his days

quietly in some corner of the vast Russian Diaspora, content enough if he could escape the fast-expanding worldwide Communist regime. But it was precisely now that he entered his most fruitful years, thanks to the inspiration, encouragement, and help of two far-sighted hierarchs of the Diaspora: Archbishop John Maximovitch and Archbishop Vitaly of Jordanville, both of whom keenly recognized the great contribution he could make to the Russian Church Outside of Russia.

After the death of his wife he was ordained priest in 1945, and soon he joined the ranks of Archbishop John's clergy in Shanghai, participating in this great hierarch's labors of Orthodox enlightenment by giving lectures in the Shanghai cathedral on historical Orthodox Russia. On being evacuated from China together with Archbishop John, he was invited by Archbishop Vitaly to come to Jordanville to become editor of *Orthodox Russia,* the chief Russian-language organ of genuine Orthodoxy. Here, in 1949, he received the monastic tonsure. For the next quarter-century, it is no exaggeration to say, he was the most important single editor and publicist of any of the Orthodox Churches, writing in any language, who upheld true and uncompromising Orthodoxy. Let us list here only some of the accomplishments which are owing directly to him, leaving aside the many books printed by Holy Trinity Monastery in these years, most of which would have appeared without him.

1. *Orthodox Russia.* This twice-monthly Russian-language periodical became, under Archimandrite Constantine, *the* voice of genuine Orthodoxy in the 20th-century world, far surpassing other Orthodox publications in any language in its outspokenness, the breadth of its intellectual scope, and its upright confession of unchanging, age-old Orthodoxy against the innovations of "Parisian Orthodoxy" and the Russian schismatic groups of the Diaspora in general, against the tragically soul-destroying political path of the Moscow Patriarchate, against the increasingly open apostasy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other ecumenist Orthodox bodies; for those caught in any of these traps set by the devil for 20th-century Orthodoxy, the blunt editorials of Fr. Constantine became identified as the voice of the hated "Jordanville ideology" which, although never powerful numerically, constituted a stumbling-block to the cause of modernist "Orthodoxy," which was eloquently exposed by this literal conscience of Orthodoxy as a preparation for the coming of Antichrist.

2. Fr. Constantine added to the list of Jordanville's Russian publications a monthly periodical, *Orthodox Life,* for Lives of Saints and other material rather out of place in a polemical newspaper, and — his major theological contribution — a yearly theological review, *Orthodox Way* (or *Path*), a collection of major articles of theology and religious thought which is also unsurpassed

among recent Orthodox theological publications in any language for the purity and sensitivity of the Orthodoxy expressed in it, uncontaminated by modernism and totally independent of the academic fashions which are expressed in the other supposedly Orthodox theological publications of our day. The Orthodox writers represented in this collection are, sadly, still almost unknown save to a small circle of Orthodox Russians; but it is in them that is to be found a good part of the true theological scholarship of Orthodoxy in the 20th century.

3. From the very beginning Fr. Constantine insisted that Holy Trinity Monastery publish a regular *English-language* Orthodox periodical (*Orthodox Life*). This was a project far "ahead of the times" and most difficult to carry out. In 1950 English-speaking converts in the Russian Church Abroad were almost unheard of; there was no "demand" whatever for such a publication, there was virtually no one to write for it, and the first translators more often than not had English as their second tongue. But for Father Constantine this was an absolute duty for the Orthodox mission in America, of which he was intensely conscious — despite the unfair accusations made by some against his narrow "Russianness." Despite the early difficulties (which were not helped by Father Constantine's own complicated literary style, difficult enough in his native Russian!), this periodical survived and prospered, giving actually the first real spiritual food and serious Orthodox material in the English language, apart from a few sporadic earlier attempts. This publication has had an incalculable importance for the Orthodox mission in America. Without it the English-language movement of true Orthodoxy — weak and frail as it still is — would not be what it is today, and perhaps would not exist at all.

4. Fr. Constantine wrote also a number of major books. One may mention his *Lectures in the History of Russian Literature* (Jordanville, 2 volumes, 1967-68), a compilation of his lectures in this course at Holy Trinity Seminary, in which he teaches a principle quite unique to "literary criticism": all literature is viewed in its relation to Orthodoxy — a principle, to be sure, which holds valid in modern times for no country but Russia, where Orthodoxy penetrated so deeply the national culture that even the secular writers of the last century could not escape its influence. His articles on Russian composers in the Jordanville periodicals also probed far more deeply than any mere "music criticism," seeking always the very "soul" of the music, where the composer's relation to God is revealed.

A closely related book is his *Chefs-d'oeuvres of Russian Literary Criticism* (Harbin, 1938), an anthology of essays on Russian writers by other writers, with introductions by Fr. Constantine that place the great figures of Russian

literature in the last century in their Orthodox context and perspective. His *Ethics* (Harbin, 1940) is a survey of both pre-Christian and post-Christian ethical teachings, giving a sound Orthodox evaluation of them. In such works as these he showed that true Orthodoxy, while precise and strict, is not narrow in its intellectual outlook, and that a fully developed Orthodox world-view has a sound and balanced approach to all manifestations of human knowledge and culture. His last book, *The Miracle of Russian History* (Jordanville, 1974), is a collection of his articles on Holy Russia and the state of Orthodoxy in the world today.

One of Fr. Constantine's smaller books has appeared in English: *The Spiritual Face of St. John of Kronstadt* (Jordanville, 1964). Written at the time of the Saint's canonization in 1964, it is largely a compilation of quotes by those who knew him, forming an excellent spiritual portrait of this great Saint; it is the best introduction to St. John for English-speaking readers.

But Fr. Constantine's major work, the masterpiece of his life, is his *Pastoral Theology* (Jordanville, 2 volumes, 1960-61), compiled from his seminary lectures. In this work his own rich life-experience, his great intellectual culture, his philosophical mind, his uncompromising stand for Orthodox truth, together with his priesthood and monasticism accepted late in life, flowered in a pastoral work unrivalled in the 20th century in any language. One has only to look at the "Paris" equivalent of this book to begin to realize its greatness. The *Orthodox Pastoral Service* of Archimandrite Cyprian Kern (Paris, 1957) is a course, based largely on Western sources, on "how to be a successful worldly priest," always trying to catch up with the latest intellectual fashion, following one's worldly flock while pretending to lead it, keeping up always a "proper" exterior and constantly looking at oneself in a spiritual mirror in order to calculate how well one is keeping up one's "image." Such an approach, totally foreign to Orthodoxy, was decisively rejected by Fr. Constantine, whose book, born in the blood and tears of 20th-century history, renounces every kind of fakery and affectation in order to teach Orthodox youth how to be a true Orthodox pastor in an age of apostasy and revolution, how to save one's soul and keep one's flock on the right spiritual path even when all religious values and even civilization itself is falling to pieces around one.

There were those who thought that Fr. Constantine dwelled too much on the subject of the apostasy of our days and the coming reign of Antichrist, for which contemporary mankind is obviously preparing itself. These, indeed — together with his uncompromising stand against what he invariably called the "Soviet Church" — were the center of the critical side of his thought, and it

was not possible to deceive his keen mind with any of those "new" phenomena of our times which try to pass themselves off as Orthodox; he was quick to spot the lack of Orthodox substance in the "religious" writings of Pasternak, the pseudo-religious Berdyaevism of some later Orthodox writers in the USSR, the ecclesiastical fakery of the American "autocephaly." It was, however, our times — the age of the counterfeit in religion as in everything else — rather than his own basic views that made him seem sometimes a "negative" thinker. But far more fundamentally his outlook, deeply Orthodox, was positive and even optimistic. He encouraged and inspired young priests and religious writers, both Russians and converts; was an active supporter of the canonization of St. John of Kronstadt and, in his last years, of the New Martyrs of Russia headed by the Royal Family; supported and encouraged the veneration of Archbishop John Maximovitch; called for a positive and conscious assimilation of the values of true Orthodoxy and the Orthodox past; was a firm supporter of the much-persecuted and slandered Catacomb Church in Russia; and even hoped for — without false hopes — a stupendous miracle: the restoration of the Orthodox Monarchy in a renewed Holy Russia (albeit only for a short time before the end of the world), without which, he believed, the historical forces now in operation will lead mankind directly to the reign of Antichrist.

But Archimandrite Constantine was above all a Christian realist and always placed his ultimate hope, not on anything earthly at all, but only in the Church of Christ. All the wealth of his cultural and intellectual attainments were of value precisely because they were placed in the correct Orthodox hierarchy of values, in which the Church and the things of God are the ultimate value, only in subordination to which does anything lesser have any value or meaning at all. "The only treasure," he wrote, "which we, the left-overs of historical Russia, possess is the joy of belonging to the true Church; it is in the power of our conscious membership in the Russian Church Outside of Russia. What are we in the many-colored pluralism of the free world, even of the Christian world? Less than a small minority — a tiny grain of sand, a nothing. But in this nothingness — from the world's point of view — we possess, inasmuch as we belong to the true Church, the path to the blessed eternity which arises for all of saved humanity at the Second Coming of Christ."

A great man has departed from us, leaving a rich intellectual and spiritual heritage for us who remain with the difficult task of being true Orthodox Christians in the darkest days of the apostasy of the last times. In particular, American Orthodoxy has great need of those who can absorb his Orthodox mes-

sage and pass it on to others. This message is by no means only for some intellectual elite; it is the message of true Orthodoxy at a time when pseudo-Orthodoxy in a hundred forms threatens to engulf us!

Father Constantine to the end remained an "intellectual"; the task of understanding and defending Orthodoxy was his life's work. But Orthodoxy for him was not merely the answer to his intellectual search for truth; it became the whole of life for him, and was reflected in everything he did. In it he found deep peace, which flowered not only in polemical and theological works, but also in his life as priest and monk. He was a spiritual father for many, and for years he was the only English-language confessor at Holy Trinity Monastery. There were perhaps times when he was a little too painfully straightforward and honest; but even this "defect" was a proof of the wholeness of his acceptance of Orthodox truth.

Father Constantine had suggested to some of his students the compilation of a book on death — specifically, on how various people have met death, thus revealing their spiritual state. In his last years especially he was concerned with this question, and with his own preparation for death; for here, indeed, is the proof of the depth and fullness of one's conversion to the truth. Suffice it to say that Fr. Constantine himself died a peaceful and Christian death, after receiving communion of the Holy Mysteries on that very day, on the feast of the great Father, St. John Chrysostom — just as the monastery was beginning the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the dedication of its cathedral the next day.

One of Fr. Constantine's spiritual children, A. P., supplies an epilogue to his earthly life: "I dreamed of Father Constantine the night that he died. He looked so good — 30 pounds heavier, fresh, with a bright face, although he was stooped. He asked why he hadn't seen me for so long, gave me blessings and said that he was very well. When I awoke, only then did I get the phone call that he had died, and I hadn't even known of his final illness."

One may have bold hope that Father Constantine, having carried through to the end his search for and discovery of Christ's truth, has indeed entered into that *new life* which is the answer to the feverish unrest of our unsettled times. Grant him, O Lord, eternal rest with the saints!

(*Continued from page* 19)

He sent to search out the watchman of the building; but during this time the door opened by itself, and, realizing that this place was the object of a Divine visitation, he entered with reverence into the midst of an angelic vigil. The light which he had seen from outside ceased immediately, and he no longer saw anything but the virtue of the glorious Virgin.*

11. He is Elected Bishop of Tours

IN THE YEAR 172 after the death of St. Martin, the twelfth of the reign of King Sigibert,** the blessed Euphronius, who, grown old in the midst of virtues, had been enriched by a grace so great that he seemed to have in him the spirit of prophecy, was laid beside his fathers.† The time had come when Gregory, inflamed with the love of blessed Martin and become capable of exercising the pastoral office, should take up in his place the government of his episcopal see. The blessed Euphronius thus being dead, the people of the diocese of Tours assembled to make a choice of his successor, and as a result of an affable discussion all were persuaded that Gregory was the preferable choice. They were acquainted with him by his very frequent presence in this land and knew of him a great number of actions worthy of a man of decorum.

All, therefore, joined together with a single voice, and by the favor of God his cause prevailed. In fact, the multitude of clerics and noble persons, as well as the people of the country and the towns, cried out all with the same opinion that the decision should be for this Gregory, equally illustrious by his brilliant merits and by his nobility, eminent in wisdom, surpassing all others in generosity, known by the princes, revered for his uprightness and capable of all the duties of the office. Messengers were directed to the king at a moment when, by the Lord's dispensation, Gregory himself was present [with the king]. Informed of what was happening, with what humility he strove to decline! By how many means he endeavored to escape! But where the will of God is, there everything else must yield. The king charged him to obey his authority; Queen Brunhilde pressed him to submit. And because true humility does not refuse obedience, he finally gave his consent.

---

* *The Glory of the Martyrs*, ch. 9,

** King of Austrasia and Auvergne, 561-576.

† A.D. 573, actually the year 176 after the death of St. Martin. Bishop Euphronius, who was a cousin of St. Gregory's mother, ruled the Diocese of Tours 556-573,

Immediately —for fear, I think, that any delay would give him a pretext to flee — Egidius, Archbishop of Reims,†† consecrated him, as the poet Fortunatus has written in these verses:

> "Saint Julian* sendeth to Saint Martin his dear disciple; the one who was so pleasing to him, he giveth to his brother: it is he whom the venerable and paternal hand of Egidius hath consecrated to the Lord so that he might direct the people, he whom Radegunde loveth; joyful Sigibert encourageth him, and Brunhilde giveth him honor" (Bk. V:2).

Thus the episcopal see of Tours, eighteen days after having lost Euphronius, received Gregory. When the inhabitants of Tours solemnly came out before their new pastor, the same poet composed again in his honor the verses that follow:

> "Applaud, O fortunate people, whose desire hath now been accomplished. Your hierarch arriveth; it is the hope of the flock that cometh. May lively childhood, may the old and bent with age celebrate this event; may each proclaim it, for it is the good fortune of all."

And the poet continues in showing Gregory celebrated by the people of Tours and enthroned, according to the forms, in his see.

12. He Restores the Basilica of Saint Martin

TO SAY BRIEFLY what he was and how great he was when he was invested with the episcopacy: it may be seen in the several churches which he newly constructed or whose roofs he restored, and it is demonstrated at once by the books which he composed in praise of the saints or for the explanation of the Divine Scriptures. The mother church which the lord Martin had constructed, and which was in ruins as a result of age, was restored by him in arch-form, and he adorned the walls of it with histories having for subject the exploits of the same Martin.** Our poet is not silent about this, saying, among other things (Book X:2):

> "By the aid of Martin, Gregory raiseth the ediface; we find again in the new man that which was the celebrated man of old."

And again:

> "In restoring these ancient foundations, the excellent bishop giveth them the splendor with which they shone before."

---

†† Who later became involved in a political plot, was convicted of treason against King Childebert and deposed from the priesthood, and died in exile. See *The History of the Franks*, especially Book X, 19.

* The Martyr of Clermont, buried in Brioude. His tomb was the chief holy place of Auvergne, as St. Martin's was of Touraine. St. Gregory wrote a book on his miracles.

** See the Introduction following this Life for more sources on iconography in Gaul in the 6th century.

He also restored, as we have said, and as one may find in his own chronicles, several churches, such as the church of the Holy Cross in the village of Marsat.†

13. Instructor of Monks

THE FERVOR with which he gave himself over, whether to the construction of religious edifaces or to the care of his flock, is what one principally notices when one considers that he could not receive even from the most holy men the model of his perfection. In fact, to say nothing of those whose sins are manifest, as the Apostle says (all that we could say of them would be superfluous), let us take only two among those whose marks of sanctity are such that no one but Gregory could answer them well; and let us show how delicate he manifested himself in a worthy matter.

Not long after Gregory's ordination, the holy abbot Senoch left his cell and went to greet him. The holy man received him with great respect, and after gradually becoming acquainted with him in the exchanges of conversation, he was not slow in seeing him to be infected with the disease of pride. But he healed him completely of this pride by means of the heavenly grace which aided him in penetrating to the evaluation of spiritual things.*

He had no less power and no less concern with regard to St. Leopardus, whom the evil spirit was disturbing with sinister thoughts to the point where he had decided, following a verbal injury which had been made him, to leave the cell where he had long been enclosed. But he was unable to incur this fall, since he merited to have Gregory for support. The latter, in fact, going in the usual way to Marmoutier** in order to kiss there the sacred marks left by the memory of Martin, turned aside toward the hut of Leopardus in order to be informed, as a concerned pastor, how a sheep chained in the love of Christ was governing himself. Leopardus soon opened to him the secrets of his heart which the devil had represented to him as reasonable. Gregory, his spirit filled with keenness, immediately discovered the designs of the devil, and, sighing with extreme anguish, he began to admonish this man and to unveil for him, by his conversation filled with good sense, the diabolic trick; then, having returned to his house, with a pious concern he sent to him some books which were in harmony with the monastic calling. Leopardus, after having read them thoroughly

† At the end of the 17th century Dom Ruinart mentions this church as still existing.
* *The Life of the Fathers*, ch. 15, §2, where a much fuller account is given.
** *Major Monasterium*: St. Martin's monastery outside the city of Tours. The original monastery (or rather, hermitage) is described by Sulpicius Severus in Chapter 10 of his *Life of Saint Martin*.

was not only healed of the temptation which he had suffered, but was subsequently endowed with a much more penetrating spirit.† Seek nothing more excellent, expect nothing more remarkable that one might say in praise of Gregory. If the soul is worth more than the body, it is a sufficiently great miracle to resurrect it in someone; the liar himself [the devil] would not dare to deny it. As for how commanding his voice was, and how authoritatively the example of his life imposed itself upon his subordinates, the careful reader will ascertain this in his own books.

16. He Stops a Fire with his Relics

GREGORY did for the healing of the sick many things which it would be too long to relate here; however, he gave the honor for this to the saints whose relics he carried, and he endeavored to divest himself of the merit for himself. The more it was true that they were done by him, the more humbly he would attribute it to others. Here is an example:

He was proceeding once on the highway carrying around his neck a cross of gold in which there were relics of the Blessed Mary Ever-Virgin, or of blessed Martin. He perceived not far from the road a poor man's hut which was burning; it was covered, according to the custom of poor people, with leaves and small branches, that is, with flammable materials. The unfortunate one was running hither and thither, with his wife and children; he was crying out, throwing water, but all in vain. Already the flames were prevailing and one could no longer stop them. But then Gregory hastened there, raised the cross against the sheets of flame, and soon the whole fire was so paralyzed at the sight of the holy relics that it could burn no more, not even a little, the parts which it had already seized.†

(*Continued*)

† *The Life of the Fathers*, ch. 20, §3, where the fuller account specifies that the books which St. Gregory gave him were the "Lives of the Fathers" (that is, of Egypt) and the "Institutes of the Monks" of St. John Cassian.
† *The Glory of the Martyrs*, ch. 11.