A HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE NON-RUSSIAN AND FOREIGN MISSION
ACTIVITY OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

by

ALLA SEMIONOVNA BABIY

submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of

MASTER OF THEOLOGY

in the subject

MISSIOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF J REIMER

NOVEMBER 2000
The thesis is titled "A HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE NON-RUSSIAN AND FOREIGN MISSION ACTIVITY OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH" by ALLA SEMIONOVNA BABIY. The thesis is a Master of Theology in Missiology promoted by PROF J REIMER.

Summary:

Protestants often think that the ROC has no mission just because Orthodoxy pays to more attention to Service life. We tried to understand motives, goals and objectives of the ROC missionary activity. We found out that the ecclesiologic way of thinking was the basis missionary idea of the eastern missionary practice and it showed itself differently in special historical moments.

This work divides the whole history of the Orthodox Church in Russia (XI - XX centuries) into 3 periods of mission and makes its brief survey and analysis.

In the first period (XI-XVI) only single monks-colonialists realized the Great Commission among Finnish tribes and russified it. Only certain people used the methods of well planned contextualizing mission, like Stephen of Perm.

During the second period (1552–middl.XIX) the ROC worked in close combination with the State to the detriment of the deep evangelization of natives.

In the third period (the middle of XIX- the beginning of XX) the missionaries of Orthodox Missionary Society used all the achievements of the native and foreign missionary: contextualization, Liturgies in the national languages, enlightenment by schools of all levels, the training of national leaders, social work etc.

At the present time, the ROC is renewing its own mission tradition after the sleep of the Soviet period.
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INTRODUCTION

At the beginning I was asked: “You don’t have any missions now, as you didn’t have it before, do you?”; then: “is it true that you have a mission in Japan ...?” (Sminnov 1904:V). In due time the enemies of the Orthodoxy set an idea afloat, that the Orthodox Church of East has never had and still doesn’t have missions and this is a church of stiffness and backwardness (VIII; the italic type is ours).

The missionary activity didn’t fall into decline ... since the moment the Orthodoxy came to Russia (Nikolsky 1895:30. Apostolic duty is a basic element of being Orthodox (Anastasios 1989:64). Indifference to mission is a denial of Orthodoxy (88).

From the distant times till today the concept that the Russian Orthodox Church (further on ROC) is not a missionary Church and that it has never been engaged in sending missionaries to different regions is quite a common one in East and West, among the Catholics, the Protestants and even the Orthodox. Moreover, quite often it is considered, that any activity similar to missionary work is completely alien to this church. Fortunately this point of view has started to change in some circles.

Of course, lack of sufficient information is one of the main problems here. It’s not a secret, that the information about ROC missionary activity is rather poor even in serious multivolume historical transactions of the western writers. And in the majority of other works, as a rule the fact of Russia’s christening (Reimer 1996:14) 1 is mentioned only.

But there are a lot of historical sources about the broad missionary work of Russian Orthodox Church that you can find in ROC archives and libraries. The truth is that those documents are not published and, most of them are not studied. Now, the present state of affairs is changing gradually, some materials have started to be issued. The publishing of archpriest Vladimir Fedorov’s collected articles “Orthodox mission today” has become a real event in the world of Orthodoxy and missiology (Fedorov 1999). There are some works of Russian and foreign Orthodox missiologists and the crucial(key, dominant) program documents of ROC Synod are collected. These documents are talking about the revival of Orthodox missionary

1 «For example see: Robinson Ch... Walker W... Qualben L. P.... Meyer C. S.... Nichols R. H. There is less than two pages dedicated to this subject in Neill... Rosenkranz didn’t write much more about it either... There are the whole 11 pages about the Christianization of Russia in "A History of the Expansion of Christianity", the monumental work of Lattourette K. S. (see Reimer 1996:14)."
practice in Russia (ROC Synod 1995; Joann (Popov) 1995), and were not accessible to the broad audience of the readers before. The book is intended as a textbook of missionology course for Orthodox theological educational institutions and has been introduced in educational program not long ago. All these facts show the desire of ROC to revive its former missionary activities after the seventy-year “Babylon” capture of Soviet period.

Nevertheless, the need for discovering the missionary past of the Church that has made Orthodox the bigger part of the continent of Eurasia is simply obvious as long as the interest has arisen towards the eastern branch of Christianity because of Orthodox Churches having taken part in the ecumenical movement.

It is rather useful, and even necessary for Russian protestants, to get acquainted with a history of Christian faith expansion in the territory of Russia and beyond its borders in order to learn from the past. And for ROC itself the heroic missionary experience of past centuries would help to drop fetters of a sopor, Anastasios Janoulautos writes about in a self-critical manner «the evangelical activity of certain local churches slowed down and interest in missions has become lethargic» (Anastasios 1989:64). Unfortunately, the similar self-evaluations in the literature of ROC are rather rare.

The purpose of the given work is to present a brief survey and analysis of three periods of the Russian Orthodox Church mission history, filling in a little information gap in this problem. But as it is difficult to understand anybody’s missionary activity, without having any idea of its missionary thinking, therefore in the beginning, the theological foundation of ROC mission will be briefly represented. We will start considering how the obtained concepts worked in different cultural, language and historical contexts of the Orthodox mission, as soon as we clarify that the dogmus of the Orthodox mission are based on ecclesiology.

We will make the analysis of the history of the Russian Orthodox Church mission history and foreign mission since XI c. till the beginning of XX c. But as the volume of the given work does not allow us to consider ROC activity in its entirety, we will represent only key moments of the mission history, especially bright personalities, and the mission in the most significant

---

2 The theses for this survey will be taken from the author's earlier research (Babić 1998)
regions, such as the territory of Finno-Ugric tribes, Tatarstan, Eastern and Western Siberia, Kalmykia, Yakutia, Alaska, China. The ROC mission in the Caucasus, in Central Asia, in central Russia, in Japan, Korea and other countries will not be represented.

Considering methods of contextualization in ROC mission, we shall try to clear up the question if the judgement about ROC as the "church of stiffness and backwardness" is a correct one. (Smirnov 1904:VIII). We shall make an attempt to see the difference in purposes and tasks of ROC missionary activity in different historical periods. Also it will be important for us to understand, what the reason of this missionary activity was: whether it is the product of RC missionary qualities as ecclesia; or it is the destiny of the sanctified individuals, certain "rara avis", who were not understood by contemporaries and were erected on a pedestal of honour by offsprings; or it is a simple state necessity. In this work you will meet such missionary terms as: evangelization, russification, civilization, politicization, enlightenment, deaconry, contextualization, training of national leaders, translations, organization of missionary work, Church and state contacts, finances and church architecture.

The research will be based mostly on the unique Russian-language materials of the past and the beginning of our century that are kept in archives of the St.-Petersburg Spiritual Academy library and Saltikoff-Schedrin public library of St.-Petersburg and are inaccessible to the western research workers. Also it will be based on known western missionary idea writers, such as Anastasios, Boch, Garrett, Jon Bria, Keshishian and researches of Russian orthodox mission of Dr. J. Reimer.
PART 1: THE IDEOLOGICAL BASIS OF ROC MISSION

1.1 Survey of the theological grounds of the mission

In a dogmatic part of our research we simply represent ecclesiological substantiations of the Orthodox mission, without any analysis, just the ready material, as the offered concepts could be found more widely in the previous work of the writer on Theology of ROC mission (Babiy 1998).

It is obvious, that ecclesiology is the base, OC missionary thinking built on: «ecclesiology became so primary» (Bosch 1991:201,207; see Anastasios 1965:281; 1989:79; an italic type ours). Obviously, the similar thinking expresses itself in missionary activity, because we act as we think.

These are found ideas based on ecclesiology of the Orthodox Church:

1) *Church is the object, not the instrument of the mission* (see Bria 1975:245; see 1980:8; Bosch 1997:223).

2) *The Orthodoxy does not imagine the complete missionary activity outside itself.* Because, it is the only one that corresponds to four definitions of Nicaea Symbol of the Faith (see John (Popov) 1995:13; see also Makarios [1857] 1993:150-157; Hopko 1991:66-67; Tsiplin 1996:404). Therefore it keeps free distribution of Christian faith only to itself. These are the origins of the ROC apologetic mission, but their research exceeds the limits of our work. This is exactly one of the reasons why the Protestant mission had difficulties on Orthodox territories.

3) Nowadays the «canonical territory» of the Orthodox state is considered to be the «apostolic apanage» of OC, which makes the Church responsible for carrying on the missionary activity and guarding it from non-Orthodox missionary activity (see ROC Synod 1995:5-6; John (Popov) 1995:21-23).

4) OC is a cosmocentral Church - Kingdom. It is «the center of the universe». The destiny of the universe is decided here, the one that «has been invited to enter the church, to become the church of Christ» (see Lossky 1976; is cited in Anastasios 1989:83f; the italic type ours). The notions ekklesia and Kingdom are practically the same in OC. To be in the Church means to be in the Kingdom (see Bosch 1991:207). The sanctifying effect of the Church, as
Kingdom, turns not only to a human soul, but also to all beings. Church brings blessings to the whole world, to the living and dead by means of a prayer (see Bulgakov 1985:293-294; Debolky 1994:36; Makarios [1857] 1993:2/145). The mission starts with spiritual retaking of a territory (see Reimer 1996:204).

5) The mission is inherent to the nature of the Church (ROC Synod 1995:3-4; John (Popov) 1995:10-11). It is «not one of the «functions», or tasks, «but the life» (Keshishian 1992f:98). In OC the approach to mission is «organic rather than organized» (Bosch 1991:207).

6) The Orthodox Church is the centripetal mission of presence with the new center in Christ, where new believers should be brought (see Anastasios 1965:285; 1989:64-70; Blauw 1962:43; is cited in Glasser 1966:39; see also John (Popov) 1995:16; Bosch 1991:207; Reimer 1996:206)

7) Church = Mission (Spiller; is cited in Stamoolis 1986:116; is cited in Bosch 1997:223). Therefore in OC mission is the whole life of the Church from the global events up to the smallest details. The temple arrangement, peal (chime, ringing of bells), icon-painting, iconostasis, and wall painting — everything has a missionary orientation. The architecture and painting - everything works for the mission.

8) The construction of a temple is one of the first main steps of OC mission (Anastasios 1989:65f). The orthodox temple is extremely logical in all its details and bears in itself all dogmatics of the Orthodoxy, the whole idea of salvation, embodied in the architectural forms. This sermon is expressed with the language of symbols - signs (see Vladishevskaya1993:48; see also Methews 1994:11; Fudel 1996:23; Grushevsky 1996:6/2/338). The temple is important and sacred because «it contains in itself an Altar for the sacrifice of the Eucharist. It is the «instrument of a religious rite, as equal as the Priest» (Simeon 1993:385). According to the church canons, the life of a Christian should be connected to a temple from birth till death.

9) «The spatial hierarchy» of the order of murals in the temple is the result of OC conception of the universe. It represents the universe in its sketchy outline (see Metews 1994:10). The system of the Grace of God descending (see Vladishevskaya 1993:114) and the scheme of prayerful mediating of saints and Mary is consolidated in the architecture and painting, and is passed to a spectator through the method of psychological influence. In all aspects of its work OC has always been using the technique of delivering a message to one’s consciousness by putting
him into a special world. The painting in the temple represents all centuries-old knowledge and experience of the Church: the Old Testament and the New Testament, Orthodox dogmatic doctrine, the whole history of Church (see Methews 1994:8-14; Grushetskiy 1996:6/2/340).

10) The mission of an icon is an extremely important aspect of OC mission. It is of the same importance for the Orthodoxy as «the Bible for a reformer» (Stanly; is cited in Snegirev 1993:101; the italic type is ours) and as for its place, it is the «second only to the eucharist» (Fairbairn 1984:76; the italic type is ours). Its main purpose is a dogmatic one, it is the «example» and the «book» (see Anatoliy (Martinovsky) 1993:71; Gavriushin 1993:101-102; Snegirev 1993:101-102; Fairbairn 1984:75; Tsarevsky 1991:23-24; Arseniev 1993; 140). Besides it is the Emblem of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ (see Ouspensky 1978:51f; is cited in Fairbairn 1984:72f; Florovsky 1976:210; Anatoliy (Martinovsky) 1993:83; Gavriushin 1993:8; Grushetsky 1996:6/2/340; Men 1991:149;). And partly, *epiphanically, it shows a spiritual reality* (see Shmekan 1992:41; Markin 1994:271). It also plays the role of an intermediary, the «receptacle» of grace and a helper for believers in reaching the Theosis (see Sosnin 1993:61; Ouspensky and Lossky 1982:36; is cited in Fairbairn 1984:75,77). Thus «the art, as a path of saving» is canonized in OC (see Bulgakov 1993:289; the italic type is ours).

11) Iconostasis works as the act of cathedral unity of Church terrestrial and Church celestial (see Shmekan 1992:17-18), the picturesque credo of faith, the opened «superbook» and express-course of both Testaments History and the history of Church. Its system of tiers of images shows the idea of a celestial hierarchy (see Grushetsky 1996:6/348-349 and others).

12) The whole system of OC Liturgical life represents the chief mechanism of the missionary work (see Bria 1975:247), and the Orthodox Church expresses its care of the flock in mainly in its Liturgy (see Deboldsky 1994:7; see Bosch 1991:210). Religious rites go along with the Christian, all his life from the moment of birth till death. Each service has a permanent liturgical theme. Year's, seventh-day and day's circles completely represent the basic Gospel and historical events of the Church (see Fairbairn 1984:26f, 89f; Grushetsky 1996:6/2/363). The particular method of OC missionary activity is holidays (see Men 1991:54). As well as religious rites are the method of missionary work (see Deboldsky 1994:52; Men 1991:9-10).

13) In OC the sermon is during the Liturgy «a general rule, though not the law» (see Bulgakov 1985:289). The attitude towards it, as *a desirable, but not obligatory feature*, always
drove to the fact that homilies were made very seldom in the temples. Probably such a situation exists because of understanding, that «the kerygma is not limited to the verbal proclamation» (Bria 1975:248; 1980:9f; see Bosch 1991:207; the italic type is ours) and that the liturgy itself, with all its components, is already the expressive sermon.

14) The beauty and the particular mysticism of a service, element of beauty, as Glory of God that is filling up the temple, all these elements have their individual place, along with a prayer and an edification (see Bulgakov 1985:278,295). The Orthodoxy tries to show to a visitor the Glory of God with the help of beauty and at the same time glorifies God with the beauty of its services. Here, they teach us to worship God at a level of subconsciouness.

15) The Liturgy of the Eucharist or the Divine Liturgy is a central missionary event of the Orthodox Church. The center and the driving force of the Orthodox mission are in it. OC is «a eucharist-centered and eucharist-oriented» community (see Keshishian 1992d:27,22f; Fudel 1996:13,90; Men 1991:31; Bria 1975:248; Hopko 1991:91; Khodr 1975:15; Fairbairn 1984:25; WCC 1977:1-2)

16) The ties between the Eucharist and ecclesiology is the fundamental idea, the center of rotation because

Christ calls the bread his body, and that Paul later refers to the Church as the body of Christ. Just as the bread becomes Christ's body during the eucharist, so also the people who partake of it are transformed into Christ's body, the Church (Fairbairn 1984:16).

In other words the meeting of Christians becomes the Church exactly through the Eucharist «the Eucharist constitutes the church» (see Bria 1975:248; Anastasios 1989:82; Keshishian 1992d:22f; WCC 1977:1; John (Popov) 1995:18; Meyendorf 1973:27; is cited in Fairbairn 1984:16; the italic type is ours). The Eucharist plays the role of the most important mystical Intermediary, due to the Orthodox doctrine about μεταφυσικός (transsubstantiation). And in its turn the Church makes the Eucharist possible, as it can not exist beyond of institute of the Church and without the presence saints' relics in the antimension (see Bria 1975:245; Averintsev 1993:1/523).

17) And as according to the OC philosophy the mission is not entrusted to the Church, but the Church is the mission (see Bria 1975:245f), the Church and the Mission are united. Therefore, everything that the Church does in the world is the mission. Its Liturgy is the sermon
in the Church, through the Church and about the Church (see Anastasios 1969:7; 1989:83; 1990:53; Bosch 1991:207; and others). We take part in the mission of God when we participate in the Eucharist and therefore all who receive the communion are missionaries (see Anastasios 1989:83).

18) The purpose of OC mission is the construction of independent, self-governing eucharistic communities (see Keshishian 1992d:22f; WCC 1977:1; John (Popov) 1995:16; Anastasios 1989:65f). «Nobody is saved alone. The saved one is saved in the Church as Its member, and in the unity with all its other members». «We are saved by entering a specific local community» (see Keshishian 1992c:16; WCC 1977:1; John (Popov) 1995:13-14).

19) «The aim of the mission is in the projection of the relations inside the Trinity to the human relations». This is «the passing of experience of relationship with God», the life of a community that lives in God (see ROC Synod 1995:11; John (Popov) 1995:13-14).

20) The uniting power of the Eucharist has an incredible number of versions of koinonia and unity:

*Man — God = Theosis.* The personal deification becomes the primary aspect of the missionary activity and the aim of the mission. The Christian is the missionary. If you save yourself, you save others. (see John (Popov) 1995:10,16; Bosch 1991:209; Bria 1986:9; WCC 1977:6);


*Local Church — Local Church, Culture — Culture, Local Church — Ecumenical Church.* The local Church communicates with all local churches and Ecumenical church through the Eucharist (see Keshishian 1992d:23,24,98-100; Anastasios 1968:21; Marhovich 1982:105-106; WCC 1977:4-5).

*Church Terrestrial — Church Celestial, Mary, Saints and Angels (their intermediary role) Church of Past centuries — Modern Church* (see Fairbairn 1984:26);

21) JPIC (a term from Keshishian 1992d:22). The discussion on this topic is the main subject of WCC arguments. The help to the «poorest», the establishment of peace and justice between nations, the annihilation of famine, poverty and illnesses, assistance in observing human rights — all these items should be part of the work of the Church. This is its «liturgy after the Liturgy», «the Eucharist in the extension», diaconia (WCC) 1977:6; Bria 1987:267; Keshishian 1992d:27f; Bosch 1991:210; Bria 1976:182,185 etc.)

22) The Divine Liturgy — this is Marturia and Kerugma of OC through Anamnesin, Cataggello and Eucharistia. The whole sacrament of Incarnation from the Manger of Bethlehem to the Mount of Olives and the survey of all prophecies about Christ are given in it (see Bulgakov 1985:286; Grushetsky 1996:6/2/356,370; Simeon 1993:380; Shmemann 1992:273; Dmitrievsky [1894] 1993; Debolsky 1994).

The parish and the priests that take part in the Liturgy, proclaim the Gospel Message and the Church traditions. Laity that takes part in the Liturgy, take in the truth. The whole eucharistic community is the evidence itself, and as an example invites one to follow Christ.

So, these are the ideological bases of the Orthodox mission, where the incarnate nature of the Eucharist is the center of rotation. As exactly at the time of taking the Flesh and Blood of the Son, the meeting of people becomes “co-blood” to him and mystically turns into the Church, and into the Kingdom, and into the Mission. From this follows the centripetalness of the Orthodox mission, that invites everybody to participate in the Cup of Life in the eucharistic local communities, whose construction is the purpose of OC mission. Deification of some individuals is the aim of the mission, and without having it done there can’t be any missionary work, also it is impossible outside the church, the Eucharist and other sacraments. At the same time, the Eucharist can not exist without the institution of Church and temple, with all its contents. The Church, being by its nature a missionary body, makes everything that belongs to it the mission: the church architecture, icon-painting, frescos, music and others. From the point of comprehension, OC consists of one sheer mission.

Hereinafter, looking at the OC mission history, we shall see the way the principles of OC missionary thinking have been working in the history of Russian Orthodox missionary activity.
But before it is necessary to clear up the correlation between the ecclesiology, as the foundation of the Orthodox mission, and the practical principles of its missionary activity.

1.2 Forms and principles of the missionary activity

Nowadays the Russian Orthodox Church has come into a stage of the revival of its missionary activity, after the seventy years' stagnation of the Soviet period that interrupted in the heyday its «external mission», as well as non-Russian and foreign. The numerous program documents of ROC, issued for internal use (see ROC Synod 1995; John (Popov) 1995 etc.\(^3\)) clearly testify that the Russian Orthodox Church has started the revival of the mission in all its aspects and will use everything to fulfill these commitments. As has been already mentioned in the introduction, the Orthodox Research Missiology Institute with the archpriest Vladimir Fedoroff at the head of it, has issued collected articles “Orthodox mission today”. These documents threw open ROC thoughts about the history and further destiny of the orthodox mission to the broad audience of the readers. Not long ago the books came into the market, in specialized bookshops and already are in demand by the Christians of different denominations. It is quite possible, that the small circulation of the book (1500 copies) will not satisfy the demand, as this book is a text-book missiology course for ROC spiritual educational institutions.

The above mentioned documents, except for the theological grounds of the mission, also represent the principles and forms of ROC missionary activity, that we find almost to their full extent in ROC mission of XIX-XX century. Makariy (Gluharev) (1792-1847), Innokentiy (Popov-Veniaminov) (1797-1879), Nickolai (Kasatkin) and even earlier missionaries -- Stephen of Perm, Trifon of Pechenegia and Filofey (Tobolsky) were using them with success. Therefore it is extremely important to consider them, before we shall begin the analysis of the historical mission events.

\(^3\) Now these documents are included in the archpriest Vladimir Fedorov's collected articles “Orthodox mission today” (Fedorov 1999) along with other sources of the similar subjects. We didn’t make additional references to this secondary source. The references in this work are made to the primary sources.
The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church describes four forms of the mission: informational, apologetic, educational and external in the mentioned above program missionary document.

1.2.1 Informational mission

The informational mission includes: a) mass-media means; b) parochial libraries; c) the special missionary literature (see ROC Synod 1995:6). On the parochial level this mission should be expressed in the publication of parochial leaflets and TV and radio missionary programs (7). In ROC pre-Revolutionary mission the issuing of the different printed missionary Bulletins, Gazettes and Leaflets was up to the mark, now they are the most important material for the research of ROC mission.

1.2.2 Apologetic mission

The apologetic mission of ROC is expressed in an opposition to not orthodox missionary work. Its basis is the «principle of freedom in Christ» that leaves freedom for propagation for the Orthodoxy only, and the «principle of the canonical foundation of the mission» that makes it responsible for the enlightenment of the Orthodox state territories and prohibits any non-Orthodox mission on its territory (see John (Popov) 1995:21-23; ROC Synod 1995:3-6; the italic type is ours). We have already mentioned these principles above.

The present state of affairs exists because of the ecclesiological self-consciousness of OC, as the «united and unique» Church (Tsiplin 1996:404; see also John (Popov) 1995:13; Makariy [1857] 1993:150-157; Hopko 1991:66-67; Bouigakov 1985:93; the italic type is ours). Obviously there can’t be any Evangelism outside the Church (only OC is meant) (see Bria 1975:245 etc.).
We should admit that this kind of ROC mission has been always organized better, than any other. However God’s work suffered more than benefited from it. It happened because ROC, having state power, went beyond apologetic speeches and works, and shed a lot of «heretics» blood, beginning with strigolniki (XIV- XVc.) and finishing with Evangelical Christians in Pobedonostsevsky persecutions time (1882-1905) (see Ribakov 1993:4; Savinsky 1995:48-67; Grachev 1972:1-58; the EHB history 1989:96-136 and others). The interesting fact is that the time when K. Pobedonostsev was he chief public prosecutor was also the time of the heyday of the Orthodox non – Russian mission.

Unfortunately we shall not touch on the apologetic mission in this work, but only have mentioned that the similar mission existed and was one of the responsibilities of any non - Russian missionary. Of course in foreign states: China, Japan and Korea the status of the apologetic mission wasn’t aggressive. On the contrary, the members of Russian mission tried to be friends with non - Orthodox missions and supported each another in difficult situations. There were good reasons for it. One of them was that the territory of a foreign state was not considered to be the canonical ROC territory, and a foreigner was not obliged to be necessarily Orthodox, because he was not connected to Russia with the cultural backgrounds (except for Chinese-Russian Albazin people) (see part 5).

The modern apologetic point of view suggests to create missionary parishes and even rehabilitation centers for victims of sects (ROC Synod 1995:6) in each diocese.

1.2.3 Educational mission

There are three stages of educational mission or putting in church: work with those who get ready to being baptized, introducing those who have already been baptized in the church life to the full and forming the orthodox life style. In other words the work on the parish level has the following scheme: catechesis – christening - teaching. In the beginning audients (or catechumens, competents, hearers, neophytes) go through the series of catechetical conversations. Then they are baptized and this is the special holiday for all the community. Well, after they become
stronger in their faith during liturgical readings and interviews outside the Church. There is a need for issuing the special literature for such kind of activity both for catechists, and for neophytes (see ROC Synod 1995:6-7).

The similar activity program resembles more the Baptist church rather than Russian Orthodox parish due to no community life or catechization (with very rare exceptions). Now such a situation is going to change.

However missionary activity of non-Russian and foreign missions of the third period really worked in such a way. There were a lot of Catechists and they were turned out by special educational institutions. Non-Russians who really believed were baptized, and catechists spent much time with them before and after the christening, except for scattered nomads’ encampments, the orthodox missionary managed visit no more than once a year.

Informational, apologetic and educational missions were used in ROC not only as «the internal mission», but also as aspects of «external mission» work, though there is such a separate mission as well.

1.2.4 External mission

The external ROC mission should be built using the principle of making the independent, self-governed Eucharistic communities in each region (see Anastasios 1989:65f; Keshishian 1992d:22f; 1992f:102). The preparation of the local national spiritual leaders, liturgy on an understandable national language, translations of the Scripture and other spiritual literature on national languages it is not the program of the modern Protestant mission only, but also of Byzantine and Russian Orthodox missionaries. She bases on the following principles: a) the principle of a universality, b) the principle of use of different languages, c) the principle of freedom in Christ. These principles are the rooted in the Orthodox doctrine about the Church.
1.2.4.1  Principle of universality

«The principle of universality » takes in the basis (Acts. 10: 34-35): «And God accepts any person who worships him and does what is right. It is not important what country a person comes from» (ROC Synod 1995:5) and directly arises from OC ecclesiology.

The orthodox Church is the Church — All panta⁴. First, it is the center of Universe, where the destiny of the whole Universe and not just the Earth is decided. Second, «the whole universe has been invited to enter the church, to become the church of Christ, in order to become after the end of centuries the heavenly kingdom of God» (Lossky 1976:178; is cited in Anastasios 1989:83f; see also Bosch 1991:207; the italic type is ours). Therefore the desire of ROC to bring the Gospel to all peoples is quite natural, moreover if they find themselves in its canonical territory due to political fate.

The correlation with cosmism and centrism of the Orthodoxy and with the concept of Catholicism or Catholicity of Church according to Nicaea definition (John (Popov) 1995:17-18) is clearly seen in the concept «the principle of universality of ROC missions» where the Eucharist is «the source of catholicity» of the Church (Keshishian 1992:23).

The unity of Church is its catholicism. Catholicism or catholicity, is the integrity of the whole Church body that is saved by spiritual, dogmatic, sacramental, institutional unity and received its completeness and finality in the unity of the Cup of God. (Theological transactions 1977:18/184; is cited in Marhovich 1982:105-106). Cathedrality expresses this internal unity of Churches, separated with distance, culture or time (:104).

So everybody is urged to enter the sacramental unity of the Church, that «exists in the world from one end to the other end» and «teaches all dogmas, that everybody should know». The doors of salvation are open to the people of any race and social status (see John (Popov) 1995:17).

There is some similarity with the concept of the Lozansky movement, that was stated in the Manifest of Manila (1989): «The whole church brings the whole Gospel to the whole world» (see LKBE 1990:21-59; Grachiova 1996:1; LCWE 1981:507-538).
1.2.4.2 Principle of the use of different languages

«The principle of the use of different languages» (ROC Synod 1995:5) follows from the principle of «universality» the one we have just discussed, as the Gospel should be proclaimed in their "own language" for listeners of different nations to understand it (:5). It is simple.

Unfortunately, not many people know that this principle is really inherent in the East Church and is not a one-time, anomalous manifestation. The majority thinks that the Scripture translations into national languages is entirely the merit of the Protestant mission. Our humble work will try to show this principle as the example of the Russian Orthodox Church non-Russian and foreign missions. We should mention that ROC mission, as an obedient and grateful child of the Byzantine Mother, followed the example of Cyril and Methodiy mission who gave the Slavic people the possibility to hear the Evangelical message in a language they could understand (see Liunitsky 1885 and many others). Later on such "legends" of missionary work as Stephan Permskiy, Innokenty (Popov-Veniaminov) and others came out of ROC mission.

In ROC the principle of the use of different languages also has its grounds in its ecclesiology that has a Catholic character:

The traditional use of languages of the different peoples in Liturgy (so-called Cyril-Methodiy philosophy) already means that the Christianity does not abolish native cultures, but take them in the integrated variety of Catholic tradition (Meiendorf, is indicated in John (Popov) 1995:19).

1.2.4.3 Principle of the church reception of culture

In other words this principle can be called the principle of contextualization in mission. It was stated by the apostle Paul in (1Cor. 9:20-23): «to the Jews I became like a Jew to win Jews ... For people who live without a law — I became a person who lives without a law... I have become all

4 All things
things to all people, so I could save some of them». In ROC non-Russian mission Paul’s words would sound as: «for the Buryats as the Buryats» and so on.

The similar approach expects the consideration of the features of different contexts: a) non-Orthodox b) other religious; c) urban; d) agricultural; e) youth and so on (see ROC Synod 1995:5). We can say it with certainty that the contextualization of ROC mission of XIX-XX century took into account all listed kinds of contexts. We shall make sure of it.

It is worth mentioning one more time that the principle of the Church Reception of Culture, as well as two previous principles, also follows from understanding of the catholic character of Church. «For the Church mission local measuring of Catholicity means the appropriate opportunity of cultural, liturgical and theological variety in United Church of Christ» (John (Popov) 1995:18). The archpriest V. V. Zenkovsky writes the following about it:

National «flesh»... has never been denied in the East, though the ideal of the unity of church was not less powerful and deep, than in the West,—the only thing is that it was understood as an ideal of the internal unity, not the external one. (Zenkovsky V.V. 1923. The idea of the Orthodox Culture, from: The Orthodoxy and Culture. Berlin: Russian Book. p. 41; is cited in John (Popov) 1995:19)

During our research we shall find some more principles of ROC mission that haven’t been mentioned in its official documents.

1.3 ROC plans on realization of the mission forms and principles on the diocesan and all-church level in a present-day period

It seems inappropriate to speak about the present of ROC mission before we shall consider the history. But we shall do it deliberately, because the Synod offers certain progressive methods for revival of ROC missionary activity, that have been already used by it in the mission history.

On the Diocesan level the Holy Synod orders the acquisition of libraries, opening of missionary courses and schools, or at least the missionary subjects in the educational programs of spiritual academies and seminaries that already exist. There is even a proposal to revive the institute of diocesan missionaries for the missionaries – laymen and clergymen, and also to arrange the courses for retraining of the priests who have been already working; to help diocesan
archbishops with program-methodical materials for the organization of similar work (see ROC Synod 1995:8).

On the all-church level they want to create all-church Missionary financial fund. There is also a need for the scientific base for mission. There is also a suggestion to create a scientific-coordinating department, that should work in the following areas:

a) The collecting of materials about missionary work:
   — ROC in the pre-Revolutionary period
   — Modern missionary experience of ROC local churches
   — Missionary experience of non-Orthodoxy
   — Methodical works for the missionary work in modern conditions

b) Mohammedan and Buddhist regions:
   — study of work methods in similar surroundings
   — elaboration of the missionary programs

c) Non-orthodox missionaries and sectarians in Russia and at all canonical territory of ROC:
   — Information gathering about their activity
   — Preparation and issuing of revelatory materials

d) Creation of the legal department to study the legitimacy of different religious organizations

e) Creation of the educational programs for missionary courses and schools:
   — opening of a special educational institution for missionary training

f) Issuing of all-church missionary journals and newspapers

g) Creation of a commission (committee) for translation of the Scripture and revival of the Liturgy in languages of the peoples who live on the canonical territory of ROC.

This is an excellent, comprehensive program, where there is much to be learned and it is starting to be realized. And if the modern ROC will put these plans into practice, it will not be something new for it, but the revival of the completely destroyed past ...

And now it is the high time to see the way it was the centuries before us...
PART 2: THE FIRST PERIOD OF ROC MISSION:
FROM THE BAPTISM OF RUSSIA TILL THE CONQUEST OF KAZAN
(988 - 1552)

2.1 The first type of a missionary: cenobites – colonialists. The foundation of monasteries and the assimilation of Finnish tribes.

In the first ROC missionary period we have permitted ourselves to unite two different historical periods of Russian history: the period of ancient Russia and the period of the Tatar-Mongolian yoke in Russia. They were united as the methods and means the missionaries were using are alike. Smirnov E. K. (Smirnov 1904) represents the same division at periods, in contrast to Anastasios Ioannaulatos, who distinguishes premongolian and mongolian periods (see Anastasios 1989:67).

2.1.1 The "incorrect" mission of the cenobites – colonialists

The cenobites-colonialists were the first Russian missionaries. In majority their names are unknown to the history, but we can name at least some of them. These are Saint Leontiy, Isaya and Avraamiy - Rostov enlighteners (XI c.) (see Talberg 1994:1/20-21 etc.), the enlightener of vyatichi – Kuksha and Gerasim of Vologda (XII in.) (:21), St. Cyril Chelmogorskiy who enlightened Chuds (XIII in.) (see Talberg 1994:95; Bakhmeteva 1904:339-340; Znamensky 1996:78), Sergiy and Hermann - wonder-workers of Valaam who lived among Karelians (see Talberg 1994:95-96; Ostrounova 1897:150-156), Reverend Arseniy Konevsky (see Znamensky 1996:78), St. Stephen of Perm – the enlightener of Komi – Ziryans and Komi - Permyaks (see Epifaniy 1995:50-261; Prokhorov 1995:3-47; Anastasios 1968:25; 1989:67; Averintsev 1995:II/635; Smirnov 1904:5; Kologrivov 1961:110-119; Talberg 1994:1/97-100; Makariy

According to Smirnov, the cenobites-colonialists have appeared «immediately after the introduction of Christianity and suited perfectly the national characteristics of Russian people» who identified Christian faith, that had been taken from the East, with the withdrawal from the world and its temptations» (Smirnov 1904:1, cm 2,3-4; the italic type is ours). The monks, priests and bishops worked heroically in the evangelization of the Slavic tribes in the North (see Anastasios 1989:67). But finally this type of a missionary has developed under the influence of the Tatar-Mongolian yoke (1240-1480) (see Smirnov 1904:3), when many people came to seek *consolation in the religious feat* because of a lot of sorrows. At that time «the period of the unusual fast growth of monasteries began in Russia» (:3-4) and «a great number of monks retired to the forests and built hermitages that became centers of missionary and cultural activity» (Anastasios 1989:67; see Bakhmeteva 1904; 2/88-90). Thus gradually, the original type of the Russian missionary activity was formed: «a monk and his monastery» (Glazik 1954:15; is cited in Raimer 1996:199; the italic type is ours). In the following historical periods, when the «correct», organized mission of Russian Orthodox Church was organized and was steady on its legs, the cenobite-colonialist, “fell back into the shadow” a little bit, but nevertheless he still was the considerable helper, in the enlightenment of non – Russians. Just his creative energy was dispersed «on a very vast geographical area» (see Smirnov 1904:13).

Golubinsky doesn’t overestimate missionary activity of the monkhood of an early period at all: «in Moscow period monks assisted in the colonization of the country, though their assistance was *unintentional* and it wasn’t *so important as some people imagine it to be*. And as for the premongolian period «*this colonization is out of the question here*» (Golubinsky [1904] 1997:1/2/734; the italic type is ours). Such judgment is quite normal, because Golubinsky, as a serious historian, points to the lack of sufficient information and does not see the possibility of
having any common missionary structure among the monks «something deliberately common, something like a real missionary community» (:733). The absence of mission organization he takes for the absence of a missionary organism with all its internal mechanisms of growth.

Indeed, looking at cenobites through the eyes of today's mission one can think that cenobites' work is incorrect, without great results, hardly noticeable and not purposeful. But we must not forget that they did their work(part), as they could and as they understood it. Very often they had to plough completely virgin pagan lands from the religious point of view without having any special theological missionary training. Only the one who hasn't worked in similar conditions «can throw a stone first». Nevertheless the results of their mission are obvious. In the Xth century all northeastern parts of the present territory of European Russia that in the religious – ethnographic terms had tens of pagan Finnish tribes: *Lopars, Idzors, Corels, Vods, Chud, Cheremises, Votyaks, Mers, and even Mordvinians on the middle current of Volga* (see Smirnoff 1904:3,4), had turned almost into Russian populations. This confluence, «the turning of non-Russians into Russian people has taken place mainly due to the Christian faith» (Russian 1907:3, see 2-3).

2.1.2  *The principle of cellular division*

The continuous and dilative, though sluggish, process of the assimilation of Finnish tribes was put into practice through this centrifugal - centripetal scheme. Looking for a religious feat, for the salvation, cenobites usually went into the dense forests, settled down near the rivers, among numerous wild Finnish tribes. They built unassuming cells and a simple church. Pagans who lived near by, came to the monks attracted by the Light of Christ and by the pure life of loving monks, who had some success in crafts and gardening. Cenobites «enlightened» them with the light of Christ doctrine, christened, settled them down near their place of living, taught them to clear away the thickets of the forest, to cultivate land, to build dwellings and boats, to net, to fish etc.» (see Smirnov 1904:2; the italic type is ours). So, thus they turned natives from the nomads into settled dwellers. «In time the area grew up into a real monastery, and the settlement near it -
in the whole city». A cenobite-colonialist was a real leader - teacher «not only in the religious-moral, but also [in] the civil aspect» (:2; the italic type and the inset are ours). Looking at him, a non-Russian adopted Russian speech and culture, learnt to love the Church with its spectacular liturgies, devotions, fasts and icons and so gradually a foreigner realized that he was a Russian and a member of the Russian state. Then some cenobites decided to create their own «deserts» or solitary (secluded) cells and abandoned their «maternal» monastery, taking away with them the principle of work. On a new spot there was the same method of activity. In such a way there was created a big, extensive network of «filial», «grand» and «great-grand» lamps of Christianity that hallowed the pagan territories with the Light of Christ.

This principle of work is similar to the modern theory on development and division of cellular churches and groups.

2.1.3 Some monasteries - missionaries

In the period we are considering now, there were two fundamental in every respect including and a missionary one, monastic movements — the tradition of the Kiev-Pechorsky monastery during the Kiev period in Russia and the school of Sergiy Radonezhsky in the Moscow time (see Raimer 1996:199). The assemblies of neophytes of Trinity Lavra were zealous in particular. Educated on missionary consciousness of St. Sergiy (see Raimer 1996:168-175; see also Nikon 1904:2-238) in XIV and XV centuries they have covered the North of Russia with the whole network of monasteries. Trinity Lavra has accepted a cenobite-colonialist from Novgorod as an ideal, since in the premongolian period under the prince Vladimir the temporal colonization appeared from there, heading to the East and North. (see Smirnov 1904:3).

Such central monasteries of the North as Valaamsky (on the Ladoga lake) and Solovetsky (at the White sea) also did a lot in the missionary field. In the midst of Valaamsky monastery

---

1 Presumably Valamo (fin). Height (see Averintsev 1995:1/320), or Valamo (in Izborsky language) — «mo» - a land, a rampart. The word «Rampart» has the same root with Vaal, Volos, Veles. So Valamo means «the land of Veles», that is the «place, devoted to Veles» (Spiridonov, Summer 1991:4). There is no exact information neither about the origins of the name, nor about the century of the monastery foundation. Presumably it is the X, XII, XIV centuries.
there were many Karelians (see Ostroumova 1897:156; Znamensky 1996:78). This fact shows us the missionary spirit of this strict work monastery that has become the «seed-plot» of the Orthodoxy, Russian culture and statehood among the Finns and Karelians (see Spiridonov, Yarovoï 1991:4). At the end of XVIII century its cenobites were the first who reached Alaska and paved the way for Innokentiy (Popov-Veniaminov) by beginning the evangelization of Aleutian people (see Smirnov 1904:15).

Among Russian people the word «solovki» associates with the prison of state significance. Indeed in the Solovetsky monastery there was a famous prison, where hundreds of convicts from all part of tsarist (see Ostroumova 1897:29) and then Soviet Russia were brought together. This monastery was also known as a powerful fortress that defended the northern boundaries of Russia from Sweden, Norway and Finland (:18), its weapon arsenal was very big (:31). Novices had to be ready both for cenobite and military activities. These two monastery duties symbolized the lasting alliance between the Russian Orthodoxy and the State, when the service to the fatherland is part of the service to the God. Here again the cosmism of the Orthodoxy spread its wings on everything.

But only a few people know the early history of Solovetsky monastery, when he played an outstanding role as a bulwark of faith and godliness, as a colonialist and enlightener of Northern coastal area, the land of Korelians and Lopar people.

The monastery, as an exemplary master, spread its cultural influence, practical genius and grains of Christianity in the back lands of the North through 12-14 years old summer boys so-called «godovniki», who were sent by their parents to work for Reverends Zosima and Savaty (see Dunaev 1914:4 ), for free and at the same time to learn the trade, reading and writing. The

Saint Sergiy and Hermann are considered to be the founders. The Finnish Orthodox Church honours these two people as well as with the cult of Saint Alexander of Svisr, saint Arseny Konevsky and saint Trifon of Pechenga (:5).

6 The Karelians — live in Karelia, areas of Arkhangelsk, Murmansk etc. The total number is 130, 9 thousand people. The spoken languages - Karelian (and Finnish). Orthodox. They were formed on the basis of the native tribes of Southern Karelia and South-eastern Finland. In XII century migrated between the Ladoga and Onega lakes (the territory of Novgorod ). Some of vest people (vespese) and saami people (Lopars) mingled with them there. The Russian population exerted the strong influence on the culture. Since XIV century the development of writing skills based on Russian, and since the eighties of XIX century the development of the writing language on the basis of Latin script (see Klementiev 1994:186-189).

7 Hermann and Savaty, the first settlers came to the uninhabited Solovetsky island in 1429. After Savaty's death Hermann found Zosima (see Averinisev 1995:II/603-604; see Ostroumova 1897:15).
monastery was also visited by a great number of pilgrims, thousands of free-will apprentices and «trudniki» from the common people were huddling near the cloister, keeping the vows and coming away with «a kind edification for life» (see Smirnov 1994:171).

As for the household there were a lot to obtain (look at): cucumbers and cabbage, a miracle for the North, were grown here, blacksmithing and tanning industry prospered, there was a brickyard, a watermill, a place where they made kvass, the system of water supply, a hospital and many other things (see Ostroumova 1897:36-39). The economic documents of the Solovetsky monastery show the "normal economic development" of the subordinate territories even during the sharp economic recession in central areas of Russia (see Liberzon 1990:3). The Solovetsky monastery had «many patrimonial estates all along the seacoast, between the settlements of Karelians and Lopar people. There were courts, attached to the patrimonies, where cloistral elders lived looking after crafts and grounds» (see Dosifei; is cited in Makariy 1996:4/1/181). These elders were in the direct communication with the natives and acquainted them with the Christian faith.

In the monastery itself not only crafts, but also reading, writing skills and prayers were taught. And though the enlightenment has never been the main object of this mainly work monastery, according to Ostroumova «the community don't take the school kindly and treat it as an useless establishment that is just the waste of time» but «still it spreads literacy among the people» (Ostroumova 1897:40-41). The example of the monks, who subdued the external asceticism to the internal doing and who cared for the love to shine at every contact with people (see Kologrivov 1961:135,136), had some effect on the souls of people around and taught the piety better than the school.

2.1.4 Analysis of the missionary activity of the cenobites-colonialists

The ROC missionary activity of the early period is widely investigated by Dr. J.Raimer, and we strongly recommend people who are interested in it to read his scientific work (see Raimer 1996:1-300), as the information about the expansion of Christianity in the early period is really
scent (see Golubinsky [1904] 1997:1/2/733). Dr. Johanes notes while describing the mission of this period that practically it «is not acquainted with the centralized, church organized missionary work», and most likely it is connected with «the spiritual movement in cloistral circles». It was «the genuine motions of the spirit that originated independently in their initial phase and were collected by the Church much later put inside it» (Raimer 1996:199; the italic type is ours). ROC as the ecclesiological organizational structure «did not show any interest in the missionary work among pagan tribes that had been included in the Moscow state», «these were sporadic, spontaneous, unplanned moves(acts)» (:197).

Little by little the Finnish tribes have been slightly evangelized and besides «as times went by they completely lost their originality, mixed with Russian Slavs and all together made up a Great Russian nationality» (see Smirnov 1904:1-2; Kluchevsky [1906] 1992:57). The mission of contextualization with the considering of the cultural contexts and translations of the Holy Scriptures as the main principle was out of the question so far. Though the documents of ROC show that these principles were inherent to OC missionary activity at all times (see ROC Synod 1995:4-5), Stephen of Perm and partly Trifon of Pechenga will be the first to use «the principle of the Church reception of culture» (:5) at this time period. As we have seen, for the most part the Evangelization of tribes in XI-XVI centuries was connected with a civilization, natural nonviolent russification and instillation of State system foundations. In other words up till now the universalism of salvation occurred only within the bounds of the superiority of bearing culture.

But, in spite of the obvious desire of cenobites to make natives a part of Russian culture, we have no the right to ignore the sheer evangelistic motive, presented in their activity or to identify the church mission with the policy of russification kept by temporal leaders (see Raimer 1996:198-199). There were two different movements. Yes of course, the religious colonization followed in the tracks of state colonization, «hand in hand with the political expansion of princes» (Rosenkranz 1977:188; is cited in Raimer 1996:198-199; the italic type is ours). Sometimes they changed places. That is «the missionary activity led to the colonization and the colonization - to the missionary activity» (Glazik 1959:9; is cited in Raimer 1996:203). Both kinds of expansion perfectly supplemented each other: the missionary activity of the monks was «a moral counterbalance» to society wishes, unscrupulous by its character (see Smirnov 1904:3;
the italic type is ours), on the other hand, the attempt of Evangelization without the political support of princes «would be broken by the resistance of pagan tribes» (Raimer 1996:203).

So, this was the union of a cross and a crown. It was the influence of one of the Byzantine imperialism features—*a full integration of Church into the state and vice versa* (see Raimer 1996:198). «It goes without saying that the mission is not only an soteriological-eccesiologic enterprise, but political as well» (:198). The Russian mission, also imitated Byzantium in the following

*together with the gospel, the Byzantines transfused into their converted peoples the whole of their experience — political, artistic, economic, cultural — permeated by evangelical principles and the Christian vision of life. They contributed to the self-awareness developed by the young nations, along with their own culture (Anastasios 1989:66; an italic type ours).

Moreover, maybe everything was because of the Orthodoxy love for the territorial principle. Then quite easily there could be the motive of the responsibility before God for the territory around. Thus, monks considered the outskirts a canonical missionary apostolic apanage that had to be sanctified with a prayer, enlightened with the Light of the Gospel and where the demons should be pressed (see ROC Synod 1995:5-6).

The non - Russian mission of ROC XIX-XX of century will take a lot from principles of work of the cenobites-colonialists, but it will develop them much better.

2.2 The Second type of a missionary: Stephen of Perm

2.2.1 Life and missionary activity of the apostle of Zryan

We know the life and the missionary activity of Stephen of Perm (1340-1396) owing to the wonderful hagiography of Epifaniy the Wise (see Epifaniy 1995:50-261), who knew Stephen personally and even lived in the same monastery with him in Rostov. Other sources that we use in the survey article: (see Prokhorov 1995:3-47; Raimer 1996:175-190; Kologrivov 1961:110-
119; Averintsev 1995:II/635; Talberg 1994:1/97-100; Znamensky 1996:79; Makariy (Bulgakov) 1995:III/88-92; Smirnov 1994:168-170; Bakhmetyeva 1904:1/329-338 etc.) take the information over from this hagiography. Nevertheless the name of Stephen of Perm is the most known among the historians. It is mentioned by the foreign writers even in the brief historical surveys of ROC mission (see Anastasios 1968:25; 1989:67; etc.). What was so unique in this monk - missionary who had been enlightening Komi people for 17 (18) during the Tatar-Mongolian yoke?

In 1365 Stephen leaves for a secluded place in the Rostov monastery of Grigoriy the Theologian. The idea of going to the Perm land to preach the Gospel occurred to him long ago. Within 13-14 years, in a monastery, his spiritual formation is taking place. In contrast to other monasteries of that time, the Rostov monastery, was famous for its vast (numerous) library and was an educational institution, «enobites, who performed monastic feats as well as searched for theological learning, shut themselves up here» (Prokhorov 1995:9). Here Stephen has become proficient in theology, acquired the missionary vision reading hagiographic and patristic literature, has learnt Ancient Greek, Modern Greek and Ziryan languages. We should mention here that Stephen was one these few people in ancient Russia, who could read and speak Greek (see Kologrivov 1961:111).

Then he made up the *Komi alphabet*, having taken money signs of Ziryan «tamga» or «passes», using some Greek and Slavic letters and began the translation of the Liturgical texts, the *Book of Hours, the Octoechos, the Psalter* and others. He also collected the necessary data about the *lands of Perm*, its inhabitants and neighbors (see Makariy (Bulgakov) 1995:III/88; Averintsev 1995:II/635).

In 1379 (1378) he was ordained as a priest in Moscow and as soon as he got the protective letters from great prince Dmitry Donskoy (that was really important for his safety), he left for the *Ziryan people area*, the ancient *Biarmia*. Starting in *Kotlas* and going along the *Northern Dvina*

---

8 The written language created by Stefan of Perm was almost lost. Only 225 words of one text are left (see Konakov 1994:196-200).

9 Ziryan people is the eastern - Finnish tribe, lived between Dvina and Pecheneg rivers. Area inhabited: Komi - ziryans and Komi - permyaks. *Komi - ziryan*: The total number in the former USSR is 344,5 thousand. Have sibling connections with Komi - permyaks and Udmurds. Komi -ziryan language plus dialects Orthodox but there are Old Believers as well. The *tribes of pern vichegodsoya* were formed in 10-14 centuries. At the end of 14 century were christianized by Stephan of Perm. After the joining of the Great Novgorod to Moscow (1478) the lands passed to the Russian state (see Konakov NRE 1994:196-200).
and the Vichegda river, he preached and built chapels. Of course, he met with the strong resistance of shamans, but God saved him with his miracle. When Stephen came to Ust-Vim (at the confluence of the Vim and Vichegda rivers) he built the first Christian temple in this region in the name of the Annunciation of the Birth-Giver of God, that attracted everybody with its beauty. He had taken his courage and burned a pagan temple. He had also cut down a sacred fur-tree (probably it was a birch), but Ziryan «gods» didn’t punish him. The natives were struck with the power of the Christian God and started to hesitate. But the success of the sermon was predetermined, when Stephan agreed to pass through the fire and under the ice together with priest - prince Pam (or Pam - sotnik). The shaman feared and refused to pass the test.

So, this is the way the pagan resistance was broken and the mass conversion and christening of Ziryan people began. It was so successful, that in 1383 (in 3-4 years after arrival) Stephen went to Moscow to ask a bishop, but he himself was ordained as a bishop for Ziryan people, as nobody else wanted to go to such a remote diocese of his own free will. His Episcopal chair was in Ust-Vim. «The establishing of a diocese was of a great importance for the Komi region — as a matter of fact it meant its annex into Russia of Moscow period» (Ust-Vim. Pages of history. Siktivkar. 1992:2; is cited in Prokhorov 1995:23-24).

Everywhere, where Stephan preached he combined quiet long-suffering, humility, love and readiness for sacrificing with a method of confrontation. At the same time with the building of churches, they pulled down the idols everywhere, that was practically the proof of impotence of the pagan gods. He spent his time teaching, baptizing, translating, and copying the books of worship, going deeply into social, economic and political problems, building churches, schools, monasteries, old people’s houses and asylums, organizing the delivery of the humanitarian bread from Vologda during the famine, petitioned for Ziryan people benefits in Moscow and even strove against the pagan volgul people with Ziryan army.

He used the following plan in his christening service of neophytes: catechesis—christening — teaching:

---

Komi — permymaks: Perm was mentioned for the first time in the hagiography of Stephen of Perm, written by Epiphany the Sage. In 1463 the bishop Iona christened some of Komi — permymaks. In 1472 their territories were finally joined to the Moscow state. The population of Komi — permymak autonomous region, in the Kirov area. There is a possibility that some of them originated from Pricamye and Vyatka-Kamsky region. Now there are some acting orthodox temples, not many believers, but their amount is increasing. The center of Old believers is in Pudva village (Shabaev 1994:200-203).
They perceived his sermon and readily believed... when he made the sign of the cross, and proclaimed (announced), and prayed and blessed and let them go in peace at home and commanded them to come every day to the holy Church of God — to come to catechesis. And he bade all neophytes — men and young men, and adolescents, and small children — to study reading and writing, that is Breviary, Octoechos, Songs of David, and also all other books (Epiphany 1995:113).

By teaching people reading, writing and singing through the worship books, he prepared the national leaders of different levels: abbots, priests, deacons, singers, then he ordained them (:113-114). «His priests celebrated the mass, the matins the vespers in Perm language, they sang in Perm, and chief singers did their job using his Perm books and the readers read in Perm, and the singers sang in Perm» (Epiphany 1995:169; see Makariy (Bulgakov) 1995:III/92 etc.).

He also could paint icons.

Stephan died approximately in 1396 at the age of 50-56 years in Moscow, where he had gone because of some church concerns. «He had not time to convert all the inhabitants of Dvinskaya area to Christianity, but he converted a lot of Perm people» Makariy (Bulgakov) 1995:III/93). He has converted all Small Perm with Ziryan people on Vichegda and Vim, but Great Perm with the different inhabitants dwelling on Cama and Chusovaya, remained pagan (see Talberg 1994:1/100).

The information about the work of Stephen’s successors is very scant (poor). Only Isaac and Gerasim (martyrish death from a Vogul) are mentioned, who tried to convert the people around and the cenobites of the Trinity monastery founded in 1397 in 600 versts away from Ust-Sisolsk, who spread the faith on Pechora up to Pustoozersk. Bishop Pitirim (is violently tormented by Voguls) and bishop Iona under whom the faith has gained victory are also known.

Stephen’s activity aroused suspicion in the official Church "with its traditional policy of russification" even when he was alive. (Rainer 1996:200-201). Some were perplexed, «Why to invent an alphabet 120 years before the end of the century?!... It should have been better to give them the ready Russian alphabet» (Epiphany 1995:183). And after the unification of Perm and Vologda dioceses in XVI c, Stephen’s books of the Ziryan period were taken away and destroyed (annihilated), and people who tried to save them, were persecuted (see Prokhorov 1995:37). Out of Breviary, selected readings from the Gospel, Apostile, Parenhy, Octoechos and Liturgy, translated into Russian language by Cyril and Methody, only Liturgy in four lists remained safe till the present days (:37). Stephen’s project for organizing of national Ziryan church wasn’t put
into effect at that time (see Fedorov; is cited in Ioann (Kologrivov) 1961:114). Though the activity of Stephen of Perm was quite compatible with OC theology it wasn’t understood, because in the epoch of land centralization around Moscow and ideas of Filofey of Pskov\(^{10}\), the petty concerns of ethnic minorities looked politically and religiously unreliable, and Church catholicism was understood more horizontally, than vertically.

But the experience of Stephen will become «a supreme ideal» for Russian missionaries of XIX-XX century, who will work among non-Russians.

\[2.2.2 \textit{Analysis of missionary activity of Stephen of Perm}\]

\[2.2.2.1 \textit{Stephen — the Apostle of Perm}\]

Thoughts expressed in the hagiography of «Stephan of Perm» written by Epifaniy have something in common with the ideas expressed by Illarion in «A word about the Law and Grace». Both of them glorify an Equal-to-the-Apostles feat, one — of our «prince» Volodimir (see Illarion 1994:34), the other — of enlightener of Perm lands - Stephan (see Epifaniy 1995:219; in many places). Epifaniy, as well as Illarion, puts a feat of the enlightener of Komi people among the feats of the first apostles. The land of Rome praises its two apostles, Peter and Paul, and Aziiskaya land reveres and gratifies Ioann the Theologian, and the land of Egypt doesn’t forget Mark the Evangelist, and the church of Antioch is grateful to the evangalist Thomas, and Greek church is grateful to the apostle Andrew. Why not to glorify Stephan, as he «has accomplished an undertaking equal to apostolic» (:219), proves the hagiographer. There are also our native examples of people honored for their apostolship: the Russian land honors Equal-to-the-Apostles Vladimir, who christened it, «Moscow gratifies and honors metropolitan Peter as new wonder-worker. The land of Rostov honors Leontiy, its bishop» (:219). Therefore it is

\(^{10}\)The theory of the elder Filophey of Pskov - “Moscow is the third Rome” is meant. (the first half of the XIV century) (see Zamaleev 1994:41-43). It was developed after the Union of Florence (1439) and the fall of
worthy that «you, the bishop Stephan, the land of Perm praises and honors as an apostle, as a teacher, as a leader, as a preceptor(mentor), as a tutor, as a preacher, for thanks to you we have saved from the darkness, for thanks to you we have got to know the light (:219). He has ploughed with a sermon as with a plough, and «has studded with words of the book doctrines as with the seeds» (:219) the ground, that none of the apostles went to before. There was no teacher or preacher here, «nobody preached them the word of God» (Epifaniy 1995:67). Even the apostle Andrew, who went through Russian lands, didn’t reach Perm (:69).

The evaluation of Stephan missionary work as apostolic, made by Epifaniy is quite fair.

2.2.2.2 Stephan repeated the feat of Cyril and Methodiy

The mission of ROC of XIX-XX century will name its mission Cyril - Methodiy tradition in the manner (spirit) of Stephan of Perm because it will be deriving its strength exactly from their examples for the non – Russian mission considering the cultural context. The phenomenon of Stephan was that he was the first in Russia. He somewhat has forestalled his time, the fact that afterwards the results of his mission were destroyed by the russification and centralizing policy of the Moscow state. It is quite natural, that «the great Ziryan» knew about the example of Cyril and Methodiy and followed it, realizing what he was doing. Stephan has originated the writing, appropriate to the phonetics of Permyaks-Comi-Ziryan, and has translated the Sacred books for them. In that way he has continued, according to G. M. Prokhorov, «the monks – missionaries’ tradition that originates from the apostles» who many peoples who became Christian are obliged to by having of their own writing system (Prokhorov 1995:14). But Epifaniy thinks that unlike others his feat is more amazing, as he worked absolutely alone, by himself. «Methodiy, the brother of Cyril the Philosopher, helped his brother a lot... And Stephan had nobody to help, unless only God alone» (Epifaniy 1995:187). The same in Greece: «many years a lot of Hellenic philosophers have been gathering and making up the Greek reading and writing system! And they have hardly made it up working hard and spent much time putting it together» (:185). And

Constantinople (1453).
here: «one cenobite, having prayed to one God, and has put up the alphabet, and has made the
grammar, and has translated the books for a few years with God's help» (:185). Therefore he is
«indeed a new philosopher», as well as Solunskie brothers Cyril the Philosopher with Methodiy
(:181).

2.2.2.3 Contextualization of the mission before the western analogs

In XIV century in his mission Stephan used methods of evangelization, which are considered
essential by modern missiology for the work of missionaries in different cultures. He created a
national church, with national leaders, with an understandable Liturgy and Holy Scripture in a
local dialect. He was the first not only in Russia. Metee Richi (1552-1610) and Nobili (see
Tucker 1993:63-64), will appear later. Something similar to Stephen’s attempts could be found in
their activity though their ideas certainly do not coincide with the ideas of the Russian
missionary, but related to them (see Ioann (Kologrivov) 1961:110:115). The author of this work
thinks that Stephan of Perm has advanced in his mission and deserves to be known in the world
missionary history.

2.2.2.4 Universalism of salvation without the russification

Stephen’s hagiographer pays much attention to the subject of universalism of salvation. He
represents an interesting selection of texts from the Old and New Testaments saying «about the
calling and believing of people from many nations» (Epifaniy 1995:171-179). No wonder that
Stephen was carried away with these ideas as well. Generally universalism is inherent in the
Orthodoxy. According to the doctrine of OC all nations are called to enter the Church (see John
(Popov) 1995:17). This world outlook was represented well by Illarion (Illarion 1994:33-34; see
Raime 1996:77-80).
Stephen lived in epoch, when a phantom of the idea «Moscow is the third Rome» wasn't in the air yet, but there were necessary prerequisites to it. If he were born later, it would have been difficult for him to realize Ziryan people's rights to the national church, and he would not think of saving the people of Komi without its total confluence with the Russian nation, chosen by God. We think, that cenobites - colonialists of XY-XYI centuries will be engrossed in this messianic and at the same time missionary idea that imposes the responsibility on the people «chosen by God» to bear the Light of the Gospel. We agree with Dr. Raimer, that «by his world outlook Stephen is the product of his time, the product of the monastic movement that has its roots very deeply in epoch of Russia at Kiev times». Also we agree that «his missionary-theological positions are not his independent ideology» (Raimer 1996:200-201). Before his missionary service of 14 years he was busy with his own theosis, and then he had a home monastery in Ust-Vim where a few cenobites lived. He acted in frameworks of the Orthodoxy and by its tradition: «he took with him relics of saints and antimensions... and sacred chrism» (Epifaniy 1995:83), «hastened to lay the foundation of the holy church of God» and «decorated it with every ornament, as a bride» (:91), built monasteries et cetera. In his speeches, for example, he enumerates Ecumenical councils where the faith, preached by the apostles was established (:141-143).

But why did he subdue his national consciousness to the national idea of Ziryan people, a very small group and didn't wished to unite the process of christening of pagans with their russification? And why did he perform such an unordinary deed as coming out from a secluded place, his fruitful kenosis (see Ioann (Kologrivov) 1961:111). This is the main difference between him and cenobites-colonialists. It is quite possible that Stephen was more familiar with the Byzantine missionary experience than others. And the translations of the Liturgy and the Scriptures for the mission were the usual thing for Byzantium (see Anastasios 1989:65-66). And as for the blessing fruits of Solunskie brothers' mission «who opened eyes and ears» on the faith of Greek even to the simple Russian people (see Lioutnitsky 1885:7) and gave «an entire possibility to each of us to make out what is God's Will» (:1) Stephen could put this burden on his own shoulders. And he wanted Ziryan people “to be called to perception and comprehension of life-giving truth in their native language, as the Slavic people had been called in old days» (:2). Moreover, the fact, that Stephen was not a simple performer but a sincere child of God, who was
directed by the Lord is very significant. It was important for him, that people were not simply christened, but really believed. This was the reason of using all the time the catechism in the best traditions of Eastern fathers instead of ritual christening in Russian parishes. His sermon, cited by Epifaniy (Epifaniy 1995:141-143) is the sample of the full evangelical message:

And he started to speak about the mercy of God and His care about us. And in such a way, with the help of Holy Scripture, having started with the creation of the world, with the creation of a living creature, that is Adam, he came up to the crucifixion of Christ and the Resurrection, and the Ascension and then up to the end of the world (:143).

So, Stephen's universalism of salvation without rassification arose from the excellent knowledge of patristics, mission history of the Eastern Church, the personal guidance of God and the sincere desire to bring Ziryen people to the acceptance of the faith.

2.2.3 Was Stephen an exception?

Smirnov thinks that Stephen's type of the missionary, «has not found a further expression for itself» and will revive only in XIX century (see Smirnov 1904:5). On the one hand, he is right, but, on the other hand the writer of this work considers that nevertheless Stephen was not an exception (see also Rainer 1996:200-201).

Feodorit (died in 1583) and Trifon od Pechenega (or Colsky, or Novgorodsky, or Mitrofan) (1485-1583) — the enlighteners of Lopar people11 (see Evdokimov 1899:1-4; Anastasios 1989:67) who have been using some elements from the Enlightener of Perm mission

---

11 Saam-Lopar people. According to the latest information there were 1835 people. They live on the Kola Peninsula, and also in Norway, Sweden and Finland. In contact to Scandinavian Saam, they are called Kola. Lop, Lopar from (Finnish) lapa, lapea (sicle) and (Swedish) lapp (place). Saam language. The written language is on the basis of Russian script. Orthodox. The indigenous population of the north of Europe pressed back to the north by Russian, Karelian, Finns, Scandinavian. On the boarder of the 1st and 2nd thousand years AD they occupied a broad area: Northern Scandinavia, Kola Peninsula, the part of Finland and Karelia, the coast of the Ladoga and Onega lakes, basins of Onega and Northern Dvina rivers. Now they live in Lovozersky region of Murmansk area, with the center in Lovozero village. Since 16 century the Pechenegsky monastery, founded in 1550 played a big role in the
are mentioned in the history without being related to Stephen of Perm. Most likely their experience was quite independent.

2.2.3.1 Feodorit among Lopars and Chuds

Feodorit followed in Abba Lasar's footsteps (died 1391) (see T-oi 1871:1-2; Znamensky 1996:78), who settled down on the Murom island, in the middle of the Onega lake, and founded a cloister where Lopars and Chuds of Murmansk lived. But Feodorit has done more. Having left the Solovetsky monastery «because of the love of absolute silence», as all cenobites-colonialists, he made his home at the mouth of the Kola river, «where he has spent about twelve years in absolute solitude» (Makariy (Bulgakov) 1996:4/1/182).

He felt sorry for Lopars, these «poor children of the poor nature» (see T-oi 1871:5-6) and after having learned their language, he started to preach the Gospel, translated some prayers, taught Lopars how to read and write. His sermon brought abundant (bounteous) fruits, in one day he managed to baptize up to two thousand people (see T-oi 1871:5-6; Makariy (Bulgakov) 1996:4/1/182; Bakhmeteva 1904:2/92 etc.).

He founded the monastery of the Holy Trinity at the mouth of the Kola river (see Averinsev 1995:3/93). Even having left these wild places for reasons not depending on him he went back here again two times and visited all who he had christened, his dear Lopars, as Apostle Paul in old times (see Makariy (Bulgakov) 1996:4/1/182).

Christianization. The spreading of Christianity among Kola Saam people is also connected with the activity of Solovetsky, Antonio-Siisky, Krestny and Voznesensky monasteries. (Lioukyanenko 1994:310-312).
2.2.3.2 Trifon of Pecheneg — the orthodox missionary - layman

Here, on a coast of the Arctic Ocean, at the border with Norway, in Lapland, near the Pecheneg river Trifon of Pecheneg, the founder of the Trinity-Pechenegsky monastery (1550) has been enlightening Lopars for 70 years (see Evdokimov 1899:1). He also played an important role in the christianization of Saams of Kola (see Lukianenko 1994:310-312). Trifon (or Mitrofan) is the person of amazing life. Mitrofan, the son of a priest in Novgorod was called to be a missionary among Lopars, when he was not even a cenobite. «Once, when he was praying in a secluded(lonely) place, he heard a voice: «your place is not here; an unenlightened and zealous land is waiting for you» (T-oi 1871:3; see Bakhmeteva 1904:2/92).

We should note that, in the early period of ROC mission, when the church as the organization had no missionary structure, program and purpose, the factor of «Macedonian» call (Acts 16:6-8) for a mission was almost the only motivating force for Russian «Stephans» and «Trifons» (i.e. though the Church as an organism was engaged in the mission).

T-oi writes, that Mitrofan entered into first relations with Lopars «under the guise of(pretext) of trade business. Then he spoke with them about their beliefs and about one divine faith» (T-oi 1871:3). Enduring fast all beatings of pagan priests, he went away, then came back again finding more and more followers. Trifon used prayers, translated by Feodorit to teach newly enlightened(converted) (:4). This fact says there is a chance that they have met before (see Bakhmeteva 1904:2/93).

When the number of new-converted began to increase, he found a hieromonk who christened Lopars and made Trifon a cenobite (approximately after 1531). The construction of a cloister began.

Despite of his not having experience, Trifon trained the national leaders and missionaries, who «passed the seeds of godliness to others with the vivid animation and the whole wild area was completely changed» (T-oi 1871:5).

According to this brief information we can presume that Trifon of Pecheneg preached in a national language, christened through the faith, used translated prayers, found and trained
priesthood and cenobites among the natives. There is no information on whether he translated the Scriptures and party the Liturgy or not. Most likely he didn’t.

The history of Trifon of Pechenega is more amazing because he was a layman. Now there are a lot of discussions in the modern missiology field about the role of laity in the church work. The missionary activity of laity is considered in the present day documents of ROC as well. This is the sign that the paradigm of thinking is moving. Even Catholic and Orthodox churches have started talking about it with all their lung power. But in his time, Trifon of Pechenega realized his unusualness, though he was obedient to God's call. Exactly for this reason he hurried to be made a cenobite to get out of the difficult situation.

So, as we see, Stephen of Perm was not alone in his undertakings. He has just gone further and deeper, working perfectly and professionally, as he had a personal, purposeful training before. Non-Russian mission of XIX-XX c will develop more widely the experience of Stephen of Perm, Cyril and Methodiy.

2.3 The evaluation of the first period mission from the ecclesiological point of view

The status of the mission in Premongolian and Mongolian periods is the result of ecclesiological thinking of the Eastern Church that is the basis of its missiological ideas. According to them «the mission is inherent in the nature of Church» (ROC Synod 1995:3-4; John (Popov) 1995:10-11), all Church life is the mission (:10) and everyone is called to the testimony (:10-11). Therefore Church grows due to the internal mechanisms of growth that are put in it by its Head - Christ. It is a mission of the organism, not the organization (see Bosch 1991:207), where it is not one of the functions but life (see Keshishian 1992f:98).

Some Christians who want a personal relationship with God, under the influence of the Holy Spirit and the Eastern monastic ideal of sanctity, leave for a secluded place or for an already
existing monastery. There they achieve the desirable \textit{theosis}^{12} by means of \textit{imitatio Christi}^{13}, saints and their abbot, and also through «a continuing state of adoration, prayer, thanksgiving, worship, and intercession, as well as meditation and contemplation of the triune God and God's infinite love» (Bria 1986:9). The mission is impossible without the theosis. «Where this takes place, mission [of God in a single person] has attained its end» (Bosh 1991:209; the inset is ours) and at the same time it is the beginning of the missionary work of the «deified» Christian, as a worthy «vessel» of God, as the acquired «good behavior»^{14} implies the \textit{kenotic}^{15} way of life (Rainer 1996:202). The motto and the principle of this mission is: «Save yourself and you will save those who around you» (WCC 1977:6). That is a Christian, working on his theosis, takes part in Missio Dei (see John (Popov) 1995:16) and becomes a primary aspect of the missionary activity. \textit{If there is no theosis, there is no mission.} Thus even the anchorites and monks who have taken a vow of silence became the foremost workers of the missionary fields, because they achieved high level of theosis and could work as missionaries only by their prayerful presence purging the pagan territories from demons’ influence.

Following this path, the mission of a monastery or a single anchorite took on (got, acquired) the character inherent to the Orthodox Church: \textit{centripetalness + the mission of presence}, though the monasteries, using the method of«training of disciples», and putting them into the «experience of relationship with God» tended to the centrifugal mission. But as they were multiplied using the following method: the new branches moved away from the mother — kenovia and founded new «deserts», they again made the centrifugal centers for native hearts craving for truth. And the territory of north-eastern Russia was covered with a network of monasteries. Using this method the missionary call of OC to theosis and renewal succeeded, though it has never meant to have a man for an object, but the renewal of the whole Cosmos as

\textsuperscript{12} Theosis — it is not the deification of a man, as some may think, but the \textit{union with God}. \textit{By means of this union a Christian during his life approaches to the image of God lost in the garden of Eden and becomes a New Creation} (see Rosenkranz 1977:243, 470; Lowe 1982:200-204; Greshake 1983:61-63; is cited in Bosch 1991:209 etc.).
\textsuperscript{13} (Latin) imitation of Christ
\textsuperscript{14} Good behavior — (an orthodox notion)is a devout temper, the behavior of a radical follower of Christ who lives in imitation of His image. That is it is one of the qualities of a Christian who reached some degrees of a theosis.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Kenosis} (Greek) — the humble descent of God of Word to the people. The main idea here is the idea of self-abasement of the Son of God (see in details Averintsev 1995:III/278-281). Therefore the \textit{kenotic way of life} implies a self-abasement of a Christian who comes to serve in the world. // Kenosis is love in a free-will self-abnegation. A desire for salvation for all people. These are ideals of Feodosiy. The hagiographies of C. Radonezhsky and Stephan
the final salvation of God (see Keshishian 1992:59). This global reconstruction of Universe that has lost the harmony with the Creator started with the theosis of an individual and its starting-point at that historical period were not parishes but monastic communities. In this case the monasteries were parishes, and Eucharistic communities, and catholic Church in its entirety. When a monk came to a new place the first thing he usually did was the building of a small church to start public services, the Liturgy and the Eucharist, that is not only the center of the Church (see Keshishian 1992d:22f; Fairbairn 1984:25) and the starting-point of a mission (see Anastasios 1989:83; 1990:53 and many others), but also sets up the Church (see WCC 1977:1; Keshishian 1992d:22f). Thus, the monastery is in the sacramental, dogmatical, etc. unity with the Church, though it has always been a separate structure. Monkhood did not exist without the ecclesiastical basis.

Therefore, we have the right to say that in the presented period the Russian Orthodox Church was not amorphous, but was engaged in mission through one of its structures — Monkhood. Such situation is typical for the Orthodox Church of East, where mission has always been burdened with cenobites and unmarried monkhood.
PART 3: THE SECOND PERIOD OF ROC MISSION:
FROM THE CONQUEST OF KAZAN TILL THE FIRST MISSIONS
(1552 – THE MIDDLE OF XIX)

3.1 The historical reasons of the second period mission

The first and second missionary periods of ROC have some features in common but at the same time they have a big difference. In both cases the colonization took place but each time it was the expansion of a different kind. *In the first period the nonviolent moving* of Russian settlers to the north-east and the process of mixing with pagan Finnish tribes took place. Therefore «out of this mixture of Russian and Finnish elements, with Russian as a dominating element, *the Great Russian tribe has been formed*» (Kliouchevsky [1906] 1992:57, see 53-57) *having Orthodoxy as their religion*. The beginning of *the second missionary period* was marked with *the military actions* of the new Moscow state that was going to the east and southeast.

The Tatar-Mongolian yoke was over when the standing on the Ugra river in 1480 took place. The liberation of Russia was «a landmark in its struggle with steppe» (Vernadsky [1967] 1997:89). But the forays of Tatars on Russian settlements continued: the frontier farms were ravaged, people were taken away to the «polon» (see Plato 1993:201; Ostrogorsky 1992:44-45). The unstable situation required an eternal vigilance and big military activities from the Moscow government» (Vernadsky [1967] 1997:89). Kazan became «a chronic ulcer» of the Moscow life (see Plato 1993:201), and Ivan IV (the Terrible) has finally decided to conquer it (see Rambo 1994:153).

At the beginning, the military victory was supposed to be not only the triumph of Moscow over its ex-enslavers, but also «*the triumph of the cross over the crescent*» (:154), thus the war acquired the status of a «*crusade*» (see Talberg 1994:1/200; Ioann (Ladozhskiy) 1995:143). The proofs of the existence of this idea could be traced in the icon-painting of those years, in the icon «the militant Church», for example, that personifies the campaign of the orthodox army (see the reproduction in Volodikhin 1997:5/1/328). At the time when the powerful walls of Kazan fell and
Russians rushed into the city to destroy the «foul people» (Turks-Moslems), with the cries «God is with us!», in the field church of saint Sergiy the Liturgy had been conducted, and a deacon was reading the Gospel: «Let the flock be united and let the pastor be united» (see Znamensky 1996:132; Rambo 1994:154; Talberg [1959] 1994:1/201; Bakhemeteva 1904:2/167; Smirnov 1994:185). In commemoration of the triumph of the Orthodoxy in the Kazan citadel all the monuments of Mongolian past were destroyed and churches and monasteries were built at their place, and the city was populated with Russians. Tatars were sent beyond the bounds of the city (see Volodikhin 1997:5/330; see Rambo 1994:154; Znamensky 1996:132). In three years in Kazan the archepiscopal cathedra was opened (see Smirnov 1994:185).

The conquest of Kazan had an important political and religious significance. Some different nations: Mordvinians, Cheremis, Chuvash16, Votyaks, Bashkirs were under the Tatar horde of Kazan that united all of them. Cheremis over the Volga river, on the banks of the Unhza and Valtuga rivers and Mordvinians over the Oka river have been always restraining Russia from aiming its colonization at the East. Now, after a long-term opposition all this intricate non-Russian world should submit to Moscow (see Rambo 1994:154; Ostrogorsky 1992:45).

Of course Russia wanted to rule over the new non-Christian territories without any problems that's why Russia as a worthy successor of Byzantium, hurried to take advantage of its missionary-political principle: «convert and rule» (Rainer 1996:49). Ivan the Terrible clearly understood the political importance of such a religious event as sending of missionaries, that is why ministers of religion were sent there at the same time with voevodes (see Rambo 1994:154). So, in 1552 the second period in the history of Russian missionary activity began with conquest of the Kazan empire, that lasted up to the latter half of the XIX century (see Smirnov 1904:6).

Soon, in 1556, the annexation of another Tatar empire — the Astrakhan Empire took place (see Smirnov 1904:6). Due to this fact «the whole territory on the banks of the Volga river has been taken under the control» from the source to the mouth (see Vernadsky [1967] 1997:89), and the access to the Persian possessions has been opened for Russia through the Caspian sea (see Rambo 1994:155).

The national colonization, so-called movement to «the wild field» began simultaneously with the expansion of the state power over the newly-seized territories (see Vernadsky [1967]
1997:89; Ostrogorsky 1992:45). Moscow understood the political importance of this movement and helped new settlers to build fortifications against Tatars' attacks. «With the successful course of the colonization the existing lines of fortifications kept further» (see Vernadsky [1967] 1997:89). The significant number of settlers was settled down in the valleys near the rivers far ahead from the fortifications. They were forced to live as numerous military communities for the sake of defense (being defended) (:90).

Thus, little by little, the Russian colonizers reached the middle territories of Ural from the Permian region (:90). Businessmen Stroganov are known in the history. They mined the mineral resources of Ural. Stroganov crossed the natural boundary of the Ural mountains and found themselves in the Tatar empire of Siberia. They hired a group of the Volga Cossacks17 led by the legendary ataman Ernak Timofeevitch. Less than in one year this small army of about 540 (or 840) men, «took the Siberian empire and led many people who lived there and spoke another language to the great hand of the Tzar» having only fire-arms against the numerous armies of Tatar archers (Volodikhin 1997:5/1/340; see Ostrogorsky 1992:49-50 etc.). This is how «the gradual conquest of Siberia started in 1582 and went on until 1697 when the Cossacks, the conquerors of Siberia reached the borders of the north-eastern Asia» (Smirnov 1904:6).

The annexation of the new territories expanded the missionary field more and more.

3.2 Analysis of peculiarities and difficulties of the mission in the given period

This analysis is given before we represent you the outstanding mission figures for you to see them in all their magnificence.

---

16 Radlov considers Chuvash people to the descendants of Bulgarians (see Rambo 1994:154).
17 Cossacks as a separate social group appeared in XV century during the disintegration of Golden Horde. A Cossack (from Tatar) – "a free man", "a free adventurer". Lublin union of 1569 when the Ukraine provinces were taken from Lithuania and given to Poland and the serfdom became stronger assisted a lot to the increase of number of Ukrainian Cossacks. Many people from Russia joined Cossacks after the first decrees that limited the freedom of movement for peasants (1581). The main activity: fishing, hunting, military actions, highway robberies. In spite of the independence of Cossacks, their neighbors – Turks and Tatars considered them to be the Tzar subjects. In its turn, Moscow was not against using Cossacks to move to the Southern and Eastern directions (Vernadsky [1967] 1997:99-101).
3.2.1 The alliance of the cross and the crown

Due to the new conquests the canonical apanage of the Russian Orthodox Church (see ROC Synod 1995:5-6; John (Popov) 1995:21-23) had increased and ROC felt its responsibility for the enlightenment of conquered foreigners. It had «a new missionary problem, enormous (tremendous) in size» (Smirnov 1904:8). When we will be discussing the politicization of the ROC, we should not forget about the existence of this strong motivation of the missionary duty in the mission of XVI-XIX centuries.

It was the period when the Church acted not only as the «organism» represented by the cenobites-colonialists, as it was in the first period, but also as the organizational structure that had the power. During this period the religious colonization was too much interrelated to the policy of the Russian state (see Nikolsky 1990:284), had powerful backing and quite often the guidance from the tsarist government. It was an immediate corollary or a natural continuation of the military expansion as well as the ideological weapon to suppress the non-Russians. The Byzantine pattern of the full confluence (merging) of Church and state interests that considers the mission a soteriological-ecclesiological and at the same time political undertaking (see Raimer 1996:198) had much more effect here than in the first period.

The methods of mission could be cruel or lax (lenient), it depended upon a tsar who was in power at the moment. Peter the Great, under whom «the principle of freedom of conscience» was proclaimed (see Talberg 1994:2/635) and Catherine the Second who helped «even pagan religions» and sponsored mullahs and lamas (:635-636; see also Rambo 1994:309) were in particular tolerant to the other denominations. But under other Tzars the attitude of Russians towards the natives of the North has never been cruel. Nobody tried to make them live in reservations, nobody tried to annihilate them or make slaves of them, as Anglo-Saxons had done to American Indians. «Yasak» — the tax for the Russian Tzar was very small (1-2 sables). The subdued nations lived freely and had business contacts with Russians in different fields (see Gumilev 1992:226-227).

Vast sums of money were sent from Moscow for building of temples and monasteries, that were supplied with the books, icons, church plate and clergy (see Znamensky 1996:268). The
government gave different privileges to people who had been christened, sometimes to the prejudice of non-christened population.

For example:

- In 1628 «after having been christened, bondmen were freed of their non-Christian masters», and «for the seduction of a christened bondman in other religion, the execution through burning was set (:270)»;
- In 1681 there was an order to take the patrimonies with the Christian population away from non-Christians giving them instead the lands of non-christened Mordvinians (:270);
- «Forgiveness for crimes accomplished before the christening» was declared; money, lands and different things were given (see Talberg 1994:2/635);
- In 1720 christened people were granted «the freedom from taxes and recruiting for three years» and «it cost the state nothing, as the taxes and recruits were taken from the recalcitrant confreres of Christians» (Nikolsky 1990:284; see also Talberg 1994:2/635).

It was the best way to form the hostile attitude towards the Christianity. It was «a double-edged weapon». The government helped the Church and at the same time did harm to the cause of Gospel.

One of the interesting features of that period was the separation of the new christened people and having them in the special settlements with a church, close to the Russian population to keep the Christian religion. During the reign of Alexiy Mikhailovitch there was an order to «to punish christened as well as non-christened» for living together, in the same settlements without permission (Znamensky 1996:270). The authorities exercised the strict supervision over the natives who were Orthodox. Those who «won’t be strong in faith» should «be sent to the lord for being pacified or put into the prison» (:270).

Probably it was necessary in that historical situation. However such measures of destruction of the national unity could not be gladly accepted by the non-christened part of (the nation) non-Russians. But ROC didn’t want this negative reaction. It sincerely tried «to drive the mankind [i.e. unwise non-Russians] into the happiness with an iron hand»¹⁸ and at the same time it actively used «the method of a gingerbread». It had the state power in its hands and it was difficult to go to subdued nations as a meek pilgrim, as it had been in the first period.

43
The basic failures of the evangelical work of this historical period are in this union of a scepter and a crozier as well as in the military invasion that preceded the mission. «Some tribes were placed under the authority of Russians and lost their former political independence. This is the reason why they acted unfriendly towards their conquerors and didn’t trust the religion they were introducing (bringing in)» (Smirnov 1904:10).

Tatars were more unfriendly than other nations «They were the most numerous among others, had rather high cultural level and could not forget that Russia had been under their yoke for almost two centuries» (:10) not many of them were christened. As for the other nations, it was going pretty well according to Talberg for example «everyone from Mordvinians has been christened, a small number of Cheremis, Chuvash, Votyaks remained non-christened» (see Talberg 1994:2/638).

Nevertheless the concealed political and religious antagonism has been always binding the Russian policy and Russian mission on the non – Russian territories. It has been the reason of numerous non – Russian revolts too (:638). There were also a lot of non – Russian taking parts in the revolts of Pugatchev and Stephan Razin who hoped to have the freedom of religion in case of success.

The Byzantine principle of giving to the people inverted «together with the gospel» «the whole of their experience — political, artistic, economic, cultural» (Anastasios 1989:66) is also inherent to this period. They tried to accustom Non – Russians who had been leading a nomad’s life for centuries to the farming, settling down. They tried to inculcate Non – Russians the basics of the state system. The situation will be the same in the third period of the mission. Actually the process of bringing the Non – Russians «to the nationality and civilization of Russia through their enlightenment with the light of Christian faith» (Smirnov 1904:7) consists of it. In contrast to the first period it was done quite often from the position of strength and without the respect for another’s cultural values. Russian did not win a Non – Russian over because «by right of the conquerors and in the manner(spirit) of that time they often started the establishment of a new life with the demolition of a mosque and the overthrow of idols» (Smirnov 1904:10; also see Znamensky 1996:270; Rambo 1994:154 etc). And then they tried to strengthen the russification

---

18 The slogan of times of Stalin I.V. (the insert is ours).
of growing generations of Non – Russians with the help of schools (see Nikolsky 1990:286) and by putting newly-converted into the special settlements.

Due to this historical background, the orthodox preachers, even gifted ones who sincerely preached the Gospel, had great difficulties with the penetration in the concealed internal world of Non – Russians and «for a long time they only were touching it lightly on the surface. Non – Russians shrunk into their shell and remained a dark, mysterious and inconceivable substance for Russians» (Smirnov 1904:10-11). Naturally, in such a situation «the internal mastering of Christian truth and putting it into practice were out of the question at that time» (:9).

3.2.2 The impracticability of the missionary task

Except for the circumstances mentioned above that made it more difficult for Non – Russians to perceive the truth of the Gospel, the mission of the second period had a lot of other difficulties that hindered the deep perception of the Christian faith by the native people.

We enumerate them briefly:

1. ROC has a «new missionary task» that was beyond the strength of even a healthy and strong ecclesiologilcal organism. The vast areas, 8-9 times bigger than Russia have been joined to it extremely fast, within 145 years (see Smirnov 1904:8).

2. Non – Russians differed in the tribal origin and were subdivided into three main groups: Finnish: Vogul, Ostyaks and Samoyeds;
   Mongolian: the Kirghiz, Kalmyks, Buryats, Tungus, Yakuts, Chukchis, Koryaks, Kamchadals and different nations that lived in the Amur river area;
   Turkic-tatar: tatars(:7)

3. They had different beliefs, languages and cultures. Basically three forms of religion predominated: the Finns had shamanism\(^{19}\), the Mongols had Lamaism\(^{20}\), the Tatars had Islam\(^{21}\). There was no Christianity in Siberia «before the Russian appeared» (:7).

\(^{19}\) Shamanism — the most general and ancient form of religion of all nations of Siberia.

\(^{20}\) Lamaism — was introduced in Siberia by khan Kioublai at the beginning of the XIII century.
4. They were settled far apart from each other on vast territories of Siberia (:9),
5. They had nomadism (:9),
6. They had a down level of development, they were almost wild. (:9)
7. The climate was extremely severe, specially in Siberia (:9),
8. The slow speed of development of Russian secular colonization (:9),
9. The negative example of life and attitude towards Non – Russians from the secular colonizers’ side.
10. Russians were not familiar at all with languages, culture and the religions of numerous subdued tribes. The majority didn’t have written language or even alphabetic symbols (:9).
11. Sacred books and service books haven’t been translated to Non – Russian languages (:9).
12. The service was conducted only in Slavonic language of the Church (:9)
13. The missionaries started working without any training: without knowing the language, way of life and religions of Non – Russians (:9).
14. The missionary of that time could not be trained, as there were no missionary educational institutions at all.
15. The missionary methods haven’t been tried and approved in practice (:9). There was an experience of the cenobites-colonialists and Stephan of Perm, but probably their transactions were not canonized and consolidated in hagiographic literature and iconography yet.

The missionary could not inculcate in Non – Russians the principles of the Christianity in such a situation. The only thing he could do is to christen them and then a Non – Russian simply imitated the rich ceremonial way of the Orthodox religion and at the same time continued his pagan way of life (:9). The dual faith prospered, only a Russian priest was put instead of a mullah or a shaman (see Никольский 1990:285). Of course not everybody has been Christianized only nominally. There were martyrs among the new Tatars-Christians—Stephen and Peter (1552) the martyrs of Kazan, victims of the relatives - Moslems (see Talberg 1994:1/204) and this shows the faithfulness to Christ.

21 Akhmet-Giriy started to spread Islam in Siberia in the XVI century, 50 years before the Cossacks (Smirnov 1904:7)
3.2.3 The development of experience of the contextualization

Practically the mission of the second period did not know the contextualization. Sometimes, though very seldom, when the missionaries had at least some knowledge of a language and culture, their work according to Smirnova «usually scored a great success; they christened thousands of Non – Russians» (Smirnov 1904:9). For the most part messengers of the Gospel had to make headway with the cut-and-try method. The achievement of the missionary searches of this historical period is that the consciousness of the Church little by little got ready for the perception of the fact that it's necessary to consider other cultures. There was another variant: ROC originally understood such a necessity, but as a huge amount of work came like a bolt from the blue, and the church was not ready for it at all, it began to use the principle of «the spiritual reception of culture» only at the end of the second missionary period. But in any case this way was historically inevitable for the preparation of the contextualizing mission of XIX-XX centuries.

And still, despite the absence of a «correctly organized» mission in practice and in consciousness, the absence of a mission that acts continuously, successively, collectively and relies on the previous experience in its activity (:14) and having not enough missionaries, ROC has not given in to difficulties and has done everything possible to promote this impracticable task.

Now when we know the general background of the missionary activity of XVI – XIX centuries, the time has come to show the activity of some eminent persons of the second missionary period. For the most part they worked as single missionaries, scattered about «often alone in different places, under different conditions and of course with unequal success» (:14). After all the missionary communities still have to be formed.
3.3 The missionary activity among Tatars

3.3.1 "The Great Three of Kazan" — the Apostles of Tatars

3.3.1.1 The consecrator Gurjiy

In 1555 on the pastor council the decision was made to open the episcopal cathedra in Kazan (see Smirnov 1994:184-185) it was decided by lot that the consecrator Gurjiy would be a pastor there (around 1500-1563) and the archimandrites Hermann and Varsonovi were appointed his assistants "His departure to the eparchy was performed with an unusual solemnity; it was another, spiritual campaign to the Kazan empire" (Znamensky 1996:132). Moscow provided the missionaries with everything required: finance, icons, books, church plates. The Tzar and metropolitan Makariy sending Saint Gurjiy, imposed him as a duty «to convert to the faith with love and not against one’s will», winning them over with caress, "feed", gifts, intercession. The best from christened people he should edify in the faith at his house, others - send to monasteries, intercede for the defendants, expose lies of the authorities, participate with the authorities in all councils. Judging from the life of Gurjiy before his Kazan mission, there was no need to give him such advice, he served through the spirit as an apostle. His missionary fervency had no limits. He «taught people all the time in church and at home, built temples and monasteries, opened schools and took the oppressed under his protection» (see Smirnov 1904:10-12). He assuaged the hearts of Tatars with his love to beggars and accused. His schools were open both for Christian children and for children of Mohammedan and pagans. During nine years of his service (from 1555 till 1564) he converted «many thousands» of men, women and children (see Znamensky 1996:133; Smirnov 1904:11-12;). The last three years Gurjiy could not walk because of his illness, that was the consequence of an old, undeserved imprisonment in a hole. But nevertheless he kept teaching his flock, lying on a stretcher. (the general information is given according to Talberg 1994:1/203; Znamensky

As we have seen, Guriy’s serving wasn’t only the service of evangelization, enlightenment and deaconry, but also included some political aspect — the influence on the temporal power which should be kept within the limits of Christian standards. The similar plan of work, is typical for ROC mission and shows the cosmism of the Orthodoxy, when the Church consecrates all the existing structures of society, because it is the center of the Universe and the Empire where everything is called to enter the Universe (see Lossky 1976:178; Anastasios 1989:83-84; Bosch 1991:207).

3.3.1.2 Varsonofiy — the expert in Islam

*Varsonofiy* (Johnor Vasiliy in the world) was Guriy’s companion-in-arms, a son of a priest in Serpuhov. We are interested in him in particular. ROC of those times had no missionary educational institutions (see Smirnov 1904:8-9), but God prepared this man in His «special missionary school». At the age of 17 this inquisitive, gifted for sciences young man was taken prisoner by the Crimean Tatars. He could gain confidence of his enslavers and during three years of his captivity he studied the Tatar language, culture, and also the main parts of the Koran. When he was set free, he became a monk in the Andronnikov monastery of Moscow (see Makariy (Bulgakov) 1996:4/1/192). This knowledge in the best possible way proved to be useful in his missionary activity among Tatars. His sermon even reached the hearts that were set against Moscow, and he had no equal in the debates with the erudite defenders of Islam (see Talberg 1994:1/203-204; Znamensky 1996:133). He was also an excellent doctor that attracted people to him. (:133). Guriy couldn’t think of a better assistant. In Kazan Varsonofiy founded Spassko – Preobrahzensky monastery (see Makariy (Bougakov) 1996:4/1/192) and also gave it a charter(regulations).

In some way Varsonofiy acted as a part of contextualizing mission, there were not many such missionaries at the beginning of the second missionary period (see Smirnov 1904:8-9).
The third member of «the Great Three of Kazan» is Herman. He is from a noble family of Sadirevs-Polevs, a cenobite of Volokamsky monastery. According to his contemporary, Herman was a man «of a huge intellect... of pure and truly sacred life... adherent of God ... a great helper in misfortunes and troubles, and kind to the miserable» (see Makariy (Bugakov) 1996:4/1/191-192). He worked in outskirts, where he founded Svyazhskiy monastery of the Blessed Virgin so that «the cenobites can teach children and convert non Christians» (:192). This monastery has become the center of enlightenment for all upland part of the Kazan area, as its founder wanted it to be. In 1564, after Guriy’s death, Herman was raised to the cathedra of the Kazan metropolitan and zealously continued his work (general information also see in Talberg 1994:1/204; Znamensky 1996:133; Averintsev1993:1/409-410; see Makariy (Bulgakov) 1996:4/1/191-192).

A fruit of the missionary activity of these three persons was «the consolidation of Christianity among mainly the cities of the Kazan area. Big settlements of so-called old-christened Tatars were left after their activities» (Smirnov 1904:11-12; see Smirnov 1994:185; Znamensky 1996:133; Makariy (Bugakov) 1996:4/1/191-192).

These three missionaries acted in the orthodox tradition, attaching importance to the building of temples and founding of monasteries, as the missionary centers on further enlightenment of neighborhoods with the light of the Gospel. For them the monasteries were the mechanism and the security of continuation of the mission development.

Now there was the continuity of Eastern missionary activity traditions and also the experience of the cenobites-colonialists.
3.3.2 Some moment of the Kazan mission history after Guriy

It is a pity, but the successors of Guriy and Hermann, except for Germogen, didn't show enough eagerness in the conversion of ннородцев, and their good undertaking fell into decay without a due support. Some too «zealous» missionaries did a lot of harm to the course of the sermon as Luke (Konashevitch) — the bishop of the Kazan area from 1738 till 1755 who put the children of non-Russian in schools by force and destroyed the sacred ancient Mohammedan buildings (see Talberg 1994:2/637; Znamensky 1996:354; compare Smirnov 1994:233).

All Orthodox writers point to the incredible mission success as a result of finding the famous icon of the Kazan God's Mother in 1579, and the wonders it worked. Due to this fact, the Mussulmen were convinced of the power and righteousness of Christianity (see Talberg 1994:1/204-205; Znamensky 1996:133 and many others). Here we can see the importance of an icon as an instrument of the mission for the Orthodoxy. The icon is not only a kind of the Bible in OC (Stenly in Snegirev 1993:101) the example, book, school and emblem of embodiment (see Fairbairn 1984:75; Anatoliy (Martinovsky) 1993:71,83; Uspensky 1989:120; Men 1991:149; Gavrioushin 1993:101-102,8; SNEGIREV 1993:101-102; TZAREVSKY 1991:23-24; Grushetsky 1996:6/340; Arsenyev 1993; 140; Ouspensky 1978:51f; Fairbairn 1984:72f; Florovsky 1976:210), but also plays the role of an intermediary, a «receptacle» and a certain «carrier» on passing the Divine grace that helps a person to come to God, and to reach the Theosis after (see Sosnin 1993:61; Ouspensky and Lossky 1982:36; is cited in Fairbairn 1984:75,77). It is one of the examples, when «the art as the way of salvation» is practically canonized in OC (see Bulgakov 1993:289).

In the history of the Kazan mission there was one very interesting undertaking that was «the first signs», a certain prototype of a missionary community. In 1740 a «Newly Chrisiened bureau» (or commission) was established, attached to the Svyahzsky monastery and was headed by the archimandrite Dmitry (Sechenov) and then by Silvestr (Glovatsky).

2 archpriests, 5 translators, 6 clerks and soldiers had been working there. The presence of translators shows that there were certain translations. The provinces of Kazan, Nizhniy Novgorod, Voronezh and Astrakhan were in the missionary area of the «office» (see Talberg

The history notes the large success of their activity: non – Russians were christened in «the broad masses», «the whole settlements were christened», «under Elizabeth there were more than 430 000 souls of christened people in the area of the Kazan mission» (see Znamensky 1996:355). «But at this time for the most part all the pagans have been christened, — all Mordvinians have been christened, not many of Cheremis, Chuvash, Votyaks remained non christened; up to 8 000 people have been christened from Tatars and Mohammedans» (:355).

But Evangelical Christians usually are interested in the quality of so numerous christenings. The orthodox historians say that the conversion wasn’t quite satisfactory «the missionaries had time only to christen them but they couldn’t teach them the religion» (:355).

«Newly Christened commission» existed only for 24 years, it was closed in 1764 under Catherine the Second and «the care about the civil life of newly converted was handed over to the civil authorities» (see Talberg 1994:1/239; Znamensky 1996:356).

Later on the church tried to make the Gospel more understandable for Tatars for example in 1847 in the Kazan academy the sacred books and service books were translated into the Tatar language, but these measures were of no use because the books were translated not into the spoken language but to the bookish language (see Znamensky 1996:357).

In the third missionary period Kazan will become the most significant center on translation and training of the professional missionaries who knew non - Russian languages and culture. The «pioneers» of the second missionary period with their mistakes and achievements did a lot for it to happen.

3.4 The missionary activity in Kalmykia

In 1724 Tatishim (the grandson of Kalmyk khan Aiouk) was christened in St. Petersburg and Peter the Great gave him a field church as a present. Hieromonk Nikodim (Lenkevich) who knew well the local language contributed to his conversion. The government granted to the converted
Kalmyks the lands along the Volga river, above Samara, where Stavropol was founded. As
history says Nicodim christened the whole horde and stayed with Taishim widow Anna for
catechesis of people who wanted to be christened.

Soon the system of mobile temples was developed, the priests were appointed to *field
churches* for going around the uluses, as well as a *translator* for the translation of the New
Testament to the Kalmyk language.

After hieromonk Nicodim’s death in 1739 the archpriest Adrian (Chubovsky) with his
assistants Bestuzhev and Lyakhow had been working in this area. All three spoke the Kalmyk
language fluently. Andrew has christened 6000 persons, including Ombo (the widow of khan
Dunduk) with children.

The missionary work was progressing and in 1741 the Kalmyk-Russian school was
opened in Stavropol, the *New Testament and prayers* were translated into the Kalmyk language.
However under Catherine the Second the mission among the Kalmyks has loosened as well as
everywhere. (the general information is given according to Talberg 1994:2/640-641; Znamensky

At the beginning and in the middle of XVIII century the missionaries of Kalmykia used
many *methods of contextualization*, tried to work *taking into consideration the nomadic way of
life* of non-Russians, and instead of accustoming them to the settled life around one permanent
temple the missionaries *moved with their churches*.

However these temples had all the necessary attributes of a permanent cathedral, and of
course the antimension with relics of saints for making a sacrifice of the Eucharist (see
Averintsev 1993:1/523). It couldn’t be otherwise because OC is an «eucharist-centered and
eucharist-oriented» community (Keshishian 1992d:27), and the conducting of the Eucharist is the
central missionary act(action) and starting point of the mission for the church (see Anastasios
community of non-Russians could not be the true Catholic church as according to the OC
document the meeting of the Christians becomes Church only through the Eucharist (see

In spite of the *centrifugal character* of the nomad tent that served as a temple, every time
it arrived at the next ulus or nomads’ camp it always became the *centripetal center*, that is
characteristic of the Orthodox mission concentrated around temple life (see Bosch 1991:207; Anastasios 1965:285).

3.5 The missionary activity in Siberia

The Cossacks continued to conquer the territories of Siberia, the temporal colonization followed them, Russian settlements and towns with churches and monasteries were founded. In 1620 the eparchy was opened in Tobolsk. Kiprian (from the abbots of Khutinsky monastery) became the first archbishop who was anxious not only about the bad wicked morals of Russian «orthodox» settlers, but also about the enlightenment of the pagans-natives.

There is not much information about the early period of missionary activity in Siberia. There were some monasteries that played an important role in the mission life. We will mention (point out to) two of them: the Dalmatovsky monastery founded in 1644 by elder Dalmat and the Kondinsky monastery founded in 1653 in Ostyak area (see Znamensky 1996:268).

Thus the missionary activity in Siberia has been moving up thanks to the work of some individuals (360). We will consider the activity of some of them.

3.5.1 The Western Siberia: Filofei of Tobolsk

Filofei (Ieschinsky), the metropolitan of Tobolsk (1650-1727), a graduate of the Kiev Spiritual Academy was famous with his missionary feats in the west of Siberia. When he arrived in Tobolsk he saw the «great spirit» in churches (see Talberg 1994:2/642). He got a huge eparchy, and not in the high fettle. He had to work hard and needed assistants as the breath of life.

Filofei realized the need for a local educational structure for training of leaders and sent for the educated monks to teach and work in the missionary field. He opened the Slavic school for clergy in Tobolsk (see Averintsev 1995:III/123). He intended to open a local printing house, but Peter the Great ordered him to buy books in Moscow (see Talberg 1994:2/642).
The heart of the Evangelist did not let Filofei live quietly and within 25 years, from 1702 till 1727, he made six missionary trips and travelled the length and breadth of Western Siberia (see Znamensky 1996:360-361; Smirnov 1904:12-13; Smirnov 1994:234).

Usually his missionary «cruises» all over this land of severe nature, lasted «several years». He «christened hundreds of Tatars, Ostyaks, Voguls and other non - Russians, destroyed idols and built churches» everywhere (Smirnov 1904:12-13). Together with his assistants he converted to Christianity from 40 up to 50 thousand non - Russians and built 37 churches for them (see Znamensky 1996:360-361 etc.).

Filofei worried about the conversion of the inhabitants of the most remote lands of Siberia and foreign Asia. In 1704 he fitted the mission out to Mongolia, but it was unsuccessful (see Averintsev 1995:III/123). He didn't give up and in 1705 the first missionaries were sent to Kamchatka, led by the archimandrite Martinian, who erected there the Uspensky desert (see Talberg 1994:2/642 etc.), as an outpost post for the following mission. In 1728 the whole mission was sent to this monastery, worked successfully on Kamchatka and converted 5000 Kamchadales.

The work of Filofei lived in his disciples and in 1742 a new mission was sent to Kamchatka. The educated Archimandrite Iosaaft (Khotuntsevitch), 2 hieromonks, 2 hierodeacons and several students from the Moscow Academy have christened 5000 Kamchadales, have opened three schools during five years. The Archimandrite Iosaaft has written a brief catechism for newly christened.

The sending of a mission to Yakutsk in 1724 is also regarded as a merit of Filofei «He was the first one who brought the activity of Russian missionaries out of Russia. In 1714 he sent a mission to Peking» (Smirnov 1904:12-13).

In 1727 during the sixth missionary trip that was the last one for Filofei the Apostle of Siberia passed away (see Smirnov 1994:234). The incessant work and the severe climate affected his health.

There was no «consecrator before or after him equal to him in fervency of the conversion of non - Russians at the Tobolsk cathedra» (Smirnov 1904:12-13). After Filofei, there was an upsurge in the missionary activity under the lord Silvester (Glovatsky) (see Talberg 1994:2/643). Under Catherine the western-Siberian mission fell into decay (644).
3.5.2 The Eastern Siberia: two Innokentiys

3.5.2.1 Innokentyi (Kulchinsky)

Innokentyi (Kulchinsky) was intended to be sent to «Khinsky state», that is in China, to preach the Word of God to the descendants of Russian Albazin people and for the «spreading (expansion) the Orthodox faith». But the Chinese emperor didn’t allow him to go to Peking due to the intrigues of the Jesuits (see Talberg 1994:2/644; Znamensky 1996:361 etc.). He lived in Irkutsk nine years waiting for the problem in China to be settled and he didn’t waste time.

Innokentyi worked with great zealosity at the conversion of the Buryat and Mongols. In 1727, when the eparchy of Irkutsk received independence from the metropolis of Tobolsk, Innokentyi became its head (Smirnov 1904:13).

It is interesting that Innokentyi, as well as Filofei of Tobolsk, worried about the future of the mission, that is why he organized a school for missionary training attached to the Voznesensky monastery (see Znamensky 1996:361). All together his mission lasted for nine years, from 1721 till 1731.

The great missionary of the third period Innokentyi (Popov-Veniaminov) will be inspired with the example of Innokentyi (Kulchinsky) and will take the name Innokentyi in his honor. This is the succession in missionary work.

3.5.2.2 Innokentyi (Nerunovich) and other preachers

Innokentyi (Nerunovich), the successor of Innokentyi (Kulchinsky) (from 1732 till 1746) also made a lot for the enlightenment of that territory, he christened the Buryat, Tungus and Yakuts. In 1748 he christened the Ostyak prince Murzin, and after it other Ostyaks were enlightened too.

Other preachers also worked in the territory of the Eastern Siberia. Beginning in 1724 unknown missionaries began to convert the Yakuts.
The abbot Iova (1751) also went down in history. He converted to Christianity a significant number of the Buryat, Tungus, Votyaks, Voguls and unknown natives in the territory of the Lena river.

The mission was increasing in size (extending), and under the empress Anna the northeastern part of Siberia, the land of «wild Chukchi people» was won for Christ (Talberg 1994:2/645). For 16 years, since 1799 the archpriest Grigoriy Sleptsov were traveling all over the territory of Yakutiya with the mobile church enlightening the Yakuts and Chukchi people (see Znamensky 1996:362; Talbert 1994:2/645).

Even under Catherine when the missionary activity faded away without the help of the state, the Lord God found the workers for the Eastern Siberia. A certain Cyril Shkohanov, having learned the Tungus language, went to the Tungus of Dauria with only one bag, without any support (Talberg 1994:2/646).

The Samoyeds were the most obstinate tribe who didn’t want to be converted to a new faith. They cut out the hearts of christened Ostyaks, committed other atrocities, multiplying the number of nameless non-Russian martyrs. «In 1740 the missionaries from Arkhangelsk were sent to them but they failed» (Talberg 1994:2/646). Only after the successful preaching of courageous Feodor Istomin (since 1821), in 1825 the special Samoyed mission was organized with two mobile churches, that was headed by Veniamin Smirnov. The sermon for the natives was in the local samoyed language, the prayers, the catechism and the New Testament were translated to this language too. By 1830 there were 33000 christened people (see Znamensky 1996:360).

As we have seen, the Russian Orthodox mission did not stand still, it had been working towards the mission considering the context.
3.6 The beginning of the American mission: the cenobites-colonialists at the Aleutian territory

At the end of the second missionary period, when the Siberian virgin soil had been already ploughed with the sermon of the Orthodox missionaries and sowed with the seeds of the Christian truth, ROC made one more spurt to the American continent. Russians came to Alaska not because of the spiritual search for reaching the theosis as it was in the first missionary period. There were no missionary concerns to save people who didn’t know about the new faith yet. But «the yearning of Russians for gaining the territory was the motive of introducing the Christianity among Aleutians» (Innokenty 1997x:156-157; the italic type is ours).

In 1793 the Aleutian mission was organized that had 8 monks of Vaalamsky monastery and the hieromonk Iosaaef Bolotov as its head. A merchant Shelekhov, the founder of the first settlement and an American company suggested to send such a mission. (see Vavilov 1950:2/202-208).

\[22 A leutians — migration from Asia to America 10-12 thousand years ago (see Lyapounova 1994:81-82), “but just from Kamchutka or Japan through Kuril Islands”. “Aleutians with their faces look like Japanese”, “but their way of life is more like North Americans” (see Innokenty 1997a:211-213). At the present moment the general population is about 3 thousand people (1989). Dialects: Unalashkinsky (east), Aikinsky (central), Attuansky (west). Belief in ghosts, shamanism. Converted to Orthodoxy, had a strong influence of Russian culture (Lyapounova 1994:81-82).

\[23 A historical reference: The first time Russians got some information about the part of the modern Alaska was between the voyage of S. Dezhnev (1648) and the Great Northern Expedition. Then there was a trip to Kamchatka, the expeditions of V. Bering and A.Chirikov (1728-1741). Though there were some information before, the discovery of the modern Alaska is connected to a remarkable voyage of Bering and Chirikov (1741 r.). During this voyage some information about nature and population of this region was gathered. Aleutian and Commander Islands were discovered. Russian manufacturers became interested in fur trade. There was also an English rivalry. It was the expedition of Cook (1778), Russian expeditions of Krinitis and Levashov (1768-69), Billings and Saritchev (1790-92) followed it.

In 1784 Shelekhov founded the first settlement of Russians on the Kadyak Island. Beginning with 1786 Russian settlements appeared in the areas close to Alaska. In 1786-87 a navigator Pribilov discovered the biggest fur seal-rookeries in the world. In contrast to unsuccessful attempts of Spanish and French, Russians continued with success the search for new areas of getting furs and developing of northwestern coast of America. In 1804 NovoArckangelsk city was founded - an economic and administrative center of Russian possessions in the North America.

Since 1824 Russians began to cede to USA and UK. The position of Russians became more unstable, it was more difficult to hold their possessions in the North America. According to the treaty from 30 of March,1867 Alaska was sold for 7.200.000 $ (11 mln. rubles in gold).

Alaska consists of a continental part, Aleutian Islands, Islands of Pribilov, Kadyak Island and archipelago Alexander (see Vavilov 1950:2/202-208).
In 1794 hieromunks Makariy and Uvenaliy (they are from these eight monks) in two months christened the whole Kadyak island (see Averintsev 1995:3/279) and opened a school there. They also worked on other islands of the archipelago: Makariy worked on Unalashka, Uvenaliy christened the inhabitants of Kenaisky bay. «The life of these first religious devotees, full of evangelical simplicity and sanctity was a good example for imitation and converted lot of Aleutians to Christo» (see Smirnov 1904:15). Later on, in 1823 the most outstanding missionary of ROC Innokenty (Popov-Veniaminov) will start his missionary activity at Unalashka church. Znamensky 1996:361). Cenobites of Valaam prepared a path for him in spite of the fact that since 1756 till 1824 the Russian mission had a hard time.

3.7 The reasons for seventy years' of stagnation of missionary activity at the end of the second period (1756-1824)

In XVII century Siberia was finally conquered (see Volodikhin 1997:5/2/580). At first the orthodox Church and state administration tried to oust the local beliefs (587), but in the second half of XVIII their missionary burst slackened. «The period of stagnation began» and lasted approximately for seventy years from 1756 till 1824 (see Smirnov 1904:15).

The stagnation in the missionary activity affected badly the religious and moral position of non-Russians in Russia. Nobody supported and propagated Christianity. So, Christianity didn't win new followers but was losing old ones; More and more there were the isolated instances of falling away from the faith (16).

The author of this work surmises the following reasons of mission stagnation. Peter III who didn't like Russia «neglected too much the Orthodox clergy» (Morozova 1990:14), in 1762 he handed the church lands over to the temporal administration and gave the equal rights to Protestant and Orthodox churches (Konta 1994:88). Catherine the Second followed the same policy towards ROC. With the decrees of 1763 and 1764 she carried out the secularization of church and monastery lands, the church serfs became state serfs, and many monasteries were closed (88). Under Catherine all religions received the equal right to life, and almost all incentive measures for newly christened were cancelled (see Znamensky 1996:353). Moreover, she even
patronized not Christian religions: she gave her permission to erect mosques, gave state money for the running costs of mullahs and lamas (see Talberg 1994:2/636,646,760; Znamensky 1996:353 etc.). The following two emperors Paul I and Alexander I were also remarkable for their toleration. Kazan became «the real center of Mohammedan education in Russia», the Asian printing house printed the Koran and «tens of thousands of Mohammedan books» at public expense (Talberg 1994:760). Of course in such a situation, without state support and incurring great material damage, ROC could not actively continue its mission and other religions were given a chance to spread again. Besides it seemed that the Orthodox Church was too tired of a permanent overstrain of two centuries when it had been trying to develop spiritually the «thorny» non - Russian soil.

The previous experience of the mission and this «period of stagnation» helped ROC to uncover its internal resources. It entered the third period with the best church missionary organization and spiritual potential. The Acts of toleration didn’t disturb it anymore, the church was quite competitive. The Orthodox Church started to take the initiative and to act as an ecclesiological structure, and not just as the servant of the state concerns.

The contingent of sponsors of its mission was changed too, the contributions from rich and poor laity constituted a considerable part of its missionary fund.

The political objectives of the mission receded into the background, giving way to the spiritual motive of soul salvation.

Now there was a possibility to work «deep into» the territories «christened» before, and not only «in breadth», as it was for the most part during the second period.

Moreover there was a certain experience of the previous centuries’ work and some examples for imitation.
PART 4: THE THIRD PERIOD OF ROC MISSION:
HEYDAY OF THE MISSIONARY ACTIVITY AMONG NON-RUSSIANS OF RUSSIA
(THE MIDDLE OF XIX – THE BEGINNING OF XX CENTURIES)

4.1 The reason of the beginning and distinctive features of the non – Russian mission
of the third period

During the period of stagnation «the mass falling away from the faith of old christened Tatars
began» (Smirnov 1904:29-30) together with other non - Russians: Cheremis, Chuvash, Votyak,
Mordovians (see Talberg 1994:2/761). This circumstance gave a powerful incentive to the non –
Russian mission of ROC. Considering the cases of falling away from the faith in twenties of XIX
century it was decided to open some missions again «with a steady purpose to attach to them a
strong character and engaging to their activity people who were disposed to and gifted in
missionary work» (:16).

During the second period ROC realized that the christening without understanding has no
effect, and to hold such «newly christened» people in the Orthodoxy from the position of strength
or taking them under control is simply impossible. It was clear that the missionaries should work
with the natives respecting their language and culture and preaching the Gospel in their native
language. So there was a need for inventing the written language and translating the Holy
Scriptures, Liturgy, Patristics, ABC books, grammar etc. into a great number of languages and
dialects, as well as to study their religions and customs, train the professional missionaries, open
special educational institutions. There was so much to do!

The examples of a similar mission have already existed, —Cyril and Methodiy, the
enlighteners of the Slavs and Apostle of Ziryans — Stephen of Perm, who had become an ideal
for imitation. There were other figures who used partly the methods of contextualization:
Varsonofiy —the fellow-fighter of Guriy in Kazan (since 1555) (he knew the Tatar language,
culture and the basics of the Koran), the activity of the «Newly Christened commission» (since
1731), as a prototype of the future missionary societies (see Talberg 1994:637), Nikodim
(Lenkevitch) and Andrew (Chubovsky) with Bestuzhev and Lyakhov (a sermon and translations to
Kalmyk language. 1741, Veniamin Smirnov (a sermon and translations to Samoyed (Nenets) language till 1830) and others (see Znamensky 1996:360).

To tell the truth the similar initiative was not always welcome. For example, at the beginning of XIX century the archbishop of Kazan Amvrosiy Protasov suggested to translate to non – Russian languages not only the Shorter catechisms and prayers, but also the service books «his idea didn’t meet any sympathy» (Znamensky 1996:357).

Things changed after 1930. The initiative of the Holy Synod about the beginning of the new missionary company was crowned with success. «There were some really gifted figures who appreciated the missionary activity as saint Stephen, the enlightener of Perm did in his time» (Smirnov 1904:16-17):

They began to study non – Russian languages, translate the Sacred and service books, put their translations into the church liturgies, open schools, make text-books, teach non – Russian children using these text-books and put the christened non – Russians from nomadic to the settled way of life (16-17).

In the third period there will also be opponents of the mission of contextualization.

The third missionary period is extremely interesting for a broad research and there are a lot of initial archive materials from those years. Most of these documents haven’t been examined yet.

The third missionary company has given a whole galaxy of the great missionaries to the Russian Orthodox Church. We will take a closer look at the life and work of only two of them: Makariy (Glukharev) and Innokenty (Popov-Veniaminov), and also the activity of the Orthodox Missionary society. Then we will make the general analysis of the considered period paying attention to the struggle between the methods of contextualization and non contextualization missions.

We should note that the period of Orthodox non – Russian mission’ heyday has coincided with the origin, development and heyday of the Evangelical movement in Russia, the part of this period fell at the terrible persecutions under the chief-public prosecutor of the Synod K. Pobedonostsev (1882-1905), that took thousands of lives of evangelical believers (see Savitsky 1995:48-67; Grachev 1972:1-58; the History of EHB 1989:96-136 and others). At that time ROC worked beyond comparison, without wasting time and strength on apologetic debates.
4.2 The western Siberia, the Mission of Altai: Makariy Glukharev (1792-1847)

Holding a synodic Bible in the hand, we should remember, that the earlier translation from Jewish to modern Russian made by Makariy Glukharev was assumed as a basis for the translation of the Old Testament. In epoch of the reaction against(towards) the Russian Biblical company, Makariy was almost put into the prison for his requests to publish this translation, but after all he got only a penance (see Аверинцев1995:11/71).

The archimandrite Makariy (Michael Yakovlevitch Glukharev) was not only «the outstanding philologist, who knew the Bible very well and the best translator of it to Russian» (Smirnov 1904:17-18). He was also a famous missionary and laid the foundation of the «right» missionary societies in Russia.

In 1828 he founded a mission in Altai, in the center of western Siberia. At that time Altai was inhabited (populated) with Tatars, Kalmyks, Teleutians and other wild non – Russians (see Znamensky 1996:362-363).

Makariy learned the languages of the multinational Altai population, and he made up «The comparative dictionary of the Altai dialects». Later on he translated «the essential prayers and the necessary parts of biblical and service books» into the telenguisky dialect (the most understandable for all natives). Then little by little he began to bring his translations into the service (see Smirnov 1904:17-18; Znamensky 1996:363). He was the first who started to preach to Altai people on their native dialect. His non – Russians sang the church hymns on their native dialect, and used to take part in the service (see Smirnov 1904:17-18).

Makariy was not satisfied with the money given for his mission and found rich private sponsors in Tobolsk and Moscow (see Znamensky 1996:363). It will be the new resources of missions’ material security.

*Women’s charitable community and a hospital were opened. At all times the deaconry was the part of the ROC missionary activity’ program and Makariy didn’t stop this practice.*

The Altai mission was remarkable for *its serious approach to the catechesis of non-Russians*, the translations and sermons in a national language contributed to it. Only Altai people who «learned the foundations of the new religion quite consciously» were allowed to be baptized.
(Smirnov 1904:17-18). Makariy said that «the baptism in only the beginning of the conversion, and took care of newly christened even more than before their christening» (:17-18; an italic type ours).

As in the second missionary period he also settled the converted nomadic Altai people in the Christian settlements, teaching them to cultivate the land. In this field he showed his gifted nature too, he «developed the whole plan of settling the nomads» (:17-19; the italic type is ours).

Makariy took care of the future of his mission and prepared a worthy successor, for whom he was «and Theological Seminary, and Spiritual Academy and University» at the same time according to metropolitan Filoret, was (:19). After Makariy the Altai mission was headed by his disciples, gifted missionaries: archpriest Landishev (died in 1883), archimandrite Vladimir Petrov (1828-1897), archimandrite Makariy (Michael Andreevich Newsky) (1835-1926) (see Averintsev 1995:1/367; II/13,73).

In 1865 the whole service was conducted in the Altay language (see Znamensky 1996:363; Smirnov 1904:20), after Makariy’s death.

In the reports of the Orthodox Missionary society, the Altai mission takes the second place for the number of christened people after the Irkutsk mission. From 1870 till 1893 there were christened 10 896 people (see the table in Никольский 1895:141), by 1893 there were fourteen active missionary camps (:89). Smirnov writes, that the Altay mission is fairly considered the most well-planned and comfortable:

Out of 45 000 non – Russian inhabitants in Altai 25 000 are already Christians. They live in 188 settlements almost separately from pagans. In 67 churches and houses of prayer the service is conducted in their native dialects. Altai people in congregations read and sang in the services. In 48 schools the teaching of children is also conducted in Altai dialects; there are 800 boys and 250 girls there. In addition to that, in Buisk catechistic school 200 students are training to teach in the missionary schools. (Smirnov 1904:21; the italic type is ours).

Smirnov notes that looking at the Christians even «pagans began to build warm Russian houses, to be engaged in farming and thus to settle down. They began to open pagan schools where, on their own initiative, their children are taught Christian prayers and God’s law» (Smirnov 1904:21).

The Altai mission with its example and sometimes with its assistance gave rise to several smaller missions: Kirghiz (since 1882), Obdor (since 1832), Kondinskaya (since 1844), Surgut
(since 1867), Turakhanskaya (since 1850), the mission of Minusinsky district (since 1876), Semirechenskaya (since 1868) (see Znamensky 1996:364). The missions in Eastern Siberia were built as the Altai mission (see Talberg 1994:2/766). Irkutsk and Transbaikalian mission were opened by Parfeniy (Popov), who worked with the Altai mission before and had some experience of such work (:766-767). They were the worthy successors of the Altai mission. The head of the Zabaikalian mission was a gifted missionary Veniamin (Blagonravov) (:767), who would be a successor of Innokenty (Popov-Veniaminov), when he would be appointed metropolitan of Moscow (see Znamensky 1996:366).

4.3 The Eastern Siberia and North America: Innokenty (Popov-Veniaminov) (1797-1879)

4.3.1 The significance, heritage and brief biography

Bury the sinful body of mine in Sergiev Lavra, at a common cemetery within a fence... I entreat and beg not to give any speeches not before, neither during, nor after my interment... don’t erect any monuments above my body (Innokenty 1997d:364-365).

The will of this humble Christian, who didn’t want to arrogate not a gram of God’s Glory, was not carried out (fulfilled, accomplished).

The unforgettable metropolitan Innokenty, the consecrator of Moscow, the apostle of America and Siberia must be recognized among saints, who are glorified with the grace of God (the Acts of the Holy Synod of October 6, 1977, from: the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate. 1978. №1, page 9; is cited in Pivovarov 1997:5; also see Reshetov 1993:107).

There are reasons for everything. Probably it is not an overstatement to say that the author of the epigraph’ lines - Innokenty (Popov-Veniaminov) is not only the most fruitful missionary of the Russian Orthodox Church, but also an outstanding missionary of the whole Christian world, along with such figures as William Carey, David Livingston and Hudson Taylor. That is why the ROC could not disregard the work of the saint of Alaska and canonized him after one
hundred years. However, if anyone will try to find his name in the history of the world missionary movement, his search will be unsuccessful. He also will not find the information about other outstanding missionaries of Russian Orthodoxy.

«Selfmademan in the best meaning of this word, who exerted the salutary influence over every business he concerned» — these are the words of the archpriest E. K. Smirnov who appreciated Innokentiy (see СМИРНОВЪ 1904:22).

The life of Ivan Veniaminov was brightened up with the light of a missionary star in the Irkutsk seminary. In 1840 he accepted the name Innokentiy in honor of the missionary and the first bishop of Irkutsk (Innokentiy Kulchinsky) (died in 1731) (see Pivovarov 1997:8). He lived with dignity and raised the banner of the Russian Orthodox mission higher than all who went before him. He has already become the example for many missionaries - contemporaries. It is known that Innokentiy met twice with Nickola Kasatkin (of Japan). The first time they met in Nikolaevsk, where he gave his blessings to the young missionary for the work ahead and «gave him many sage pieces of advice and instructions» (Platonova 1916:10). The second time they met was in September, 1861, when he was travelling in Japan and conducted the Liturgy there (see Pivovarov 1997:12-13). Doesn’t it look like the Orthodox mission in the country of the rising sun owed its prosperity to Innokentiy Veniaminov’ prayers?! Here is the spiritual succession of the generations of missionaries in ROC.


He started his missionary activity in 1823 on the Unalaska island as a simple parish priest among Aleutians. Then in 1833 he was transferred to the Sitka island, where he evangelized American Indians kolosh. In 1840 Innokentiy became the head of the new-opened eparchy of Kamchatka (see Averintsev 1993:1/614).


After 1867, Alaska was sold to the United States (see Vavilov 1950:202:208) and there was a problem with what to do with the flock, Innokentiy "didn’t leave his sheep to the mercy of fate". In 1870 in America according to Innokentiy’s project the Independent Episcopal Cathedra was founded that took care of not only Aleutians but also of other orthodox flocks of different races: the Greeks, Afro-Americans, Spaniards, Englishmen, Americans and Russians (see Znamensky 1996:366).

The translations of Innokentiy can be compared to the acts of Cyril and Methodiy, and his voyages in small holds along the northern seas (see Innokentiy [1842-1843]:123) remind one of the Mediterranean missionary voyages of Paul (with the difference in climate and landscape).

For years Innokentiy went tirelessly round vast lands using boats, sailing vessels, deer, dogs, and sometimes even skiing or simply on foot. He christened all kinds of non-Russians, erected temples, established missionary camps, taught priests the missionary work and kept his eye on the spreading of the Christian faith (Smirnov 1904:23-24).
While he was far away at the world’s end, Innokentiy kept on sending many projects to the Holy Synod about the improvement of the church administration throughout the Siberia (see Pivovarov 1997:19), but later on he himself had a chance to make his many ideas reality.

In ripe old age, when Innokentiy could not stand severities of northern long voyages any more, God used him in his special way in mission work. In 1868 he handed the mission over to his successor Veniamin (Blagonravov), who tried to settle the affairs of the mission in the area of mission administration (see Znamensky 1996:366). Innokentiy was transferred to Moscow and he inherited there the cathedra of the famous metropolitan Filaret. When he became the head of the Moscow metropolis, he didn’t forget his calling to missionary work and used his high rank in full measure. Thanks to his work in 1870 the Orthodox Missionary Society was founded in Moscow, and Innokentiy was its president till his death in 1879 (see Никольский 1895:5; Smirnov 1904:24-25; and many others). There had never been a missionary organization in Russia before with such a wide range. All the experience of native and even non – Orthodox missions were involved in this organization. Due to the practical organization of the Society, there was the possibility not just to work in all regions of immense Russia but also to work using a specific system (see the tables about the mission work in: Nikolsky 1895:132-137, 141).

But Innokentiy became famous not only for his missionary activity. He described mountains, seas and straits, volcanoes and earthquakes, plants, fauna and climatic conditions (see Innokentiy 1997a:204-216), settlements, clothes, customs, habits, traditions and dialects (1997b:217-256) just for the needs of the mission. And so without even knowing it, he became an outstanding scientist, naturalist, an ethnographer and linguist, the founder of the Russian school of ethnography, the Corresponding Member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, the honorary member of the Moscow University and the honorary member of the Moscow Society of natural science, anthropology and ethnography. His research has never lost its value and is even recognized abroad (see Pivovarov 1997:13-15; Talberg 1994:769).

This is the "treasure" that was given to the world by the Russian Orthodox missionary field. When we consider the activity of Veniaminov, there is a question that immediately arises:  
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who is he, a genius or just a servant of God who was born in the right time? It’s interesting to consider who inspired whom with the mission? Did the Church inspire Innokenti or did Innokenti inspire the Church? Maybe a man and time met as in Martin Luter’s times? But it goes without saying that such a personality as Popov - Veniaminov, his spiritual development and calling for the mission, mutual relations with the flock, colleagues and his own children, the methods of missionary activity are worthy of our close attention.

4.3.2 Calling for the mission

Let my example be the new proof of the true, that God puts the man on the right path, and that all of us, workers of His Church are nothing else than the instrument in His arms (Innokenti [1863] 1997:23).

In 1797 in the village Anga of the Irkutsk Province in the family of a poor sacristan there was born a son Ivan Evseevich Popov – Veniaminov (Saint Innokenti) (see Averintsev 1993:1/614; Pivovarov 1997:8; Talberg 1994:2/768). In 1807, at the age of nine and a half years, he entered the Irkutsk seminary after the vain attempts of his mother - widow to find the place of a sacristan for her son. Innokenti sees the sign of God in it (see Innokenti [1863] 1997:23).

In his «Autobiographical Note» he tells us in detail how the arm of God led him to America. The rector of the Irkutsk seminary intended to send him to study in the Theological Academy, but the heavy (bad) floating of ice on the Angara river that divided the Seminary and the monastery, where the rector lived, prevented this order from being carried out. In the meantime Innokenti was married. The marriage blocked his way to the Academy and further on to the higher church ranks and scientific spiritual work, but opened the missionary horizons for him ([1863] 1997:23-24). However God will make this man, who was «without books» a

---

14 Innokenti was a witness of amazing events. He saw the new island of Theologian coming into the world. It "literally grew out of the water and continued to grow during several years (1796-1823)". The birth of Unimak island that "started to grow and bulge" is also described by Innokenti. (see 1997a:204,206-207).

15 It was a usual thing at those times.
metropolitan ([1868] 1997:269) without going to the Academy. He would carry out researches for the welfare of the mission and would become a prominent scientist and all that without a university education (see Pivovarov 1997:13-15; Talberg 1994:769). But there will be only one way to it - through Alaska.

God «wished to choose for me my field of serving him in America, and this came true, in spite of the resistance of my will» (Innokentyi [1863] 1997:23; see Pivovarov 1997:9). It happened that a certain Ivan Krioukov who had lived with Aleutians for 40 years came to Irkutsk. He used everything to persuade Innokentyi to go to the Unalashka island, «but I was deaf to all to his stories, and his convictions left me cold» (Innokentyi [1863] 1997:24).

And really, how could I go nobody knows where if there was no point in it? I was in one of the best parishes in the city, I was held in respect and love by my flock and had a good reputation with my authorities, I already had my own house and got a better profit than the salary that was in Unalashka. ([1863] 1997:24; see Pivovarov 1997:8).

Many other clergymen were also asked to come, but all of them wrote that they didn’t want to go due to the remote position of the eparchy and the fear that their families would not receive the necessary care if they stayed in the homeland. But when at parting the same person again started to convince Innokentyi and tell him «about the eagerness of Aleutians for prayer and listening to the Word God» for the 100-th time

All of a sudden...I had a burning desire to go to such people. I still remember it very vividly, as I was waiting impatiently for the moment to declare my wish to the Right Reverend and he was kind of surprised at it but he said nothing but: “We’ll see”. How could I regard my going to America as a merit or consider it to be a feat afterwards? (Innokentyi [1863] 1997:25,24; see Pivovarov 1997:9; compare Smirnov 1904:22).

When Innokentyi informed everybody of his desire to go, the authorities behaved in a strange way: they declared that «a person to whose lot it will fall, will certainly go» but they didn’t invite Innokentyi to throw in his lot. A man who drew the lot, a fellow student of Innokentyi in the Seminary refused categorically to go. The consecrator testifies that he died being a soldier, «bitterly repenting of his obstinacy» (Innokentyi [1863] 1997:26).

The Russian proverb says: "God can’t have the sacred place empty", and God chooses another person for this mission, a person who will be totally devoted to Him till the end. But the path of the servant of God might not be easy at all... Alaska will take a lot away from Innokentyi: his wife will die, his children will grow far away from their father, who loves them tenderly and
consoles them and himself with the hope for a future eternal meeting. But as the Holy Scripture promises, he will have other lands, houses and friends instead of people left behind, there will be his new native "spiritual" children – his flock.

4.3.3  Family and children

Ivan Popov – Veniaminov (Innokentiy) was married and had seven children: three sons and four daughters. The family followed him to Unalashka, but his wife died a year before he became an archbishop ([1863] 1997:26). After his wife's death he became a monk (see Znamensky 1996:365) and «The Church and state gave the support to (provided the care for) his young children», so that Innokentiy could perform his missionary duties (see Pivovarov 1997:17). We are not going to discuss the propriety of such a decision here. He loved his children, he loved them as their father and their pastor. For the sake of the lofty aim he endured the separation with patience and meekness and he taught the children to behave the same way. This is what he wrote in a letter to one of his daughters:

You write... that you wish to see me one more time in this life... What is there in this meeting! Though it will be pleasant but it had to come to the end... You’d better pray and take care for us to see each other there - in the abode of our Heavenly Father (Innokentiy [1855] 1997:340).

His fatherly words moulded his children even at a distance. Here is the passage from the letter to his son — Gavrili Ivanovitch Veniaminov, a student of the St.-Petersburg Seminary, the future missionary of the Amur mission, and there is also a quotation from the letter to his daughter — the nun Paraskeva:

Do not growl and do not lament for not having great abilities. All that we have, our Lord gave us. He knows why you were not given the excellent abilities. But you have a kind heart and this is one thousand time better than to have intellectual faculties. Therefore, the good God provided you with it. So be careful and display vigilance and do not waste your precious talent. Pray to God; learn how to pray to God. This is the main knowledge, especially for the person who is preparing to be the preceptor for others... Do not contact with people, who don't like to pray to God, no matter how educated or clever he is ([1843] 1997:334).

You write, that you would like to go to any other monastery instead of the Petersburg monastery. All the monasteries are equal; there is no monastery where you can find peace of mind without prayers and deeds ([1850] 1997:339).
The letters of Innokentyi are also enlightening for his modern spiritual children.

4.3.4 Innokentyi and his folk

Innokentyi was not the first missionary in Alaska, since 1793 during the second missionary period 8 monks of the Valaamsky monasteriy had been christening the Aleutians. The most well known of these are Makariy and Uvenaliy (see Znamensky 1996:361; Averintsev 1995:3/279; Innokentyi [1842-1843] 1997:128).

According to Smirnov the monks mainly preached the Word of God through their holy life and converted [to put it more precisely conciliated] many Aleutians to Christ without even knowing the language (see Smirnov 1904:15; the insert and the italic type are ours). «The Father Makariy, as well as all our orthodox preachers offered the new faith not with fire and sword» (Innokentyi 1997:156-157). Innokentyi thinks this is «the reason of the quick and true conversion of the Aleutians into Christianity» as well as «the character and the frame of mind» (156-157). Of course «the father Makariy could not tell them all Christian truth except for the general notions about God, His omnipotence, goodness and so on because he didn’t have much time and there were no good interpreters» but when Innokentyi 741 came there the Aleutians were still Christians (157-158).

However Innokentyi found a lot of omissions and problems in the work of the old mission. The shamanism among the Aleutians wasn’t extirpated ([1842-1843] 1997:127-129; 1997e:224-227). But the internal state of the Christians – non-Russians «though not very satisfactory in some respects, was not very poor in comparison with the orthodox Russians even of the better times» (see Pivovarov 1997:12).

Innokentyi worried about the Russian flock not less than about the Aleutian because many Russians «haven’t made their confession for twelve or even thirty years» (Innokentyi [1842-1843] 1997:127-129). Moreover they did «a lot of harm in the moral respect», corrupted the morals of non-Russians hampering the progress of the mission work. «Koryaks when asked why they do not want to be christened will always answer «Why should we be christened? If only to
become as bad as Russians» ([1846-1847] 1997:155). The same situation was everywhere not only in Alaska, because not the best people of the Russian nation had been developing the distant lands of the North.

Veniaminov’s diaries prove that during his stay in Alaska the spiritual atmosphere there took a big turn for the better. The present governor of the Kadyak department Innokentiy Kostromitinov «stopped the progress of the shamanism with his exemplary piety...» ([1842-1843] 1997:128). «Many of the shamans sincerely confessed and got back on the right path of truth» (:129). The Aleutians testified to Innokentiy in church during the time of his sermon that today they «start to come out of a dark place» (:129). Even «Russians became more abstemious in hard drinking» (:128) probably looking at the eagerness of the Aleutians. According to Innokentiy the congregation «succeeds in the faith and kind deeds; it is indeed a small flock (in the eparchy of Kamchatka there are only 18000 people), but this is such a flock where there are many people who can be given communion or who are close to that small flock to whom the Lord deigned to give the Kingdom» ([1842-1843] 1997:122; see also:138).

In his reports about the zeal of the Aleutians Innokentiy often narrates with delight about their devotion among other non - Russians. «And only the bell rings — everybody is in church. And during the prayer «they stand surprisingly firm... Even if it lasts for 4 hours... children stand without shifting one foot to the other» (1997ж:159). They behave in the church «sedately and with due attention and reverence» ([1842-1843] 1997:131). «In spite of anything, frost or snow — they go to the matins by their own wish. The matins are conducted in a chapel made of wood without an oven and sometimes they stand barefoot without shifting one foot to the other» ([1845] 1997:194). Their craving for listening to the Word of God is so strong that «the most tireless preacher will get tired, rather than their attention and eagerness for the listening to the Word will weaken», they listen «not taking their eyes off» ([1846-1847] 1997:147). According to Innokentiy such examples are not the exceptions of an ordinary faith, «the fruits of sincere repentance can be seen in many Aleutians» ([1842-1843] 1997:131). And «some of them can pray from the heart», "they gladly bring something to church or make donations", "they quarrel very seldom", "they are patient, even till the loss of consciousness» (1997е:217,219; 1997ж:160-162), «they fast in the true sense of this word» because of penury and sameness of the food they can not fast eating the dishes accepted in the Orthodoxy (:159). The atmosphere of their churches
resemble the times of the Apostles. They «make a kind of one Christian family, in the true sense of this word, that surprises everybody with its virtues» ([1842-1943] 1997:140).

Innokentiy speaks more guardedly about the faith of the other nationalities. The Kamchadals— «show more eagerness than before»; the Yakuts— «becoming better... Ask for public prayers»; Olioutorians and Chukchi people— «continue to join» ([1846-1947] 1997:152), «in Anadirsk the third parish is being formed out of the newly enlightened Chukchi people» (:146); the Koryaks— «as usual are deaf to the sermon, only one was christened» (:152); the Tungus people— «became even more zealous to the church, are more industrious in the Christian responsibilities and when they leave shamanism, they become stronger in the faith» (:152). The sermon has an effect on Indians of the kolosh tribe and now «80 people are asking to be christened» ([1842a] 1997:327; see [1842b] 1997:328). Moreover kolosh and Chukchi people started to adopt Christianity «without any gifts and selfish ends» ([1842b] 1997:332; see [1842c] 1997:336). These are passages from the early diaries and correspondence of Innokentiy, later things also improved among these nationalities.

Innokentiy loved his flock «as children, as brothers, as sincere friends... with pure Christian love» ([1842-1843] 1997:135). He said «the more I get acquainted with wild people, the more I love them and I am certain more and more that with our enlightenment we swerved far away from the course of perfection» ([1843] 1997:335). We think that the secret of the Aleutians' eagerness is not in themselves but in the devoted, caring pastor, just like Innokentiy. They returned gratitude for his love:

And whenever I arrived and it doesn't matter what time of the day or night, but as soon as the message that the father (adack) had come was spread, at once everybody who could walk went to meet me at the wharf (1997e:159).

The flock met and saw him off in tears, as in former times people had seen off the Apostle Paul (The Aleutians don't easily to shed a single tear) (see [1842-1843] 1997:140).
4.3.5 The construction of temples and new sponsors

We know that even at the time of the centrifugal mission for reaching other nations, the ROC activity has always had a centripetal character (see Bosch 1991:207,223; Rainer 1996:206). The temples, or at least their mobile equivalents with antimensions as a necessary part, should have been such centers (see Averintsev 1993:1/523). The new believers should be brought exactly here (see Anastasios 1965:285; 1989:64-70; John (Popov) 1995:16). The Liturgy, a central missionary event and driving force of the Orthodox mission was conducted here (see Keshishian 1992d:22f; Bria 1975:248; Khopko 1991:91; Simeon 1993:385). It was the sermon in the Church, through the Church and about the Church (see Anastasios 1969:7; 1989:83; 1990:53; Bosch 1991:207). Besides the Eucharist made the meeting of Christians a complete Catholic Church (see Fairbairn 1984:16; Bria 1975:248; Anastasios 1989:82; Keshishian 1992d:22f, WCC 1977:1; John (Popov) 1995:18; Meyendorff 1973:27; is cited in Fairbairn 1984:16). In light of this «a eucharist-centered and eucharist-oriented» system of the missionary activity (see Keshishian 1992d:27; Bria 1975:245,248; Khopko 1991:91; Khodr 1975:15; Fairbairn 1984:25), the construction of temples was one of the first, main steps of ROC mission (see Anastasios 1989:65f).

Everything had a missionary orientation - the beautiful lay-out of a temple, the peal, icon-painting, iconostasis and wall painting (see Methews 1994:8-14; Vladishevskaya 1993:114; Grushetsky 1996:6/340, 348-349; Snegirev 1993:101,102; Fairbairn 1984:75,76; Anatolii (Martinovsky) 1993:71; Gavrioushin 1993:101-102; Tzarevsky 1991:23-24; Arseniev 1993:140; Sosnin1993:61; Ouspensky and Lossky 1982:36; is cited in Fairbairn 1984:75,77; Shmeman 1992:41; Bulgakov 1993:289). The life of a person should revolve around the activity in a temple, as the whole system of the Liturgical life of OC represents the main mechanism of missionary work (see Bria 1975:247), and the care of the Orthodox Church for its flock was expressed mainly in its Liturgy (see Debolsky 1994:7; see Bosch 1991:210). It was particularly obvious when the missionaries after having formed the independent, self-governing eucharistic communities (see Keshishian 1992d:22f, WCC 1977:1; John (Popov) 1995:16; Anastasios
1989:65f) and having trained the national leaders, cut down their activity and the responsibility for "converts" passed on to the parish priests.

The consecrator Innokenty as a true Orthodox missionary also considered the establishing of new temples to be «one of the most important methods of a missionary doing» (Pivovaroff 1997:16). In his reports about the work he has done and in his missionary notes he often informed of the state of the local temples, of their decoration and utensils.

All temples and houses of prayer are in a good fettle and are kept in cleanliness and in due order... In other words, the local temples it's a credit to the Russian Government and Russia (Innokenty [1842-1843] 1997:122). The icons in the iconostasis are rather good paintings, there are enough utensils (125; see also 137,138,139,142,144). The bell was purchased ([1846-1847] 1997:146).

In the beginning of his missionary activity, Innokenty built temples and made utensils himself with the help of the Aleutians, whom he taught different crafts and brickwork. «There is a church in the name of the Ascension of Our Lord Jesus Christ in Unalaska, and I built this church in the true sense of this word» ([1842] 1997:333; see also Smirnov 1904:23-24).

But later on, Innokenty changed tactics and worked on the problem of finding money for the building of temples, apart from the fixed state and church grants from the center, he searched for assistance from people of consequence. Here is a quotation from the letter of Innokenty to Furutel'm I. V. (the main governor of the Russian Colony in America):

At last there is a good deed— we are allowed to take the money from the Treasury for the building of churches. But if you, Your Excellency will not render us your assistance, we shall lose money, and we shall not have churches, or will have some and some time ([1866a] 1997:346).

(Further on in the same letter, the consecrator discusses the possibilities of the building of 4 churches instead of 3.).

It is interesting that Innokenty always noted who, when, and with whose donations he built the liturgical buildings. Thanks to his diaries, we can trace the change of the sponsors' contingent in the third missionary period. The patronizing and contributing private companies appeared: «the local chapel was built in the name of the great Martyr George with the support of the Company... it is decently decorated, there are enough icons there» ([1842-1843] 1997:122).

At the same time the self-consciousness of the newly-converted non-Russians grew and they started to build churches and chapels at their own expense. For example, the consecrator
notes that after his first travel to Kamchatka (1842-1843) there were nine liturgical buildings built «without the treasury allowance» but «only with the zeal of inhabitants» of those settlements where they are situated ([1846-1847] 1997:147 the italic type is ours).

But it wasn’t always possible to have churches in every parish because of the severe weather conditions in the North and the great distance. It wasn’t an obstacle for Innokentiy, who used all possible methods of the contextualization of the mission in his activity but he kept himself within the limits of the Orthodoxy.

4.3.6 Mission considering the context

Innokentiy’s mission was successful not only because of his personal pastoral abilities and the predisposition of the Aleutians to the Gospel, but also because of the missionary methods he used. For modern missiology his methods are not new, they have become the classics of the mission in different cultural contexts. But here, in Russia, only Stephen of Perm had been working using such a system, other missionaries used the experience of Stephen only in part. Innokentiy uses the complete set of the contextualizational mission: the study of language, culture, religion and environment, translations of the spiritual literature, catechetical manuals and catechesis of the newly converted, lectures and discussions, development of community life, training of national leaders, children and female work, work with the men, deaconry and enlightenment, construction of temples, liturgy outside the temples, work in a missionary team and many others. We are going to talk about some of these things in detail.

4.3.6.1 The successor of the Cyril – Mathody tradition

The craving of the Aleutians for the Word was so strong that even before the issuing of translations, Innokentiy saw more than once, as somebody «who didn’t know a single Russian word was sitting all day long and reading the Slavic Psalter» (Innokentiy 1997:158). Was it
possible not to translate the Scriptures for the Aleutians if you watch such a picture everyday?. Moreover the results of the previous mission (see 1997:157-158) convinced Innokentiy of the necessity to follow the experience of the Slavic Enlighteners and Stephen of Perm even for the small and minor nations.

So, he learnt the Aleutian language without any text-books or grammar books. This language is considered to be extremely difficult for an European. This language has a lot of guttural sounds that are difficult to pronounce. Then he repeated the feat of the Solunsky brothers: he invented the Alphabet and the writing language for the Aleutians, did the first translations and issued the first books (see Smirnov 1904:22; Pivovarov 1997:14). He translated the Shorter Catechism, The Holy history, Matthew, Luke (partly) the Acts of the Apostles. There were neither letters nor a reading and writing system before the translation of the catechism into the Aleutian language though according to Innokentiy, in a comparison with the scarcity of other non-Russian languages, «this language is not poor in words even for an explanation of some abstract concepts» (Innokentiy 1997:e:251-252),

There were also some precepts about the responsibilities of a Christian (see 1997:x:162). His catechetical precepts were indispensable to many missionaries and were translated into several non-Russian languages (see Pivovarov 1997:10). The most famous is the precept called “Indication of the way to the Heavenly Kingdom” (see 1997:27-120).

It was a great joy for Innokentiy to see that his translations «do not lay on the shelf, but are read even by the women» (Innokentiy [1842-1943] 1997:134-135; 19976:257). It was his reward. When the Aleutians saw the books on their native language, everybody, «from young to old» started mastering the new science. «Many people learn how to read by themselves, and the rest listen to them with pleasure» ([1842-1843] 1997:138,134-135). «Little children during their free time are taught how to read being supervised by the island governor; there is an idea to teach young girls as well» (:140). «Even the old men began to learn how to read in Russian in order to be able to read as they wanted» (1997:x:158). As a result almost all men of the Aleutian people could read.

Innokentiy not only translated, but also «promoted the translation of books on languages of the tribes living in Siberia» (Pivovarov 1997:19). Some books of the Holy Scripture were translated not only to the Aleutian language, but also to the Kuril and Yakut languages «with the
significant and direct assistance» of Father Innokentiy (see Talberg 1994:771; Innokentiy 1997:257-260). Due to his efforts, the translations to the Gold language had been progressing. (see Znamensky 1996:366; Talberg 1994:771). Very often he found people of totally different levels to work on the translation of the books (see Innokentiy 19975:257-260 etc.).

When Innokentiy could take the advantage of the ready translations, he usually did it. For example when in 1860 the Ussuriisky region had been joined to Russia, he ordered the books in Manchurian language from the Chinese mission for the evangelization of the ethnic groups whose territory belonged to China before (see Znamensky 1996:366; Talberg 1994:771).

Innokentiy could speak six local dialects (see Talberg 1994:769). He also decided to learn the language of the Indians kolosh and he accomplished that as well (see Innokentiy [1835] 1997:322). By learning their language Innokentiy won the hearts of these natives who hated Europeans for Christ (see Smirnov 1904:24-25). Following his example other priests from his eparchy, zealously learned languages of the native people (see Innokentiy [1842-1843] 1997:131).

4.3.6.2 Contextualization of Liturgies and Sacraments

The translations made by Innokentiy and his associates were used right away during the services:

At the time of the Liturgy after the ordinary reading of the Gospel in Slavic language the priest should read from the Aleutian Gospel of Matthew instead of the sermon or he should make sacristan read from the Aleutian book called «Indication of the way to the Heavenly Kingdom», and during the fast and other days read from the Aleutian catechism (Innokentiy [1842-1843] 1997:139; the italic type is ours).

The services in native and therefore easy understood language gave a deep satisfaction to non - Russians: «in the Yakut area... he conducted a Yakut Liturgy that was met by non – Russians with a great pleasure» (see Talberg 1994:769; the italic type is ours). Their hearts were won over for Christ and the new faith.

In spite of the fact that Innokentiy Veniaminov considered the establishing of new temples to be «one from major means of the missionary doing» (Pivovarov 1997:16), it did not prevent him from conducting the Liturgy:
• «in a tent on a mobile antimension» (Innokenty [1842-1943] 1997:135,139 the italic type is ours);
• «in a clean uninhabited house» (1997:173; the italic type is ours),
• «in the open-air» (:173)
• on deck ([18426] 1997:327-328),
• in the territories where nomads roam.

The Tungus... getting a chance to see service of the Divine Liturgy and to take the Sacrament in the territories where they roamed and lived (that they didn’t have before), became even more zealous in church, more industrious in their christian responsibilities and abandoned (rejected) shamanism, they become stronger in the faith ([1846-1847] 1997:152; the italic is type ours).

It’s clear that such a strategy assisted in reaching the nomads without making them live in a settled place. Thus the culture of the converted nations was preserved at least partly. He worked using the contextualization and taught his ministers to work in the same way (1997:173). But using the contextualization Innokenty did not go against the principles of the Orthodoxy. He conducted the Liturgy according to law on «the sacred antimension» and then he put crosses (:173) in places of committing of the «bloodless sacrifice». While he was away, this place became «the place of public prayers» (:173) for the inhabitants.

There were not many priests in Innokenty’s eparchy and ordinary laymen were allowed to administer the sacrament of baptism of infants in order so that the children’s souls did not perish, dying without baptism, as used to happen in the Kadyak region.

According to the instruction, every priest who has a big parish should choose a pious person in each settlement and after having taught him to say the formula of baptism he can be allowed to christen newborns in absence of the priest... let’s hope that by the next year 1843 there will be no undipped infants in Kadyak. ([1842-1843] 1997:130).

Innokenty tried to do his best in all areas, to do as much as possible to save the non – Russians. And he was wise enough to find ways to adjust, to fit into the non-typical conditions of the distant northern mission, staying within the framework of Orthodox canons.
4.3.6.3 Work with the leaders

The eparchy of Innokenti Veniaminov was very large and he understood the importance of the training of the new leaders more clearly than anybody else. One can read his wonderful minister precepts in the book «The Precept to the Priest Appointed to Convert non-Orthodox and Supervision of Newly Converted in Christian faith» (see Innokenti 1997:163-181). Everything in this work breathes of the Spirit not of the Letter: the responsibilities (:163-164), advice for the creed (denomination) (:165-171), precept of how to work with non-Russians (:171-178) and with and nations from other countries (:180-181).

The father Innokenti had never worked alone, he always had a missionary team. For example during his journey along the Aleutian islands his retinue consisted of «a hierodeacon, a cellarer, (he is also a subdeacon and a secretary) and 4 choristers, and altogether - 6 persons » ([1842-843] 1997:134). The consecrator wasn’t pleased when all the glory belonged to him alone. He was satisfied with the work of his parish priests except for some:

Now almost all pastors of the church fulfil their duties with a great zeal, many — ver good ... [they] are the praise of the Russian Church ([1842-1843] 1997:122,138; see [1842a] 1997:326; the italic type and the insert are ours)

Wherever Innokenti was he always tried to give instruction to the pastors ([1842-1843] 1997:124), replaced negligent priests and cared to appoint mature clergymen. He bitterly writes that he would desire to lay hands on the seminarians of the Novoarkhangelsky seminary and consecrate them as priests at the age of no less than 25 years and with the ministry experience of 2-3 years at least, but the circumstances force him to appoint the immature instead ([1846-1847] 1997:149-150). He taught priests to have interns and train them in the field of leader activities. For example when Innokenti transferred a priest from Akhta to Kadyak, and appointed the deacon Salamatova to his place, «he charged the priest with teaching him the history of church (the catechism he knows) and made him translate something from the Holy Scripture into the Aleutian language» ([1842-1843] 1997:143).
But most of all the father Innokentiy tried to prepare the priests among non-Russians. We can definitely assert that by 1842 there was a national clergy on islands of Unalashka (138) and Akhta (142). The advantages of their work were obvious:

almost each Liturgy [the Aleutians] hear something in their native language, and the priest (not to mention his jealousy), as the native himself, always has a possibility to satisfy their wish to listen to the Word of God. That is why very often he spends the whole winter nights talking to them in his house ... especially the priest (widowed); is zealous and active up to the point of exhaustion, he has an austere and pious life, is modest, kind and is charitable (generous). He preaches to the Aleutians and Russian using the sermons, written by him with all his heart (143; the italic type and insert are ours).

The work on discovering and training the future leaders started with free and easy, restrained conversations, like those he led, while staying on the island Sitka 38 days more: «to our mutual consolation it gave me a chance to meet with almost all Aleutian men» (137).

There were local sponsors for the maintenance of clergymen, as well as for the construction of temples. For example, the Russian-American Company paid a salary to the clergy of a parish and priests on the Kadyak island (126). We know that the inhabitants of the island of St. Paul asked Innokentiy «to give them a special priest, they agreed to give him a salary» (140; the italic type is ours). In these brief notes we can see that Innokentiy had a genius for organizing and trained not only leaders, but was conscious of their possible future sponsors.

4.3.6.4 Innokentiy and the Enlightenment

The consecrator Innokentiy Veniaminov writes much about the importance of teaching and instructing children in his doctrinal works and children’s manual. «A note about the education of children» (see Innokentiy 1997p.182-191) and almost the whole letter to the chief-public prosecutor of the Holy Synod N. A. Protasov ([1845] 1997:192-203) is dedicated to this subject-matter.

It’s interesting that he stands up not for the already known forms of education when the child is taught how to write and read and has a notion about the Law of God because «the present schools, not excepting the higher educational establishments, educate and enlighten only the
mind instead of the mind and heart together» (1997н:183). Innokentiy cared more for the heart and morals. And he offers a plan on how to achieve it without any investment ([1845] 1997:197). As parents and educators are not engaged in the religious education of their wards, pastors should be made responsible for it (1997н:182,186,187; [1845] 1997:197). Moreover «all children starting with the age of 4-5 years\(^{16}\) without any exception» have to go to children's conversations (:186), that will be held before or after a service (:1997н:189), in a temple or at home ([1845] 1997:196-197), in concordance with the age. Boys should be taught but especially girls because «nobody can teach morals better than the mother, and a pious mother will always have children with high moral principles» ([1845] 1997:194). The goals of teaching are:

So that they [children] were good Christians, good citizens, good wives and husbands, good heads of families, good masters, good members of society and faithful sons of the Motherland devoted to their Sovereign as the true father of the Motherland. But all these responsibilities are born and united in a prayer ([1845] 1997:195; the italic type and insert are ours).

«How many perfect fruits there will be even in 15 years! And in 20 years it will be impossible to recognize Russia» if we will act like this (:201; the italic type is ours). This is quite a orthodox approach, the concern of the state are taken into account. The incredibly high purposes stretching in the future.

Innokentiy would carry his plan out (:193). Though at the beginning Innokentiy even had to build a school, where he himself taught children using the textbooks he himself had written (see Smirnov 1904:23-24). Then he instructed the priests to call all children of both sexes starting with the age of 5 and to teach them their responsibilities «in proportion to their age» (Innokentiy [1842-1843] 1997:132). In some places only boys were taught the Law of God (:143; [1846-1847] 1997:150).

Innokentiy also took care of the more serious spiritual education. When the Right Reverend moved with his cathedra to Amur, he not only opened many schools in missionary camps, but also in 1857 he established a religious school in Blagoveschensk (see Znamensky 1996:365-366). In 1870 two years after Innokentiy became a metropolitan a full seminary was opened.

\(^{16}\) In other places Innokentiy suggests to take also children from the age of 2 and even infants and accustom them to a prayer at the level of unconscious automatic habit ([1845]1997:194,195).
When Innokentiy became the head of the Orthodox Missionary Society, he made headway in the education programs and was the first one who developed a system of serious missionary education in Russia. (see Никольский 1895:74-81; etc.).

The survey of St. Innokentiy activity shown above is very interesting for the reader. His ministry amazed us with the deep devotion and sacrifice, there is a remarkable strategy and variety of methods of missionary activity and contextualization. How could one man travelling all the time manage to translate, write text-books, teach, conduct services, have personal meetings with his flock, train missionaries, build temples with his own hands and at the same time learn several local languages? Moreover he had a gift to organize everybody around him to work for the mission.

Such a man could not be stopped even during the declining years after he had accumulated a lot of precious experience. God gave him a worthy ministry in his old age. Through the activity of the Orthodox Missionary Society Innokentiy was able to influence the mission in the territory of immense Russia. His experience will become the priceless example for the developing Orthodox non-Russian missions and the missionaries who have just begun their activity. We will see that the mode of the OMS missionary activity and work of Popov-Veniaminov in Alaska will be very similar.

4.4 The Orthodox Missionary Society

In 1868 when Innokentiy Veniaminov left missionary activity, he became the metropolitan of Moscow. At that time when there were no Patriarch in Russia, this position meant almost the power of a Patriarch, although straitened by the Holy Synod headed by a person from society — the chief-public prosecutor («an eye of a Sovereign» over the Synod). The consecrator writes in his "appeal to the Moscow flock":

God wished that here, in the center of Russia, in my old age I wasn't devoid of the missionary activity, to what I had devoted my whole life beginning from the my young years serving God in the distant lands of our Motherland (Innokentiy [1870] 1997:270;).
Maria Alexandrovna the wife of Alexander II invited Innokenti to head «The Missionary Society for assistance of distribution of Christianity among pagans» that had been opened 3 years before (in 1865). She patronized this society (see Averintsev 1995:II/118; Talberg 1994:2/771), and its structure «was improper because there were many secular elements» (see Znamensky 1996:369).

Innokenti composed new regulations for this organization. This document was worked out really well and took into account all aspects of work to the smallest details. Only a real expert could create such a masterpiece. This document was approved by the highest authority in 1869. The name of the institution was also changed (see Никольский 1895:5; Smirnov 1904:24-25; Smirnov 1994:236; Talberg 1994:2/771; Innokenti [1870] 1997:270; Pivovarov 1997:15; Znamensky 1996:369; Averintsev 1993:1/614). Under Innokenti «The Orthodox Missionary Society» (further on OMS) received a new beginning and was seriously changed.

Thanks to his help the activity of all existing missions considerably revived and has developed (see Znamensky 1996:370; Talberg 1994:2/778). New missionary camps, missions, schools, asylums, alm-houses, churches and many others were opened (Никольский 1895:89). The experience of Innokenti (Popov - Veniaminov) served the cause of missions.

17 "There were 8 camps in 1870 and 14 camps in 1898 in Altai mission. In 1870 in addition to the central school there were 12 schools and in 1893 – 37 schools. In Irkutsk mission there were 11 missionary camps with 3 missionary schools in 1870, and in 1892 there were 18 camps and 14 schools. In 1870, in Transbaikalia mission there were 11 camps and 1 school in Posolsky monastery, in 1893 – 18 camps and 27 schools. In 1871, in Kamchatka eparchy there were 5 missionary camps and 2 schools and now there are 14 camps and 9 schools ... The Council took great interest in Japanese orthodox Mission that was taken under the patronage of Orthodox Missionary Society in 1875 and also in the opening of a new Kirghiz mission (10 missionary camps) in three eparchies: Tomsk (in 1881), Tobolsk (1894) and Orenburg (1894). ... In 1877 the mission was opened. It consisted of two camps: Noin-Shirensky and Ulan-Erensksy and worked among Kalmyks of the Astrakhan province, ... Irrespective of this fact, the Council supported the missionary activity among non-Russians of European Russia through missionary schools" (Никольский 1895:89; the italic type is ours).
4.4.1 The goals of the Orthodox Missionary Society

OMS had one very interesting custom that probably was introduced by Innokentiy. Every year on the eleventh of May the Orthodox Missionary Society celebrated the memory day of Saint Cyril and Methodiy (§ 5/5) as the example of the mission, OMS aspired.

The Missionary Society was interested in unconverted non-Russians. Its goal was «to assist... orthodox missions in converting non Christians who lived on the territory of the Russian Empire into the orthodox faith and to strengthen the converted in the truth of the holy faith and rules of Christian life» (Nikolsky 1895: § 6/6; the italic type is ours).

In order to achieve this goal OMS found «the cash benefits for the support(keeping) of missionaries, for the opening and keeping of missionary churches, schools, hospitals, and also for issuing of the books» (§ 7/6; the italic type is ours) but without taking part in the administration of the missions in other fields (§ 8/6).

The excellent organization of business. Innokentiy, as nobody else, understood how difficult it is to serve God without necessary finance. He also understood that it is more difficult to carry out any missionary projects when only incoherent directives come from the center that had no idea of the real situation at the local level due to the absence of mass media. Therefore under Innokentiy (Popov - Veniaminov) the missionary camps had due freedom and could take the initiative.

4.4.2 The Structure of Orthodox Missionary Society

As it was already mentioned above, Innokentiy as a missionary expert with great experience, thought the structure of OMS management through very well. The society was «under the patronage of Her Majesty the Empress» (§ 1/5, the italic type is ours) and also was «under the higher observation of the Holy Synod» (§ 2/5, the italic type is ours). The chairman was the Metropolitan of Moscow (§ 3/5). The scheme of power incarnated the idea that the mission serves as a business of state importance, and not just as an aspect of church work.
The Counsel in Moscow with the Metropolitan of Moscow as its head and Committees in the cities and town of the eparchy with the local Reverends as their heads were in charge of the Missionary Society activity (§ 4/5).

The central body — the Council consisted of two Assistants of the Chairman and twelve Members (§ 24/9; § 26/10). One Assistant was appointed from the ecclesiastics and the other Assistant was elected by the Society of the secular people (§ 25/9). The council assembled at least 1 time a month to discuss and decide the questions (§ 29/10). All the affairs were decided by majority vote (§ 30/10). According to the elaborated missionary strategy the council gave instructions to the Eparchial Committees (§ 32/10). It also collected all the information about the activity, funds and needs of missions (§ 33/10) and every year made out the reports about the state and activity of the Society and missions during the past year. This information and new projects were brought up for discussion at the annual general meeting of all members of the Society (§ 42/11), where all members exercised their franchise «except for persons of a female sex» (had right § 19/9). The council also was a connecting link between missions and different governmental men and organizations (§ 37/10).

The Eparchial Committees had the same structure as the central body (§ 50/12). Their responsibilities included: taking care of the satisfaction of the missionaries and missionary establishments’ material needs, assisting missionaries with their petitions, removing the obstacles on the way of the mission prosperity. There was an efficient system of the reports on the work done and money spent. These reports were done for the annual local general meeting (§ 60/13), and for the public and all members of the Society. They were distributed through newsletters (§ 64/14) and mass media. This information, published in the local bulletins (§ 58/13; § 64/14) was also excellent advertising for attracting of new sponsors.

The introduced scheme was surprising with its reasonableness and would prevent considerable difficulties.
4.4.3 Finance collecting and OMS work with the potential sponsors

Money was not the most important but rather an essential matter for the success of missionary activity. Everybody who tried to collect money for the mission knows what a hard and ungrateful work it is. We think OMS outclasses many people in this field.

The principle "many hands make light work" was not alien to this reliable organization. The missionary magazines wrote: "the great rivers are made out of the small streams" (OMS 1899:13-14) "if you don't have much — give as much as you can; just give, do not miss the chance to help a non—Russian to find Christ the Savior" (OMS 1899:43), "everybody who calls himself an orthodox ... has a special duty to assist to the success of the orthodox missionaries with all possible means" (OMS 1899:52). And the people made donations. There were annual membership dues (three rubles) in the Society. Under these conditions there were a lot of members-patriots of the Orthodoxy, Russian culture and state system in the Society «of different ranks, fortunes and of both sexes» (§ 14/8). Russia is a big country and every person there is Orthodox.

Moreover the Church and OMS urged everybody to make single donations in cash or non-cash form, donations of interest from bank accounts, jewelry, lands and things. Money also was collected using the cups, that were put not only in temples, but also in other public places. There were a lot of other ways of collecting money (see Никольский 1875:§ 21/9).

In order to cultivate the sense of responsibility for the mission in the flock, since 1873 at least once a year, the sermons dedicated to the missionary work were held in all churches of Russia during the week of Orthodoxy (a holiday when a lot of people gathered in church) (55,54,57,58). These sermons were printed and given out to each parish priest (see Journals of the Orthodox Missionary Society Council. 1872: № 4/4; is cited in Никольский 1895:54; The cause of the Orthodox Missionary Society Council, № 706; is cited in Никольский 1895:57,55). That is how people from the church cathedra got acquainted with the missionary work, that is how they drew attention from people because

Russian Orthodox people who had been receiving the spiritual education mostly in church, historically got used to pay the special attention to what was said in the church and that is why the introduction of the missionary work in the church could attract the sympathy of people to this cause,... and win the great prestige
to all the undertakings of the Society that are made for the use of the missions (Никольский 1895:54; the italic type is ours).

Pay attention how wise it was.

Usually, in the vestibules of churches the visual aids that told about the work of missions and with the proclamations of the Missionary Society (see Case of OMS council № 706; is cited in Никольский 1895:57-58) were posted up to bring the people to the due state even before the sermon. OMS worked on ear and sight at the same time and visualization is a very important thing for the Russian people. Of course after such a large-scale action there were very generous contributions (see the Report of Orthodox Missionary Society. 1888:7-9; is cited in Nikolsky 1895:59).

We should also note the big part that the missionary periodicals of those time such as: "Orthodox Messenger", "Orthodox conversation ", different kinds of "Missionary leaflets" played in the business of aquatinting the Russian society with the mission activity. In these editions, from the reports of Orthodox Missionary Society one could find out the following information: where the money went to; the warm-hearted stories of certain missionaries about their progress and difficulties in the missionary field; the stories about the miserable non – Russians who need enlightenment, civilization and the Light of Christ.

Thus, the purses of the generous Russian soul were opened with pleasure to give money for the cause of mission, that is not only a matter of state importance, but also the personal responsibility of every orthodox Christian before God.

4.4.4 The training of the missionaries

In his time Innokentiy Veniaminov didn’t graduate from a special missionary educational institution, but he understood the need for the preliminary training and testing of future missionaries seeing in practice the difficulties of work in the different cultural aspect.

The Metropolitan Innokentiy wrote in his declaration to the Holy Synod (dated 17 of May 1870, №9) that one of main duties of the Missionary Society should be training of the men in the missionary field ( is cited in Nikolay 1895:75; the italic type is ours).
It took a lot of trouble, people, time and money to fulfil such a many-sided goal (:74). By the way such a training of the missionaries was impossible at the moment because of the financial problems. Then Innokenti offered a simple but economical and efficient project of the missionary education that was even more effective.

The Metropolitan Innokenti was sure that the monasteries must not keep aloof from the missionary work, they could be of great help (:74). Moreover the connection between the monastery and the mission had a common historical background. He called the Pokrovsky monastery of Moscow to take the active part in this work (:76,77,79,81).

People who wished to devote themselves to the cause of missions had to be introduced to the future ministry and put to the test their intentions and character (:74,75). It was made because very often people who handed in the applications to serve in the missions in Siberia were just "casual, various and unreliable types" (see the Case of OMS Council. № 73; is cited in Никольский 1895:86).

For the most part they were fortune hunters with the dark past and loose morals (shady reputation)... the Metropolitan Innokenti had to report about it to the Holy Synod many times and tell the principals of the missions that there were no men capable of the missionary work at the disposal of this Society (:86).

Only after a careful selection the candidates that were left were supposed to be trained for the missionary ministry in the mentioned above cloister.

According to the project of Innokenti, the Pokrovsky monastery should be not only a missionary educational institution but also a retirement home for the missionaries – pensioners and invalids of the mission, a hotel for the coming missionaries, a cozy, secluded place for the scientists who worked for the use of mission and translated for it, a warehouse for storing books, manuscripts and missionary archives (:74,77). Such an atmosphere ensured the exchange of experience and worked for the fulfillment of the task:

There will be gathered the results of the missionary activities of many years, there the fervent but inexperienced spiritual zeal will be guided and cautioned; there the traditions, inaccessible for the public but useful and important for missionary work will be saved there (Никольский 1895:74; the italic type is ours).
According to the wise idea of Innokentiy, even having a missionary oriented profile, the certain monasteries should not “be considerably changed” and should not lose “any of the existing historical features that exert the salutary influence on the Orthodox people” (:75; see:77).

The existence of such educational structures of the monasteries didn’t exclude the work of the traditional theological educational institutions where the special missionary subjects and the teaching of non – Russians and foreign languages were introduced.

_The Spiritual Academy of Kazan_ was especially remarkable for its missionary orientation. It trained the missionaries for many ethnic groups of Russia. _The Academy of St. Petersburg_ laid special emphasis on the training of the specialists for the missions in China and Japan. The graduates of the Academy who had been trained to work in the Eastern countries knew the Chinese and Manchurian languages very well. There were other famous educational institutions of the missionary orientation such as _the seminary of Irkutsk and the catechetical school of Biisk._

4.4.5  _The survey and the activity analysis of the Orthodox Missionary Society_

Those who have an impression that the Russian Orthodox Mission does not exist in reality, will be surprised to hear that the OMS had a great variety of methods in contextualization and non – Russian mission with wide territorial, cultural, religious and language coverage. Though in comparison with the Catholic and Protestant missionary society, there is nothing special or new “the morning sun never lasts a day” and “It happened long ago before us” ( Eccl.1:9-10). However the activity of OMS was the result of the evolution of the personal experience of the ROC missionary activity, not of the external undertakings. It’s interesting that the methods of the OMS missionary work in many respects are similar to those that were used by Innokentiy (Popov – Veniaminov).

We are not going to consider all the methods of OMS work in detail. The information presented in the survey could be proved with many more footnotes to the source, that is why this

\[4.4.5.1 \text{The geography of OMS missionary work}\]

The OMS activity included the whole area of vast Russia: \textit{all northern regions, including Kamchatka, Asia and the Caucasus} (see Methodiy 1898:3-23), there were missionary institutions for converting of non – Russians and making the “heretics” change their mind in Central Russia. \textit{It is such a huge missionary field because of the many territories inside.} And even if ROC had no foreign mission at all, the non – Russian mission could be recognized as this mission.

The documents of OMS of 1870-1893 had a list of missions that had the financial assistance of the Society: \textit{the eparchies of Altai, Irkutsk, Transbaikalia, Yenisei, Yakut, Tobolsk, Kamchika, Japan, Astrakhan, Samara, Kazan, Ufim, Vyatka, Perm and Orenburg}. Each of the mentioned missions or the missionary eparchies usually consisted of certain missionary camps or stations and worked among several nations or ethnic groups.

Considering the gravity of their missionary work, many missions that were part of OMS could act as separate missionary societies and didn’t yield to the similar foreign missions in it. If we view the activity of the individual structures from this perspective, we could say that the Russian Orthodox Church had not one, but tens of missionary societies, united in the central missionary alliance in the considered period.

In spite of the immensity of its own territories, the Russian Orthodox Church also had \textit{foreign missions in the North America, China, Japan, Korea and Vietnam}. In other countries

4.4.5.2 The direction of OMS activity

The Orthodox Missionary Society can't be accused of narrowness in its missionary work. There are the typical set of the aspects of missionary activity, that are not often found in one missionary organization: the variety of methods of evangelization, the contextualization in all aspects; the translations of the Holy Scriptures, Legends, Liturgy and different theological literature; the enlightenment at different levels, the training of the national leaders; the scientific missionary works, the educational structures for training of missionaries; the programs of civilization and inculcation of the state system basics to the converted people to realize the political goals of the state, the deaconry of the Church through social work.

4.4.5.3 The russification and contextualization

The Mission of the Russian Orthodox Church is often blamed for the russification and but very often nobody pays attention that there were and other features.

Such a rigidity is not fair. "There is no smoke without a fire", such accusations are not groundless. But together with the evident predominance of the missionary politics of russification when it mildly tried to settle the nomads, there were a lot of elements of the contextualization and respect for the other cultures in the missionary strategy of OMS.

There is nothing special about this contradictory combination. It's quite typical for the Orthodox missionary ideology, where there is a law of the church reception of culture (Fedorov 1999:13) that gives the right to every nation to understand the Evangelistic message and the
holiness of Christianity, particularly the Russian culture, consecrated by the experience of the Orthodoxy.

The notion of the superiority of all Russians over non-Russians is seen even among the abstract discourses in the missionary periodicals of those years. For example, somebody accuses a missionary that Koreans, students in the school (Khrisanph 1904:7), don’t know the Russian language and holds up as an example the Koreans of Ussuriisky schools, who speak Russian well (9). Then he is indignant at the Japanese mission where only Japanese Seminaries and a school for women were opened. There are outspoken opinions in this respect: non-Russians of the Transbaikalia mission of the Kudarinsky department “get used more to the thought about the superiority of the Christian faith over theirs and show their liking to it. All local authorities including taisha practice the Christian religion and that is why there are no oppressions (OMS 1891:77; the italic type is ours, the orthography is left as it is)”.

If we look at the mission of the western missionaries, we will see that they also consider their culture is superior in comparison with the indigenous culture. At theological schools and schools of general education that had a western background or were under a western influence the English language meant a lot.

The role in the missionary activity of the culture that accepted Christianity was very important to the Orthodox Church. It becomes “a carrier of the Evangelical Message”, even when the sermon ceased (Fedorov 1999:31; the italic type is ours). That is why ROC tried to send to the non-Russian people this permanent reliable missionary.

As children of their great motherland — Russia, ... they didn’t stop after having baptized the non-Christsians but tried to inculcate in them together with the Christianity and Russian culture in order to merge this ethnic group with the Russian people. Russian faith, that is Christianity, Russian language at school and at home, Russian clothes...house...food...plough...harrow, instead of riding — a cart and sledge, in short all Russian are inculcated in народным not excepting Russian feelings (OMS 1893:15; the italic type is ours).

But our reader can say that this is the real russification, that is condemned by the modern missionary analysts. But ROC has never denied the fact that OMS has been using this method unapproved by many in its mission. Moreover if in the first missionary period, the russification looked like unplanned process, in XIX-XX centuries it was a thought-out strategy of the missionary activity. The cenobites-colonialists made Russians out of Finns using the passive way, the missionaries of OMS russified non-Russian using the active way.
Applied to the language, we would like to ask: how could they become russianized (the middle voice, consequence, state), if we don’t try hard to russianize (the active voice, action, but not forced but enthusiastic). (by analogy with Rom. 10,13-14) (Khrisanth 1904:12-13).

First of all, schools worked on this problem: “Russian children who didn’t know Altai language studied together with children of non-Russians; … since Russian children contribute to the learning of Russian language by children, this is one of the most important tasks of missionary schools” (OMS 1893:20; the italic type is ours). This special missionary program was the development of the arable farming, it was decided to make “a project-farm for the newly baptized non-Russians…with having their farming (OMS 1894:36-37)”.

Lamas tried to hamper this not at all harmless process, they more than anybody else understood that “with the development of farming убородство automatically come closer to the Russian culture” and therefore “they will be not far away from Christianity” (OMS 1893:20; the italic type is ours). Lamas forbade categorically to do farming “developing the doctrine of the migration of souls; according to this doctrine it’s not allowed to pull up any plant because in this plant a soul of an ancestor can live and pulling it out you will shatter his peace and quiet and he will suffer a lot (55-56). You can imagine how difficult it was for the newly converted to live in the former pagan surroundings.

In order to ensure the newly converted a peaceful life practicing a new religion, there was an interesting method in the missionary practice of OMS: they made an effort to single new Orthodox out of “the surroundings of their pagan relatives” and put them in special Christian settlements – “New baptized settlements”; They tried to settle the new Christians, to teach them crafts. It was made because of two main reasons: not to let pagans press neophytes and deprive them of their lands and property; for neophytes not to be involved in the former pagan life (the report of Irkutsk mission for 1897, Orthodox Mess. 1898, #21, supplement, page 112-114; also see Smirnov 1904:18). Besides some missionaries considered it expedient to settle in every settlement several real Russian Orthodox families that were known for their honesty, diligence and piety” (the report of the Kirghiz mission for 1899, Orthodox Mess. 1900 #21, supplement, page 249). Missionaries tried not to settled the baptized non-Russians in Russian settlements because the new Christians could be taught bad things (we can’t say that the best representatives of the nation lived in Siberia). Moreover
To our shame among Russian Orthodox people there are a lot of ignorant mean people, who laugh and jeer at the new baptized for their way of talking, backwardness, not knowing of church ceremonials and other things, reproach them with their former faith and life, call them dirty, non Christians, dogs, baptized trowels and similar offensive and indecent nicknames. It embarrasses and upsets the new Christians (the report of the Kirgiz mission for 1899, Orthodox Mess, 1900 #21, supplement pages 245-246).

Missionaries especially tried not to settle the new converted with dissenters.

The fruits of the non forced strategy of russification gave very good results and met support in the souls of non - Russians. “In the upbringing of their children the newly baptized try to copy Russians. As, for example, having Buryat clothes, for their children they buy Russian clothes (OMS 1893:50-51; the italic type is ours)”. In their family life they try to “approach Russians or take over Russian customs. For example a table and a chair are the essential attributes of a decent non – Russian house; in some prosperous families there are no Tatar plank beds at all (OMS 1891:96; the italic type is ours)”. In the papers of the Orthodox Missionary Society such information can be found:

All inhabitants of the Korsakovskoye settlement have been russified, they speak Russian well, understand enough of the Christian doctrine, talk about their new faith in the church and also at home in private discussions... they are not inferior to Russian Orthodox in faith and piety, in household, in cleanliness and neatness, diligence and especially in their desire to teach the children how to write and read (OMS 1895:58; the italic type is ours).

While missionaries accustomed the nomads to the settled life, they also spread “the first seeds of civic consciousness” (OMS 1895:18; the italic type is ours), because a mission as the Orthodoxy sees it, it is not just ecclesiastical but also a state undertaking. That is why it was important to train non – Russians to be good citizens of the Russia motherland and good nationals of the Tzar.

This is how the culture becomes the carrier of the Message in the Orthodoxy. Little by little “the Christian life of young children” of the Church got firmly established, and the hope of ROC that “the next generation of non – Russians won’t differ from “Russian Orthodox population” came true (OMS 1893:52; the italic type is ours).

This is how the strategy of russianization and the practice of ROC in the third missionary period looked. This is just one side. The other side of the coin was the broad contextualization of OMS mission. The non – Russians were preached in their native dialect. Therefore The Holy Scriptures, Catechism, Liturgy, patristic literature, motets and church writing works have been
translated with a rather high quality to the languages of even small ethnic groups. The translations were not made only by the single missionaries but also by special companies like the famous *Translation Committee* at the community of *St. Guriy* with the first-rate linguist H. H. Il'minsky as the head of it (see Kharlamovitch 1904:6-7; Nikolsky 1895:95; Khrisanph 1904:12-13; OMS 1893:79 and many others). Russian Orthodoxy following the example of Byzantium, always tried to give all its knowledge to the enlightened people. Non – Russians were also offered the national divine service and non – Russian priests. People could follow their ancient customs and traditions (see OMS 1893:61), except for really pagan customs that were censured. Nobody forced them to be baptized. Such russianization contributed a lot to the success of the mission.

In the Orthodox mission two notions: Russianization and contextualization lived in harmony with each other. They were the two sides of one coin.

4.4.5.4. *Il'minsky H. H. and the Translation Committee at the community of St. Guriy in Kazan*

“He has never been a missionary in the strict sense of this word; but all his life was dedicated to missionary work, and gradually he was the head of it, first in the Kazan region and then in the whole territory of Russia (Смирнов 1904:31-32)”. This is written about Nikolay Ivanovitch Il'minsky, an outstanding linguist of OMS.

The translation activity of the Russian Orthodox Church was a midpoint, a center of rotation, a perpetual motion machine and a generator of the third period mission. National Liturgy, and non – Russian schools, the Holy Scripture, Holy legends and textbooks in comprehensible languages, national leaders – without them ROC mission made headway only in several generations, when nomads assimilated into Russian people and would begin to understand their language. Thanks to the translations, the process of converting went on more quickly and many non – Russians put their faith in Christ knowing what they did.
The conversion of Tatars into Orthodoxy, "just surface and ritual" (:29), didn't give any troubles to ROC till the mass falls away from the faith of not only oldbaptized Tatars, but also Chuvash, Cheremis, and Mordvinians into Islam began (:29-30). This process was going on though at the beginning of the XIX century the Bible Society had made an excellent translation to Tatar language. The reason was that Tatars didn't understand this wonder of linguistics. Nobody could understand why.

Ilminsky Н. И., a graduate and a professor of Tatar and Arabic languages of the Kazan Spiritual Academy resolved this dilemma. He knew many languages: Yiddish, Greek, Latin, Arabic, Persian, also Turkish, Tatar, Cheremis, Kirghiz, Mordvinian, Altai, Yakut and many other languages (:31); he worked on probation in the center of Arabic Islam – Cairo for two years (:32). This "well educated theologian, a great connoisseur of the Bible and Orthodox services and an eminent linguist" (:31) after studying this subject for many years, proved that the Tatar language "is divided into two independent languages: a bookish – scientific" one, with a lot of Arabic and Persian words, the language of the Koran and the mosque, that is accessible only to mullahs; and "common-colloquial" that is used only in everyday life and is not used for giving the shades of "abstracts" at all, "the language of the common people, who doesn't understand the language of the mosque" (:33; see also Kharlamovitch 1904:6).

When Ilminsky Н. И understood it, he invented the system of translation to the spoken Tatar language, using the Russian alphabet with Tatar sounds (see Kharlamovitch 1904:6). It was done in order to break off the connection between the Tatars Christians and Mohammedanism (Смирнов 1904:31). When he tested some passages of the translation in practice, he understood that even Tatar boys understood them without any difficulties. But this great innovation was excoriated on one hand by the scientists who study Tatar language and the translators to the literary Tatar language, and by "unwise adherents of Russian nationality and hidebound patriots, who saw and still see the threat to the state unity of Russia in the non - Russian translations" on the other hand (Kharlamovitch 1904:7). The Archimandrite Vladimir while defending the translations of Ilminsky insisted on the fact that "they should translate with a special missionary purpose" (:7) and not for the museum of literature.

This discussion reminds today's debaters about the translation of the Liturgy from the Old Slavonic language to the Modern Russian language and the arguments in favour of saving the
unique language to the prejudice of the saving of souls. It should be done but the main purpose should be done as well. Russia took from Byzantium "the principle of using different languages" (see Fedorov 1999:13) or "Cyril-Methodiy ideology" (:47). According to this ideology ROC must consider the native cultures as "united variety of catholic legends" (Meiendorff; is cited in Fedorov 1999:57; the italic type is the author's) and preach to them the Gospel in their "own language" (:13). It was known in the XIX century.

Because of the variance with the Tatar translations, in 1858 Ilminsky was forced to leave the Translation Committee at the Kazan Spiritual Academy. The academy was closed soon after his leaving because it lost its leading specialist (see Smirnov 1904:35). Working hard on his ideas, he worked out "the special system of translations to the common language" (:35). All texts, translated by him: Tatar, Chuvash, Чере́мис, Altai, Yakut were edited with the help of non-Russians. Ilminsky "explained them the Russian text" giving them the exact theological meaning. After these translations were read by the students of the school and were corrected according to their instructions (see Kharlamovitch 1904:9). Many specialists admitted that his translations "were the patterns of translation" (Smirnov 1904:37).

Seven years after Ilminsky left the Translation Committee of the Spiritual Academy, in November of 1865, the Translation Committee at the community of St. Guriy in Kazan "was established on the initiative of the Orthodox Missionary Society and on their money" (Nikolsky 1895:95). The goal of this missionary structure was the translation of the Holy Scripture books and also service, dogmatic and spiritually moral books to the languages of non-Russians in Siberia, Volga region and other regions of the immense Russia using the system of Ilminsky. The head of the Committee "became and was there [till 27 of December, 1891] the famous inventor of the non-Russian system of teaching and educating in Russia, the director of the teachers in the seminary of Kazan N. I. Ilminsky" (:95; the inset is ours).

He organized this difficult and important matter properly in all respects and with his considerable and solid works on the publishing of the Holy books and the service books in the languages of non-Russians he paved the way for one of the most significant undertakings of the Higher Church Authorities – the Permission of the Holy Synod (in 1883) to conduct service in non-Russian languages (Nikolsky 1895:95; the italic type is ours).

His colleagues in this difficult field of translation were the professor of the Spiritual Academy of Kazan Mirovtsev (for Mongolian translations) and the principal of the Simbirsk
non-Russian school, Yakovlev (for Chuvash translations) (see Smirnov 1904:39). The good name of the Committee became more and more known and became the only authority. Now N. I. Ilminsky was in charge of all the translation activities in the regions of Russia, without his advice nobody tried to translate anything, “he was a kind of universal scientist in all missionary problems” (:39) He gave advice to the experts about the details of the инородческой languages and soon there was “the whole school of the gifted translators” (:40).

The business grew and soon there were several “branches” and “independent committees”: A committee for translations from and to the Chuvash language in Simbirsk with Яковлев as its head; a committee for translations from and to Ziryansky, Karelian, Lappish and Samoyed languages in Arkhangelsk; a committee for translations from and to the Yakut language in Yakutsk; the Altai mission also opened a printing-house to print the Altai translations (:51).

The Translation Committee distributed widely its editions among the missions of the Orthodox Missionary Society (OMS 1893:79), their editions were used in the missionary non-Russian schools that had a beneficial effect on the generations of “new Russian” people.

For the first eighteen years of its activity, the Translation Committee published “846,280 copies of dogmatical and moral books in 14 languages” (Nikolsky 1895:95). By 1904 there were translations in twenty main languages of people of Volga region, Siberia, the Caucasus, and Asia: Tatar, Chuvash, Cheremis, Votyak, Mordvinian, Kirghiz, Bashkir, Kalmuck, Permiansky, Altai, Buryat, Tungus, Gold, Yakut, Ostyak - Samoyed, Chukchi, Arabic, Persian, Avar, Azerbaijan”19 (Smirnov 1904:50)20.

We were amazed by the huge amount of the high quality translations in such a short space of time the same as pastor Matie of Reformed Church – the founder of the Biblical Museum, who had no idea about the ROC mission when he received “a big box of non-Russian books of Holy Scriptures (:41)”. Yes, ROC had a powerful basis but for the Revolution of 1917, it could have reaped a fine crop. Maybe now Russia wouldn’t have problems with militant Islam.

This is how the academic movement of Kazan with Ilminsky as its head restored the foundations of the missionary work in the manner of Stephen of Perm (see Smirnov 1904:28) and

19 Probably Azerbaijan
20 If you have noted the translations made by Innokenty (Veniaminov), branches and single translators are not included in this list. It means there are much more. Unfortunately the author couldn’t find out the number of
in the Cyril - Methody spirit (Fedorov 1999:47). It followed the ecclesiastical principle of different languages' usage (John (Popov) 1995:17-21) and acting like this it opened the new epoch of missionary work "for all Russian East" (Smirnov 1904:28; the italic type is ours).

4.4.5.5 The forming of the national non – Russian churches and leaders though the russification and contextualization in the Enlightenment structures

Mission is similar to the teaching... teaching is not a craft, it is an art and one of the most difficult arts (Mironositsky 1903:9; the italic type is ours).

After a Holy temple, the Orthodox church is the most godly and useful institution... It is difficult to enlighten and educate new converted without a school (The Orthodox Messenger 1900:1/12-13; also see Dionisy 1905:36; the italic type is ours).

OMS opened a lot of educational institutions: schools, boarding schools, colleges of different kinds for non – Russians and their children with a purpose of assistance to the mission cause: to speed up the forming the national non – Russian churches, to “spread Christianity among pagans and to strengthen new converted in faith”, for russianization, civilization, and forming their national consciousness with the inculcation of love to Russia-mother and Tzar-father (see Orthodox Messenger 1893:8, also see Dionisy 1905:36).

A teacher of a missionary school with his pupils are the first and devoted visitors of the temple of God, readers and singers during the service and performer of the church regulations. Inside the school itself there is a system of education and pupils' behavior that has a strict church character... Reasonable learning of prayers... puts a student in the life relations with God, inspire... the dogmatic truth and sacred events (see Orthodox Messenger 1893:8/83-84).

A teacher was like a pastor for a pupil and moreover very often a building of a missionary school was a substitute for a temple. When a school was “out of the residence of a missionary”, “the teacher as a member of the clergy conducted a service on holidays, arranged the readings of moral and spiritual literature and looked after the moral and religious life of new baptized (the report about missions in the Tomsk eparchy for 1893; is cited in Orthodox Messenger 1893:8/83-84 the italic type is ours).

languages, the books of the Holy Scripture had been translated to. But the information provided is enough to understand that work in Russia was carried out on a large scale.
Imagine how great the Orthodox influence over the people of the North through non-Russian educational institutions was. The first mission period covered the north-west of Russia with a network of monasteries. In the third period the enlightenment of non-Russians took place through the dense network of schools. We can find the number of schools in each of OMS missions using the tables of the Society (see Smirnov 1904:44,60-65; see also Nikolsky 1895:89). There we can see that the number of educational institutions, students and teachers steadily grew. For example in one of the most successful missions – Altai mission, there were 48 schools by 1904 (741 boys and 233 girls) and one catechetical school (196 students), in the most unsettled mission there were just 6 schools (39 boys, 16 girls). In general in Russia by the 1st of January 1905 there were 43,893 parish schools with 1,923,698 students (see Smolitch 1997:110). In comparison with these numbers, the percent of missionary schools are not high, and the area of their spreading is rather wide.

As it has been already mentioned OMS combined in it the elements of russianization and contextualization. According to the orientation toward the context, it offered to non-Russian educational institutions of different levels where they were russianized for the motivation of Christian love and care.

We will enumerate all categories of schools offered by the Society that were found during the research and will describe some of them in detail paying attention to the ideas that are of interest for us. At the end of XIX – at the beginning of XX centuries the Orthodox Missionary Society had the following educational institutions:

- mixed schools for boys and girls
- schools only for boys
- schools for non-Russian girls, who will become mothers and will bring up their children, the next generation in the Orthodoxy.

*Attracting girls to schools* plays an important role... Men are very often away... and that prevents them looking after the religious development of their children. But *women always stay at home and have a big religious influence not only over children but over their husbands as well. But non-Russians can't realize the use of education for girls and we have to admonish non-Russians to send their daughters to schools* (see Mironositsky 1903:15; the italic type is ours).

- In addition to ordinary schools, where children could come every day, at the
missionary camps there were permanent boarding schools for children from distant uluses. In this case children were away from their parents, hearth and usual household for a long time and it made them almost Russians in the way of life;

The dormitories at schools do a mission and non — Russians a big service. Besides the fact that they allow children to study, they accustom children to cleanliness and let them understand that it is better to live in a Russian house, with Russian traditions than in dirty, cold and smoky yurts (Orthodox Messenger 1900:6/59; see also Smirnov 1904:43).

The dormitory at missionary schools were also important because it provided close relations between teachers and students and helped him to have an influence over children (the report of Volga region mission for 1899; from Orthodox Messenger 1900:15/115; the italic type is ours).

- Except for the usual permanent schools, OMS had mobile schools, where the teachers together with all study aids and textbooks moved from one nomads’ camp to the other.

There are places in Siberia where non – Russian settlements are very scattered away and there is no use of establishing the permanent schools even with dormitories. ... For such places the most expedient thing to do is to arrange a mobile school. ... These schools can be in such elm huts as non – Russians had during the fishing period that lasts for 3-4 months (Orthodox Messenger 1903:15/41; the italic type is ours).

- Schools were divided into church/parish schools and schools of literacy. At church/parish schools the following subjects were taught: Religion, Holy History, church singing, History of Russia, Russian and non – Russian reading and writing, hygiene, farming, gardening and also different crafts. Children worked in a smithy, joiner’s shop, a bindery, and also sewed shoes for themselves (Orthodox Messenger 1900:1/15-16). Such activity accustomed them to the settled life, “more convenient in religious, moral aspects and also in everyday life” (1900:6/59). The OMS program of russification of non – Russians acted through the young generation.

- In the schools of literacy the subjects that were related to Christianity were taught in order to influence children of parents who were against the mission at least indirectly through the civilization and enlightenment. If parents – pagans agreed to send their children to parish/church school, they were taught together with children of non – Russian Christians (see OMS 1893:45; see Orthodox Messenger 1900:1/17; 1900:6/59).
A powerful mean for leading the Buryat people out of the darkness of ignorance and for preparing them to the Christian Faith and learning of Russian public spirit could be the organization everywhere schools of literacy ... [because non — Russians] as a result of the religious fanaticism are afraid of missionary parish/church schools and don’t send there their children (see Orthodox Messenger 1900:6/59; the insert and italic type are ours).

For the purpose of russification, in junior school the teaching was conducted in non — Russian languages, and in senior school — already in Russian; the textbooks were published in non — Russian language but with Russian letters. Thus students “got acquainted with Russian written language” (see Orthodox Messenger 1900:1/17).

- Sometimes grown up non – Russians were taken in schools for children if they proffered themselves for being students (OMS 1893:45).

   It was the first level of non – Russian schools, the leader among these schools were the central baptized Tatar school in Kazan. “There was a general spirit coming out if it ... as well as management and supervision in the person of Ilminsky”, they received the textbooks and principles of teaching, made up by Ilminsky (see Smirnov 1904:44,46). The category of educational institutions we are going to examine later on trained personnel for aforesaid educational institutions.

Thus:

- Schools for teachers of non – Russian schools, chosen out of the best students of foregoing institutions; Practice showed that teachers from “natives” —

   They are completely devoted to their work, not sparing themselves. On working days they taught for 5 hours writing and reading, in the evening they taught singing and they arrange the common rehearsals; on holidays they lead religious and moral readings for people in their [native] language (Report of Saratovsk Eparchial Committee 1892[1983]:6; the insert and italic type are ours).

- Spiritual schools for women are of interest. The wives for the future national priests and catechists were educated there, who later on worked among women, children and were engaged in musical and chorister work. A wise long-term strategy.

   The teaching mainly has a success ... where catechists are married to the students of missionary women school: there all the children know all main prayers, Symbol of the Faith, Decalogue, and while worshiping it they are not embarrassed to read them, even 3-5 years old know short prayers and can cross themselves religiously. Missionary women schools turn out to be a very useful institution for the church. Students ... make ... two wonderful choirs for the missionary meeting and after graduating they merry the ministers of religion and represent a lively and strong church element The parish considers itself a lucky one if the catechist’s wife is a graduate of the missionary school, ... Christian women find an excellent leader in her, we even are not talking about church singing here ... The teaching staff of WMS publishes a monthly moral, religious magazine “Uranisiki” (“Modesty” ... “decorated lining”, “hidden virtue”) (from the reports
of Japan mission, is cited in OMS 1893:36-37; see also OMS 1893:44 about the Chuvash women school; the italic type is ours).

- **The educational institutions with a special catechist direction** satisfied the requirements in the national clergy of the lower level. The graduates of these schools became assistants of the Russian priest-missionary and sometimes shouldered a burden of everyday personal, group catechesis, music work and teaching. Such schools were at the large missions of OMS: non – Russian Boarding house of Obdor, non – Russian Boarding house at the Theological Seminary of Tobolsk, Teaching class at the archpriest house of Chita and the Catechistic school of Biisk.

Some of them provided a program of education that can be compared with the modern bachelor's degree program.

*Non – Russian Boarding house of Obdor* was opened in February 1898 only for children of non – Russians Oistyaks and Samoyeds for the purpose of training them to be the pioneers of literacy and spiritual enlightenment among their congers [27 students: 17 boys, 10 girls] (for more details see the report of OMS 1898:32; 1902: 36-37; Orthodox Messenger 1899:24, 136; the insert and the italic type is ours).

*Non – Russian Boarding house at the Theological Seminary of Tobolsk* [opened in 1892] ... was located in the building of the Znamensky monastery of Tobolsk.

... *A teaching class in Chita* was opened in 1898 at a central parish school in Chita that was located at the archpriest house ... there is also a class of psalms at school. These schools train teachers and psalmists for missionary schools and churches of Transbaikalia mission. (Dionisy 1905:46; the italic type and is ours).

*The Catechistic school of Biisk* founded in 1883 should be put at the head of all missionary schools of Siberia. Its purpose is to “make teachers and psalmists out of children of non – Russians and Russian children who know non – Russian language for non – Russian missions and parishes (The regulations of the Missionary Catechistic school of Biisk, approved on September 14, 1898:1). ... Subjects taught: Holy Scripture of the Old Testament and the New Testament, Holy History of the New and Old Testaments and the public service doctrine, Russian and Slavic church languages, practical homiletics, arithmetic, elementary geometry, civil history, church history, history and exposure of Schism, Altai language, didactics, basic physics, basics hygiene, church singing, calligraphy and sketching (1898:32). “A course takes six years (1898:12)” (see Dionisy 1905:46-48; the italic type is ours).

- Even if the mission was not doing well, still there were some godfearing non – Russians – “zealots” of faith, who wished to work for the Church. Mironotsisky calls them diamonds ingrained in mass, who should be appreciated and paid much attention because they are the “core” of the future mission (Mironotsisky 1903:20; see also OMS 1893:48). Using the language of the modern terminology the leader teaching and has the methods of apprenticeship.

- Further the most talented national leaders were taught in simple Russian academies and seminaries or in similar institutions with missionary profiles. There were also Russian
students who wanted to devote their lives to the non-Russian mission. The most famous are the Theological Seminary of Tobolsk (Dionisiy 1905:46), non-Russian Teaching Seminary in Kazan (Smirnov 1904:45; Makariy 1997:8/2/234) and Spiritual Academy of Kazan. Kazan was the training center for the expansion of Christianity and Russian culture among non-Russians. In 1854 the missionary departments were opened here attached to the Spiritual Academy of Kazan. These departments were reorganized as two-year Missionary courses and later were moved to the Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery of Kazan and became an independent educational institution (see Smirnov 1904:28). There were Tatar, Mongolian and Chuvash departments in this institution. There students received except for the general missionary education, acquire knowledge necessary for a non-Russian missionary: Islam, Buddhism, Lamaism with apologetics against there religions, the ethnography of tribes and the history of the Christian mission on their territories; Tatar, Mongol, Kalmuck languages with their dialects, adopted pastor theology (see Smirnov 1904:56-57; compare Makariy 1997:8/2/235). The professors of the Spiritual Academy of Kazan were teaching there. The Spiritual Academy of St. Petersburg also worked for the mission, training specialists for Chinese and Japanese missions. In general there were 57 seminaries and 4 theological academies: in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev and Kazan in ROC on the territory of Russia. (Chrysostomus 1968:63-64; is cited in Penner 1999:190; also see the tables in Smolitch 1996:8/1/667). The Academy in St. Petersburg was considered to be the best (see Penner 1999:194).

- non-Russians — graduates of theological institutions became priests in their nations (OMS 1893:3) but sometimes they wanted to devote themselves to the mission and with other nations (OMS 1893:24). But in spite of graduating from seminaries, the future priests from non-Russians were not worthy for the pastor ministry because they took care “not so much about the enlightenment of their congeners as about a better position”. This is the reason why Mironositsky advises “to train talented non-Russians for the pastorate ministry from early childhood” (Mironositsky 1903:8).

---

21 “One priest from the Christened Tatars of Kazan eparchy expressed his wish to join the Kirghiz mission ...” (OMS 1893:24).
This was the system of different educational institutions of OMS and ROC in the third period. Of course not everything went off so smoothly as it may look at first sight. The reports of missions are full of complaints that there were not enough schools, teachers, study aids and what they had were not the best. There are totally negative opinions: “the teaching of God’s Law is quite unsatisfactory in non-Russian schools”. During the revision Mironositsky found this fact: “a student can tell about a historical or religious event in Russian, may pronounce the prayers and commandments correctly but at the same time doesn’t understand what he is saying.” (Mironositsky 1903:12; the italic type is ours) What a phenomenal memory a “wild” non-Russian has? (It’s a joke). But as a matter of fact one of the main problems of the Russian Orthodox education where the memorizing played a big part is implicit in this phrase.

However missionaries, catechists and teachers of OMS worked arduously, we should give them their due for this feat and professional skills (see the epigraph). As we have seen all the educational institutions that were supported by the Orthodox Missionary Society were adapted to the local conditions and met the requirements of contextualization being at the same time the subjects of russianization strategy. This mobile, extensive, multibranch network of schools gave great results.

As it has been already mentioned the school had close connections with the Church and the activity of a missionary camp. A teacher often acted as a missionary and a catechist, held the home discussions about the faith. The students of missionary schools were the first zealous parish people and school choirs provided services with harmonious singing. Their melodious singing attracted to the temples not only the parents of children because many non-Russians had a love for music from birth, by nature (see OMS 1893:45; see also Orthodox Messenger 1900:1/17). It happened that inhabitants of the uluses where there were “no house of prayer, no school” “sent to their missionary a delegation with a request of building a house of prayer or a school and expressed their willingness to help in the building” (A report of OMS 1907:37; Dionisy 1905:49-50; the italic type is ours).

The results of the long-term program that was aimed at the young generation were obvious, children taught the Christian truth at schools “brought their parents and relatives to the Holy font” (OMS 1893:53). Such things happened often. When girls became mothers they brought up their children – the next generation – in the Christian faith. The national priesthood
institution was developing. Step by step the nation acquired the traits of Christian Orthodox culture, in its turn the culture became missionary and educated next generations at verbal and non-verbal levels (see Fedorov 1999:31). Going to a church "became flesh and blood" of the enlightened people. Here Orthodoxy fulfilled its mission through the services. Orthodoxy, autocracy and national roots were deeply inculcated in the consciousness of a nation that was taken in a big Russian family because "here in Russia all the questions of faith and church are at the same time the state questions" (Skvortsov 1897:1; the italic type is ours). It applies to all the missionary activity in general and to missionary educational structures in particular.

What is the result? They managed to enlighten, russianize and reclaim — and the communists continued what they hadn’t managed. They failed in developing of national local Churches with national clergy, the revolution impeded it and atheism destroyed everything that was gathered so carefully. The revival of ROC mission of XXI is called to lift up the fallen torch of the fathers.

4.4.5.6 The contextualization in the evangelistic and divine service practice of OMS missionaries

It is known that a service in a temple is very important for the Orthodox Church. It is the knot of the matter of the missionary work (see Bria 1975:247) and the life of ecclesia. In the service the Church’s care of its flock is realized (see Debolsky 1994:7). By what means? Maybe by the means of a sermon? Partly yes but it hasn’t the central role here (see Bulgakov 1985:289). It is because OC sees it as “the kerygma is not limited to the verbal proclamation” (Bria 1975:248; 1980:9f). The service itself with all its components is already an expressive sermon, the beauty and the special mysticism of a service, an element of beauty as the Glory of God that fills the temple has its own place along with prayer and edification (see Bulgakov 1985:278, 295). To worship God is taught here at the level of subconsciousness.

The central event in the Orthodox Church is the Divine Liturgy, when the Lord’s supper takes place. It is a center of Orthodox life and the driving force of its mission. The Eucharist is
very important, because through it the meeting of Christians becomes a Church – “Just as the bread becomes Christ’s body during the Eucharist, so also the people who partake of it are transformed into Christ’s body, the Church (Fairbairn 19984:16) – “the Eucharist constitutes the church” (see Bria 1975:248; Anastasios 1989:82; Keshishian 1992d:22f; WCC 1977:1; John (Popov) 1995:18). In its turn the Church make the Eucharist possible because it can’t exist out of the institution of Church and without the Holy relics in the antimension (see Bria 1975:245; Averintsev 1993:1/523). OC is “a eucharist – centered and eucharist – oriented” community (see Keshishian 1992d:27,22f) in contrast to Bible –centered Protestants and Pope – centered Catholic. Parish people and priests that participate in the Liturgy, proclaim the Gospel and Legends of Church. The laity assimilate the truth participating in the Liturgy. All people present serve as an example inviting pagans to follow the Christ.

The object of the OC mission is constructing of independent self-governed eucharistic communities (see Keshishian 1992d:22f; WCC 1977:1; John (Popov) 1995:16; Anastasios 1989:65f) pagans may be included in these communities and be saved (see Keshishian 1992c:16; WCC 1977:1; John (Popov) 1995:13-14). In these communities through the Eucharist and other sacraments a man reaches a personal theosis, come into contact with other Christians and with the Universal Church in heaven and on the earth.

As a result of all mentioned above the construction of a temple becomes one of the main steps of OC mission (Anastasios 1989:65f). A temple is sacred and important because it “contains in itself the Altar” for the sacrifice. It is “an instrument of a religious rite, just as a priest” (Simeon 1993:385). It preached using the language of symbols and gestures (see Mathews 1994:11; Fudel 1996:23) through the schemes of descending God’s grace (see Vladishevskaya 1993:114), prayerful mediation of saints and all centuries-old knowledge of Orthodox Church presented in architecture, frescoes and icon painting. The icon mission in OC is “second only to the eucharist” (Fairbairn 1984:76), for Orthodoxy it is “the same as the Bible for a reformer” (see Snegirev 1993:101). Its main purpose is dogmatic, it is an “example”, a “book” (see Gavriushin 1993:101-102; Fairbairn 1984:75; Arseniev 1993:140). Besides the icon is also “an Emblem of the Incarnation” of Jesus Christ (see Ouspensky 1978:51f; is cited Fairbairn 1984:72f). It also plays the role of an intermediary, a “vessel” of grace and a helper in achieving theosis by believers (see Sosnin 1993:61; Ouspensky & Lossky 1982:36; is cited in Fairbairn 1984:75,77).
The Gospel is spread with a method of a psychological influence over a spectator by means of immersion of a man in a particular world of the Service.

All enumerated earlier notions worked well not only in real Russian Orthodox Churches but in the non-Russian mission of ROC. The missionaries of the Eastern Church, following the principles of the Byzantine mission, always tried to establish the services as soon as possible. But at the same time they worked at the translations of Scriptures, Legends of Church and the Liturgy. The canonical basis for this aspect of a missionary activity was: 1) the principle of using the different languages, “for hearers to understand the Scripture”; 2) the principle of universality because God accepts any person who worships him (Acts 10:34-35); 3) the principle of church reception of culture, that advises to become all things to all people “in order to save people in any way possible” (1 Cor 9:20-23) (see Fedorov 1999:13). We are going to consider how missionaries managed to put into practice these rules in such an unstable situation of the Northern mission. And how they managed to work still following the instructions of the Church that were not so flexible at first sight.

As we know the solemnity, beauty and “touching” of a service plays a big role in Orthodoxy. For this purpose in missionary temples there were always choirs, usually comprised of students of the local schools (see Orthodox Messenger 1897:5/34). In the OMS reports there are many notes about the level of development of singing in different missions and generally how much “beautiful and ceremonial atmosphere of a service” influences Non-Russians (34).

A powerful impression made by the harmonious singing of a choir in a missionary temple on people praying, on parents and relatives of choirboys, and especially on Buryat people – these people of steppes who haven’t heard the harmonious singing, … Some of Buryat were so interested in a service … that they didn’t leave the temple till late at night, having forgotten even food (Orthodox Messenger 1897:5/34 – 35; the italic type is ours).
“The practice of common reading and singing” after a reader during the service time was introduced in the temples for Non – Russians to understand the service and take part in the prayer. It made the services “lively” for Non – Russians and cultivated the need for a church prayer in them (Orthodox Messenger 1893:1/5 –6; 1894:8/7-9).

Moreover everywhere where it was possible and where the ready translations existed, the Divine Liturgy and other services were conducted in Non – Russian languages according to the different languages usage principle (see Fedorov 1999:13).

As Universal Church teaches to preach and to serve God in all languages, spoken by tribes and nations, and Orthodox Church that has in the territory of Russian state so many different tribes, enlightens many of them in their native dialects. (Collected stories about Orthodox missions 1872:2/284-285; is cited in Nikolsky 1895:95).

The missionaries didn’t act on their own initiative, but following the instructions of the Holy Synod and with the blessing of parish archpriests, when there were “more or less considerable number of baptized Non – Russians “at the service. During the service the priests should use the editions of OMS, published by the Translation Committee at St. Guriy community in Kazan. The hand-written translations were allowed temporarily but they had to be approved by the mentioned above Committee. If there were also Russians in the church, then “it was required to combine Russian and Non – Russian languages during the service” (The decree of ROC Synod 15.1.1883:#1; in cited in the Magazine of OMS council 1883:2/2; the italic type is ours). This rule also served to the russianization of population, not demanding the thoughtless faith and helped the neophytes to realize “the spiritual tie with their mother Russian Church and Russian Orthodox Motherland” (Orthodox Messenger 1894:8/79). But the work with the national services wasn’t organized everywhere equally well.

The Altai mission succeeded in this respect. The translation of all the necessary sacred and service books has been made here … and the service can be conducted and is conducted in Altai language. Though sometimes it is conducted in Russian (by turns) (1894:8/79; the italic type is ours).

Everything was fine in Kazan, Ufimskaya, Orenburg and Vyatka parishes. “In 1892 the service using Tatar language together with Church-Slavonic language has been conducted in 73 churches and 100 village parishes” (The report of OMS Translation Committee 1892:9; is cited in Nikolsky 1895:95).
In missionary temples almost every Liturgy was accompanied by a sermon or a precept in Non – Russian and Russian languages, spoken by a missionary, psalm-reader or a local teacher. Parish priests noted with pleasure that “Non – Russians are especially interested in a sermon in their native language” and begin to “share their impressions with each other and retell the contents” right away during the service (The report of Irkutsk mission 1894; is cited in Orthodox Messenger 1895:23/106-107; 1898:6/258; OMS 1893:96). It is difficult to picture such behavior in an Orthodox Church as well as the fact “children and infirm brothers are allowed to sit where and how they can” (The report of Altai mission 1893; Orthodox Messenger 1894:8/79-80). Moreover missionaries tried to make the service as understandable as possible for the people present: they conducted rites slowly and explained the meaning of all actions. Of course with such an attitude towards the Non – Russians in missions that were using methods of contextualization, their “churches were overcrowded with people” that listened to sermons (OMS 1893:65).

This is how the service was conducted in temples of missionary camps, newly baptized settlements and uluses where Non – Russians settled and had already taken in some elements of Russian culture and life. But what about a sermon to nomad Non – Russian tribes that were scattered on the vast territories of new Russian lands?

In order to preach the Gospel to small groups of nomads in steppes, deserts, taiga and tundra, OMS missionaries had to be very resourceful. In spite of the centripetal character of Orthodox mission and invariability of the service style that was traditionally conducted in a temple, they found a lot of means of bringing the faith to the most remote uluses and nomads’ camps (see Orthodox Messenger 1900:20/239; 1898:6/257). It was allowed to conduct the Eucharist just having an antimension with a piece of relics. It substituted for the altar for the Eucharist sacrifice and embodied in a way the whole temple. (It is an excellent illustration of the central role this sacrament plays in OC). With such conditions it was possible to conduct the Divine Liturgy everywhere, where a missionary could go. A priest with a mobile antimension on a horse, skiing, on a camel, on a dog or deer harness, in an elm boat could be seen everywhere. If there were no church or chapel built it was a usual and normal thing to conduct a service in the open air, on the street, at the market, in a house of a missionary or a converted Non – Russian.
In remote nomads’ camps missionaries didn’t disdain to put the Precious Gifts on the earth floor of a smoky stinking yurta, where just a presence could be considered as a feat.

Contrary to the existing concepts, the work of an Orthodox missionary in every Non – Russian camp was not only to conduct necessary rites, communions, burial services, wedding services and christening of newborn children. In many aspects his activity didn’t differ from the activity of a Protestant missionary. Except the Liturgy and other prescribed services of Orthodox Church, missionaries of OMS had other, more understandable forms of ministry: different service readings, Bible and catechetical lectures, evangelical discussions and apologetic arguments with shamans. As a rule the subject of the discussions was:

a) The Holy History according to the Bible; b) … as with the grace of God the Russian land was created; c) selected hagiographies. … The discussions start and finish with the common saying of prayers and in the middle they (in Altai and Kirghiz missions) singing [in Russian and] … Altai language … These songs make a deep impression on [Non – Russians] with their poetical language and affecting original motives (The report of Altai mission for 1893; from: Orthodox Messenger 1894:8/80; the insert is ours).

Those who wished to listen about the faith usually gathered in groups in a place suitable for everybody: in a temple or in its yard, in school, at a house of a missionary or a baptized Non – Russian. It was easier to gather people on holidays and days-off or during the days of the winter off-season. The discussions often were held from the morning till midnight as it was with the Apostle Paul (The report of Altai mission 1893; from: Orthodox Messenger 1894:8/80). There are also documents in the missionary periodicals of those years that say that people were brought to the readings by the police officers and village elders, allegedly without the missionary’s knowledge about it. A missionary didn’t suspect anything and sent to OMS the enthusiastic reports about the high attendance (see Mironositsky 1903:17-18).

Honest missionaries didn’t resort to force, but at the same time they didn’t wait when Non – Russians would come to the lectures, they themselves came to Non – Russians.

In addition to the usual forms of readings and discussions, there is also other form in arranging readings in Altai mission – a reader or a teacher went about the yurts of Non – Russians … Non – Russians

And here they met the wishes of non-Russians, changing their established procedure: “When missionaries visit christened non-Russians, they baptize infants, marry people on the proper days. The exception is Obdor missionaries who are allowed by the Holy Synod to marry christened Ostyaks during the Peter’s fast (because at this time the priests with mobile churches can come to their places) and Samoyeds during the period of 25 of December till 6 of January, when Samoyeds usually visit Obdorsk” (see the report of OMS 1900:35) They also treat patients, read the burial service over deceased. As you see in case of need, they could break the present order.
lived scattered and sometimes it is not easy to bring them together in one place (Orthodox Messenger 1898:6/260).

It turned out that the individual work was more effective. At such discussions people felt more free and missionaries could "talk and read for good". They used different methods of attraction of the listeners attention right up to the humorous fables of a missionary M. Chevalkov about the ridiculous pagan customs (Orthodox Messenger 1894:8/). Of course such things could be allowed only outside of the service. But missionaries thought that as "substitutes are necessary for the food" as "we must adapt to the psychology of a hearer, as if to vest an idea in a proper gown, that will be essential not only for the idea but also and for the hearer" (Lipsky 1910:4,5; the italic type is ours). A Non – Russian would visit such discussions and stay for a while, will listen to the stories of missionaries and folk songs, the strings of his soul will sing and now he goes to a missionary to ask for a hagiography to read it at home (Orthodox Messenger 1898:6/260). And maybe he will go to a church and will be baptized soon.

Adaptability and resourcefulness of certain missionaries was amazing: it happens that a missionary plowed together with a new converted preparing him for a christening or went to a pasture together with families of deer-herds to teach their children.

A missionary sent his interpreter to one Altai man who wanted to be baptized and lived far from a missionary camp in order to prepare him for the christening. It was the season of work. The Altai man ... was at the ploughed field all day long ... How to unite these things together? The interpreter found the way to do it; the plowman is plowing and the interpreter goes after him ... the plowman repeats the prayers and the interpreter prompted him ... Lunch time. The plowman is eating and the interpreter tells him about the Christian Truth, some things from the Holy history or explains a prayer ... thus two areas are being cultivated: material and spiritual (OMS 1893:64).

We must note that not all OMS missionaries were known for such mobility, even in XX century there were heads of missions that thought the "a mountain" doesn’t go to "Mahomet", he himself should come to it.

Did such a flexible service work contradict the Orthodox conception of importance of the Liturgy, the temple and the centripetal scheme of a mission? No. The Russian Orthodox Church built a lot of chapels, churches and temples on the territory of Tsarist Russia. The Eucharist was conducted in any place administering the natives to the Body of Christ and making the Body – Church of them. It organized local eucharistic communities and brought Non – Russians –
Christians to the Universal (Catholic) Church. OMS missionaries combined both schemes in their work: centripetal and centrifugal. But as a rule, centrifugal mode of work was an intermediate (supplemental) variant for organizing permanent centers of the mission that worked according to the centrifugal scheme. The mobility of Orthodox missionaries was approved by a canonical principle of the church reception of culture (see Fedorov 1999:13; ROC Synod 1995:5) more known as contextualization of the mission. Such a method is not something new, Jesus Christ was the first contextualizer who took the human body, Apostle Paul formulated this missionary rule in his letter to Corinthians (1Cor. 9:20-23). In mission of ROC Paul’s words were heard as: “to the Buryats like a Buryat” (Yastrebov 1899:9). The principle of church reception of culture is the result of the Orthodox concept of the Church Catholicism that means “an appropriate possibility of cultural, liturgical and theological variety” (John (Popov) 1995:18) with an obligatory internal unity (see Zenkovsky 1923:41; is cited in John (Popov) 1995:19).

Considering the documents about the ROM revival that have been collected by Archpriest Fedorov (see Fedorov 1999:3-22; 40-50 and others), the modern orthodox mission, also offers to take into account the peculiarities of different contexts: a) non – Orthodox b) non - Christian c) urban d) rural e) youth etc. (see Fedorov 1999:13; ROC Synod 1995:5).

4.4.5.7 Mission and deaconry

The Orthodox missionaries never forgot to help the wards in their needs. OMS documents show us the selflessness of missionaries who gave their last money to needy Non – Russians (see The report of Tomsk eparchy missions 1892; Orthodox Messenger 1893:18/67).

The state, ROC and Orthodox Missionary Society financed their social programs, but there were not enough subsidies from the center (see Dionisiy 1905:57). That is why one of the main goals of the mission directors was to find funds for the construction and maintenance of
shelters for old people, beggars and homeless people, hospitals, almshouses, doss-houses, charity dining-rooms and children’s houses (see Nikolsky 1895:89,143)\(^3\).

For example a hospital at the catechetical school in Biisk, a shelter for children of both sexes at the Nikolaevsky women monastery in Ulal, almshouses on the territory of Transbaikalia mission, dormitories for students of the catechetical school in Biisk, dormitories for 6 Gold schools in Kamchitka mission and in Bukonsky camp of the Kirghiz mission (Tomsk eparchy) and in some other places (Никольский 1895:89; the italic type is ours) belong here.

The world missionary practice also included the medical assistance to natives. The knowledge of medicine always helped the missionaries in evangelization of population. The names of such doctor-missionaries and missionary-doctors as Hudson Taylor, Helen Rosewier, Idda Skadder, Carl Baker are in the annals of the missionary history. At the beginning of the XX century the medical missions became independent because of the particular specialization (see Taker 176,242-247,315-336 and others). The non – Russian mission of ROC had missionaries who combined missionary activity with medical practice and professional doctors who worked at the hospitals of OMS. OMS missionaries clearly understood that:

The medical knowledge and medical treatment attracts the non – Russians to a missionary and wins their favour for Christianity; and also turned them away from shamans and lamas, who possessing some medical knowledge (very often doubtful) take non – Russians in their iron hands. ... Just one rumor that a Russian lama is a doctor makes everybody who needs medical help go there. ... not only the Buryat people, but sometimes lamas. Cases when grave illnesses were cured (God’s will) attract non – Russians to a missionary even more (see the report of missions of Tomsk eparchy 1892; Orthodox Messenger 1893:18/67).

Non – Russians were especially surprised that missionaries were not afraid to treat infectious diseases, while the relatives of a patient didn’t risk to come closer to the sufferer (see Dionisy 1905:60). Natives applied for the medical care with a great joy though the medical knowledge of Russian priests were not big. Considering it, they started to teach medicine in the Theological Seminary of Irkutsk (see Dionisy 1905:60-61). On the territories of non – Russians not only missionaries but also monasteries rendered medical assistance:

The Kondinskaya women community was founded in 1892 ... Sisters started their missionary activity among non – Russians and could win them over to their side and now non – Russians treat them kindly with love and trust them. In addition to enlightening discussions sisters of the community also make good ...

\(^3\) Money, bread, meat and milk could be a contribution (see Dionisy 1905:58).
through the medical care, food supplies and other help (see the report of Missionary Committee of Tobolsk 1895; Orthodox Messenger 1897:6/4).

There is no doubt that all kinds of charity organizations exerted "a wholesome influence on new converted non – Russians" and contributed to the mission activity (see Nikolsky 1895:89). But the social work attracted Orthodox missionaries not just because of it. And the fact that "the cause of conversion" of unbelievers into Christianity "if it is based on the hard ground, it will stimulate the rise of many permanent subsidiary institutions" (Nikolsky 1895:143) was not decisive. There were and there are still a lot of other factors in the Orthodoxy for the motivation to social work:

First, deaconry is its essence. For example the notion "The Liturgy after the Liturgy" (the second liturgy) (see Bria 1987:267; WCC 1977:6; Bosch 1991:210; Keshishian 1992:27 and others) always presupposed the Church will continue its ministry in the world. That is why "co-body" and "co-blood" to Christ during the Eucharist gives an impulse to "the eucharistic community" to share the joy with poor, sick and outcasts (see Keshishian 1992:28). And according to Bria without this identification with a naked and hungry person, the Eucharist doesn’t mean anything (Bria 1976:185; 1987:267). "A vertical line" of man’s fellowship with God in the Eucharist must be finished with "a horizontal line" of the ministry to the world. This notion is not something new in OC, considering the social orientation of the Ecumenical discussion, it was just "a new growth from a very old root" (Bria 1976:182).

Second, The Orthodox Church as the Church of "all things" and cosmocentral Church-Kingdom considers itself responsible to God to exert influence on everybody and everything. That is why it doesn’t just look forward to the renewal of the Kingdom in the Universe and the reconstruction of all fallen creation in the future (see Keshishian 1992:29), but also tries to bring it in right now through the Church, that was sent to the world for the transformation and consecration of creation (:29). Considering this question there is no questions of minor importance, "not spiritual" work for OC. This is the principle of Byzantium that always passed its spiritual experience and civilization to the converted people.

Third, the social work for the Orthodoxy is not just the element of the testimony as in the Protestantism, but the mission itself. As everything that bears the stamp of Church is the mission.
Fourth, the suffering of the soul has been always a typical feature for the Orthodox East. Most likely this motive is the main engine for the most part of the Orthodox Christians, who is far from scholastic arguments of theologians.

Fifth, the question of personal salvation is inseparable from the doing of good deeds. Here a careless Christian risks not to lose the crown or some stones from a diadem in the Heavenly Kingdom, but he might not find himself in the Kingdom at all.

On the assumption of these notions, a special attitude towards the social assistance to non – Russians of Siberia and other regions from the side of the missionaries of Orthodox Missionary Society is quite natural and is the essence of the Orthodoxy. This is the deaconry of Church, its Liturgy after the Liturgy.

4.4.5.8 The parties of russianizers and contextualizators among OMS missionaries – who baptizes more?

It is known that every missionary measures the success of his mission with the number of baptized people. But it is not fair to evaluate ROC mission using such indices because there were a lot of religious rites and the baptizing of infants. Nevertheless we will try to do it.

Judging by the reports of the Orthodox Missionary Society, only for the period between 1870 and 1893 the missions of OMS “enlightened though the holy baptism” 103,531 people. But in some areas the results of work were extremely unequal. The best situation was in Irkutsk (38,965 people were christened) and Altai (10,896 people were christened) missions, the worst situation was in Orenburg Eparchy (only 66 people were christened) (see Никольский 1895:132-137,141; compare Smirnov 1904:66-67). Though the large number is not always the index of quality.

What was the reason of such different results? Of course missions were in unequal local conditions, there was the age difference and it means that in some places there were more experience than in others, more or less spiritually gifted people were at the helm of missions. But it was just one side of the question, the question is still can’t be settled. If we go deeper into the
question, we will see that the success of some missionaries and the failure of others were in the
different interpretation of the mission.

Brothers! - It would be natural if the activity of the apostle of language and the example of St.
иноко витие should convince every missionary as Apostle Paul did in the Areopagus of Athens. But through
some strange misunderstanding till now there is a striking difference of opinions not only among common
missionaries but also among leaders. (Yastrebov 1899:4; the italic type is ours).

The point is that in spite of the wide contextualization of OMS, among the orthodox missionaries
there was a fight between two interpretations and two practical approaches to the missionary
activity. Let’s call them “parties” of contextualizers and russianizers.

The adherents of the first group stood up for the principle to be everything for everybody
(1Cor. 9:20-23) as Apostle Paul and Innokenty (Veniaminov). For the enlightenment of pagans
they should “condescend to knowing their language and ideology” in order to “enter their soul,
take their ideas as present and develop them till the truth of God’s revelation” (Yastrebov 1899:4,
1-2; the italic type is ours). They said that first they should reach the consciousness of a non –
Russian through the translated Word of God and understandable sermon and after accustom him
to the settled Russian culture and civilization or do it at the same time. One of the adherents of
this theory is Kharlamovitch K. In his book “About the missionary translations to the non –
Russian languages” he gives a lot of examples in defence of the priority of the sensible faith and
not of the thoughtless rassification. In his opinion such an approach answers more the Spirit of
the Scriptures and will be more fruitful for receiving Christ and strengthening in the faith. And
the adherents of the rassification may not worry because the rassification will take place anyway
but a little bit later and will be even stronger.

Uniting ... by faith without the same language leads to the unity in spirit, then – in nationality and
certainly ... will be concluded with the unity in language: history and experience is witnesses (:13), ... Or we
should wait ... till ... all the Buryat people still without the truth faith - will become rassified and suddenly
will receive the Russian faith with pleasure (:14). ...Isn’t it better [if they] will become Christians in their
language, Russians by faith, by spirit, zealots of conversion of their congener? Even if it happens in Buryat
language! ... Because how could they believe of they don’t listen to, how could they understand if the sermon
is in the unknown language? (:16). ... As for the fear that it will delay the rassification or secure Buryat faith
then the answer to this question has already been given above (:20) (Kharlamovitch 1904:13,14,16,20; the
insert and italic type are ours).
As you can see from the text the question whether to russianize or not is not brought up, there is just a discussion the order of working points. That is missionaries of both parties, according to the Byzantine way of thinking, thought that as a result non – Russians should assimilate a lot of knowledge and culture of Russian nation. As we know exactly with this purpose neophytes were taken from their pagan relatives and settled in special Christian villages where only converted non – Russians and pious Russian Orthodox families lived.  

Of course the situation wasn’t ideal from the modern missionary point of view: 1) it was considered that the non – Russian nomad way of life cannot be compared with Russian Christian settled culture; 2) nations along with gaining of many advantages still lose their national face. You can’t measure everything by the bushel of the modern day, probably the methods of the past ages were correct for that historical situation.

How many OMS missionaries can act like this? ... Names of such preachers of Gospel “are remembered forever, are honoured reverently and some of them are given honorary title of “the apostle of so-and-so tribe, or people” (Yastrebov 1899:2; the italic type is the author’s).  

In comparison with the described above party of missionaries-contextualizers, it will be difficult for a Protestant to understand the logic of missionaries-russificators. The adherents of this missionary theory thought that non – Russians should listen to the Word and the Liturgy in “the perfect and holy” Old Slavonic language, and thus they will learn the Russian language and become russified. Then they will be able to assimilate Russian faith and the Russian state system. “Let them become russified as soon as possible: it will strengthen them in their faith and their children will know nothing Buryat: neither faith, no language”. According to the bishop Veniamin of Selenga to introduce the service in non – Russian languages “means to support artificially ... the affection” of non – Russians for everything national and pagan. “If we leave them to be Buryats then we will have to find new missionary methods for each future generation” (The case of the Holy Synod Archive 1869:#1805/II/235-237; is cited in Yastrebov 1899:5; the italic type is ours). This is the point. The Orthodoxy in the person of some “thinkers” (see Fedorov 1999:31) could bring to the world such an inverted logic.

---

A principle that is used in the world missionary practice; John Elliot with his “praying cities” of Massachusetts Indians of XVII century at once comes to the mind(see Tucker 1998:77).
“Thirty years have passed since they started to use in practice these two systems: the one allows the non—Russian language and the one that doesn’t allow it in the Christian service. The experience of thirty years shows clearly” (Ястребов 1899:5-6) who won. Missionaries-contextualizers had a great success in their activity, whereas missionaries-russifiers complained that their things are “quite wretched”. Let’s compare some documents of missionary chronicles. The first quotation tells us about the work in Altai mission that used a lot of different methods for attracting of non—Russians (right up to following the converted man while he is working).

The Christian life of new converted is bursting: non—Russians highly esteem the Christianity, fast every year, like churches and services as their own and understandable, make up their own Christian prayers, some of them even write religious and moral articles; ... they formed guardianships, make donations for hospitals, almshouses, schools ... support missionaries on their money ... the schools are overcrowded (Ястребов 1899:5-6; the italic type is ours).

The following sad news are from missions that still think whether to introduce the Services in national languages.

Missionaries are complaining that baptized Buryats have two beliefs or sometimes three beliefs; they don’t feel much excited about the Holy Church and sacraments; ... they hide their children from being christened, take part in pagan ceremonies together with non christened; don’t have any moral rules and are ignorant in faith; don’t know prayers and can’t cross; if a missionary comes they try to escape as soon as possible (see the reports of Irkutsk and Transbaikalia missions 1897; from: Orthodox Messenger 1898:18,19/106-109; 1899:1/5,6). Looking at such new christened congregation, non christened Buryats despise them and don’t want to hear about the baptism (Ястребов 1899:5-6).

They don’t differ much from their pagan congers... don’t stop relations ... with lamas ... whom they ask sometimes for help, especially in the case of illness, ... they address witch-doctors and fortune-tellers, ... believe in evil eye and wasting disease... there are a lot of hard drinking and other vices ... (The report of Transbaikalia mission; from: OMS 1895:61).

In some parishes there are hundreds of Cheremis families that remain non christened and a great number of christened fall away from the faith and keep on falling in the paganism ... there are groves for praying almost in every village of republic ... where they gather and make pagan sacrifices, slaughter ... horses, cows, sheep and poultry. This is an unattractive picture of religious life that is aggravated more because some priests conceal the truth about the real state of thing in their parishes (Мироновский 1903:11-12,16).

The situation is not the best that could be and everything is because “Buryats were totally ignorant of the faith they have been converted to” (Ястребов 1899:6-7; the italic type is ours). According to Ястребов eight out of ten missionaries don’t know the Buryat language and “use the ignorant interpreters” and “Buryats don’t understand anything in Slavic service” (as many Russians though). “A person, christened against his will is divided into two or sometimes three parts” receiving everything: a cross, an amulet from a lama, and a piece of sacrificial meat from a
shaman (:6-7). Mironositsky also thinks that one more reason of spiritual decay of the flock is that “majority of priests gave up teaching the Word of God and reading of the Holy Scriptures, some priests don’t even have a Bible at home not talking about the Holy Scriptures” (Mironositsky 1903:23). But even now “the striving of a lost soul that is still a Christian by nature” is seen (Yastrebov 1899:9).

This is how two missionary strategies worked. The conclusion suggests itself: it is better to christen a person who realizes what he is doing and to hand him some elements of culture than to inculcate all the culture together with fate and to wait till the grandchildren of wild natives will be reclaimed. But soon the ranks of the adherents of the russification theory among OMS missionaries were thinned out.

If we come back to the statistics of OMS from 1870 till 1899 and put together all the efforts of missionaries of both parties and then will divide 124 204 christened people by 30 years of work, we will find out that every year the Russian Orthodox Church got 4 140 non – Russians (see statistical tables in Smirnov 1904:66-67; compare Nikolsky 1895:142). Only God knows how many real sincere conversions and how many conversions of infants and just ritual rites were there. And only God can judge was it much or little for such a big missionary field as the Russian Orthodox Church had.

4.5 The difficulties of the third period mission

We complete the survey of ROC mission in the third period where the policy, methods of work and achievements of OMS missionary activity in XIX-XX centuries were examined. But during this historical excursus we haven’t talked a lot about the difficulties that orthodox missionaries had at the local level. It is high time to fill in this gap. There is no mission without great effort, this is a permanent process of breaking the resistance and pressure of the inward and outward environment. It has been always this way. Now we are going to enumerate without a detailed analysis the outward factors that prevented the success of the ROC missionary activity in the third period.
Do you remember the difficulties in conversion of non-Russian tribes in XVI-XIII centuries, when during a short period of time Russia added huge territories to its area? The problems of those years were similar to the difficulties of the examined period:

- One factor we have already discussed in the previous paragraph. *It was the absence of understanding between OMS missionaries.* The struggle between missionaries-contextualizers and missionaries-russifiers prevented them from using all progressive methods everywhere.

- *The immense territories* of missions and eparchies “where the Orthodox people are scattered away and some missionaries can’t visit their wards more than one or two times a year” (Dionisiy 1905:15).

- *The sparseness* of nomad camps:

  To make the round of 15 villages of one parish, make a discussion in each, then to go to the other parish, then to the third ... Will there be any use of it? ... Sometimes it will be more useful to talk with a single person (Mironositsky 1903: 18-19; the italic type is ours).

- *The variety of languages, cultures and religions* of nations that at times meet new “Russian faith” with hostility:

  Lamas ... forbade to be engaged in farming, they developed the doctrine about the removal of souls, according to it was forbidden even to pull up any plant (OMS 1893:55-56). *They turned down a Christian wedding* under different pretexts, ... “how to get married? - ... if a wife won't have children, I will stay childless and I can’t take another wife” (OMS 1893:59). ... not many people enter into a lawful marriage ... they don’t think it a sin to live together without a marriage according to the nomad customs (OMS 1894:9). They avoid marriage with the blessing of the Church ... some marry pagan women and call them stryapki, their children stay non christened ... Their tradition is *not to christened a new born child as long as possible* because of a pagan superstition ... when nobody is allowed to enter a house where a child was born for a period of one or two years. ... Till now these Christians use to hide their children from being christened by means of registering them in the families of pagans (OMS 1893:54-55).

- *The down level of development and culture* of non-Russian tribes:

  Pagans have *unsanitary customs and superstitions* ... Doesn’t matter where, even in the middle of an ulus, if an animal was killed with a lightning, a dais on 4 columns was made and the killed animal was put there... and rots there during the whole summer (OMS 1893:67; the italic type is ours). ... The cases of *leaving dead people in the open place* just digging them in the ground for several vershoks (OMS 1891:167;
the italic type is ours). ... Kalmyks ... wash their faces very seldom and almost never wash themselves ... underwear is not changed till it is worn out, the outer clothing is interchanged from winter to summer clothes and vice versa (OMS 1891:168; the italic type is ours). ... Astrachan Kalmyks ... preserved the patriarchal nomad way of life and slave-holding relations between classes (OMS 1891:169; the italic type is ours).

- **The absence of the written language** except for Tatars. OMS missionaries had to not only translate the Holy Scripture and other literature but also create an alphabet and grammar for every non—Russian tribes. Thanks to the work of Russian missionaries now almost all nations of Russia have written language on the basis of Slavonic alphabet.

- **The lack** of educated missionaries.

- **The lack of missionary institutions**: missions, missionary camps, schools, hospitals, shelters and other social institutions.

- **The shortage of funds**, lack of books, study aids, utensils, temples.

- **Awful behavior of Russian colonists** of every stripe on non—Russian territories, that were “a temptation” for non—Russians.

   The influence of the biggest part of Russian population on Siberian non—Russians ... is pernicious as before 1) Russian merchants, manufacturers and different kulaks see in non—Russians not people but “creatures”, oppress them in every way possible, deceived them with purchase and sale, couple and corrupt them (Orthodox Messenger 1896:21/100,101; compare 1895:12/191-195). ... Some of geeks of Russian population set non—Russians against Orthodox priests and missionaries (1896:4/274,275). 2) crowds of fanatics-schismatics, sectarians, ... with a sermon about the Kingdom of antichrist that has come, throw into confusion with senseless self-torture and sometimes self-incineration (1899:19/84,85) ... [their number] in some areas of Siberia twice is much than the number of native inhabitants (1893:5/91,92). 3) deportation of different state criminals ... who infect non—Russians morally and physically (1899:19/84,85) (the italic type and insets and numeration is ours, the orthography is not changed).

- **“the fear of non—Russians to lose former rights and benefits and also — to suffer indignity, oppression and revenge from their pagan congener and especially from the pagan authorities”** (Dionisiy 1904:99; the italic type is ours).

   The christened people became the object of systematic persecution from the direction of pagan authorities. Buryats used to say that to cross oneself before the authorities is the same as to hang oneself; they
will trample you to death (Nikolsky 1895:119). Receiving the Christ, a non-Russian ... has to lose his land right, to become a kind of social outcast (:123).

- The problems of missions with Moslem people were the same that all missionaries in the world experience. It is polygamy, the en-slaving situation of women in the family and society, a close connection inside clans and the impossibility to overcome all the difficulties in one generation. In many cases missionaries and ROC Synod found a reasonable way out of a stalemate. But it didn’t turn out well in all cases. Here is one of such examples:

  Kirghiz of trans-Ural horde – Karmiza ... nun Manefa ... after having become a Christian ... started to spread Christianity among her congers (see Orthodox Messenger 1893:17) ... she thought about receiving “a Russian faith” because of extremely difficult conditions of family life ... The Christian doctrine, preached by Kabinova found its way to the hearts of miserable Kirghiz women, who were oppressed by their husbands. ...[Karmiza] personally submitted an application ... to the Empress “to permit Orthodox priests to marry christened Kirghiz women with Orthodox, without the consent of their ex-husbands – Muhammadans” ... The Holy Synod “admitted the right to marry an Orthodox husband, in spite of the will of former husbands – Muhammadans” (Nikolsky 1895:112; the insert and the italic type are ours).

- Missionaries have to work as a parish pastors, “they spend not much time enlightening pagans” (Dionisiy 1905:15). As a result of lack of parish pastors “missionaries were forced to be in charge of very big parishes”. Moreover missionaries have to settle a lot of economic questions, to do all clerical work. “Thus missionaries are concentrated on doing not the work they were called to do ... They spend on missionary activity only what is left” (Orthodox Messenger 1900:11/116-117; is cited in Dionisiy 1905:16).

- “since the time of declaration of toleration on the human principles, the state is half free from the Church and temporal power considers the Orthodoxy to be the matter of minor importance” (Bogdanovitch 1911:24; the italic type is ours).

  They don’t even want to give us a guard for our religious processions, and just forbid them when raging rebellious non-Russian demand it. Our mission is deprived of the right to struggle against hostile to the Orthodoxy opinions. ...[they want us] to become ... zealots of a duty and be in the fight with the nature without any funds (Bogdanovitch 1911:24; the insert and the italic type are ours).

- The rules of letting non-Russians to be christened were not perfect and sometimes made the christening impossible for certain social non-Russian groups of population.
1) When they want to christen pagan children who are orphans, it is very difficult to get the necessary assent of tutors as the rules require because it is impossible to find parents or tutors of a young Kalmyk who has been left in a steppe because of the poverty or his being sick (Nikolsky 1895:103-105). 2) To ask parents who consider the Christian faith false and who are set against it for an assent to christen their children means to ask for the impossible and to close the doors of Christianity to the children younger 14 years old. 3) Local authorities who are for the most part idolaters and fanatics, must witness that a non – Russian receives the new faith of his own free will and for sure will do everything to prevent a pagan taking baptism. Moreover the Russian Orthodox Priesthood has never given rise to unfavorable criticism for forcing non – Russians to be baptized (Nikolsky 1895:103; the italic type and numeration are ours).

The list of problems is not full but it covers the main problems that OMS missionaries faced every day. “But though it is difficult work to preach the Gospel among pagans and the influence of a sermon over pagans is slow and weak – zealous missionaries trust in God’s help, don’t despair but do their ministry with patience and love” (Dionisiy 1095:16).

4.6 The evaluation of the third period from the ecclesiological point of view

May we call the Russian Orthodox Church the church of “stiffness and backwardness” that has never had a mission possessing the information about non – Russian mission of the ROC third period? Of course not. Everything that was done by OMS missionaries, and such individuals who preached the Gospel as Innokenti Veniaminov, Makariy Glukhwarey, Nikola Kasatkin is worthy to be admired and considered carefully. Moreover we should be thankful to God for it and imitate everything that is wise there.

It is clear that missionary activity of XIX-XX centuries it is the fruit of natural development of native missionary activity. ROC came to the conclusion that the methods of Salunskye brothers and Stephan of Perm are much more ancient and effective than the nationalistic policy of russification. But many sources give us information that Russian missionaries were not ashamed to learn from Catholics and Protestants, adapting their experience at the local level.

The mission of the Russian Orthodox Church in the third period looks like a giant of thought, organization and practice. This is a work of a mature ecclesia, an organism and also a church structure that is quite independent in its funds.
At this time it is not the state policy that determines the objectives and goals of the missionary activities as it was during the second period (XVI-XVIII). Mission stopped to be the lot of single individuals who take private initiative or who involuntarily spread the Gospel in search of a secluded place for the personal theosis as it was in the first period (XX-XV c.). In this period everything is connected: the Church work, the work of single individuals, Orthodox people and various social, commercial and state structures.

What was the role of outstanding missionaries of that time? We think that they “didn’t discover America” so to say in the field of contextualizing, missionary activity in the Russian Orthodox Church. They used the previous experience of missionaries but they went on further. The experience of Church mission had an influence on them and in their time these missionaries enriched the missionary practice, strategy and organization and became a shining example for others. It is possible that if they had been born earlier, they wouldn’t have worked so productively, their consciousness would not had been ready to apprehend many progressive methods. But they always had their chance to become such a missionary as Stefan of Perm of their time. Personal virtues, talent and deep devotion to God played a vital part in the success of the mission of Ivan Evseevitch Popov-Veniaminov and Mikhail Yakovlevitch Glukharev. They loved Christ with all their hearts and reached their theosis all the time. The orthodox mission is impossible without it. This was the meeting of time and a personality transformed into the image of Christ.
PART 5: THE FOREIGN MISSION OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

It would be incorrect not to include in our survey the missionary activity of ROC in foreign states because the representation of ROC would be not complete. The question if any denomination tried to preach the Gospel in other countries is still of interest for missiologists in spite of the fact that the narrow notion of a mission has sunk into oblivion long ago.

5.1 ROC mission beyond the bounds of its canonical territory

This part is of special interest for us because China, Japan (see Platonova 1916), Korea (see Augustin (Nikitin) 1993:133-147), Vietnam (Grigorieva 1993:147-151) and other states (see Smolitch 1996:385-388) where ROC had its missions were not the canonical territory of the Russian Orthodox Church. Therefore ROC had no responsibility to do missionary work on other territories especially since it has its own “field” and a very big one. Didn’t it looked as a “proselytizm” that ROC condemns (Fedorov 1999:34-39,54-56 and others) because it respects other believes and cultures (if they are not other Christian denominations on the Orthodox territory)? What made it found new missions in the country of the rising sun and others? Was the foreign mission of ROC a regular or a casual event? What goals did the ROC mission have? Was it an independent ecclesiologlcal structure or a diplomatic adjunct to the Russian State?

In the next part ROC church in China will be examined as the earliest, longest and the most arranged out of all foreign missions of Russian Orthodox Church. Unfortunately the mission of Николай Касаткин in Japan will be just mentioned. To highlight key points in such a way seems to be the most acceptable for the author of this work.
5.2 Russian Spiritual Mission in China

5.2.1 Preface

In 2001 there will be 285 years since the first ROC mission, that had been founded under Peter the Great (1682-1721), came to Peking. It should be noted that Russian Spiritual Mission (further on RSM) didn’t stop its activity as it often happened in missionary work, but successively during XVIII-XX centuries (see Bogolioubov 1993:5) till it was closed by Russian Orthodox Church that was under communists’ thumb. As it was beyond the bounds of USSR, it managed to “hold on” longer than all other ROC missions. During the time of the existence of RSM (1715-1956) its staff has been changed twenty times. A missionary team formed in St. Petersburg out of trained volunteers who were ready to spend the next ten years of their lives in a foreign country.

But Russian missionaries didn’t go to China for the first time. Over two hundred years under Tsygan dynasty the Nestorian church had been preaching here that by XIII century had “27 patriarchs and 200 bishops under their direction” (see Tucker 1983:45,63;1998:35; Gelmont 1896:2/88).

In 1294 (or 1289) a Franciscan friar John from Montecorvno who christened thousands of converted people and who built a Christian church a Peking came here after a successful completion of the mission in Persia (see Gelmont 1896:2/90; Kane 1983: chapter IV). Non Christian regents expelled uninvited preachers from their countries for fear that the Christianization will destroy the local culture and state system. But in spite of this fact all orders of Catholic Church could be found in Japan and China. In XVI century a great contextualizator – Jesuit Matteo Richi, masked as a Confucian scientist preached here (see Tucker 1983:63-66; 1998:52,452).

---

36 Bogolioubov Mikhail Nikolaevich (born in 1918) – a professor and academician, full member of Russian Academy of Sciences. The dean of the faculty of Oriental Studies of St. Petersburg State University (see Bogolioubov 1993:158).

37 However Stephan of Perm (XIV century) has been using the methods of contextualization before Matteo Richi.
Russian Orthodox Christians came to this land in one hundred years. Russian Spiritual Mission in Peking was developing and we can surmise that people working there could meet a famous Hudson Tailor (XIX c.) and watched missionaries of Internal Chinese Mission working (see Tucker 1983:173-188,304f; Tucker 1998:161-167,173,176,293). Later on Russian missionaries would work at the same time with Catholic and Protestant missions.

There is a lot of literature about the Chinese mission of the Russian Orthodox Church because this organization was engaged in various kinds of activity and wasn’t limited to the religious field. It also worked in political, commercial, economic, scientific and cultural fields. It had pastor responsibilities among the not numerous Orthodox population of Peking, spread Orthodoxy among Chinese people, translated Christian canonical literature and scientific surveys, that laid firm foundations of native and world sinology. In addition to that RSM also was an instrument of diplomatic work (right up to the opening of the Russian embassy in Peking) and rendered Russian government a priceless service (see Bogolioubov 1993:5; Kichanov 1993:35; see Veselovsky 1905:1; is cited in Novgorodskaya 1993:9). Due to these factors RSM activity was examined in full measure.

Before analyzing the mission of the Russian Orthodox Church in China, we have to look at its background, which will help us to understand the character of its work. It is necessary to consider all historical periods of ROC in China because the activity of Peking mission was unequal in different historical periods and different methods were used there. Did Russian missionaries try to russianize their flock? Or did they use all achievements of Russian non-Russian mission and form the national church with the understandable Liturgy and Chinese priesthood? Did the interests of the State go with the interests of the Church? What kind of relations did RSM have with Chinese government, local religious leaders, other Christian missions (Catholic and Protestant) in the world where it had no great power? The Russian

---

38 There are a lot of articles in Russian written by native sinologs. Western science didn’t fall abreast. For example Eric Widmer (1976) wrote a monograph in 262 pages, and Kenneth Latourette (1929) wrote 7 monographs of 600 pages (see Volokhova 1993:27). Some works of scientists of Russian Peking Mission were translated into other languages and are known abroad.


40 Novgorodskaya Natalia Yurievna (born 1958) works at the Institute of the Far East, RAS, at the centre “Russia-China” (see Bogolioubov 1993:158).
Spiritual Mission in Peking can be proud of the whole group of outstanding religious figures and men of science, but we will tell you only about one of them – Reverend Gurij.

5.2.2 Historical periods of Russian Orthodox Mission in China

There are different variants in the RSM history division. For example Н. Адоратский, the author of a monumental work “Orthodox mission in China for 200 years of its existence” that is based on a large variety of sources, thinks that there were two periods and their border is 1745, the beginning of the fourth mission. In one of his articles he argues for his point of view because exactly at that time the reports of RSM started to be more correct and they also started to work in diplomatic and scientific fields (see Adoratsky 1888:1/155-156; is cited in Sarkisova41 1993:17-18,22). But the author of this work thinks that it would be better to divide the history into five periods as Father Victor – the last head of RSM had offered. We will use it in our work.

5.2.2.1 The first period: assimilation of Albazins (1685-1728)42

Though Russian Spiritual Mission in Peking will be set up later we can say with certainty that ROC mission in China started in 1685 with the capture of defenders of Russian fortress Albazin by Chinese troops. Cossacks began to penetrate into an unusual culture (see Ipatova43 1993:79-80). The first period was finished with a Kyahotinsky treaty of 1728 (or 1727) (compare

---

41 Sarkisova Galina Yurievna (born 1954) a research officer of the centre “Russia-China” of the Institute of the Far East, RAS (see Bogolioubov 1993:158).
42 The general information is given according to: Bogolioubov 1993:5-6; Novgorodskaya 1993:9; Augustin(Nikitin) 1993:38; Ipatova 1993:75; Kratkaya 1905:1 and many others.
43 Ipatova Aida Semenovna (born 1933) - Deputy director of the centre “Russia-China” of the Institute of the Far East, RAS. A specialist in China, the new Chinese history and the history of Russian-Chinese relations (see Bogolioubov 1993:158).
Новгородская 1993:11; Sarkisova 1993:17) that confirmed the right of Russians to have a Russian Spiritual Mission in Peking, and its representatives had been living there since 1715.

It was clear from the beginning that Russian missionaries didn’t come to China with an already existing plan of salvation of the Chinese nation and determined goals and strategy as Catholic and Protestant missionaries usually did. No. It happened constellatio⁴⁴ (due to the concatenation of circumstance) as it often happened in ROC mission. A famous historian Н.И. Veselovsky showed the point of it when he gave such a definition to the beginning of RSM: “Russian Spiritual Mission in Peking is an original institution, that appeared according to a historical chance” (Veselovsky Н.И. 1905:1; is cited in Novgorodskaya 1993:9).

Very often Christian faith was spread through captives. That is how the Chinese mission was started. At the end of XVII century at the time of armed conflicts in Amur area, Chinese troops took a Russian fortress Albazin. Chinese were very kind to their captives. According to the decree of Kansi Emperor at the north-east of Peking a Russian settlement was founded. The captives were given apartments and were married to Chinese women, registered in the Tzinsky regiment, paid a salary, and called them a “Russian sotnia”. In other words they had everything for normal life and natural assimilation.

But the Chinese Emperor didn’t want to “chinesianize” Russians and he gave them freedom to have their own faith. Moreover they were given a Buddhist joss-house as a present, that was consecrated in the name of Nikolay Wonderworker, whose icon they brought with them to Peking (see Augustin (Nikitin)⁴⁵ 1993:38). The Chinese called that temple “Locha myao” (“Russian temple”).

Father Maxim who was brought together with captive Russians was the first priest on Chinese land. “This meek pious pastor has been strengthening the native faith in congeners and winning Chinese people over to Christ with services, religious rites and sermons for more then 25 years” (Bogolioubov 1993:5-6). “His quiet, unnoticed ministry was of a great importance. He created the tradition of the Orthodoxy among Albazin people, his successors were just to support it” (see Melenty 1935:25; is cited in Ipatova 1993:80).

⁴⁴ (from Latin con – together and stella- a star) – a positional relationship of heavenly bodies in the figurative meaning – a concatenation of circumstances (see Gubsky 1994:564).
In the considered period the Russian Orthodox Church-Mission was at the starting point. Its enlightened activity can be described as *a centripetal mission of eucharistic community presence*. Its life is *concentrated around a temple*, flows because of *organic* not *organizational processes* and and sets as *an object a preservation* not an expansion. That actually agrees with the point of view of the Orthodox mission. RSM work at that time reminds us a little bit of the influence that cenobyes-colonialists exerted over Finnish tribes. RSM started to think over the purposefulness of the Chinese mission later.

In such a situation only very wishful and inquisitive Chinese people could hear about Christ. Nevertheless even this kind of activity had its results. According to N.U. Novgorodskaya “at the beginning of XVIII century Chinese people knew rather well what role the Christian religion played in the life of Russians (Novgorodskaya 1993:10). As it is written in the letter of Peter the great to A.A. Vinious (dated 1689) Orthodox Christians built a church in Peking and “many Chinese have already been christened” (is cited in Shatalov 1993:154). Peter the Great approved this undertaking and as a wise politician warned Russian pastors:

> Act carefully there and not very active not to make Chinese authorities mad, as well as Jesuits who had their nest there for a long time. Priest should be wise and easy-going not to destroy this sacred undertaking and turn it into a worst downfall (154; the stylistics and orthography didn’t change).

With this direction he predetermined the missionary strategy of the Chinese Orthodox Mission for many years.

At the same time Russian Orthodox missionaries “were combing” Siberia, steppes of Kalmykia and other regions looking for non Christened инородцев. It was the second period. In China everything was one step later, the time of centrifugal had not come yet. It should be expected, as nobody grows up in one day.

There were almost no connections with the native land and its state structures during the first period. It gave ROC of China a possibility to work as an ecclesia.

---

45 Archimandrite Augustin (Nikitin) (born 1946) – a senior lecturer of St. Petersburg Theological Academy. The author of articles on history of church connections of Russia and countries of Western Europe, the Near East and Far
5.2.2.2 The second period: science and diplomacy (1728-1861)

But the freedom of Albazin church without a political burden did not last long. At the beginning of XVIII century (probably in 1815) the archimandrite Илларий (Lezhaisky) came to China. He was sent “not only for spiritual support of Albazintzi” but also as a representative of the Russian state. He delivered to the Chinese Emperor a letter from Peter the Great⁴⁶ and was given for it a rank of mandarin of fifth level. This is the beginning of RSM and its diplomatic activity. The Kyaitinsky treaty of 1728 would consolidate more its position in the country of the rising sun. The mission would have this burden till 1894 (or 1961) when the Russian Diplomatic Mission would be founded in Peking (compare Ipatova 1993:80 and 79). In the considered period RSM had not only been working to establish ties between two states, it also did much for home and world science, did a lot of translations, didn’t forget about its Albazin people and according to RSM papers converted into Christianity several hundreds of Chinese.

It would be quite appropriate to illustrate every aspect that was characteristic for the second period.

5.2.2.2.1 RSM as a diplomatic resident and the Intelligence Service

As we have already mentioned above, the Orthodox Mission of China has acted as a diplomatic service for 150 years (see Bogolioubov 1993:7) and thus “made a significant contribution to the history of diplomatic relations of two great countries” (5). There was a need for it because there was no Russian resident in Peking.

[But] instead of him Russian archimandrite has the intercourse with the Tribunal; its members and other officials often come to Russian embassy court on celebrations and holidays to watch church rites and decorations. The archimandrite treats them with a dinner in order to create a good name for Russia and makes

⁴⁶ Peter the Great clearly understood the importance of having an Orthodox community in Peking and started to work in this direction in 1700 (see Bogolioubov 1993:6).
It is known that the RSM didn’t function only as an embassy in Peking but also was engaged in espionage. It was a real godsend for Russia to have such an “eye of Tzar”, a whole intelligence service there, especially at that time when China was closed for foreigners. For example, in XVIII century, in sixties when Russian commercial activity was forbidden in China, the RSM became “an only permanent and reliable source of information of what happened there. In their reports members of the mission … paid much more attention to the political news and intergovernmental relations” (Novgorodskaya 1993:14; see also Kichanov 1993:33).

At that time a new post was established there – an officer of Spiritual Mission. One of officials of Ministry of Foreign Affairs was designated for diplomatic service (see Skatchkov 1977:181-182; from Novgorodskaya 1993:14015). “According to instructions” of the officer of sixth mission V. Igumnov, students of RSM wormed “state secrets” out of high-ranking Chinese officials using their friendship and kept a register of secret actions, intentions, events and changes in Titzin state from 1772-1782” (Kolosov, Ivan. The continuation of Diplomatic Meeting between Russian and Chinese States from 1764 till 1796. Moscow: Lenin ОРГ Φ. #273, Card 27, #2, L. 209-209; is cited in Novgorodskaya 1993:14; the orthography is kept; the italic type is ours). Some “missionaries” were doing better. For example a certain A. Vladikin “through a lot of pains, secretly, with the help of one officer from the khan’s library” got “the plan of all Chinese state and the land of Mongolia” (IL.280; is sited from Novgorodskaya 1993:13). The maps were translated into Russian and were presented to Russian Emperor (see Skatchkov P.E. 1977. Historical essays of Russian Sinology. Moscow. P. 376; is cited in Novgorodskaya 1993:13).

The most interesting thing is that they managed to do it in spite of the strict censorship. Members of the mission had very good relations with Chinese officials of high rank and emperors because in the opinion of the latter, the RSM “wasn’t a political organization” (Adoratsky N. 1887:10-11; is cited in Sarkisova 1993:18).

Such a combination of missionary and political activity proves again that the ROC mission was not only an ecclesiologic, but also a political undertaking and these two fields are

47 Zimin Stephen is the clergyman of the RSM court in XVIII century.
connected. As the Orthodoxy believes that Church as Kingdom bestows its blessing on everybody and everything, than it is normal that its missionary activity includes elements unacceptable for the evangelistic mission (see part1). We can see some diplomatic and political elements in the work of Protestant missionaries. Mary Slessor was a Vice-Consul of Oikong tribe (see Tucker 1998:150) but she worked for the sake of the tribe.

During the second period RSM was engaged not only in espionage and diplomacy but also in the scientific work. Its verve and solidity are amazing. We are going to talk about it right now.

5.2.2.2.2 Translations

The Russian Spiritual Mission in Peking has been occupied with translations for a long time not only in the second (1728-1861) but also in the third period (1861-1900). There was nothing significant in this field of RSM activity during other periods.

During these years mission members have translated a lot of literature from Chinese and Manchurian languages to Russian and vice versa. There were three purposes of translations: scientific, missionary and diplomatic. Russian science got important documents about history, religion, culture and art of China. This knowledge together with numerous Chinese Grammar books and dictionaries were a perfect research material for the missionary activity of ROC and other denominations.

Evidently the leaders of Peking mission sooner or later wanted to christianize Chinese nation and the mission needed translations for assimilated Albazin people. The far-sighted leaders of RSM clearly understood that there would be a great need for translation of Christian literature if they wanted to preach the Gospel following the Cyril-Methodiy tradition. The preparatory stage for this work was the elaboration of different grammatics, dictionaries and other ancillary literature (see Samoilo\v{c} 1993:50).

---

48 Samoilo\v{c} Nikolay Anatolievitch (born in 1955) - a senior lecturer of the department of the Far East countries history of the Eastern Institute of St. Petersburg. The author of many works (see Bogolioubov 1993:158).
It is impossible to name all eminent people of Peking mission, and we will mention just some of them.

Stephen Vasilievich Lipovtsov (1770-1761) is one of the best known translators of the early period. When he was a student of the eighth mission (1794-1807), he made Manchurian-Chinese-Russian dictionary and translated the New testament in Manchurian language. English missionaries ordered him this translation "because among them there were nobody who knew Manchurian language well and who was able to do such work" (Pan49, 1993:122). This translation is still "the only translation of the Gospel to Manchurian language" (122,121-125; see Bogolioubov 1993:6-7).

Tatyana Aleksandrovna Pan also mentions that Illarion Kalinovitch Rossokhin (1707-1761) "used his translation of Manchurian grammar Show Pin" (is published in 1730) and it was its first translation to a European language (the English translation was made in 1855) (see Pan 1993:120). According to these facts we can assume that Russian translators held a leading position among different missions.

Iakinth (Nikita Yakovlevitch Bitchurin) a great sinolog of the ninth mission (1807-1821) wrote "Grammar of Chinese language" (see Bogolioubov 1993:7). A head of the thirteenth mission, a famous archimandrite Palladiy (Petr Ivanovitch Kafarov) completed his life-work – an unique "Big Chinese-Russian Dictionary". He also wrote a fundamental work on history of China, Mongolia and their religions, that made him famous (see Samoilov 1993:50; Bogolioubov 1993:7). Many translations were made "under his direction and with his active assistance" (Samoilov 1993:50). Contemporaries of Palladiy also did great job. A hieromonk Isaya (Polikin) (died in 1871) translated Prayer-book and Breviary (till 9th hour), made up Russian-Chinese dictionary of theological and church dicta and Chinese-Russian tonic dictionary (7700 hieroglyphs), worked out a Phrase-book and a Dictionary of spoken language (8000 words) for missionaries beginners and also a popular Brief Chinese Grammar. He also translated Confucian classical books (:50-51).

---

49 Pan Tatyana Alexandrovna (born 1955) – a junior research officer of Far-eastern textual criticism group of the branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies in St. Petersburg, RAS. Scientific interests: Manchurian philology, history of Manchurian studies in Russia (see Bogolioubov 1993:158).
Each next mission continued the work of their predecessors, separate Protestants could be only envious of this useful succession. The head of the sixteenth mission (1879-1883) Flavian (Gorodetsky) who liked the publishing activities, together with his co-workers: a hieromonk Alexy (Vinogradov) and Nikolay (Adoratsky) collected translations of Palladiy and Isaya and “made them perfect” with the help of Orthodox Chinese people. By common effort they also translated the Sunday services of Octoechoi into Chinese language (:51).

Clergymen of Peking mission understood that their translations would serve many people and worked carefully. It was a self-sacrificing and a high-quality job. Probably they even didn’t expect that their linguistic works would be of enormous demand. Due to the hieroglyphic character, Manchurian and Chinese translations were understood by people of Amur region, Korean, Japanese, Chinese and Manchurian population of Priamurje, Kamchatka and Siberia. Amur mission and other missions of OMS used these translations; they were sent to Innokenty (Popov-Veniaminov), to the bishop of Turkestan Alexander and to the bishop of Kamchatka Martinian (see addition to “Irkutsk Eparchial Bulletin” 1871:#32.p.631; Church Herald 1884 #46; Pilgrim 1887. V.1.p.629; is cited in Samoilov 1993:52-53).

It is generally known that Japanese Mission with Nikola (Kasatkin) as its head also received “the translation of the New testament to Chinese language, Short Holy History, Catechism and other books” from Peking. The bishop Nikola respected the works of RSM and considered it to be the mother of Japanese mission; without this mission “Japanese are inexperienced and dumb” (Nikolay (Adoratsky). 1887. The Orthodox Spiritual Mission in China for 200 years of its existence. Kazan. P.16; is cited in Samoilov 1993:52; see Bogolioubov 1993:8). The Russian Spiritual Mission in Seoul was able to convert Koreans due to the same translations (Samoilov 1993:52).

It was just a little excursus. Many interesting aspects of this work such as the training of translators in Russia and in the Mission, were not shown. It’s worth considering and evaluating the translation work of the Orthodox Mission, because they will produce a strong impression on every research worker.
5.2.2.3 The scientific, artistic and enlightenment activity of RSM

The scientific services and now arose respect, admiration and reverence (Reshetov 1993:117).

Scientific and translating activities of Chinese Orthodox Mission were closely connected. Very often their objectives intersected and they served to each other, the missionary work and Russian State, as the mission of the Russian Orthodox Church, the church of all panda (all things) should do (see part1).

These two aspects were typical for the second (1728-1861) and third (1861-1900) periods of RSM mission. The second period is important for us because it was the time when “the foundation for the native sinology was laid” and “a galaxy of brilliant scientists grew” (see Doronin50 1993:105; the italic type is ours).

A.M. Reshetov considers Iakinth (Nikita Yakovlevich Bichurin) (1777-1853) a translator whom we have already mentioned in the previous chapter (see Reshetov51 1993:107,108-109,110; Doronin 1993:105), to be a really “gigantic person” among the galaxy of Russian sinologs of RSM.

He did so much that now it looks fabulous, how could one man create so much. As if the whole research institute with qualified stuff worked there (Reshetov 1993:108).

The archimandrite Iokinth, the head of the ninth mission (1807-1821) had encyclopedic knowledge of China, he had a perfect command of Chinese, Manchurian and Mongolian languages. His scientific works in linguistics, history, religions, geography and ethnography are based on “classical Chinese primary sources” and on “deep penetration in the Chinese reality” (107-108). He took interest not only in ethnography and history of Chinese and Manchurian people, but also of Mongols, inhabitants of Tibet and Uigurs (108). His numerous works “are of great importance for the science” even now (108). Bitchurin was also a good artist. His

50 Doronin Boris Grigorievich (born 1928) - a senior lecturer of the department of the Far East countries history of the Eastern Institute of St. Petersburg. Reads lectures in history and ethnography of China. The author of works (see Bogoliubov 1993:157).
51 Reshetov Alexander Mikhailovich (born 1932) – a leading worker of Peter the Great’s museum of anthropology and ethnography. The author of articles (see Bogoliubov 1993:158).
drawings of Chinese way of life, clothes, utensils and portraits are “valuable ethnographic sources” (:109).

For a long time the Orthodox mission was a source and a school of “practical and scientific knowledge in all fields of sinology” (Bogoliubov 1993:6). “Many famous sinologists, ecclesiastics and men of the world have spent years in this school, learning languages and written languages, religions, morals, manners, customs, history, literature of people of the Far East” (:6). The first Russian professors of Chinese and Manchurian languages were among the priests and students of the mission. The academician M.N. Bogoliubov gives the whole list of them (:6).

Sometimes there were students of the Eastern Institute on the period of probation (see Khokhlov 1993:73) and several boys – translators for the merchants’ work of 12-16 years of age. The archimandrite Guriy dreamed to open a school of translators within the mission. Chinese, Manchurians and Albasin boys learnt Russian there (see Pan 1993:120; Khokhlov 1993:62-69). The level of teaching Chinese in Peking mission was rather high and probationers “got the satisfactory knowledge of written and spoken language in 2-3 years” (see Khokhlov 1993:69). But “the presence of the people of society” in “the RSM organization, that become more and more missionary” wasn’t very convenient. That is why the archimandrite Innokenti (Figurovsky) – the head of the eighteenth mission (1896-1931), “asked for assistance to release the mission from the responsibility incumbent” (АВПР. 1885-1899. Chinese table. Д.155, лл. 149-150; is cited in Khokhlov 1993:72). It is no wonder that he had such a request. Though ROC likes to serve the state, but the devout monastery solitude, that assists in reaching the theosis, must not be broken.

There was a rich library in the mission (see Kichanov 1993:32) including the rare collections of Sacred Buddhist books that had been given as a present by the Chinese Emperor (see Vostrikov 1962:123-130; Malanova 1979:2/44-45; is cited in Augustin (Nikitin) 1993:40). “A huge library of Portugal missionaries in China that had been collected during 200 years was

52 Khokhlov Alexander Nikolaevich (born 1929) a senior research officer of the Institute of Oriental Studies, RAS. Specialist in modern history of China, Russian-Chinese relations and history of native sinology (see Bogoliubov 1993:157).
53 “There is no such a copy in any of European libraries, 600 huge volumes! In China this thing costs 15,000 rubles in silver, and in Europe it is priceless. Such a thing can be found only in China and if you have a special favour of the Emperor!” (Guriy 1884:9/661; Augustin (Nikitin) 1993:40).
also kept there” (Kitchenov 1993:32). It was a good help for the scientific work of the mission. The Orthodoxy has been always noted for its love to books and knowledge.

There was one more aspect of work of the Orthodox mission in China—fine art. Father Ioakinth (Bichurin) wasn’t the only artist of RSM, he was just an amateur. In every missionary team there were professional artists (see Nesterova 1993:127,132). They decorated new cathedrals and chapels (:132), and we have already talked a lot about the importance of a temple and its decoration for ROC missionary activity (see part 1). The artists of the mission served as cameras or movie cameras making drawings of China, that were priceless from the ethnographical point of view. There are a lot of their works in the collections of Russian museums (:129). Heads of the mission often gave these paintings as presents to Chinese of high rank and doing this “gained an exceptional respect” (:130) of Chinese Emperor court (:131). Don’t you think it is an interesting diplomatic move, “the art brought together the representatives of different nations” (:132).

It is a pity that though the scientific works of RSM were “on a level with the world standard of sinology of those times and in some cases even higher”, and some of them “are still of great importance” (Doronin 1993:105), but they were not claimed by the Russian science of those times. Russian society of XVIII century preferred to draw information about China from the West” (see Widmer E. 1976. The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking during the Eighteenth Century. Cambridge. pp. 167; is cited in Volikhova 1993:29-30).

In conclusion we would like to note that scientific researches of RSM members were a great help for RSM missionary activity among Chinese population in the fourth period.

---

54 Nesterova Elena Vladimirovna (born 1956) - specialist in arts. Scientific interests: Russian-Chinese art connections (see Bogolioubov 1993:158).
55 Volikhova Alena Alexeevna (born 1934) - a senior research officer of Diplomatic Academy of MFA of Russian federation. A specialist in modern history of China, foreign policy of China and CNDR (see Bogolioubov 1993:157).
During the second mission period the situation was not always even, there were some troubles that mostly concerned "the Christians of the Roman Law". For example in 1768 Jesuits suffered religious persecution because some of high rank Chinese thought that "Jesuits converted [Chinese]nationals into their faith deceiving them" (Zimin [1773] 1993:23; the insert is ours). Usually they didn't disturb Orthodox mission because RSM having the orders of Peter the Great in mind, acted very carefully and at first sight worked only with Albazin people who "were Russian offsprings". Under this pretext "other Chinese and Manchurians went to the Church to listen to the Word of God without any problems" (:23; the orthography is kept, the italic type is ours) though it was strictly prohibited.

There in an interesting information about the activity of the fifth mission. Amvrosiy (Umatov) (1717-1771), the head of this mission carried out a policy of christianization "foreseeing all the circumstances in order not to give cause for any indignation or displeasure from the part of the court and people there" though the mission stuff can't be called the best⁵⁶ (see ABOC 1763-1798:op 2/1, #304. P.90; is cited in Sarkisova 1993:20-21).

During 17 years of Amvrosiy's work as an archimandrite 220 people from Manchurians and Chinese were christened but not in one year, 20 people in one year, 30 -- in other and in some year - nobody (Zimin [1773]1993:23; the italic type is ours).

Every christened person was given money from a treasury to buy "a cross and dress" for the ceremony of christening (:23). "The number of Chinese, converted into Christianity grew and there were some outstanding figures among them" (Samoilov 1993:50). Missionaries of RSM were very glad about it because for the mission to have followers from nationals means to have future. In light of it, archimandrite Palladiy wrote in one of his letters to Russia:

⁵⁶ «A hieromonk Silvestr drank a lot ... was greedy; a hieromonk Sofrony ... hung himself; a hierodeacon Sergiy ... was sent to Russia for his ungovernable behavior and hard drinking» (see Sofroniy-Gribovsky 1905:1/28; is cited in Sarkisova 1993:180; the orthography is kept).
Our mission gained a new proselyte for the Orthodox Church, a Chinese official with the surname Su, he was baptized ... I believe this gain is the most important and useful of all that our mission had for the last ten years; we hope that considering his character, devotion to the Orthodox faith and level of education, in the course of time he will be a good fellow-fighter for the mission (ЦГИА. Ф.797, Оп.53.И отд.3, ст. Еп. хр.436.Л.2; is cited in Самохин 1993:50; the italic type is ours).

In 1858 "By the treaty of Tyantzin, foreign missionaries were allowed to stay in the country and to preach Christianity freely" (Korostovets 1893:78). In connection with this decision, in 1859 the Holy Synod sent a special directive to archimandrite Guriy: "The activity of the Mission can be aimed at spreading the Orthodox faith among Chinese people" (78). Due to these circumstances, at the end of the second period, RSM enlightened people "in Peking and outside it". In the report of 1859-1862 it was said "in three years, generally not good for spreading the faith, 200 pagans of both sexes were christened" (Guriy 1864:1/504; is cited in Augustin (Nikitin) 1993:42; the italic type is ours).

Personal qualities of certain missionaries assisted to the success of mission: "kind and caressing treatment ... helped new christened. We can convert people to the Holy Faith with such treatment" (Zimin [1773]1993:23-24; the italic type is ours).

It is obvious that during this period of time, ROC mission served the Russian State and science, and only by implication it served the enlightenment. But it is difficult to decide if it was the right strategy. Without research work there would be no basis for future development of the mission, and without the diplomacy, Chinese regents wouldn't give Orthodox missionaries a "clear passage". Moreover the Orthodox Church continued its mission of presence that had the effect on Chinese population. ROC being a spiritual organism bore its fruit.

5.2.2.3 The third period: continuation of researching China (1861-1900)

We considered in details diplomatic, translating and scientific activity of Russian Spiritual Mission in Peking during the second period (1728-1861). But as RSM continued this activity and
in the third period (1861-1900) it was also included there. It was done to present the complete picture of the mission activity. We will not touch on the subject in this part of the work.

The third period of mission was similar to the second but now Orthodox pastors were not drawn away with the diplomatic and espionage activities. In 1861 a special Diplomatic Mission was established for this purpose. In 1863-1864 RSM “passed from the MFA department on the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod” (Samoilov 1993:49).

Now they had a chance to concentrate attention on their duties “concerning church, flock and schools” (ЦГИА. Ф. 796. Оп.158. Ед. хр. 810. Л.1; is cited in Samoilov 1993:49). It was impossible to enlarge the missionary activity a lot because the stuff and budget were greatly chipped, but the mission became more active.

Samoilov mentions that by 1864, 2 nationals – a priest and a catechist were the members of the Spiritual Mission (see Messenger 1864:1/33-34; is cited in Samoilov 1993:48). Probably one of them was a priest Mitrofan Tschichunya (Tzi) with whom in 1882 the archimandrite Flavian (Nikolay Nikolaevitch Gorodetsky) went to Japan to the bishop Nikolay Kasatkin to introduce him for ordination (Bogolioubov 1993:7). He was the first Chinese priest for 100 years of ROC in China. Father Tzi was very zealous in faith, helped a lot with translations, conducted services in Chinese. Due to this man there was a Liturgy in a native language already in the third period. He was entrusted with important tasks and when father Flavian left China “a religious perfection of the flock was incumbent upon a priest from Chinese people - father Mitrofan Tzi and his assistant - a catechist Pavel Va” (ЦГИА. Ф. 796. Оп. 166. Ед. хр. 2259; is cited in Samoilov 1993:51). Mitrofan was martyred during the days of “boxing revolt” (Bogolioubov 1993:7-8).

The mission activity went further, beyond the bounds of Peking. Services were conducted in Tyantzin city (ЦГИА. Ф. 797. Оп. 53. II отд. 3 ст. Ед. хр.436. Л. 1; is cited in Samoilov 1993:49-50), Hanckou, Urga, Kalgan, Fuchzhou, and in the village Dundinyan (ЦГИА. Ф. 796. Оп. 174. Ед. хр.2961. Л. 2 об - 3; is cited in Samoilov 1993:52).

Many research workers mention exactly this village. Isaya (Polikin) worked there, who converted a big group of Chinese and assisted to the construction of the Orthodox Temple (Samoilov 1993:50).

In accordance with its understanding of the mission purpose, where a temple and everything that happens there plays a key role (see part 1), RSM tried to build temples in China.
There were temples in Hanckou, Port-Arthur, Dalny (see Samoilov 1993:53) and in other places. Orthodox Chinese also subscribed for construction (see Gurij 1864: 1/504; is cited in Augustin (Nikitin) 1993:43).

Little by little the mission achieved a good pace of work. But political events changed the situation. Demolition of 1900 during the boxing revolt of (hetuans)\(^5\) is a “watershed in the work of the Mission”, and the end of the third period. Buildings of missions were destroyed, Orthodox churches in Kalgan, Dundinan, Beidikh and Northern yard of the mission were also demolished. The damage was so great that it was doubtful if the mission stayed there (see Ipatova 1993:75-76). “A unique library was destroyed in the fire. It had been collected carefully and patiently by the members of 18th mission”, “a valuable archive” of the Peking Mission was burnt too (:75; the italic type is ours). The members of the mission saved themselves in the Embassy buildings, but the Orthodox Chinese couldn’t do it. A young national Orthodox Church buried first Chinese martyrs – 222 people (:78), according to the other information there were 400 out of 700 (see Smimov 1904:84).

Does it tell us anything about the truth and profundity of a “foreign” faith they received, or does it tell us about the quality of spiritual work of RSM? There is a possibility that they just couldn’t escape and suffered as traitors of their nation. It looks like all these theories are right. But it is clear that by the end of the third period there was a local church and the blood of its members “became seeds” as it was under Tertulian.

It looked like everything was finished, and ROC mission will never rise from the ashes. But in 2 years, in 1902 the revival of RSM began. The Orthodox Episcopal cathedra was established in Peking, that had “a task to expand the missionary activity” (:76; the italic type is ours). As it is said in a Russian proverb “there is no evil without good”.

\(^5\) The boxing revolt or the revolt of hetuans – was organized by the society of hetuans (a fist in the name of justice and consent) and was directed at the foreign domination, though it had started as a popular uprising against Manchurian government and local landowners. It was put down by international armed forces (see Kharenberg 1994:820-821).
5.2.2.4 The fourth period: the heyday of missionary work and economics (1902-1917)

At this period Russian Peking Mission had nothing, the work of many years: temples, a unique library, archives were destroyed in a flash. But the most important and sad thing was that Christians – nationals – the future and the treasure of any mission were killed. It is not easy to start from nothing. Moreover the situation in Europe and on the East was not the best. It looked like “the world went crazy”, went to the bottom as “Titanic” (1912), Russian-Japanese war (1904); the horror of “the Bloody Sunday” and the revolution of 1905; the dethronement of the last Chinese Emperor Pu E (1912), national party Gomildan and the second revolution on China; the first world war (1914-1918); difficult relations between China and Japan, their struggle for the spheres of influence, Korea, “gripped in a vice”; the demise of Nicolay II, and the revolution of 1917 (see Kharenberg 1994:830-840). But in spite of difficult environment, RSM recuperated quickly and took the path of its heyday.

The establishment of the independent Episcopal cathedra in China by the Holy Synod in 1902 and “entrusting it with the task of expanding the missionary work” marked the beginning of this period. 1917 was the end of this period, when the line of mission changed, it devoted much time to Russian emigrants.

They didn’t expect money assistance or spiritual help from Russia, the country was involved in the war, but now RSM had a certain canonical independence. The head of the 18th mission (1896-1931) – the archimandrite Innokenty (Figurovsky) who was consecrated a bishop, was a person of exceptional ability. Thanks to this man the mission held out these difficult 35 years. Contemporaries described Innokenty as “a man of athletic looks and inexhaustible energy, an excellent scientist\(^{58}\), an erudite person with encyclopedic knowledge, a great orator and an good company (is cited in Ipatova 1993:76). Moreover he was a courageous man, didn’t give way to panic and gave hopes and certainty to others. His extraordinary leadership abilities, great talent for commercial and economical activity proved at the reconstruction and creating of a solid resource base for almost totally destroyed mission.

\(^{58}\) Innokenty (Figurovsky) was also the author of “Complete Chinese-Russian dictionary” (see Ipatova 1993:76).
For a short period from 1903 to 1917 the Mission was not only reconstructed but also expanded the field of its activity. It purchased and received as gifts from Chinese land lots in different cities and towns of China. In Peking a printing house, a mill, a candle factory were built or restored. The Bishop Innocent tried to make the Mission financially independent. With this purpose he opened a number of business enterprises, where for the most part Orthodox Chinese worked. By 1917 its financial capital was close to 1 mln. rubles (in gold) and was invested in Russian military loans (p.76-77; the italic type is ours).

It wasn’t for the personal prosperity of the mission, the profits from the business enterprises were used for “intensification and developing of missionary activity” (p.77). In the Peking mission they had everything that could be of interest for modern missiologists: preaching, enlightenment, training of national leaders and national service (see Churginsky 1993:59), the usage of earlier made translations and research works, social work, publishing houses and moreover the mission was self-supporting. It’s fantastic.

During this period RSM opened 22 missionary stations, 21 schools, various charitable funds (see Ipatova 1993:76). Two monasteries were founded in Peking (for men and for women), and also one seminary (see Chinese Messenger 1935:29; is cited in Ipatova 1993:77; the italic type is ours). During the Russian-Japanese war the Orthodox mission supported a military hospital and established “The community of Orthodox Church in China” (p.76). It published a magazine “Chinese Messenger”. Thanks to this magazine we know what was going on in the Mission (p.76).

The considered period coincides with the heyday of the Japanese and Non Russian missions on the territory of Russia. It was also the time of a fantastic development of missions of all denominations, in all continents of the world (see Kane, Neill, Tucker). What is it? A spirit of times or a natural process of development of the Orthodox Chinese Mission? What made Russian Orthodox Church tackle the matter of its missionary work with Chinese people in real earnest? Or is it God who through sufferings showed the mission the right way to set priorities?

We hope that on the basis of all aforesaid about the Chinese mission, we could suppose that each of risen assumptions are right. The RSM mission in the fourth period is a good work, the work of a mature ecclesiologic organism, that kept step with time and whose activity was based on the experience of previous years. The titanic work of previous generations on studying religion, culture and languages of China was not lost. In addition to that, such shocks from outside were often used in the Christian history to sober up the spiritual consciousness, to
renovate the faith and to serve God. And one more thing, "a man and time met" here again, as it was under Martin Luther.

5.2.2.5 The fifth period: emigrant service and the end of RSM (1917-1956)

The Chinese mission existed much longer than non-Russian missions on the territory of Russia. Soviet Authorities tried to finish off the Orthodox Church depriving it of its former power and prestige. But China was far away, the mission wasn’t under the jurisdiction of MFA anymore and it was almost financially independent episcopate. Yet 1917 had a big effect on the future of the Chinese mission. The military loans were cancelled, the mission lost the lion’s share of its income, and there were no money from Russia anymore. OSM had to change radically its status, directions, mode, objectives, goals and methods of work.

But it was impossible to stop the big range of its activity quickly and without any consequences. The mission got into big debts and had to sell its property in Dalyan. In 1917-1921 at the cost of maximum effort the bishop Innokenty saved the mission from the bankruptcy. He cut down its activity and made it self-supporting (Ipatova 1993:77).

But in 1921-1922 new problems befell the mission. “The big flow of refugees and emigrants from Soviet Russia”59 poured into China (:77) and as it usually happens “in other countries of Russian dispersion”, the church became a peculiar center that “gathered around it all Russians” and where a priest became “an informal leader” (Keping 60 1993:92).

The power changed, but the church – well-known and close, stayed. The same happened in China (:93). It was the same old Russia with churches, monasteries, novices in calottes, monks in klobuks, but the main thing – peace and calm, that were broken only with ringing of bells (:92).

Very soon emigrants understood that they would stay in this country for a long time. Little by little new ways of life of the huge Russian colony started to take shape. OSM had to develop in

---

59 The data about the number of this emigration vary from 100 thousand (see Chinese Messenger 1935:30) till 0.5 mln people (see Voronin 1990:132-133) (is cited in 1993:83).
60 Keping (Svyatina) Olga Victorovna (1900-1992) is the sister of the last head of RSM – the archbishop Victor (see Bogolioubov 1993:157).
the total seclusion, that is why in 1933 the bishop Victor (from emigrants) became a head of the 20th mission. The crisis was overcome and the Peking mission continued its activity.

During his time as a head of the mission, the Archbishop Victor opened parishes, churches and prayer houses in Peking, Kaigan, Chifu, Girin, on a Dam, in Hong Kong, Canton, Macao, built a temple and a house for a priest in Manila, a monastery for women and a temple in Cacacashi near Diren, Saint Panteleimon sanatorium with a temple in the Laoshan mountains, the city temple was reconstructed and a house for a priest was built in Tzindao, a big house was built at the missionary lot in Hailar, St. Pokrovsky temple was built in Tyantzin, the construction of the church of Annunciation in Harbin was finished ... a prayer house was opened in Westside in Shanghai "a dining room for the poor" (Chinese messenger 1946:22; see Keping 1993:95; the italic type is ours).

The familiar scheme of the Orthodox Mission: the construction of temples, that were the centers of the life, the establishing of monasteries where people reached the theosis; the deaconry of church. It looked like everything was fine, but Victor was anxious about the future, he saw that "Russian young people left China, the priests were old people ... and he was horrified thinking about what would happen with the mission" (:96). Therefore he kept sending reports to the patriarch Alexis "insistently asking to send a new 21st mission" (Keping 1993:96; the italic type is ours):

Here, among local Russian population there are no people suitable for the big organizational work. These people are tired and sick in their souls, there will be no enthusiasm and devotion from their side. And people from the homeland will have more prestige among local Chinese population ... the mission from the Soviet Union should be sent over here. The mission has a huge potential, but owing to the historical circumstances, the economical state of the mission is sad (Keping 1993:98; the italic type is ours).

And then the archbishop Victor made a mistake. He decided to recognize the jurisdiction of the Moscow patriarchate (see Tikhvinsky 1993:86; Keping 1993:95) and put in an application to be restored in civic rights in USSR (see Tikhvinsky 1993:87). How could he expected the country that strangled the faith to send a new mission?

Moscow didn't send the 21st mission to Peking. The archbishop Victor was ordered to abolish the mission and in 1956 he returned to Russia and was appointed to the Krasnodar eparchy (Keping 1993:88,98).

It is strange that such a zealous missionary took down a non-Christian dictation of communist ROC. Though he acted canonically right. Victor died of an infarct in the homeland of the author of this work.
In 1956 the Autonomous Orthodox Chinese Church was established (see Bogolioubov 1993:8) and the archimandrite Vasily Yao Fu-An was consecrated a bishop of Peking (see Tikhvinsky 1993:89). By that time there were priests among Chinese and offsprings of Albasin people.

This is the end of 250 years of the Russian Spiritual Mission in China, that was started thanks to the capture of defenders of a Russian fortress Albasin in Priamurie in 1685. The life of the mission stopped, but the life of the Orthodox Chinese Church, now free from any paternalism, continues.

5.2.3 The evaluation of OSM activity from the Eastern and Western point of view

Analyzing the missionary activity of the Orthodox Spiritual Mission in China, various research workers evaluate it differently.

Many pre-revolutionary historiographs with the hieromonk Nikolay Adoratsky saw almost a prophetic, messianic meaning just in “one fact of existence of the Orthodox community in China where millions live” among “other pagan and Christian confessions, strong in their adherents” (Shatalov 1993:152; the italic type is ours). They believed that “only Orthodoxy was destined to create its own national church in China” and that it would become a part of “the national consciousness without holding anything back” and become “a truly Chinese faith” (Sergiy (Starogorodsky); is cited in Shatalov 1993:154-155). They repulsed the attacks of Protestant and Catholic scientists asserting that members of RSM “equally” “consolidated diplomatic and church representative in Peking” (see Dennett 1963:255; is cited in Shatalov 1993:153). And the things were not going as fast as the West would like it to be, because it was a special “fabian” tactics of “the need for a careful and slow penetration into China” (Shatalov 1993:153, the italic type is ours). Exactly this kind of tactics ensured “a stable and lasting

---

62 Tikhvinsky Sergey Leonidovitch (born 1918) in 1943-1950 was engaged in the diplomatic work in China, knew father Victor personally. A full member of Russian Academy of Sciences (see in details Bogolioubov 1993:158).
nature" of the Mission and the Mission achieved "the greatest success among other European powers" (Nikolay (Adoratsky) 1887:622,626-627; is cited in Shatalov 1993:152-153; the italic type is ours).

In the nearest future it can't ... make such a great progress in preaching the Christianity, as western european missionaries have, but it compensated this failure with the stability of the political contacts and completeness of the scientific research of China (:153).

And the fact that non-Russian evangelists always had problems, whereas Russians "have never been persecuted", shows nothing else but the "injudicious zeal of [western] missionaries in the cause of preaching" (Parker 1903:537; is cited in Shatalov 1993:153; the insertand the italic type are ours).

Is it a success if the price of peace is a sinful compromise of silence? And what is a "wise" sermon then? This is the stumbling block in the evaluation of RSM activity. For a person from the West it will be difficult to understand the Orthodox mission because the way of thinking, practice and dogmatic basis of missionary activity differ a lot:

The activity of Russian Christian missionaries differed a lot from the activity of Catholic and Protestant missionaries, who worked actively for converting Chinese into their faith (Wildmer 1976; is cited in Volokhova 1993:27-28; the italic type is ours).

Therefore many western and some Russian research workers think that the stable position of OSM in China was achieved "mainly because Orthodox priests ignored their preaching duties" (Brendon; Skatchkov; is cited in Shatalov 1993:153). According to M. Montgomery Russians couldn't even use "all opportunities that no other Christian state had" (is cited from Wildmer 1976:5; is cited in Volokhova 1993:28; the italic type is ours) and "made no contribution to any spheres of Chinese society" (see Quested 1968:26-27; Shey Guanay 1984:1/108-111,3/95-102, is cited in Ipatova 1993:81). What would come out of it, if other denominations had such a chance?

Who is right here? Did OSM do its best? In its interpretation - yes. Considering the missionary activity of ROC in non Russian countries, we understand that the Orthodox Church can't imagine

---

62 Tikhvinsky writes that father Victor introduced him to two Chinese Orthodox priests - the offsprings of Albazins - father Vasily Dey and father Fedor Li who were heads of two big groups of Orthodox Chinese inhabitants of Beiping. A Chinese with blue eyes and a Russian surname Dubinin was father Vasily Dey.
a mission in isolation from the State. If it is a territory of “its” country, it will spread the faith here, if no, it will try to make a sovereign “Orthodox” in order to continue together the work on enlightening the land out of the pagan darkness. And if the pagan government didn’t fall under its unobtrusive, delicate influence, the OC could temporarily content itself with a friendship so as not to be disturbed when it works with nationals. But the Orthodoxy will work for its ideal – a union of the cross and the crown that serve God and are mutually complementary. This was how it happened in Chinese mission. ROC came to China due to a historical fluke, but it stayed and developed there. And if it managed to stay there, probably “prophetic” dreams of N. Adoratsky would come true.

RSM could do no more than it could do, it has been developing gradually, and we have seen all these periods. The fourth period is a mature mission and it is difficult to imagine it without a previous experience of translating and scientific work. It is also difficult to realize that RSM renounced the diplomatic duties, because for the Orthodox Church a mission always has a state significance and to serve the state is one of the ways to serve God. RSM couldn’t stay away from the Russian refugees because the deaconry is the essential part of Orthodoxy.

One more important aspect is that OC places the emphasis on the theosis, and a Christian that reached the theosis can preach the Gospel. This is the power of the Holy Spirit that lives in the Universal Church of Christ. That’s why in any Orthodox mission charismatic leaders play a big role, much depends on them at the local level. There was a whole galaxy of such leaders in OSM. But for them the Orthodox Mission in China, without a right course, would remain one of the appendages of the diplomatic representatives, as happened with other foreign missions of the Russian Orthodox Church.
PART 6: THE REVIEW OF CONCLUSIONS AND INFERENCE

6.1 Preface

Is Russian Orthodox Church a missionary church by its nature? Has it ever been engaged in the missionary activity in the narrow sense of this word? Or maybe it dies in the “stiffness” of the ceremonial way of life and continues to consider the Eucharist its main work?

This work had an object to find out if these accusations are well-grounded. In order to do it, we divided the whole history of existence of the Orthodox Church in Russia from XI till XX centuries into 3 periods and made a brief survey and analysis. Since it is impossible to understand any missionary activity having no idea about its ideological basis, we presented the theological and canonical grounds of ROC mission.

We tried to understand motives, goals and objectives of the ROC missionary activity and to realize if it was the result of missionary qualities of OC or the concern of some devoted people, or just a state necessity. During our research we focused our attention on such aspects as: evangelization, russification, civilization, politicization, enlightenment, deaconry, contextualization, training of national leaders, translations, organization of missionary work, Church and state contacts, finances, church architecture.

We found out that ecclesiologic way of thinking that was the basis the missionary ideas of the Eastern Church, influenced ROC mission thoroughly but in practice, it showed itself differently in different historical moments.

6.2 The first period of ROC mission

The state of the mission in pre-Mongolian and Mongolian periods confirmed the thesis “the mission is inherent to the nature of Church” (ROC Synod 1995:3-4; John (Popov) 1995:10-11),
the whole life of Church is the mission (:10) and everybody is called to testify (:10-11). The Church grew due the inner mechanism of developing that had been put there by its Head-Christ. It was the mission of the organism, not organization (see Bosch 1991:207) where it is not one of the functions, but life (see Keshishian 1992:98). The mission of that period didn’t know a centralized, organized by Church, missionary work, most likely it was connected with “spiritual movement in the monastery circles”. It was “genuine movements of the spirit that arose independantly in their initial phase and only later were gathered by Church and put in the church” (Reimer 1996:199). The ROC as an ecclesiological organizational structure “didn’t show any interest to the missionary work among pagan tribes that were members of the Moscow state”, “there were sporadical, spontaneous, unplanned moves” (:197).

Some Christians who wanted a personal relationship with God, under the influence of the Holy Spirit and the Eastern monastic ideal of sanctity, left for a secluded place or for an already existing monastery. There they achieved the desirable theosis or deification by means of imitatio Christi⁶³, saints and their abbot, and also through «a continuing state of adoration, prayer, thanksgiving, worship, and intercession, as well as meditation and contemplation of the triune God and God's infinite love» (Bria 1986:9). The Orthodox mission is impossible without the theosis (Bosch 1991:209). The motto of this mission was: «Save yourself and you will save those who around you» (WCC 1977:6). Thus anchorites and monks who have taken a vow of silence became the foremost workers of the missionary fields, because they achieved a high level of deification and could work as missionaries only by their prayerful presence purging the pagan territories from demons’ influence. Following this path, the mission of a monastery or a single anchorite took on the character inherent to the Orthodox Church: centripetalness + the mission of presence, though the monasteries, using the method of «training of disciples», and putting them into the «experience of relationship with God» exhibited a tendency to the centrifugal mission. But as they were multiplied using the following method: the new branches moved away from the mother – kenovia and founded new «deserts», they again made the centripetal centers for native hearts craving for truth. Due to such “disorganized” work, the territory of north-eastern Russia was covered with a network of monasteries and churches. Using this method the missionary call of OC to deification and renewal succeeded, though it has never meant to have a man for an
object, but the renewal of the whole Cosmos as the final salvation of God (see Keshishian 1992:59). This global reconstruction of Universe that has lost the harmony with the Creator started with the theosis of an individual and its starting-point at that historical period were not parishes but monastic communities. In this case the monasteries were parishes, and Eucharistic communities, and catholic Church in its entirety. When a monk came to a new place the first thing he usually did was the building of a small church to start public services, the Liturgy and the Eucharist, that is not only the center of the Church (see Keshishian 1992d:22f; Fairbairn 1984:25) and the starting-point of a mission (see Anastasios 1989:83; 1990:53 and many others), but also establishes the Church (see WCC 1977:1; Keshishian 1992d:22f). Therefore, we have the right to say that in the presented period the Russian Orthodox Church was not amorphous, but was engaged in mission through one of its structures — Monkhood. Such a situation is typical for the Orthodox Church of East, where mission has always been burdened with cenobites and unmarried priesthood.

As we have seen, for the most part the Evangelization of tribes in XI-XYI centuries was connected with a civilization, natural nonviolent russification and inculcation of State system foundations. In other words the universalism of salvation was presented only within the bounds of the superiority of bearing culture.

But, inspite of the obvious desire of cenobites to make natives a part of Russian culture, we have no right to ignore a pure evangelistic motive, presented in their activity or to identify the church mission with the policy of russification kept by temporal leaders (see Reimer 1996:198-199). There were two different movements. Of course, the religious colonization followed in the tracks of state colonization, «hand in hand with the political expansion of princes» (Rosenkranz 1977:188; is cited in Reimer 1996:198-199; the italic type is ours). Sometimes they changed places. That is «the missionary activity led to the colonization and the colonization - to the missionary activity» (Glazik 1959:9; is cited in Reimer 1996:203). Both kinds of expansion perfectly supplemented each other: the missionary activity of the monks was «a moral counterbalance» to society wishes, unscrupulous by its character (see Smirnov 1904:3; the italic type is ours), on the other hand, the attempt of Evangelization without the political support of princes «would be broken by the resistance of pagan tribes» (Reimer 1996:203). So, this was the

63 (lat.) imitation of Christ.
union of a cross and a crown. It was the influence of one of the Byzantine imperialism features—full integration of Church into the state and vice versa (see Reimer 1996:198). «It goes without saying that the mission is not only a soteriological-ecclesiological enterprise, but also political» (:198). The Russian mission, also imitated Byzantium in
together with the gospel, the Byzantines transfused into their converted peoples the whole of their experience — political, artistic, economic, cultural — permeated by evangelical principles and the Christian vision of life. They contributed to the self-awareness developed by the young nations, along with their own culture (Anastasios 1989:66; an italic type ours).

Moreover, it was possible that the reason of it was that Orthodoxy liked the territorial principle very much. In the first period there could be the motive of the responsibility before God for the territory. Thus, monks considered the outskirts of a monastery a canonical missionary apostolic apanage that had to be sanctified with a prayer, enlightened with the Light of the Gospel and where the demons should be pressed (see ROC Synod 1995:5-6).

Non-Russian mission of ROC of XIX-XX centuries will take a lot from principles of work of the cenobites-colonialists, but it will develop them much better, wider and deeper.

The mission of contextualization that has translations of the Holy Scriptures and consideration of the cultural aspects as its principle was out of the question at the moment. Thought ROC documents present these principles as part of OC missionary activity at all times (see ROC Synod 1995:4-5). Stephen of Perm and Trifon of Pechenga (partly) will be the first ones to use «the principle of Church reception of culture» (;5) at this time period.

Ephiphyli will evaluate the missionary work of Stephen of Perm as apostolic. Stephan repeated the feat of Cyril and Methodious, and ROC mission of XIX-XX century will name its activity a Cyril - Methodious tradition in the manner of Stephen of Perm, because it will take its strength for the non-Russian mission exactly from their examples considering the cultural context. The phenomenon of Stephan was that he was the first and not only in Russia. He somewhat has forestalled his time, that is why afterwards the results of his mission were destroyed by the russianizing and centralizing policy of the Moscow state. Moreover he began to use the methods of contextualization before the western analogues. He could embody the universalism of Orthodoxy without the russianization. In spite of his strong personality, "by his world outlook Stephen was a child of the his time, the product of the monastic movement that has
its roots very deeply in epoch of Russia at Kiev times» and «his missionary-theological positions were not his independent ideology» (Reimer 1996:200-201). It was possible that Stephen's universalism of salvation without russification arose from the excellent knowledge of patristics, mission history of Eastern Church, the personal guidance of God and the sincere desire to bring Ziryan people to the acceptance of the faith.

6.3 The second period of ROC mission

The first and second missionary periods of ROC have some features in common but at the same time they have a big difference. In both cases the colonization took place but each time it was the expansion of a different kind. In the first period the nonviolent moving of Russian settlers to the north-east and the process of mixing with pagan Finnish tribes took place. The beginning of the second missionary period was marked with the military actions of the young Moscow state that was going to the east and southeast.

Kazan became «a chronic ulcer» of the Moscow life (see Platonov 1993:201), and Ivan IV (the Terrible) has finally decided to conquer it (see Rambo 1994:153). At the beginning, the military victory was supposed to be not only the triumph of Moscow over its ex-enslavers, but also «the triumph of the cross over the crescent» (:154), thus the war acquired the status of a «crusade» (see Talberg 1994:1/200; Ioann (Ladozhskiy) 1995:143). The conquest of Kazan had an important political and religious significance. Some different nations: Mordvinians, Cheremis, Chuvash, Votyaks, Bashkirs were under the Tatar horde of Kazan that united all of them. Now, all this intricate Non-Russian world should submit to Moscow after a long-term opposition (see Rambo 1994:154; Ostrogorsky 1992:45). Of course Russia wanted to rule over the new non-Christian territories without any problems that's why Russia as a worthy successor of Byzantium, hurried to take advantage of its missionary-political principle: «convert and rule» (Reimer 1996:49). Ivan the Terrible clearly understood the political importance of such a religious event as sending of missionaries, that is why ministers of religion were sent there at the same time with
voevodes (see Rambo 1994:154). In 1552 the second period in the history of Russian missionary activity began with conquest of the Kazan empire, that lasted up to the latter half of the XIX century (see Smirnov 1904:6). Soon, in 1556, the annexation of another Tatar empire — the Astrakhan Empire took place (see Smirnov 1904:6). Due to this fact the whole territory on the banks of the Volga river has been taken under the control from the source to the mouth (see Vernadsky [1967] 1997:89), and the access to the Persian possessions has been opened for Russia through the Caspian sea (see Rambo 1994:155).

The national colonization, so-called movement to «the wild field» began simultaneously with the expansion of the state power over the newly-seized territories (see Vernadsky [1967] 1997:89; Ostrogorsky 1992:45). Moscow understood the political importance of this movement and helped new settlers. Thus, little by little, the Russian colonizers reached the middle territories of Ural from the Permian region (-90). In 1582 «the gradual conquest of Siberia started that went on until 1697 when the Cossacks, the conquerors of Siberia reached the borders of the northeastern Asia» (Smirnov 1904:6). The annexation of the new territories expanded the missionary field more and more.

Due to the new conquests the canonical apanage of the Russian Orthodox Church (see ROC Synod 1995:5-6; John (Popov) 1995:21-23) had increased and ROC felt its responsibility for the enlightenment of conquered foreigners. It got «a new missionary problem, enormous in size» (Smirnov 1904:8). We should admit the existence of this strong motivation of the missionary duty in the mission of XVI-XIX centuries.

It was the period when the Church acted not only as the «organism» represented by the cenobites-colonialists, as it was in the first period, but also as the organizational structure that had the power. During this period the religious colonization was too much interrelated to the policy of the Russian state (see Nikolsky 1990:284) and had powerful backing and quite often the guidance from the tsarist government. It was an immediate corollary or rather a natural continuation of the military expansion as well as the ideological weapon to suppress non-Russians. The Byzantine pattern of the full confluence of Church and state interests that considers the mission to be the soteriological-ecclesiological and political undertaking at the same time (see Reimer 1996:198) had much more effect here than in the first period.

---

10 Radlov considers Chuvash people to the descendants of Bulgarians (see Rambo 1994:154).
The methods of mission could be cruel or lax, it depended upon a tsar who was in power at the moment. But Russians have never treated natives of the North cruelly. The subdued nations lived freely and had business contacts with Russians in different fields (see Gumilev 1992:226-227).

Vast sums of money were sent from Moscow for building of temples and monasteries, that were supplied with the books, icons, church plate and clergy (see Znamensky 1996:268). The government gave different privileges to people who had been christened, sometimes to the prejudice of non christened population. ROC sincerely tried «to drive the mankind [i.e. unwise non-Russians] into the happiness with an iron hands»64 and at the same time it actively used «the method of a gingerbread». It had the state power in its hands and it was difficult to go to subdued nations as a meek pilgrim, as it had been in the first period.

The basic failures of the evangelical work of this historical period are in this union of a scepter and a crosier as well as in the military invasion that preceded the mission. «Some tribes were placed under the authority of Russians and lost their former political independence. This is the reason why they acted unfriendly towards their conquerors and didn’t trust the religion they were bringing in» (Smirnov 1904:10; the italic type is ours). The concealed political and religious antagonism has been always binding the Russian policy and Russian mission on the non-Russian territories. It also was the reason of numerous revolts of non-Russians (:638).

The Byzantine principle of giving to the converted people «together with the gospel» «the whole of their experience — political, artistic, economic, cultural» (Anastasios 1989:66) is also inherent to this period. They tried to accustom non-Russians who had been leading nomad life for centuries to the farming, to settle them down. They tried to inculcate in non-Russians the basics of the state system. The situation will be the same in the third period of the mission. Actually the process of bringing non-Russians «to the nationality and civilization of Russia through their enlightenment with the light of Christian faith» (Smirnov 1904:7) consists of it. In contrast to the first period it was done quite often from the position of strength and without the respect for another's cultural values. Russians did not win a non-Russian over because «by right of the conquerors and in the manner of that time they often started the establishment of a new life with the demolition of a mosque and the overthrow of idols» (Smirnov 1904:10; also see
Znamensky 1996:270; Rambo 1994:154 and others). And then they tried to strengthen the russification of growing generations of non-Russians with the help of schools (see Nikolsky 1990:286) and by putting newly-converted into the special settlements.

Due to this historical background, the orthodox preachers, even gifted ones who sincerely preached the Gospel, had great difficulties with the penetration in the concealed internal world of non-Russians and «for a long time they only were touching it lightly on the surface. Non-Russians shrunk into their shell and remained a dark, mysterious and inconceivable substance for Russians» (Smirnov 1904:10-11). Naturally, in such a situation «the internal mastering of Christian truth and putting it into practice were out of the question at that time» (:9).

Except for the circumstances mentioned above that made it more difficult for non-Russians to perceive the truth of the Gospel, the mission of the second period had a lot of other difficulties that hindered the deep perception of the Christian faith by the native people. A «new missionary task» of ROC was beyond the strength of even a healthy and strong ecclesiological organism. The vast areas, 8-9 times bigger than Russia have been joined to it extremely fast, within 145 years (see Smirnov 1904:8).

The mission of the second period almost did not know the contextualization. Sometimes, though very seldom, when the missionaries had at least some knowledge of a language and culture, their work according to Smirnov «usually scored a great success; they christened thousands of non-Russians» (Smirnov 1904:9). For the most part messengers of the Gospel had to make headway with the cut-and-try method. The achievement of the missionary searches of this historical period is that the consciousness of the Church little by little got ready for the perception of the fact that it’s necessary to consider other cultures. There was another variant: ROC originally understood such a necessity, but as a huge amount of work came like a bolt from the blue, and the church was not ready for it at all, it began to use the principle of «the spiritual reception of culture» only at the end of the second missionary period. But in any case this way was historically inevitable for the preparation of the contextualizing mission of XIX- XX centuries.

And still, despite the absence of a «correctly organized» mission in practice and in consciousness, the absence of a mission that acts continuously, successively, collectively and

64 A slogan of Stalin's times (the insert is ours).
relies on the previous experience in its activity (14) even not having enough missionaries, ROC has not given in to difficulties and has done everything possible to promote this impracticable task. Some eminent persons of the second missionary period worked for the most part as single missionaries, scattered about «often alone in different places, under different conditions and of course with unequal success» (14). After all the missionary communities still have to be formed.

6.4 The third period of ROC mission

ROC entered the third period with better church missionary organization and spiritual potential. The previous experience of the mission and a certain «period of stagnation» before the third period helped ROC to uncover its internal resources. The Orthodox Church started to take the initiative and to act as an ecclesiological structure, and not just as the servant of the state concerns. The contingent of sponsors of its mission is changing, the contributions from rich and poor laity constitute a considerable part of its missionary fund. The political objectives of the mission receded into the background, giving way to the spiritual motive of soul salvation.

Now there was a possibility to work «deep into» on the territories «christened» before, and not only «in breadth», as it was for the most part during the second period. Moreover there was a certain experience of the previous centuries and some examples for imitation.

The activity of the missionaries of Orthodox Missionary Society can't be accused in the narrowness of the missionary work. There is a typical set of the missionary activity aspects, that is not often met in one missionary organization: the variety of the methods of evangelization, translations, services in national languages, national priesthood, the enlightenment at different levels, the scientific missionary works, educational structures for training of missionaries, the programs of civilization and inculcation of the state system basics that work to realize the political goals of the state, the deaconry of Church through the social work.

May we call Russian Orthodox Church the church of “stiffness and backwardness” that has never had a mission possessing the information about the non-Russian mission of the ROC third period? Of course not. Everything that was done by OMS missionaries, and single...
individuals who preached the Gospel is worth to be admired and considered carefully. Moreover we should be thankful to God for it and imitate everything that is wise there.

The mission of the third period is the fruit of the gradual development of native missionary activity. ROC came to the conclusion that the methods of Cyril and Methodiy and Stephan of Perm are much more ancient and effective than the nationalistic policy of russification. This research shows that it is not an outward taken experience of non-Christian missions. The mission of Russian Orthodox Church in the third period looks like a giant of thought, organization and practice. This is a work of a mature ecclesia, an organism and also a church structure that is quite independent in its funds. At this time it is not the state policy that determines the objectives and goals of the missionary activities as it was during the second period. Mission stopped to be the lot of single individuals who take private initiative or who involuntary spread the Gospel in search of a secluded places for the personal theosis as it was in the first period. In this period everything is connected: the Church work, the work of single individuals, Orthodox people and various social, commercial and state structures. God worked through Orthodox Church.

6.5   The foreign mission of ROC. The Russian Spiritual Mission in Peking

In our survey we considered not only non-Russian but also foreign mission of ROC, with the Chinese Orthodox Mission as an example. It was noted that other states are not canonical territories of ROC, but some embassy Orthodox churches developed a bigger activity than it was needed.

We presented five periods of RSM mission in Peking. Diversification of activity of this mission that includes diplomacy, science, translations, evangelization and many other aspects had different comments. Did RSM do its best or its temporal duties prevented it to fulfil its main task? From its point of view – yes, it did.

We understood one interesting thing. It is known that the Orthodox Church can’t imagine the mission in isolation from the State. If it is a territory of “its” country, it will spread the faith
here, if no, it will try to make a sovereign “Orthodox” in order to continue together the work on enlightening the land out of the pagan darkness. And if the pagan government doesn’t fall under its unobtrusive, delicate influence, the OC can temporarily content itself with a friendship so as not to be disturbed when it works with nationals. But the Orthodoxy will work for its ideal – a union of the cross and the crown that serve God and are mutually complementary. This union assists to the spreading of the Kingdom of God that became new through the Church of the Universe. This was how it happened in the Chinese mission. ROC came to China due to a historical fluke, but it stayed and developed there. And if it managed to stay there, probably “prophetical” dreams of N. Adoratsky about Orthodox China would come true.

RSM could do no more than it could do, it has been developing gradually. The fourth period of OSM work is a mature mission and it is difficult to imagine it without a previous experience of translating and scientific work. It is also difficult to realize that RSM renounced the diplomatic duties, because for Orthodox Church the mission always has a state significance and to serve the state is one of the ways to serve God (see Skvortsov 1897). RSM couldn’t stay away from the Russian refugees because the deaconry is the essential part of Orthodoxy.

One more important aspect is that OC places the emphasis on the theosis, and a Christian that reached the theosis will always preach the Gospel. This is the power of the Holy Spirit that lives in the Universal Church of Christ. That’s why in any Orthodox mission charismatic leaders play a big role, much depends on them at the local level. There was a whole galaxy of such leaders in OSM. But for them the Orthodox Mission in China, without a right course, would remain one of the appendages of the diplomatic representatives.

6.6 Conclusion

Thus we saw that God worked through the Orthodox Church and the missionary consciousness is inherent in it. The accusations that it has no mission are absolutely groundless.
The originality of the Russian Orthodox Church is based on the foundation of ecclesiology and here ROC is considered to be the only true church according to the Nicene Creed. This true Church realizes its responsibility to open the Gospel through the Orthodoxy to the whole world. In other words "to make the world Orthodox" without making compromise with any other confessions. Such a credo say that ROC has a missionary consciousness.

But usually Russian Orthodoxy doesn't aim at going to other countries in order to be engaged in the missionary activity there. As a rule it "takes" only territories that "were given to it as a gift" by God as a result of some events. These are the lands of Orthodox States, so called "canonical territory" of the Orthodox Local Church, or countries where there are diplomatic representatives of above-named countries. ROC bears the responsibility before God for these lands.

Protestants often think that ROC has no mission just because the Orthodoxy pays more attention to Service life, to the construction of temples and russification of the tribes that were evangelized, than to the preaching "the pure Gospel". Such situation can be easily understood if you know what the Liturgy, the Eucharist and other services mean for the OC. The group of believers becomes the Body of Christ – Church at the moment of taking the Bread – the Body of Christ. This mystical action – sacrament must take place only in a temple, then the mission acquires an obvious centripetal scheme. According to this point of view, the aspiration for building of temples and starting the services is quite logical. This scheme seems to be impossible if it should be applied to the nomads. In this case ROC allows to conduct the Eucharist in mobile churches or on a mobile antimension in the presence of relics of saints.

Groups of non-Russian Christians, united around the Eucharist, are called Eucharistic communities. The construction of such communities is the ultimate aim of the ROC mission. All canonical rules of the mission are used to achieve this aim. This is a principle of universality, a principle of spiritual reception of culture (or the contextualization of the mission), a principle of translation of Scriptures to a languages of a nation enlightened, a principle of conducting the Liturgy in national languages, the enlightenment and civilization of all spheres of life of non-Russian nations, the forming of the institution of the national priesthood. We talked a lot about it in our work.
As for the russification, the Orthodox mission can't imagine its activity without it, the question is how deep it is. The adoption of Russian settled culture by other nations is the pledge of strengthening of the Christianity among non-Russian tribes.

As we have seen, the ROC mission was connected with collaboration with the State, that was also subjected to the evangelical criticism. But ROC thinks that Church must consecrate and exert the influence on everything and everybody beginning with a single soul and finishing with the whole Universe. Moreover the union of the cross and crown always increases the strength of Church and its missionary activity.

In the Orthodoxy the consecration of a person in the Church is called "Deification" (or theosis) and it is a starting point of every mission. The missionaries of ROC, who left their tracks in the history of spreading the Christian faith, as a rule, reached the high levels of "theosis".

In the three considered periods, the missionary principles of ROC showed their worth differently. In the first period the mission moved forward due to single monks who wanted solitude and theosis. Here ROC acted as a body of Christ where the mission was a natural thing. Only certain people used the methods of well planned contextualizing mission, like Stephen of Perm. During the second period ROC worked in a close combination with the State, it often served state interests to the detriment of the deep evangelization of natives. Due to this union the Church ploughed up and sowed the seeds of the Gospel on new huge territories of Russia. Exactly at this period Missionaries of ROC understood that there was no high-grade mission without the clear understanding of non-Russians what they believed in. In the third period ROC acted as a Church structure and the Body of Christ at the same time. The state almost didn't interfere in the life of a mission and a lot of private sponsors appeared. The missionaries of ROC especially at the time of Orthodox Missionary Society worked cohesively and used all the achievements of the native and foreign missionary activities. Everything was used in practice: translations, Liturgies in national languages, schools of all levels, the training of national leaders, social work of Church.

Can we call ROC a non missionary church after all these facts? The missionary consciousness was inherent in Russian Orthodox Church and it was engaged in a missionary activity. Moreover it is going to restore it to life at the Soviet period. It is proved with the numerous documents of ROC and the revival of life in the Orthodox communities of Russia.
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