

Archbishop Tikhon and Bishop Grafton: An Early Chapter in Anglo-Orthodox Relations in the New World

PETER CARL HASKELL

Part One

DURING THE FALL of 1900 a letter arrived at the San Francisco office of Bishop Tikhon (Bellavin) inviting him to attend the consecration of an Episcopalian bishop in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin. Bishop Tikhon accepted the invitation, and the first of a series of ecumenical friendships between Eastern Orthodox churchmen in the United States and members of the Protestant Episcopal Church began. There had been a number of visitations across the seas between Orthodox and American Episcopalians over the years. In 1862 the General Convention of the Episcopal Church had established their "Russo-Greek" Committee, the first official body in history appointed to develop Anglican contacts with the Orthodox churches.¹ During the winter of 1863-4 the Russian fleet under Admiral Lesovsky was in New York harbor. With the permission of the Episcopalian bishop the naval chaplains repeatedly celebrated the Divine Liturgy in Trinity Chapel. John Henry Hopkins, Jr., the editor-son of the then Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church, was greatly moved by these services: "To hear the sweet and earnest litany, becoming more and more intense at every repetition, and seeming at times to be battering the gate of heaven—it beats all Western uses beyond comparison."² Also in 1864, the Rev. Mr. Young, later bishop of Florida, made a trip to Russia and had a series of talks with the Metropolitan Philaret.³ The purchase of Alaska in 1867 incorporated into the United States the missionary diocese of the Orthodox Church that had been established at Sitka in 1848. The Eastern Church Association in England addressed a memorial to the General Convention of 1868 asserting that the Protestant Episcopal Church was better situated than the Church of England for working toward reunion with the Orthodox. The main

reasons for this assertion were that the Episcopal Church was not encumbered by state connections, that diplomatic relations between the U.S.A. and Russia were uniformly friendly, and that with the purchase of Alaska there was an "actual juxtaposition of the two churches in the possessions on the Pacific" coast.⁴ However, the center of Episcopal church life in those years was the Atlantic seaboard, and far-off Alaska was as remote as Russia or the Orthodox East. Little personal contact was possible at that time.

Not all elements of the Protestant Episcopal Church were in harmony with the enthusiasts of the High Churchmen of the Russo-Greek Committee, nor did all have the admiration of John Henry Hopkins, Jr. for matters liturgical. In the years following the Civil War what one Episcopalian historian has called the "Second Ritualistic War" broke out in the Episcopal Church.⁵ Sharp and exceedingly bitter controversy raged around the persons of a number of clergymen who had been influenced by the doctrinal teaching of the Oxford Movement. While the controversy turned on the legality of certain liturgical practices, the real issues were doctrinal. James DeKoven was debarred from the episcopate for his traditionalist views on the eucharist. An equally bitter struggle failed to block the elevation of High Churchman William C. Doane to be bishop of Albany.

In 1873, Bishop George David Cummins, assistant bishop of Kentucky, led a movement of Low Churchmen out of the Protestant Episcopal Church to establish the Reformed Episcopal Church. The first General Convention of the new body in May of 1875 gave seven reasons for their break with the Protestant Episcopal Church, the first of which was a repudiation of the High Church doctrines of the apostolic succession and its supposed ecumenical conclusions. "Hence, while the Protestant Episcopal Church in its corporate capacity turns away from the Protestant Churches around us to seek fellowship with the old corrupt Church—as, for example, the Russo-Greek Church—the Reformed Episcopal Church . . . seeks the fellowship of all Protestant evangelical Churches."⁶ While the Reformed Episcopal Church never made much headway in drawing Protestant Episcopalians into its fellowship, its position in repudiation of the doctrines of apostolic succession, baptismal regeneration, and the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic gifts had significant support within the Protestant Episcopal Church. In the midst of these controversies the Russo-Greek Committee's existence was terminated by the General Convention of 1874. The Committee had published a series of "Occasional Papers" over the years, but there had been little personal contact between Episcopalians and Orthodox churchmen.

Bishop Charles Chapman Grafton of Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, who extended the invitation to Tikhon, was the grand old man of the Anglo-Catholic or High Church party by 1900. Having known the Episcopal

Church before the Oxford Movement had made much impact on its life, Grafton had determined to dedicate himself to fostering what he called the recovery of the church's heritage. At that time he had said, "Though I shall not see her recover her heritage of doctrine and ritual in my day, it is well for a man to give up his life in an endeavor to bring a revival of the Church to pass. It is a greater work to free the Church than it is to free the slave."⁷ In 1865 he had taken monastic vows in England as one of the first three men since the reformation to become monks in the Anglican Communion. After several years work in England, he had returned to America and assumed the pastorate of the Church of the Advent in Boston, where he remained until shortly before his election to be bishop of Fond du Lac in 1889. Attracting to his diocese like minded clergy, he quickly transformed the liturgical life of the parishes to make Fond du Lac a symbol of the aspirations of Anglo-Catholics in the matter of the externals of public worship.⁸

Although he had never held any chair of academic theology, he had written widely in journals and published several books in defence of Oxford Movement doctrine. Joseph G. Barry, onetime dean of Nashotah House, described him as having "a good working knowledge of theology and a better knowledge of spiritual (ascetical) theology than most Anglicans."⁹ Grafton's basic position rested on the assertion that the possessions of certain marks of the church made a given ecclesiastical organization an authentic or true church. He struggled to recover the Catholic heritage of the Episcopal Church inasmuch as she possessed these marks of the church. For Grafton these marks were "the Episcopal government of the Church, the three sacred orders of the ministry, the preserved Apostolic succession through Episcopal ordination, the Christian priesthood, and the real presence and eucharistic sacrifice." In these things he felt "Catholic Christendom is united." The possession of an apostolic ministry was the guarantee of the authenticity of a given church. "We may regret the divisions of Christendom, but God has overruled them in one way for good." The orthodox faith, for Grafton, is that which is universally held among the various authentic branches of the church. "What she has not, by the concurrence of her several parts, declared, she merely leaves as matters of pious opinion."¹⁰ Grafton's concept of catholicity was all but institutional in the tradition of the early Tractarians. This is the concept of Catholicity implicit in the famous Chicago (and later Lambeth) Quadrilateral of 1886 in which the General Convention expressed its willingness to enter into discussions of reunion on four essentials: 1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the revealed Word of God. 2. The Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith. 3. The two sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unflinching use of Christ's words of institution, and the elements ordained by Him.

4. The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church. Grafton felt that the Catholic school of thought within the Episcopal Church was "at once the most conservative in its maintenance of our inherited faith, so also the most wisely liberal in its efforts for Christian unity." He regarded it as a fact that the "Quadrilateral had its origin with the extreme wing of the Catholic 'party' some twenty years before it saw light in Chicago!"¹¹

By the turn of the century the powerful impact of historical criticism had brought a new emphasis to Anglo-Catholic thought. The critical approach had undermined the essentially institution-oriented and history-centered appeal of Oxford Movement apologetics. The work of Bishop Charles Gore in England rested on his conviction that the principles of the Catholic revival would be done to death unless they could be reconciled with modern thought, particularly historical thought.¹² Nashotah House Seminary in Wisconsin was in the vanguard among Episcopalian seminaries in the acceptance of biblical and historical criticism. Bishop Grafton, whose influence at Nashotah was very great, accepted the work being done there for the liberal Catholic school, as it still fitted well into his institutional view of the church. However, within the seminary itself there was developing a conservative reaction to the "humanism" of the new school of thought. Under the influence of the Rev. Henry Percival of Philadelphia this group was becoming arch-conservative and authoritarian in their approach.¹³ Professor William McGarvey of Nashotah wrote to Bishop Grafton that we should accept "the revelation of His Will as little children" and viewed the liberal Catholic school as "the first steps in progressive apostasy."¹⁴ Charles F. Sweet, an Episcopalian missionary in Japan who had been active in Anglo-Orthodox contacts there, wrote to Bishop Grafton a few years later concerning McGarvey, "For some time back, I who am far more inclined myself toward Rome than most of our sort, have noticed an ever-deepening influence among us to identify modern Roman teaching and modern Roman devotions with Catholic belief and acts."¹⁵

Grafton was a "ritualist," but he was no "Romanizer." While he did not exclude the Roman Catholic Church from his definition of an authentic church, he was in fact anti-Roman and regarded reunion with Rome to be impossible. Grafton wrote to W. J. Birkbeck, the famous English Russophile, in 1911, "My own strong feeling is that the Roman Church is both [*sic*] schismatical, heretical, uncatholic, and the Papacy a form of Antichrist. . . . It is repudiated by the Eastern Church, and the educated conscience of Christian people."¹⁶ In later years Bishop Grafton characterized himself doctrinally as "an evangelical at heart, while in belief a Liberal Catholic."¹⁷

Although Bishop Grafton had felt compelled to request release from his

monastic obedience to a superior in England due to a conflict with his bishop while in Boston, he retained a monastic simplicity in his personal life. He had founded, or assisted in founding, several monastic communities in America. His piety and outlook remained essentially monastic, and he regarded the example and influence of these newly formed religious communities as the assurance of the victory of the Catholic revival to which he had dedicated his life.¹⁸

Bishop Tikhon was in many ways the opposite of Bishop Grafton as personality and as churchman. Only half Grafton's age when he came to America, Tikhon was not a revolutionary in Church life as Grafton undoubtedly was. The Russian Orthodox Church was sharing in the revolutionary atmosphere that pervaded Russian life at the turn of the century, but Tikhon took no particular part in the debates on theological or canonical issues then in progress. Having graduated from the St. Petersburg Academy in 1888, he taught moral and dogmatic theology in the Pskov seminary as a layman. In 1891 layman Vasily Bellavin took monastic vows, becoming the monk Tikhon. Grafton and Tikhon must have felt a mutual affection for they both shared the monastic ascetic ideal in their personal lives. Transferred to the seminary at Kholm in 1892 as superintendent, Tikhon served for five years, becoming both rector of the seminary and being raised to the rank of Archimandrite. His greatest success as seminary rector, and throughout his life, was in a pastoral role. He exercised a profound influence on the students under his charge. According to canon law a candidate for the episcopate must be thirty-three years old, but the Holy Synod made an exception in ordering the consecration of Tikhon to be Bishop of Lublin in 1897.¹⁹ At his consecration he spoke almost prophetically of his life when he said, "In my youth, the office of a Bishop seemed to me to be dignity, power, might and honor. When I was a child I had childish conceptions. Now I know that it means work, striving and sacrifice. It is not easy to be weak with those who are weak, nor is it easy to be an example to the faithful in word, in one's bearing, in love, faith, and chastity, and it certainly is not easy to admonish, to threaten and to punish in all patience. The life of a true bishop is daily dying in cares and concerns for others; therefore the success of the bishop's official activities depend not so much on human qualities and faculties, but much more on the power of God which is given to those who are conscious of their weakness."²⁰ Although he had spent most of his years as a hieromonk in academic life, Tikhon never produced a single work on theology. During his whole lifetime he wrote very little beyond sermons. He championed no movements and was not associated with any of the parties in the debates over the forthcoming council of the Russian Church and its proposed reforms.

Less than a year after his consecration as a bishop, Tikhon was transferred to the North American diocese. His responsibilities in the New World

were very great indeed and taxed his pastoral skills to the fullest. He was the only Orthodox hierarch in America and was attempting to contain within the canonical unity of the church the various national factions that made up the diocese. It was a complex community of Russian, Greek, Serbian and Syrian immigration seeking a new life in America. The nine years he spent in America were in many ways formative ones for him, and the North America diocese prospered and grew both in numbers and in the critical matter of internal unity under his leadership. The new cathedral was built in New York, and Tikhon moved the center of the diocese there in 1905.²¹ A monastery and a seminary were started; looking to the future, he had begun conducting services in English in the cathedral, and service books were being prepared in the English language. Tikhon urged all his clergy to apply for American citizenship.²²

The service of consecration of Reginald Weller as bishop coadjutor of Fond du Lac took place on November 8, 1900. In addition to inviting Bishop Tikhon, Grafton had also invited the Rt. Rev. Anthony Kozlowski. Bishop Kozlowski, originally a Roman Catholic, had led a group of Poles in Chicago out of the Roman Church and been consecrated a bishop by Old Catholic bishops in Europe. Initially Bishop Grafton had intended to invite both Tikhon and Kozlowski to actually take part in the laying on of hands at the ordination, as a gesture to cement relations and to buttress the structure of Anglican Orders which had been declared "null and void" by the Papacy in 1896. He had not communicated this intention to Tikhon whom, he did not as yet know personally. However, he had asked Bishop Kozlowski, with whom he was already on very friendly terms. Bishop William C. Doane of Albany advised Grafton not to ask them to join in the ordination.²³ When the time came Kozlowski had agreed to take part, but one of the Episcopalian bishops flatly refused to have any part in the service if Kozlowski was allowed to participate.²⁴ Bishop Kozlowski, who very much needed the support of the Episcopal Church, accepted the snub and was present at the service fully vested, but he did not take part.

Bishop Grafton's reputation as a "ritualist" was fully expressed at the ordination. St. Paul's Cathedral, Fond du Lac, was decorated with banners of Latin and Greek saints and Fathers in the nave and Anglican worthies across the transept. For the first time in the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church, all seven bishops were wearing cope and mitre, and the newly ordained bishop was vested in full pontificals as part of the service. Bishop Grafton had always maintained that ceremonial usages reflected the theological position of traditional Christianity and were the natural outcome of Catholic doctrine. Early in his episcopate at Fond du Lac he officially "declared to our Council that our Prayer Book was to be interpreted in conformity with the traditions of the Universal Church of Christ. Our official ruling

as Ordinary, and so public declared, was that the Eucharistic vestments, the mixed chalice, wafer bread, the Eastward position, lights on the altar or borne in procession, and incense, were the allowed usages of the diocese of Fond du Lac."²⁵ The ceremonies of the ordination of Bishop Weller were certainly within the liturgical tradition of Grafton's own diocese, if not of the Protestant Episcopal Church generally.

Bishop Tikhon, who had been given the place of honor on the bishop's throne in the sanctuary, sensed the significance of the ceremonial usages and commented at the banquet following the ordination, "I cannot conceal from you that in the Orthodox Church there is wonder at the fact that you speak only of two sacraments as sacraments. The present solemn consecration of a co-adjutor Bishop and your profession of faith yesterday bear visible witness that consecration, as well as Baptism and the Eucharist, are considered by you who are present here as sacraments. . . . If at the same time it is permitted to me to express a wish, it will consist in this, that the Episcopal Church and its worthy representatives should proceed further in explaining their views, in accordance with the ancient Orthodox-Catholic views, and in my opinion, an excellent and convenient occasion for this explanation would be given by the General Convention of the Episcopalians to take place in October of next year, in San Francisco."²⁶ After returning to San Francisco, Tikhon wrote Grafton: "I shall always remember with happiness your hospitality extended to me both officially and personally. By this mail I send you our Ferial Menaion, which has just been published in English, together with some incense, which is used in Orthodox Eastern Churches during services, as a slight token of my esteem for you."²⁷ Bishop Grafton was singularly pleased with the ordination in all respects.

The Living Church, chief organ of high church sentiments, in reporting the consecration quoted Tikhon further as saying, "Use your influence. . . . to have the opening service of the General Convention at San Francisco modelled on the lines of this service today. It will have great weight with the Holy Synod of Russia." *The Living Church* continued, "The function at Fond du Lac was one that was perfectly loyal to the Book of Common Prayer and to the best Catholic Tradition. Certainly if there had been any—"Romeward" tendencies—if it had "aped" Rome—no one would have perceived it so quickly as the Russian Bishop, for nowhere is there greater bitterness against Rome and against all that pertains to the Roman System, than throughout the Eastern Communion."²³ The Low Church and secular press reported the service in quite another light.

The Daily Northwestern described the service as in "all respects identical with the rites prescribed by the Roman Catholic Church for similar occasions."²⁹ *The Churchman*, an Episcopalian publication in New York, characterized the ordination in extremely harsh terms in an editorial bearing the

title "Ritual Anarchy." After stating, "We have no objection whatever to any legitimate development of ritual," the editorial went on to say of the seven Episcopalian bishops who took part in the service, "These gentlemen may, therefore, be supposed to have devised or to have condoned the order of service that was used on this occasion, and so to have made themselves aiders and abettors of ritual anarchy." *The Churchman* maintained that "this 'order of service' is a disorder. . . . Rubrics are omitted, altered, added, according as the whimsical fancy of the antiquarian compilers dictated." The gospel procession is described as "taking a walk" and the kiss of peace as a "general osculation, of which our Prayer Book is happily innocent."³⁰ Bishop George D. Gillespie of Western Michigan in a letter to the editor of *The Living Church* regretted that "even the dictum of the Russian Bishop will not protect the consecration at Fond du Lac from the popular impression that it 'aped Rome.'" He went on to add, "Let us hope that what has taken place at Fond du Lac may not have more than an editorial suggestion, 'To have the opening service of General Convention at San Francisco modelled on the lines of this service,' though, 'It will have great weight with the Holy Synod of Russia.' We prefer great weight with the Church in the United States of America."³¹

The most condemning reaction of all came from none other than the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church:

To the editor of *The Living Church*:

As the recent consecration of the Bishop Coadjutor of Fond du Lac was held under the authority of a commission signed and sealed by me as Presiding Bishop of the Church, I feel myself called upon to disclaim any responsibility for the violation of the rubrics on that occasion and the introduction of vestments having no authority of use in the Church.

(s) Thomas M. Clark
Presiding Bishop³²

A controversy then raged over the authority of the Presiding Bishop and the legality of vestments through the pages of the Episcopalian press and thundered forth from pulpits until well into the next spring. In the April 13, 1901 issue of *The Living Church* a letter to the Presiding Bishop was published signed by the seven offending bishops who had taken part in the ordination expressing their willingness to be tried by a proper ecclesiastical court if any violation of Episcopalian church law be found in their actions.³³ With this challenge unanswered the controversy subsided.

The confusion created in the minds of the Orthodox observers was well expressed by Archimandrite Sebastian (Dabovich), secretary to Bishop Tikhon, in a letter to the editor of *The Churchman* dated Thanksgiving, 1900.

I wish to say that I was present at the consecration of the Rt. Rev. R. H. Weller, being attendant of the Rt. Rev. Tikhon, bishop of the Orthodox Greek-Russian Church in North America. My present introduction, or intrusion—if you so please—is in consequence of the prominent editorial of your issue of 24th of November under the head: “Ritual Anarchy.” It seems to me to be extremely harsh—the general condemning tone of this editorial. . . . In the Orthodox Church at least there are profound and historic reasons for the expression of the visible and invisible life of the body and soul of the Church. If, according to your belief, ritual is a secondary matter in the Church, why then should you openly scandalize one another? . . . Who has the power and the word to condemn the goodly representation of nine dioceses united in prayer, in love and in earnest desire for strengthening the possibilities of a union of the churches in doctrine and in the sacraments as well? This question is a vital one—for us. We, too, are anxious to extend the hand of fellowship. Our Church would not be Orthodox nor the Church of Christ if she did not desire, yea, if she did not yearn with the anxiety of mother-pains to gather all in the bond of union. . . . There is a large number of divines in this country who desire to adhere to the seven ecumenical councils, but who, as it seems to me, are to a great extent debarred from their intention by the love they bear for their uncharitable brethern. There are American Bishops who repudiate the late and erroneous additions in the creed, etc., etc. Now these are central questions. . . . If in the Protestant E. Church the General Convention is the supreme power, we pray that the coming convention in San Francisco, next year, may not be a protesting one the way of your editorial “Ritual Anarchy” is protestant, but that it may be, we pray, a catholic convention of the Church in the United States.³⁴

During the spring of 1901, Fr. Sebastian and the Rev. Francis J. Hall, “the most notable of Anglo-Catholic theologians” and professor of dogmatics at the Western Theological Seminary in Chicago, entered into a correspondence stimulated by Fr. Sebastian’s letter.³⁵ Dr. Hall requested to know more fully those points that Fr. Sebastian regarded as truly central. Fr. Sebastian stated Orthodox misgivings about Anglicanism in the following terms.

Our Bishops and school representatives declare that the Episcopal and Anglican Church *as a whole, i.e. as a church*, does not fully accept (1) The Seven Ecumenical Councils; (2) the Seven Sacraments; (3) the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; (4) [allows] too much liberty or abuse of freedom, in *personal* interpretations of the Bible; (5) the majority refuse spiritual aid unto the faithful departed and spiritual consolation unto the living, inasmuch as they reject prayers for the dead; (6) the *majority* have strong aversion to reverence shown and due the saints glorified; (7) pictures and articles for uplifting and strengthening religion are rejected.³⁶

Dr. Hall’s response to this statement was a series of three articles entitled “The Church and the East,” which appeared in the August and September issues of *The Living Church*. In the opening of his articles, Dr. Hall wanted

to stress the two churches' possession of a common ministry as the proof of the Catholicity of the Episcopal Church:

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

The peculiar historical circumstances at the time of the reformation in England and the "providential mission of the Anglican Churches . . . account for some things which are calculated to puzzle Russian Theologians."

The revolt of the teutonic races from Papal corruptions was naturally attended by more or less blind exasperation, which ultimately carried multiplies away from the historic Faith and Order of the Church. Thus arose Protestantism; a reactionary and one-sided system, the outcome of impatient and uncontrollable zeal against evils of which the Russian Church disapproves as truly as we do. . . . The Protestant element, so far as it was not too revolutionary in temper to be retained, continued in the form of a school or party within the Church . . . the Conservative element has held its own; and, in spite of the vague and halting nature of the Articles and other Reformation formularies, has grown, especially in our day, into a fuller realization of the ancient principles and practices of the Catholic Church—Romish excrescences being removed. . . . Let it be granted that the Easterns discern many imperfections in the manner in which Anglican Churches have been discharging their God-given mission or weaning back Protestant souls. These imperfections do not constitute a justification for continued rupture of communion. . . .³⁷

Dr. Hall maintained that as the Church of England was not a new church dating from the Sixteenth Century, its actions prior to the reform must still be regarded as binding unless specifically abrogated. The Anglican churches, he asserts, accepted without question the first six councils, and although "It must be acknowledged that many of our writers have repudiated" the Seventh Council, "the progress of a more enlightened Catholicity among us makes the real teaching of the Seventh Council . . . better understood." Several Anglican periodicals now "stand for the Seven Councils." On the matter of the sacraments, Dr. Hall argued that Anglican formularies, properly interpreted, and understood in historical context, state in a language that is "obviously apologetic and eirenical" to the reform an acceptance of seven sacraments. "Accordingly his Church stands committed to some recognition of the Seven Sacraments. That is, to the position that each of them is a true sign and instrument of Divine grace."³⁶ Although the twenty-eighth Article of Religion declares that the term transubstantiation "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," the rejection of the term was a rejection of a crude

late medieval materialism. "This being the case, our repudiation of the term does not signify a rejection of the language of Christ and the Catholic Faith, that the consecrated species are truly the Body and Blood of Christ. The Rev. Wm. McGarvey's scholarly pamphlet, *The Doctrine of the Church of England on the Real Presence*, expresses the official teaching of this Church correctly."³⁹ On the other points of Fr. Sebastian's letter, Dr. Hall felt that they resulted from the different mission and surroundings in which the Eastern and Anglican Churches had existed in the past. He also felt that much could be explained by the natural demonstrativeness of the Easterns and the equally natural restraint of the Anglicans, resulting in different customs and piety.

In his closing remarks, Dr. Hall stated again very clearly the branch theory ecclesiology that was behind both his and Bishop Grafton's attitude toward the Orthodox Church.

... The author has felt under the necessity, both of the highest policy and of the demands of truth, to assume that there exists a sisterhood and equality between the Churches, as Churches. . . . It is consistent with this belief that we should acknowledge imperfections in the practice of our own portion of the Church and discern imperfections in the practices of other portions. No particular Church has escaped shortcomings—not even the Eastern Churches. But we believe that, so long as real apostacy is avoided, the Spirit which guides the Church at large is present in every part.

To conclude, we believe that it is the duty of all true Churches to exercise charity with reference to particular shortcomings, and to recognize each other as sharing one life and one glory.⁴⁰

San Francisco was the site of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in October of 1901. The Convention sat for fifteen days, made significant changes in the missionary policy of the Episcopal Church, and was the scene of several clashes between the High and Low Church members of the Convention. On the second day of the Convention the House of Bishops passed a resolution to invite Bishop Tikhon to occupy an honorary seat in their midst. Bishop Tikhon was making a pastoral visitation in Alaska at the time and was unable to be present.⁴¹ However, the actions of the Convention were closely scrutinized by the editor of the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger*, who made the following observations after the Convention closed its sessions.

... Even the most superficial observer can not fail to notice the party divisions which break up the organism of the Episcopal community in America, owing to the tendency of some of its members towards Orthodoxy and the preservation of the apostolic tradition, which forcibly goes against the protestant predilections of other members of the same community.

To our mind, this growing discord amongst the Episcopalians is by no means a sign of bad omen in the activity of their Church. First

of all it helps the Episcopalians themselves to see clearer into the question of the elasticity of their dogmatics and canon laws, and also it enables other people, both their friends and their enemies, to form more exact opinions on the same subject. Secondly, once people have begun little by little to note every new move and word amongst themselves, it is a sure sign of the absence of that lukewarmness which is fatal to any work, and above all to Church work; it is a sure sign of the absence of that apathy, which lives without a word of protest in the face of the most shameful crimes against truth and grows accustomed to any amount of remissness in questions of duty and conscience.

This apathy and lukewarmness would seem especially dangerous for the Episcopalians now, in the peculiar situation, created [in regard to the question of the Catholicism of the Episcopal Church] by the frightfully general character and indefiniteness of its "39 Articles," under the general formulas of which is to be found a most secure shelter for the liberal protestant thought, a shelter which, though evidently stretching the point, can also protect the zeal for apostolic tradition.⁴²

In this same editorial, *The Russian Orthodox American Messenger* could not help but recall the Fond du Lac consecration.

One should have seen the alarmed faces and heard the alarmed outcries of the opposing party, which saw in the event a regular 'ritualistic anarchy.' Thunder and lightening fell on venerable Bishop Grafton and the whole of the High Church Press. It was a wonder what sort of things the liberal Episcopal organs found it possible to print on this occasion.⁴³

Bishop Grafton's invitation for Bishop Tikhon to attend the consecration was indeed a most significant step in Anglo-Orthodox relations in North America. For the first time members of the Orthodox Church were enabled to see with the possession of all the facts the painful divisions that beset the Anglican Church. A profound empathy was established between the two men personally and a link forged between the Orthodox Church in America and at least the party among the Episcopalians whose aspirations and religious ideals brought them closest to Orthodox aspirations and religious ideals. *The Messenger* closed its editorial on the General Convention of 1901 with the following greeting:

We send a hearty greeting to those amongst the Episcopalians, who have not been submerged by the wave of attractive liberalism, who persistently guard and try to preserve in purity that which their church has succeeded in keeping unbroken, who did not give themselves up to despair and to shameful indifference.⁴⁴

(To be continued)

Archbishop Tikhon and Bishop Grafton: An Early Chapter in Anglo-Orthodox Relations in the New World

PETER CARL HASKELL

*Part Two**

DURING THE MONTHS following the General Convention of 1901, Bishop Charles Grafton continued to correspond with his Orthodox friends, especially Fr. Sebastian (Dabovich). In April of 1902, Fr. Sebastian thanked Bishop Grafton for a book which was to be forwarded to Metropolitan Antony (Vadkovsky) of St. Petersburg.⁴³

The years at the turn of the century were years of rapid growth for the Orthodox diocese and many new churches were being built. St. Nicholas Church (later to be Archbishop Tikhon's cathedral) was consecrated in November of 1902. Tikhon invited Grafton to be present at the service. Tikhon stressed the missionary significance of the temple in his sermon.

It is true that in wealth our new church is inferior to many churches of the great Russian land, but, for a compensation, she, like the Temple of Solomon, has a missionary importance. . . . Gathering around the temple, build out of yourselves a *spiritual house* (1 Peter 2:5), so that to be able to give yourselves, your souls and your life to the service to God. Do not forget that both your church and church community have a missionary importance: *you are a chosen generation, a peculiar people* (1 Peter 2:9), so that you may announce to the foreigners around you the wondrous light of Orthodoxy.⁴⁴

Tikhon again invited Grafton to come to Chicago for the consecration of Holy Trinity Church on Leavitt Street in March of 1903. In his address to the annual council of the Diocese of Fond du Lac that year, Bishop Graf-

* See PART ONE, *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 1967, pp. 193-206.

ton reported that he had been present at the Great Friday services with Tikhon and that he “ . . . would here bear witness of the more than kindly greetings we received from this holy Bishop and his clergy.” He went on to say, “If for one hour Christendom were one, what in that hour might it not achieve! If this ever comes, it will come, not by the adopting of each other’s errors, not by the servile copying of each other’s defects, not yet by agreeing to call diversity agreement, and palpable schism unity. It will come by a searching reformation of each communion for itself and by itself.”⁴⁵

Events in the Old World began to quicken in the realm of Orthodox-Anglican relations. The Ecumenical Patriarch Joakim III sent an epistle to the Holy Synod of Russia in 1902 expressing the desire for a mutual consultation on the attitudes the whole Orthodox Church should take towards the Christians of the West. The Patriarch suggested a meeting of representatives of the autocephalous churches, but the Russian bishops felt that the complicated political situation of the Orthodox East would make that impossible. At its session in January of 1903, the Holy Synod decreed the canonization of St. Seraphim to take place at Sarov on 19 July/1 August, 1903. They then turned to the task of answering the Ecumenical Patriarch’s epistle.

Metropolitan Antony of St. Petersburg and Ladoga composed the reply. As Archbishop of Finland he had represented the Russian Church at the celebration of Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee in 1897 and since then had followed the “affairs of the Anglican Church with great care. . . .”⁴⁶ The first part of the lengthy reply was concerned with the Latins and Protestants.

The conversion of Russia and of the Russian people constitutes the secret dream and unconcealed goal of the yearnings of the Papacy in our times. . . . However pacific the speeches of the Latins may be, however assiduously they may express and emphasize in all sorts of ways their especial love and respect for the Orthodox Church, and in particular for the Russian people and state, these fair words must not, nor can they, conceal the real desires of Rome from our attention. . . . Religious exclusiveness and even fanaticism, mixed with a contemptuous arrogance in relation to Orthodoxy, is the distinguishing mark of the Protestants, one may say, even more than the Latins. Of course, much of this may be explained by the secular prejudices and general narrowness of the horizon of the German school of theology. . . . This fact imposes upon our scholars the duty of revealing before the consciousness of the West the true majesty and the really Christian purity of Orthodoxy.

Concerning the Anglicans, the epistle observed that they “. . . assume a somewhat different attitude towards Orthodoxy.”

With rare exceptions they do not aim at the perversion of Orthodox Christians, and upon every occasion and opportunity strive to show their especial respect for the Holy Apostolic Eastern Church, admitting that she and not Rome, is the true conservator of the traditions of the Fathers, and in union and agreement with her seeking a justification for themselves, i.e., for their own position. Love and goodwill cannot but call forth love on our side also, and nourish in us the good hope of the possibility of Church union with them in the future. But here, also, much still remains to be done and to be explained, before that it will be possible to think of any sort of definite step in one or in the other direction. And, first of all, it is indispensable that the desire for union with the Eastern Orthodox Church should become the sincere desire not only of a certain fraction of Anglicanism (the "high church"), but of the whole Anglican community. That the other purely Calvinistic current which in essence rejects the Church, as we understand her, and whose attitude towards Orthodoxy is one of particular intolerance, should be absorbed in the above-mentioned pure current, and should lose its perceptible, if we may not say exclusive, influence upon the Church policy and in general upon the whole Church life of this Confession which, in the main, is exempt from enmity towards us. On our side, in our relations toward Anglicans, there ought to be a brotherly readiness to assist them with explanations, an habitual attentiveness to their best desires, all possible indulgence towards misunderstandings which are natural after ages of separation, but at the same time a firm profession of the truth of our Ecumenical Church as the one guardian of the inheritance of Christ and the one saving ark of Divine grace.⁴⁷

This epistle to the Ecumenical Patriarch may justly be considered to express the attitude of Russian higher ecclesiastical circles towards the possibilities of reunion at the turn of this century.

In addition to sending the epistle to Constantinople, the Holy Synod directed Bishop Sergius (Stragorodsky) of Yamburg, Rector of the St. Petersburg Academy (later Patriarch, 1943-44), who had been serving as president of the Commission on the Old Catholics, to establish a committee to study the question of the Anglican churches as well. At this time Tikhon himself was appointed a temporary member of the Holy Synod.

When Tikhon, still in America, informed Grafton of the appointment, Grafton composed a letter to the President of the Holy Synod, the Metropolitan Antony. Bishop Grafton forwarded his letter along with some books to Tikhon with the request that he convey them to Russia. On May 21, 1903, Bishop Tikhon telegraphed to Fond du Lac "Leave for Russia 28 May. Glad to transmit your books. Accept my sincere thanks for your feelings and best wishes."⁴⁸

Grafton's letter to Antony was a remarkable document both for what he said and for the way he said it.

We have taken the liberty of sending you by the Right Reverend Bishop Tikhon, who has so endeared himself to us, and has most

kindly undertaken this office of charity, a few theological books illustrative of our Church's position and teaching. . . .

You will in your goodness not dispise our littleness, or some peculiarities that have come from our inherited Westernism, but will, we believe, make generous allowances for the defects and evils to which a Puritan invasion in the past and our present environment in America have exposed us. The Catholic Revival is gradually developing within our communion and we ask for it your sympathy, encouragement and prayers.

Our Church has preserved the Apostolic Succession and the three holy orders of the ministry, and in her formularies has not departed, we humbly trust, from any essential or dogma of the Orthodox Faith. There has been of late years a great revival of spiritual life in the whole Anglican communion, and a better comprehension of the Catholic and Orthodox theology, and a growing desire for a recognized fellowship especially with the venerable Churches of the East.

May we venture to say to your Holiness that in the approachment of the two communions, that portion of the Anglican Church which is in the United States stands the nearest to your venerated body. Politically the governments of the two countries, Russia and the United States, have always maintained most happy relations, and our Church here in America is unlike the Church in England, free from any state control, and so free to act in its recovery of Catholicity and its intercourse with other Churches. The thirty-nine Articles do not form a portion of our Prayer Book, though bound up with it, and subscription to them is not required by us as it is in England. Our Liturgy and Eucharist differs from that in the English Book in that the doctrines of the Priesthood, Altar, and Sacrifice are more explicitly and fully stated. Our Canon for the Consecration of the Holy Elements is far more full, with a distinct offering and presentation of the Holy Sacrifice, and the formal invocation of the Holy Ghost.

We use for the most part leaven bread in the Holy Eucharist, though unleavened wafers are allowed. . . . In Baptism immersion is provided for by our rubrics, but pouring, not sprinkling is allowed, which is usually done three times, one at the mention of each name of the Blessed Trinity. We hold that there is but one *Arkhe* in the Godhead, and that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father as the One Eternal Source and Fountain of Life, through the Son. While holding the faith at one, we believe, with yourselves, there seems to be a growing feeling that the *Filioque* clause which, without Ecu-
menical authority, was added to the Creed, should be omitted.

Along with yourselves we repudiate the Papal supremacy and Rome's modern dogma's of Papal Infallibility and the Immaculate Conception. We reject the Romish doctrine of Purgatory and the relief of the souls of the faithful by the application of the super-abundant merits of the Saints through the Papal system of indulgences. We venerate Mary, the ever Virgin and ever Blessed Mother of God, but do not hold with Roman doctors that she is the Neck of the Mystical Body of Christ and that all graces must pass to us from Christ the Head through her. We accept all that the recognized

Ecumenical Councils of the Church have decreed, and as the canon of the English Church requires, hold that the Holy Scriptures should be expounded in conformity with the teachings of the ancient Fathers.

Yet we have to confess that our Church is not all that the Divine Master would have it be, and the cruel marks inflicted by the stripes of past ages can be seen upon her. Like one recovering from a long illness and just regaining strength, we turn to the East, and stretch out our hands and ask for sympathy and counsel and Christian fellowship. . . . The Latin Church can no longer dominate the West. Recognition and established fellowship between the Eastern and Anglican Communion, as it would do so much towards forwarding Christ's Kingdom, is that for which we earnestly pray, and make known in our great Master's Name our desires unto you.

Asking ever your remembrance at the Holy Altar, with our profound esteem and reverence in Christ.

Your most humble servant in the Lord,

(s) C. C. Fond du Lac⁴⁹

To anyone at all familiar with the life of the Protestant Episcopal Church at the turn of this century, this letter is likely to produce a good deal of unease. All that he says is true enough of Bishop Grafton personally, but the prevailing spirit of the Episcopal Church was quite another thing. The positions stated in the letter are framed in such a way as to be most acceptable to an Orthodox reader and seemingly even to mislead him about the Protestant Episcopal Church in general. It is doubtful that "for the most part leaven bread" was used in the Eucharist. It was true enough that the rubric in one of the services for baptism in the Book of Common Prayer instructed the minister to dip the child, but no one in 1903 in fact baptized by immersion. Grafton knew full well that most of the theological issues on which he was writing did not represent either the concerns or the positions of American Episcopalians generally. The conclusion that the letter was deliberately intended to mislead would be inescapable if it weren't for Grafton's honestly declared intention in writing the letter: "The Catholic Revival is gradually developing within our communion and we ask for it your sympathy, encouragement and prayers."

Grafton had joined the *Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom*, which sought Catholic reunion on the basis of the "branch theory" when it was founded in England in the late 1850's.⁵⁰ In 1865 (the year of Tikhon's birth), he had contributed a sermon to a volume *Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom*.⁵¹ During the half century or so preceding the writing of this letter, Grafton, like most Anglo-Catholics, had been absorbed by the apparent weakness of traditional Christianity because of its divisions in the face of the secularism opposing it. Reunion of Catholic Christendom was a central concern. For most High Churchmen this concern for "Catholic Christendom" soon narrowed to Roman Catholicism. As the

then tractarian Frederick W. Faber wrote to a friend, "I can learn little good of the poor forlorn Greek Church. It is, excepting the Russian Branch of which I know nothing, in a very sad state. . . . Depend upon it, Jack, cast about as we will, if we want foreign Catholic sympathies we must find them as they will let us in our Latin mother."⁵²

The early Tractarians were concerned about "Catholic sympathies," not merely to acquire recognition from foreign churches, or as Metropolitan Antony said in the reply to Constantinople, as ". . . seeking a justification for themselves," but because they already envisioned themselves at one with traditional Christianity in its struggle with the spirit of the age, that secular, rationalistic, progress-centered liberalism present as much in Catholic France, or among the upper classes in Russia, as in Protestant England. As Christopher Dawson puts it, ". . . the Church could not reconcile itself with the anti-dogmatic and anti-authoritarian principle which is the essence of Liberalism, while Progress, which is simply the natural process of cultural change, needs no inherent claim to the allegiance of the Christian. . . . This was the main issue of the Oxford Movement, and all its measures of ecclesiastical and liturgical reform were subordinated to this central preoccupation."⁵³

The Anglican struggle for a justification of its own position was a reaction to the predatory policy adopted by the English Roman Catholic hierarchy. There could be no question of these narrow ecclesiastical politicians' understanding the Oxford Movement's Catholic and ecumenical concern. They set about to capitalize on the situation by making a few "converts" and to weaken this revival of traditional Christianity in the Church of England. As for the Anglo-Catholics themselves, they were sentimentally lured by their Western past toward Rome. W. J. Birkbeck, in writing about the relationship of William Palmer of Oxford with Khomyakov and of Palmer's attempts to join the Orthodox Church, observed of Palmer that ". . . even when he felt himself obliged to seek admission to the Communion of the Greek or Eastern Church he dreaded rather than wished for success, while on the contrary, even when he was most fighting against Rome, his heart wished for the Roman Communion."⁵⁴

Grafton's memory in 1903 spanned the time from the Tractarians who had shaped his decision to dedicate his life to the recovery of the traditional heritage of the Episcopal Church, through the convert-making policies of Roman Catholicism, the ultramontanist of Vatican I and finally to the condemnation of Anglican Orders by the Papacy in 1896. The Papal Bull *Apostolicae Curae* broke the spell of Rome for Grafton. "The denial by Rome of our orders was a judgement such as destroyed all confidence in her spiritual conduct. No political judgement has ever been more corrupt. Expert Roman theologians had said our orders were valid, but English

Romans said such a ruling was not politic.”⁵⁵ In 1903 Bishop Grafton was turning to the Orthodox Church not as a sideward glance nor as a secondary buttress for the Anglican claims vis-à-vis Roman polemics but with a single-mindedness of purpose unique in the whole history of Anglican approaches to Orthodoxy down to the present day.

As he himself wrote,

While for a long portion of my life I hoped for the reunion in Western Christendom of the Anglican and Latin Communions, after the Roman rejection of our orders, which was in itself, I believe, a great blessing, the union seemed a practical impossibility. The Holy Spirit in the last century has been striving with the Anglican Communion, to regain its full heritage of faith and worship. . . . On the other hand, the same Holy Spirit has been pleading with the Latin Community . . . to cease to be Papal and to become Catholic, . . . but only a moral earthquake . . . can shatter the Papacy.⁵⁶

Grafton’s letter to Antony may justly be seen as the mature judgement of a sincere Christian soul, convinced of the authenticity of his own church but only too aware of its dangers and weaknesses, and therefore reaching out to the authenticity and certainty of Orthodoxy. The letter was a genuine statement of his personal faith in Anglicanism, of what he believed God was doing and would do through the Catholic Revival, and of ultimate success in the gradual recovery of what he believed to be the Episcopal Church’s rightful heritage.

On July 20, 1903, the Russian Consul General in New York, Mr. Nicholas de Lodygensky, paid a call on the Rev. Edmund Smith, rector of the Episcopal parish at Fort Hamilton. Smith had been to Russia in 1901 and was a personal friend of de Lodygensky and Fr. Alexander Hotovitsky, the editor of the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger*. The Consul General’s call was to urge that the Episcopalians send a representative to Russia, and he suggested Bishop Grafton. The previous November when Grafton had been in New York for the consecration of St. Nicholas Church, of which Lodygensky was *Starosta*, the two had discussed this possibility. Lodygensky was now convinced that the fall of 1903 would be the best time for Grafton to be there. Smith conveyed the Consul General’s reasoning as follows to Bishop Grafton:

Bishop Tikhon has just been appointed a member of the Holy Synod in Petersburg. The other members are

Bishop Anthony — Metropolitan of Petersburg

Bishop Vladimir — Moscow

Bishop Flavian — Kiev

The three above mentioned are ex-officio. Bishop Tikhon and one other are the special appointees, the whole number of Holy Synod being five.

Bishop Flavian is a nobleman, an unusual circumstance in Russian Bishops, a man of breadth of view and culture, and moreover a warm friend of Bishop Tikhon. The point Mr. de L. makes is that it is very unusual for such a man as Bishop Tikhon to be in the Holy Synod—one who has *personal* acquaintance with American Bishops, and warm personal sympathies with our hoped for rapprochement & possible union—(2) that his sympathy of view with Bishop Flavian will practically mean *two* of five members [are] at one—(3) that the letter from the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Holy Synod at just this time is significant and opens the door to strong presentations of our position and feelings towards the Eastern Church—and (4) the existence of a special commission to examine and weigh this whole subject affords the best opportunity of our being in touch with the whole question.

The appointment of Bishop Tikhon is (M. de L. thinks) for a short term—perhaps only three months—so that the great advantage to be gained from his membership in Holy Synod so far as *personal* influence from American Churchmen is concerned had best be immediate.⁵⁷

It took little urging for Grafton to start preparations to go to Russia. He consulted with Bishop Weller, his coadjutor, and on July 25 wrote directly to de Lodygensky of his intention to accept his suggestion. Grafton also wrote to Bishop Anthony Kozlowski, Polish Old Catholic Bishop in Chicago, whom Tikhon had met at the Weller consecration, suggesting he go to Europe with Grafton to the Old Catholic Conference to take place in Bohemia in August and then on to Russia. Kozlowski responded that it would be impossible for him to go to Europe for financial reasons and “. . . secondly I cannot go to Russia as being a Pole their politics will not permit me.”⁵⁸

There was residing at that time in Fond du Lac a young candidate for the ministry from Philadelphia, Sigourney W. Fay, Jr. Grafton wrote to Elbridge T. Gerry, a longtime friend of the Catholic Revival and benefactor of both the Diocese of Fond du Lac and Nashotah House. Grafton told Gerry that Fay, “A person of excellent social standing and address and very clever and learned,” had offered to go to Russia at his own expense as the Bishop’s deacon. Finances were a problem for Grafton himself, and he hinted broadly to Gerry,

In order to go properly, it is thought best, I ought to have a letter or letters from our Presiding Bishop or Chairman of the House of Bishops and if possible a letter of some weight to an American Ambassador. To go properly will tax my purse rather heavily as I have been doing all I can for this Diocese of mine.⁵⁹

On the 8th of August, Grafton was in Newport, Rhode Island to see Mr. Gerry, who gave him \$1,000 for the expenses of the trip to Russia.⁶⁰ While in Newport, Grafton called on Bishop Thomas M. Clark, the Presiding

Bishop of the Episcopal Church, and received a something less than enthusiastic letter to Metropolitan Antony stating that "It is his [Grafton's] wish and that of many others to establish and continue fraternal relations between the Eastern Church in Russia and the Church in America."⁶¹ On August 22, less than a month after receiving Consul General de Lodygensky's suggestion, Grafton sailed for England on the first leg of his trip, or pilgrimage, as he preferred to call it.

As soon as he had decided to go, Grafton had written to Lord Halifax, the President of the English Church Union. Halifax invited both Grafton and his deacon to visit in his home when they arrived in England.⁶² Halifax had nearly joined the monastic community at Cowley that Grafton had helped to found in 1865, and they had remained close personal friends over the years. Lord Halifax, as president of the English Church Union, was now the spokesman for High-Church sentiments in England. One of the vice-presidents of the English Church Union was William J. Birkbeck, an English country gentleman who had visited Moscow in 1882 and was at once fascinated by the Russian Church and people. He had learned the Russian and Slavonic languages, and having spent much time in Russia he was well known there. Halifax, as his biographer puts it, had

... always regarded the Russian Church, and the approach to it, as peculiarly within Birkbeck's province, his own eyes being fixed upon Rome; but, while occasionally irritated by attempts (with which, however, he never associated his friend) to use Orthodoxy to divert attention from the Reunion of Western Christendom, he gave every encouragement to the movement to promote closer relations between Canterbury and Moscow.⁶³

As soon as he was informed of Grafton's plans, Birkbeck invited him to come to his estate for a visit also.

Not all concerned were as enthusiastic as de Lodygensky or Grafton himself about the timing of this venture. On August 17, de Lodygensky telegraphed Grafton that "Bishop Tikhon cables he will stay September in Petersburg but thinks it would be much more convenient for your reverence to arrive in Russia next year. . . ."⁶⁴ Tikhon also sent a personal letter to Grafton, but as mail between Russia and the United States took twelve to fourteen days, Grafton had already sailed for England before it arrived. Tikhon felt that the Holy Synod's considerations of Anglicanism were just beginning, that many misunderstandings and questions would naturally arise during the investigations, and that Grafton's visit ". . . after this will help both sides very much and will be more important and successful."⁶⁵ Birkbeck, who was conversant with affairs in Russia, had many more misgivings about the trip. He wrote to Halifax,

“If B. of F. L. has *REALLY* received an invitation from Antonius of St. Petersburg, of course he ought to go. . . . But, if it is merely a friendly invitation on the part of Bishop Tikhon (the Russian Consul in N. Y. *CERTAINLY* counts for nothing, as he has nothing official to do with the ecclesiastical authorities), and not really anything from Antonius, or more than an assurance from Tikhon that Antonius would no doubt welcome him, it may be worth considering whether this is the best time for such a visit, when Americans are very unpopular in Russia for having seemed to interfere about the Jews.”^{66,67}

Bishop Grafton was, however, already on his way to England and had every intention of going on to Russia.

By all accounts, the Bishop of Fond du Lac was a very charming man and pleasant company for one of Birkbeck's High-Church sentiments and interest in Orthodoxy. Birkbeck soon wrote to Halifax, “He is *quite* delightful. . . . He has persuaded me to go to Russia with him. . . . Meanwhile very wonderful things are happening in Russia. Directly Antonius comes back to St. Petersburg, the Holy Synod are going to discuss the Anglican Church. . . . You can imagine how anxious I am.”⁶⁸ On August 24, de Lodygensky sent Grafton the passports and visas along with letters of introduction to Father Ioan Leontievich Yanycheff, Chaplain to the Imperial Family, and others.

Traveling with Mr. Birkbeck, the Bishop hardly needed introductions in Russia. Grafton's letter to the Metropolitan had itself created quite a stir in St. Petersburg. Tikhon, wrote, “Your kind gifts—these books and letters—were accepted by the Rt. Rev. Metropolitan Antonius with hearty thanks. The Metropolitan proposes to send your letter, as very important, to the Patriarch of Constantinople. . . . He asks me to explain to you his earnest gratitude and thanks and best wishes.”⁶⁹

Bishop Grafton, the Rev. Mr. Fay, and Mr. Birkbeck stayed in Russia just under one month. The trip was greatly to Grafton's delight. About five days before he left Russia he wrote a description to Gerry:

From the moment we reached the Russian Frontier every door has been opened to us. It was a small thing but when we came to the first station, and custom house, everything was ready, a special room and an excellent repast well served, officials bowing right and left. At St. Petersburg we took an apartment in the Hotel d'Europe—where we were called on by the Exarch of Georgia, who was the principle Ecclesiastic in Petersburg, the Metropolitan Anthonius being absent. He subsequently entertained us at the Lavra or monastery. The celebrated Fr. John (of Kronstadt) also came. The servants flocked about him in hall and passageway so that he had to struggle to get to his carriage so anxious were they to touch him and get his blessing. We saw General Kireev who came often being much interested in our matter and having written about it; also Mr. Sabler, the Assistant Procurator of the Holy Synod did us much service. Then we went to the Monastery (near Moscow) of the Troitsa (Holy Trinity, where

the Metropolitan of Moscow had invited us.) This is one of the most famous places in Russia. We were put up at the Guest House. The Metropolitan sent his carriage for me. We attended many services here. It was the Feast of their founder S. Alexis [*sic*]. I was told there were about 5 or 6,000 pilgrims in the place. It was quite a medieval sight when from a high terrace, some forty feet above them, the Metropolitan came with his priests and blessed the pilgrims, and the food prepared on long tables for them in the court below. Here I visited the Academy—there are 4 in Russia. These are for the best students preparing for orders. Also drove out to the Ecclesiastical Seminary and assisted the Metropolitan in giving the prizes away to the students. At the Academy dinner, in a hall larger than that of the Gen. Theo. Seminary, there are some 500 students and monks at table. The dinner at the seminary was more select, prosperous, etc. Here toasts were given—and wine—and I made a speech. Vladimir the Metropolitan seems taken with me. He drove me back to the Troitsa in his own carriage, 4 horses and postilan. . . . He took us back to Moscow in his private (railroad) car. Here at Moscow we have the honor of being in the Monastery of St. Michael, in the Kremlin, no Anglican has ever been invited here. We have. We have the grand suite of rooms belonging to the Metropolitan. . . . I was present Sunday at the great church of S. Saviour's. It holds 12,000 or more standing full. The Metropolitan celebrated. He gave me his throne in the space. Afterwards, when I came up to kiss the hand cross he held, he did not let me kiss his hand, but saluted me with three kisses. This is the ordinary way of greeting a brother bishop. Afterwards we went to his place. . . . Mr. Birkbeck has been an invaluable guide. I have drawn up a letter or paper for Anthonius (which B. has put in Russian), who is the *chief power* in the *Synod* and whom B. knows and will see first. We go now to Petersburg to meet him. Much love and all Blessings to you. Ever gratefully.

Yours

(s) C.C. Fond du Lac⁷⁰

Before leaving Russia, Grafton had the meeting with the Metropolitan Antony and presented his second letter. Antony sent Tikhon, two other bishops, and two archimandrites to the station to see Grafton's party off. If Bishop Grafton had originally written to Antony seeking Catholic sympathy, he certainly had received every outward sign of it in Russia. Although the initiative for him to make the trip had come from the Orthodox side, it would have been impossible for the Episcopalians to find an envoy who by temperament, piety, and belief would have made a better impression in Russia than Grafton. As Birkbeck wrote to Halifax, "It is such a blessing to have a Bishop who knows how to behave like a Bp, and does what he ought to icons and relics, and I'm sure he is making a splendid impression."⁷¹

The letter to Antony represented the personal position Grafton had come to in 1903; the Russian pilgrimage sealed his every conclusion. After his return to the United States he wrote, spoke, and preached almost constantly

on the theme of Orthodox-Anglican reunion. The Rev. E. G. Richardson of Milwaukee was interviewed by the *Milwaukee Sentinel* about one of the bishop's sermons, and Mr. Richardson said ". . . Bishop Grafton, since he has been to Russia has got an oriental microbe on the brain, and that his mind is so badly addled that he no longer knows how to talk to Anglo-Saxons. . . ."72

Grafton had come to almost personify the Anglo-Catholic party to most Episcopalians. The Anglo-Catholic party, however, had little influence on the life of the Protestant Episcopal Church outside the small Midwestern dioceses. Furthermore, within the High-Church group it was no longer true to say that Grafton exercised any effective leadership. While his words have a stirring prophetic ring on the theme of Orthodoxy, they only served to further isolate him from both the Low Churchmen and the Anglo-Romanists then on the increase among younger High Churchmen. The General Convention of 1904 respectfully heard Bishop Grafton's report on his trip to Russia and his recommendation that,

As the Holy Governing Synod has appointed a Commission, my suggestion is, that a similar Commission be appointed by our body, consisting of its chairman, two other Bishops and two clergy, and who shall be a committee to correspond and confer with that appointed by the Synod, and of which Bishop Sergius, the President of the Academy, is the head.⁷³

The report was published as Appendix VIII of the official *Journal* of the Convention, but no action was taken on the recommendation to appoint a special committee. Increasingly Grafton was a voice crying in the wilderness among Episcopalians. Among Orthodox in America and Russia he had become a subject of great concern and interest.

Shortly after Grafton's return to Fond du Lac, Birkbeck wrote to him from England:

Meanwhile things are going a-head in Russia. I have not got it yet, but I hear that your letter to Antonius has been published in full in the "Church Messenger" (*Tserkovny Viestnik*) the organ of the St. Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy, and that the Orthodox Theologians are invited to discuss and write upon it! What shall I do? Had not the English original better appear in the English Church papers here with an intimation that it had been published in Russia? I shan't do this till I hear from you.⁷⁴

The letter in question is the one written in Russia by the Bishop and translated into Russian by Birkbeck. It is an expansion of the first letter sent via Tikhon's good offices, running to thirteen pages in Grafton's memoirs. It is less supplicating than the first letter, but covers essentially the same points: ecclesiology, the doctrines of the real presence, priesthood, and the problem of the *Filioque*, while also asking for some clarifications from the Orthodox

on matters of devotion to the Theotokos and icons. Bishop Sergius expressed the following view of the significance of the letter and of Metropolitan Antony's invitation for theologians to comment upon it, "Thus the flower of our theologians are invited to take part in the discussion, the affair assuming the character of a church event, well able to awaken in us our common church consciousness."⁷⁵ In America the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger* urged all members of the American Mission to enter into this dialogue in

a personal exchange of ideas, which has such an immense advantage over the literary intercourse. . . . The members of our mission can render a great service to the Church of God. To our mind the newly organized Committee will be interested to see the differences of the Episcopal Church in various lights, to get acquainted with its interior life and its correspondences to the spirit of the Russian Church. . . . Henceforth every bit of information on this subject, coming from people, who are in a position to observe the life of both Churches in a direct way, is more than desirable.⁷⁶

The first Russian theologian to write on the subject of Anglican orders had been Prof. Vassili A. Sokoloff of the Moscow Theological Academy. He had favored the possibility of their recognition "by economy," and had also written on the topic of Orthodox-Old Catholic relations. He was one of the first to respond to the Metropolitan's invitation to comment upon Grafton's letter. Of Grafton himself he said the following:

Our press informed us beforehand that the aged Bishop belongs to the number of people, who have sincere and profound sympathies for the Orthodox Church, and that his present voyage is the realization of an old wish of his to become personally acquainted with the Orthodox East, to see its churches, to witness its divine services, to be a direct observer of the religious life of its people.

These good tidings concerning the aged Bishop naturally disposed us well towards him even before we knew him, and our personal acquaintance with him only helped the further development and confirmation of our regard. His imposing and highly sympathetic exterior, the simplicity and kindness of his manner, his lively and interesting conversation, and especially the sincere regard and reverence, which he showed, in word and deed, to our Orthodox Church, drew to him our best feelings.

On the subject of the Bishop's letter, Sokoloff was less enthusiastic.

The teaching of the Anglican Church in comparison with the Orthodox shows with sufficient clearness that there still exist many differences between them, the existence of which will serve as a real barrier to the union of the churches, however sincere and deep may be the feelings of mutual sympathy inspiring their adherents, and however warm their desire for union may be. Great difficulties still

stand in the way of the accomplishment of this holy work, and Bishop Grafton himself is fully conscious of this.⁷⁷

Grafton regarded this observation of Sokoloff's as a "... not unkindly criticism," for Grafton was indeed well aware of the problems, but his ecumenical hopes rested not on present Anglican realities but rather on the future recovery of tradition. As Bishop Sergius put it in a statement that might as well have been Grafton's, "A time will come when the true universal and Catholic spirit will grow and wax strong in the bowels of the American Church, conquering all other tendencies in it, and then the journey to the East will become needful for it."⁷⁸

Writing in another context in his memoirs, Bishop Grafton reflects that "... Bishops are easily deceived, perhaps more easily than other men, and their approval of persons has often been most unfortunate."⁷⁹ This was certainly the case with Grafton's approval of Sigourney W. Fay. Coming from a prominent Philadelphia family, Fay was a brilliant but mercurial man. He had been ordained rather hastily to accompany Grafton to Russia and was later appointed without mature judgement to teach theology at Nashotah House. Joseph W. Barry, who was then Dean of Nashotah, describes Fay as

the most perfect example that I have ever known of the "will to believe." Fay seems to have, apart from the fundamentals of the Christian religion, no opinion that he could not change overnight. When I first got to know him he had just returned from a visit to Russia with Bishop Grafton. . . . He came back an enthusiastic devotee of the Eastern Church, as was also Bishop Grafton. The difference was that the Bishop remained so and Fay did not. But for the time the Orthodox were everything and the Anglican Church should do everything it could to achieve union with them.⁸⁰

In the pages of the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger* during this period it is Fay almost alone who responds to the numerous articles from Russian theological literature that had been stimulated by Grafton's visit. No Episcopalian of the stature of Francis J. Hall, who had responded to Fr. Dabovich in 1901, entered into this dialogue. Aside from Grafton himself and Fay, the enthusiasm for it was almost exclusively on the Orthodox side.

(To be continued)

NOTES

⁴³ Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated April 9, 1902.

⁴⁴ "An Address made by Very Reverend Bishop Tikhon on the Occasion of the Dedication of the Russian Orthodox Church in New York," *Russian Orthodox American Messenger*, Nov. and Dec. Supplement 1902, pp. 340-342.

⁴⁵ *Journal of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Council of the Diocese of Fond du Lac*, pp. 45-46.

⁴⁶ Athelstan Riley, *Birkbeck and the Russian Church* (London, 1917), p. 266.

- 47 Riley, pp. 251-252.
- 48 Telegram in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated May 21, 1903.
- 49 Grafton, *A Journey Godward* (Milwaukee, 1910), pp. 260-264.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 243. Cf. Henry Brandreth, *Dr. Lee of Lambeth* (London, 1951), pp. 76-117.
- 51 Frederick G. Lee (ed.), *Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom*, 2 Vols. (London, 1864-1865).
- 52 John E. Bowden, *Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber D.D.* (4th Ed.), pp. 99-100.
- 53 Christopher Dawson, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (London, 1945), pp. 120-121.
- 54 W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church* (London, 1895), p. 180.
- 55 Charles C. Grafton, *Pro-Romanism and the Tractarian Movement* (Milwaukee, 1908), p. 6.
- 56 Grafton, *Journey*, pp. 247-249.
- 57 Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated July 20, 1903.
- 58 Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated July 25, 1903.
- 59 Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated July 24, 1903.
- 60 Entry in Grafton's Journal (Fond du Lac), dated August 8, 1903.
- 61 *Journal of the General Convention of 1904*, Appendix VIII, p. 483.
- 62 Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated August 8, 1903.
- 63 J. G. Lockhart, *Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax, 1839-1934* (London, 1935), Part II, p. 116.
- 64 Telegram in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated August 17, 1903.
- 65 Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated August 16, 1903.
- 66 *Life and Letters of W. J. Birkbeck by His Wife* (London, 1922), pp. 240-241.
- 67 At Easter 1903, in the provincial city of Kishenev, a bloody anti-Jewish riot had occurred. Jews living in the United States had organized wide public protests, and the American embassy in St. Petersburg had attempted to present the Russian Government with a petition signed by a large number of American citizens. The Imperial Government had refused to receive the petition and regarded its presentation as meddling in the internal affairs of the Empire. Alexandre Tarsaidze, *Czars and Presidents* (New York, 1958), p. 324. Cf. Cyrus Adler, *Jacob H. Schiff, His Life and Letters* (Garden City, 1929), p. 131.
- 68 Birkbeck, *Life and Letters*, p. 242.
- 69 Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated August 16, 1903.
- 70 Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated October 14, 1903.
- 71 Birkbeck, *Life and Letters*, p. 247.
- 72 *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, November 28, 1903, p. 1.
- 73 *Journal of the General Convention in 1904*, Appendix VIII.
- 74 Letter in Grafton Papers (Fond du Lac), dated November 27, 1903
- 75 Quoted by Vassili Sokoloff, "The Answer to a Call," *The Russian Orthodox American Messenger*, June and July Supplement 1904, p. 171.
- 76 Fr. Th. Pashkovsky [later Metropolitan Theophilus], "Concerning the Union," *The Russian Orthodox American Messenger*, January Supplement 1904, pp. 24-25.
- 77 Sokoloff, *Answer*, pp. 169-236.
- 78 Quoted by Sokoloff, *Answer*, p. 237.
- 79 Grafton, *Journey*, p. 102.
- 80 Barry, *Impressions and Opinions* (New York, 1931), pp. 219-220.