

EASTERN CHURCHES

# News Letter

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

No. 65 SPRING 1973

PRICE 15p TO NON-MEMBERS

## CONTENTS

Annual Festival 1973

Editorial

St. Gregory Palamas

"Peace to all"

Anglican Orthodox Relations 1972

The Filioque

Obituary

News and Causerie

Book Reviews

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

THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN CHURCHES  
ASSOCIATION

founded in 1864

News  
Letter

*Orthodox Patron:*

The Oecumenical Patriarch

*Anglican Patron:*

The Archbishop of Canterbury

*Anglican President:*

The Bishop of London

*Orthodox President:*

Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira

*Chairman of Committee*

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

*The General Secretary:*

The Revd. P. J. MASON,

The Rectory, Church Street, Stoke Newington, London N.16 9ES

*Treasurer:*

Simon Brearley Esq.

9, Emperor's Gate, London S.W.7.

THE ANNUAL FESTIVAL OF THE  
ANGLICAN AND EASTERN CHURCHES  
ASSOCIATION

Will be held on Saturday, October 20th. 1973

Annual General Meeting

2.30 p.m.

Public Meeting

3.0 p.m.

Speaker: The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury  
In the Presence of His Beatitude Maxim Patriarch of Bulgaria

Tea at 4.0 p.m.

All in the Hall of St. Mary Abbot's, Church Street, Kensington  
Vespers in the Russian Orthodox Cathedral, Ennismore Gardens.  
(By kind invitation of His Eminence Metropolitan Anthony)  
Preacher: His Beatitude The Patriarch of Bulgaria.

*Editor of News Letter:*

EDITORIAL

The late appearance of this number is entirely due to the Acting Editor who presents his humble apologies. The only excuse he can plead is that had he not undertaken it, there would have been no News Letter at all, and his plate was already too full to undertake an extra duty of this kind. It is greatly to be hoped that a New Editor will soon be found.

This all makes us realize how much we owe to the Reverend Harold Embleton R.N. for his expert Editing of this periodical over a number of years. All members of the Association will wish him well in his new and responsible post in Brussels.

The Anglican Orthodox Joint Theological Commission meets at Hertford College, Oxford, from 6-13th. of July. This is an historic event for it is the first time that a pan-Orthodox-pan-Anglican meeting has been possible since in 1931 the great Russian Church was absent. We are sure that all members of the Association will have this meeting in their prayers.

## APOLOGY

A printer's error missed giving the name of our distinguished contributor to the last issue of the Eastern Churches News Letter. The article on the Transfiguration was written by the Very Reverend Theoklitos Fefes Abbot of the Holy Monastery of Pendelis. We offer to him our deep apology for this error. (*Assistant Secretary*).

## A NOTE ON THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF ST. GREGORY PALAMAS

St. Gregory Palamas lived in the fourteenth century, in the last but not the least Golden Age of the Byzantine Empire. It was a time of external crisis and internal conflict, but also of intellectual and cultural renaissance. As pointed out by a modern writer, theological emphasis, from the time of the restoration of the Ikons in 843, theological emphasis centered increasingly in the East round pneumatology and Grace. Following the Areopagitica, St. Maximus the Confessor, and St. John of Damascus, it was St. Simeon the New Theologian who expressed best this pneumatological current in Byzantine thought. He makes it clear that there must always be a radical difference between the need for externalising the dogmatic truths of Christology, and the inner experience of being carried away by the Mystery of the indwelling Spirit by redeemed man, that seeks seclusion in silence. In the course of the life of Palamas intervention in public controversy became an unsought need, if the spirituality of the monks of the East was to come out of its isolation and express itself in a theology of mystical experience.<sup>1</sup> This Palamas effected, not so much by the enunciation of a system, as in his consistent teaching in controversy, and in such treatises as are recognised as genuinely his.

In his teaching about the human hypostasis, Palamas is primarily combating a dualistic conception of man. As against Barlaam, who was the first to attack the Hesychist monks, and his chief and inveterate enemy, who asserted that "the fact of loving activities common to the passionate parts of the soul, attaches the soul to the body, and fills it with darkness", Palamas maintained that God, in creating man a rational creature, gave his soul a particular quality that distinguishes it from the angels, namely the power to make the body alive. The soul, he says, has by nature such a link of love with its body, that it never wants to leave it, unless forced

to do so by some great illness or wound from without. Apart from sin, nothing is wrong with this life, not even death, but everything can lead to evil. Only Messalians say that the body is evil in itself."<sup>2</sup>

This statement needs elucidation from Palamas's general anthropology. Man, he says, was created in the image and likeness of God. After the Fall, and the expulsion from Paradise, the likeness was blurred, but the image remained. Thus, for all Adam's descendants, man is in need of restoration by Grace of the divine likeness, damaged by sin, which restoration is made possible through Redemption by the Incarnate Christ, and the resurrection of the soul by Baptism. What would have followed in man's life in Paradise without the disobedience of sin, is now acquisition of eternal life in Jesus Christ. But this acquisition involves an interplay between body and soul, which is effected by prayer. That prayer is made possible by having acquired a state of inactivity of evil, which is Hesychia.

Yet again, necessary to Palamas's anthropology, is his insistence on the heart as the true centre of man, in opposition to those who consider the intellect to be man's highest faculty. It is when the mind is in the heart, that prayer finds its fulfilment, and it is when man returns his mind to the inner world and the centre of his being, that God intervenes and acts.

With reference to his teaching on Grace, and its divinisation of man, it is clear that he regards Grace as divine and uncreate, as a generic term for the divine energies or powers of God, distinguished from His essence. In His essence, God is totally incommunicable, beyond thought or definition other than negative and apophatic: but in his energies, which are divine, totally communicable. Divinisation for man can never be union with the essence, but with the being of God through Grace. He uses the distinction made by Dionysius in applying nature (physis) to all created being, but admits created grace in a certain sense, as the beauty or seemliness of a particular being. Man's recreation by Christ through Baptism and the Eucharist is not complete without the grace of nature, and by this conception he emphasises the reality of both in this life in the Church, and communion with the living God.<sup>3</sup> The great saying of Athanasius, "Christ became man that we might become God" is basic to his thought.

There is also a synergy of Grace and human effort, in which the mind (nous), the faculty in composite human nature which is able to surpass itself, must be transformed before man can reach his goal, which is God.

But a magistral element in Palamas's teaching is that of his conception of Light. The light that shone on Mount Tabor in the Transfiguration of Our Lord is still active in redeemed man, in the pure of heart. That light is no mere type or material phenomenon, but experienced inwardly and spiritually. To see God, man must

acquire a "divine eye", and let God see Himself in him. The Saints are transformed by the power of the Holy Spirit, they receive a power they did not have before, they become spirit and see in spirit, and it is the whole soul and the earthly, the whole man, that is transformed. As he again comments, speaking of the supernatural faculty to see God by the presence of the Holy Spirit in us: "As this faculty has no other means of acting, having quitted all created things, it becomes nothing but Light, and grows like what it sees; it unites without mixture, being Light. If it looks at itself, it sees Light, if it looks at the object of its vision, then again is Light. And if it looks at the means it employs in seeing, that too is Light; it is there that there is union, all that is one, so that he who sees can distinguish neither the means nor the end, nor the essence, but is only conscious of being Light and of seeing a Light distinct from any creature."<sup>4</sup>

It is unfortunate that the Palamite synthesis has been for so long known in the West through its opponents. It is these days that Orthodox scholars have undertaken the task of interpreting the Saint to a larger world. The adversaries of Palamas in his own time were, by and large, men that cared little about Christian dogma, let alone the realities of the spiritual life, or the needs of their troubled history. Also, the opposition was not only theological: a number of bishops, faced with the charismatic character of the Hesychast monks, opposed the influence of Palamas as a threat to their authority. Again, there were some leaders of Byzantine thought that accepted the ancient Councils of the Church as verbally final formulas that must not be developed in any way, not even when the development conformed to Tradition, any such development being regarded as "innovation." This element was at first strongly anti-Latin, which Palamas was not, anxious as he was to find an answer to the tragic needs of the time. Later these same opponents, seeking a compromise with the West on relativist grounds, set out on a path of seeking union with the West, without any real doctrinal conviction.

It should be noted that the whole controversy and its attendant circumstances, was a domestic one, within Orthodoxy. The shattering events of the next century, when the ancient Byzantine Empire ceased to exist, hindered the development of the Palamite synthesis, and the working out of its conclusions. In a similar period today, of violent upheaval and change, the life of the Christian in the light of the Transfiguration of the whole man, may still have its place and influence.

Austin Oakley

#### FOOTNOTES:

1. V. Lossky, "The Vision of God" p.124ff. 2. Cap. phys. 38 Col. 1148A. PG.150. 3. PG.150 1102. 4. Tr.2, 3,36 . . . 2f. Meyendorff "A Study of Palamas" p.238ff.

#### "PEACE TO ALL"

The enthronement address of the Oecumenical Patriarch Demetrios I.

Venerable brothers in Christ.

Honourable clergy of the Great Church.

People of the Lord, chosen and beloved.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. As we ascend this Holy and Ecumenical Throne, we invest ourselves with the patience of Job, and his confession we confess, in the event of the great test that has befallen us, although we are the least among the brethren, to carry on our weak shoulders the Cross of the Lord and of the Church.

We are in amazement as we delve into the mysteries of the Will of God, for while we never, even remotely, dared to think of the possibility of a wondrous event of such dimensions, suddenly, as if with a whirlwind, the Holy Spirit with His tongue of flame chose Matthias. While all our thoughts and our concern were directed on our ministry among our beloved people of Imbros and Tenedos, utterly unexpected, came to us the call to carry the Cross of Christ.

The Lord was searching for a man from Cyrene. The Church was in need of a man from Cyrene. But we ourselves had neither the courage nor the stature of the man from Cyrene at the Crucifixion; nor did we have his spirit of self-sacrifice. We did not offer, on our volition to become the man from Cyrene.

A voice called us, a voice from within the sanctuary, a voice from the depths of history, a voice of tragedy from around us, the voice of the Lord called us.

We tried to flee. We entreated, we begged, being deeply conscious of the immensity of the Cross as well as of our weakness and unworthiness.

But for the sake of preserving the spirit of the Church, thinking not in terms of our own but wholly in terms of the interest of our Holy Church, we unconditionally surrendered ourselves to the Lord and to the Holy Spirit.

And, behold, we come before you, with a clear mind, clear heart and undoubted intentions. First we pay homage to the Trinitarian God of our Fathers.

Secondly, we confess the holy and blameless Faith of the Orthodox, as this has been handed down to us by the Lord through the Apostles, through the holy and inspired Fathers, and through the Saints and Martyrs of the One, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Thirdly, we assume our Patriarchal duties under the protection of the laws of the Turkish Republic of which we are a loyal citizen. The supreme interests of this country will be accorded our special

attention. The Patriarch is a religious leader and only that. The Patriarchate is the seat of Orthodoxy all around the world, an age-long and venerable spiritual and religious centre and nothing more. We have no relations, as the representative of an institution or personally, with politics. Politics belong to the state for which, according to the command of the Lord and Paul the Apostle, we pray, thus keeping things distinct. This affirmation of ours is beyond doubt, honest and straight.

This great and awesome moment of our entering the inner precincts of the Great Church and of Orthodoxy does not allow a long address on our part. We announce no programme other than the continuance of the programme of the holy and great traditions of the Great Church of Christ.

Consequently, we limit ourselves to saying to our immediate congregation here that we shall be their faithful and alert guardian and bishop; to the world-wide congregations of the Ecumenical Throne, that in our person they will find the champion of their growing in Christ; to the Hierarchy of the Throne here and everywhere, that we shall be the first in ministry and last in seeking honours.

Addressing you at this time venerable brothers, so honourable, tested out, and worthy of glory in the service of the Church, among whom we hold only the place of Benjamin and are only graced by the grace of the Lord and the power of the Holy Spirit, we hereby affirm—invoking our Archieratical conscience as witness—that we shall be to you first and last a brother, and only that.

We consider it our sacred duty gratefully to thank the Holy Standing Synod and the voting Hierarchy of the Throne for the moving trust they expressed by their canonical vote for our humble person.

Most honourable brothers. We say to you that we are nothing before the Church. Our lives are but a shadow as against the life of the Church. The Church survives persons and personalities.

We embrace in this spirit each one of you, the hierarchs here and everywhere within the jurisdiction of the Throne, and we call first ourselves and then all of you into the unity of a faithful, honourable ministry, worthy of the traditions of the Church and our People for the glory of our Heavenly Builder.

Having thus undertaken this Cross, we wish to state that, our weakness notwithstanding, we undertake with all sacred responsibility the protection and concern for the Holy and Apostolic Ecumenical Throne of Constantinople and its age-long privileges deriving from the canonical order as well as from tradition.

From the Ecumenical Throne thus understood, we greet the holy and blessed Leaders of the Holy Autocephalous and Autonomous Orthodox Churches, Patriarchs, Archbishops and Metropolitans, extend to them the hand, love, peace and fellowship in Holy

Orthodoxy, and we assure them that our co-operation with them will be sincere, in honour, and worthy of Orthodoxy.

From the position of the first among equals in the Holy Orthodox Church, we greet the holy, blessed Pope of Rome Paul VI. the first among equals within the Universal Church of Christ, venerable and elder brother, bishop of the Elder City and Patriarch of the West. Also the blessed Presidents of the Ancient Eastern Churches, His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the venerable Leader of the Old Catholic Church, and each and all the leaders of the Christian Churches and Confessions all over the world, together with the World Council of Churches, its leaders and its member Churches.

And we hereby make known our intention to follow upon the already established policies of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, upon the footsteps of our great Predecessor Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I of blessed memory in pursuing in pan-Orthodox acquiescence, Christian unity. We shall not relinquish our obligation to institute dialogues, first with Islam and then with other major monotheistic religions.

In concluding, we address ourselves to the whole world and we extend from this ancient Church of the East the only word of recognition, our only wish: Peace.

Peace to you.

Peace to all.

#### ANGLICAN ORTHODOX RELATIONS, 1972

The subject on which you have asked me to speak is that of Orthodox-Anglican relations in 1972, and you will certainly want me to give some account of the meeting which took place at Chambésy in September of this year. Before I come to that topic, however, I should like to speak first of one or two other recent events in the relationship between our Churches, which will help us to see that meeting in perspective.

(1) First, there is the publication of the book of Archbishop Methodios Fouyas, *Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism*. The appearance of this book is, I believe, something of an event in the relations between our two Churches. Almost for the first time we have an attempt to view the complicated relationships between the three traditions from a Greek Orthodox point of view. We recognise again in its pages how well-established are the friendly contacts between Anglicans and Orthodox, and can take a fresh look at the history of the discussions which took place between the two world wars. We can see also how the contacts have been taken

up again in more recent years, and how they are now developing in a totally changed atmosphere. For though the writer is perhaps too severe in his general judgement of Roman Catholicism, he certainly recognises the great changes in the approach to interchurch relations which have taken place since Vatican II. By recalling the history of the 1930's in the context of 1972, he helps us to see how much the general setting in which Anglican-Orthodox conversations take place has altered.

(2) Then there is the address given by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the annual general meeting of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius in March of this year. This address was published in the summer number of *Sobornost*, together with a comment on it from the Orthodox view-point by Fr. Dumitru Staniloae.

The Archbishop, in this talk, sketched out three stages in the development of the ecumenical movement. First there was the stage of what is called comparative ecclesiology, in which the positions of the differing Christian traditions were carefully set out and compared, differences registered and similarities recognised. This period lasted till the beginning of the 1950's. There followed a second stage which lasted for about a decade in which thought about the Church became more dynamic; the period in which the Church was considered in terms of mission and event.

The last ten years have seen a further development. For one thing, there has been since the Delhi meeting in 1961, a much fuller Orthodox participation in the World Council of Churches; for another there have been all the changes following on Vatican II. This new phase is marked by two distinctive features. In the first place, emphasis is now placed on the renewal and reform of all the Churches. "The question shifts from 'how can we unite our existing Church structures?' how can we reconcile our existing traditions?" to "how can our Churches be renewed and reformed, so as to be more obedient to Christ in their form, their behaviour, their mission? and what can we learn from one another in the process?" Secondly a new understanding of the relation of the Church to the world is growing. This involves "the belief that we understand the Church, not by concentrating upon it as a thing in itself, but by looking beyond the Church to the world which it exists to serve and recreate."

In this address, as in other places, the Archbishop welcomes this tendency to see the Church always in relationship to the world. But in view of the very evident dangers of a secularisation both of Church and theology, he emphasises that this relationship is to be understood in terms of the tradition of the Greek fathers and of more recent Orthodox theology. The Church is to be seen as placed in the world for its recreation and transfiguration. The Archbishop quoted Dr. Nicholas Zernov, saying "Man is saved

not *from* the world but *with* the world, because he is its guardian and master."

A further aspect of the new situation is to be seen in "the growing phenomenon of non-institutional Christianity; . . . charismatic movements where the Spirit of God appears to be working powerfully in spiritual life, in loyalty to Jesus, in gifts of the Spirit, *outside* the historic Church structures." It is such developments as these which have altered the whole setting of the dialogue between the historic churches.

Not less significant than the address itself, are the comments on it, provided by Professor D. Staniloae during his visit to England in May. As is well known, Professor Staniloae is one of the most distinguished of living Orthodox theologians, and one of the outstanding theological voices of Eastern Europe. It is this which makes his extremely positive reaction to the Archbishop's line of approach of particular importance. "The Church" he writes "has the role and special capacity to understand the signs of God, the words of God addressed to men, and indeed addressed to the Church in all the circumstances of history; and these signs, these words come to the Church by way of the world, of humanity, of history . . . Thus the Church has need of the world in order to understand God better, to understand further the meaning of his commandments and of his sending of the Church into the world. The Church must listen to what men are saying in this world, must be attentive to what is happening . . . regarding the world not only as a milieu which is to be conquered . . . but as a milieu in which God speaks and is at work."

Here, both in the words of the Archbishop and of Professor Staniloae, we see the work of Christian unity, as the recovery of a wholeness of vision and life, which will enable the Church to serve God more truly in and for the world to which it is sent, making known in the world the mystery of God's saving purpose.

(3) In what has been said so far, I have attempted to outline some of the factors which make the present situation in Anglican-Orthodox relations so different from that of forty years ago. In some ways the situation seems much more difficult now, than it did then. The Anglican Churches, like all the Churches of the West, have not escaped the mood of radical self-questioning which has followed on Vatican II. Theological questions which forty years ago might have been thought finally settled are constantly being opened up. Radical re-interpretations of traditional doctrines are proposed; new departures in the field of Church order, for instance the ordination of women, are being discussed. The tensions between those who see the salvation of the Church as lying in change, and those who see it as lying in resistance to change, have certainly increased. All these things will tend to make Anglican-Orthodox

understanding more difficult. On the other hand, as our references to Professor Staniloae will have suggested, Orthodox theologians are not unaware of the fact that God speaks to us through the circumstances of our day. Everywhere men of vision perceive that the tendencies of our time call men to a new and truer realisation of human unity. If the much more fluid situation in which the Churches find themselves in the 1970s creates new problems for Anglican-Orthodox rapprochement, at the same time it offers new motives for urgency and the possibilities of new and startling insight in the matter of Christian reconciliation.

It is in this context that we must approach the meeting which took place at Chambésy in September, and which we hope will prove to be of crucial importance for the official relations of our two Churches. It can hardly fail to be of some significance that at it plans were laid for the first official meeting representing all the Orthodox Churches on the one side, and all the Anglican Churches on the other, to be held since 1931. To say this is not to forget the important official conversations held in Bucharest in 1937, and in Moscow in 1958. But these were conversations between representatives of one Orthodox Church, and the Church of England. What is planned for 1973, is something much more widely representative, and in that sense more authoritative.

If we look back to the records of the meetings of 1930 and 1931 we can see something both of the method and the content of the dialogue as it was then understood. On the Anglican side, there seems to have been a desire to find a formula which would allow the Orthodox to recognise the reality of the Anglican Churches, and hence the validity of Anglican orders. On the Orthodox side there seems to have been a desire to question the Anglicans upon the major points on which it was evident that there was disagreement between the two Churches; what was the status of the Thirty-Nine Articles, what was the Anglican teaching about ordination, was it a sacrament? What was believed by the Anglicans about the Eucharist, both as regards the presence and the sacrifice?

I do not want to be unduly critical of the pioneering work done on both sides at that time. When we remember how few official contacts there were at that stage between the different Christian traditions, and how comparatively little the theological dialogue had developed, we can see something truly prophetic about these first Anglican and Orthodox conversations. But at the same time, looking back, one can be aware of certain real limitations of method and approach. Both sides seem to have been willing to discuss particular points of doctrine, almost in isolation from one another and from the great central themes of Christian faith. The underlying differences of approach to theology between East and West seem scarcely to have been touched. One is aware of being at the stage described by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the words, "How

can we unite our existing Church structures? How can we reconcile our existing traditions?"

The conversations of 1930-31 were not immediately followed up. Indeed it was not until the visit of Archbishop Fisher to Constantinople in 1960, that an official suggestion was made from the Anglican side for the re-opening of doctrinal discussions at a pan Anglican, pan-Orthodox level. Accordingly at the Orthodox Congress at Rhodes in 1964, it was decided to begin the preparations for the opening of the dialogue, and a process was set in motion which in September of this year arrived at the first meeting of two Sub-commissions, Anglican and Orthodox, to make proposals for the full and formal opening of the dialogue in the summer of 1973.

The process of preparation has been lengthy and careful on both sides. On both sides, Commissions have been appointed, representative not of one or two Churches only, but of the great majority of the provinces of the Anglican Communion and the autocephalous Orthodox Churches. This is important since it makes clear both the international character of the dialogue, and its fully official character. On the other hand it explains something of the slowness of movement. Neither the Orthodox Church nor the Anglican Communion are centralised, authoritation bodies. Everything has to be done by consultation between a large number of autocephalous Churches. It is unnecessary to point out that the position of some of the Orthodox Churches makes swift and unimpeded decisions particularly difficult.

Furthermore on both sides it was rightly felt necessary to confer beforehand as to the positions to be taken up at the opening of the dialogue. It is notorious, for instance, that the Anglican Churches contain a very wide spread of theological views. Would the Commission be genuinely representative? There was a suspicion that Anglicans sometimes say the kind of things which their partners in dialogue would like to hear, things that are not incompatible with the Anglican position but are not representative of it as a whole. As a member of the Anglican Commission I can say that we have had this danger constantly in mind, and have taken great care to be as objective and balanced as we can. In our five preparatory meetings in 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971 and directly before the Chambésy gathering, we have been both delighted and at times surprised to find how often we can speak together, despite the fact that we come from different schools of thought within Anglicanism, and from widely separated parts of the world.

It is not, of course, possible for me to speak of the Orthodox work of preparation in the same way, though the rather full accounts of the meetings published by some of the Orthodox members have given a good indication of the course of their discussions. Although the Orthodox tradition taken in itself is an integrated unity in a way

which is not true of Anglicanism, it is quite clear that on the question of the correct attitude towards other Christian bodies, Orthodox theologians, and indeed Orthodox Churches take widely different attitudes. There was therefore on the Orthodox side also room for differences of view.

During the preparatory meetings, the Anglican Commission worked on their replies to the four questions to which the Orthodox had requested answers as a first step in the dialogue, that is to say, "How the Anglican Churches would understand their union with the Orthodox Churches," "What was the possibility of union between Anglican and Orthodox in view of the measure of intercommunion practised between Anglicans and some other bodies?" "In what way would any decisions reached by the Joint Doctrinal Commission become binding on the Anglican Churches?" and "What was the status and authority of the Thirty Nine Articles within the Anglican tradition?" At the same time they prepared for their Orthodox colleagues two statements on the Anglican understanding of Comprehensiveness in relation to the mission of the Church.

The Orthodox for their part were asked by us, for statements regarding the Orthodox understanding of the redeeming work of Christ in cross and resurrection, and of the Holy Spirit as the Life Giver and Interpreter of the Gospel in the Church today.

Naturally enough on the Anglican side, we gave some consideration to the way in which the dialogue might be expected to develop, and in which we might get beyond the limitations of the early period. To this end we made a statement at the end of our meeting in Jerusalem in September 1969, indicating our desire to broaden both the context and the nature of the dialogue, so that it might contain all the truths of the Christian faith considered in their relationship both to the Church's worship and to its daily life.

We come now to the meetings held at the Orthodox Centre at Chambésy, near Geneva, from September 12th-14th, 1972. Both Commissions had met separately and in full for a few days before the joint meeting of the two Sub-Commissions. On the Anglican side we had a very full representation of members of the Commission for this preliminary meeting, our Chairman, \*Bishop J. H. Carpenter, \*the Bishop of Winchester, \*the Bishop of Long Island, \*the Bishop of Clogher, the Bishop of Quincy, \*Bishop Graham Delbridge, the Bishop of Montreal, \*Dr. Eugene Fairweather, Canon E. Every, \*the Revd. Roger Beckwith, \*the Revd. A. M. Allchin, together with the Revd. H. R. T. Brandreth and the Revd. Colin Davey, and Dr. Paul Anderson and Mr. Peter Day. Of these, eight, (i.e. those whose names are marked with a \*) together with Fr. Brandreth and Fr. Colin Davey, went on to the joint meeting, where we met on the Orthodox side, Archbishop Athenagoras

of Thyateira (Chairman), Archbishop Methodios of Axum, Archbishop Basil of Brussels, Metropolitan John of Helsinki, Metropolitan Stylianos of Metitopolis, Professor John Romanides, Professor A. Kalitis, together with Fr. L. Voronov.

Our meetings were extremely frank and friendly. Most of our business was conducted in English, though some interventions were in Greek, and the final communiqué was drafted in the two languages, English and Greek.

The decisions at which we arrived were as follows;

(a) that granted the approval of the appropriate authorities we should meet as a full Joint Commission in England from July 6-13, 1973.

(b) that "the dialogue should be extended and should include all the truths of the Christian faith, in the hope that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we may arrive at unity in faith." Questions relating to Church life and worship are to be included.

(c) that "we should take into account the results of previous meetings", i.e. while we are not bound by them, their conclusions clearly provide an important element in the preparation of our work.

As to the particular subjects to be discussed next year, they fall into two groups. The first relates to the Anglican answer to the four preliminary questions asked by the Orthodox, and certain connected questions. These were already briefly discussed at Chambésy, but will need to be further examined in full session. The second group of subjects is provided by the prepared papers, i.e. those on the Work of the Holy Spirit, and the Redeeming Work of Christ prepared by the Orthodox, and those on Comprehensiveness and the Mission of the Church prepared by the Anglicans.

Having given this brief account of our meeting last September, I may perhaps be allowed to add one or two personal and tentative comments on the way in which we may hope that the Conversations will proceed.

When we begin to consider our future *method of work*, it at once becomes clear that the full Joint Commission will be a rather large body (with between 40 and 50 members) in which to attempt to enter into detailed discussion of theological topics. May we hope that after our initial meeting in 1973, the Joint Commission will set up a number of smaller sub-groups to examine particular questions, perhaps, with the assistance of other experts, which will be able to report back to the next full meeting of the Commission? In this way it might be possible to imagine a number of smaller groups, meeting more frequently perhaps in Britain, in Eastern Europe and North America preparing material for consideration by the full Commission which would meet at longer intervals.

As to the *content of the dialogue*, the indications would seem to be that we shall seek to begin, not from a discussion of controverted questions, but with a common examination of certain major and basic areas of Christian faith, seeking to see whether we can together make common affirmations of our faith. The Anglican members of the Commission certainly have had in mind the report of the Committee on Relations with the Eastern Orthodox Churches, at the Lambeth Conference of 1968. This spoke of the search for "a theology which is both fully Orthodox and at the same time contemporary . . . a contemporary expression of our common commitment to the faith of the early undivided, ecumenical Church and of our determination to continue to present that faith in the future." I do not think that we should underestimate the importance and the value of solid and substantial common affirmations of our faith in God the Holy Trinity, and in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, made by our Churches, if we were enabled to make them with one heart and mind. In the present confusion of the Christian world, they could, I believe, have a very real and stabilising value, not only to our two Communions, the Anglican and Orthodox, but more widely for all our Christian brethren. It seems to me that this, at least, might be a way of approach to the difficult questions on which we are liable to differ.

One thing was very clear in our meeting at Chamb  sy, and that is that neither side was concerned to score debating points, but that both were seeking to serve and be true to the fulness of the truth which is in Christ, which is always larger than our human comprehension of it. This was a theme stressed by both Chairmen in their remarks at the opening of our conversations. "We are servants of God seeking to understand what the Spirit says to the Churches," said Archbishop Athenagoras. "We do not meet as ecclesiastical diplomats, but as servants of Christ's truth," said Bishop Harry Carpenter. We may recall also some words from the section of Lambeth '68 already quoted, "We believe that in leading us into all the truth, the Holy Spirit may have some surprises in store for us in the future, as He has had in the past." Finally we may recall the words with which the Archbishop of Canterbury characterised our present ecumenical situation, "How can our Churches be renewed and reformed, so as to be more obedient to Christ in their form, their behaviour, their mission? and what can we learn from one another in the process?"

(The Anglican answers to the Orthodox questions are published in the December issue of *Theology*, together with the two papers on Comprehensiveness).

A. M. Allchin.

## THE FILIOQUE

by the Revd. C. H. L. Davey

The Orthodox continue to demand the removal of the Filioque clause from the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed as a condition of unity with other Churches.

1 Thy do this *primarily* on the grounds of *Canon Law and Church Order*.

(a) They take very seriously indeed the embargo on further additions to the Creed or the compilation of new Creeds contained in Canon VII of the Council of Ephesus in 431 A.D. This reads: "The Holy Council then decreed that no-one should be permitted to profess any different belief or faith, or in any case to write or compose any other than the one defined by the Holy Fathers who met in the city of Nicaea."

The last phrase, however, refers not just to the original Nicene Creed, but includes its developed form as promulgated by the Council of Constantinople of 381 A.D. This is not "double-think", but was the common, if confusing, usage at the time. (see J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, pp. 322-331.)

(b) This implies that from 431 onwards the *Creed* should be left in its Constantinopolitan form unchanged, "without additions or subtractions." And that henceforth the Creed is one thing and *further doctrinal definitions* a separate matter. An Orthodox commentator has written: "None of the Ecumenical Councils following the Third added anything or removed anything from the common Creed, notwithstanding that they were hard pressed to do so. The Third Council . . . contented itself with making a definition of its own . . . and the other Councils likewise." (*The Rudder*, p.231).

This meant that the *method* of settling doctrinal disputes changed. Instead of promulgating new Creeds, specific doctrinal definitions would now be made.

(c) Because of this, the Orthodox will not accept arguments such as that put forward by St. Paulinus at the synod of Friuli in 796/7, that the Filioque "no more violated the principle that new creeds must not be framed than did the alterations which the fathers of 381 had felt obliged to make to the Nicene Creed." (Kelly, *op.cit.* p.364). The Orthodox argue tenaciously that this misses the point of the 431 A.D. prohibition, which occurred at a specific date in history. Needless to say, Westerners have repeated St. Paulinus's argument ever since, but without convincing the Orthodox.

The most important Western corroboration of the Eastern point of view is to be found in Pope Leo III's refusal of Charlemagne's request that he should approve the addition of the Filioque to the Creed. "With Roman conservatism, and a shrewd sense that if he

yielded he would put himself in an awkward position vis-à-vis the East, he parried their ingenious arguments. The doctrinal truth conveyed by the Filioque, he freely admitted, was essential to orthodoxy, but not all essential truths were enshrined in the creed . . . He had sanctioned the singing of the creed in Frankish territories, but his permission had not been intended to cover an amended form of it." (Kelly, op.cit.pp. 365-6).

(d) If one takes the Council of Ephesus seriously, and distinguishes between Creeds and doctrinal definitions, and between these and theologoumena, the Orthodox case remains unanswerable, and they rightly demand the removal of the Filioque from the Creed. Certainly no Orthodox theologian will be convinced that it ought to remain. The only exception to this I have found in the past is the surprising instance of the perhaps over-praised Greek Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus, who in 680 A.D. presided over the synod of Hatfield which produced a profession of faith containing the words: "We glorify . . . the Holy Spirit, ineffably proceeding from the Father and the Son." (Bede: *Ecclesiastical History* IV: 17). But then his companion Hadrian had been ordered by the Pope "to ensure that Theodore did not introduce into the Church which he was to rule any Greek customs which conflicted with the teachings of the true Faith." (ibid. 11.)

It is also clear that no amount of *theological* argument will convince the Orthodox of the propriety of adding the Filioque, since this misses the point of their argument from Canon Law.

2 The Orthodox also object to the Filioque on *theological* grounds.

(a) First, they argue that its insertion into the Creed raises its status from that of a *theologoumenon* into a *dogma*—to remove it would leave it, quite properly, as some of them say, as a permissible opinion, not as a binding article of faith. But to remove it from the Creed and still treat it as a *dogma* would require the authority of an Ecumenical Council, which it has never possessed.

(b) Others also argue that the Filioque is *heretical*, and accuse the West:

- (i) of introducing two "principles" into the Trinity, which undermine the "monarchy" of the Father.
- (ii) of stressing the unity of the "essence" of God at the expense of the diversity of the persons.
- (iii) of subordinating the Holy Spirit to the Son, and in practice neglecting the person and work of the Spirit.
- (iv) as a consequence of this theological imbalance, of regarding the Church too much as an institution of this world, with too great an emphasis on centralization and Papal authority—

the result of which, at the Reformation, was too great a diversity of opinion and excessive individualism.

We can observe in the developed form of the arguments on both sides "a fundamental difference of approach to the problem of the mystery of the triune Godhead." (Kelly op. cit. p.360.) We should also note that the context of the arguments has, for the most part, been mutual hostility and a determination to preserve each side's own point of view. When attempts have been made towards unity, however, considerable confusion still results from each taking the other's statements and placing them in the context of their own system of thought, without adequate attention to the basic differences of approach to theological thinking.

The following quotations may help us to see the nature of these different approaches, and why the "dialogue" was really two monologues.

George Every has written: In Latin Scholastic theology "the main influence . . . was the passionate desire to form an harmonious logical construction out of a number of apparently divergent texts from Scripture and the Christian Fathers. This kind of systematic Theology never took root in the East." (*Misunderstandings between East and West*, p.42).

"The Greeks' weakness in controversy lay in their inability to see heresy except on the deepest level, as a distortion of the proportion of faith, or superficially, as a departure from the letter of tradition." (ibid. p.47).

Joseph Gill writes of the Council of Florence: "The Greeks' approach to theology, and particularly the theology of the Blessed Trinity, was on purely patristic lines, and that in the simplest way." With few exceptions, they "had little theological formation apart from the general tradition of the faith which they had imbibed from childhood . . . So Montenero's display of metaphysical niceties . . . far from clarifying the thought of most of his Greek hearers . . . would have served only to mystify them the more and to make them cleave the more tenaciously to their sheet-anchor in Trinitarian theology—"from the Father alone"—feeling that Latin thought on the Blessed Trinity was far removed from the simple tradition they had inherited . . ." (*The Council of Florence* pp.227-9).

George Every comments: "This explains the constant conviction of the Latins that they always won the disputation, and of the Greeks that no Latin argument ever touched the heart of the problem. The conflict of *method* is independent of the question at issue, and indeed has a different history." (ibid.p.43).

This remains a problem for us still today, as can be seen, for instance, from the Conference in Moscow in 1956, when Dr. Ramsey's strong defence of the value of the Filioque as a weapon against heresy, and the Revd. F. J. Taylor's argument that it had

in fact preserved an orthodox understanding of the Holy Spirit, were simply ignored by the Russians, who went on to re-assert the old arguments one after the other. (*Anglo-Russian Theological Conference* pp.96-99).

In all this the underlying questions at issue are the legitimacy of different models and analogies for a developed Trinitarian theology; the adequacy of different theologies to preserve the Church from heresies such as the subordination of the Son and the Spirit; and the legitimacy of using terms in one frame of theological reference—where they make sense given the total balance of thought—even though when displaced and put into a different frame of reference they produce an obvious imbalance or distortion.

Unless these prior questions are discussed and solved, we shall remain talking at cross-purposes and an Orthodox—if we defend the Filioque—will still think he is being asked to incorporate Filioque into *his* (not *our*) theological picture of the Trinity, and so will automatically reply that it makes two “principles” or that there are better ways to counteract heresies than by inventing a new one—and anyway, he will continue, it is uncanonical—and we shall find ourselves back discussing the Council of Ephesus again.

I would suggest that the theological way forward would be (a) to remove the Filioque from the Creed, and so reduce it to a theologoumenon; (b) to show the scholastic theological approach to the Trinity is not the *only* Anglican one; but that within its own theological framework it does not necessarily imply the Subordination of the Spirit to the Son. (I might add that it has always surprised me that this latter point has not led, by way of safeguarding the doctrine of the Spirit, to a “Spirituque” clause, affirming that the Son is “begotten of the Father and the Spirit before all worlds” as could be logically argued—though I have no desire to invent yet another heresy); (c) to show that recent Anglican theology (Leonard Hodgson for instance?) is not inconsistent with Orthodox Trinitarian teaching; and (d) to explore, with our Orthodox friends, the practical issue of how to worship, experience, and talk about the Trinity today, bearing in mind George Every’s warning that “in a scientific civilisation, abstract statements in metaphysical terms generally fail to convey meaning, and the only theology that will make sense to lay Christians must be expressed in terms of their own experience of relationship with God, on their own knowledge of the difference between created gifts and uncreated grace.” (op.cit.p.49).

I would suggest then that, following the example of the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. in its new proposed Liturgy, the Church of England Liturgical Commission should be asked to delete the Filioque from the Creed in the Holy Communion Service Series III, and that the other Churches of the Anglican Communion should be asked to do the same. 28th July, 1969.

## OBITUARY

### HIS ALL HOLINESS ATHENAGORAS I

#### THE MAN OF THE RENEWAL

“The shared chalice can be seen shining on the horizon of the Church.” The Patriarch’s Christmas message for 1968.

Athenagoras was in the strict sense of the phrase, the Oecumenical Patriarch. For more than twenty years, he dominated our ecclesiastical world. Myth and symbol of reconciliation, he became for our generation the promise of our drawing closer, the challenge to the thinkable. But in his own Church he was first and foremost the man of renewal, and this is why he was able to establish a remarkable resounding dialogue with the West.

Like a prophet, he knew how to touch the heart of Western Christians. Upon himself he imposed a disarming simplicity. In him was a most remarkable conjunction of the sublime and the immediate. In his office at the Phanar he received his visitors with a love and attentiveness which masked the tiredness of this year which was to see the end of his life. The courtesy of this Oriental prelate, not without a little rogueishness, enwrapped you in an unfailing love in this atmosphere of incomparable modesty which masked the splendour of bygone Byzantium. If on leaving the Patriarchate you went to Santa Sophia to meditate there on things eternal, you would forthwith have grasped the whole poignancy of the contrast which day after day this pastor lived with, from the moment of his accession to the throne of Constantinople in 1948.

He never uttered a word of complaint. He believed that dialogue was possible with the Turks. When in 1953 the Turks ceremonially celebrated the 500th anniversary of their occupation of what Runciman called “the city dear to God and to His Mother,” the Patriarch ordered the Greek establishments of the city to hoist flags. Two years later, scores of churches were sacked. Thereupon Athenagoras sent the following message to the Prime Minister: “If, sir, you as head of the government do not repair within an agreed period of time the damage we have suffered, this will amount to your personal declaration that the Church is under persecution.” The Patriarch reached his Calvary last summer when the government closed the theological seminary at Halki and so rendered impossible the training of clergy in Turkey. A month after this astonishing move on the part of an officially secular state, I met the Patriarch. He was imperturbably calm. Yet he had just been bereft of the heart of his Church. His astounding impassiveness he owed to the patience of the saints accumulated during nearly two thousand

years' experience of Christian presence in Constantinople. He was determined to continue this presence amid ever-increasing difficulties. A fracture of the thigh brought his life to its end. May this break become the precursory sign of revealed resurrection in the magnificent fresco of Karyet Jamih! Why be made enough not to hope that one day the priest who, as the story goes, walled himself up when the church was sacked on Tuesday, May 29, 1453, will emerge to continue the liturgy at the point he had reached when Mehmet II sacked the Cathedral? perhaps Athenagoras was that priest, who will celebrate in his own way this divine liturgy in the entire Christian infinity.

He believed that even now, despite theological differences of which he was fully aware, intercommunion in one Cup between the Eastern and Western Churches is not impossible. But, as he suggested with a touch of irony, the theologians could resolve these problems. The lifting of anathemas would not do much to change the destiny of the Churches; Eucharistic communion would not automatically be re-established. But, like the prophets, Athenagoras proceeded by means of signs. It was for us to understand, on our road towards unity as symbolised by the meetings in Jerusalem, Istanbul and Rome, that his approach was that of the dialogue of the love in which Christ embraces us. The theology will develop from this embrace; its starting point will be what Athenagoras called "unity", that is a practical working together in the service of man. Theological dialogue will achieve the transformation of this "truth" into "unity." In his doctrinal thinking, the Patriarch was vague; he will never be proclaimed a Doctor of the Church. His glory is of a different order. It was granted to him to live in the time of John XXIII who plunged the Roman Church in this stream of simplicity and love. Their feelings on this point of unity were alike, though they were not of the same spiritual type. Athenagoras the liberal, John the conservative, transcended their personal limitations and dared to confront that thorn in the flesh of the Church-division.

Athenagoras wanted to include the whole Christian world in this march towards the Absolute of love. His prayers, his efforts were directed towards the Oriental Orthodox Churches no less than towards the Catholic Church. He sought the spiritual and sacramental unity of that Orient which is truly one. These churches, at one time chained to their own nationalism, have no longer anything to fear from an orthodoxy which, all over the world, is losing its temporal privileges.

The autocephalic Orthodox Churches were becoming more and more interested not only in establishing contact with the World Council of Churches in Geneva but also in bilateral inter-church relations. This movement began in the congresses in Rhodes where the Orthodox Christians sought their own unity. Their union,

being sacramentally consummated, had to be expressed in a unity in depth, a renewal of the Church from within, an attack on all outstanding doctrinal and liturgical and pastoral problems.

Under the stimulus of Athenagoras, Orthodoxy moved towards a destiny of clearer historical definition. In this respect he acted with solicitude for all Christian Churches in communion with him. From this point the renewal of Orthodoxy was inseparable from the ecumenical movement.

Athenagoras will remain like the icon in which our memory is transfiguring him. No one has lived to the same degree as he has the words of John "God is love." The universal and sufficient expression of this truth will come to us as a revelation of the Spirit to the extent that we have rediscovered our freedom, lost in linguistic complications and historical labyrinths. Athenagoras has taught us that man is authentic only when he stands with all his brethren before the one God. May Athenagoras be ever remembered.

Mgr. George Khodre.

Orthodox Metropolitan of Mount Lebanon.

L'Orient-Le Jour, July 9, 1972.

By kindness of Al Montada.

## NEWS AND CAUSERIE

THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE  
Patriarchate Declared Turkish Institution

ANKARA, TURKEY

The Minister of Foreign Affairs in a written question of Mr. Tselal Kargili, an independent member of Parliament, in reference to the Patriarchate of the Phanar, said that in the discussions of the conference of Lausanne the Patriarchate was characterized as a Turkish institution and the Patriarch as a religious leader of the Romanic minority.

"And since the Patriarchate is a Turkish institution", the minister continued, "it falls under the jurisdiction of the Turkish laws and is therefore subject to lawful control. The appropriate authorities can at any moment examine the Patriarchate, which, since it is subject to the Turkish laws, cannot have any objection. Furthermore it is known that during the last election of the Patriarchate, we implemented a new system.

"The Patriarchate and those who belong to it have the benefits of religious freedom and the protection of the laws in Turkey, the only presupposition being that they deal with religious matters. Our authorities oppose all efforts not conforming to this condition. In accordance with this, the printing press of the Patriarchate was

closed in 1964 as not having any relation to its religious nature and an examination was begun of the finances of the lands of the Monastery of St. George. The appropriate authorities of the nation follow this subject with utmost care. "It is beyond question" Bylkin concluded, "that there can be no thought nor can any opportunity be given to the Patriarchate to initiate any activity, religious or political, that is not foreseen in the decrees of the Treaty of Lausanne."

Please pray for the Great Church of Christ at Constantinople, for His All Holiness the Oecumenical Patriarch Demetrius and the Holy Synod.

#### OECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE PROCLAIMS A SAINT

Istanbul—Lydia, the first person converted in Europe to Christianity by the Apostle Paul, has been proclaimed a saint by the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Oecumenical Patriarchate.

St. Lydia's feast day will be marked on May 20. The request for sainthood came initially from the Diocese of Philippi and Cavala in Greece.

The saint will be known as Lydia of Philippi in the Orthodox Churches.

As recorded in Acts 16, the Apostle Paul came from Asia Minor into Europe near the city of Philippi in Greece. He met Lydia, a rich woman and dealer in purple dye, by the River Ganga.

Originally from Thyateira in Asia Minor, she was among a group of Jewish women who had come to the river to conduct prayers because there was no synagogue in the city.

Lydia and her household were baptised by Paul and she provided hospitality to the Evangelist and his colleagues Timothy and Silas.

The Christian community in Philippi to which Paul later wrote one of his most important letters, found in the New Testament as the Epistle to the Philippians.

Lydia was possibly one of the women cited by Paul in the letter as being of help to him.

#### REVISION OF THE HOLY SYNOD OF THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE

His Holiness the Oecumenical Patriarch Dimitrios 1st has just nominated the Metropolitan Maximos of Stavroupolis, and Chrysostom of Myra members of his Holy Synod. Two of the Metropolitan members of the former Synod Iakovos of Derka and Aimilianos of Miletos, have retired. Thus, under the presidency of

the Oecumenical Patriarch, the Holy Synod is now composed as follows, in order of precedence: (1) Meliton of Chalcedon, (2) Dorotheos of the Ile des Princes, (3) Kyrillos of Chaldea, (4) Chrysostomos of Neocesarea, (5) Maximos of Laodicea, (6) Maximos of Sardis, (7) Hieronymos of Rhodopolis, (8) Maxim (Maksimos) of Stavroupolis, (9) Chrysostome of Myra, (10) Symeon of Iranoupolis, and (11) Gabriel of Kolonna.

In the course of its first meeting, which has just taken place, the Holy Synod has elected (1) the Bishop Photios of Tralles, Auxilliary of the Metropolitan of Chalcedon (Kadiköy), and (2) the deacon Athenase Papas as Auxilliary Bishop of the Metropolitan of Chalcedon, with the honorary title of Bishop of Helenoupolis.

The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain celebrated its Golden Jubilee on Sunday, October 22nd. The Divine Liturgy was celebrated in the Greek Orthodox Cathedral of St. Sophia by the Metropolitan Kyrillos of Chaldea, representing His All Holiness the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and other Greek and Russian prelates con-celebrated with His Eminence. H. E. the Greek Ambassador and members of the Royal Greek Embassy attended the Liturgy. The Right Reverend Bishop Harry Carpenter (formerly Bishop of Oxford) represented the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Winchester also attended as chairman of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Counsellors on Foreign Relations.

Patriarch Meletios of Constantinople in 1921-23 took some important steps in furthering the cause of Anglican and Orthodox relations. In 1922 he issued the Patriarchal and Synodical Encyclical bringing the Greek Orthodox parishes of the Diaspora back under the jurisdiction of the Oecumenical Patriarchate. (In 1908 Joachim III had given them to the Church of Greece), and creating the Metropolitane of Thyateira with its See in London, as the Exarchate of Western and Central Europe and appointed Metropolitan Germanos as the first Metropolitan of the See and Apokrisarios of the Oecumenical Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The holder of the See of Thyateira is always the Apokrisarios to the Archbishop of Canterbury. For almost thirty years Metropolitan Germanos worthily discharged the duties entrusted to him and carried out the reunion policies of the Oecumenical Patriarch and the Orthodox Churches in general. Metropolitan Germanos was the first Orthodox President of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. He gave his support to the work of the Association and on a number of occasions spoke at meetings for it.

In 1951 after the death of Metropolitan Germanos, Metropolitan Athenagoras I. was appointed to the See of Thyateira and he carried forward the work of the late Metropolitan. After his death Metropolitan Athenagoras II was appointed in 1964. The Metropolitanate was raised to become an Archbishopric in 1967.

The Archdiocese has now entered a new chapter in its life. The Anglican and Eastern Churches Association extends to the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain its warm congratulations on its Golden Jubilee. May His Eminence Archbishop Athenagoras and all members of the Greek Archdiocese of Thyateira and Great Britain have many years of happiness and God's rich blessings be upon all they do to the glory of His Holy Name.

#### GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHDIOCESE OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA.

*Consultations in Greece result in New Programmes.*

*Archbishop Iakovos expresses satisfaction.*

New York. Archbishop Iakovos returned to New York last week after a brief visit to Greece. During his visit His Eminence spoke extensively with the Prime Minister and Regent of Greece Mr. G. Papadopoulos as well as with numerous other government officials, concerning various topics pertaining to the life of the Greek Orthodox Church in America. The Archbishop stated to reporters that the results of these fruitful consultations can be summarised as follows:

The newspaper of the Greek Government will in a few weeks publish the legal document which recognised our Holy Cross Theological School in Brooklyn Massachusetts as equal to the Theological School of the University of Thessaloniki.

Plans were completed for the production of educational slides, films and books for the Greek Archdiocese of America. It was decided to expand the Ionian Village in Bartholomio so that it can accommodate youngsters 16-18 years of age. Three additional buildings will be added to the summer camp facilities. It was decided to continue the programme involving the travel of 30 Greek-American priests to Greece each summer as the Guests of the Greek government. In addition 30 Greek-American Educators will be invited to Greece next summer to participate in a conference on Education. A final topic of discussion was the establishment of a high school in Athens for the children of Greek-Americans. This will be fully recognised by the State of New York and will offer all the required courses of an American High School in addition to Greek and religious courses. Official announcement on this project will be released once details have been finalised.

Chicago Ill. A centuries old ceremony for Orthodox Christians, the celebration of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross was commemorated on Sunday September 17th at McCormick Place-on-the-Lake. The observance also marked the Golden Jubilee, fifty years of the life and development of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of the Americas. The highlight of the ceremony was the casting of a golden cross into Lake Michigan. The cross symbolises

death when it submerges and resurrection when a youthful diver retrieves it and returns it to the Bishop. As long as the cross is submerged, says Bishop Timotheos, the divers can struggle over it—in a nice way of course. It is believed that good fortune will follow the triumphant diver and his family in the ensuing year.

Bishop Timotheos officiated in the ceremony and at the Divine Liturgy before it in the Arie Crown Theatre of McCormick Place. Bishop Firmilian of the Serbian Orthodox Church and 30 Greek Orthodox priests assisted. The Choir Federation (80 voices strong) under the direction of John Douglas sang the responses. All Greek Orthodox Churches in the Chicago area were closed so that members could participate in the service. There are approximately 250,000 Greek Orthodox Christians and 20 parishes in Chicago and suburbs.

#### HANDBOOK OF AMERICAN ORTHODOXY PUBLISHED.

Cincinnati, Ohio. A new Handbook of American Orthodoxy has been published under the sponsorship of the Council on Relations with Eastern Churches of the Joint Commission on Ecumenical Relations of the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. This handbook is a successor to the Directory of Parishes and clergy published for many years under the editorship of Bishop Scaife. It contains not only the up-to-date listing of all the clergy and parishes of the Orthodox Church in America but also an introduction written by Dr. Anderson as an orientation for those who are unfamiliar with Orthodoxy. In addition there is a Glossary which is helpful in defining terms in Orthodoxy. Also included is the Easter Homily of St. John Chrysostom and the Orthodox Calendar of the Church's Year. For copies contact Forward Movement Publications, 412 Sycamore Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, U.S.A.

#### ALEXANDRIAN PATRIARCHATE CONDEMNS ECUMENISM

In an interview given to the Athens newspaper *Orthodoxos Typos*, Patriarch Nicolas VI of Alexandria condemned ecumenism as "the pan-heresy, all the heresies rolled into one." He called on the Greek Orthodox Church to withdraw forthwith from the World Council of Churches and underlined the need for a clear declaration of Orthodoxy in the dialogue between the Churches. The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria was one of the founding members of the WCC. in 1948 and has since collaborated in the activities of the ecumenical movement.

#### ALEXANDRIAN PATRIARCH WILL REMAIN ACTIVE IN WCC

Athens. (RNS). Greek Orthodox Patriarch Nicolas VI of Alexandria, Egypt, has declared that the Alexandria Patriarchate continues to be an active member of the World Council of Churches. In a report received here from Alexandria, the Patriarchate clarified remarks he has made a month ago, which had been interpreted as

criticisms of the ecumenical movement and a suggestion that the Alexandria Patriarchate would withdraw from the World Council. According to the latest report the Patriarch has affirmed that "nothing has changed" in the Patriarchate relationship with the ecumenical body.

#### THE PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM AT ORTHODOX CENTRE

His Beatitude the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Benedictos, during a private tour to Europe, has been the guest of the Orthodox Centre of the Oecumenical Patriarchate from 22 to 25 August. With him were the Archbishop Vassilios of Jordan, Secretary to the Holy Synod, the deacon Theophilos, and his doctor, Dr. Petrakis.

The Patriarch was received by the Metropolitan Damaskinos of Tranoupolis and the Centre's administrative council. On His arrival a Te Deum was sung in the Chapel of the Centre and the Metropolitan of Tranoupolis gave an address of welcome to which the Patriarch replied, and there after nominated the Metropolitan Grand Master of the Order of the Stavrophores of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Grand Protophresbyter Georges Tsetsis, Stavrophore. On Sunday 27th. of August, the Archbishop of Jordan, Mgr. Vassilios, representing His Beatitude the Patriarch, and the Metropolitan of Tranoupolis, Mgr. Damaskinos concelebrated the Liturgy followed by a Requiem for the repose of the soul of the Oecumenical Patriarch Mgr. Athenagoras, of eternal memory. Homilies were given by the Archbishop Vasilios of Jordan and Metropolitan Emilianos of Calabrd.

#### PATRIARCHATE OF ANTIOCH

*Cardinal Willerbrand's Visit to Damascus.*

His Excellency Cardinal Jean Willerbrands, President of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, concluded his visit to Damascus on 15th. of June. In the name of Pope Paul VI, he returned the visit made to the Vatican last October by the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch Mar Yakoublll.

The Patriarch received Cardinal Willebrands at the door of St. Georges Cathedral in Bale Touma where prayers were said by Syrian Orthodox and Roman Catholics of different rites. Present also were H. B. Patriarch Maximos V, Hakim and the Nuncio Mgr. Achille Glorieux.

Cardinal Willebrands delivered a letter from His Holiness Pope Paul VI to the Patriarch who addressed his thanks with the expression of his wishes for the unity of the Church. On Wednesday, June 14th., a common prayer was recited in St. Paul Memorial Church.

Invited by Mgr. Barnaba, Syrian Orthodox Bishop of Homs and Hama, the Vatican Delegation visited Homs and two neighbouring villages. On 16th. of June Cardinal Willebrands left for Erivan (Soviet Armenia) to return the visit made in May 1970 to Pope Paul VI by the Armenian Orthodox Catholicos, His Holiness Vasken I.

The Cardinal was accompanied by; His Excellency Mgr. Roger Etchegaray, Archbishop of Marseille, the Diocese where there is the largest Armenian population in Europe (60,000 faithful); Father Pierre Duprey, undersecretary of the Secretariat for Union, Father Jean Long, of the same secretariat and Father Der Nersessian of the Mekhitarista of Venice.

*By kind permission of Al Montada.*

#### ROMANIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE

##### RELATIONS WITH THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

*Telegram Sent By His Beatitude Patriarch Justinian to His Grace Dr. Michael Ramsey On the Death of Lord Fisher of Lambeth, Former Archbishop of Canterbury.*

On the 14th. September 1972, the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Fisher of Lambeth, died. His Beatitude Patriarch Justinian sent the following telegram of condolence to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury:

"We were deeply saddened by the news of the death of the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Fisher. By his death the Anglican Church has lost one of its most vigorous personalities, who held the See of Canterbury in the post-war years. We share with Your Grace in the sad loss and pray God for His eternal rest. Please convey to his family our sincere sympathy.

+ Justinian  
Patriarch of Romania

##### RELATIONS WITH THE ORIENTAL ORTHODOX CHURCHES.

###### *The Armenian Church*

Professor Ioan Coman's Manual of Patristics translated and printed in Armenian.

The Manual of Patristics written by Professor Ioan Coman for theological studies and published by the Romanian Patriarchate's

Institute for the Bible and Orthodox Mission in 1956 is to be translated and published in Armenian. His Holiness Vasken I, Supreme Catholicos of all the Armenians wrote to Professor Coman to ask his consent for the translation and publication of his book in Armenian. His Beatitude Patriarch Justinian also gave his consent. The translation is to be made by Professor Atanasian. The Manual will be used by Armenian seminarians at Etchimiadzin and in the Armenian diaspora.

#### RELATIONS WITH THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

*An Exchange of Telegrams between His Beatitude Patriarch Justinian and Cardinal Suenens.*

On the 6th. of September in connection with the fire at Malines Cathedral His Beatitude sent the following telegram to Cardinal Suenens:

"We are sorry to hear of the fire which has devastated the famous Cathedral at Malines and convey our sincere regrets to your Eminence and your clergy".

+ Justinian  
Patriarch of Romania.

On the 13th. of September, Cardinal Suenens sent the following telegram in reply.  
Your Beatitude.

Your telegram of sympathy sent after the fire in our great Cathedral of St. Rombaut gave me much consolation. I am very grateful for Your kindness at this trying time. It moves me when I recall the splendid service which we celebrated together a few months ago in the Cathedral. I am happy to give you the good news that thanks to certain precautions and in particular to the building of a fire-proof wall ten years ago we escaped a major catastrophe. The fire destroyed only the upper part of the choir and a small bell-tower, situated at the crossing of the nave and transept. The vault was not damaged and the Cathedral was reopened for worship. Restoration work will take a year. I am also grateful to the people of Malines who, when the fire began, carried all the artistic treasures of the Cathedral to safety in less than thirty minutes. The generous assistance of many young people was very moving.

I thank you once again for your sympathy you have shown and assure Your Beatitude of my brotherly affection in Jesus Christ".

Cardinal Suenens,  
Archbishop of Malines-Brussels.

#### RELATIONS WITH THE CHURCH OF ANTIOCH.

In June 1972 there will be three centuries since the death of Patriarch Makarios Zaim of Antioch, a well-known figure for his

struggle against the Ottoman domination. He also carried out an intensive work for rapprochement between the Christian Churches. The memories of his journeys in Russia and the Balkans written by Paul of Aleppo, provide us with important historical data concerning the religious situation in the Romanian principalities in the first half of the XVII-century.

ROC. Bucharest.

#### THE BULGARIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE

Sofia Bulgaria (RNS) Metropolitan Andrey of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in the Americas died here on August 10th. He was 85 years old. The Prelate came to Bulgaria in late June from his home in New York and had been in hospital for much of his visit. He died in Government Hospital. U.S.A. citizen, Metropolitan Andrey had been visited by the American Ambassador Horace G. Torbet Jr. on August 3rd. The diplomat said he found the aged Bishop well cared for but sinking rapidly. He had been ailing for many months. Metropolitan Andrey was first sent to the U.S.A. in 1938 by the Holy Synod to head the then newly created Bulgarian Diocese of North and South America and Australia. He was recalled in 1939 spending a part of World War II in Istanbul where he helped to settle a schism between the Bulgarian Church and the Oecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul. Returning to the U.S.A. after the war, he was offered and accepted the title of Archbishop by representatives of Bulgarian parishes who were in Buffalo. This led to protests both from Sofia and Istanbul, and to a condemnation by the Bulgarian Holy Synod. In the 1960's contacts were re-established with Sofia. This, in turn led to a withdrawal from Metropolitan Andrey's jurisdiction of parishes that had no relations to the Orthodox Church in Bulgaria, which was considered under communist domination. Metropolitan Andrey was a member of the Standing Conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops in America. Despite his ecclesiastical ups and downs, Metropolitan Andrey is remembered as a man of wit and stamina.

#### THE PATRIARCHATE OF MOSCOW

The Russian Orthodox Church is in general agreement with plans and procedures for an anticipated Pan-Orthodox Council a leading churchman from Moscow said in Athens.

Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad and Novgorod, head of ecumenical relations for the Patriarchate of Moscow, held a press conference while on an official visit to Greece with the Patriarch Piman of Moscow. He said that it is not easy to convene a Pan-Orthodox Council since none has been held for about a thousand

years, but that his Church is in agreement with the planning for such a Council being carried out by the Oecumenical Patriarch of Istanbul.

The late Oecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras launched the move for a world meeting of Orthodox, on the same level with the councils of the church in early centuries, more than a decade ago. The Oecumenical Patriarch is first-among equals in the Orthodox hierarchy but does not hold administrative authority over the other Orthodox Churches. Metropolitan Nikodim said plans for a council must be made with "due seriousness, care and study".

He was also questioned about the attitude of his Church towards the Oecumenical Patriarchate. Moscow and Constantinople (Istanbul) do not always have cordial relations, and moments of tension arose in the early 1970s over the independence of the Orthodox Church in America (OCA). "We Orthodox acknowledge only a Primus in the Orthodox Church and as such we acknowledge the Oecumenical Patriarch", Metropolitan Nikodim said. "In Orthodoxy we do not have a sovereign".

Patriarch Pimen and his party were honoured by both the State Orthodox Church of Greece and the Government. The Holy Synod of Greece presented the Russian Primate with the Great Cross of Apostle Paul.

#### RUSSIAN ORTHODOX AIDE CONFERS WITH CARDINAL WILLEBRANDS

Archimandrite Serafin, representative abroad of Patriarch Pimen of the Russian Orthodox Church, visited the Vatican at the invitation of Cardinal Jan Willebrands, president of the Secretariat for Christian Unity. The Vatican sources said the purpose of the visit was to prepare the groundwork for a later visit to Pope Paul VI by the Patriarch. Patriarch Pimen has just completed a "pilgrimage" tour of Eastern Europe and the Middle East, in the course of which he visited several Orthodox Patriarchs.

#### GERMAN CHURCHMEN VISIT RUSSIAN ORTHODOX LEADERS

A delegation of the Federation of Evangelical Churches in East Germany (BEK), led by Bishop Albrecht Schoenherr, recently

completed a two-week tour of U.S.S.R. religious centres at the invitation of Russian Orthodox Church authorities.

Moscow Radio said the group had met officials of the Government's Department for Religious Affairs, as well as with Patriarch Pimen, head of the Russian Orthodox Church.

#### DELEGATION FROM THE CHURCH OF GREECE TO THE OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH

A delegation from the Church of Greece comprising the Metropolitan Stylianos of Nicopolis and Preveza, Bishop Cosmas of Derbe, Secretary of the Holy Synod and the Archimandrite Chrysostomos Korakitis has paid a visit to His Holiness the Patriarch to express felicitations and good wishes on the occasion of his election and enthronement.

The delegation was cordially received on 28 August by the Patriarch. During the audience the Metropolitan Stylianos of Nicopolis and Preveza delivered to him a letter from the Archbishop Hieronymos of Athens as well as an episcopal crosier on behalf of the Church of Greece saying, "In visiting with profound respect the renowned and time-honoured centre of Orthodoxy, from where the Truth and the Light of our pure faith has radiated, the delegation presents itself humbly on the order of the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece and its president His Beatitude the Archbishop of Athens and All Greece, Mgr. Hieronymos. It is with all due respect that the delegation brings to your Holiness, who worthily takes in hand the helm of the Church, greetings full of veneration, from the sister Church of Greece for the behoof of your beloved Mother Church, the Great Church of Christ; joyous greetings that Your Holiness has been justly elected by the Canonical voice of the Hierarchy about Her to take on the succession of the great and inspired Patriarch Athenagoras, of happy memory, and of all the choir of great Patriarchs. We bring you felicitations of the clergy and faithful of Greece together with a letter from His Beatitude the Archbishop and we have the pleasure of delivering to you this episcopal crosier as a symbol of the power and wisdom and of the considered guidance of the Orthodox Church in the great highways marked out by the glorious patriarchs across the troubles, sufferings and sacrifices of this eternal Golgotha which leads to the joy and glory of the Resurrection.

"We express humbly to Your Holiness, divinely guarded, the hope that the Builder of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ, may fortify You in your great efforts to preserve the spiritual beacon of Orthodoxy and guide You towards the greatness and glory of orthodox faith." To these words the Patriarch replied: "Mother Church and we personally welcome you, honoured representatives of the very

holy Church of Greece, with joy, love and honour in this holy centre of Orthodoxy."

"We appreciate especially this visit which we accept as an expression of affection from the very dear sister Church of Greece to the Mother Church, the great holy Church of Christ.

"The exchange of crosiers has persuaded us of the mutual support between our churches in response to the Pauline commandment "Bear ye one another's burdens", with the object of offering more effectively a witness for the Lord and Orthodoxy.

"We heartily thank His Beatitude the Archbishop, the Holy Synod, and all the very holy Church of Greece for this fraternal salute.

"We affirm that during our whole humble patriarchate we shall spare no effort to reinforce interorthodox co-operation to the end that, in the strong unity of all the orthodoxies, we may realise the will of the Lord on the unity of all those who believe in Him; and we hope to benefit in our effort from the generous collaboration of the very holy Church of Greece.

"We pray you on your return to convey the kiss of peace from the Mother Church to the very holy Church of Greece and our blessing to the faithful of Greece."

A cordial interview followed, which gave an opportunity to reaffirm the respectful ties of the Church of Greece towards the Ecumenical Patriarchate, then a banquet was given in honour of the delegation.

#### EASTERN ORTHODOX SCHOLARS WEIGHT BIBLICAL RESEARCH

The role of the Eastern Orthodox traditions in modern biblical research and interpretation was the topic of an unprecedented conference of scholars and prelates here in Athens.

Meeting in the first Conference on Orthodox Hermeneutical Theology Professors from the Universities of Athens and Thessaloniki and 11 representatives from abroad drafted an eight-point communique, beginning with the reason for the gathering.

At a time when the interpretation of Scripture has "become the focus of theological controversy", the meeting was called to give account of "the Orthodox witness" and to confront the vital issues which arise from contemporary biblical research.

Participants included Russian Orthodox Bishop Michael of Astrakhan and Yenotayev and delegates from the Serbian, Rumanian, Syrian and other independent Orthodox Churches.

The conference stressed the importance of the teaching of the early Church Fathers for the twentieth century biblical study and recognised that the Patristic traditions stimulate creative thinking and lead to the critical use of scientific methods of Bible study. The conference also held that the "correct interpretation of Holy

Scripture is above all the fruit of the illumination of the Holy Spirit received by the exegete as a member of the Church."

Church tradition was called the "final and secure criterion of interpretation." Conference participants said close co-operation and communication is needed among Orthodox Scholars so that they may "maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." a quote from Ephesians 4-3.

#### AT THE ORTHODOX SEMINARY OF FINLAND

... from the beginning of September, 1972, there came into force a considerably revised curriculum, putting more emphasis on the central themes of theology and pastoral work. For the first time, canonical theology will be studied as a separate subject. This new curriculum is the result of collaboration between the Finnish Orthodox hierarchs and the Ministry of Education, which is responsible for the Seminary as a State controlled institution.

#### PRAYER FOR THE NEW OECUMENICAL PATRIARCH

The first Sunday of September, 1972 a solemn Te Deum took place in the Orthodox Cathedral of Helsinki in thanksgiving and intercession for the work of the new Ecumenical Patriarch Dimitrios 1st. The service was conducted by the Metropolitan John of Helsinki, who described the Patriarch's programme. Among those present were the new Lutheran Bishop of Helsinki, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Finland, the Lutheran Bishop of Borga, the bishop of the Finnish armed forces, the President of the Lutheran World Alliance who is at the same time Rector of Helsinki University and representative of the Ministry of Education.

#### GREEK CHURCH HONOURS ARCHBISHOP PAUL, ORTHODOX PRIMATE OF FINLAND

Athens—Archbishop Paul, Primate of the Orthodox Church of Finland, was awarded the Grand Cross of the Order of St. Paul during an official visit to the Orthodox Church of Greece.

The honour is the highest which can be conferred by the Greek Church. It was presented by Archbishop Ieronymos of Athens during a reception given by the Greek Holy Synod.

Earlier, Archbishop Paul was welcomed on his arrival by a delegation of churchmen and government officials.

During a service at Athens Cathedral, he noted that a Greek missionary had brought Christianity to Finland.

#### NEW ORTHODOX BISHOP CONSECRATED IN PARIS

The Archpriest Stefan Timchenko, rector of Stockholm Orthodox parish, was consecrated as Bishop Seraphim on May 7 in the St. Alexander Nevsky Cathedral in Paris.

Bishop Seraphim graduated from the theological faculty in France. After serving at various Orthodox parishes in France, he was appointed rector of the Stockholm parish, the oldest church outside of Russia founded three centuries ago.

Archbishop Georges, assisted by six other bishops, officiated at the consecration.

#### BOOK REVIEWS

*Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism.* by Archbishop Methodios Fouyas. London. (Oxford University Press). 1972. XXI. 280 pp. £4.50.

An addition to the relatively small number of books in English by Orthodox writers on ecumenical subjects is greatly to be welcomed. A particularly valuable aspect of Archbishop Methodios's book is the way in which the major episcopal Churches are consistently considered together. The usefulness of the book is enhanced by its very thorough documentation, though for an analysis of the documents themselves it does not supplant Professor Istavridis's *Orthodoxy and Anglicanism* (now unfortunately out of print).

The Archbishop, who is a member of the Inter-Orthodox Theological Commission for dialogue with the Anglican Communion, does not minimise the differences between the two Churches, nor the difficulties which lie ahead, but, from a somewhat conservative Orthodox point of view, he consistently tries to make a case for Anglican-Orthodox rapprochement. Moreover, he knows Anglicanism well, having been for a number of years head of the Greek parish in Manchester and, be it said, a warm and active friend of this Association.

For all these reasons one regrets having to interject a critical note. In his dealing with Orthodox-Roman Catholic relations, the ecumenist is eclipsed in favour of the polemicist. In many places he is less than fair to the Roman Catholic side of the case, and from time to time offends against charity in imputing base motives to Roman Catholics rather than assuming that at least they meant what they said. None the less, this book will be of value in this sphere as showing the outlook of a not inconsiderable section of Orthodox opinion.

Perhaps an even more severe criticism concerns the authorities cited by the Archbishop. Who in this day and age, would expect to find Karl von Hase's *Handbook of the Controversy with Rome*, not only cited as an authority but also some of his questionable renderings of the Fathers quoted in place of the originals? Far too many quotations are at second-hand. Then, again, certain authors on the Anglican and Roman Catholic side, are not those whom either Church would regard as having much weight as spokesmen.

(They are worthy pamphleteers so that it would be unkind to name them).

Certain details should be called into question:

- p 61 I know not what is meant by saying that at the Malines Conversations the two parties (i.e. Anglicans and Roman Catholics), "came to complete agreement". Where is this remarkable concord to be found? Certainly not in the *Report of the Conversations*.
- p 64 "The Church of England from its foundation to King Henry VIII was an independent Church". I have no idea what this means as, for example, against the Church in France in the same period.
- p155 It is not true that either the Chicago General Convention of 1886, the Lambeth Conference of 1888, nor the Lambeth Conference of 1920 regarded the quadrilateral as a basis for union. They said, in fact, that agreement on the four points were pre-requisites for reunion negotiation.
- p165 The Roman Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is incorrectly stated. The doctrine does not say that our Lady was outside the realm of redemption, but rather that she was the first fruit of it.

These criticisms have to be made, but it remains true that this is an important book for which all members of the A. & E.C.A. should be grateful. As books go today it is cheap, so that members that cannot afford to buy a copy can at least make sure that their local library obtains it.

H. R. T. Brandreth, o.g.s.

*Beyond The Grave: An Orthodox view of Eschatology.* By Constantine Callinsiou. Translated from the Greek by the Reverend George Dimopoulos and Leslie Jerome Newville. Scranton Pa. (Christian Orthodox Edition) 1969 175pp 5 dollars.

The author of this book was for many years Greek Orthodox Priest in Manchester and will be remembered by the older members of the Association of which he was an active member. He was the author of a number of small books in English explaining the Orthodox Church to readers in this country. The present book, which the publishers claim to be his most important is now for the first time translated from the Greek. We are not told the date of the original edition, and one wonders whether the author would have written precisely the same book were he writing today—he died in 1940. It is of somewhat uneven texture and into the middle of a section of rather naively expressed doctrine of the last things, there is a long section on psychic phenomenon, with some very

strange passages about ghosts. The most rewarding chapter is entitled "Relationship of the living and the dead before the resurrection" which captures something of the wonderful apprehension of the communion of saints which the Orthodox has.

*Orthodox Sermons For All Sundays of the Year.* By the Reverend George Dimopoulos, Scranton Pa. (Christian Orthodox Editions) 1971 176pp. 5 dollars 50.

Orthodox writers are generous in supplying the non-Orthodox with many books about themselves. One, does however, perhaps learn more about them from books written for their own consumption. This is one thing that makes this so useful a book. The sermons appear not to have been preached, but are rather published as models or guides for English-speaking Orthodox preachers. They are simple and direct and appear admirably suited to their purpose. Non-Orthodox readers will have much to gain from them. We look forward to further volumes which are promised.

#### AIMS OF THE ASSOCIATION

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

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

#### SOME METHODS OF HELPING THE WORK

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

Lectures – with or without visual aids – can be arranged by writing to the General Secretary.

#### SUBSCRIPTION

The minimum annual subscription is £1, but none will be excluded solely on account of inability to pay this amount which it is hoped that those who can afford to pay more will do so.

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

