

—where the guilds possess great commercial and social importance, and to engage openly in commercial pursuits, from which they had hitherto been debarred. From a political standpoint this is an important concession, as it means toleration for the "Old Believers" and other kindred sects, whose adherents amount in round numbers to something like 12,000,000 souls. The concession comes not one bit too soon, and will serve as a counterpoise to the evil and destructive influences of the Nihilists, which have honey-combed all ranks of Russian society to such an extent as to cripple progress, and to make all non-Nihilists to walk with their lives in their hands.

The "Old Believers" have ever been an industrious, peace-loving folk. They have never raised the standard of revolution, nor did they ever, like the Cameronians and Covenanters in Scotland, the Cromwellian Puritans in England, or the Mormons in America, rise up in arms against the powers that be. Their only crime was that they worshipped God after a fashion not approved by the Czar. When met by the secular arm they offered no opposition, but moved off bodily into the forest, retaining their loyalty and their religious opinions at the same time. There they became the pioneers of civilization, the explorers and early colonists of the vast and lonely waste lands of the empire. As M. Alfred Rambaud says in his "History of Russia," "The Raskolniks or Dissenters, Russian Puritans or Mormons, persecuted as they are by secular and ecclesiastical law, seek from forest to forest the Jerusalem of their dreams."

This sect of "Old Believers" owes its origin the Minister of Alexis Mikhailovitch, father of Peter the Great. Nothing was further from the intention of their founder than to start a sect of heretics. He was the son of a peasant, who became Metropolitan of Novgorod, and afterwards Patriarch. Some years before Dionysius, of the Troitza Monastery, had undertaken the task of correcting the Russian Sacred Books. His mantle fell upon Nikon. As a critical inspection and recession of the Vedas undermined Brahminical authority from its very foundation, so in the case of the Russian Sacred Books. Many false readings were discovered on which ceremonial and theological rites and ideas had been based. "A number of gross mistakes, and even interpretations (says M. Rambaud) had slipped into the Slavonic manuscripts, and thence passed into print." The texts were collected by Nikon, who chose a revising and collecting committee of scholars and divines. This was the beginning of the schism—of the sect of the "Old Believers." These took their stand upon the ancient corrupt readings and the old-fashioned interpretations. So far did they carry their conservatism that, relying upon mistranslated or misinterpreted texts, these dissenters not only refused to shave their beards, but also demanded that the sign of the cross should be made with two fingers and not with three, and that there should be seven and not five *prospheires* in the Liturgy. They adhered rigidly to their opinions, and were ready to go to the stake or to be drowned in the river rather than read "Iisous" for "Isous." In their eyes every jot and tittle of the sacred—that is the corrupt—text should be kept inviolate till heaven and earth should pass away.

The schism swiftly assumed large and more formidable proportions. The "Milk-Drinkers," the "Flagellants," the "Champions of the Spirit," and many other sects, with names and opinions equally odd, threw in their lot with the "Old Believers," feeling that the revision of the text of

the Sacred Books meant the cutting away from under their feet the ground they boasted for the truth of their religious ideas. The Czar sided with Nikon and drove into exile the 'religious madmen,' the 'false prophets,' and the 'fanatical people.' The extreme penalty of the law was even resorted to, and report has it that one of the new sect was burned at the stake.

But, as we have already pointed out, the innovators were guilty of no acts of violence, nor did their existence cause any trouble in the State. Dissent has never been at all a powerful factor in Russian politics—except in the case of the Uniats, who have been both persecutors and persecuted in turn, and, perhaps, the Skoptzi, a sect whose imitation of Atys, Origen, and the worshippers of Cybele can never gain many adherents. As a rule the Nonconformists have been neither rich enough nor strong enough—hardly ambitious enough—to create political disorder. They usually aimed at a kingdom not of this world, and so long as they could enjoy their organization into substantial communities of their own, with their priests, and their schools, and their husbandry, they were content to live and let live. Their only strife was polemical, in which some, like Daniel Vikoulof gained a reputation for dusty and dry scholarship and research. So impressed was Peter the Great with their peacefulness of life and disposition that, on passing through one of their settlements, he ordered them to be left alone and begged of them that they should pray for him. "Heaven he said, in one of his intervals of sobriety, has given the Czar power over the people, but not over the consciences of men." Yet, shortly afterwards, when pressed for money, he doubled their taxes and made them wear a peculiar costume. He persecuted their preachers, and made the "Old Believers" attend the "Orthodox" worship at stated times—as, till later years, the Jews were "converted and reconverted" in Rome. The present Czar seems to know better. If he hopes to convert them, he prefers to do so by leaving them to their own devices. He knows what in this matter was the experience of Elizabeth Petrovna—a religious and austere monarch—whose persecution drove fifty-three of the "Old Believers" to burn themselves to death at one time near Oustiongue, and one hundred and seventy-two near Tomsk, in Siberia. Alexander I. tried the other plan and protected the Raskolniks, on whom, as he publicly proclaimed, "sermons had no effect." "Does it become a government," (he asks), to bring back these wandering sheep to the fold by violence and cruelty?" This protection of his, by the way, some would think, degenerated into latitudinarianism, seeing that he allowed a sect of Dancing fanatics to celebrate their rites (by giving a ball) in the Mikhail Palace; nor did the Minister of public worship himself, Prince Galitzin, disdain to honor by his presence the sacred dances of the priestess Tatarinof and her disciples. But as his years increased, so did Alexander become surly. When the tolerant Galitzin ceased to be Minister of Public Worship the priestess was curtly informed that for the future she was to hold no dancing "at homes" in the Mikhail. The present Czar, with that sagacity and liberality in religious matters which have distinguished his reign from the first, knows that it is not too much freedom in religion that is likely to hurt his authority and overturn his power, so much as the denial of all religion and the reign of the Nihilists, who in reality own no God and possess no creed save that of the Commune.

DR. DOLLINGER'S REPLY TO DR. NEWMAN.

THE following letter has been addressed to the "Times":

SIR,—In my letter which you inserted in *The Times* of the 10th inst., I said, "We may expect that Professor Dollinger will in reply quote passages from the Cardinal's writings and prove his assertion." My anticipation was not unfounded. The letter of Dr. Dollinger, addressed to me, of which I append a literal translation, cannot fail to convince unprejudiced readers that Dr. Newman was accused of heterodoxy, and why his books have escaped the *Index* the letter explains satisfactorily.

Munich, June 18.

"Highly esteemed Sir,—I learn from your letter addressed to *The Times*, and I thank you most cordially for forwarding it to me, that my assertions about the Romish *Index* and Dr. Newman's words need to be more substantially supported by the following facts:—

"1. The cause for the forbearance shown to Dr. Newman at Rome is not exclusively attributed to the fact that the Romans do not understand the English language; but Rome was conscious that Dr. Newman is looked up to by the educated English people as a high authority in spiritual things; and as he is, indeed, the most brilliant and the most precious acquisition the Church of Rome has made since the Reformation, to censure him would have been equivalent to making an incision in her own body.

"2. Dr. Newman has, notwithstanding, not escaped being denounced at Rome by English Ultramontanes. This denunciation was, in the first instance, owing to his paper, 'On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Religion' (Rambler, 1859); partly on account of his expressed opinions respecting 'Mariolatry,' and of what he wrote against St. Alphonsus Liguori's book on morality. It was considered highly offensive that he should in his '*Apologia pro Vita Sua*,' treat the youngest, and in all questions on morals, the most weighty, 'Doctor Ecclesie,' so disrespectfully in declaring his not being able to reconcile to himself the doctrine of Liguori, 'on the admissibility of telling lies' and of 'perjury'—a doctrine which has received the Romish approbation. Dr. Newman was then obliged to send his most intimate friend and disciple, the late Saint-George of the Oratory, to Rome, so that he might avert the pending danger of his book being placed upon the *Index*, and the mission was successful.

"3. The theory on construing new dogmas, which Dr. Newman has advanced in his celebrated essay, 'On Development,' which served as a preliminary to his secession to Romanism, must have been then, and still must be, most objectionable to Romish theologians. His theory on new dogmas was apparently condemned by Pius IX. in 1854, in the bull called '*Ineffabilis*,' of course without making mention either of Dr. Newman or of his book. Such a course of action was adopted because Dr. Newman wrote it as a member of the Anglican Church. Again, the Romish policy considered it requisite that such a conspicuous personality should be treated with the utmost forbearance.

"You are at liberty to make of the preceding communication any use you please. Commending myself to your continued kind remembrance,

"I remain, with high estimation, yours,
"J. V. DOLLINGER."

There is only one passage in Cardinal Newman's letter which Dr. Dollinger does not seem to have taken notice of—namely, that he sees in Professor Dollinger's action a want of benevolence towards him.

Dr. Dollinger's answer would, no doubt, have been the old Aristotelian proverb,—"*Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas.*"

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

M. HEIDENHEIM,

British Chaplain and Lecturer of Divinity in the University of Zurich.

Zurich, June 21.