

EASTERN CHURCHES NEWS - LETTER

*A quarterly publication of the
Anglican and Eastern Churches Association*

*The General Committee does not hold itself responsible for every
expression of opinion in the News-Letter*

No. 18

JUNE, 1960

CONTENTS:

1. Editorial.
2. The Anglican—Orthodox Doctrinal Commission of 1931.
3. Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies.
4. The Significance of the Eastern and Western Tradition
within Christendom.

THE ANGLICAN & EASTERN CHURCHES
ASSOCIATION
founded in 1864

Anglican President:
The Bishop of London

Orthodox President:
The Metropolitan Athenagoras of Thyatira

Chairman of Committee:
The Revd. AUSTIN OAKLEY

General Secretary:
The Revd. H. R. STRINGER
S. Stephen's Vicarage, 25, Talbot Road, W.2.

Treasurer:
J. S. ULLMER, Esq.
18a, Queen's Avenue,
Muswell Hill, N.10.

Editor of News-Letter:
Dr. R. E. WITT, F.R.S.L., J.P.
1, Oakwood Park Road,
Southgate, N.14.

The Editor is not responsible for the views expressed in
articles published in the News-Letter.

EDITORIAL

For the late issue of the News-Letter, which is largely due to circumstances outside the new editor's control, apologies are offered to all readers and contributors. To all who have sent articles for this number thanks are extended. Pressure of space has unfortunately prevented publication of everything received, but some material in hand may be included in later issues.

The gratitude of the Association to the Rev. Austin Oakley for all that he has done in the past as editor deserves more than a brief mention. A fitting tribute will be paid in the next issue.

A new editor must state a policy. 1. Every effort will be made to issue the News-Letter at three-monthly intervals. 2. Articles will in general not exceed a certain length, so that as many different writers as possible may contribute. 3. The aim will be to reflect the breadth of interest which should characterize the Association by the variety of topics in the News-Letter. 4. A forum will be available for discussion of members' views. 5. A column will be devoted to News from Abroad.

By the courtesy of the Ecumenical Press Council of the World Council of Churches we are able to reprint a number of articles and news items.

The General Secretary has addressed a Deanery group of Anglican clergy on the Orthodox Church and the Assistant Secretary has discussed the same subject and the work of the Association in a number of parishes. The Association plans a reception in Scotland for those Orthodox who will be attending the meetings of the World Council of Churches.

Warmest greetings and prayers are offered to the Right Reverend Stanley Ely, newly consecrated Bishop of Gibraltar.

To many Church people the death of the Archimandrite Athanasius Papaconstantinou must have come as a special sorrow. For nearly fifty years he had served the Cathedral of AGHIA SOPHIA with faithful and saintly devotion. At the funeral service the Archbishop of Thyateira well described him as a real "Greek gentleman". May his soul Rest in Peace!

The forthcoming meeting of the Pan-Orthodox Synod should be in the thoughts and prayers of all members of the Association. Archbishop Iakovos of the Archdiocese of North and South America has announced in this connection the holding of an ecumenical study centre at Rhodes.

Archbishop Theoklitos of Athens after his recent visit to Istanbul described it as an "expression of due respect, affection and love of the daughter Church of Greece towards the Great Mother Church of Constantinople." In return five members of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Istanbul have been meeting representatives of the Greek Church to discuss such questions as the status of the Athonite monasteries and the 1961 assembly of the World Council of Churches. Other news of the Greek Church is the consecration of Archimandrite Georgiadis as Archbishop of Tiberias, the growth of the Orthodox Faith in Uganda and Kenya, and the publication of a very good history of Orthodox Christendom.

In view of the closer Christian fellowship with the Russian Orthodox Church it is gratifying to note the tone of a speech recently made by the Patriarch Alexius and to record that in a reference to it Fr. Rodzianko of the Serbian Orthodox Church at a united service of Anglican and Free Churches on May 15th at High Wycombe declared that a new page had been turned in the history of the Russian Church and indeed of the Soviet State.

THE ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX JOINT DOCTRINAL COMMISSION OF 1931

Resolution 40 of the 1958 Lambeth Conference reads as follows:—

"The Conference has learned with satisfaction of the correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Ecumenical Patriarch, and warmly endorses the desire of the Patriarch for a continuation of joint Anglican-Orthodox doctrinal discussion on the pattern of the Joint Doctrinal Commission of 1931."

This Joint Doctrinal Commission, to a resumption of which the Lambeth Fathers here look forward, was one of the important milestones in Anglican-Orthodox relations. In the hope that the pan-Orthodox Synod, which is due to meet in September, will open the way for the realisation of the desires of the Ecumenical Patriarch and of the Anglican bishops, it is well that we should look back to 1931 to see exactly what this Joint Doctrinal Commission was.

The whole thing grew out of the 1930 Lambeth Conference which, though less spectacular than that of 1920 in the general matter of Church unity, was of far greater importance in what it did for our relations with Orthodoxy.

The invitation to be present was sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Ecumenical Patriarch, and by him transmitted to the autocephalous Orthodox Churches in the warmest terms.* The response was such as even ten years before would have been impossible; the delegation consisted of eight bishops officially commissioned by their respective Churches, and led by the Patriarch Meletios of Alexandria himself.

The leaders of the two Churches had clearly seized upon a psychological moment in their relations. For the first time Anglicanism and Orthodoxy were ready to confront one another in the field of dogma. The question of Anglican Orders had been provisionally settled (i.e. settled as well as possible apart from full dogmatic union) when, in 1922, the Holy Synod of Constantinople had accorded them the same recognition as that given to the Orders of the Roman Catholic Church or the other Eastern Churches, and had recommended the admission of isolated Anglicans to Communion by Economy. This decision had been communicated to all the other autocephalous Churches, and controverted by none of them. Now a representative delegation was able to go forward to explore more fully how far there was that necessary dogmatic agreement which, for the Orthodox, is an indispensable prelude to reunion. In the words of the late Canon J. A. Douglas, to whom so much of this was due, "The visit of the delegation had become desirable and, indeed, almost inevitable, not so much because their common experiences and their mutual practical services since 1914 had drawn Anglicans and Orthodox together, as because the possibility of their dogmatic agreement had emerged upon the horizon."

In the midst of much pomp and circumstance attendant upon such occasions, the Delegation had four meetings with the Anglican bishops, the practical result of which, reported the Patriarch of Alexandria later to his Synod, "exceeded our anticipation." Four main questions were posed by the Orthodox and discussed:

1. Does the Anglican Church accept Ordination as a Mystery and its being a link in unbroken succession with the Apostles?

* Full documentation will be found in *The Christian East*, Vol. XI, Nos. 2, 3 & 4.

2. Does it accept that the Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Christ? and that the oblation of the Divine Eucharist is a spiritual *thusia hilasterios* for the living and the dead?

3. In the Anglican Church what is the body which decides authoritatively upon differences as to the Faith?

4. If a member of the Anglican Church shall have preached in contradiction to the Faith of the Church, what is his status in the Church? and how is it decided?

In general the Orthodox were satisfied with the replies given to their questions, and felt that there was sufficient agreement to justify further discussion. Thus was the appointment of a Joint Doctrinal Commission decided upon, not, of course, to negotiate reunion, nor even to suggest specific terms upon which reunion might be possible but rather, by theological confrontation, to seek bases which might be used in time to come by those who were empowered to negotiate at a more hierarchical level.

It was agreed that the Joint Commission should be asked to take as its starting-point a document somewhat infelicitously called *Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church*, which had been produced by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Eastern Churches Committee in 1921.*

On the Anglican side the obvious Chairman was Bishop Headlam of Gloucester, and with him were the Archbishop of Dublin (Gregg) and the Bishops of Gibraltar (Hicks), Fulham (Batty) and Northern Indiana (Gray), Professors Goudge and Grensted, with Canon J. A. Douglas and the Rev. Philip Usher. It will be noted that with the exception of Professor Grensted, and the partial exception of Dr. Headlam, all these were 'High Churchmen'. On the Orthodox side the personnel consisted of delegates appointed by the various autocephalous Churches themselves. The Orthodox representation was remarkably comprehensive, in spite of the absence of delegates from Russia or Bulgaria. The Commission spoke of its work in the following terms:

"The duty of this Commission, according to the terms of its appointment, is to examine the teaching of the two Churches, to register the points on which agreement may be

found between them, to note any differences which may appear to be of importance; and to report these matters to their respective Churches. With this object in view they have discussed: 1. The Christian Revelation, 2. Scripture and Tradition, 3. The Creed of the Church, 4. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 5. The Variety of Customs and Usages in the Church, 6. Certain Questions regarding the Sacraments."

Differences and agreements were expressed most freely and frankly. The amount of agreement was probably a surprise to all who participated. There was, if not disagreement, at least some divergence on the matter of Tradition and on the number of the Sacraments. At the end of their Report the Joint Commission unanimously affirmed: "We have been able in the time at our disposal to discuss several fundamental questions which concern the Christian Faith. There are others which we have not had time to consider and we hope it may be possible to arrange a further meeting at some subsequent date to continue our discussions. But we would like to say in conclusion that we believe that in spite of differences there is much underlying agreement between our two Churches."

It seems that the time is now ripe for a group of new theologians (of the original Commission only Dr. Gregg still lives) to carry on the work of their predecessors. In 1930 the great Church of Russia was in isolation; in 1958 her representatives were for the first time present at a Lambeth Conference, and were among those who endorsed the desire for a resumption of the Joint Commission. We have seen by our theological conversations with them at Moscow in 1956 that they have constructive and eirenical contributions to make. It is much to be hoped that such theological meetings as those of 1931, interrupted by political events for almost thirty years, will as soon as possible be resumed.

HENRY R. T. BRANDETH, O.G.S.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ECUMENICAL STUDIES

The name of the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey (near Geneva) will be known already to most of the readers of this periodical. However, I shall try to give a clearer idea of what goes on at this international centre for ecumenical contact, prayer and study, by describing some of my own experiences there during the past winter, as far as they throw light on Anglican-Orthodox relationships.

* Printed in Bell's *Documents*, Vol. I, pp. 77ff.

From October 1959 to February 1960 the eighth Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies was held at Bossey, sponsored jointly by the World Council of Churches and the University of Geneva. About 40 post-graduate students, most of them ordained clergy and ministers, were enrolled on this course, representing 17 nationalities and 9 different denominational families. The Anglican delegation included three priests from various parts of the Anglican communion (South Africa, Kenya and Canada), and three ordinands from theological colleges in England (Wells, Ridley Hall and Cuddesdon). The Eastern Orthodox delegation numbered only two students — a lay theologian from Rhodes, who was formerly assistant editor of the periodical 'Orthodoxos Skepsis' and is now a research student, and an ordinand of the Syrian Orthodox Church in the U.S.A., studying at St. Vladimir's Seminary. There was also a member of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, who has studied in Halki and Athens. However, we had several other valuable Orthodox contacts. On the permanent professorial staff of the Ecumenical Institute is Dr. Nick A. Nissiotis, who visited England last year and spoke at a reception given by the Association. Visitors to the Graduate School included Archimandrite Emilianos Timiadis, the Ecumenical Patriarch's permanent representative in Geneva; Fr. George Khodre from Lebanon; the synodical secretary of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from the Phanar; and Fr. Sarkissian of the Armenian Orthodox Church, who formerly studied in Oxford. In addition, the entire Graduate School visited the Russian Church in Geneva for their celebration of Christmas. Thus it can be seen that the Ecumenical Institute provides many useful opportunities for personal meetings between Christians of East and West.

As to the academic programme of the Institute, the main theme of last winter's course was entitled 'Ministry and Ministries within the Life and Mission of the Church'. During the months of October and November we tried to discover what light was thrown on this subject by the Biblical doctrine of 'ministry' as well as by the theological discussions which have been carried out during the last thirty years within the Faith and Order movement. For two weeks Anglicans and Orthodox sat together in a working-group whose task was to describe, for the benefit of all other members of the course, their own churches' understanding of ordination as the *entrance* into the ordained ministry. Certain documents were

taken as an introductory background to the work of this seminar, and these included the reports of the Joint Doctrinal Commission of 1931 and of the Anglican-Rumanian Orthodox Commission of 1935, as well as various historical and dogmatic books by Orthodox and Anglican writers. The seminar was requested to elucidate their understanding of certain particular points, including the following:

- the meaning of the word 'sacrament' as applied to ordination;
- the relation between ordination and 'charisma';
- the difference between 'order' and 'office';
- the purpose of ordination;
- the meaning of succession;
- who acts in ordination?
- what makes a man able to be ordained, and why?
- what are the conditions for a man's being ordained?

The report from Anglicans and Orthodox on all these points was discussed in plenary session, and it must be quite evident that these questions of faith and order were very seriously and thoroughly treated at Bossey. Also during the opening weeks of the Graduate School lectures were given by Dr. Nissiotis to introduce the Orthodox theological tradition; these treated mainly of theology as doxology, and of Light as the central category of our receiving knowledge of the triune God. Regular weekly Bible-studies on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians were also led by Dr. Nissiotis during October and November.

In December most of our time was devoted to a study of the ministry of the laity. Here there was opportunity to examine the current movements of parish renewal and lay endeavour in the Orthodox churches, such as the Sunday School movement, Apostoliki Diakonia, the Orthodox Christian Unions, Zoë and Syndesmos, and to hear of the place and work of lay theologians, lay preachers and deaconesses.

In January and February a main course of lectures was delivered by Dr. Nissiotis on 'The Holy Spirit and the Church, according to the Eastern Orthodox tradition', which dealt especially with the Filioque and the doctrine of ministry. In the regular seminars which were held throughout the course on worship and spiritual life, we came round to a discussion of the Eucharist, and found our linguistic and theological difficulties greatest at this point. Two lectures were also

given by Dr. W. A. Visser't Hooft, the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, on the relations between Orthodoxy and the World Council in the past, present and future. We were also privileged to hear the private and unofficial impressions of three members of the World Council of Churches' delegation to Russia in December 1959.

This is not all. The deepest and most lasting part of the experience gained at Bossey comes from daily life in an ecumenical community over a period of four and a half months. This includes joining together not only in each others' traditions of worship (Vespers, the Divine Liturgy, 1662 Holy Communion, Matins, Compline, and many other forms of service), but also in regular Bible-study, corporate intercession, washing-up, volley-ball and general fun and games. Acquaintance made here goes deep, and enables one to think of Orthodoxy (or whatever tradition it may be) in terms of *persons*, not merely ideas.

It is difficult for me to assess from so close at hand the experiences of last winter at Bossey. What I have described above is only a tiny part of the whole. So far, two things have struck me as being specially important for Anglican relations with Orthodoxy, and they are these:

- (1) Direct personal contact plays the key-role in drawing us closer together. Without this it is possible to acquire a mass of theoretical facts, and yet to have a total impression that is far from authentic. Personal contact brings the facts into focus. It also urges us on from the preliminary stage of mutual self-description and recognition — when we say: 'You stand there and I stand here' — to the further stage of serious theological and spiritual *exchange* and *rapprochement*. We must not only describe the gap, but also bridge it together.
- (2) Our Anglican-Orthodox relationships need to be seen against the background of the whole ecumenical movement, as is often not done. We stand now with 40 years of Eastern Orthodox participation in the World Council of Churches and its precursors already behind us. Last year's misunderstandings at Rhodes at least made one thing quite clear: how deeply many Orthodox leaders are committed to the World Council of Churches. Experience at Bossey confirms this. The contacts between Ortho-

dox and ourselves will be inadequate if they are not seen in this wider perspective.

DAVID TUSTIN,
Cuddesdon.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EASTERN AND WESTERN TRADITIONS WITHIN CHRISTENDOM

by

PROFESSOR CHRYSOSTOM KONSTANTINIDIS

1. The importance and the difficulties of the subject.

There is no doubt that the subject "The significance of the Eastern and Western Traditions within Christendom" has as great an interest from the Orthodox point of view, as from the Protestant and Ecumenical. Certainly, in the extensive interconfessional dialogues of the last decades within the Ecumenical Movement, the discussion of the subject of "Tradition" has acquired a great importance, especially in the examination of the relation of this fundamental conception with our particular "traditions".

Of course, the study of this subject presents many difficulties. They mainly spring from the historical and theological background of the term "tradition", from the diversity in meaning and interpretation which has been or can be given to this term, and from Orthodox and Protestant reactions, which put the Orthodox Church on guard lest its fundamental teaching about the Tradition should be endangered, and which require the Protestant world not to abandon any one of the old "theses" of the Protestantism which wishes to continue to be faithful to its biblical foundation.

Therefore, the subject of Tradition is pre-eminently delicate for the Orthodox speaker as well as for his Protestant colleague.

I shall try, however, to analyse this subject from the largest possible perspective. I know it is not possible to use the word "Tradition" properly as far as Protestantism is concerned. In the meantime, it is known that our Protestant brothers have sufficiently progressed in the discovery and adoption of some of the basic elements of "Tradition". We should not forget that a special Commission within the Faith and Order Commission under the name "Tradition and traditions" brought Orthodox and Protestant theologians together for a free discussion on this subject; a subject which was never brought up before.

2. **The historical misunderstanding and the common theological ground of understanding of Tradition.**

I sincerely believe that a larger study and inquiry into the notion of Tradition will be precious for the contact and mutual understanding of our two worlds. It only needs an unprejudiced understanding on both sides about this subject; it is necessary for the Protestants to understand what is meant by Tradition in Orthodoxy, and for us Orthodox to know what the term "tradition" would mean in Protestantism.

Before any study or inquiry is made of the subject, I think we should recognise that there certainly is a historical misunderstanding about tradition, but that, at the same time, a minimum theological ground of common understanding and acceptance of the meaning and reality of what we call Tradition in our Church exists.

In fact, from the way the subject is being treated, I shall remain between these two main points, that is to say: the historical misunderstanding and the common theological ground of understanding of Tradition.

I

THE TRADITION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE IN THE EARLY CHURCH

3. **Revelation and Tradition.**

I shall not discuss the well-known points of our Theology concerning the ways of transmission of the Revelation to the Primitive Church. We know that Scripture was not the only and exclusive way of this transmission. The "unbound" word of God was free to be transmitted, and in fact inevitably was transmitted from the very first through the spoken word and oral teaching. The Christian message was not "written". It was oral, it was a preaching by word of mouth delivered to the Church.

The testimonies of Our Lord (Matt. 28:9; Mark 16:15; Acts 1:8), of the Apostles (John 30:30; 21:35; II John 12; I Cor. 11:34; 15:11), and of Saint Paul (I Timothy 6:20; II Timothy 1:13 and 2:2; Rom. 16:17) are clear on this point. The Apostles never accepted anything written from the Lord; they received by His own word in their hearts the Revelation made by the Holy Spirit; and the believers, similarly, received the word of God from the mouth of the Apostles Exakoes (Rom. 10:17) and preserved in their hearts the Truth delivered by the Grace of the Paraclete, who

cooperates in the preaching of the word of God. Thus was created by tradition the "Depositum" the parakatatheke of the revealed Truth.

4. **The "written" and "unwritten" transmission of the Revelation.**

We are, therefore, facing a very early "oral tradition" which was anterior to the Scripture, and from which the contents of the N.T. have been formed. Certainly the whole "oral tradition" was not exhausted, and besides, it did not cease to remain what it formerly was; that is to say, the Scripture has never replaced the tradition.

In this parallel manifestation of the Holy Revelation we have only the "written" and the "unwritten" tradition of the word of God. And the written tradition, being completed by the last of the inspired Apostles, formed the Canon of the N.T. The unwritten tradition of the Apostles, on the other hand, which was formed under the action of the Paraclete, has been preserved in the Church, first orally and then in the form of literary monuments, as the large Tradition of the Church, i.e. the "Apostolic", or the "Ecclesiastical", or simply the "Holy" Tradition, according to our conceptions.

5. **Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Tradition.**

Certainly, from all that we are saying now, it is evident that Tradition, when considered under the temporal perspective, can be distinguished, from the quantitative as well as the qualitative point of view, in two different forms: As Apostolic tradition and as Ecclesiastical tradition. These two terms are not mutually exclusive. The Apostolic Tradition is also Ecclesiastical, but the Ecclesiastical is large enough to contain some other forms of tradition, which are "forms of tradition *in the Church*," but not directly Apostolic. None of the others interests us here.

When we say Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Tradition we mean only those elements which concern the faith and the salvation of mankind, and which come from the Lord and the Apostles. These elements have been preserved, interpreted and formulated in the Church without losing any element of their apostolicity and have been still further enriched from the treasure of the ecclesiastical "depositum" of the faith.

The historical misunderstanding between us and our Protestant brothers appears at this point. And here is the reason:

6. **Points of transition from the Apostolic to the Ecclesiastical Tradition.**

Though we Orthodox consider that it is quite normal to have some sort of transition from the unwritten to the written word and *vice versa*, since these are the only two ways of transmission and preservation of the Revelation by man, Protestants find this difficult to understand.

The Revelation and its preservation and interpretation have known, in the inevitable perspective of time, some quite normal points of transition. There was first a relatively long period of "oral transmission" of the Revelation (which we can name "tradition", with a small "t"); this period was followed by a second one, a period of "written transmission" of the Revelation (which we can name "Scripture", with a large "S"); this second period was followed by a third one, which produced more and more varied forms of written expression, interpretation and formulation of the formerly delivered Truth (which we can name "scripture", with a small "s"); and finally the fourth state has been derived from the previous one, and this we may name "Tradition" in the proper sense of the word.

7. The contents of the Holy Tradition.

This conception can be represented graphically as follows:

t-radition — S-cripture — s-cripture — T-radition.

I do not think there is any natural evolution of these ideas besides those which can thus be represented. Only in a perspective such as this, can one understand why we Orthodox consider the Holy Scripture and the Holy Tradition as two sources of the Revelation of equal weight and authority, as two equivalent sources of the dogma and of supernatural faith. And it is only under this prism that one can understand how the Holy Tradition can be divided into Tradition concerning the faith and consequently of equal authority to the Holy Scripture, and traditions of larger ecclesiastical character, that is to say, historical, liturgical, canonical traditions, etc., changeable and with only relative authority, because they do not affect, of course, the faith and the dogmas of the Orthodox Church.

In the fourth period of this transition, which we named "Tradition" with a capital "T", we find that the teaching of the Church, which the Lord and the Apostles transmitted and which had been preserved in the Church, has already been incorporated in concrete literary monuments, which are the principal forms of the Holy Tradition. They are (1) the valid

and authentic interpretation of the Scripture in the Church; (2) the official formulations and confessions of faith; (3) the formulations, definitions and creeds of the Ecumenical Councils; (4) the larger accords of the teaching of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical Authors, in other words, the "Consensum Patrum"; and (5) the forms, acts and institutions of worship and liturgies of the Early Church, which form the living expression of the apostolic spirit in the ways of worship in the Church. Everything which remains outside of these forms of the "depositum" of faith of the Church, can be a tradition in the Church, but it cannot be Tradition of dogma and saving faith; it is not the Holy Tradition.

This Tradition — static in its divine origin, like the Scripture, but dynamic in its external forms — remained integral and undivided in the Church, as a living and continuous expression of the Revelation.

8. The ecclesiological meaning of this Tradition.

It is not necessary to say what is the significance of this integral and undivided Tradition of Christendom. Primarily it is of ecclesiological importance, because the tradition, stable and undivided, not only projects the divine and continually living substance of the Church, but becomes also the most secure criterion of its unity. Here is how Saint Athanasius the Great expresses this truth: "There is," he says, "a primary tradition and teaching and faith of the catholic Church, which Lord Jesus gave, the Apostles preached and the Fathers preserved: on it the whole Church has been founded." (Athanasius, Epist. ad Serapionem, 28, PG 26,593.)

This Tradition, described by Saint Athanasius, is the ecclesiological element of our Christian unity, and the conjunctive element of the undivided Church. The refusal of this Tradition is equivalent to having no faith. "One who does not believe according to the tradition of the catholic Church, says Saint John of Damascus, is without faith." (John of Damascus, Expositio Fidei Orthodoxae, IV, 10, PG 94,1128.)

II

THE DICHOTOMY OF THE TRADITION IN THE SCHISM. EASTERN AND WESTERN TRADITIONS

9. The Tradition and the Schism between East and West.

The second aspect of the Tradition within the Church is that which begins with the manifestations of the historical division of the Church into the Eastern and Western Churches, as we are accustomed to say.

Two different types of tradition have been formed under different local and temporary limits. These are the "differentiated Traditions of the East and West". And so the subject of Tradition appears, once more, as a clear ecclesiological theme; the divided Church appears in divided Tradition, and the dichotomized Tradition corresponds to a Church divided in itself.

10. The Continuity of the Tradition.

Certainly, at this point it is necessary to say that the Tradition, in spite of this historical dichotomy, has not ceased to continue existing as the one, integral and undivided Tradition of the Church. In its basic and supernatural meaning it cannot but continue to be an unbroken whole within the "One, Holy, Apostolic and Catholic Church." But in its external form and its historical conception, as a different way of cultivation of the revealed Truth by the different Christian communities, Tradition can be considered as cultivated in any other Christian community or confession while being in error.

This means that the Tradition is "One" principle, and "Undivided" as the revealed Truth; but it does not prevent us from speaking about some "traditions", which are met within the differentiated forms of the Church. This is the case of the multiple examples of all heresies; but it became more evident in the case of the great Schism of the XI Century and has been multiplied afterwards in the later centuries.

The existence of one or more parallel traditions beside the one Tradition of the Church does not obscure or destroy the sacred character of the one Tradition; in the same way erroneous interpretations of the one revealed Truth do not destroy the Truth itself, but only damage the man who is misled by them.

If therefore we speak about the Eastern and Western Traditions separately, or about the Tradition and the "traditions" within other Churches, we must not forget that above these two, the former or the latter, or even above the different "traditions" or forms of tradition, there is the One and Undivided and Unbroken Tradition of the Church. And according to our teaching, the Eastern Tradition is not one of the regular forms of Tradition, but it is the Holy Tradition of the Church of Christ itself.

11. The significance of the dichotomized Tradition.

In spite of the continuing and unbroken Tradition of the Church, the existence of other forms of "traditions" within

divided Christendom raises the question of the significance of this differentiated or dichotomized Tradition in the Church.

We can, I think, summarize our thoughts about this problem in the following points:

(1) The differentiated forms of Tradition emphasize the significance of the Tradition itself, one and undivided in its base and substance.

(2) The measure to which they depart from the one and undivided Tradition of the Lord and the Apostles determines the ecclesiological depth of the Church to which they belong. The "vestigia Ecclesiae" and the "vestigia Traditionis" are directly proportional.

(3) No matter how far these differentiated forms of Tradition depart from each other, yet often they still co-exist in such a way that the question of the unity becomes the occasion of their meeting.

(4) The longer these differentiated forms of Tradition follow and get to know each other, the more are their points in contact; the more positive and beneficent is the influence of the true Tradition upon them, and the greater is the possibility of their re-integration into the One Tradition.

III TRADITION AND TRADITIONS

12. The Protestant Schism and the polytomy of Tradition.

When the second big Schism in Christendom took place, i.e. the Reformation, the theme of the tradition became broader. The already separated Western Tradition developed into the newly appeared Reformation under a quite different theological but also historical conception.

13. The theological conception of the Tradition in Protestantism.

Theologically the subject of Tradition became a point of dissension between Protestantism and the one Tradition of the Eastern Church on the one hand, and on the other between Protestantism and the differentiated form of tradition in the Latin West.

An anti-traditional system, depending onesidely on the Bible as Protestantism did, ignored the Tradition. I will not examine the well-known thesis of Protestant Theology on this Subject. I think it is enough to say that the Tradition is rejected as a source of the Revelation equivalent to the Scripture. A first and common period of Tradition for the

Early Church is accepted, as a historical reality, but without any ecclesiastical authority.

14. The historical reality of the "traditions" in Protestantism.

Though this is the theological conception of the Tradition in Protestantism, our subject from the historical point of view can be presented as follows:

All the forms of Protestantism, even the most liberal ones, have their own "traditions", some of which spring from their historical background, and some others have been created in their own bodies. I say "They have their own 'traditions'" because no Church can be conceived as existing without traditions.

15. "New Churches — old traditions."

Do not let us consider this an exaggeration! Here is the example of the Young Churches that arose from missionary work. It is not possible in the long history of missionary work for one newly founded Church or Community not to be the outcome of one of the traditions, of one of the old forms of Christianity. No one of these churches is a "new church" in the proper sense of the word, i.e. as new a church as the Church of Pentecost, because the Church is not a continuously repeated foundation *ex nihilo*, exactly as the created world is not a repetition of the six-day creation *ex nihilo*. The multiplication of the number of churches is a continuation forever of the Church, which has been founded by the Lord's Sacrifice. Therefore, new forms of Christianity or new Churches and Tradition are things that presuppose each other.

16. What do the "traditions" represent in Protestantism?

It is not necessary to say that these "traditions" present some common points with the One Tradition of the Church, but that they have also their different character which renders them "protestant traditions" in the proper sense of the word, thus:—

These "traditions" are the most positive reflection of the world from which the Protestant Communities arose. They are in general "western traditions". They include many historical, racial, national, rational and linguistic elements, and many other elements of mentality, psychology, civilization and culture, but also elements which are clearly theological and ecclesiastical, which are common to the whole Christianity.

The same "traditions" are at the same time realities which Protestantism has lived and still lives, or has created and still creates in its body in every moment of history. As persons, these "traditions" contain all the figures of the active Reformation, from Luther and Calvin, Zwingli and Melancthon up to the last missionary of today. The same "traditions" find their reflection in all the realities which make up the Protestantism of yesterday and today. This Protestantism with its varieties and ramifications, with its historical confessions and statements of faith, with its contemporary tendencies and currents, with its interconfessional and unionistic disposition and desires, with its mutual "repulsions" as well as its rivalries, with its missionary experiences, with its special way of thinking and living the commandments of the Holy Gospel, and finally with its proper "Theology", is the most inclusive conception of what we define as "western traditions". And we Orthodox are called to know and to evaluate exactly these "traditions".

17. These "traditions" and the teaching of the Lord and the Apostles.

What are these "traditions" for our Protestant brothers? The answer is given in an antinomy: their "traditions" are not the One Tradition, but the teaching of their Communities, their message to the world. This teaching is biblical, and reflects the teaching of the Lord and the Apostles.

Of course, from the Orthodox point of view, such a conception can be disputed. On the other hand, it is not possible to forget that this teaching of Protestantism claims for itself a true 'churchly' or 'ecclesial' character. Therefore, automatically, this teaching acquires a notion of Tradition. What kind of Tradition? Here, as the Orthodox see it, is the most essential "crisis" of contemporary Protestantism. It is not the Tradition of the "One, Holy, Apostolic and Catholic Church" which safeguards the integrity of revealed Truth. But it appears to us to be a kind of "consensus", a kind of symphony of the individuals under the Grace of Christ, a kind of accord which is itself quite subjective and elastic. In other words, it is an accord of each Christian member of the Church, illuminated by the Holy Spirit in the reading, understanding and interpretation of the Bible. This accord presupposes the presence of the Paraclete, but there is no criterion to render this presence more tangible to the Christian.

18. The "traditions" and the "consensus" of individuals.

In fact, such a conception of the "consensus" renders the "crisis" within Protestantism more evident. It is constrained to find some "non-biblical criteria" for the correct interpretation and understanding of the revealed Truth. We may, I think, ask at this point:

Would it not be of great utility for our Protestant brothers to emphasize here that these criteria lie in what we call "Tradition"? We said: In the Tradition we have the whole teaching of the Church; it is the teaching of the Lord and the Apostles; it is a *depositum fidei*, parallel to the Holy Scripture.

And something else: Would not this "consensus" of the individuals be more positive and theologically more concentrated if it is accepted as a "consensus Traditionis"? And the Grace of Christ which assists and illuminates the individuals, can it not be considered as the Grace which acts upon the individuals as Fathers of the Church, and upon the Church itself, when it interprets and formulates its dogmas and its saving truth? Does not this accord of individuals have a greater value when it has the character of catholicity, antiquity and of larger numerical agreement? On this point we want to bear in mind the definition of the Tradition given by Saint Vincent of Lerins: "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est, hoc est vere proprieque catholicum." (Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitorium*, 2, PL 50,640.)

19. The "traditions" in Protestantism and their relations with Orthodoxy.

Let us now look at the "traditions" within Protestantism from the above perspective and emphasize the points in which these "traditions" present some points of contact with our Orthodox world and not the points in which, theologically, Protestantism goes further away from us in the subject of the Tradition.

In fact, if we examine the "western traditions" under this prism, we see that in the vicissitudes of history, while the Roman Catholic tradition continuously goes further away from the Eastern Tradition, the Protestant form of the Western tradition followed another course as Orthodoxy also followed a course which led towards Protestant "traditions".

In the presence of the extreme developments of the conception of the Tradition within Papacy, the Protestant world showed greater sympathy for the Orthodox Tradition even

though Protestantism rejected the notion of the Holy Tradition.

On the other hand, the Eastern Orthodoxy tried to present its Tradition in a way which would be comprehensible for Protestant minds. This is the significance, I think, of most of the relationship between Orthodoxy and the Churches of the Reformation in these last four Centuries. The Orthodox confessions of faith of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries, the long exchange of letters, the published "Tomoi", the mutual contacts and visits between Schools and individuals, and also the political and diplomatic relations between the Protestant Powers of West and Greek-speaking and Slavonic-speaking Orthodoxy, were the most natural ways for Orthodoxy to make its Tradition comprehensible in this sympathetic world of Protestantism. And all these ways were neither the refusal of nor treachery towards Orthodox teaching; nor suspicious means for proselytism to Orthodoxy for anyone of the members of the communities of western traditions. If we are accustomed to speak about some influences of Protestantism upon Orthodoxy, I think we must remember that apart from any question of influence, the biggest pre-occupation of the Orthodox writers was to render the Orthodox Tradition more and more comprehensible to the Protestant world.

It is another question whether the critical antinomy in Protestantism, which denied the acceptance of the Tradition above is its own "traditions", would not permit our Protestant brothers to come to a real restoration of the conception of the Tradition, to a real "re-traditioning".

CONCLUSION

20. "Retraditioning", ecclesiological restoration and re-uniting.

"Retraditioning!" Let us finish this paper by this term. Please do not consider it either too bold or too unusual.

My Protestant brothers will agree with me that the period between the beginning of the Reformation until now was a period of "detraditioning" in spite of some notions of "traditions" which they cultivated from time to time. They will also agree that this period of detrading was negative for the ecclesiological restoration. We have already said: Church and Tradition are things bound together.

If we now take into consideration that with the delay of ecclesiological restoration, any desire and attempt for the

reuniting must remain unfruitful, we can understand, I think, what is meant by "retraditioning".

We cannot consider ecclesiological restoration and reuniting except as a sincere effort for "retraditioning".

Aims of the Association

To unite members of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches for the following objects: (1) To pray and work for Reunion; (2) To promote mutual knowledge, sympathy, and intercourse between the Churches; (3) To encourage the study of Eastern Christendom.

Some Methods of Helping the Work

1. By joining the Association and getting others to join.
2. By arranging for a meeting in the neighbourhood, when a lecture may be given on the Eastern Churches and Reunion, and the objects of the Association explained.
3. By asking the Parochial Authorities to promise a Sunday collection every year either in the service or afterwards at the doors.
4. By uniting in local centres for the study of Eastern Christendom, and for Intercession for Reunion.

Lectures — with or without lantern illustrations — can be arranged by writing to the General Secretary.

Subscription

The normal annual subscription is 10/- (Life-membership £5), but none will be excluded solely on account of inability to pay this amount, while it is hoped that those who can afford to pay more will do so.

All members receive the Eastern Churches News-Letter which is published quarterly.

LOCAL MEETINGS. The Association is willing to provide speakers on Eastern Christendom for both large and small groups of people — of parishes or societies. For information apply to the General Secretary.