



Monastery of St. John the Theologian, Patmos

KOINONIA

THE JOURNAL OF
THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN
CHURCHES ASSOCIATION

New Series No. 48 Autumn 2003

ISSN No.
0012-8732

**The Anglican and Eastern
Churches Association**

Founded 1864

Orthodox Patron: The Ecumenical Patriarch
Anglican Patron: The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury
Orthodox President: The Archbishop of Thyateria and Great Britain
Anglican President: The Lord Bishop of London

Chairman of the Committee:

The Revd William Taylor
St John's Vicarage
25 Ladbrooke Road
London W11 3PD

0207 727 3539

wtaylor@btconnect.com

General Secretary:

The Revd William Gulliford
Hen and Chicken Court
184A Fleet Street
London EC4A 2HD

william.gulliford@london.anglican.org

Treasurer:

David Powell
32 Westminster Palace Gardens
Artillery Row
London SW1P 1RR

Contents

Orthodoxy from an Anglican Perspective (Revd Dr John Binns)	2
Anglicanism from an Orthodox Perspective (Fr Gregory Woolfenden)	8
The Anglican–Oriental Orthodox Commission Armenia, November 2002 (Fr William H Taylor)	14
Agreed Statement on Christology from the Anglican–Oriental International Commission	22
Report from The Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies, Cambridge	26
Remembering Rev. Dumitru Staniloae (Mihail Neamtu)	29
Obituary: Metropolitan Anthony (Canon Dr Andrew Walker)	33

From the General Secretary, The Revd. William Gulliford

On the Association's behalf I should like to congratulate Fr. Kevin Ellis, our new editor, for commissioning the articles contained in this issue of *Koinonia*. Fr. Kevin is bearing the burden of a lengthy interregnum in his parish in the Gloucester Diocese and I am delighted to preface this edition with a few words.

As I write the Pilgrimage is coming to an end in Greece and Fr. Philip Warner has just been installed at St. Magnus the Martyr, once the parish of Fr. Fynes Clinton, a luminary of the Association's past. Fr. David Bond has given this pilgrimage his all and I am sure it will prove to have been a most uplifting time for everyone. It is good to have Fr. Philip restored to these shores. At Fr. Philip's installation, the Bishop of London paid a fitting tribute to his sojourn in Belgrade. Extending friendship and engagement with the realities of day to day life in Orthodox communities is one of the great strengths of the Association. The Association and the Church of England has a great deal for which to thank Fr. Philip. In uncertain times for the life of the Anglican

Communion all initiatives which spread the desire for unity and the necessity of a common Christian witness in our broken world, are essential.

The recent death of Metropolitan Anthony was the opportunity for Christians of all traditions to honour the outstanding contribution he made to 20th century Christianity. We are pleased to print the obituary from the Independent which is by Professor Andrew Walker – our last Constantinople Lecturer. The Association was represented by the Chairman of the Committee and myself as well as many members. May he rest in peace.

Fr. John Binns' contribution to *Koinonia* is most welcome after the recent publication of his book, *An Introduction to the Christian Orthodox Churches*. He states most eloquently the unmistakable and lasting impact of Orthodoxy on faithful Anglicans. Fr. Gregory's observations about the Anglican tradition give pause for thought and are timely in the current climate. Fr. William Taylor's summary of the dialogue with the Oriental Churches is most illuminating and underlines the Association's firm support for the Oriental Churches and Assyrian Church of the East.

I look forward to welcoming all members, friends and guests to the Annual Lecture on Thursday 27th November at my Church, St. Dunstan-in-the-West at 6pm. One further notice is that Sarum College, Salisbury in conjunction with the Fellowship of SS Alban and Sergius is offering the following two-day course, *An Introduction to Orthodoxy*, over 12-13 December 2003. For further details please contact Sarum College, 19 The Close, Salisbury SP1 2EE.

A Critical Appreciation of some Aspects of Orthodoxy from an Anglican Perspective

Revd. Dr. John Binns

I was baptised into an Anglican church when I was a few months old - was confirmed at the age of 14 - ordained deacon at 26 - then priest at 27 - and have been ministering in various Church of England parishes for over twenty five years since then. While I cannot foresee the future I would be surprised if, at some time in the future, I was not buried with Anglican funeral rites. Yet within this apparently straightforward Anglican progress, Orthodox writers, teachers and friends have given me guidance, support and inspiration. The fact that both east and west have been inextricably tied up in my experience of the Christian life means, I suppose I must be both appreciative of the Orthodox tradition, since it has exercised such an influence, and critical, since I have not found myself drawn into membership of the Orthodox Church.

It began when, as a student who was somewhat hesitant and uncertain in my faith, and becoming a little disillusioned with the Anglican church which I had grown up in, I saw advertised a week long mission conducted by Metropolitan Anthony Bloom. So on Monday of the mission week I went to the evening talk on faith: By Wednesday I was there at the lunchtime session on prayer as well, and by Friday I was spending most of the day at the events, with informal discussion with the Bishop in the morning as well as lunchtime and evening talks. The vision of Christianity which he offered was intellectually rigorous, poetically beautiful, ascetically demanding, and suffused with a deep compassion which was rooted in human experience. It made a strong impression on me and led me into a period of several months of turmoil and searching which resulted in my enrolling in the theology faculty and then to ordination as a priest.

Before ordination, I spent about six months based at the Orthodox Theological Faculty in Belgrade, but travelling around the country trying to experience the life and worship of the church in the villages, monasteries and seminaries of Serbia. It was an entry into a new world. In those days Serbia was still part of the Yugoslavian federation and definitely a Communist country. Russian was the language taught in schools and the dominant influence, and I met very few people who spoke English. The Serbian Orthodox Church, while suffering much discrimination, was firmly rooted in the devotion and piety of the villages of Serbia. It was a different world not only from the theology faculty of Cambridge University but also from the Orthodox communities I had begun to know in England. Being Orthodox was inextricably tied up with being Serbian. I shared in the veneration of the bodies of the great medieval saint kings, the annual commemoration of the Battle of Kosovo Polje (1398) on Vidovdan, and numerous festivals or slavas when many thousands of people travelled miles to the church or monastery, stayed up all night singing and listening to sermons, and then feasting after the liturgy the next day. In comparison with these great expressions of popular faith, the Sunday liturgy seemed less important and was often hurried, perfunctory and poorly attended. The churches were often in a poor state of repair, grubby and poorly maintained. Icons were often cheap reproductions of Italian Catholic as well as Greek prints. I was constantly asked how I crossed myself, whether I kept the fasts and how many sacraments I affirmed - what mattered was being identifiably and visibly part of the Orthodox community and nation.

I was struck by how faith was deeply rooted in the life of the community, how it was naturally and unselfconsciously lived out, and was firm, rigorous and uncompromising. The people were amazingly hospitable and my own faith was once again questioned and reshaped by the friends, teachers and experiences which Serbia

gave me with such great generosity. But, I thought on many occasions, it was a very different experience from the Orthodoxy I had been introduced to by Bishop Anthony and had seen at the Cathedral at Ennismore Gardens and in other English Orthodox circles.

I returned to my Anglican theological college somewhat confused. I remembered to cross myself as instructed by the bishop in Belgrade, fasted until after the eucharist, read the fathers, placed my icons on the wall as the first thing I did on moving into a new room. I was also looking forward to ordination, and ministering in the Church of England. Mixed loyalties are the price to be paid for encountering other church traditions.

So like many Anglicans who encounter the Orthodox Church I was faced with the problem of what to do with the experience. One possibility is to embrace the life of the church and seek to be admitted. Another is to keep the church at a safe distance, occasionally dropping in to the liturgy, enjoying the music and reading some popular Orthodox books. But perhaps there is a third way. This is to try to be loyal to both, taking both with the greatest seriousness, constantly trying to understand what is unfamiliar, recognising that both are part of the tradition of the church. This way is to recognise that we believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, but also to recognise that we find somewhat inconveniently that this one church of the creeds is not coterminous with any of the church communities as they have emerged from two thousand years of history. Faithfulness to the presence of the Spirit in the Church compels us to somehow see ourselves as belonging to a complex, divided community. While we must retain our place in a given eucharistic community, we also recognise our roots in and our need of other parts of the church.

This is the base of ecumenism - the leading by the Spirit into all truth, the recognition that truth transcends our understandings of it, the call to be an uneasy and unsettled member of your own church, to acknowledge the movement of God in other church communities, and - above all - to realise that for your own faith to be whole it must share in this reaching out and this openness to others.

Such an approach is difficult and demanding to maintain with honesty and integrity, but conforms to the Anglican understanding of the church. For us, the Church is diverse as well as one. We Anglicans cannot but be aware, often painfully aware, of the diversity within our own communion, and the public and adversarial way in which difference is paraded and played out. But we see this, I hope, as a positive and necessary condition of being the church in a fallen world. Unless we seek the safety and security of becoming a sect of likeminded people, diversity and difference has to be recognised and welcomed. By contrast the Orthodox understanding of unity is attractive, but I wonder whether it is sufficient.

I understand the insistence by Orthodox theologians on the unity of the church - based on the celebration of the liturgy, the tradition enshrined in the decisions of the ecumenical councils and teachings of the fathers, and communion with the patriarchate of Constantinople. But I find myself asking why this unity of faith does not lead to unity of practice, and why Orthodoxy looks so different in different communities. I would suggest that to be the church truly and honestly in the contemporary world, we need a clear and positive recognition of the diversity in the church. This has implications both for how we see our own church, but how we see others too.

Following on from this, I wonder what the point of ecumenism is for an Orthodox. For an Anglican it is fairly clear - we affirm a fairly simple nucleus of the Christian faith, accept intercommunion leading to mutual recognition of ministry, and participate in a growing unity of mission and local common life. Anglicans may not be good ecumenists in practice but our understanding of the church enables us to engage in ecumenism, and there is a fairly clear idea of what ecumenism is trying to achieve. I do not sense the same clarity among the Orthodox. For the more conservative, ecumenism is a great heresy of our age, attacking and eroding the church from within. Others are more positive, but even among these, I don't understand what they are hoping and working for in the ecumenical dialogue and I don't know what is actually meant by unity in faith and I cannot visualise what this unity would look and feel like. There is a real engagement by the Orthodox in the dialogue with other churches which has been of the greatest significance, and this must, I think, shape how they understand both the Orthodox and other churches.

The questions we are exploring here are relatively new. The arrival of Orthodox in significant numbers in Britain is a phenomenon of the 20th century. In 1900 there were less than ten Orthodox parishes. In 2000 there were more than 200. The turmoil of the last century has led to large scale migration which has decisively ended the barrier between east and west. The gain to the west has been great and it is worth reflecting how much the worship of the Anglican and other western churches has been enriched by this encounter. The encounter between east and west has had hugely rich and fruitful results, at least for the west.

Icons are now an accepted part of both corporate and private devotion. The Vladimir Mother of God and Rublev Old Testament Trinity must be among the most familiar images to be seen in churches today in Britain.

They are recognised as more than religious pictures, often with a votive candle stand next to them or placed near the altar. Reproductions of icons appear not only in glossy covered art books but in collections of meditations and prayers as well.

Some Orthodox may complain that icons lose their meaning and cease to have the character of an icon if removed from their proper liturgical setting in an Orthodox Church and part of Orthodox liturgy, but it is surely the case that if there is a true theological content to the icon then it should be able to reach out to others outside its strictly correct liturgical place. The gift of the icon to the west has opened fresh dimensions of worship and theology for people who had been encouraged to be wary of the risk of idolatry at worst or distraction from a pure faith at best by the looking at visual images. As a reminder of how rapidly and painlessly iconography has entered into the tradition of the west, look at the Bibliographical sections of books published only a few decades ago. I was rereading the little book on Orthodox Spirituality by Lev Gillet, the Monk of the Eastern Church, published in 1944. The section of the bibliography on icons contains just three titles one in Russian, by Sergei Bulgakov; one in French, by Louis Brehier; and one in German by E. Trubetskoi. Today a similar bibliography could contain a long list of works in many languages.

The discovery of the icon is an obvious example but many other examples could be added. The Jesus Prayer has become a recognised part of western spirituality, and fine books on its practice have been published by Anglicans, Methodists and Lutherans as well as Orthodox. In contrast, it is little used in many Orthodox countries. In Egypt, for example, where you could argue that it all started, the Jesus Prayer was until recently regarded as something of a novelty.

Here there is no doubt, the tradition of Orthodoxy is appreciated, and has become part of a world wide Christian tradition. The Anglican view is clear - if it is helpful then we welcome it and what's more we are untroubled about claiming it as our own. It becomes part of our tradition.

But news bulletins and reports have also publicised a less savoury aspect to Orthodox life. Bosnia, Kosovo, Chechnya, Nagorno-Karabakh - these names evoke a dark and violent world in which intolerance, violence, nationalism, anti-Semitism, hostility to Catholics and Muslims are bound together with faithfulness to the Orthodox Church. Affirmation of Orthodoxy demands total rejection of what is not Orthodox. Here Anglicans are more than critical and utterly condemn these travesties of our faith, and dissociate themselves from them.

But before being too quick to condemn we should reflect on some of the roots of these conflicts. In common with Jews and Muslims, Orthodox have maintained a strong sense of community. Faith is not a personal conviction which is reached after reasoned consideration and which belongs in the private realm of inner spirituality. Instead faith is concerned with all of our lives - our personal, social, and political

relations as well as spiritual. The Byzantine Empire existed from 320 to 1453 - well over half of Christian history. Here Emperor and Patriarch worked together in a 'symphony' of co-operation to govern and regulate society according to Christian principles. This long period of Christian rule was followed by a period of non-Christian rule in which Orthodox were always discriminated against and often actively persecuted - by Arabs, Ottomans, Communists and nationalists (the latter especially in Turkey in the late 19th and early 20th centuries). Thus, deep in the heart of Orthodox communities there is both the dream of the truly Orthodox state and the vivid memory of family and friends brutally killed. I can recall many discussions with Orthodox friends who had been tragically embroiled in ethnic conflict, when my western liberal concern for ecumenism or tolerance seemed to trivialise or even dishonour the memory of the numerous family members killed by those of a different faith community. It was not that tolerance was not needed nor that reconciliation was not essential. Rather that, as a westerner from a liberal democracy, I was speaking in a different language with ideas and experiences which had little meaning or relevance. I think that for many Orthodox both the past and the present are both hard to live with. It is hard for Orthodox to build a church and a society which is faithful to the memory of those who have suffered in the past and also open to the possibilities of a creative and different future.

Amidst confusing and rapidly changing societies in Orthodox parts of Eastern Europe, we can discern a new determination to build a society which is truly Orthodox. This is shown by the way that renewal is happening. There are a huge number of church building projects so that the landscapes of towns and cities is being transformed to show that the church is visibly reemerging from the shadows, and becoming once again present in the midst of daily life. Then there also seems to be a preoccupation with education, in schools, churches and various institutes. The remarkable growth of education projects is equipping the laity as well as the clergy to rebuild the church and to educate young people in Orthodox principles. These two concerns - building and education - seem to me to show a determination not just to encourage people to become Orthodox but to build a society soaked in Orthodox traditions and principles. I suspect that these two concerns could be the basis of a society which is both Orthodox and open. In post-Communist societies the church is discovering its identity and its mission, after many centuries of discrimination. It is too early to discern the shape of the Orthodox churches of the future, but it may that they will retain their rootedness within local communities, develop a social and corporate understanding of their mission, and remain close to the national consciousness of the people.

Is it too much to hope, I wonder, that the encounter between Orthodox and Western Churches may produce a church which is both open and accepting of others but also confident in its witness to and assertion of a truly Christian society?

As an Anglican, I value and draw life from the church. The church, I believe, is not the infallible guardian of all truth, but is the place and the community where Christ is encountered.

Here we read the Scriptures and celebrate the Eucharist within a community committed to the same way of faith. Here we meet the Risen Lord present in His Spirit. But this Lord is always above and beyond, and one of the directions in which he leads is towards an encounter with other churches.

For me the encounter with Orthodox is always an encounter with the Spirit of God; and our meetings with members of other churches is a discovery of new friends in the faith. Here is the place where the Spirit of God is leading us into truth. Ecumenism is far more than official discussions between the representatives of churches or the programmes of ecumenical agencies. It is the pilgrimages in and to the Kingdom of God and the friendships we all make along the way which lead us into the truth. The last century has transformed relationships between Orthodox and Anglicans, and the next century will continue this process.

I owe deep gratitude to many in the Orthodox and Anglican churches, who have been companions, teachers, guides and friends.

The Revd Dr John Binns is Rector of Great St Mary's Cambridge and author of *An Introduction to The Christian Orthodox Churches* (CUP, 2002) which will be reviewed in the next issue of *Koinonia*

A Critical Appreciation of some aspects of Anglicanism from an Orthodox Perspective

Fr Gregory Woolfenden

Having been invited by the editor of *Koinonia* to write an appreciation and critique of the Church of England/Anglican Communion, I must first admit that my perspective is not that of a cradle Orthodox, but rather one whose journey has taken him from Anglicanism through Roman Catholicism to Orthodoxy. Now I am in a sense back again, teaching in an Anglican Theological College.

On the other hand the Anglicanism of my youth now seems a different world and I find that I in fact am an outsider looking in.

People do not gain a real impression of a Church by first studying its constitution and polity. Nor does the full realisation of what a particular church is about come from a study of its doctrines, no matter how hard the more cerebral of its adherents appear to press such a line. Most people will only start to understand what a church's life is really like when they encounter and experience it as a living and worshipping reality. For this reason I will start by reflecting on Anglican worship, and that most particularly within the Church of England, for, except for some experience of the Church in Wales, that is where my personal experience has been gained.

It is almost *de rigueur* when speaking of Anglicanism to emphasize the dignity of Anglican worship. As a child, my parish church had a very well attended Parish Communion every Sunday. It was dignified and impressive, and for many years if I wanted to remember the words of the Creed, I simply sang it to Merbecke. I discovered Cathedral Evensong as a teenager and that service was for some years an integral part of my regular worship pattern. Between those two poles of Eucharist and Daily Office I discovered the joy of worshipping God in the company of others. One of Anglicanism's great strengths was and, to a great extent still remains, a realistic and readily accessible Daily Prayer in memorable and broadly understandable language. Unfortunately there is a developing rift between the Prayer Book offices of the choral foundations and the new Daily Prayer services of *Common Worship* which latter appear to be primarily aimed at private recitation, or for the use of small, largely clerical, groups. It is odd that such a traditional service as choral Evensong can be so often well attended in college chapels and Cathedrals, when received wisdom would have it that modern language and simple hymnody have a monopoly of 'relevance'.

It is probably true to say that historically, the centrality of the offices in Anglican life was due to a reduced emphasis on the Eucharist as the normal main service of Sunday, even though that was the intention of so many Reformers. The revivals of the nineteenth century and the Parish Communion movement brought the Eucharist back to the centre of Anglican church life. Now the potential riches of *Common Worship*, that can have prayers based on the *Apostolic Tradition* and St Basil, as well as the Prayer-Book, bodes well for the eucharistic future of the Church of England, and for many other provinces of the Anglican Communion.

On the other hand, the long neglect of the Eucharist and the rise of enlightenment ideas left many Anglicans unsure as to why they celebrate the Holy Communion at all. The desire to place preaching at the centre of worship remains strong in many parts of Anglicanism but carries a seeming inability to recognize that actions may speak at least as loud as words. The populist assumption that everything must be readily understandable from the very beginning, and a misplaced worry about seeming to exclude seekers, appears to be making much modern worship little more

than second rate entertainment. The same understandable, but ultimately wrong-headed, itch to preach at rather than to people has led to a culture of one-off services that are aimed at conveying a message. This surely ignores the fact that Christian worship has no other purpose than the adoration of God - edification can happen, but it is ultimately secondary. Worship must be Godward first.

However, preaching is closely connected and in fact integral to worship. Anglican preaching at its best has been critical and yet inspiring. Perhaps the finest sermon on sin I have ever heard was delivered by an Anglican. The problem in many places is that inspiration has given place to education, and in all too many cases, sheer pressure of other work means that many admit that their sermon preparation is nothing like as thorough as when they were in theological college. Some seem to use the sermon to parade their doubts as a sign of their honesty. Honesty in preaching is essential, but so is the ability to inspire and encourage one's hearers, too much doubt may lead to disheartenment. On the other hand there are plenty of preachers who are appear to be so convinced of the rightness of their theological and/or moral convictions that they either lead their people into an intolerance only matched by their own, or simply drive them away.

The consideration of preaching raises the question of what one preaches. Hooker's triad of Scripture, Tradition and Reason has often been the foundation of a very distinguished Anglican scholarship. At one time Anglican scholars dominated the world of patristic theology, and although no English Barth seems likely, there have always been those, like the present Archbishop of Canterbury, who are willing to push the boundaries of dogmatic statements without losing touch with a foundational orthodoxy of belief. One also cannot forget that lay persons like Evelyn Underhill have exercised an enormous and beneficial theological and spiritual influence. All the best Anglican theologians have always given the impression that their theology was intimately connected with their prayer.

Recently there has been a tendency to add 'experience' to the triad. This does not appear to be so healthy. In the first place there is a modern inclination to treat scripture, tradition and reason as self-contained boxes. For some Anglicans the box marked scripture is paramount, to the extent that the role of the shared church tradition in bringing the Bible into existence at all is dangerously ignored. Many would-be upholders of tradition see it as a receptacle of past decisions rather than the continuing life of the church, while some emphasize reason as almost able to produce new doctrines that have little or no connection with the scriptural tradition in its fullness. On top of these confusions comes a frankly self-centred emphasis on the individual and the personal, on experience. If experience is to be of value then surely it must be rationally examined against the scriptural tradition of interpretation.

In addition to this, we are now witnessing a serious decline in Anglican theological scholarship. Though Biblical Studies are still attracting dedicated and able scholars, it is getting ever more difficult to find top-ranking Anglican theologians to fill chairs such as those at Oxford. No doubt connected with this is a real lack of theological depth in ministerial training. This is not, I believe the fault of the institutions that educate the clergy. From my own, admittedly biased, perspective, I believe that colleges and courses are doing their best, the problem is closely connected with the depressing lack of a basic biblical and theological knowledge amongst many now coming into training. Colleagues across the Anglican spectrum report a depressing lack of Biblical literacy and a highly attenuated experience of church life and belief. This lack of a background once widely assumed, combines with an often rushed course, to produce good, but frequently, theologically underdeveloped clergy.

One must also say that Orthodox find it difficult to understand the ease with which some Anglicans seem determined to jettison traditional beliefs, and even the reality of God, while continuing to hold ecclesiastical office. This does not mean that we would encourage an inquisitorial witch-hunt, but surely those of us who are both ordained and theologians must combine our theology with the tasks and responsibilities we freely accepted at ordination. Similarly some Orthodox are suspicious of a theological pragmatism that appears to declare certain areas as being of no theological importance, when that is perceived as suiting the current climate of opinion. One of these areas must be the continuing question of women's ordination. Is this really, as is often claimed, a matter of no doctrinal significance, when there is a major discussion in the Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches of the significance of the simple fact that such ordinations are no part of the scriptural tradition we have received? This does not mean that women cannot ever be validly ordained, it means that the theological discussion of ordination is still not conclusive either way for the Orthodox and for a very influential part of Roman Catholicism. I hope that some of my readers will stay with me long enough to learn that I have always supported the ministry of my women students, and several of them are amongst my closest friends. I also hope that others who have now decided that my remarks are 'unsound' might stay with me to the end!

There is of course, a question of authority here. Since Orthodoxy has resisted the tendency to concentrate centralizing authority upon the see of Rome, the more

¹ One thing that many Orthodox find very distressing is the way in which opponents of women's ordination often abuse those they differ from. Even this discussion can and should be carried on with courtesy and mutual respect.

dispersed model of authority in the Anglican Communion is immediately attractive. It has often been noted that although the Anglican Communion no longer finds its common identity in the English (or Scottish/American) prayer books, there remains a shared sense of Anglicanism that is very difficult to define. Some parts of that identity include the fact that the great majority of Anglican clergy, like their Orthodox brothers, are married and have families. The shared experience of a ministry of word and sacrament that is solidly based in a life not that different from that of the laity can mean that clergy and people have mutual empathy for and support of one another.

A very different aspect is the concept of the 'national church'. Although the only Anglican church to actually be established is the Church of England, other Anglican provinces frequently maintain close contacts with national and local government agencies and can do much to influence those authorities for good. The Orthodox have great sympathy with the idea of the church of the *ethnos*, the nation, but have often fallen into the trap of seeing that as excluding other religious groups from genuine participation on the national stage. Anglicans have often been much better at maintaining the balance between established privilege and public responsibility.

An Orthodox observer might however now be concerned with a seeming desire to ape a Papal style of leadership on the one hand and to adopt a highly bureaucratic and managerial style on the other. Recent discussions about the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the possibility that a non-Briton might one day be chosen for that role, show that the pattern of the modern Papacy is highly influential. The idea is one of supra-national leadership which, excellent as it sounds in theory, can dangerously downplay the idea of the church as a conciliar body headed by Christ. The desire for what has been called 'a visible centre of unity' has attractions for many; some Orthodox see it as a way of giving a more prominent role to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Many western and eastern Christians see it as a role that might be filled by a 'purified' Papacy. The question that an Orthodox should put is whether our Lord really did will a visible centre of unity, or whether He desired His people to be one in Him?

The problem of managerialism is found in other churches as well, and seems to be particularly obtrusive where dioceses are large and impersonal, or where the attractions of supposed economy power a movement towards supra-diocesan central structures staffed only too often by clergy whose pastoral role has been dangerously attenuated. I must emphasise that this is not a purely Anglican tendency, however rather more peculiarly Anglican is a weak and sometimes non-existent monastic witness. While Orthodoxy and Anglicanism share the many advantages of a predominantly married clergy, Anglican religious communities tend to be the preserve of certain groups within the various churches. It must also be admitted that the

numbers of Anglican men and women adopting this form of Christian witness is very reduced even from the small numbers that embraced it at its height.

Another difficulty that one may perceive may be the mirror-image of the managerialism and centralisation of the Anglican churches, and especially the Church of England. This is the temptation to a form of congregationalism. One manifestation of this is the sort of Evangelical parish that, secure in a large congregation and its attendant financial strength, behaves as an independent organization. This is a body that only relates to the bishop, or even to the diocesan/general synod, when it suits them or they are deemed to hold the right opinions. Another manifestation of this is the parish that believes itself authorized to use the liturgy of the Roman church while not being under the obedience of a Roman bishop. This form of congregationalism is made worse where parishes opt out of normal diocesan structures. It is even reported that some parishes are picking and choosing between diocesan and non-diocesan oversight. Of course, the concept of alternative episcopal oversight has its counterpart in some of the jurisdictional nonsense that has characterized Orthodoxy outside of its traditional countries, but in Anglicanism, it seems to be used as an instrument to divide off into a network of like-minded and self-regarding enclaves².

At the same time, fairness demands that an Orthodox observer should express disquietude at the way in which traditional minded clergy who are fundamentally obedient to the Anglican canons in force in their provinces are persecuted and pressurized for not following some politically correct line. It would appear that this is more characteristic of some non-British Anglican churches, but a growing emphasis on personal rights rather than upon seeking to do the right thing, seems to be increasingly pervasive in modern Anglicanism, and the Church of England may not be able to avoid it.

Fr Gregory Woolfenden is Tutor at Ripon College, Cuddesdon.

² It is true that for example that, alongside the Russian and Greek dioceses, there is a parallel jurisdiction for Serbian Orthodox in the UK. However we all happily pray and concelebrate with each other, something that is not always true of Anglican parallel jurisdictions.

**Anglican – Oriental Orthodox Commission
Armenia November 2002**

Fr. William H. Taylor

The Anglican-Oriental Orthodox International Commission met in Armenia in November 2002. Five days of friendly and productive meetings produced the first agreed statement on Christology between our two Communion. This article gives the background to the Christological work and is an abbreviated form of a report presented at the Conference by the AECA Chairman. The full text of this will be available at our website in the near future.

The Anglican Oriental Orthodox steering group met in Sussex, England, in 2001. It requested a group of Anglicans and Oriental Orthodox to prepare papers for the meeting of the commission in 2002. This paper is in two sections. The first outlines the christological agreements already reached in ecumenical fora between Anglicans and Oriental Orthodox and their ecumenical partners. The second part gives a brief outline of the christological agreements reached between the Assyrian Church and other churches with particular attention to the resolutions regarding that church in the Lambeth Conference documents.

Preliminary

In the modern period, serious theological debate and discussion began to be generated in attempting to analyse some of the root causes of the divisions which occurred at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D., in particular statements descriptive of the Church's experience of its common Lord. None of the christological positions held at the Council of Chalcedon are theologically or semantically simple, and are often capable of more than one interpretation. Much work has already been done on this by (among others) Tiran Nersoyan, Hakim Amin and Paulos Mar Gregorius from the Oriental Orthodox perspective, by John S. Romanides, John D Zizioulas and George Florovsky from the Eastern Orthodox perspective, by W. de Vries, A. Grillmeier and P. Schoonenberg from the Roman Catholic perspective, and by J. Robert Wright and W. Rusch from the Anglican and Protestant perspectives.¹ It is not the brief of this writer to examine these factors *ab initio* but rather to give a summary of recent theological work on the christological question. In particular, this paper will give a resume of more recent theological progress made in christological agreements between the Oriental Orthodox Churches and Churches of the Anglican Communion.

Ecumenical work between members of the Anglican Communion and the Oriental Orthodox Churches does not take place in a vacuum. There has been much detailed work already done, and much agreement already reached, in particular by the Oriental Orthodox in dialogue with other Churches and families of Churches. Much progress has been made; some of the more important elements of which are set out below.

Oriental and Eastern Orthodox Agreements

This dialogue began in a formal sense in the 1960s. The results of the dialogue were published in full in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*.² The papers of V. C. Samuel and John S. Romanides on the terminology of Chalcedon were particularly helpful in their analyses of Severus' use of 'one incarnate nature of God the Word' and Cyril's use of 'one physis' respectively.

This groundwork led to the first Agreed Statement of Aarhus, 1964, with this central tenet, 'Both sides found themselves fundamentally following the christological teaching of the one undivided Church as expressed by St Cyril'. More specifically, three years later, the Bristol Agreed Statement, 1967 read, 'Some of us affirm two natures, wills and energies hypostatically united in the One Lord Jesus Christ. Some of us affirm one united divine-human nature, will and energy in the same Christ. But both sides speak of a union without confusion, without change, without division, without separation'.

The Geneva Agreed Statement, 1970 went on to reaffirm the earlier Agreed Statements, particularly on the christology of Cyril in this way, 'We both teach that he who is consubstantial with the Father according to Godhead also became consubstantial with us according to humanity in the Incarnation ... and that in him the two natures are united in the one hypostasis of the Divine Logos, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation'.

The statement then went on to draw attention to the fact that the Oriental Orthodox regard this christological formulation as having been completed by the time of Chalcedon, whereas the Eastern Orthodox regard the first seven councils as an indivisible whole in christological teaching. They then said, 'It is our hope that further study will lead to the solution of this problem by the decision of our Churches'.

In this series of conversations, the final agreed statement was that of Addis Ababa, 1971. Addis Ababa was principally concerned with the mutual lifting of anathemas, but it did raise the important question of 'reception' of the work of the consultations by the authorities of the Church. All the Conversations were described as 'unofficial' and Addis Ababa then submitted the results of the four Consultations in the hope of

official reception by the Churches involved.³

This informal basis was then raised to the level of a Joint Commission, and led to the Agreed Statement of the Joint Commission of the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches, Wadi Natrun, 1989. The Wadi Natrun statement draws substantially on the work of the earlier conversations in asserting, 'the four adverbs used to qualify the mystery of the hypostatic union belong to our common tradition - without confusion, without change, without separation, without division'.

The statement was to be used 'as an expression of our common faith, on the way to restoration of full communion between the two families of Churches.

Oriental Orthodox and Anglican Agreements

Much of the close ecumenical cooperation and mutual understanding between Oriental Orthodox and Anglicans has taken place traditionally in the fields of practical and pastoral diaconal service, one to another. This is not to say, however, that theology has been absent from the exchange between Anglicans and Oriental Orthodox. The close pastoral co-operation, which the two families of Churches have traditionally enjoyed, has often led to detailed theological reflection. Theology has thus tended to spring out of practical and pastoral cooperation. In this scheme of things, it is not surprising that the first Anglican - Oriental Orthodox Forum in 1985 concentrated on Pastoral Cooperation.

In the christological area a concrete example of theological reflection springing out of pastoral co-operation can be seen in the case of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch in 1921, Elias III Ignatius and the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson. The Patriarch was interested to know the conditions for intercommunion for Syrian Orthodox living in the United Kingdom and the USA who had no access to a priest of their own Church, and initiated contact with the Archbishop on this question. The Archbishop of Canterbury instructed his Eastern Churches Committee to prepare a statement on the nature of Christ to be communicated to the Patriarch for his assent. It was described as 'a carefully framed statement of faith as to Our Lord's Person'.⁸ This was to be the condition of intercommunion. Patriarch Elias III Ignatius responded in 1922 that according to Syrian belief, the second person of the Trinity took mortal flesh from the Virgin Mary, that manhood and deity were fused, but in the fusion manhood retained the properties of manhood and deity of deity.⁹ The letter led to an immediate agreement of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the clergy of his own Church to administer the sacraments to members of the Syrian Orthodox Church when deprived of that means of grace through isolation.¹⁰

This exchange is mentioned in some detail because it demonstrates well the interplay between praxis and theology, which has characterised the Anglican-Oriental Orthodox relationship. Revealing a certain reticence to be too heavily reliant on the philosophical abstractions of some of the christological formulations of Chalcedon, it was another Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple, who wrote, 'Chalcedon marked the bankruptcy of Greek metaphysics'. Nevertheless, theology has not been absent, and the christological work of Pro Oriente was again employed in the Joint Statement of Faith of Patriarch Shenouda III and the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1987. Their Statement of Common Faith again employs the Pro Oriente formula in its christological definition. This christological progress does not happen in a vacuum and it does not start de novo.¹¹

It is the view of many working now in formal ecumenical dialogue between the Oriental Orthodox churches and the Anglican Communion that so much work has already been achieved on the terminology of Chalcedon that the time is now ripe to move to a formal agreement. In the William Reed Huntington memorial sermon Archbishop Khajag Barsamian of the Armenian church said "The dialogue begun in recent years to investigate... The Council of Chalcedon, and within the past decade the theological issues of the dispute have actually been resolved. This was one of the oldest divisions in Christianity - begun 1500 years ago - and within the space of a generation it has been settled - on theological grounds at least. This was able to happen through dialogue and the mutual good will built within the ecumenical movement. But most of all, it was able to happen because all of the parties opened themselves up to the greater possibilities that God has in store for his children."¹² This view is also reflected by a Coptic author, Bishop Angaelos who writes "Today, however, most scholars have agreed that the unfortunate events and decisions at the Council of Chalcedon were based on misunderstandings and a misinterpretation of terms and words, rather than a question of orthodoxy and agreement has now been reached regarding the nature of Christ between the Oriental family of churches and the Eastern Orthodox churches and also the Catholic church."¹³

All these agreements were referred to in the fourth meeting of the heads of the Oriental Orthodox churches in the Middle East in Cairo in March 2001 when the decision was taken to respond positively to the Archbishop of Canterbury's invitation to upgrade the work of the forum to that of a formal commission.¹⁴

The Lambeth Conference of 1998 had formally recommended the upgrading of the work of the Forum to that of a Commission in resolution IV:19 "The conference reaffirms Resolution V:9 of Lambeth 1998 that the work of the Forum should be upgraded to an International Theological Commission to seek Agreement in christology in the light of the christological agreements reached between the Orthodox

christology in the light of the christological agreements reached between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches, between the Roman Catholic Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches and between the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Reformed World Alliance and to consider other theological and ecclesial issues.

The Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East in Ecumenical Dialogue

The 1888 Lambeth Conference placed relations between the Anglican Communion and the Eastern Churches in a special place in the agenda. The Archbishop of Canterbury proposed the establishment of a Conference Committee to draw up a report on relations with the Eastern churches. This was unanimously accepted. The Bishop of Winchester became Chairman of the Committee and this Committee used the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrians as a paradigm for ecumenical relations between churches.

The 1908 Conference saw the most significant development in terms of the relations between the Anglican Communion and the Assyrian Church. The Bishop of Moray and Ross spoke of many of the Assyrian writings using Nestorian language but he also quoted Dr Bright (the distinguished Oxford liturgist) as citing passages from the East Syrian service books which could not possibly have been used by any true Nestorian. He argued that, though they had not accepted the Council of Ephesus, they had informally accepted the Council of Chalcedon. He suggested that the commissions should examine the doctrinal position of the separate Oriental churches and prepare carefully worded statements of faith "as to our Lord's person." In the simplest possible terms, for submission to the churches to ascertain whether the statements accurately represented their faith. He again cited Dr Bright: "your duty... is to try and get behind words try and find out what is really meant by their words and explain to them that we really mean by our words." The Commission's findings would be sent to the metropolitans and presiding bishops of all the churches of the Anglican Communion.

Shortly after the Conference a Committee was appointed to take forward the work with the Oriental Orthodox and Assyrian Churches. A statement of faith as to our Lord's person was put before the Assyrian Church asking also for an explanation of the term 'Mother of Christ'. The Commission came to this conclusion in 1912: "We entertain no doubt that the intention of the document is to profess a bona fide adherence of the Catholic faith concerning the person of our Lord Jesus Christ as set forth in the clauses of the Athanasian Creed." They also accepted the Catholicos's statement of faith about the union of the two natures of Christ:

The blessed Virgin Mary is the Mother of our Lord and God Jesus Christ, in that from the commencement of the conception of the Humanity of our Lord, God the Word, the second person of the Trinity was united therewith and became one Christ, one Son, in one Person to all eternity.

On this basis the committee declared:

(This) appears to us to satisfy the conditions of orthodoxy and not to fall short of what we ourselves mean when we use the term *Theotokos* in accordance with the doctrines of the Councils to which we adhere, viz.: - Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon.

The Lambeth Conference of 1920 had a major interest in the development of a theological agreement and the Assyrian Church. The report of the conference expressed it like this, speaking of the Oriental Orthodox and the Assyrian Churches:

"These Churches have all at some period of their history been accused of theological error with regard to the Incarnation, and it is, therefore, necessary that we should examine with some care their doctrinal position at the present time. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 desired the formation of Commissions to do this, and to prepare some carefully framed statement of the faith as to our Lord's Person, in the simplest possible terms, which should be submitted to each of such Churches where feasible, in order to ascertain whether it represents their belief with substantial accuracy." Further, the Conference suggested that if such a statement were found to be acceptable to any such Church occasional inter-communion might be advantageously provided for. A Commission was formed, and proceeded to take action with reference to the East Syrian, Assyrian, or Nestorian Church; and it resolved that the statement of Catholic doctrine to be submitted to this Church, or to any other that lay under analogous suspicion of error as to the Incarnation, should be the Christological versicles of the Quicumque Vult. The Commission also resolved to ask the East Syrian Church to explain in what sense it used the term "Mother of Christ" as its technical description of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Archbishop wrote to this effect to the now deceased Patriarch Benjamin Mar Shimun, Catholicos of the East, who, after consultation with his bishops, and with their assent, returned answer under date June 13th, 1911, entirely accepting the statement of faith propounded to him, as expressing the belief of that Church; and giving an explanation of the use of the term "Mother of Christ" which was considered entirely satisfactory by the Commission. With this judgement your present Committee agree.

It was, however, more important still that a careful examination of the East Syrian voluminous liturgical books should be made. This has been done, with the result that it is seen that they contain much that is incompatible with real Nestorianism, together with some things that might be interpreted either in an orthodox or in a Nestorian sense. It is suggested that the latter must be judged by the former. The watchword Theotokos is absent from their service books, and in one place is repudiated; on the other hand, its equivalent in other words is several times found, and strong instances of the language known as *communicatio idiomatum* occur. One phrase, which has caused some perplexity, is that which asserts that there are in Christ one *parsopa*, two *q'nome*, and two natures. The word *q'noma* is equivalent to "hypostasis", namely "substance," and this makes the phrase, if redundant, at least perfectly orthodox. It should be added that the East Syrians accept the decrees of Chalcedon, while rejecting those of Ephesus.

Your Committee agree with the Commission in thinking that we need not insist on the East Syrian Church ceasing to mention in their services the names of those whom it has hitherto revered."

The situation in the Middle East prevented further substantial work being done between the Conference of 1920 and 1930 so the Conference of 1930 reported: "It has not been possible, owing to political and other condition, to obtain the authoritative statement recommended in 1920 as to whether or not the present ecclesiastical authorities in the Assyrian Church adhere to the position of 1911. We hope that an opportunity for securing such a statement may appear, and we are of the opinion that some measure of spiritual hospitality should be authorised forthwith."

Between 1930 and 1988 there is little or no reference to our relations with the Assyrian Church in the reports of the Lambeth Conferences. In 1988 the picture changed again.

The Conference of 1988 returned to the theme with the words: "The Conference warmly welcomes the renewal of relationships between the Anglican Communion and the Holy Apostolic Church of the East." It went on to say "The Conference particularly welcomes the presence of more Observers from these Churches than at any previous Lambeth Conference, thus regaining the momentum of the Conferences of 1908 and 1920". It was more specific in its recommendation that it "desires that in view of the importance of Anglican-Oriental Orthodox relations, the Anglican Consultative Council enter into consultation with the relevant Oriental Orthodox authorities with a view to the Forum being upgraded to a formally recognised Commission."¹⁵

The 1998 Lambeth Conference, in resolution IV:14 says of the Assyrian Church of the East that the conference "Encourages regional conversations between Anglicans and the members of the Assyrian Church of the East in areas where their communities coincide.

Further Progress

The above outline seeks to demonstrate some of the achievement in converging christology in the recent past. It is principally concerned with the bilateral fora in which the Oriental Orthodox Churches have been participating, and also examines agreements the Assyrian Church of the East and other Churches. This is not to minimise the participation of Anglicans and Oriental Orthodox in such multilateral cooperation as the important WCC document *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (1982).

The World Council of Churches' study 'Towards the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith Today' should push this process further. Having achieved so much agreement in clarification of the terminology of Chalcedon, and moved towards the adoption of common formulae, the way should now be clearer to making christology dynamically renewed and renewing in our corporate structure of faith.

Analysis of the technical terminology of Chalcedon is of course important, as is analysis of its underlying philosophical and linguistic framework. All the dialogues have emphasised too the role of sociopolitical factors in the divisions of the early Church. Theology and theological formulations are not produced out of a vacuum. But much of this important technical groundwork has already been achieved through the detailed scholarly work of the dialogues mentioned above, and the next phase in the renewal of our belief in our common Lord should now be considered. Our common christological work must have more than an antiquarian impetus, which Paulos Mar Gregorius described as 'a sign of advanced decadence and degeneration'. In our corporate structure of faith christology is the key to our understanding of soteriology. As the Bristol 1967 Statement puts it 'God became by nature man that man may become by grace God... God draws us into fulness of communion with himself in the Body of Christ, that we may be transfigured from glory to glory. It is in this soteriological perspective that we have approached the christological question'. This soteriological task is ultimately the mission of the Church to the world. As Jeffrey Gros puts it, 'Understanding the person and nature of Christ is intimately connected to understanding the Church and its mission to the world'.²⁰

The Church's mission to the world is thus dependent on a renewed christology affirming Our Lord's true humanity and true divinity, that all humankind might believe. The World Council of Churches' document, *Gathered for Life* puts it like this in envisaging a renewed model for unity:

'The Churches would share a common understanding of the Apostolic Faith, and be able to confess this message together in ways understandable, reconciling and liberating to their contemporaries. Living this Apostolic Faith together, the Churches help the world to realise God's design for creation'²¹

Fr William H Taylor is Chairman of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association

Anglican-Oriental Orthodox International Commission

Agreed Statement on Christology

Holy Etchmiadzin, Armenia, 5-10 November 2002

Introduction

In 1990 the second Forum of representatives of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Churches of Anglican Communion, meeting at the Monastery of St. Bishoy in Wadi el Natroun, Egypt, was able to produce the following statement: God, as revealed in the life, teaching, passion, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ calls his people into union with himself. Living by the Holy Spirit, his own people have been given authority to proclaim this Good News to all creation.

The Forum was also able to suggest that an agreement on Christology between the Oriental Orthodox and the Anglican Communion was now possible, taking note of the detailed theological work done by representatives of the two families of Orthodoxy between 1964 and 1971, resulting in the agreed statement of 1989, the work done in the unofficial Pro Oriente conversations, and of the history of convergence in Christology between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the Oriental Orthodox Churches. To this must now be added the agreed statement on Christology of the Reformed-Oriental Orthodox Dialogue (Driebergen, Netherlands, September 13, 1994).

Our first meeting as the Anglican-Oriental Orthodox International Commission, in Holy Etchmiadzin, Armenia, November 5-10, 2002, following the meeting of the Preparatory Committee in Midhurst, England, July 27-30, 2001, has taken forward this work. This has been done in a spirit of service of the Risen Christ and of the human race whom He came to save. Our work recognizes the presence of Christ with

those who suffer in the tragic history of humanity. It expresses both the hope of a new humanity and the hope of glory wherein we will partake in Christ's holiness. With the will for unity-in-Christ within us it has been our privilege in this work of exploration and collaboration to handle the person of Christ Jesus (1 John 1.1) together. After hearing the papers presented in our meeting and studying relevant documents we have been able to agree on the following statement:

AGREED STATEMENT ON CHRISTOLOGY

1. We confess that our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ is the Only-Begotten Son of God who became incarnate and was made human in the fullness of time, for us and for our salvation. God the Son incarnate, perfect in His divinity and perfect in His humanity, consubstantial with the Father according to His divinity and consubstantial with us according to His humanity. For a union has been made of two natures. For this cause we confess one Christ, one Son and one Lord. [Based on the Formula of Re-union, AD 433].
2. Following the teaching of our common father Saint Cyril of Alexandria we can confess together that in the one incarnate nature of the Word of God, two different natures continue to exist without separation, without division, without change, and without confusion.
3. In accordance with this sense of the unconfused union, we confess the holy Virgin to be Theotokos, because God the Word became incarnate and was made man, and from the very conception united to himself that perfect humanity, without sin, which he took from her. As to the expressions concerning the Lord in the Gospel and in the Epistles, we are aware that theologians understand some in a general way as relating to one person, and others they distinguish, as relating to two natures, explaining those that befit the divine nature according to the divinity of Christ, and those of a humble sort according to his humanity. [Based on the Formula of Re-union, AD 433].
4. Concerning the four adverbs used to qualify the mystery of the hypostatic union: "without commingling" (or confusion) (asyngchotos), "without change" (atreptos), "without separation" (achoristos), and "without division" (adiairetos), those among us who speak of two natures in Christ are justified in doing so since they do not thereby deny their inseparable indivisible union: similarly, those among us who speak of one incarnate nature of the Word of God are justified in doing so since they do not thereby deny the continuing dynamic presence in Christ of the divine and the human, without change, without confusion. We recognize the limit of all theological language and the philosophical terminology of which it makes and has made use. We are unable to net and confine the mystery of God's utter self-giving

in the incarnation of the divine Word in an ineffable, inexpressible and mysterious union of divinity and humanity, which we worship and adore.

5. Both sides agree in rejecting the teaching which separates or divides the human nature, both soul and body in Christ, from his divine nature, or reduces the union of the natures to the level of conjoining and limiting the union to the union of persons and thereby denying that the person of Jesus Christ is a single person of God the Word. "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever" (Hebrews 13:8 NRSV). Both sides also agree in rejecting the teaching which confuses the human nature in Christ with the divine nature so that the former is absorbed in the latter and thus ceases to exist. Consequently, we reject both the Nestorian and the Eutychian heresies.
6. In the Anglican tradition in the 16th century Richard Hooker witnesses to the continuing relevance of these concerns. In the fifth book of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, section 5e, he emphasizes the necessary mystery of the person in Christ. "It is not man's ability either to express perfectly or to conceive the manner how (the incarnation) was brought to pass." "In Christ the verity of God and the complete substance of man were with full agreement established throughout the world, until the time of Nestorius." The church, Hooker contends, rightly repudiated any division in the person of Christ. "Christ is a Person both divine and human, howbeit not therefore two persons in one, neither both these in one sense, but a person divine because he is personally the Son of God, human, because he hath really the nature of the children of men." (Laws 52.3) "Whereupon it followeth against Nestorius, that no person was born of the Virgin but the Son of God, no person but the Son of God baptized, the Son of God condemned, the Son of God and no other person crucified; which one only point of Christian belief, the infinite worth of the Son of God, is the very ground of all things believed concerning life and salvation by that which Christ either did or suffered as man in our belief." (Laws, 52.3). In the following consideration of the teaching of St Cyril, Hooker maintains, both the importance of St Cyril's insistence on the unity of the person of Christ while repudiating any Eutychian interpretation of that unity. Hooker quotes with approval Cyril's letter to Nestorius: "His two natures have knit themselves the one to the other, and are in that nearness as incapable of confusion as of distraction. Their coherence hath not taken away the difference between them. Flesh is not become God but doth still continue flesh, although it be now the flesh of God." (q. Laws 53.2).
7. We agree that God the Word became incarnate by uniting to His divine uncreated nature with its natural will and energy, created human nature with its natural will and energy. The union of natures is natural, hypostatic, real and perfect. The natures are distinguished in our mind in thought alone. He

who wills and acts is always the one hypostasis of the Logos incarnate with one personal will. In the Armenian tradition in the 12th century St. Nerses the Graceful (Shenorhali) writes: "We do not think that the divine will opposes the human will and vice versa. We do not think either that the will of the one nature was different at different times, sometimes the will was divine, when He wanted to show His divine power, and sometimes it was human, when He wanted to show human humility."

8. The perfect union of divinity and of humanity in the incarnate Word is essential to the salvation of the human race. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life" (John 3:16 NRSV). The Son of God emptied himself and became human, absolutely free from sin, in order to transform our sinful humanity to the image of His holiness. This is the Gospel we are called to live and proclaim.
9. We also note the concerns of the Oriental Orthodox Churches about the Christology of the Assyrian Church of the East as expressed in its official and unofficial dialogues with other churches. A particular concern of the Oriental Orthodox is that the Assyrians consider the persons and teachings of Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius as orthodox and thus venerate them in the liturgies of their church. The Oriental Orthodox concerns were also addressed specifically to the report of the 1998 Lambeth Conference, which made reference to the consent made towards the Christology of the Assyrian Church, based on the Lambeth Conference of 1908 and 1920 reports and resolutions 08.63/64 and 20.21. We have noticed that the report of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 was not addressed in 1998. While the Eastern Churches Committee of the Church of England did preliminary Christological work between 1908 and 1912 both in relation to the Oriental Orthodox Churches and to the Assyrian Church, this work was never brought to an agreed statement on Christology. With reference to the Assyrian Church, the 1930 Lambeth Conference reported "It has not been possible, owing to political and other conditions, to obtain the authoritative statement recommended in 1920 as to whether or not the present ecclesiastical authorities in the Assyrian Church adhere to the position of 1911". The Anglicans are therefore asking the Inter Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (IASCER) to take into account these Oriental Orthodox theological reservations in any further Christological work with the Assyrian Church of the East, which, in accordance with the Lambeth Conference Resolution of 1998, will be in local and regional discussions. The result of any such discussions will have to be evaluated by IASCER and any future Lambeth Conference, in the light of this Christological agreement.

10. We submit this statement to the authorities of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Anglican Communion for their consideration and action.

Geoffrey Rowell
Anglican Co-Chairman

HE Metropolitan Bishop
Orthodox Co-Chairman

September 2003 Report and Evaluation from The Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies

The Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies (IOCS) in Cambridge is now entering its fifth academic year. After four years of activity and growth it is time to evaluate our work and to reflect for a moment, before October is upon us, on where we are.

Summer term 2003 ended on a high with an excellent Summer school – the best so far according to those students who have attended each one. The theme *Living Orthodoxy in 21C* was approached from different angles by an eclectic group of lectures. Orthodoxy and ecumenism, Orthodox social witness, issues of language, responsibilities of Orthodox Christians today, were among the topics on the programme. IOCS students contributed to the theme with a series of fifteen-minute presentations on such areas as bio-ethics and the role of women in the Church. The days were full – prayers, lectures, presentations – and the warm summer evenings in Cambridge bars on the banks of the river Cam were a fine way to round up discussions and begin new ones. Fifty-five students enrolled on the course from nine countries of Europe and America.

The great demand from students for copies of the Summer School papers leads us to conclude that the time is now right to disseminate to our students, and further afield, some of the wonderful resources that are stock piled on our shelves. In four years there have been many memorable study weekends and summer schools here at the IOCS, at which lectures and meetings have changed lives, comforted and inspired, shed new light in unexplored territory, opened new doors and contributed to helping many along their way. We are currently devising plans for digitalising and publishing this material, to be available as a study aid for our own students and for interested learners who

cannot follow a Cambridge-based course. Currently IOCS has one video available for purchase, featuring the late Metropolitan Anthony Bloom – of blessed memory – giving a presentation on Prayer during an IOCS Study weekend in June 2001. This can be ordered from IOCS for £10 + postage & packing by email: info@iocs.cam.ac.uk

A distinctive feature of the Institute in Cambridge is that its courses cater for two particular groups of students: the part-time students who follow, on a monthly basis, either the University of Cambridge Certificate or the Diploma Course of Higher Education in Orthodox Christian Studies, and the full-time students who are based in Cambridge all year round, and follow a degree course run by the Cambridge Theological Federation (CTF) – a consortium of denominational colleges of which the Institute is a member. This past year four full-time students and one part-time student have followed the Masters Degree in Pastoral Theology.

The Masters degree is a modular course, including an Orthodox module taught by the Institute. This year, as in previous years, the majority of the MA students come from outside the UK, bringing to Cambridge the cultural background, language and life experience of their home countries, from which all at the Institute can learn and be enriched. They also come with expectations which stretch beyond the academic interest – to gain an experience of life in Britain, to enhance their English language skills and to be exposed to life in the so-called Orthodox diaspora (most are from traditionally Orthodox countries).

For these students, the opportunities and challenges which living abroad present are of course part of the Cambridge experience. At the same time, the IOCS and the CTF need to find ways to give more support and guidance to the overseas students so that the impact of a new culture and alien systems can be a positive one. For instance, to develop an introductory programme for overseas students on the British post-graduate education system would help them to understand the working methods at the basis of the educational process – where developing a well-argued case is favoured above learning facts by rote. In countries where books and resources are not so accessible, an emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge rather than on presenting an argument and personal opinion is natural. New students need to be initiated in

a more coherent way to the expectations of an academic institution, to be better prepared for this shift in emphasis and also to be helped to develop their written skills in English. The IOCS together with the CTF are looking into how to improve this process.

If you are still deciding what to do next year and would like to come and join a lively group of young Orthodox living, studying and working in Cambridge, it is not too late to enrol for the MA in Pastoral Theology. Alternatively, if you are interested in spending one or two or more weekends a year in Cambridge from October 2003 onwards you can join the Certificate course or simply choose the weekends that interest you most (see dates below). In either case, or if you would simply like to join our mailing list, please email your request to: infor@iocscam.ac.uk

We look forward to hearing from you!

**Certificate of Higher Education in Orthodox Christian Studies
Modules in 2003-2004**

Date	Title
10-12 October 2003	The Bible in the Orthodox Tradition
7 - 9 November 2003	The Theology of the Trinity
12 - 14 December 2003	The Theology of the Church I
9 - 11 January 2004	Liturgical Time
23 - 25 January 2004	Elective
6 - 8 February 2004	Sanctifying Life and Death
12 - 14 March 2004	Orthodox Britain
7 - 9 May 2004	The Martyrs
11 - 13 June 2004	Sanctity and Asceticism
5 - 9 July 2004	Summer School

**Diploma of Higher Education in Orthodox Christian Studies / Modules in
2003-2004**

10-12 October 2003	The Orthodox Church in Modern History
7 - 9 November 2003	Mission
12 - 14 December 2003	Theology of the Church II
9 - 11 January 2004	Prayer of the Heart
6 - 8 February 2004	Working out the Baptismal vocation in Marriage, Monasticism and Ordination
12 - 14 March 2004	The Canons of the Orthodox Church
7 - 9 May 2004	Scripture: Master Themes III
11 - 13 June 2004	Scripture: St Paul
Date to be confirmed	Project-based Module

**In Search For Holiness. Remembering The Romanian Theologian,
Rev. Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993)**

Mihail Neamțu

Undoubtedly, Fr Dumitru Stăniloae (1903-1993) was the most important Romanian theologian in the modern times. Some of his contemporaries even praised him as 'the greatest Orthodox theologian of the 20th century' (O. Clément). Indeed, D. Stăniloae is the author of a vast number of books on Christian doctrine, worship and spirituality, and has also written an impressive number of translations and exegetical commentaries on the work of the early Church Fathers. Proof for the importance of Fr Stăniloae for the contemporary society of Christian theologians is also the increasing number of his studies and books that have been already rendered into languages of international circulation³.

³ In English translation, the reader can find, D. Stăniloae, *Theology and the Church*, translated by Robert Barringer, foreword by John Meyendorff. Imprint Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980; *The Experience of God*, foreword by Kallistos Ware, Holy Cross Press, vol. I (part 1), 1994; *The World, Creation and Deification*, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2000, vol I (part 2); *Orthodox Spirituality*, St Tikhon's

D. Stăniloae was born on the 16th of November, 1903 in Transylvania (county Braşov), being the youngest child of a couple of very simple and devout peasants. After he received in Braşov a basic education of German inspiration, in 1922 the young student Dumitru started his theological studies at the University of Cernăuţi (the cultural centre of the former Romanian province Bucovina, nowadays part of Ukraine). Being disappointed by the Scholastic methods of teaching theology in Cernăuţi, Stăniloae decided to enrol at the University of Bucharest, reading Classical Languages and Literature. Yet, at the recommendation of the Metropolitan of Transylvania, Nicolae Bălan, carried out his theological studies, graduating in 1927 with a thesis on the "Infant Baptism". He immediately received several scholarships for post-graduate research in Athens (1927), Munich (1928, where he followed the courses of the famous scholar in Byzantine studies, Professor August Heisenberg), Berlin and Paris (1929) and, in the event, Constantinople (1930). It was in Paris and Constantinople where Stăniloae did his first research on the work of the last Byzantine theologian, St Gregory Palamas, whose life and work he first presented in a monograph in 1938. Married in 1930, Stăniloae was ordained priest in Sibiu just one year later. During the decade before the Second World War started, Fr Dumitru performed extraordinary activities in the religious, educational and cultural fields in Romania. He published hundreds of articles and several apologetic books, among which the most notable is perhaps his essay in Christology: *Jesus Christ and the Restoration of Man* (Sibiu, 1943). Starting with the late summer of 1940, Fr Dumitru took part, along with other religious and cultural personalities of Romania (such as the hieromonks Ioan Kulighin, Benedict Ghiuş, Sofian Boghiu, the poets Sandu Tudor and Vasile Voiculescu, the young theologian Andrei Scrima, etc.) in the spiritual conferences organised, under the title "The Burning Bush", by the most important monastic centre of Bucharest (ie. Antim Monastery). A growing interest in the monastic spirituality of Eastern Christianity determined Fr Dumitru to start his translation of the *Philokalia*, a famous compilation of texts on prayer and

Seminary Press, 2002. The Community of Sisters of the Love of God (Convent of Incarnation, Fairacres, Oxford) has published three pamphlets on *Eternity and Time*, *The Victory of the Cross* and on *Prayer and Holiness (The Icon of Man Renewed in God)*. For an excellent introductory study in D. Stăniloae's theology, see A. Louth, "The Orthodox Dogmatic Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae", *Modern Theology*, 13 (1997) 2, pp. 253-267; see also C. Miller, *The Gift of the World: An Introduction to the Theology of Dumitru Stăniloae*, T&T Clark, 2001; In French, see the very fine volume of conversations with Fr Costa de Beauregard, *Ose comprendre que je t'aime*, Paris, Cerf, 1983; in Italian, it has been translated the short volume D. Stăniloae, *La preghiera di Gesù e lo Spirito Santo. Meditazioni teologiche*, Imprint Rome: Editrice Citta Nuova, 1990. In German, see his three-fold systematic work, *Orthodoxe Dogmatik*, transl. by H. Pitters (foreword by J Moltmann), 1985, 1990, 1995.

contemplation, gathering in 12 volumes (the English edition has only five) the wisdom of the Greek Fathers from the IVth up to the XIVth century. Fr Dumitru's genuine search for the "hidden treasure" of the Eastern Orthodox Church later contributed to his unjust imprisonment by the Communist authorities (who ruthlessly ruled over the country for almost fifty years, after 1947). Between 1947 and 1955, Fr Dumitru Stăniloae was severely marginalised, while his courses at the Faculty of Theology in Sibiu were totally suppressed. In 1955, he was condemned for five years of detention (being considered as an "obscurantist propagandist" of the ancient regime) in the dreadful prison of Aiud. Later on, Fr Dumitru used to say that this very difficult period of incarceration helped him to practice the incessant prayer of the heart ("Lord, Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me"), which for centuries was so much cherished by the hesychast monks of the Christian East.

In 1963, Fr Stăniloae was released from prison, but the maltreatment continued until 1969, when the governmental Department for Cults decided to put across a better image of the Romanian religious life. Fr Stăniloae was then allowed to travel abroad. In 1970, Fr Dumitru came to Oxford, being hosted by the Convent of Incarnation (SLG), where he also met his life-long friend, the Canon A. M. Allchin. In 1976, the second series of *Philokalia* started to be published in Romanian, when the University of Thessalonike (Greece) offered Fr Stăniloae the title of *Doctor Honoris Causa*. Though already aged and having frail health, Fr Stăniloae had the stamina and the great inspiration of writing his monumental work of systematic theology, issued at once in three volumes (1978). Little by little, the depth of Fr Stăniloae's theological thinking and his well-balanced ecumenical spirit received a just appreciation among Western theologians (among whom one counts, in the early stage, J. Moltmann, O. Clement or J. Meyendorff). Fr Stăniloae received also innumerable international awards, among which one should mention "The Cross of St Augustine of Canterbury" (offered by the Bishopric of London). Almost every single year during his last decade of life, with an indefatigable energy and limpid faith in his call from above, Fr Stăniloae continued to publish important books (with emphasis on Christian ethics and worship) and authoritative translations of the works of great theologians, such as St Athanasius the Great, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximus the Confessor, St Symeon the New Theologian or Gregory Palamas. In 1991, Fr Dumitru became a member of the Romanian Academy of Science, and was also awarded the *Doctor Honoris Causa* of the University of Athens (1991) and Bucharest (1992). On the 4th October 1993, Fr Stăniloae passed away to a divine and eternal rest, leaving behind an impressive theological legacy and an outstanding model of Christian life.

For more than fifty years and under the most austere circumstances (which included five years of severe imprisonment during the communist regime), the Romanian theologian worked indefatigably for the construction of a 'neo-Patristic synthesis' –

the project initiated in the 1930s by the Russian theologian George Florovsky. It was an attempt to refresh the theological thinking of the Orthodox Church, which, in early modern times, was caught in a long cultural and religious captivity (the Balkans being under the Ottoman Rule while Russia suffered the impact of the Western *Aufklärung*). In this way, Stăniloae and his Orthodox fellows hoped (such as Vladimir Lossky or Justin Popovici) – not unlike the representatives of the Oxford movement within the Anglican Church and of the *nouvelle théologie* within the Catholic Church – to answer the challenges of modern culture and to surpass the barren “theology of repetition”, in which even the greater minds of the late Scholastic and of the post-Byzantine tradition, were hopelessly stuck. This return to the biblical and patristic sources of the Christian theology, in which he saw the only possible bedrock for the ecumenical dialogue among the Christian communities, was paralleled by a genuine interest in the work of various representatives of the Continental philosophy of the 20th century (such as L. Lavelle, M. Heidegger, L. Binswanger etc.). Stăniloae believed that much theological discourse could be articulated in the language of contemporary philosophy.

Yet, Fr D. Stăniloae got inspiration for his theological work not so much from books, but above all, from the living testimony of the saints of the Church. From time to time, he used to go up in the Carpathian Mountains of Moldavia in search for spiritual advice from illuminated hermits and confessors (such as Father Paisie or Father Cleopa), with whom he would converse on spiritual matters (such as prayer, the reading of the Scriptures, etc.). In fact, Fr Stăniloae's entire life could be described as a search for the love of God, which is at best reflected in the radiant light of His saints. Bearing in mind all this, one can rightly remember the personality of Fr Dumitru Stăniloae ten years after he departed this life, and one hundred years following his earthly birth. May his memory be eternal!

Mihail Neamțu received a grant from the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association towards his studies

Obituary

Metropolitan Anthony

Metropolitan Anthony of Sorouzh, the senior bishop in the Russian Orthodox Patriarchal Church and the head of the Russian Church in Great Britain and Ireland, was the single most influential voice of the Orthodox tradition in the British Isles.

A charismatic figure, with a palpable spiritual presence, he was cast more in the mould of a Staretz (a holy man of great spiritual insight and wisdom) than a career bishop responsible for the administration and pastoral oversight of a diocese. With his striking dark looks, and beautifully spoken English – reprised through a French rather than a Russian accent – he would hold an audience in the palm of his hand. His gifts of communication were legendary: he never used notes or prompts, and whether he was preaching in the Russian Cathedral at Ennismore Gardens, giving a lecture on the Orthodox tradition at a conference, discussing Christianity with a group of students, or giving spiritual direction to an individual, he always radiated a sense of personal depth and boundless faith.

He could also be disarming. His conversation on BBC television in 1970 with atheist Marghanita Laski would have been memorable enough for his respect of her intellectual integrity, and his undeniable charm. But it was the more remarkable for his wit, intellectual toughness, and his unconventional arguments. Instead of trying to justify his faith, for example, he told Ms Laski that he knew that God existed, and was puzzled how she managed not to know. This unexpected turn in the conversation was typical of him and it threw her off guard.

The hallmarks of his ministry throughout his fifty years in Great Britain were pastoral sensitivity, penetrating insight as a spiritual director, and an eirenic missionary outlook. He took the view that everyone was welcome in the Church – Russian, African, or indigenous Briton. And while he was congenitally opposed to proselytising, he attracted hundreds of English converts over the years. More significantly he indelibly stamped the spirituality and theology of the Orthodox tradition upon the British religious consciousness, influencing many thousands of British lives through personal contacts and his writings, chiefly on prayer. At the height of his fame in the 1970s, Gerald Priestland, the renowned BBC religious correspondent called him, ‘the single most powerful Christian voice in the land.’

Metropolitan Anthony had strong aversions and predilections. Despite making a significant contribution to the World Council of Churches at Delhi in 1961 he was allergic to institutional ecumenism. And while he deeply respected individual

Catholics he was less than enthusiastic about Roman Catholicism. Conversely he warmed to Evangelical religion. In the early 1980s he requested a meeting with the Evangelical Alliance, and on arrival stunned them right from the start by, in the argot of Evangelicalism, 'giving his personal testimony'. He told them that when he was a young teenager living in France, and a convinced atheist, he was reading St Mark's Gospel in his room when he was aware of a personal presence which he was convinced was Christ.

This dramatic story of conversion highlights Metropolitan Anthony's existential approach to faith. He said in a published interview in 1988, 'I don't know anything of metaphysical language. What we [the Orthodox] say about Christ is experiential.' While many labeled him as a mystic, he eschewed this designation, and preferred to talk of Christianity in the language of asceticism and disclosure. He genuinely believed that Eastern Orthodoxy was the simplest way to faith. The combination of simplicity in his personal life (he was completely indifferent to money and ecclesiastical *haute couture*) and his passionate commitment to the Gospel, were the inner springs of his spirituality. He once said that he had never preached Russian Orthodoxy in his life, but only Christ.

This Christian for all Christians was nevertheless strongly attached to Russia. During the Soviet era, his BBC Radio talks, and his books and sermons, penetrated deep into Russian culture and were proudly accepted as the authentic voice of 'Holy Russia'. When he visited the USSR in person, he was overwhelmed by excited crowds eager to hear his words and just to see him. Metropolitan Anthony's stature among the people of Soviet Russia was enhanced by the fact that he remained loyal to the Patriarchate but maintained total political independence. This unique position of a See in the Russian Diaspora was the lynch pin of the Metropolitan's *realpolitik* throughout the Soviet years.

The end of the Soviet empire in the early 1990s opened a new chapter in his relationship to Russia: with the easing of travel restrictions by President Yeltsin, a fresh influx of émigrés found their way to his door. He welcomed them with open arms and devoted the last few years of his life trying to facilitate these post Soviet Russians into the diocese as best he could.

One of Metropolitan Anthony's favourite quotations was Nietzsche's aphorism that chaos gives birth to a star. It could stand as a summary of his own life. He was born Andre Bloom, at Lausanne in Switzerland on June 19th 1914. His father was a Russian imperial diplomat of Dutch extraction and his mother was the half-sister of the modernist composer Scriabin (and also related to Vyacheslav Molotov). While the young Andre admired his father, they were not really close. His mother, on the other

hand, was the dominant influence in his life until her death when he was 40 years of age and already well established in Britain.

The young Andre missed the cataclysmic events of 1917 for at that time he was living with his parents in Persia. After sundry adventures and hardships they ended-up living in Paris. His experiences as a refugee were mainly negative: his parents were living separate lives and he was the victim of bullying at school. After his dramatic conversion it was not to the priesthood he first turned but to medicine. He trained initially at the Sorbonne and then in the French Medical Corps with the outbreak of war. During the German occupation he worked as a doctor, but joined the Resistance. He took secret monastic vows and was first professed as a monk in 1943, when he adopted the name of Anthony after the founder of monasticism. And then quite unexpectedly, he was ordained priest in 1948 and came to Britain to pastor the predominantly White Russian émigrés in London. His rise through the ecclesiastical ranks was meteoric. He was ordained bishop in 1957, Archbishop in 1962, became the Patriarch of Moscow's exarch of Western Europe in 1963, and in 1966 was elevated to Metropolitan – the highest ranking bishop in the Russian tradition outside the office of Patriarch.

But like most people of genuine charisma, Metropolitan Anthony was a powerful and perplexing figure. Conservative in theology and politics he was nevertheless totally free of sexism even to the point of daring to question the theological warrant for an exclusively male priesthood. A personalist through and through, he was an inspired visionary but had a poor grasp of administrative detail and diocesan strategy. He liked to be in control but ideologically he was deeply committed to lay participation in the Church and always talked of hierarchy in terms of service rather than power. He put his money where his mouth was too, and set-up a democratically elected Assembly and Council to run the affairs of the diocese of Sourozh in Britain which, in concert with him, it has done so until the present time.

Charismatic leaders, however, whether saints or savants, grow old and inevitably judgement falters as health and vigour fade. Towards the end of his life Metropolitan Anthony simply had more on his plate than he could manage and people expected too much of him. But one thing remains clear: he once said that no one could turn towards eternity if he has not seen in the eyes or in the face of at least one person the shining of eternal life. Metropolitan Anthony was not infallible, despite what the hagiographers will say, but he shone. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh born June 19th 1914, died of cancer at 3.30pm on Monday August 4th, 2003.

†
The author of the obituary is Canon Dr Andrew Walker. The text appeared in *The Independent*

