

EASTERN CHURCHES

News Letter

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

No. 52. JUNE 1969

PRICE 2/6 TO NON-MEMBERS

CONTENTS

Editorial

Obituary

The Filioque

A new Confession of Faith

Book Reviews

*No responsibility can be accepted either by the General Committee or by the Editor
for the views expressed by contributors*

THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN CHURCHES
ASSOCIATION

founded in 1864

Orthodox Patron:

The Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I

Anglican Patron:

The Archbishop of Canterbury

Anglican President:

The Bishop of London

Orthodox President:

Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira

Chairman of Committee:

The Revd. H. R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

General Secretary:

The Revd. P. J. MASON
Top Flat, 85 Mortimer Road, London, N.1

Treasurer:

J. S. ULLMER, ESQ.
32 Chiltley Way, Midhurst Road, Liphook, Hants.

Editor of News-Letter:

The Revd. HAROLD EMBLETON, R.N.
5 Marryat Gardens, Manadon, Plymouth, Devon

EDITORIAL

There is a proverbial saying about good intentions: fashionable nowadays is the word "flexibility". Between the two lies my explanation as to why all three items promised last quarter for inclusion in this number are not here.

In the first place, it has not proved possible to complete the review of developments in Greece to my satisfaction; and secondly, it seemed preferable to use the space that would have been taken by an account of some developments in Orthodox theology in order to print in full Professor Agouridis's paper on the *Filioque*.

Dr. Agouridis pays us a great compliment by writing specially for us on this subject. It is not a subject that many Anglicans find easy to comprehend; but in this present analysis the Professor succeeds both in presenting the heart of the problem for the Orthodox and also in showing differences of approach by them to it. This is certainly an article to keep by one for re-reading.

It is always a pleasure and a boon to the Editor when he receives your contributions and your letters: it may not always be possible either to print them or to act upon the suggestions, but they will never be ignored.

ANNUAL FESTIVAL 1969

For your diaries, here is the date for this year's Annual Festival:

Saturday, 11th October

Full details will be given in the next issue of the *News Letter*.

IN MEMORIAM

SIR HARRY LUKE, K.C.M.G.
died in Cyprus, on 11th May, 1969

Members of the A. & E.C.A., together with many others who seek East-West reunion, are conscious of the sad loss they have sustained by his passing from among us.

It was, however, happy for him that he spent some of his last days in the surroundings of Malta and of Cyprus, both of which places were dear to him.

A note from him, dated 23rd January last, came from Malta and told me of his great pleasure to be staying in Mdina once again and enjoying both his Maltese friends and the charms of the old citadel town. (Mdina was Malta's capital in Roman times, and remained so under Arabs and Normans) Sir Harry Luke was glad that a piece of Siculo-Norman architecture, which he helped to preserve in Mdina 35 years ago, has been reproduced by the present Government on a new stamp.

Britain has seldom possessed a more able Colonial administrator. His industry was formidable, his memory fantastic, and his enthusiasm for the welfare of the people under his charge outstanding. Among his special gifts was the gift of languages, and this brought him into very close contact with the people wherever he happened to be serving—Armenia, Georgia, Palestine, Cyprus, Malta, and so on. The foreign element in his ancestry no doubt enriched his distinctive character; but at the same time it was sheer hard work and keen sense of duty which made him so valuable a public servant.

A. & E.C.A. has good cause to be grateful for the kindly help, as speaker and as author, that he always proved ready to lend to our cause. (And, of course, the same will be said of C.F.R. and the Nikaean Club). His loyalty to his Church needed no proof, yet I recall a day (in '34 or '35) in Malta, when he insisted upon taking over "some job or other"—as he said—"for our pro-Cathedral" there.

As Lieutenant Governor he was perhaps the busiest man on the Island at the time, and the spirit in which he served the community was itself a fine bit of "God's service". Nothing would stop him, however, and he undertook the not too enjoyable task of cataloguing the Cathedral library (mostly 19th century and early 20th century Theology and History).

To explore the lesser known corners of Christendom was a passion with him. For instance, at the end of his time in Malta, he made a trip to Sicily to make himself familiar with its Greek temples and Norman architecture. He was soon diverted, however, by the discovery of a Uniate church of Italo-Albanians there, about whom he wrote a learned article for *The Times*. This is included in a collection of essays which he published under the title "*More moves on an Eastern Chequerboard*".

God grant him peace . . .

—HAROLD BUXTON

One who worked closely with Sir Harry on C.F.R. writes:

Two of the many activities of Sir Harry Luke which were only briefly mentioned in *The Times* obituary of 12th May 1969 were his membership of the Eastern Churches Committee appointed by Archbishop Davidson in 1919, and of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations which Archbishop Lang appointed to work in an expanded field of activity in 1933. In both decades Sir Harry was holding appointments overseas, and while sustaining his interest by correspondence his appearance at meetings was, of necessity, infrequent. After 1946, however, he was more often in London and, when in 1955 it became vacant, he was free to accept the chairmanship of the Council's committee in relation to the affairs of the Ancient Oriental Churches.

He succeeded Sir Ronald Storrs as chairman of the Nikaean Club, which in commemoration of the Council of Nicaea exists to

offer hospitality to official guests of the Archbishop of Canterbury and to promote social intercourse and solidarity between members of the Anglican and other Christian Communions. It was a particular pleasure to Sir Harry Luke to exercise this responsibility; and those who heard him speak appreciated his colourful scholarship and humour, his wide knowledge, and his amazing memory.

During his service overseas he contributed a number of articles to the *Christian East*.

Those who worked with him knew, and remember with gratitude and affection, his courtesy and kindness.

THE REVEREND R. M. FRENCH

died at Canterbury on 1st March 1969

For 21 years, from 1924 to 1945, Reginald Michael French was our General Secretary and held the A. & E.C.A. together during the difficult period following the First World War, the disruptions of Europe and in particular Eastern Europe that came out of the Second Great War.

His experience and contacts as English Chaplain at Archangel gave him a deep and unforgettable love and reverence for the Holy Orthodox Church of Russia, and in particular led him to undertake the translation into English of "*The Way of a Pilgrim*". Through the latter, a classic of the spiritual life and a literary gem, many have gained an insight into the Russian religious mind: it also made his name as a writer.

During his tenure of office he was responsible for gathering a body of Serbian young men and establishing a course of training for them in Oxford, the fruits of which became evident in the careers of a number of distinguished Serbian clergy in later years. This experiment was repeated later under the inspiration of Bishop Buxton; and a body of about 40 staff and students were established at Dorchester.

French was an eloquent speaker and preacher, as well as an accomplished writer; and his gifts were put to unstinting service of the Association during the long term of his secretaryship. A Requiem for his repose was offered at St. Dunstan's-in-the-West on 28th March.

AUSTIN OAKLEY

ON THE FILIOQUE

Whenever serious attempts have been made to find unity between the Eastern Church and the Churches of the West the *Filioque* takes first place in the minds of the theologians. This is natural, and it is true even today. In view of the current ecumenical dialogue between the Churches the following thoughts on the subject have been written, with no other aim than that of expressing the Orthodox position in this matter.

I would begin with some general observations and by referring to the contribution of more recent Biblical studies on this theme. Anyone going through the relevant bibliography might think that those studies had no bearing on the dogmatologists in their treatment of the question of the *Filioque*.

Western commentators continue to interpret the passages relevant to the *Filioque* from traditional theological presuppositions. In *John xv 26*, for example, all Western exegetes take "proceed" as being the same as "send". In this sense both words are understood to have the same apocalyptic meaning as the five references to the Paraclete in Jesus's farewell words to His disciples: so say the Protestant commentators, B. Weiss, W. Bauer, W. Howard, R. Bultmann, and others. The Roman Catholic commentators make certain reservations and allow the possibility that the passage speaks of the eternal procession of the Spirit in the Godhead, on which "send" depends; but this is always done in the terms of the *Filioque*. Thus, the *Jerusalem Bible*. (p. 1422) notes that the phrase "who proceeds from the Father" means "the mission of the Spirit in the Trinity"; and Lagrange, ". . . it seems to us . . . the present tense 'proceeds', as distinct from 'I will send', points to an emanation or, according to the accepted and more textual term, an eternal procession of the Spirit in relation to the Father. This procession goes from Himself for the Son, as the very name indicates: it should be indicated for the Spirit, in order to show His supreme authority" (*The Gospel according to St. John*. Paris. 1927. p. 413).

On the other hand, the Easterns accept the relative clause in the total context as a parenthesis, understanding "proceeding" as an eternal present and clearly distinguishing "proceeding" from "sending". In this way N. Damalas (*Memorandum on St. John's Gospel*, p 624) and P. Trembelas (*Memorandum on St. John's Gospel*, p 559) interpret it, in agreement with the exegesis of Theophylact and Zygavenos.

I am of the opinion, however, that in more recent Biblical studies three things have happened which, if I may say so, directly support the Eastern point of view on this subject:

- (a) the analysis of the concept of the Spirit of the Lord, in the Old Testament. Modern Biblical scholarship is re-establishing the Church's doctrine of the Trinity on the old, firm, Patristic basis, viz. the Old Testament. The Fathers of the Church developed her Trinitarian dogma in the face of the world's various excitements on the basis of the concepts of the Word of God, the angel *malak Jahwe*, the wisdom, the Spirit, or the glory of the Lord in the Old Testament.
- (b) the contemporary study of the Gospels has established more clearly and consciously the role of the Spirit in the life and work of Jesus. This did not happen in the past: the work of O.

Holzmann, *War Jesus Ekstatiker* (1903), was merely the point of departure.

- (c) Biblical study has established more clearly and consciously the concept of "the age of the Holy Spirit", i.e. the Church, in the field of the Divine Dispensation as well as the importance of the Spirit for the life of the faithful.

The significance of these observations lies in the vindication, through modern Biblical studies, of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Divine Economy in the face of certain accusations made by some Western theologians against the pneumatocracy and mysticism of Eastern Christianity. Personally I believe that in both cases it is a matter of intemperate views being justly condemned. But the development of pneumatology in modern Biblical scholarship can, I think, help Western Christians to understand better the Easterns, and precisely in the matter of the latter's struggle against the *Filioque*.

* * * * *

The present position of Orthodox theologians over the question of the *Filioque* can be summarised under the following three standpoints.

- (1) The *Filioque* is to be found in a fair number of the ancient Fathers of East and West in an Orthodox sense, i.e. the procession of the Holy Spirit from the common essence (*ousia*) of the Godhead; and this does not mean the hypostatic nature of the Son. The West has tried, from fear of polytheism, to emphasise the unity of the Godhead by means of the *Filioque*; the East has had exactly the same object, stressing the *monarchy* of the Godhead by rejecting the *Filioque*. The greatest stumbling block as regards the *Filioque* has been its introduction into the Creed, in spite of the explicit forbidding of such action by all the Ecumenical Councils, which have anathematised any alteration of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.

Whatever the reasons for the insertion of the *Filioque* into the Creed in Spain—probably in order to combat Arian heresies—it is a fact of history that it was German theology principally, encouraged by Charlemagne's displeasure at not being recognised by Byzantium, which put forward the *Filioque* as a question of the unity of the Church. As long as the Pope played the part of mediator between the Germans and the Byzantines, even after the schism of 863, the unity of the Church had not been shaken to its foundations. Only when, after the renaissance of the Papacy and its demands for sovereignty over the whole Church, these demands and the German theology of the *Filioque* had been joined together and imposed in Italy, only then did the *Filioque* and these demands by the Popes divide the Church fundamentally.

According to this view, whilst not overlooking the importance of the religious and dogmatic questions in the Schism between the Churches of the East and of the West, particular emphasis is laid on the historical, cultural, economic, social, linguistic and other causes which led to the Schism: not suddenly, as a result of some error of tactics by Pope Nicholas or Photios, but as a result of deeper changes which from the fourth century onwards took place both in East and West, so that the two parts of the Christian Church were separated from each other and ceased completely to understand one another.

Again, it is held by these theologians that the insertion of the *Filioque* into the Creed by the Westerns would not have dealt a fatal blow to ecclesiastical unity if it had not been for the intervention of the antagonism between East and West engendered by the christianisation of the Slavs, and also if the Crusades had not been diverted to pillage and destruction in Byzantium—culminating finally in the occupation of Constantinople in 1204 and the establishment of a Latin hierarchy in most parts of the Empire (and outside it), many parts of which had been Greek by tradition for centuries. Under these conditions, for the Orthodox the *Filioque* meant the creed of the conquest of the Popes, the Franks, the Venetians and the Genoese in the East.

Today the situation is no longer that of the past which created this situation. On the contrary, new historical factors attract West and East the one to the other. If the conscience of the Easterns were to cease to tie up the *Filioque* with the *Drang nach Osten* of the Popes, without the question of the *Filioque* being resolved from the side of the theologians—since it is only its insertion in the Creed which constitutes a problem—the Churches would be able to return to a form of communion and to the relationships which obtained in the period from Photius to the time of the Fourth Crusade.

This view of the *Filioque*, without the Easterners' underlying feelings, is accepted by the greater part of those Greek intellectuals (a small party of Orthodox theologians being the exception) who either are not interested in the deeper theological questions or think that over this question the whole furore has been about words and phrases without any essential meaning for the religious life.

(2) The majority of Greek Orthodox theologians believes that the *Filioque* is not only an addition to the Creed of Nikaia-Constantinople but is also in essence a heresy. These theologians reiterate the arguments of Photios in his *On the Mystagoge of the Holy Spirit*. There Photios enumerates most of the arguments against the *Filioque*, of which the chief are two: firstly, the *Filioque* abrogates the *monarchy* in the Godhead, and secondly, it reduces the Person of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity.

Both are very serious charges; and their effects on religious and ecclesiastical life are not inconsiderable. For an Orthodox faithful

the Church's life consists essentially in the appropriation of the energies of the All-holy Trinity. An erroneous doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, means an erroneous religious and ecclesiastical life. I will give two examples: for an Orthodox the *Filioque* expresses a mistaken "sole-government" (*monokratoria*) by Christ in the Church which in a way facilitates a sole-government therein by the Pope of Rome as successor of Peter and supreme representative of Christ on earth. Secondly, for an Orthodox the clericalism of the Roman Church is an outcome of the *Filioque*, since by contrast monasticism and the lay element in Orthodoxy could never have occupied the place which they do possess without repudiation of the *Filioque*.

It is not necessary, then, to be over-suspicious in order to see that, in the history of the relations between the Churches of East and West, the two problems—*Filioque* and the *monokratoria* of the Popes of Rome—as problems of the unity of the Church have appeared almost simultaneously. This is no chance, whatever may have been the cultural and other reasons which have been bound up with these theological questions.

(3) In recent decades a comparatively small group of theologians has revived in the conscience of the Orthodox Church a concept of the *Filioque* which was developed in the East by Archbishop Gregory Palamas of Thessaloniki, in his love of the Hesychasts and in opposition to the Latinisers, in the middle of the fourteenth century. The strange thing is that Palamas's argument had been wellnigh forgotten; and stranger still is the fact that in the Minutes of the Council of Florence (1438–39) the Greek representatives seem scarcely to have used this argument. Today this point of view has some famous representatives within Orthodoxy.

According to it, the *Filioque* is based on the confusion of the divine essence and the divine energies in the West, which knows only a divine essence and a created divine energy. The mission of the Holy Spirit to the world is certainly not a created divine energy: wherefore the Western theologians relate it to the divine essence, when mission and procession come to mean the same thing. By natural reasoning, too, we come to the *Filioque*. According to the Eastern theologians, who from the time of the early Church have made a clear distinction between the divine essence, the uncreated divine energy, and created divine energy, the procession of the Holy Spirit belongs to the divine essence and His mission to the uncreated divine energy. In this latter sense we say either that the Spirit is sent by the Son or through the Son, which means the same thing. But the Spirit proceeds only from the Father, just as the Son is begotten only by the Father. The begetting and the procession are relationships of the Trinity within the divine essence: the mission of the Holy Spirit is an uncreated divine energy, i.e. it belongs to what we call "God", and relates to the revelation of the Triune God to the world but not to the ineffable, inexplicable,

unknowable essence of God. "The divine is infinite and incomprehensible, infinity and incomprehensibility being comprehended only by the divine", writes John Damascene (*Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, I.4 in Migne P.G. xciv, 800b).

If indeed the *Filioque* is related to the confusion in Western theology between the divine essence and the divine energy, then the *Filioque* displays very deep differences between Eastern and Western interpretations of Christianity. Palamas, for example, writes: "if there is no difference between the divine essence and the divine energy, then there is no distinction between doing and begetting or proceeding; and God the Father acts through the Son in the Holy Spirit. And so He begets and proceeds, according to their particular glory, through the Son in the Holy Spirit" (Migne P.G. cl. 1189), and he adds: "if, in their idle talk and thinking, there is no difference between the divine essence and the divine energy, then doing, which is the work of energy, is no different from begetting and proceeding, which are of the essence. If doing is not distinct from begetting and proceeding then the actions are not distinguishable from the offspring or the projections; and if this is so applied to them, the Son of God and the Holy Spirit are nothing but creations, and all creatures are of God, offsprings and projections of the Father, and the creation is made divine, and God is ranged with His creatures. Wherefore the blessed Cyril shows the difference between God in His essence and God in His energy, His begetting being of His divine nature and His action being of His divine energy; and he speaks out clearly—nature and energy are not the same thing" (*ibid*).

Western theology, especially since Augustine, because it does not distinguish between the divine essence and the divine energies, has interpreted God's revelation in the Old Testament as having been made through created symbols which God created *ad hoc* and obliterated as befitted the requirements of the revelation. This it did because, according to the presuppositions of Augustinian theology, the essence of God would come into contact with the world, which was impossible without falling into pantheism. But anyone of this opinion thinks that a real revelation to mankind and man's communion with God in the Biblical sense is problematical. What is called "knowledge" of God, the union of God with man, and deification, become doubtful.

By distinguishing between essence and energy in God, man can know God, and have fellowship and union with Him, and be deified, without partaking of the divine essence: he partakes of the energies of God, which are God but not identified with the essence of God. On this basis the mission of the Holy Spirit, as well as the mission of the Son, are uncreated energies of God: it is God, the divine grace, coming down to man, and thereby is effected revelation to, communion with, and deification of man; but the begetting of the

Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit refer to the relations of the Trinity within the divine essence.

Thus the *Filioque*, looked at from this point of view, can be considered to be an expression of a difference between East and West in their understanding of the revelation of the glory of God, and of the communion of God with man. For it is obvious that the doctrine of the uncreated energies of God safeguards man's direct communion with God as it is taught both in the Old Testament and in Christ and the Church: in this communion man partakes of the grace and the glory of God, is transformed, is deified, but without at all partaking of the divine essence. The whole spirituality of the East is founded on this experience, which is expressed theologically by Palamas. This spirituality is expressed in that view of the Church and the sacraments which sees them not as treasuries of the created divine graces, but as direct illumination in human life by the uncreated energies of the Holy Trinity. It is expressed, too, in the view of the administration of the Church as directed by the Holy Spirit through the gatherings of her representative bishops, and in the view of the clergy and laity, etc. True Orthodox theology has always been a theology of worship and sacraments.

* * * * *

CONCLUSIONS

(1) A theological dialogue between East and West, and discussion of subjects like the *Filioque*, cannot take place without first separating theological themes from the psychological accretions with which history has loaded them (schisms, crusades, propaganda, etc). The dialogue of love is essential before the theological dialogue. The Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras and the holy Popes of Rome have achieved much; and much more (e.g. the Uniates) could be done in this field. History will recognise this work.

(2) The theological dialogue between the Churches, as in the case of the *Filioque*, will have then a very substantial content, in contrast to what happened in the past at Lyons (1274) and Florence (1438) due to political and other pressures. It will not be a case of "pretend-subjects" so that one part of the Church may assume the guardianship over another: it will be a case of the regeneration of the whole of Christianity. The recognition that the views typified under (1) and (2) above are representative of only a small minority of Orthodox theologians presents the *Filioque* as a problem even on the Orthodox side. It is, therefore, itself a reason for having theological dialogue as a means of regenerating the whole of Christianity.

(3) In the discussion of the *Filioque* between Old Catholic/Anglican and Orthodox theologians (which began at the Bonn Conference in 1874 and 1875) it has been made clear repeatedly that our Old Catholic and Anglican brethren do not attach due importance to the *Filioque*: they believe that it is a matter of termi-

nology, of rephrasing past misunderstandings and removing the inability of Greeks and Latins to understand one another. But, from the Orthodox standpoint, such a position cannot lead on to fruitful discussion.

"IS A NEW ORTHODOX CONFESSION OF FAITH" NECESSARY?

SAVVAS AGOURIDIS
Professor of New Testament at Athens University

The question of the composition and publication of an Orthodox confession which would be complete and common to all is a rather new problem for Orthodoxy, at least if we stress the word "complete", which corresponded, it seems, to the thought of those who drew up the agenda for the Pro-Synod at the Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes. We have, of course, several confessions coming from the post-conciliar period. (1) Among them we note, above all, that of St. Gregory Palamas to the Council of Constantinople of 1351 and that of St. Mark of Ephesus to the pseudo-Council of Ferrara-Florence of 1439-1440. Equally well-known is the confession of Gennadios Scholarios, Patriarch of Constantinople, which he presented to Sultan Mohammed II (2); its goal being limited to introducing the Christian faith to the Moslems, it lacks rigorous dogmatic precision and is of no theological interest. We also have a series of confessions from the post-Byzantine period. Among these the best known are those of the (future) Patriarch of Alexandria, Metrophanes Critopoulos (1625), of Metropolitan Peter, Mogila (1640-1643), of Patriarch Dositheos (1672) and that of the Council of Constantinople of 1727, the author of which was patriarch Chrysanthos.

All these confessions were composed in response to concrete situations and precise theological problems; they therefore did not pretend to be complete and universal, or able to replace the others. Certainly in our time there will be no objections in principle against a new order of confession, either general or particular, which can be established and approved by a future ecumenical council. The Church today provides all the gifts of grace, and the aid of the Holy Spirit is always at work to formulate the teaching and avoid falling into error. Therefore the question is not so much of a possibility in principle, but of the necessity or usefulness of publishing a confession of a general order in our time, and also of the practical means of realising such an enterprise.

One must say first of all that "complete" confessions of faith, i.e. general and universal, are more characteristic of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism than of Orthodoxy. Because they

were in many respects new religions, distinct from the faith and teaching of the ancient Church, these two groups experienced the vital necessity (it is hard to say which of the two experienced this urge more acutely) to formulate, for the sake of their own preservation, their new doctrine in more or less complete detailed confessions of faith. Thence come the symbolic books of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.

The situation of the Orthodox Catholic Church is very different. It not only continues the ancient Church in our time, it is identical to it in faith and doctrine. For no other reason than that, the Orthodox Church has experienced rather less sharply than others the need for formulating confessions of faith, especially confessions of a general nature.

One cannot deny that since the Ecumenical Councils a large number of errors have appeared, especially during the last centuries, as much among Orthodox as among the heterodox and unbelieving world which surrounds them. It would appear to be incumbent upon Orthodoxy to respond to these errors and define its attitude towards them.

This question is in reality more complex than it appears at first. First of all, the Church avoids, from earliest times, judging and studying in detail beliefs and doctrines which are strange to it; it had rather consider it to be its task to respond to errors and deviations born within the bosom of Christianity itself and to express itself about them. Thus the Ecumenical Councils did not discuss or study pagan beliefs or philosophic doctrines, but refuted and condemned Christian heresies. The Church completely rejected non-Christian doctrines, but it considered it sufficient to oppose its faith to them in a positive way, without analysing in detail (at least officially and in session) those beliefs which were alien to Christianity. It would be a mistake to establish this attitude as a general rule, all the more since the external circumstances have now changed; but the example of the ancient Church retains its general prestige. On the other hand, numerous errors of our time, seemingly new, in reality are the rebirth of old heresies under new names, already defined and condemned by the Councils. Finally, the questions and the intellectual and spiritual needs of humanity in our time are so varied and numerous that it seems really difficult to respond to them by the means of any "complete" confession.

One must say that in general the idea of a "complete" and universal confession of faith is on the whole strange to the Orthodox ecclesiological conscience. The tendency to define everything and formulate all the objects of faith exactly violates the essential principle of theological and ecclesiastical liberty in unity and love, which the celebrated formula of St. Augustine expresses with such relief: *in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*. As for what the Fathers considered to belong to the domain of free theology, I

would cite the following words of St. Gregory of Nazianzus the Theologian: "philosophise about the universe, or the universes . . . about the resurrection, the judgment, the retribution, the sufferings of Christ, for in these subjects it is not without usefulness to press on to the end, especially since it is not dangerous to be in error. But let us pray to God for success, in a small degree now, and later, perhaps, in a more perfect way in Jesus Christ Himself" (3).

In other words, questions of creation, redemption, and the final destiny of man belonged, in the eyes of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, to the domain of theological liberty, where "it is not dangerous to be in error". This is not to say, of course, that the Church ought not to touch on them, but it would be improper to define all that in a dogmatic and conciliar manner. In a general way, the Orthodox Church is distinguished in this from Roman Catholicism, for it does not promulgate dogmatic decisions where they are unnecessary, where there is no danger of error. In effect, in the conscience of the Church, a dogma is rather a guarantee against error, an indication of what cannot be thought about God, than a positive revelation of the teaching about God. Professor A. I. Vvedenski said, "Orthodox dogmas are neither impediments nor fetters to thought . . . they are no more than preserving definitions by means of which the Church wants to place human reason in the necessary perspective for opening to it the possibility of an unencumbered and unhalting progression, avoiding the dangers of a deviation into deceiving ways" (4).

The composition of a new Orthodox confession, finally, could be a pretext for scandal among the "rank-and-file", the pious faithful who could see in the very fact of such a confession the admission of a certain insufficiency, even of an error requiring a rectification in Orthodox doctrine as it existed until now. One cannot afford not to take into account this possibility, for such was the response of Eastern Patriarchs to Pope Pius IX in 1848. "Among us neither the Patriarchs nor the Councils have ever been able to introduce novelties because the defender of the faith is the body of the Church itself, that is to say the people themselves, who war the faith to be without change for ever and that it be identical to the faith of the Fathers" (5). In the present case, this would be only a psychological obstacle, since, of course, there is no question of a new faith, but of its new complementary formulations, such as have occurred many times in the history of the Church. However, the promulgation of a new, complete confession of faith could provoke some difficulties, even schisms.

What is even more important is that the composition of a complete confession of Orthodox faith effectively worthy of this name is difficult to realise from a practical point of view. Must not such a confession express the whole plenitude of the Orthodox ecclesiastical tradition, such as is manifested by the Fathers in their consensus?

However, it could neither mechanically repeat what has already been said nor be a mosaic of texts and patristic quotations: it would have to be a creative synthesis and an application to our time of "a neopatristic synthesis", according to the expression of a well-known contemporary theologian, Fr. Georges Florovsky (6).

But the moment has not come for such a synthesis, faithful in spirit to the holy Fathers and at the same time free and complete. First of all, the study of the Fathers itself is still far from the degree necessary to provide sufficient foundation and material for a synthesis, despite the development and success of patrology in the last decades. This is all the more so since the participation of Orthodox theologians in the current renewal of patristic science is still very weak, as the patristic congresses of the last years have proved. For we cannot base ourselves on the results of the work of non-Orthodox scholars, however high our regard for their scientific work may be.

One may fear, consequently, that the composition of a complete Orthodox confession at this time would be a little beyond the capacity of Orthodox theologians. Or rather we risk composing a confession which would be felt to be inadequate and a failure, if not immediately, at least in succeeding decades: it would be too much conditioned by the limitations and defects of the theological thought in our own epoch. Such a confession could, even if it is approved by council, be a dead weight hanging over free and creative theological thought, making itself an impediment and a constraint instead of serving as a direction and a guide. The Holy Spirit would certainly preserve such a conciliar text from errors in faith. But, since the human factor is also active in the Church, and since the Holy Spirit does not do violence to human liberty, the infirmity of men in all its poverty could not help but be manifested in the text of a complete Orthodox confession.

It seems to us, consequently, that the moment has not arrived for the composing and publishing of a complete confession of the Orthodox faith.

+ BASIL (KRIVOCHINE)
ARCHBISHOP

FOOTNOTES

- (1) The sources are indicated in our article "Les textes symboliques dans l'Eglise Orthodoxe" in *Vestnik Patriarshego Ekzarkhata* No. 48, pp 197-217, No. 49 pp 10-23, No. 50 pp 71-82. The present article examines new aspects of the problem.
- (2) Text in I. Karmiris *Dogmatic and Symbolic Monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church* Vol. I Athens 1960, pp. 429-436 (in Greek).
- (3) *Hom.* 28 in Migne P.G. xxxvi 25a.
- (4) *Bogoslovsky Vestnik*, June 1904, p. 196.
- (5) Karmiris, *op. cit.* II p. 920.
- (6) "L'ethos de l'Eglise orthodoxe", in *Vestnik* No. 42-43 (1963) p. 141. (This article is re-printed from *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, Vol. II No. 2, 1967 by kind permission of the Editor).

THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE SERBIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

Liberation left the Church plundered and disorganised in 1945. The separation of Church and State, the abolition of the law on the Patriarchate tax and State assistance, the confiscation of nearly all Church property—all these things happened at the same time. What remained was subject to such taxation and conditions as to be more of a burden than an asset.

In the agrarian reform, 70,000 hectares of land and forest were confiscated. Ecclesiastical establishments (such as the press and the insurance corporation) were nationalised. The currency reform liquidated pension and other funds. 1180 church buildings were nationalised (worth 8 milliard dinars then, five to ten times as much now). Compensation was so poor as to be hardly worthy of that term, and in any case was to be paid over a period of fifty years.

There were 3,148 priests, 537 other officials, and about 100 pensioners, widows and orphans to be paid. The budget had to be reduced from 284 million dinars to 10 million, and beneficiaries from 3,600 to 100. What other organisation could have survived, when nine-tenths of its assets had been decimated?

Now the Church is experiencing a rebirth, possibly on a healthier basis than when it had all it needed. This convinces us that the Church must find the means for its existence and its mission fundamentally in its tie with the people and in faith in itself. How did it recover?

The parochial clergy were removed from the budget and entrusted to the care of their pastorate. At first it was difficult, but then the people accepted responsibility for the priest. The Church can be very proud that so few priests left the ministry. Diocesan staff and bishops were struck off the budget and had to make arrangements for their own upkeep. Catechists (in the schools) who lost their jobs were sent to parishes. Eventually the Theological School was struck off the State's budget and dismissed from Belgrade University. What State aid remained was finally cut off. But life had to go on.

A system of voluntary contributions was instituted: the income was divided, 10% to help distressed dioceses, 25% for the general needs of the Church, and the remainder to deal with emergencies. But collecting the contributions was difficult because of the different laws in the various republics which comprised the Federal State. Eventually it was left to the dioceses to collect them; but further interference on the part of the State led to the collapse of the system. Since then, the Church has never been allowed freely to collect contributions: a house-to-house collection is regarded as breaking the law. Other methods had to be found.

An appeal to the parishes to levy a tax three times a year for the general needs of the church helped to increase revenue; and a candle factory was established. Now income is increasing from voluntary contributions, taxes, sale of candles, icons, records, postcards and calendars. But it is still not enough, and there is nothing available for investment. There are still many ruined churches; and St. Mark's and St. Sava's in Belgrade are still not finished.

We must openly admit that without the State's assistance we could not manage. The fact that the Church has been receiving such aid (apart from an interruption in 1952-5) continuously should be no surprise: it is a repayment for the enormous estates confiscated, a minimum compensation for all the sacrifices made—and it is right, since other religious groups receive aid.

The well-known Marxist writing in *Politika* on 29th November 1967 can help us to understand why it is given: "our society is moving towards making self-government its fundamental principle—and this not just for atheists, who are a minority among those who govern themselves". But aid is not unlimited; and just at the moment, when it is the most needed, it is more constrained than ever. A duty is laid on all to seek the best way out of the present situation. It can be found: it must be found.

(Translated by the Revd. Peter J. Mason, and gratefully reproduced from *Pravoslavje* of 9th May 1968).

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH OF BULGARIA

Professor Todor Sabev, of the Theological Academy in Sofia, and a member of the Executive and Central Committees of the World Council of Churches, was interviewed last month by the Ecumenical Press Service of W.C.C. in Geneva: the following article is made up from Professor Sabev's replies to questions about his Church in Bulgaria.

* * * * *

Out of a total population of 8,400,000, nearly 6 million Bulgarians are Orthodox Christians; and their Church has some 3,200 churches and 500 chapels (where a service is held only on the Feast of their patron saint), served by nearly 2000 priests. There are more than 100 monasteries (some very small) with about 400 monks and nuns.

The Bulgarian Church is the oldest Orthodox Church in Europe (*sic!* Ed.). Founded in 870, it was elevated to a Patriarchate at the beginning of the 10th century; but after the Turkish invasion at the end of the 14th century, the Bulgarian Orthodox Church was

brought under the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In 1870 it was reconstituted as the Bulgarian Exarchate, and in 1953 it regained the status of a patriarchate.

Bulgaria has eleven dioceses, each under a Metropolitan who is chosen by an Electoral Council, selected by the faithful of the diocese and composed of priests and laymen in equal numbers: the Council elects two bishops, and the Holy Synod chooses one of these as Metropolitan. The Patriarch is elected by a "People's Ecclesiastical Council", composed of metropolitans, priests, monks and laymen representing the dioceses, the larger monasteries, and religious schools.

The Holy Synod, composed of the Patriarch and the Metropolitans, is the supreme religious and administrative authority. Legislative power is exercised by the People's Ecclesiastical Council: economic and financial affairs are the responsibility of the Senior Ecclesiastical Council, consisting of clergy and laity and presided over by a Metropolitan.

All Bulgarian Orthodox living abroad are under the Church's spiritual jurisdiction. We have a twelfth diocese for our compatriots in the U.S.A., Latin America, Canada and Australia, as well as Bulgarian priests in Istanbul, Vienna, Budapest, Bucharest and Galati, ecclesiastical representation in Moscow and a monastery on Mount Athos.

In the field of education, we have a theological college (which is a secondary school) with 200 pupils, and an Academy (university) with 145 students. The number of students is growing, especially in the past two years.

Relations with the Protestants have been improving in the past few years. The increasingly favourable ecumenical atmosphere should enable us to establish a National Ecumenical Council. Representatives of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, such as Professor Stephane Tzankov, have been pioneers in the Ecumenical Movement, from which also we have received substantial help, particularly during the schism with the Patriarchate of Constantinople (1872-1945) and the prolonged isolation from our sister-churches.

The Church was separated from the State after the Socialist revolution of 1944. This move was well received, for under the previous regime the Church had suffered greatly from ruthless State interference in ecclesiastical matters. Article 78 of the present Constitution and the law on ecclesiastical affairs give all the religious communities the right to "self-organisation and self-administration". "Citizens are guaranteed liberty of conscience, confession and religious worship" (Art. 78). "Whoever forcibly or by threat hinders the citizens of the recognised confessions from freely practising their faith and carrying out their rites and religious services is liable to punishment" (Art. 304 of the Penal Code).

Existing legislation ensures freedom to build churches, houses of prayer, religious schools, etc. (Arts. 7, 8 and 14 of the Law on Public Worship). "When required, the State may grant financial aid to the various confessions" (Art. 13, same Law). The Orthodox Church receives an annual grant, representing between one-sixth and one-eighth of its total budget. The other Churches receive no grants. My Protestant friends tell me: "We prefer not to ask the State for a grant—it is not part of our tradition". Oh, these Puritans!

Indirectly the State has encouraged ecumenism. Under the Constitution, the law on public worship and the Penal Code: "Whoever, for religious motives, on a religious basis, by word, deed, press or other means, preaches hate, is liable to three years' imprisonment and a fine of 400 leva". Also "it is forbidden to abuse religion and the Church for political ends, and to form political parties with a religious basis".

To summarise, the principle governing relations between Church and State is one of non-interference. We take for our own the words of Jesus: "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things which are God's". The Church is therefore free to organise its own affairs.

However, we do not always agree with the State. For example, Christians openly disapproved the plan to transform the large Monastery of Rila into a national museum (1961). Finally the State, heeding the people's feelings, reversed its decision and allowed the Church to re-establish the monastic life. We try to do our Christian duty and help the Church in its mission, while remaining loyal citizens, faithful to the interests of our people and country.

The Church has the right to own property: the Holy Synod, the dioceses, the monasteries and most of the parish churches own land. Near the monasteries there are 75 farms belonging to the Church, with more than 1,600 hectares of land. The Church owns administrative premises, housing, schools, factories, old people's homes, a technical organisation for the construction of ecclesiastical buildings (with its own engineers, architects and technicians, paid by the Holy Synod).

The State has granted the Church a monopoly in the manufacture of certain religious articles made in several small workshops in the capital and in monasteries and diocesan centres. The Church fixes the price of the finished articles. This not only enables it to exercise its mission, but also provides an important source of revenue.

The Holy Synod is undertaking a new translation of the Bible in Bulgarian, and a representative of the Protestant Churches will take part in the work of the Biblical Commission. So far the Catholics have not expressed a wish to participate. Preparations for the publication of the New Testament will probably be completed by the end of this year: revision of the Old Testament will

take longer. Cooperation with our Protestant brethren in this field will enable us to rediscover together the message of the Scriptures, an important aspect of ecumenism!

Unquestionably it is possible for the Church to exercise its missionary function unhindered, although existing laws restrict activity among children and the rising generation. In addition to preaching geared to the catechism, the Church conducts religious education through discussions, lectures given by theologians and priests and organised on church premises by Orthodox Christian confraternities, periodicals (*The Church Magazine*, a weekly, and the monthly review, *Spiritual Culture*), and religious and theological literature issued by the Holy Synod's own publishers and sold by several bookshops and religious shops.

The law on public worship (Art. 20) says the education and instruction of the rising generation "are the special province of the State and are outside the sphere of activity of the religious confessions". We can work with those children and young people who come to church, attend discussion groups and religious lectures and show an interest in religious life.

THE ORTHODOX AT UPPSALA

The Fourth General Assembly of W.C.C. at Uppsala last year was a most significant event both for Orthodoxy and for the "Ecumenical Movement": for the first time the Orthodox constituted the largest confessional group attending the conference, and this preponderance is heightened if one adds the representatives of the several non-Chalcedonian Eastern Churches. The great change took place at New Delhi in 1961, at the Third General Assembly, when the Russian Orthodox Church applied for membership of W.C.C. and was followed by practically all the Orthodox Churches of Eastern Europe.

It was only twenty years before, at the First General Assembly at Amsterdam, that the comparative handful of Orthodox delegates from the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Orthodox Churches of Greece and U.S.A. felt obliged to issue a separate report, having been unable to sign the majority's Report. Now, in 1968, there were Orthodox delegates in every Section and sub-section, and their influence on the discussions and in the final reports was considerable: this time there was no need for a separate report.

The large number of delegates from Eastern Europe, Orthodox churchmen from Communist countries, also had an effect when political, economic and social questions were being discussed; and as a result of the political cleavage between East and West, the relevant documents emanating from Uppsala lacked a certain balance and fairness.

Theologically and spiritually, however, the Orthodox showed a great and practical unity in their treatment of the Assembly's theme: "I make all things new". This unity was due in no small part to their action in setting up a small committee of theologians from the various national Churches, under the chairmanship of the Revd. Professor John Meyendorff. This group had three working sessions, where reports of the various Sections were heard and given appropriate Orthodox evaluation; and then all the Orthodox delegates were given advice before the plenary sessions and the voting. In consequence the Orthodox maintained complete unity, in witness to the unbroken tradition of the Fathers.

The opening address to the Assembly, on the general theme of the gathering was delivered by an Orthodox—Metropolitan Ignatios Hakim of Latakia in Syria, of the Patriarchate of Antioch. The Bishop analysed the Biblical concept of "renewal" and concluded that "new", at its depth, can only be the Resurrection of Christ. "The event of renewal occurs in the darkness, for it is challenged, it fights because the structure of this world is also diabolical".

The Bishop accused the so-called "new theology" of blurring the distinction between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world. He went on: "the best way of solving the doctrinal or pastoral issues which still prevent full communion between separated Christians consists in turning oneself toward the Coming Lord . . . If this is done, one would be able to distinguish better in the Church between the structures and the organisation. The only true ecclesiastical structure is the sacramental one, i.e. everything which the Spirit gives as a sign and permanent energy of the coming of the Lord. The Church is essentially sacramental, because the Lord is not outside, or beyond this world, but comes into this world. Organisation, meanwhile, is man-made: it is obviously necessary, if it serves the acts of love, but it is historically contingent. It is not yet the new thing. The Church is not a sociological order: it is a power of creativity, an instrument of the Holy Spirit. On this level only it has structures".

In the light of this sacramental understanding of Christianity, also, the Orthodox reacted to the other major concerns of the Assembly: social injustice, the disparity between rich and poor nations, racial conflicts, and war. True justice and true reconciliation are to be found in Christ and the Spirit.

In the work of the first Section, "On the Holy Spirit and the Catholicity of the Church", the most significant amendments to the original draft were due to Orthodox initiatives. But no less decisive was the Orthodox influence in the fifth Section, on "Worship". Its chairman was Professor Meyendorff, under whose guidance the title of the Section's subject was reduced to the one word "Worship", since it was felt impossible to reach any agreed

definition of "secularism". Once again, it was Christ's newness and not some secular newness that was proclaimed; and how typically Orthodox it was to see the "crisis of faith" behind the "crises of worship".

Many Orthodox delegates shared the opinion voiced by the "Youth delegates" — that there was too much emphasis put upon the preparation of documents for publication: was there not some other way of "communicating" themselves and their message to the world? Too much had to be attempted in too short a time; and too much time was taken up with formal speech-making.

On 16th July the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom was celebrated in Uppsala Cathedral, under the auspices of the Finnish Orthodox Church. In his sermon, Archbishop Paul of Finland referred to the longing of all Christians for fellowship at the one Lord's Table; and recalling the Assembly's theme, he said "the foundation of all renewal has been laid for all ages in the words of Jesus: "This cup is the New Covenant in my blood". This New Testament, and the Eucharist as the actual realisation of it, remain the sources of continual renewal unto the end of the present age of the world".

Speaking many weeks later, after due reflection, Metropolitan Meliton of Chalcedon said in Vienna that the central theological problem which Uppsala failed to solve was how to view the Christian faith. Should the Christian Church and W.C.C. "move in a vertical direction, aiming mainly at conversion, rebirth and the fulfilment of man in Christ? Or in a horizontal direction, aiming at curing the evils in the world, the creation of a moral order of things on this earth?"

"The great Fathers of the Church in the East never distinguished between the vertical and the horizontal, because their theology held in view the whole vision. It was a theology of the whole of cosmic dimensions, of the God-man who became "flesh-bearing" so that man might become spirit-bearing.

"Today we need to renew theology at the springs of Patristic thought. This does not mean turning back, but it does mean turning away from fragmentation and towards the whole, and openness to the prophetic element".

Such a renewal of theology, together with their sacramental approach to the whole of life, could well be the continuing contribution of Orthodoxy in W.C.C. To say this shows no great gift of prophecy! But if I were to venture any "prophecy" it would be that this new "presence" of Orthodoxy within the World Council of Churches, coupled with the increasing association and involvement therein of the Roman Catholic Church, could lead to a new polarisation in Christendom—the details of which might yet surprise us, even if they vindicate the vision of our illustrious fore-runners in this Association.

HAROLD EMBLETON

BOOK REVIEWS

The Witness of the Oriental Orthodox Churches: Recovery, Re-discovery, Renewal. By Bishop Karekin Sarkissian. With a Foreword by Dr. Charles Malik. Beirut, Lebanon. 1968. (Obtainable in England from S.P.C.K. Bookshop, 17s. 6d.)

Dr. Aziz S. Atiya in his *History of Eastern Christianity* has recently provided English readers with a definitive and exhaustive history and description of that group of Churches variously described as "Ancient Oriental" or "Non-Chalcedonian". Bishop Sarkissian, who is already well-known in this country for his important work *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church*, has a different aim. He seeks to evaluate the contribution which those Churches sometimes called "Monophysite" have to make to ecumenical dialogue.

The book falls into three parts: 1. "The Witness of the Oriental Orthodox Churches", originally written and delivered as a lecture at the Centennial of the American University of Beirut in 1967 during an ecumenical week of study on the theme "God and man in contemporary Christian thought". 2. "The Old and the New in our Churches", a public lecture delivered in Cairo in 1966 on the occasion of the second meeting of the Standing Committee of the Conference of the Oriental Orthodox Churches. 3. An Appendix of Extracts of the "Findings and Decisions of the Conference of the Heads of the Oriental Orthodox Churches" held in Addis Ababa in 1965. Dr. Malik, who introduces the book, is himself a (Chalcedonian) Orthodox.

The first main section of the book is undoubtedly the most important. The Bishop does not disguise that there is need for renewal in certain areas of the Non-Chalcedonian Churches, but he also makes clear that all the seeds of renewal are there, and that the common Western assumption that they are hidebound and anachronistic survivals is as false as it is unfair. He is not without his criticisms of the Western Church, and of the Ecumenical Movement as a predominantly Western phenomenon, and some of the most important things he has to say are concerned with how the Ancient Oriental tradition may complement Western progressiveness.

The extracts from the report of the Addis Ababa meeting are most useful, since the full report (which was published in Ethiopia) is not easy to see in this country.

That this book has an importance quite out of proportion to its size is due to the high prestige which Bishop Sarkissian enjoys not only among the Churches of his own faith, but throughout the *oikumene*. As the Non-Chalcedonian Churches play an increasing part in the Ecumenical Movement, it is important that this book be widely studied.

H.R.T.B., O.G.S.

The Martyrdom of Bishop Platon. By Juri Poska. Stockholm. Publication of the Estonian Apostolic Orthodox Church. 1968. n.p.

Bishop Platon (Paul Kulbusch) was murdered by Red Guards on 14th January 1919. The exiled Synod of the Estonian Orthodox Church has decided to apply to the Ecumenical Patriarch to confirm canonisation. His panagia is already venerated by the Estonian Orthodox as a relic and was placed on the altar of St. Nicholas Church in Stockholm when Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira (the present Locum Tenens of the Estonian Orthodox Church) celebrated the Liturgy there in 1964. This slight but interesting study is designed to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of his martyrdom.

The Archpriest Paul Kulbusch was for 23 years (1894-1917) priest of the Estonian parish in St. Petersburg. He was a convinced Estonian nationalist, who worked tirelessly for the independence of Estonia and for the autonomy of its Church. While in St. Petersburg he was an outstanding member of the Russian branch of our Association, becoming a Vice-President after his consecration in December 1917.

During his one year as Orthodox Bishop of Estonia, he worked amidst increasing difficulties to consolidate and encourage the Orthodox parishes. Less than two months after his consecration the country was occupied by German troops, and the Bishop sent a memorandum to Archbishop Davidson complaining about the German oppression. In December 1918 Communist troops invaded Estonia; and less than a month later Bishop Platon was arrested. Twelve days later he was murdered, after undergoing torture, at the very time that Estonian troops were recapturing the city. He was given a State funeral by the Estonian Government, and his tomb is in the Transfiguration Cathedral in Tallinn.

H.R.T.B., O.G.S.

The Life of St. Seraphim. By Valentine Zander. Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. 1968. 3s. 6d.

This little book, which is attractively printed, has been translated from the French original (1953) by a Religious of the Society of the Sacred Cross: through it Western Christians may catch a glimpse of the authentic spiritual tradition of the Orthodox East, in the person of the famous Russian *staretz*, St. Seraphim of Sarov.

The author is the widow of Dr. Leo Zander, professor at the Institute of St. Sergius in Paris, who played so great a part in the Ecumenical Movement and in presenting Orthodoxy to members of other Communions in Europe and America.

Mme Zander has devoted whatever time she has been able to spare to the study of the Saint's life and teaching, and this is by way of being a first-fruits of that study. Intended originally as a book

for children one may be forgiven for hoping that she will give us the further fruits of her work in the not too distant future.

At the beginning of this book we learn how the idea of it was the outcome of a visit with the Abbe Paul Couturier to the shrine of the famous Cure d'Ars, whom that great worker for unity likened to the Russian saint here portrayed. Unifying may it be: not only between Orthodox and Catholic, but between East and West in general.

Anglican readers may not find this book always easy, living as we do in a materialistic and rationalist environment; but the simplicity of Seraphim's life is the essential prerequisite for his depth of holiness, and his Vision of God will give light on our path.

One or two errors in printing ought not to have got past the proof-reader . . . as Dr. Zernov (not "Zemov"!) will agree, no doubt.

H.E.

AIMS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The Association exists to unite members of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches for the following objects:

- (a) The principal object for which the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association is established is the advancement of the Christian religion, in particular by means of teaching the members of the Anglican Church and those of the Eastern Orthodox Church the doctrine, worship and way of life of the other.
- (b) The Association exists also to unite members of the two Communion in prayer and work in achieving the principal object, with a view to promotion of visible unity between them.

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 visual aids – can be arranged by writing to the General Secretary.

SUBSCRIPTION

The minimum annual subscription is 10/-, 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.