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PREFACE

By the Archbishop of York

This volume is issued in the belief that many readers will welcome an account of the first theological conference which has been held officially between the Orthodox Church of Russia and the Church of England. The account is necessarily selective, as a complete record of all the papers which were read would require a volume far too bulky; and the editorial note on page xiii explains the method of selection. It is hoped that enough is here included to give a fair picture of the exchange of theological views which took place, and of the reaction of the members of each Church to the thought and doctrine of the other.

The members of the Anglican delegation will remember the conference as but one factor in a busy fortnight’s visit to the Russian Church. We were the guests of the Patriarch Alexii of All Russia, and received the gracious hospitality of him and of the Metropolitan Nikolai Krutitsky who was in charge of the arrangements on his behalf. In the course of our stay we made many visits to Churches in Moscow (where some fifty were open for public worship), and received each day the warm welcome of crowded congregations absorbed in worship. It was our privilege to attend the consecration of a bishop, and the liturgy of the Feast of S. Sergius at his shrine in the monastery of Zagorsk. There was no doubt as to the spirituality, and the fraternal charity, which the Russian Church contains.

It may be useful to indicate the place of this conference within the history of the relations between the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches. From the end of the sixteenth century Anglians have looked towards the Holy Orthodox Church as to a Church which, like their own, rejects the supremacy of Rome, appeals to Holy Scripture and to the

After the conference members of the delegation also visited churches at Leningrad and Vladimir as well as in outlying villages.
ancient Fathers, and claims continuity with the ancient Church in its hierarchy and its sacramental life. The progress of mutual knowledge between the Churches was inevitably slow, as a result of centuries of separation and radically different historical experiences. To the West, Eastern Orthodoxy seemed strange, as it knew neither medieval Papalism nor the convulsions of the Reformation; to the East, the Church of England seemed no less strange as an off-shoot of the Western Papal Church. But within both Churches there has come about a feeling that the other is significant for the reunion of Christendom just because it goes behind some of the familiar modern categories in its claim to a primitive catholicity different alike from Rome and from the Reformation systems.

The interchanges between the Russian and the English Churches in the period between the beginning of the Oxford Movement and the 1914–1918 War are described in W. J. Birkbeck, Russia and the English Church (London, 1895) and in Birkbeck and the Russian Church, edited by Athelstan Riley (London, 1917). The latter volume contains essays and reminiscences of W. J. Birkbeck, who will ever have a place of special honour in the story of Russian and English Church relations. A scholarly layman of ardent devotion and an accomplished Russian linguist, he strove throughout his life to make the Church of England known in Russia and to stir English Churchmen to a concern for the Russian Church. He died after a last visit to Russia shortly before the Revolution of 1917. In the period covered by the volume of his papers, there took place the fraternal exchange of letters between Archbishop Benson and the Metropolitan of Kiev in 1888 at the commemoration of the conversion of Russia, the visit of Bishop Creighton of London for the Coronation of the Tsar in Moscow in 1896, the visit of Archbishop Maclagan of York for the Easter Festival of 1897, and the formation of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union in 1906. These events seemed to point forward to official conversations between the Russian and English Churches. But the time was not yet ripe for them, and the Revolution of 1917 interrupted the intercourse between the two Churches.

In the years between the Revolution and the second World War, there was no resumption of intercourse between the Church of Russia and the Church of England. Significant progress was, however, made in friendly relations and in theological discussion between the Church of England and other parts of the Holy Orthodox Church. A delegation from the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople came to London for consultation with Anglican bishops attending the Lambeth Conference of 1920. An important document entitled Terms of Intercommunion suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in Communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church was drawn up by Anglican theologians in 1921. In July 1922, Meletios, Patriarch of Constantinople, together with the Holy Synod, declared that Anglican Ordinations ‘possess the same validity as those the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches possess.’ The Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Church of Cyprus took similar action shortly afterwards. In 1925 the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem joined with the Archbishop of Canterbury in reciting together the Nicene Creed in Westminster Abbey at the celebration of the sixteen hundredth anniversary of the Council of Nicaea. In 1930 representatives of all the Patriarchates (with the exception of Moscow) and most of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches came to London at the time of the Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops, and the discussions which took place led to the appointment of a Joint Doctrinal Commission between the Anglican and the Eastern Orthodox Churches. This Commission issued, in October 1931, a very valuable statement upon Points of Agreement and Difference. Subsequently, there were discussions between delegations of the Church of Rumania and the Church of England at Bucharest in June 1935, and the Report of this Conference indicated agreement upon some important theological questions. Throughout the period 1919–1939, the presence in the West of many Russian Christians of the emigration did much
to increase the mutual knowledge of Anglican and Orthodox Churchmen, and a growing number of members of each Church were led to an appreciation of the liturgy and the ethos of the other.

It was not, however, until the second World War that relations were renewed between the Church of England and the Church in Russia itself. In 1943 Dr. Garbett, the Archbishop of York, visited the Patriarch of All Russia in Moscow and witnessed in the churches of the city the mingled fervour of religion and patriotism at a critical time of the war, and the welcome to a nation then in alliance as well as to a friendly, foreign Church. In 1945 the Metropolitan Nikolai visited the Archbishop of Canterbury. These visits paved the way towards the conference which the present volume describes.

The chief features in the discussions with the other Orthodox Churches in the inter-war years are found to recur in this conference. It will be seen that, in the mind of Eastern Orthodoxy, the question of validity of orders is of lesser moment than the question of the integrity of Orthodox faith. The Russian Church has not yet recognized the validity of Anglican Orders, and, if it were to do so, the recognition would set forward ecclesiastical union only if there was also recognition of complete identity of faith. It will be seen that it was with questions of faith that the conference in Moscow was mainly concerned. What is the relation of Scripture and Tradition? What is the authority of the Ecumenical Councils? What is believed concerning the Sacraments and Holy Orders? What is believed concerning the Communion of Saints? What is the border-line between dogma and theological opinion? It will be seen that, while there are differences concerning faith which seem very hard to reconcile, there are also differences which arise from the two Churches asking different questions as a result of totally different historical experiences.

The conference will be rightly judged if it be remembered that it was not only the first official conference ever to be held between the Church of Russia and the Church of England, but also the first exchange of thought held for many years between the theologians of two Churches long separated. There was the difficulty of language; for while the excellent interpreters could build a bridge, no interpreter can enable a complete impact of mind upon mind. There was the difficulty of our unfamiliarity with the process of discussion with one another. And there was a big difference in theological training and method. While Orthodox theologians are accustomed to the dogmatic method of expounding the doctrine of the Church as one indivisible whole, Anglican theologians are more accustomed to the historical method of asking by what process the doctrine of the Church came to be. It will be, none the less, a happiness to all the participants in the conference if the readers of these pages perceive, not only a clash and an exchange of minds, but also some deep common understanding of the mysteries of the Church's being and its life in union with God, the Blessed Trinity.

Meeting, as it did, in a year of strain and stress in the world of nations, the conference was a proof that across all barriers there is a unity of those who worship the Triune God and are baptized into His Threefold Name. The expression of this unity in discussions concerning the Faith cannot be separated from its expression in prayer, in worship and in charity. Those who read this book will join with its authors in the prayer that the conference which it records may be used by Almighty God towards the integration of His Church in faith and love.

MICHAEL EBOR:
EDITORIAL NOTE

For publication lack of space has made it necessary to shorten the records of the conference. Thus, only extracts of the Russian Orthodox papers presented to the conference can be included, except in the case of the papers by Bishop Michael of Smolensk and Archpriest Alexander Vetelev. The former is included in full because it gives essential information about the setting of the conference, the latter because of the importance of its subject and its brevity.

No papers in English are included. Some compensation for this resides in the fact that in the reports of the discussions the English contributions are for the most part given in full and the Russian in shortened form.

It should be emphasized that the form of minutes in this book have not had the approval of the full conference. They have, however, received the approval of the leaders of the English delegation as an accurate record of what took place. A verbatim record in Russian was compiled and is available in Russian in England and in the United States.
OFFICIAL COMMUNIQUÉ

ISSUED BY THE ANGLICAN DELEGATION

A THEOLOGICAL conference was held in Moscow from the 16th to the 23rd July between Russian Orthodox theologians and theologians of the Church of England.

The Russian Orthodox delegation was appointed by the Patriarchate of Moscow and consisted of Bishop Michael of Smolensk, Bishop Sergii of Staraya Russa; Archpriest K. I. Ruzhitsky, Rector of Moscow Theological Academy; Archpriest A. A. Vetelev, Professor of Moscow Theological Academy; Docent Archpriest V. M. Borovoy, Professor L. N. Pariisky, Professor N. D. Uspensky, Professor A. A. Osipov, all of Leningrad Theological Academy; with others from Moscow Theological Academy as follows: Professor A. I. Ivanov, Docent the Revd. K. V. Nechayev, Docent A. I. Georgievsky and Docent V. D. Sarichev.

The Church of England delegation consisted of the Archbishop of York, Dr. A. M. Ramsey; the Bishop of Derby, Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson; the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. H. J. Carpenter; Dr. Owen Chadwick, Master-Elect of Selwyn College, Cambridge; the Revd. H. A. Williams, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; the Revd. F. J. Taylor, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford; Canon H. M. Waddams, General Secretary of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations; the Revd. J. Findlow, English Chaplain in Rome; with Dr. P. B. Anderson of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, nominated by the Presiding Bishop as an observer. The Anglican delegation was appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Papers were read at the conference on a number of important theological topics as follows: The history of the relations between the Church of England and the Russian Orthodox Church, the nature of the Church, the place of the laity in the Church, the Creeds, the *filioque* clause, doctrine
and its formulation, dogma and opinion, the Sacraments, Orthodox practices and Anglican formularies. Discussion took place on most of these subjects.

The sessions were chaired alternately by the Archbishop of York and Bishop Michael of Smolensk, with the exception of the first session which took place under the chairmanship of the Metropolitan Nikolai Krutitsky.

During discussion it was found that there was a wide measure of agreement between the delegations on a number of important points. There was also a number of divergencies due to different historical experiences and to different emphases and customs. There was not much time during the conference to discuss fully all these points of difference, and much work remains to be done before such discussion could be complete. Nevertheless the conference members are convinced that their meeting has been of very great value in increasing understanding of one another’s points of view. The conference was the first official conference of the kind ever to take place between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Church of England. It could therefore have only a preliminary and exploratory character. Each delegation will report about the conference to its respective Church authority and future developments will depend on the decisions taken by the appropriate Church authorities.

The conference recorded its conviction that in such ways as this meeting greater understanding can and should be built up between the Churches and people concerned. Only thus can there be hope of achieving prayerful and canonical communion in full unity between the two Churches under the guidance of the Holy Spirit of God.

25th July, 1956

RÉSUMÉ OF DISCUSSIONS

First Day: 16th July, 1956

The conference opened with papers on The Relations of the Russian Orthodox Church with the Church of England by Bishop Michael and Dr. P. B. Anderson. The Bishop of Oxford then read a paper on The Doctrine of the Church, and Professor Parisky read a summary of two papers, one on The Orthodox Idea of the Church and one on The Role of the Laity in the Life of the Church.

During the discussion which followed the Orthodox spokesmen stressed their opinion that agreement on matters of doctrine, the succession and position of the hierarchy and on the Sacraments was the main prerequisite for unity. Satisfactory agreement on these points would result in recognition by the Orthodox Church of another Church as part of the one true Church of Christ on the same footing as the Orthodox Church itself.

The Anglicans pointed out that the Lambeth Quadrilateral specified just these points, with the addition of Holy Scripture, as those on which approaches to unity should be based.

It was generally accepted by members of the conference that if agreement on the following subjects were reached by the Churches full unity would become a practical possibility:

(a) Doctrine and its sources: Scripture and tradition.
(b) The Ministry.
(c) The Sacraments.

Second Day: 17th July, 1956

On the second day of the conference proceedings were opened by papers on the Holy Scripture by Professor Osipov and on Holy Tradition by Bishop Sergii. The Archbishop of York spoke on these subjects on behalf of the Anglican delegation at the end of these two papers.

As regards Holy Scripture the conference agreed that the
Résumé of Discussions

Canon of Holy Scripture was the same for both Churches. Both Churches also accepted the uncanonical books, not as inspired by God, but as being useful and instructive. The concept of inspiration was not fully discussed, but there was some difference between the speakers in their emphasis on the character of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and on the measure of the human element in it. Both Churches adopted a similar attitude to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Septuagint. The Orthodox held to the Textus Receptus for the New Testament, whereas Anglican practice commonly made use of this and other texts as well.

On the question of Holy Tradition it was agreed that both of the Churches contain divinely inspired Holy Tradition, understanding by this the divinely revealed truths transmitted from the Apostles through the Fathers. Holy Tradition does not contradict Holy Scripture inasmuch as both are revelations of one and the same Holy Spirit, and therefore, although theology can distinguish between them, they are not separable in the life of the Church. Holy Scripture is explained and completed in the light of Tradition. The Orthodox Church gives to Holy Tradition the same importance of an independent source of faith that it gives to Holy Scripture, and the Church of England maintains that Tradition could not add to the content of Scripture anything essential to the Faith.

Third Day: 19th July, 1956

On the third day of the conference papers were presented by Professor Archpriest A. A. Vetelev on Dogma, Theologoumena and Opinion and the Formulation of Dogma; by Dr. O. Chadwick on Doctrine and its Formulation and by Canon H. M. Waddams on Doctrine and Opinion.

After the papers discussion ensued in regard to the understanding of dogma, theologoumena and private theological opinion. The Orthodox theologians asserted that the Creeds and definitions of the seven Ecumenical Councils are the essential truths of the faith in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

They also asserted that dogmas can be further revealed as far as their content is concerned but that they are not subject to development in the sense of the alteration of their content. The Orthodox defined theologoumena as opinions of the holy Fathers which do not contradict dogma, but which have not been approved by the Creeds or the definitions of the Ecumenical Councils. Theologoumena may be the subject of Church teaching but cannot be accepted as dogma. Private theological opinion is opinion on an article of faith which has not been explored by the holy Fathers or the Ecumenical Councils. It must be confirmed by Holy Scripture and be in accord with dogma. Private opinion cannot be the subject of teaching in the Church.

On the Anglican side it was stated that the dogmas of the Ecumenical Councils formulated the faith as it was accepted in the Church of England though there was no official statement with regard to the number of the Councils which had to be received. Anglicans also believed that variety of opinion in the Church could be of great service to the full understanding of the faith and for the presentation of Christianity to those outside the Church.

Fourth Day: 20th July, 1956

This was the fourth day of the conference. Papers were presented as follows: Docent Archpriest V. M. Borovyov Creeds and Councils, Docent the Reverend K. V. Nechayev and the Right Reverend the Bishop of Derby The filioque followed by discussion.

The Orthodox theologians asserted that the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in the form confirmed by the Council (i.e. without the addition of the filioque) as accepted by the whole Church, is the universal Creed. The Orthodox Church recognized seven Ecumenical Councils and considers their doctrinal definitions the essential truths of the belief of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

The confession of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed with the inclusion of the filioque is not consistent with
adherence to the purity of the faith and is contrary to the seventh rule of the third Ecumenical Council.

The Anglican representatives admitted that the *filioque* had been improperly introduced into the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed in the West without authority and recognized that in principle it ought not to be included. They stressed the fact, however, that it was not heretical and that the faith professed by the Church of England was identical with that of the Ecumenical Councils and of the Creed in its original form.

**Fifth Day: 21st July, 1956**

On the fifth day of the conference papers were presented as follows: Archpriest K. I. Ruzhitsky *The Orthodox Church's Teaching on the Sacraments, their Nature and Number* and the Reverend H. A. Williams, *Sacraments, their Nature and Number*. A discussion followed.

The theologians of the Orthodox Church asserted that all of the Sacraments instituted by God were established either by the Saviour Himself or on His commandment by the Apostles. There are seven Sacraments, viz., Baptism, Chrismation, Penance, Holy Communion, Ordination, Matrimony and Unction. The teaching of the Orthodox Church regarding the Sacraments, their essence and number, is based upon the Holy Scriptures, Holy Tradition, the witness of the Ecumenical Councils and the witness of the Fathers of the Church.

On the Anglican side it was stated that the Orthodox point of view was in accord with the basic teaching of the Church of England, which, however, distinguishes between Baptism and Communion, as instituted in Holy Writ by Christ Himself, and the other five. The Anglican rite of Confirmation was considered to correspond with the Orthodox Sacrament of Chrismation. Anglican theologians would accept the attitude adopted by the Orthodox regarding the consecration of the sacred elements in Holy Communion.

The Orthodox Church performs Unction for the sick in the hope of their healing, as S. James teaches (v. 14), but does not give to this Sacrament the meaning of Unction *in extremis* as is taught in the Roman Catholic Church.

**Sixth Day: 23rd July, 1956**

On the sixth day of the conference discussion continued on the question of Sacraments. Thereupon the following papers were presented: Docent A. I. Georgievsky *Meaning and Importance of the Rites of the Orthodox Church* and the Reverend F. J. Taylor *Orthodox Customs which may cause Difficulty for Anglicans*.

Brief discussion ensued. The theologians of the Russian Orthodox Church pointed out that devotion to the *Theotokos*, prayerfully appealing to the Saints, the use of icons, and prayers for the departed, are not customs which can be considered peculiar to a particular Church, but are the unchangeable doctrine of the universal Church.

The ritual side of the Sacraments, the rubrics of services and other prayer ritual are, in Orthodox services of worship, essential external signs for the requesting and receiving of grace, and, in their major and most essential parts, have their origin from the Apostles. Consequently they are not subject to approbation or arbitrary change.

The Anglican theologians asserted that on the question of Sacraments their views wholly agreed with the statements of previous Anglican-Orthodox conferences, in 1931 and 1935, on the subject of the Sacraments.

As regards forms of devotion and customs of the Orthodox Church Anglican spokesmen explained the historical and scriptural background which causes Anglican Christians to view with concern some of the devotional practices of the Russian Orthodox Church.
THE RELATIONS OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX
CHURCH WITH THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By Bishop Michael of Smolensk

The relations between the Russian Orthodox Church and the
Anglican Church constitute one of the factors in that historical
process which may be defined as the relations between
Orthodoxy and Anglicanism.

As a general characteristic of these relations one must state
at once that in comparison with the history of the relations
between many other Christian confessions the story of the
contacts between Orthodoxy and Anglicanism is a peculiarly
happy one in that it has never been clouded by mutual
hostility, attempts to proselytize each other's members or
similar manifestations of ill will. More than that, the Ortho-
dox Church and Anglicanism have, since far back in the past,
met each other, as a rule, exclusively in an atmosphere of
Christian fellowship and sincere good will, the main theme
of those meetings, both large and small, nearly always being,
then as now, a shared desire to achieve the best and fullest
possible mutual understanding in order that their future
relations, taking into account certain indisputable necessary
conditions, might serve as a basis for the unity they desire to
establish.

All that has been said above about the relations between
Orthodoxy and Anglicanism applies fully to the history of the
relations between the Russian Orthodox Church and the
Church of England.

The foundations of these relations were laid at the beginning
of the eighteenth century by a group of Anglican bishops
belonging to the so-called Nonjurors, i.e., those who refused
to take the oath of allegiance to William III. The Nonjurors
were deprived and, separating from the Established Church,
formed their own society which existed up to the beginning
of the nineteenth century. No doubt the ambiguity of their
situation was one of the major factors that made the Nonjursors look for support outside the British Isles. But the very fact that they addressed themselves to the Orthodox Church is of great significance and is a convincing proof of the great moral authority that Orthodoxy enjoyed among a considerable body of Anglicans at that time. The Nonjursors made use of the visit to London of Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebias, who was on a mission of charity on behalf of the Church of Alexandria, then in serious difficulties. The fact that the Metropolitan Arsenius chose to come to England may also be considered as evidence of the existence in the East of sympathies towards Christians of the Anglican confession.

In 1716, through Metropolitan Arsenius, the Nonjursors sent to the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs (and to the Russian Holy Synod) the draft of an agreement between ‘the Orthodox and Catholic remnant of the British Churches and the Apostolic Eastern Church.’ By calling themselves the ‘Orthodox and Catholic remnant of the British Churches’ the authors of this draft were emphasizing that they derived their Christianity from the Mother of all Churches, the Church of Jerusalem, and that they continued to support, as they had always done, the Faith which was preserved in the Orthodox East.

The principal idea of the draft was the establishment of communion in prayer and liturgy. The draft of the agreement drew attention to points where there was no divergence between Anglican and Orthodox believers as well as those on which the Anglican bishops (the authors of the draft) did not agree with the Orthodox Church. In addition the document proposed practical measures that ought to be taken if agreement were to be reached. In particular, the suggestion was made that a Church called the Concordia should be built in London, subordinate to the Patriarch of Alexandria, where services would be held for British Catholics, and that a Greek bishop visiting London would have the right on certain days to conduct services in the cathedral church of London.

Metropolitan Arsenius took this draft agreement back via Russia. Its authors had given him a second document: a letter addressed to the Russian Emperor, Peter the Great, which expressed the hope that he would help their cause, and requested him to dispatch the draft to the four Eastern Patriarchs. In Russia the draft agreement was regarded with much sympathy, for the idea of uniting the Churches fully harmonized with the broad unification ideas which distinguished the era of Peter.

Strange to say, the Established Church of England had nothing to say for several years about the negotiations undertaken by the Nonjursors; in the light of history this group of Nonjursors may be considered only as a schismatic one.

The reply of the Eastern Patriarchs, drawn up in 1718 and transmitted to the authors of the draft in 1721, was couched in friendly terms but its contents were extremely reserved. The Nonjursors, their composition now somewhat changed, maintained their position and wrote and dispatched to the East a further message in which they elaborated a number of the views expressed in the original document, that had met with objections from the Patriarchs. This was in 1722.

The second message of the Nonjursors was likewise sent through Metropolitan Arsenius, then in Russia. At the same time its authors drew up and sent a letter to the Holy Synod of the Russian Church, in which they again sought support for the cause of Church unity. The Holy Synod responded to this request most readily and promised to act with all means possible to reach the aims envisaged. On the initiative of Emperor Peter I the proposal was made that the Anglican bishops should send to S. Petersburg two representatives for discussion and impartial examination of the points where there was agreement and disagreement between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches. The Eastern Patriarchs replied to the Nonjursors’ second message in 1723, through the Holy Synod of the Russian Church. In essence their reply did not differ from the previous one: if there were to be communion in prayer and liturgy there would have to be complete unity
of faith. To this answer was attached an account of the Orthodox Faith which had been drawn up at the Church of Jerusalem in 1672 and was known as the ‘Message of the Eastern Patriarchs.’ Addressing themselves to the Holy Synod the Patriarchs expressed the earnest hope that the Russian bishops would speak in full conformity with these principles. Nevertheless the Holy Synod informed England that the Emperor Peter continued to believe that the holding of talks between Orthodox and Anglicans would serve a useful purpose. The suggestion was accepted. In the summer of 1724 the Nonjurors, replying to the Synod, declared that through unforeseen circumstances they were not able to send their representatives to Russia at once for the talks that were envisaged but hoped to be able to do so in the spring of 1725.

But these intentions remained unfulfilled too. The complicating following the death of Peter I diverted the attention of the initiators of the proposed talks in Russia elsewhere, and once again they were postponed. And later (still in 1725) there finally came an official explanation of the long drawn out misunderstanding from the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Wake. The Archbishop, addressing the Patriarch of Jerusalem, informed him of the schismatic nature of the activities of the group of Nonjurors and of their lack of competency to establish contact with the Eastern Church.

In this manner the venture proved fruitless. However, the concluding words of Archbishop Wake’s message may be taken to have been a kind of programme for future relations. Speaking in the name of the real English episcopate the Archbishop assured the Patriarch that Anglican Christians, basically held the same faith as Eastern Christians, and expressed his confidence that the relations between them would never be curtailed, despite the great distance that separated them.

A considerable time passed before direct official contact between representatives of the Anglican confession and the Russian Church was renewed. In the ’thirties of the last century there arose within the Church of England a movement known as the Oxford Movement, Puseyism or Tractarianism. The founders of this movement sought to revive amidst their fellow-believers the spirit of Catholicism and set themselves the task of returning to the tradition of the ancient united Church. As we know, a section of the followers of this movement deviated afterwards to Roman Catholicism. However, some members of the Oxford Movement looked towards the Orthodox East, including Russia. The most ardent efforts for attaining unification with the Orthodox Church were made by the well-known deacon William Palmer. He twice visited Russia, studied Russian and made a most serious attempt to penetrate the spirit of the Orthodox faith. We should note the personal contacts he made with a number of prominent persons of the Russian Church. Unfortunately Palmer did not find in Orthodoxy what he sought and, like many other Puseyites, ended up a Roman Catholic.

Despite the unsuccessful conclusion of several attempts, the interest of the Anglican hierarchy and English theologians in the Russian Orthodox Church grew in strength and breadth. This problem came to interest a wide circle of Anglicans. A powerful wave of interest and sympathy for Russian Orthodoxy arose in connection with the apostolic activities of the Russian Spiritual Mission to Alaska and adjacent areas of North America. Russian missionaries, priests, bishops and monks of the Valaam Monastery who worked in this glorious walk of life, performed the functions of their sacred calling with such devoted and selfless love that they attracted general attention. It is here that we must seek the roots of that deep sympathy for Orthodoxy which was born among members of the episcopal Anglican Church in North America [viz., Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America] in the second half of the nineteenth century. It is necessary to underline that it was precisely there, in North America, that there were created quite unique conditions for Anglicans and Orthodox to become acquainted with each other: they had no need to undertake special research of a documentary character, there was no need to send special representatives far and wide to study this or that question; all that was
required was to make careful observations and see what was going on there, on the spot. A great positive role in giving North American Anglicans their first acquaintance with Orthodoxy was played by the Dean of the New York Orthodox parish Nikolai Bering. He undertook, incidentally, the publication in English of a special magazine dealing with Orthodox life in America. A little earlier (in 1862), at the general convention of the North American episcopal Church, a 'Greek-Russian Committee' was set up. A year later a similar committee was formed in Britain. Both committees worked on questions concerning the uniting of the Churches. At the same time the foundations were laid in England of yet another organization with a much broader programme. This was the 'Eastern Church Association.' The Association undertook a thorough study of the life of the Orthodox East, it endeavoured to acquaint English people with this life and at the same time to acquaint Orthodox Christians with the Church of England. In addition, the Association set itself the task of using every opportunity to make friendly contacts with the Orthodox Church and to help the spiritual welfare of the Orthodox inhabitants of the East. As a result of the Association's publishing activities, questions relating to relations between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy were for many years constant themes in Russian theological literature. Beginning from the seventies of the last century both Russian and English (including overseas) theological literature accumulated much exceptionally valuable material on the above-mentioned questions, upon which the best minds of the day occupied themselves. In 1864 some Anglicans posed a direct question to the Russian Holy Synod about the conditions of taking British Christians into communion, and in 1865 in London there took place a solemn meeting devoted to this theme. This meeting was attended by bishops of the Church of England, many prominent Churchmen, the Chaplain of the Russian Embassy church in London, members of that Embassy, and the Russian Minister in Brussels. The first Lambeth Conference of the bishops of the Anglican Communion, which took place in 1867, examined the question of unification with the Orthodox Church. There were further journeys of leading Anglicans to the East, including visits to Russia. Personal contacts were established during these journeys and the British clergy grew to know many prominent members of the Russian Church. A particularly strong impression was made on them by the Metropolitan of Moscow, Philaret.

The main objective of all the measures undertaken in those days by the Church of England towards unification with the Orthodox Church was the establishment of communion in prayer and Sacraments; there was no profound analysis of differences in dogma and no attempt made to remove those differences. This could not fail, for reasons of principle, to cause some concern to Russian theologians and hierarchs, and it is for this reason that despite frequent expressions of mutual sympathy the question of unifying the Churches made no real progress on this occasion. In 1870 the Russian Holy Synod officially informed the Anglicans that the Orthodox Church held the opinion that before there could be communion in the Sacraments agreement on faith was necessary. The nature of this agreement corresponded fully to the points of view of the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches. As a result of these events a certain period of stagnation succeeded the activation of efforts on the part of the English hierarchy and theologians to bring about unification of the Russian and Anglican Churches. However, there was no falling off in the interest of the English and American Episcopalian Churches in Russian Orthodoxy. Personal contacts between leading members of the Churches were maintained.

When in 1888 the Russian Orthodox Church celebrated the nine hundredth anniversary of the Conversion of the Russians to Christianity the Church of England alone among Western Churches sent greetings, in the form of a message from Edward Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, to Platon, Metropolitan of Kiev. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in congratulating the Metropolitan on that memorable occasion, asked him to convey his best wishes to the bishops, clergy and
believers of the entire Russian Church. In his reply, Metropolitan Platon expressed the hope that a fuller spiritual union between the Russian and Anglican Churches would be established. As a result of these friendly exchanges the Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops, held in 1888, returned to the question of the unification of the Churches. The close of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century saw a revival of contacts between the Churches. There were visits, official and unofficial, from both sides, and these helped to establish new friendly relations. William John Birkbeck, who attended the 1888 jubilee celebrations at Kiev, mastered the Russian language, travelled through Russia on several occasions, studied ancient Russian choral music, and was tireless in acquainting his compatriots with the life of the Russian Orthodox Church. The visits to Russia of members of the English hierarchy gave each of them the opportunity to convince themselves of the unshakable good will and spirit of profound understanding on the part of the leaders, clergy and believers of the Russian Church. In 1895 Bishop Wilkinson, Suffragan of the London diocese, visited Russia; in 1896 he was followed by Bishop Creighton of Peterborough, and in 1897 there came the Archbishop of York, William Macalgon. In 1912 the Russian Church received a large Anglican delegation headed by four bishops (the Bishops of Wakefield, Bangor, Exeter and Ossory). The address of welcome which the Rector of the S. Petersburg Theological Academy, Bishop Georgii, read to the visitors made an exceptionally good impression on them. “May it please God,” said Bishop Georgii, “that careful mutual study and research in the light of impartial theological science will lead to the desired unification on the grounds of historical religious truth and the study of the ancient universal indivisible Church. May it please God that the time will soon come when we, united in a single faith, will sing with one heart and voice and glorify the most-honoured and splendid name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” In 1897, at the celebrations of the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, a member of the Holy Synod, Archbishop Anthony of Finland (later Metropolitan of S. Petersburg), was sent to London. From this journey the Archbishop returned fully convinced that the Anglicans entertained deep and firmly-rooted sympathies for the Russian Orthodox Church.

All these manifestations of mutual friendship between the Church of England and the Russian Orthodox Church developed in an atmosphere of constantly growing sympathy among Anglicans of Britain and America for the Orthodox Church as a whole. In this connection mention should be made of the fact that these sympathies were in no small measure strengthened by the peremptorily negative decision on the question of Anglican Orders taken by the Vatican and published in the Bull of Pope Leo XIII in 1896. The Anglican hierarchy protested several times against the Bull, addressing their objections also to representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church as well as to the Russian Holy Synod. The question of the validity of Anglican Orders was a subject of lively discussion in Russian theological literature.

Then came the first World War, followed by the great October Revolution. As a result of the Revolution the Russian Orthodox Church ceased to be the 'ruling Church', a part of the former state apparatus, and for a number of years concentrated nearly all its attention on problems of an internal character. Re-establishing the Patriarchate, the Russian Church was busy organizing itself on a new basis and struggling against various centrifugal trends which took the form of numerous schisms. Much time and strength was expended on this. But the ancient traditions of Christian fellowship and unity which have written glorious pages in the history of inter-Church relations in Russian Orthodoxy, were not forgotten. That is why to-day, having put its domestic affairs in order, the Russian Orthodox Church responds with love to words addressed to it from without. And now, as in the past, the problem of relations with the Church of England stands high among those questions which deeply interest the hierarchy, clergy and theologians of the Russian Church.
Now, as before, the Russian Orthodox Church is attracting to itself the most serious attention of the leaders, theologians, clergies and believers of the Church of England.

Before we give a brief outline of the history of Russian-Anglican relations in recent years it should be noted that in the years after the first World War the Church of England made great efforts to maintain its contacts with individual autocephalous Orthodox Churches of the East. Certain results were achieved in the course of those contacts, but they could not be considered as final and generally recognized by the whole Orthodox Church since on many of the questions broached the opinion of the Russian Church was not at that time expressed.

The renewal of regular contacts between the English and the Russian Churches dates from 1943. Despite the exceptional difficult conditions of wartime, in September that year a delegation of the Church of England visited Moscow, consisting of His Grace the Archbishop of York, Dr. Cyril Garbett, and two priests. The visitors handed to His Beatitude Patriarch Sergii a message of friendship from the Archbishop of Canterbury, His Grace Dr. William Temple; this was a reply to the appeal addressed to the Church of England by the Patriarch (then locum tenens).

The Church of England sent a solemn greeting to the new Patriarch when His Beatitude Sergii was elected and enthroned. It was the purpose of the Anglican delegation, headed by Dr. Garbett, to assure the Russian Church of the warm sympathy felt for it on the part of the Church of England. In addition the Archbishop of Canterbury's message contained an invitation to the Russian Church to send a delegation to Britain. The reception given to the Patriarch by his honoured guests, the solemn Liturgy celebrated in the Patriarchal Cathedral, on the occasion of the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, which was attended by the Archbishop of York and the English priests wearing their robes, provided evidence of the sincere love the hierarchy and believers of the Russian Church entertain for the Church of England.

RELATIONS OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH WITH THE C. OF E.

In December that year the Archbishop of Canterbury and His Beatitude Patriarch Sergii exchanged further cordial messages.

On May 15th, 1944, His Beatitude Patriarch Sergii, that great helmsman of the Russian Church, died. The bereaved Russian Church received on that occasion the sincere condolences of the Church of England. On the initiative of the Archbishop of Canterbury a solemn memorial service was held in London where Anglicans offered their prayers for the soul of the deceased.

Five months later (on October 23rd, 1944) the Church of England was bereaved by the death of the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Temple. The grief of Anglicans was shared by Russian Orthodox churchgoers. Expressing deep sympathy for the Church of England, His Beatitude Patriarch Alexii (at that time locum tenens) held in the Patriarchal Cathedral, before a vast congregation, a memorial service for the Archbishop of Canterbury.

At the beginning of 1945 a local synod of the Russian Orthodox Church was held at which His Beatitude Patriarch Alexii was elected to the Patriarchal Throne. The Church of England warmly greeted the newly-elected Head of the Russian Church.

In June that year took place the long-awaited visit to England of a delegation of the Russian Orthodox Church. As envoy to his Anglican friends His Beatitude Patriarch Alexii sent his closest assistant the Most Reverend Metropolitan Nikolai, accompanied by the Archpriest Nikolai Kolchitsky and the priest-monk Yuvenali Lunin. The message from His Beatitude the Patriarch Alexii handed by Metropolitan Nikolai to His Grace the Lord Primate of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Geoffrey Fisher, contained a greeting and best wishes to the newly-appointed Head of the Church of England. The message bore witness to the unchanging love of the Russian Orthodox Church for its sister Church in England.

During their stay in Britain Metropolitan Nikolai and his
companions had an opportunity of convincing themselves of the unity of the lofty ideals that inspire both Churches. The Russian Church delegation assisted at solemn services. At the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Metropolitan Nikolai, in the vestments of an archbishop, blessed a vast congregation of believers. There were many moving occasions, receptions, visits and journeys. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York and other leaders of the Church of England delivered frequent speeches in which the idea of the communion of the Churches was illuminated and developed. Metropolitan Nikolai, in replying to addresses of welcome, also made frequent speeches of which the main theme was the joy of mutual communion. On the eve of its departure from Britain the Russian Church delegation was invited to Buckingham Palace where its members were received by His Majesty King George VI in the presence of the Archbishops of Canterbury and of York.

In summing up the results of his visit to Britain the Most Reverend Metropolitan Nikolai wrote in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*: 'We returned to our country with undimmed memories of wonderful English hospitality, of sincere friends of the Russian Church—the leaders of the Church of England, the unforgettable and ever dear to our hearts Archbishops of Canterbury and of York—convincing that the friendship of our Churches will grow still more in strength and depth as a result of such friendly meetings between Churchmen.'

In 1947, the Archbishop of Canterbury addressed a further message to His Beatitude the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, Alexii. This message described the talks between the Anglican Church and the autocephalous Orthodox Churches during the period covered, and also contained a request that the Russian Church consider the question of the validity of Anglican Orders. This question was one of the principal ones that interested the participants in the Moscow Conference of heads and representatives of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches in 1948, held during the Celebrations of the five hundredth anniversary of the autocephaly of the Russian Orthodox Church. The problem of the validity of Anglican Orders was subject of thoroughly prepared reports by the Metropolitan of Sliven, Nicodemus (from the Bulgarian Orthodox Church), the Archpriest Professor P. Vintilăscu (from the Rumanian Orthodox Church) and Professor V. S. Vertogradov (from the Russian Orthodox Church). These reports not only analysed the main theme in detail but paid serious attention to a number of questions connected with it. The special commission set up by the conference to study the question of the Anglican hierarchy went into the main question and relevant problems in even greater detail. At the conclusion of the work of the conference a resolution was adopted which, in conformity with the unchanging principles of Orthodoxy, stated that recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders required as a presupposition a unity of belief, confirmed and witnessed by the leading organs of the Anglican Churches. It should be noted that, in the resolution of the conference on the question posed about the Anglican hierarchy, emphasis was laid on the attention and sympathy with which Orthodoxy regarded the present movement among many Anglicans towards restoring relations and communion between Anglican believers and the Universal Church. The resolution closed with these words: 'We pray that this, in God's unspeakable mercy, may be accomplished and that our Lord may bestow the spirit of love and good will on this beneficent work to the glory of His Holy Church.'

After this conference the relations between the Church of England and the Russian Orthodox Church developed in the form of epistolatory exchanges as well as of mutual visits. In 1949 the Archbishop of Canterbury invited His Beatitude Patriarch Alexii to attend the annual Lambeth Conference or to send his official representatives. In his reply to this invitation His Beatitude Patriarch Alexii expressed the firm hope...
that the fraternal ties between the Russian Church and the Anglican Churches would become stronger.

In that year too the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote once more to His Beatitude Patriarch Alexii on the question of the unification of the Churches. In this new message the Archbishop spoke of the results that had already been achieved in that direction and then, as a basis for unity, dwelt on those points on which there had been based the communion in the Sacraments that had existed since 1932 between Anglicans and Old Catholics. (These points permit communion in the Sacraments provided that there is agreement on essential points of doctrine, but allow freedom of theological opinions and liturgical practice in the Churches which are partners to the agreement.)

In 1955 there took place another meeting between representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and leaders of the Church of England. In July that year a delegation of representatives of the Christian Churches of the Soviet Union went to England on the invitation of the British Council of Churches. The Russian Orthodox Church was represented by the Metropolitan of Minsk and Byelorussia, Pitirim (leader of the delegation), the Rector of the Moscow Theological Academy Archpriest K. Ruzhitsky, Professor N. D. Uspensky of the Leningrad Theological Academy, and assistant professor of the Moscow Academy the priest-monk Philaret. The representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church held a number of official and unofficial meetings with the Archbishop of Canterbury, His Grace Geoffrey Fisher, and with many members of the hierarchy, theologians, priests and believers of the Church of England. On July 12th, at Lambeth Palace, talks took place between representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Church of England. During the course of these talks several points of religious doctrine and canons were dwelt on, together with other aspects of Church practice which require detailed study so that they may serve the aim of bringing the two Churches closer together. The prospects of the work at the talks between Russian and Church

of England representatives opening in Moscow in July 1956, were also dealt with.

Commenting on the plan of the 1955 talks with representatives of the Russian Church, His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury noted with satisfaction that relations with the Russian Orthodox Church had again entered a more active stage. The Archbishop also gave an assurance that the Church of England would use the opportunity to prepare a meeting with representatives of the Russian Church to study theological questions. His Grace said—and this is of great importance—that the Churches ought to look ahead, try to overcome all differences that lay between them, and increase all kinds of co-operation in the hope of achieving growing unity among God’s people and in the desire truly to glorify the name of God. “We cannot,” the Archbishop affirmed, “take upon ourselves the task of teaching the principles of Christianity—co-operation and the overcoming of isolation—unless we ourselves learn to apply these principles in the Church.”

The relations between the Church of England and the Russian Orthodox Church which we have outlined above have already borne fruit. Despite the fact that the principal aim of the contactsthe establishment of dogmatic, canonical and liturgical communion—has not yet been reached, mutual understanding between the Churches is constantly growing. The aspirations of the Church of England to the traditions of the ancient universal Christendom is receiving a new stimulus through these contacts. And, parallel with this, another process is taking place—the gradual freeing of the religious conscience of members of the Church of England of certain extreme attitudes brought to it in the past by protestantism. We may assert that in the voices of most of its members—laity and clergy alike (including members of the hierarchy)—the Church of England has not only expressed its constant respect and love for the Russian Orthodox Church but also a desire to draw closer to it. At the same time it must be emphasized that the Russian Church has not sought or
tried to gain this achievement for its own advantage, and this makes the facts mentioned above all the more significant.

This report does not pretend to exhaust the subject. Far from it. We have touched on only the main and most important aspects of the history of relations between the Russian and the Anglican Churches. Much more could have been said—including many interesting facts—about certain less well-known contacts between Russian Orthodoxy and Anglicanism (for example, the activities of the Russian Bible Society, founded and functioning in the nineteenth century in close contact with the British Bible Society). We could have dwelt on the work of the Commission organized by the Russian Holy Synod in the first decade of the present century, consisting of prominent theologians who met to study the points of difference from the Anglican confession, or on the work of the Fellowship of S. Alban and S. Sergius with its regularly convened Abingdon Conferences. Finally we might have illustrated the matters dealt with above with countless statements by personalities of both Churches—some mentioned here, others not—made in the past or in more recent times, some very recently. But all that, while swelling the chorus of witnesses in favour of the development and strengthening of friendly relations between the Churches, would, unfortunately, have taken up very much time. And so, in conclusion, allow me to choose from the wealth of evidence just one statement that is highly indicative, and which has preserved all its significance despite the fact that it was made over half a century ago. It is an extract from the conclusions which Hoare drew in his fundamental study *Eighteen Centuries of the Greek Orthodox Church* (London, 1899). Noting that in his opinion the Russian Church ought to play the greatest role in the matter of uniting Anglicanism and Orthodoxy the author writes:

‘At a time when Rome is afraid and filled with loathing of the national Churches, the Russian and English (Churches) constitute the two major national Churches in the world; not in the sense that the nations
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In the ninth article of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, immediately after the article of belief in the Holy Ghost, comes the confession of belief in the Church: (I believe) ... 'and in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.'

Belief in the Church is put on the same level as belief 'in one God the Father Almighty' ... 'and in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven' ... 'and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life.' ... This shows that belief in the Church is linked with the highest articles of the Christian religion.

The mystery which lies at the root of the origin of the Church leaves its impress on all teaching about the Church.

In distinction from all religious associations the Church is not in truth an association of believers in Jesus Christ which was founded and had an ordinary human origin. In its interior essence the Church is not an assembly of a greater or smaller number of believers, finding themselves in external, mechanical, mutual association. The Church—is something whole, linked in a living organic relationship, it is—the Body of Christ, headed by Christ and inspired by the Holy Ghost (Ephesians 1:22-3; 4:4-6). 'Christ is the head of the church and He is the saviour of the body' (Ephesians 5:23). The unity between the Lord Jesus Christ and true members of the Church bears the same intimate, organic character as is imprinted on the unity between the head and the members of the body, 'Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular' wrote the Apostle to the Corinthian Christians (1 Corinthians 12:27) and the whole of the twelfth chapter of his first epistle to them is devoted to the development of this thought. The organic nature of the Church of Christ is shown in the moving, picturesque words of her divine founder and head. 'I am the vine,' said the divine founder of the Church to His first followers, 'ye are the branches. ... As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me. ... He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned' (S. John 15:5-6).

Often in systems of theology the question has been raised whether the activity of the Holy Ghost is not overshadowed by the acts of Christ the Saviour.

How are we to distinguish the activity of the head of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ, from the action of the Holy Ghost?

S. Gregory the theologian expressed the opinion that 'with the Ascension of the Lord the bodily actions of Christ were finished and the action of the Spirit begun' (Sermon 41, vol. IV, 7).

In the message of the Eastern Patriarchs it was stated that Christ the Saviour rules the Church through the Holy Ghost, who in the end is inseparable and indivisible from Him.

In the 'office of joining the Orthodox Church' we read 'I believe and confess that in the Holy Orthodox Catholic Church the head and chief hierarch and high priest is our Lord Jesus Christ and that the governor and guide of this Church is the Holy Ghost.'

The Church is one, but consists of two parts: heavenly and
earthly. The conditions of life of one and the other are different.

The Church in Heaven is composed of the angels, the saints and men who have died in faith and repentance (Hebrews 12:23). This part of the Church is invisible and is called triumphant, seeing that it is in Heaven, "in Jerusalem which is above" and triumphs, sharing in the glory and blessedness of Christ.

The Church composed of men living on earth is visible, earthly and is called militant, because it must continuously wage war on many visible and invisible enemies.

In spite of their different composition and conditions of life, the heavenly and earthly Church are in harmonious unity, in close association and mutual communion. They preserve unity in duality and duality in unity. They are united in Christ by the Holy Ghost as in one invisible Head, in one body.

The Church always and through all the time of its existence is one. Bodily death does not break up the unity of the dead either with the Lord Jesus Himself or with the faithful left on earth. On the contrary it strengthens and elevates it. This living unbroken unity between the earthly and heavenly Churches is expressed by decorating churches with ikons and paying reverence to them, by honouring relics, in prayers for the dead, in honouring and calling upon the saints honoured by God. The Church in Heaven is close to the Church on earth: heavenly powers invisibly celebrate with the priests at the liturgy, particles of holy relics in the Antimeneses lie on the altars, particles in honour and memory of the Blessed Virgin and the saints are placed on the diskos at the time of the proskomidion.

The Orthodox Church, teaching of the unity of the Church in Heaven and on earth, warns against any false conclusions which might arise if intentionally or unintentionally the earthly Church should be isolated from the heavenly, against the demand to recognize a special head for the Church on earth. Orthodox teaching does not weld both parts of the Church into one inseparable and undifferentiated whole. If this were so, then the centre would involuntarily be transferred to the Church in Heaven, and the Church on earth would go into the shadow, losing many of her rights, as has happened with sects of a mystical character.

However, many separate individual Christian communities there may be on earth, they are all only parts of one great whole, as long as they keep one and the same faith, and live by one and the same Holy Ghost, and teach of themselves as of the body of Christ headed by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and by no one but Him. If, however, any of them lose the purity of faith, the Church is not broken up by this, but is smaller in size, remaining as before one, as the Apostle Paul taught, when he spoke of the small community of Corinth as 'the body of Christ' (1 Corinthians 12:27).

'I believe... in the holy Church.' The epithet 'holy,' just as the epithet 'one,' characterizes the Church as a whole, as a unity of the Church on earth with that in Heaven, although without doubt it does also apply to the Church on earth: united and uniting, sanctified and sanctifying.

The Church as the body of Christ is made holy by His teaching, by prayers and by the Sacraments. Even though not all members of the Church are pure, even though at all times there are in her weak, feeble, sinful Christians, this does not prevent her from blossoming with spiritual perfections. Just as undeveloped and even withered branches on a tree do not prevent it from being green, flowering and bearing fruit, as long as the root is sound and the life force has not ceased to cause the nourishing sap to flow through all its parts, so it is with the Church. Weak members of the Church who have not fallen away can cleanse themselves by true repentance, while unrepentant stubborn sinners cease of their own will to belong to the body of Christ and although they remain within in appearance, they have no part in its life, like dead branches on a tree.

The characteristic 'catholic' (soborny) of the Church relates primarily to the Church on earth, but in part also to
the Church in Heaven, which helps the Church on earth to preserve Christ's teaching. The word 'faith' (belief) in the ancient fathers was understood as doctrine. Sobornost was understood in the sense of the unchanging nature and identity of the doctrine of the Church always, everywhere and among all peoples, beginning from apostolic times.

The sacrifice of Christ was made once and for all for the whole human race. The gospel had to be preached in the whole world. There is no people for whom the doors into the Church of Christ could be shut. People of every country could become members of His Church, for 'God . . . will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth' (1 Timothy 2v). For the Church there are no limits of time or space. Its mission is eternal, for all the world, for all mankind. The Sobornaya Church is the same as the universal, the Catholic Church.

The Church is apostolic. Our Lord Jesus Christ only laid the deepest and unchangeable foundations for His Church: the further development and organization of the Church on these foundations was given over to the holy Apostles. The Apostles fulfilled their task in the most perfect manner. They revealed in all possible fullness the meaning of the teaching of Christ, they achieved the building of the Church, they laid down a special order in it, the same for all places and unchangeable for all time. Naturally the organization of the Church by the Apostles was not so complete that it was impossible for there to be further development. But all later definitions, rulings, organizations in the Church had their root in the original apostolic foundation. The true Church must always be unchangeably true to apostolic teaching and order and uninterruptedly preserve the heritage of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Therefore the Orthodox Church is apostolic.

The Church of Christ is the guardian of the truths of the Christian faith in their wholeness and inviolability. All the great truths of the Christian religion have their source in Divine Revelation, which is disseminated and preserved among men by two means or paths—by means of Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition.

Holy Tradition acts as a valuable complement to Holy Scripture for determining the canon of Holy Scripture and for interpreting it correctly. In the holy books many things are mentioned with exceptional brevity, as it were in hints. Without the help and guidance of Tradition it would be impossible to elucidate the truths of Scripture. Not everything in Holy Scripture is clear and comprehensible. Tradition is then necessary for the correct celebration of the Sacraments. It is necessary for observing the sacred rites in their original purity and also for correctly settling many problems of Church order and arrangement. Holy Tradition has come down to us in the ancient Creeds, in the apostolic canons, in the decrees and canons of ecumenical and local Councils, in ancient liturgies, in the acts of the martyrs, in the writings of the holy Fathers and doctors of the Church and also in liturgical books.

Summing up all that has been said about the origin of the Church and its characteristics, we can apply the full Orthodox definition of the Church drawn up by Metropolitan Philaret (Drozdov): 'The Church is the mystical body of Christ, raised up by its head Jesus Christ, inspired by the Holy Ghost, containing and joining together in one all God's faithful people in Heaven and on earth, uniting believers to itself through the Catholic Sobornoy apostolic faith, through the Sacraments and the sacerdotal principle (i.e., the hierarchy ordained of God).’ In this definition the word 'raised up,' which recalls the words of the Saviour, 'destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up' (S. John 2v) points to the summoning of the body of the Church to life through the resurrection of Christ, and finally to the continual making alive of the Church with the life which flows from its head, Christ the giver of life (Ephesians 4v).

The Church carries on the work of Christ, who said of Himself 'I am the way, the truth and the life' (S. John 14v). In the knowledge of its real unity with Christ the Church
insists on confessing itself to be the one vehicle on earth of the inviolable teaching of Christ, the treasure house of all gifts of grace, the only door to salvation.

The Church is the guardian of the way, the truth and the life of Christ through observing hierarchical order, the teaching of the ancient Church up to the schism, and the Sacraments. In order to live the life of the Orthodox Church, one must be grafted on to the tree of the Orthodox Church, be nourished from its roots, in general live on its soil. This can only be done through the hierarchy, the doctrine and the Sacraments, through complete obedience to Church rules. Every Orthodox Christian is obliged to acknowledge the hierarchy of his Church, to be in the necessary relationship of spiritual dependence on it, to show it obedience, submission and devotion.

HOLY SCRIPTURE
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THE BIBLICAL CANON

The Bible is divided into two sections—the Old Testament and the New Testament. The canon of the Bible includes thirty-nine books of the Old Testament and twenty-seven books of the New Testament, namely:

The Old Testament

The five books of Moses, or so called Books of the Law: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy;

Twelve so-called historical books: Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kings, 1–2 Chronicles, 1 Esdras, Nehemiah, Esther;

Five so-called books of teaching: Job, the Psalter, the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs;


The New Testament


Twenty-one books of Epistles, corresponding to the
Old Testament division of teaching books, namely: seven catholic epistles: one of James, two of Peter, three of John and one of Jude; fourteen epistles of Paul: Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1–2 Thessalonians, 1–2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon and Hebrews;
One book of Revelation or Apocalypse of S. John the Divine, corresponding to the Old Testament division of prophetic books.

This composition of the canon the Holy Orthodox Church deduces from a comparison and interpretation of the 85th canon of the Apostles, the 60th canon of the Council of Laodicea, the 33rd canon of the Synod of Carthage and the list given by S. Athanasius in his 39th letter.

Our Understanding of Inspiration

All these books are considered inspired. It is necessary to observe, in so far as the concept of 'inspiration' is not infrequently interpreted in deeply differing ways, that we mean by this: 'The inspiration of Holy Scripture consists in this, that the sacred writers, whatever they wrote, wrote all in accordance with the immediate stimulus and direction of the Holy Spirit, so that not only were they preserved by Him from error, but positively received a revelation of Divine truth, yet without violence to their natural abilities; on the contrary, they became the means of communication of Divine revelation with the full retention and active exercise of all their powers, for example: in the manner of understanding and presenting things, in the plan of their works, in the choice of words and expressions for their thought, and so on.'

The Text of the Old Testament and the New Testament Employed by Us

All this, however, by no means concludes our teaching about Holy Scripture. It is not enough to say in what com-

position we accept the Bible; we must still state the text which we use and accept.
Here is a second point in which are met basic differences between the Orthodox and heterodox understanding of the Holy Bible.

In the Liturgy

For liturgical use our Russian Orthodox Church, following the tradition of the Oecumenical Orthodox Church, of which it is an autocephalous part, receives and honours as the single authority: For the Holy Scripture of the Old Testament the text of the Seventy interpreters (LXX), and for the New Testament the so-called Textus Receptus. These are the texts that are read by us in the Slavonic translation at services.
This is the tradition of the practice of our Church sanctified by thousands of years, and is supported by the deep confidence in these texts and by their authority in the minds of the Orthodox faithful.

In Theology

In theological practice our Church is guided by precise directions left in his day by Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow.

LXX and MT

In accordance with these directions the Orthodox Church does not reject the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the so-called Massoretic text; but uses it under the indispensable control of the Greek text of the Seventy, and in all cases of a dogmatic character, in the exegesis of Messianic passages and prophecies and in a number of other cases, gives preference to the latter over the former.

Opinion of the Metropolitan Philaret

The Metropolitan Philaret in his day based these views on the following considerations, which for us are irrefutably clear and trustworthy, and are here represented by excerpts:
'The teaching of the Eastern Church concerning the merit of the text of the Seventy is opposed by two
Western teachings. The Roman Church accepts the text of the Latin translation known as the Vulgate as trustworthy in itself, real and authentic (authentica). The modern Western confessions and sects make it their general rule to adhere exclusively to the Hebrew text and to allow no dogmatic importance to any translation. The Orthodox theologian must discern the narrow one-sidedness of both these teachings and take a firm stand between them, based on the facts, under the guidance of the Word of God and of tradition."

As to what constitutes this middle position, the Metropolitan Philaret says:

'In the Orthodox teaching regarding Holy Scripture the text of the Seventy must acquire a dogmatic value, in certain cases equal to that of an original, and even exceeding that view of the Hebrew text which is prevalent in modern editions.'

Why is such an exceptional importance to be given to the text of the Seventy? His answer is quite clear and precise:

'The text of the Seventy is the oldest translation of the Hebrew sacred books, made by learned men of the Hebrews before they had ceased to be the People of God, while Hebrew was still a living language and while the Jews had as yet no motives for perverting the proper meaning of the sacred books by bad translation. Its beginning goes far back beyond 200 years before Christ.'

'It is a mirror of the Hebrew text as it existed 200 and more years before Christ apart from those passages where can be seen the marks of change occurring for various reasons in the course of time. It must also be remembered that the Hebrew text was all the time in the hands of the enemies of Christianity and might be subjected to deliberate corruption, as S. Justin Martyr has said.'

The New Testament writers, particularly the Evangelist Luke, 'in some passages keep closer' to this text; our Orthodox Church has always adhered to this text 'in lections in church'; a series of texts (e.g., Psalm 144:3, Ps. [sic: ? Proverbs] 21:7) proves the advantage of the text of the Seventy over the present Hebrew text in the sense of correctness.

Nevertheless respect for the text of the Seventy must not be so exclusive as to remove the Hebrew text from consideration. Justice, expediency and necessity demand that in dogmatic worth the Hebrew text also should be taken into account in the interpretation of Holy Scripture.

The Metropolitan requires the comparative study of both texts. This is because 'the text of the Seventy obviously does not give the desirable clarity in all passages,' whereas it can best be obtained by comparing the translation with the language of the original; and because the corrupted passages in the Hebrew text are well known and exposed and so harmless for the interpreter, while the Jews, as the Apostles testify, are still the people to whom 'were intrusted the words of God' (Romans 3:1). It must not be forgotten that in our catechisms we define the canonical books by their Hebrew number, that the New Testament writers produce a series of quotations according to the Hebrew text, and our Lord turned to this text in His saving sufferings on the Cross (Eli, eli, lama . . .). Sometimes the Hebrew text helps to expose heretics who exploit the ambiguity of the text of the Seventy (for example Proverbs 8:32 in the Arian dispute). Considerable importance is given to the Hebrew text by many of the Fathers (S. Basil the Great, S. John Chrysostom, and the rest). When slips and corruptions appeared in the course of time in the text of the Seventy, it was corrected by the martyr Lucian (the so-called Lucian Revision) in accordance with the Hebrew text. Finally, 'the Holy, Orthodox, Ecumenical Church neither in any Council nor through the Holy Fathers, has ever decreed that in interpreting Holy Scripture the text of the Seventy alone should be adhered to and the Hebrew text rejected. And in this as in other cases of her rule, her silence is evidence of her infallibility and constancy, raising her above the Western Church of modern times.'

'But, lest the use of the Hebrew text as an aid to the
exposition of Holy Scripture should give rise to arbitrariness, and in order to be protected in this matter from departures from the precision of Orthodox dogmas and to preserve the sacred significance of the text of the Seventy in its ancient purity, for this conservative rules must be applied in teaching about Holy Scripture, drawn from the nature of the work and from ecclesiastical and patristic example.

Needless to say, in the interpretation of Scripture we reject the arbitrariness of the proud human individual reason, and require the interpretation in the spirit and traditions of the Church, in the light given us by the Fathers and the Councils, on the basis of the same Holy Scripture, of unshakable truths. Only by the observance of such conditions will our Church be One and Holy and True, guaranteed from dissolution into all kinds of learned schools and dissenting doctrines.

HOLY TRADITION

Extracts from a paper

BY BISHOP SERGI OF STARAYA RUSSA

'Tradition is that with which thou art entrusted, and not that which thou hast contrived; that which thou hast accepted, and not that which thou hast excogitated; not a thing of the mind, and yet one of knowledge; not a personal belonging, but handed down from generation to generation.' S. Vincent of Lerins.

Conjointly with the Holy Bible, the teachings of faith, religion, and the sacramental and holy rites are preserved by the Church by means of Holy Tradition, which is part of the divine revelation.

Tradition is needed as an added divine source of Christian belief, attesting the canonical authenticit and inspiration of the books of the Holy Scriptures; being a trustworthy and unerring guide in expounding the Holy Scriptures and a voice of the Ecumenical Church, embodying the Holy Spirit.

Tradition in the literal sense of the word means a handing down by word of mouth, especial stress being given to the very act of conveying the living word.

According to the Catechisms of the Russian Orthodox Church, Holy Tradition is defined as 'when real believers in the Faith and in God, by word and example convey one to another, from ancestor to offspring, the teachings of faith, religion and the sacramental and holy rites.'

Tradition is composed of: dogmatic teachings, moral rules (religion), the sacramental and Church rites. Everything regarding the Faith and the Church is included within its composition.

Therefore, Holy Tradition represents the Christian revela-
tion in general, the essence of all belief and the fullness of Church life.

This is the broad meaning of Holy Tradition.

From this point of view the Holy Scriptures themselves are a main component of Holy Tradition.

From time immemorial Holy Tradition has existed in the Church as an all-embracing means of conveying revelation and religious faith.

The teaching of the truth and a genuine religious life began long before the Holy Scriptures. For this Holy Tradition is the only source of revelation and religious belief.

Even after the appearance of the Holy Scriptures, Holy Tradition continued its existence, retaining its initial freshness and elementary creative power and dogmatic canonical significance, for the Word of God lives for ever.

Thus, Holy Tradition must not be understood as only an oral source of spiritual import, equal to the Holy Bible. In its entirety, Holy Tradition represents the bountiful life of the Ecumenical Church as a living organism, as the body of Christ, continually living in the Spirit of the Lord.

The following are the tokens by which genuine Tradition may be known:

1. Absence of internal contradictions or contradictions bearing upon other undoubted traditions.

2. Agreement with, or conformity with the Holy Scriptures. Both sources of religion must be in complete harmony and unity with each other, as taught by the Church: 'Tradition must agree with both divine revelation and the Holy Scriptures.'

3. The apostolic age of Holy Tradition. It is recognized as most ancient. It is the everlasting revelation of knowledge that has been preserved by the Church and founded by the Apostles.

(4) Holy Tradition is universal. 'What is true is that which is recognized by all, which causes unity with many, which is not contrived but inherited.'

Of this S. Vincent of Lerins uttered the following: 'That which is accepted and kept by all or by many always and in unity, as if by mutual agreement with their Teachers, must be considered authoritative and without doubt.'

In another place he says: 'In the Ecumenical Church we must maintain with all strength that which has been believed everywhere, always and by every one.'

Hence, that which is uttered by the Ecumenical Church is only an expression of that which satisfies the conditions 'everywhere, always and by every one.'

(5) The acceptance of Holy Tradition by the hierarchy in the Church.

Another aspect of Holy Tradition contains all the historical sources of Christian belief and life, except the Holy Scriptures. They are:

1. Ancient Creeds that have come down to us from the apostolic times, preserved in the most ancient local apostolic Churches, resembling each other in spirit, although differing in letter, subsequently embodied in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.

2. Laws of the Holy Apostles, applied throughout the Ecumenical Church, forming a basis for defining ecumenical and local councils which have acquired general indisputable necessity.

3. Definitions and rules of the Councils: (a) local, at which twice a year bishops gathered to discuss faith and practice bringing with them one or other tradition preserved in their Churches; especially—(b) ecumenical councils, embodied in their representatives, personifying the Church of Christ—the keeper of the heritage.

In the definitions and rules of these councils are embodied and come down to us not only the dogmatic heritage, but also
moral and ritual matters, and in general all that concerns the subject of Christian belief and the Church.

4. Ancient Liturgy, originating from the times of the Apostles, such as the Liturgy of S. James.

These liturgies may be considered as the most important treasures of apostolic heritage and true belief in the original Church, judging by the antiquity of their origin and by their high purpose and application in the Church.

In these the chief Christian truths have found reflection.

5. The most ancient acts of martyrdom, recorded by contemporaries as well as witnesses of their confession and martyrdom.

In these acts are recorded the confession of the martyrs before their torturers, clarification of various Christian truths which are the most precious monuments of the Church belief of those times.

6. The works of all the ancient Fathers and teachers of the Church, who had written religious works on various subjects for the teaching of Christians, sometimes containing accusations against heathen and heretical transgression and containing within them a very rich source of tradition.

7. Ancient Church histories, among which as of special importance may be noted the Church history of Eusebius, incorporating in his works the most ancient and authentic documents, in which were reflected the facts of Tradition from the time of the Apostles—canonical, dogmatic and ritual in character.

8. The whole sum of Church practice, in which the whole life of the Church and her religious service found reflection, contained in the religious books, ecclesiastical revelation, holy acts, rites, hymns, filled with the rich content of moral Christian truths and Church belief, various Church customs, Church discipline, regulations and other details of Church life.

The first traditions are founded on an authentic origin from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself; the second—on the teaching of the Apostles, and, finally, the third group—on the teaching of the Church.

Under the heading Holy Tradition is understood the teaching originating directly from the lips of Christ, secretly taught to His disciples (Acts 1). To this class of Tradition chiefly belongs the Church teaching of the Sacrament (1 Corinthians 11:28), about which there is no detailed account in the Holy Scriptures.

Holy Tradition in its authenticity is equal to the Holy Scriptures, for it is all one—whether included or not in the Revelations of the Scriptures.

The Apostolic traditions are usually thought to be those Christian teachings and institutions that were established in the Church by the Apostles, directed by the Holy Spirit, and of which there is no literal mention in the Holy Scriptures (1 Corinthians 10:12).

Among these traditions are, for example: the Apostles' Creed, the baptism of infants, unrepeatable baptism, veneration of icons and other traditions, made valid by the Apostles according to the needs of their times.

Under the heading of Church tradition is understood all dogmatic definitions of faith and canonical decrees composed by Church authority.

These are, for example: the custom of facing East while praying, the use of the sign of the Cross, the manner of performing all Church Sacraments and other Church rites, not included in the Holy Scriptures (1 Corinthians 11:10). These ecclesiastical traditions originate from the Holy Fathers and teachers of the Church.

The Tradition of Christ is taught by the Apostles. Hence, the difference between divine and apostolic traditions is only formal. The heritage of the teaching of Christ and the Apostles is one indivisible whole of divine revelation.

The teaching of the Russian catechism regarding Holy Tradition may be formulated as follows:
(1) Holy Tradition, according to the catechism, is a divine revelation, kept by the Church. It is of the same importance as the Holy Scriptures, the source of divine revelation, and is a fundamental guide to the fullness of Christian truth.

(2) Holy Tradition is the most ancient and fundamental means for the dissemination of divine revelation in the Church. Through the oral and written word, and by example, Christ and the Apostles disseminated the Faith and affirmed the Church of Christ. Holy Tradition may be understood by all, while the Holy Scriptures—only by a limited number.

(3) The criterion for judging the worthiness of Holy Tradition is its complete agreement with the Holy Scriptures. It must be used together with the Holy Scriptures for its correct understanding.

(4) Holy Tradition serves as an addition to the Holy Scriptures, for it contains the teachings of the Faith, rules of conduct, the rituals of the Sacrament, and other Church rites concerning its life.

From all that has been presented it is clear that Holy Tradition has been carefully kept by the Œcumenical Church in its unharmed purity through the graciousness of the Holy Spirit, and if any alterations had been effected in its canonical content, it was due to vital necessity and sanctioned by the Œcumenical Church at the œcuménical councils and by the local church and thus made valid.

An outstanding token of each Orthodox Christian will be his obedience ‘without research or curiosity’ with ‘a simple obedience to everything’ decided and confirmed through the prophecy of the ancient traditions of the Fathers, the decrees of the saints and the œcuménical councils, from the time of the Apostles and their followers, the God-fearing Fathers of our universal Church.

Blessed be the divine Guardian and Planner of all, who gives all people the desire to be saved and arrive at an understanding of the truth, so that its judgment and study agrees with God’s Will.

This is what we believe and think, we the Eastern Orthodox Christians.

---

**DOGMA, THEOLOGOUMENA AND OPINION**

**AND**

**THE FORMULATION OF DOGMA**

**BY THE VERY REVEREND ARCHPRIEST ALEXANDER VETELEV**

**Professor, Moscow Theological Academy**

I. **DOGMA, THEOLOGOUMENA AND OPINION**

1. **DOGMA**

In Orthodox Theology, Christian doctrine is called dogmatic teaching, or simply dogma (δόγμα). Dogmas are divinely revealed truths about our salvation, preserved and taught by the Orthodox Church as indisputable and unchanging rules of belief which are binding upon all the faithful. Dogmas are binding and necessary because their significance is absolute: the acceptance and profession of them is a necessary condition of our salvation. Their indisputable character rests upon divine authority: they are the voice, the teaching, of God Himself in Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition. Their unchangeable nature is due to the fullness of absolute truth contained in them, which needs no changes either in kind (concerned with their content) or in quantity (concerning the number of dogmas). The Church of Christ ‘the pillar and ground of the truth’ (1 Timothy 3:15) is the guardian of their integrity as time goes on, and the creator of the needful conditions for their right assimilation by the faithful.

2. **THEOLOGOUMENA**

As well as dogmas, Orthodox theology recognizes theologoumena, and private theological opinions. Theologoumena are ‘the theological opinions of the Holy Fathers of the one
undivided Church, of those men among whom are also numbered those who are worthy named teachers of the whole world.' In significance and importance the theologoumenon approaches nearer to dogma than to private theological opinion. It is, however, distinguished from dogma with sufficient precision.

While dogma has divine authority, the theologoumenon has that of the holy Fathers. 'If the content of a dogma is true that of a theologoumenon is only probable': that is to say it is true in a greater or less degree.

The importance of a theologoumenon is increased if it finds support, development or consummation in identical judgments of other holy Fathers, thus forming with them the traditional patristic teaching upon some given subject (e.g., the teaching of the Cappodocian Fathers on the Holy Trinity). The great importance of a theologoumenon depends upon the fact that, like dogma, it rests upon one and the same unchangeable foundation, i.e., on divinely-revealed teaching.

The inspired thought of the holy Fathers is an accepted guarantee of rightness in their understanding of divinely-revealed teaching, and in the exposition of it in their theological works. In doctrinal matters the Fathers expressed themselves for the most part in relation to the heresies and errors in the theological thought of that time, as they strove to define more precisely and to defend more completely the Orthodox Church understanding of the impugned dogma.

What is the attitude of the Orthodox theologian to theologoumena? There is among Orthodox theologians a firm tradition in accordance with which theologoumena enter into their theological studies. The choice of theologoumena in each individual case is a free act of the theologian himself. If, however, this or that theologian does not make use of any particular theologoumenon, he does not thereby condemn those who do use it. And if he has to discuss that theologoumenon, he will do so with becoming deference and respect, in view of the high authority which one of the holy Fathers enjoys in the Orthodox Church.

3. Private Theological Opinion

In the first centuries when that part of a pagan community which had received some scientific and philosophical education began to accept Christianity, they approached it equipped with a rational method of enquiry in matters of belief and feeling the need of independent decisions upon those questions to which there was no clear and direct answer in Holy Scripture or Tradition.

In this way the systematic theology 1 of Clement of Alexandria, Origen and others was built up, and this showed that the emergence of free theological opinions over a wide field was a possibility.

The private theological opinions of Clement of Alexandria, and especially of Origen, are well known. All the heresarchs insisted upon full liberty for private theological opinion and cruelly misapplied it—Arius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Nestorius, and before them Sabellius, Paul of Samosata and others.

But at the same time there are definite limits to private opinion in theological study. These limits are set by the following requirements: it must not contradict dogmas and it must not be based upon arbitrary interpretation of Scripture.

A distinguishing mark of theological opinion is its limitedness. It usually throws light upon one side of the dogma under investigation and leaves others in obscurity. Hence the inevitable one-sidedness of private opinion, and not infrequently its error.

If private theological opinions, finding support in Holy Scripture and theologoumena develop in an Orthodox direction, such opinions approximate to a theologoumenon and win the recognition of theological science and the Orthodox Church (e.g., the theological opinions of the Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, of Bishop Theophan Vishensky, of Bishop Ignatius Brianchaninov). If, however, they have insufficient basis in theology and come to contradict Holy

1 lit. 'scientifically theological gnosis.'
Scripture and *theologoumena* they are liable to censure (e.g., the Archpriest S. N. Bulgakov’s teaching about *Sophia* or holy wisdom).

Another distinguishing mark of theological opinion is its lack of one and the same convincing authority which is adequate for all. Its author is such and such a theologian, like any other. This establishes a right to full freedom in criticizing his opinion. And if the grounds put forward in support of a theological opinion are not convincing, it is criticized, or simply rejected.

Such is the attitude of an Orthodox theologian to private opinions.

II. **The Formulation of Dogmas**

1. Dogmas, although unchangeable in content, have not always been so in form (in the letter). There could be unchangeability in the verbal expression of dogmas only if in human speech one word expressed once and for ever one and the same concept. In actual fact, however, that is not the case: almost every word has several meanings. What is more, words and phrases which have one meaning at one period of time acquire another meaning at another time. Given such instability and diversity in the meaning of words dogmas cannot be given once and for all absolutely precise and fixed formulation. And so long as the Church did not come into collision with heresies and errors she allowed diverse forms of expression to be given to the truths of the faith, and saw undoubted orthodoxy where later generations found traces of heretical views. For example, the doctrine of the one substance and equal honour of the Persons of the Holy Trinity was undoubtedly professed by the Christian Church of the first three centuries. But in ecclesiastical writers of that period there are to be met passages dealing with the relation between the Father and the Son which hint at the subordinationism which was developed crudely and to the full in Arianism.

Nevertheless this circumstance in no way hindered the Church from accounting these writers as Orthodox (Irenaeus, Dionysius of Alexandria and others). With the appearance of the heresies deviation from the accepted interpretation of the dogmas came clearly to the fore, and the need arose to protect the latter from perversion, by means of a precise and unchangeable formula. This was achieved by the adoption of a definite strictly-fixed meaning for a particular word or phrase, one which excluded every other meaning in the interpretation of that word.

It was in this way that dogmatic terms and formulas were worked out in the teaching of the holy Fathers and in the definitions of the OEcumenical Councils. An educative process of that kind in the history of dogma went on but slowly and not always easily and smoothly. It sometimes happened that words which had earlier been criticized and rejected were given a fixed dogmatic meaning. Thus the word *homoousios* had been rejected by the Fathers of the Council of Antioch in 269 on account of the wrong construction which Paul of Samosata had put upon it. And it was only after S. Athanasius the Great, in the course of his struggle with Arianism, gave an Orthodox meaning to it that the word became the oriflamme of Orthodoxy in the fourth century and found its way into the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.

There was great diversity of meaning also in the interpretation of the terms *physis ousia* and *hupostasis* in the course of the fourth and fifth centuries until each of these words was given a strictly defined meaning. When this verbally precise dogmatic meaning of disputed words had been worked out, the Church demanded that in exactly that sense the words of a dogma should be accepted ‘everywhere by every one and always.’

Thus an end was made of variability in the form of verbal expression of this or that definition of faith, and the letter of it also became binding and unchangeable. It would seem that in the future also the Church could change earlier formulations of its dogmas. For what the Church at one time formulated it itself could reformulate anew wholly or in part, taking into consideration the circumstances of a new era. It does not do this, however, both because it does not
desire to violate decisions which it itself has taken ‘unchangeably to preserve’ dogmatic formulae; and also because it values these formulae as being the most accurate expressions of the meaning of this or that dogma. ‘The Church knows that it is not for it to devise absolutely exact expressions comparable with those which it worked out in agelong and laborious effort of theological thought in the palmy days of its life’ (Professor A. L. Katansky, *An Historical Account of Dogmas*).

2. A dogma contains absolute truth which is inexhaustible in its inner content (e.g., dogmas about God: about the Incarnation of the Son of God, etc.).

When a man makes a dogma his own, that naturally creates a need for exposition and explanation of the dogma. It is precisely on this side of the matter—the elucidation of the inner content of the dogma—that one can speak of its changeability. What is changed in this case, however, is not the dogma itself as such; what is changed is the man’s inward attitude to it, it is his religious and spiritual ability to perceive and grasp that changes. It expands, it is enriched, in proportion to the depth of his penetration into the content of the dogma. And no limit can be set to this enrichment of spiritual perception.

Thus from the sphere of verbally unchangeable formula—of doctrine—dogma passes over into the field of vital spiritual perception and experience which are continually being altered and enriched. The universally recognized and most authoritative expositors of Christian dogmas are the holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church (S. Athanasius the Great, S. Basil the Great, S. John Chrysostom, S. Cyril of Alexandria and others).

In the service of theological science and the Orthodox Church many learned theologians also have laboured, and still labour, in this field (Bishop Theophan Vishensky, Bishop Michael Gribanovsky, and others).

The elucidation of the content of Christian doctrine is the foundation upon which the whole development of theological science is mainly erected.

---

**CREEDS AND COUNCILS**

*Extracts from a paper*

**By the Very Reverend Archpriest V. M. Borovoy**

*Docent, Leningrad Theological Academy*

1. **Creeds**

The Orthodox Church has always believed, professed and taught that:

(a) all Christian dogmas are given in Divine Revelation;

(b) the guardian and infallible interpreter of Divine Revelation is the Church;

(c) a dogma is a truth of teaching taken from Holy Scripture and immutably preserved in the eternally living consciousness of the Ecumenical Church—in Holy Tradition;

(d) the Tradition of the Ecumenical Church is the rule for understanding dogmas of faith taken from the Holy Scripture.

In order to guard the faithful against errors in matters of faith and to show what they must believe on the basis of revelation, the Church has provided them in Tradition with models of faith and profession which express the voice of the Ecumenical Church, which, containing the indubitable Christian truth, are obligatory for every one of the faithful.

Such models (standards, rules) of faith and profession in the Church were and are the Creeds.

The Creeds of the ancient Church of the period of the seventh Ecumenical Council expressed the teachings of faith of the whole Church and conformed to the well-known definition of Vincent of Lérins on the catholicity of truth.

After the separation of the Church in the West, besides the general ecumenical Creeds for all Christians, there appeared numerous confessional documents which were the “symbolic books” of individual Western confessions.
The Orthodox Church is satisfied with the general traditional documents of a confessional character from the period of the indivisible Church, i.e., the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed and the decisions of the seven Ecumenical Councils.

Orthodoxy appeals to the old original Christian standards as it has nothing of faith which is new in respect of dogma in comparison with the period of the seven Ecumenical Councils, but essentially it only preserves and continues original apostolic Christianity by direct and unbroken succession.

Such self-consciousness of the Orthodox Church as of true Christianity in its genuine integrity, and such self-determination of the Orthodox Church as the guardian of the ancient Christian succession, are best of all proved historically by the fact that its creed, generally called the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, was recognized by all Churches as the genuine ecumenical creed, the irrefutable model of faith for the Christian world at all times, as it is accepted by all Christian confessions notwithstanding the variety of their teachings.

2. Councils

In the Ceremony of Orthodoxy carried out in churches in the Week of Orthodoxy (i.e., on the first Sunday of Lent) in memory of the triumphs of the Church over all heresies after the seventh Ecumenical Council, after the reading of the Nicene Creed (with the additional definition of the faith of the Apostles, faith of the Fathers, faith 'confirmed by the Ecumenical Council') is immediately added 'And the Councils of the Fathers of the Church and their Tradition and the Scriptures, according to Divine Revelation, we accept and confirm.'

Thus, the second sign of Orthodoxy is (besides the Nicene Creed) the recognition of the teachings and canonical authority of the Councils, by which are meant here the seven Ecumenical Councils recognized by the whole Church before the division.

From the point of view of dogma, the Ecumenical Councils were the organs of the Holy Ghost living in the Church. From the canonical point of view the Ecumenical Councils were the supreme organs of the Church in judicial, administrative and instructive matters.

No higher power than the Ecumenical Councils was recognized, and it was considered the duty of all members of the Church, both faithful and clergy, to submit to their decisions and laws.

If indeed history knows cases in which the Church tolerated and was so to speak forced to allow hostility or violations of the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils in its fold, these phenomena extended only to the domain of canon law and not of dogma, and the Church was forced to this by its wise rule of ekonomia.

From the acts of the Ecumenical Councils we may assume the scope of their authority. From this self-testimony of the Councils it is seen that they were accorded the following rights:

(a) the right to explain the dogmas of faith in the sense of Holy Scripture and to expound them for the whole Church in the form of creeds and precise confessions;
(b) to study, test and confirm the tradition of local Churches and to define pure and true tradition as opposed to harmful and false; (VI Ec. Coun. 1, 2);
(c) to give final consideration and judgment on all teaching arising in the Church; (II Ec. Coun. 1; III Ec. Coun. 1).
(d) to consider and discuss decrees of previous Councils and to confirm or alter them; (IV Ec. Coun. 1; VI Ec. Coun. 8, 16, 25, 29).
(e) to determine the form of administration of local Churches and therefore to extend or restrict their rights (I Ec. Coun. 6, 7; II Ec. Coun. 2, 3; III Ec. Coun. 8; IV Ec. Coun. 28; VI Ec. Coun. 36, 39).
(f) to be the supreme court over autocephalous Churches and even over whole local Churches; (VI Ec. Coun. 12, 13, 32, 35, 55, 56, 81).
The definitions of the Æcumenical Councils were composed out of the agreed testimony of the local Churches in the persons of their representatives at the Council—the bishops—as to what was always recognized in them as immutable canons of Christian faith and life.

This was a conciliarity based on the harmony of the parts in the spirit of 'primacy of charity,' a conciliarity expressing the basic feature of the essence of the Church itself which is 'the union of charity in the unity of faith.'

Hence, the voice of the Councils was the voice of the whole Church, since it was the voice of the representatives of the Church empowered by the will of the Divine Spirit to bear testimony to truth.

Therefore in the view of the Councils themselves, it is to them primarily that the infallibility which Jesus Christ promised to His Church belongs. 'It has pleased the Holy Ghost and us' was the usual preamble of the decisions of the Councils. 'Our Lord Jesus Christ by the mouth of this most holy Council defines,' said the Fathers of the third Æcumenical Council. 'We see the Heavenly Bridegroom going about among us,' declared the Fathers of the fourth Æcumenical Council.

Hence the universal obligation of the definitions of the Councils for the whole Church, as is witnessed by the Councils themselves: 'He who does not recognize this (i.e., the decisions of the Councils) will be considered a stranger to the Catholic Church.'

Only those Councils were true Æcumenical Councils whose decrees really expressed the universal voice and conscience of the Church and which were therefore recognized by the whole Church. An Æcumenical Council is the one which truly expressed the voice of the Æcumenical Church.

The Æcumenical Councils have irrefutable authority in the eyes of the Church which sees in their definitions the outward expression of its interior life.

There is no other criterion for recognition or non-recognition of a Council as Æcumenical except the agreement or disagreement of its decrees with the interior voice of the Church, with the findings of its conscience. The right to decide the truth or falseness of a Council belongs to the Church and to nobody else in the world.

This acceptance by the Church of the decrees of the Councils, as the experience of the history of the Æcumenical Councils has shown, does not in the final account depend upon or require the participation of the legates of the Pope or his recognition, as the Catholics think (e.g., second Æcumenical Council), nor does it require confirmation by the state authorities as Protestant canonists think (e.g., the 'Robber' Council in 449) or the participation of representatives of all the local Churches (in the main the Æcumenical Councils, by their composition, were Councils of the Eastern half of the Roman Empire) or even immediate recognition as Æcumenical by all the individual Churches (e.g., second, fifth and seventh Æcumenical Councils).

Only one thing is required: that at the Council the truth be expressed which is contained in the whole Orthodox Church. This can be ascertained only by a long historic process. The very life and history of the Church imprint this seal on the Councils, not any outward signs. This was the case with the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.

Those Æcumenical Councils which were accepted by the whole Church before the division number seven, and it is the decrees of those seven Councils that the Orthodox Church guards as holy and inviolable for all time; it considers this the indispensable sign of the orthodoxy of any local or national Church and the indispensable sign for the recognition of any Church which maintains that it is the successor of the indivisible Church.

.........

Summarizing all that has been said here about Creeds and Councils it may be said that by 'Æcumenical Creed and decisions on dogma of the ancient indivisible Church' we
must understand the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed and the decisions on dogma of the seven Ecumenical Councils.

It is the profound conviction of the Orthodox Church that the recognition of this is the fundamental sign of every Church which maintains that it is a successor of the indivisible Church.

THE FILIOQUE CLAUSE

Extracts from a paper

By Docent The Reverend K. V. Nechayev

Moscow Theological Academy

The dogma of the procession of the Holy Ghost in the Orthodox Church keeps within the narrow limits set by revelation which speaks of the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father alone. The private speculations of the Fathers of the Church on the eternal relations between the Holy Ghost and the Son of God, notwithstanding all their weight, do not exceed the value of theologoumena of the whole Church. On this basis study of this theologoumenon and private opinion of its supporters within the limits of the academic setting of the question are free in the Orthodox Church of to-day. There is no necessity for its expansion into a practical problem for the whole Church, nor can this be considered possible.

In opposition to the Orthodox Eastern Church, the Western Latin Church has adhered to dialectical extension of the limits of the exposition of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost and has arrived at recognition of the dogma of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.

The history of the Filioque in the Latin Church allows one to conclude that this opinion represents a narrow local theological tradition which developed and spread under the influence of casual external circumstances, and not as the result of indisputable truth or of the vital interior needs of the Church. S. Augustine, its founder, as can be seen from his works, arrived at the teaching by evolution and for him it was a logical, natural and indispensable doctrine. He had
great originality, which is a distinctive feature of his. But most of the later Western theologians bowed before his authority, considered his opinion as undoubtedly right and continued to develop it by tradition.

Comparison of the Western teaching on the procession of the Holy Ghost filioque with the theologoumena of some Fathers of the Eastern Church on 'the participation' of the Son in the act of eternal procession of the Holy Ghost shows substantial differences.

The Eastern theologoumenon arose in the centre of theological discussions on the Trinity from deep penetration into the inner life of the Holy Trinity, while in the West this question was neither basic nor typical. It was isolated in the opinion of S. Augustine, whose theology in general was individualistic and isolated from general Church doctrine.

The Western dogma is not identical with the Eastern theologoumenon. The latter is taken from revelation, from which also its concepts and terms arise. Augustine applies philosophical concepts, and makes use of psychology and logical constructions; his opinion is a rationalistic speculation on revealed truths and could more appropriately be called a philosophoumenon.

Augustine's opinion differs in principle from that of the East being essentially an opinion of Father and the Son as a double principle of the being of the Holy Ghost, an opinion entirely unknown to the East, and the formulation of which is absolutely distinct from that of the Eastern theologoumena.

The Eastern theologoumenon is contained in the writings of original theologians, authoritative Fathers and Doctors of the Church, who devoted their lives to the 'apprehension and service' of the mystery of the Trinity. While having common theological conceptions, they differed in their method of expressing this theologoumenon, putting into it their own insight. They were mainly theologians of the Alexandrian school. It is of special importance to note that the antithesis of the Alexandrian school at the time was the Antioch school, in which the theologoumenon 'through the Son' was known but less spread. But the meaning of this theologoumenon was quite clear to the Fathers of either school. It is obvious that they did not allow a filioque interpretation from the words of S. Theodoret against the ninth anathema of S. Cyril. The Western doctrine had no such variety, it was the development of a single idea.

The Eastern theologoumenon always remained a private opinion of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church and the theologians and never claimed recognition by the whole Church or elevation to the rank of dogma. The opinion of certain Western theologians, in keeping with the Latin desire to speculate and decree Church teaching to the extreme, took a firm stand on the official dogma.

The appraisal of the Western filioque on the Orthodox East was specially sharpened by the militant nature of the Latin propaganda of the doctrine.

The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son is defended by the consideration that neither revelation nor ancient Church Tradition give the formulation of procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone.

In its teaching on the procession of the Holy Ghost 'from the Father' the Orthodox Church avoids using the formulation 'from the Father alone,' considering that too as a theologoumenon. But the proposition in the views of theologians differs considerably from the first theologoumenon 'from the Father through the Son.'

The Orthodox Eastern Church sees in the Latin teaching of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son a real distortion of the revealed truth of the being of the Holy Trinity and appraises it as a heresy condemned by the whole Ecumemical Orthodox Church: at local Councils (Constantinople 879; Epistle of the Synod of Constantinople 1054, the opinion of the Greek delegation to the Ferrar-Florence Council 1439) at which the Orthodox Eastern Church was represented, and then from the most important...
apostolic pulpits and in its œcumenical conscience over the course of ages.

The conception of heresy does not necessarily involve judgment and condemnation by a Council. Obstinate and persistent acts of prejudice to the Church in matters of faith and morals with scorn of her teachings cannot be considered as anything but heresy. That is why, as long as the *filioque* remained in the West a matter of private opinion, it did not lead to excommunication. One was not bound to agree with it, one was not bound to excommunicate it, but the Church as a whole could not bear responsibility for it. But as soon as it was introduced as a dogma into Church teaching, its formulation was included in the Creed, and it began to be spread compulsorily inside local Churches and outside their jurisdiction in spite of the warning of the Œcumenical Council, no other judgment could be pronounced upon it. The introduction of the word *filioque* in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed is considered by the Orthodox Church as arbitrary and anti-canonical. This is a conviction of principle, based upon the sense of the seventh rule of the third Œcumenical Council, on the attitude of the subsequent fifth, sixth and seventh Œcumenical Councils to the Creed and on a long preserved historical document. This opinion is shared by some Western Christians, particularly in the Anglican Churches.

In consequence, the Russian Orthodox Church most resolutely declared and still declares an absolute condition of union with it the exclusion of the *filioque* from the Creed and the condemnation of the teaching of *filioque*.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH’S TEACHING ON THE SACRAMENTS, THEIR NATURE AND NUMBER.

*Extracts from a paper*

**By The Very Reverend**

**Archpriest Konstantin Ivanovich Ruzhitsky**

**Rector, Moscow Theological Academy**

**The Sacraments**

In the study and clarification of all dogmas professed by the Orthodox Church, we theologians make use of Holy Scripture and Tradition, attaching equal importance to the Epistles of the Apostles and to the writings of the Evangelists, as they were all written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The works of the Fathers of the Church too are authoritative and historical sources for bringing to light all the aspects of the Sacraments, their nature and their number. For the Orthodox Church there can be no question of the Apostles having distorted in any way the teaching of our Saviour on the Sacraments. The statement that the five Sacraments, ‘commonly called Sacraments,’ namely ‘Confirmation’ (anointment with chrism), ‘Penance, Holy Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction’ are the alleged result of the false imitation of the Apostles (Article XXV) must be fully rejected.

In the system of the Orthodox Church’s teaching, the Sacraments, their nature and their number are inseparably connected with the doctrine of the Saviour and grace.

The main purpose of the life of Christians on this earth is to attain salvation, which is possible:

(a) given man’s desire to appropriate the fruits of the redemption bestowed on us by our Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ risen from the dead;

(b) given the permanent help of grace to us by the Holy Ghost by means of the Sacraments.
These visible mediators by which the grace of God is communicated to every one of the faithful are essential for the economy of our salvation. 'We recognize the Sacraments as means which inevitably work by grace on those who approach them,' write the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs (Chap. 15).

There can be no doubt that in the practice of the ancient Church there were seven Sacraments. If we do not find it said in the Holy Scripture or in the ancient Fathers of the Church that the number was precisely seven, neither do we find it said that we must recognize two or three Sacraments; even the very concept of Sacraments is not to be found in the Gospels.

There is no reason to conclude from the fact the Gospels do not mention the institution by the Saviour of all the seven Sacraments that we can diminish their number or classify them. If we presume that the first three Gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke) had been lost and that only the Gospel of S. John had remained in which nothing is said about the institution of the Eucharist by Christ Himself, would we then be in the position to deny all the grace-giving significance of the Eucharist if all the Fathers of the Church and its ancient history testified to it?

However, not all the Sacraments are necessary to every member of the Church for his salvation. But to the Church as a whole, as a single body, all are necessary. Not every one of the faithful, for instance, directly needs Holy Orders, but they are necessary for all on the way to salvation to provide distributors of divine grace, which is communicated through the Sacraments, the medium of the grace of sanctification. Not all are obliged to enter wedlock but it pleased God that wedlock should be sanctified by the special Sacrament of Matrimony.

One of the important proofs of the existence of the seven Sacraments is their recognition in the non-Orthodox societies (the Nestorians, Armenians, etc.). It is also seen from the ceremonies of the ancient Church which have been preserved that all the seven Sacraments existed long before the appearance of the precise formulation of them.

The practice of the early apostolic Church shows that Confirmation was always administered immediately after Baptism. Thus when the Samaritans had been baptized by the Apostle Philip, Peter and John were sent to impose hands on them, i.e., to confirm them. Tertullian says, 'Coming out of the pool, we are anointed with blessed oil.' Rule 48 of the Synod of Laodicea ordains: 'It behoves those who have been sanctified by Baptism to be anointed with the holy unction and to become partakers of the Kingdom of God.' As we see, in the time of the Apostles Confirmation took place by imposition of the hands and also by anointing, while sometimes the anointing was followed by the imposition of hands (Tertullian). S. Cyprian speaks of the combination of anointing and imposition of hands. But in other places in their works these same writers speak only of anointing, not mentioning the imposition of hands. All Eastern writers speak only of anointing, not mentioning imposition of hands (Theophil of Antioch). In subsequent Eastern Fathers we find indications of the method of anointing. S. Cyril, for example, says: 'Do not think that this chrism is mere chrism. For as the bread after the invocation of the Holy Ghost is no longer mere bread but the Body of Christ, so the Holy Chrism is not mere ordinary chrism but the gift of Christ and the Holy Ghost made effective by the presence of the Divinity. We symbolically anoint the brow and other organs of the senses (ears, nostrils and fingers).' At the Council of Laodicea (565) it was ordained simply and unconditionally that both newly baptized after their Baptism and heretics who had been correctly baptized on their admission to the Church should be anointed with the heavenly anointing or anointed
with chrism. The second Ecumenical Council defined how and by what rank in the hierarchy Confirmation had to be administered, not instituting any new order but only sanctioning the order already existing.

The Eucharist

Thus the Holy Orthodox Church too believes and professes, recognizing that 'in every part down to the smallest particle of the bread and wine there is not some separate part of the body and blood of the Lord, but the body of Christ is always whole and the same in every part, and the Lord Christ is present in His substance, that is by His soul and His divinity as perfect God and perfect man. That is why, although at one and the same time there are many communications all over the universe, there are not many bodies of Christ, but only one and the same Christ is present really and truly, one body and one blood in all the separate Churches of the faithful. And this is not because the body of the Lord, being in heaven, comes down to be sacrificed but because the bread offered and prepared in all the churches and consecrated and transmuted \(^1\) becomes one and the same with the body which is in heaven. For the Lord has one body and not many in many places. This true body of Christ is not in any way distinct from His body for before consumption and after it always remains the true body of the Lord' (Epistle of the Eastern Patriarchs, Article XVII).

'That is why the body and the blood of the Lord in the Sacrament of the Eucharist must always be given special worship and pious adoration, for we owe such worship to the Lord Jesus Christ and to the body and the blood of the Lord' (ibid.).

Of course we do not find either in the Holy Scripture or in Tradition the desired complete exposition of the dogma of transmutation. In the time of the Apostles and for three centuries later when the Church was persecuted, the Fathers had little cause to clarify what the Eucharist consists in; they spoke but briefly of it. If the term 'transmutation' is relatively later the proposition contained in it is by no means a novelty or a diversion from the belief of the early Church; it is the early teaching, the same which was exposed in other terms by the Fathers of the Church and is contained in the liturgies. This cannot be denied by impartial students of the beliefs of the early Church. The Eastern Patriarchs in the Confession use the term corresponding to the Latin.

The transmutation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist is beyond the understanding of man, a matter of divine wisdom and omnipotence, an object of pious belief. It is accomplished by the supernatural power of God and is not a natural physical phenomenon which can be discussed and solved. S. Ambrose of Milan said in this respect: 'The power of consecration is greater than that of nature for by consecration nature itself is changed. Moses held the rod, cast it down before him and it became a serpent. Again he seized the serpent and it took on the nature of a rod. See then by the prophet's act of blessing nature was twice changed both in the serpent and the rod.'

By its essence the sacrifice of the Eucharist is identical with the sacrifice of the cross. The sacrifice of the cross, as prototype of all the sacrifices of the Old Testament, realized by its qualities all forms of prototypical sacrifices of the old Law. Similarly, the Eucharistic sacrifice is a sacrifice of worship, thanksgiving and intercession for the living and the dead. The very word Eucharist indicates the idea of thanksgiving and the prayers and liturgical hymns of worship and thanksgiving indicate the characteristic feature of the Eucharist, a sacrifice mainly of thanksgiving. The Eucharist is also a

---

\(^1\) Editor's note: The Russian word is *preuswchestvenie*: sometimes translated 'transubstantiation.' The Russian word has no connection with the scholastic doctrine associated with the English word. Transmutation has therefore been used throughout.
sacrifice of intercession for the living and the dead. In all the early and present liturgies at the consecration of the offerings the thought is expressed that the Eucharistic sacrifice is offered for many who will not partake of the sacrifice and cannot even partake of it. In this sacramental moment the holy Church prays for every town and country and those of the faithful who dwell in them, for those at sea, on journeys, the ailing, the suffering, the captives and their salvation, for those who have died in the hope of resurrection and eternal life in order to ease their fate (S. Cyril of Alexandria). The Eucharist is also a sacrifice of intercession. The holy Church prays for various spiritual and bodily blessings for all men (S. Cyril of Jerusalem, the liturgy of the Apostle James, the liturgy of Basil the Great and John Chrysostom).

The sacrifice of Golgotha and the sacrifice of the Eucharist, though having the same significance by their qualities and their substance, differ one from the other. The sacrifice of the cross was accomplished by the Saviour in the state of humiliation and suffering of His humanity, the shedding of His blood and the death of His body; the sacrifice of the Eucharist is accomplished when Christ, having risen from the dead, can no longer die and death no longer has dominion over Him (Romans 6). That is why this sacrifice is called bloodless.

On the cross Christ sacrificed the natural flesh and blood of His humanity, supernaturally conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, but in the Eucharist He sacrifices His real body and His real blood supernaturally changed from bread and wine and existing under those appearances.

By the sacrifice of the cross, Jesus Christ accomplished the redemption of the whole human race and satisfied the justice of His Father for the sins of the whole world; by the bloodless sacrifice God is reconciled and applies the fruit of the sacrifice of the cross to the members of the Church of Christ on earth and in Heaven, for whom the sacrifice is offered and who are capable of receiving the gifts of saving grace.

On the cross the Saviour sacrificed Himself once (to annihilate original sin and the curse of the sinner) for the whole of the human race so that man could receive eternal redemption; the bloodless sacrifice is offered ever since the time of its institution up to our days in the Christian Church in all countries of the world on countless altars; and as the Saviour ordained, it will continue to be offered in memory of Him until His second coming (1 Corinthians 11:23-26).

.................

**Holy Orders**

As the Sacrament of Matrimony is intended for the sanctified birth and education by the Church of children of the flesh, Holy Orders is intended for birth and education of spiritual children.

In this Sacrament the grace of the Holy Ghost is given to man as a great gift of God (1 Timothy 4:4). The person ordained is given the divine power to call down the Holy Ghost and the gifts of His grace in the Sacraments and other religious functions and thus to bear the Church spiritual children, then to teach them with divine authority, to manifest, to loose and to bind their conscience, to forgive theirs sins or retain them (S. Luke 4:42; 2 Corinthians 10:8; Titus 2:1; S. Matthew 18:18; S. John 20:23).

The divine institution of Holy Orders is clearly revealed in the Holy Scriptures. The Saviour chooses His disciples for His own service. He orders them to profess the Gospel, to baptize, administer the Holy Eucharist, remit and retain sins, heal the sick, and govern the Church. We see the divine institution of Holy Orders from the way the disciples of Christ, having received the gift of the Lord, pass it on to others not as their own institution but as a mystery from their Master and God whose disciples and stewards they are.

.................

The administration of the Sacrament of Holy Orders with
ordination to all the Orders is combined in the Orthodox Church with the Liturgy, so that those newly ordained to the service of the Church may be able immediately to take part in performing the bloodless sacrifice, the great Sacrament of the Eucharist.

The grace of Holy Orders is distinguished according to three different degrees. The bishop, the priest and the deacon are the organs through which the Church distributes the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

From the consideration of the seven Sacraments professed by the Orthodox Church we see that through them holy forces flow into the soul and body of man which not only strengthen him and fill him with the power of grace, but confer on him something quite new, which grafted on to man the divine principle. As a wild tree, unable to bear fruit at all or at least good fruits, is made fertile by the gardener by grafting on to it a branch from a fruit-bearing tree, not annihilating it altogether but transforming the whole of its interior life, so the grafting of divine life into the soul of man with all its beneficent consequences is accomplished by means of the Sacraments. This beneficent divine life is infused into man by means of the Sacraments and is in him the inexhaustible, undiminishing, ineradicable principle of spiritual life — which is guarded and strengthened and grows and perfects itself only on condition that the sacramental beneficent principle is in man's soul. The holy Sacraments, being the indispensable condition for truly Christian life, at the same time open and ease the way to eternal life and are for man in this life the gauge of the development and perfection in him of the divine principle to infinite godly perfection.

We believe in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

That article of our faith represents the only way of possible union of our Churches for which we pray every day at divine service. We must all strive to establish and to profess a profession of faith and an ecclesiastical sentiment nearer to the present One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. If such a view and such a striving were to gain the upper hand we should be witnesses and partakers in ecclesiastical events of tremendous importance. One of the attempts to realize this holy desire is the discussion between theologians of the Church of England and the Russian Orthodox Church in the summer of 1956. There is no doubt that there are differences between the doctrines of the Anglican Churches and the Orthodox Churches on the Sacraments, their nature and their number. The doctrinal definitions of the Church of England on the Sacraments lack clarity and distinctness and allow various understandings of the bases of faith, thus satisfying all various beliefs. Possibly the Church of England in the past needed such doctrinal lack of definition in the period of its new establishment after the Reformation and its break away from the Roman Catholic Church. The basis of everything now must be the Nicene Creed and the desire to be all in the fold of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. If with the general recognition of this there is combined the great power of Christian charity, the approximation of our Churches will infallibly take place.

‘Let us love one another and let us be united in our profession of faith’ (S. John Chrysostom from the Liturgy).
MEANING AND IMPORTANCE OF THE RITES OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

Extracts from a paper

BY THE REVEREND A. I. GORSHIEVSKY
Docent, Moscow Theological Academy

In divine service two sides are to be distinguished: the exterior and the interior. The exterior side is the outward expression of the very substance of divine service and its mysterious content in words, rites and symbols, i.e., the forms through which are expressed and communicated to the man of faith the truths of the Christian faith and the graces of the Holy Ghost.

Communicating with God in interior prayer, the faithful also show outwardly their profession of faith, their sincere adoration, their love of God, the joy of life in God, their hope in God, when they make on themselves the sign of the cross, bow their heads and bend their knees or prostrate themselves, when they kiss the Holy Cross, the sacred images and ikons, take part in the singing of hymns or light candles, lamps, etc. The fuller and more profound the content of religious faith the more irresistibly it is manifested outwardly in exterior forms.

The aggregate of the symbolic rites and forms in their relation to this or that part of the divine service constitutes a ceremony, for example, the ceremony of the Sacrament of Baptism, the ceremony of burial and others. The liturgical rites also indicate the difference in the divine service between one confession and another, e.g., the ritual of the Orthodox Church in distinction to the ritual of the Catholic Church.

In the religious life of the believer, from the day of his birth to the day of his death, the ritual of the Church is an indispensable requirement, for it expresses an essential and integral side of Orthodox divine service, personal prayer; in the ritual the spiritual life of the Christian is reflected.

Let us remember the Gospel. The Lord Jesus Christ acting through His almighty word, worked wonders and miracles, in some cases for the benefit of man himself. He used something visible, e.g., made clay with spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man with it, and then ordered him to go and wash in the pool of Siloam, after which the man born blind was able to see (S. John 9:7); He touched with His fingers the lips of the dumb man or laid His fingers in the ears of the deaf man and only after these actions the sick were cured (S. Mark 7:33-34; 8:22-25).

The need for exterior forms and means in the religious life of man is clearly shown by the words of the Saviour to Nicodemus: 'Verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God' (S. John 3).

Hence, for birth to God one must be born of water, i.e., an external means, and of the Spirit in order to receive the beneficent regenerating power of God.

But the grace of God may be manifested to man not only by water, but by other objects and signs. See the Acts. When a handkerchief was laid on the sick, or Paul's body touched them, their disease was cured (Acts 19:12). Or the shadow of Peter as he passed, falling on the sick in the street where they had been laid on litters and beds, healed them (Acts 5:15-16).

Our holy Church irrefutably testifies that miracle-working ikons venerated by the faithful and the might of the glorified saints are a source of the beneficence of God just as are the sacred waters of the pool of Siloam or the waters stirred by the angel in the pool of Jerusalem.

Let us note in closing that the Sacraments with their ceremonial aspect, the services of worship and ceremonies as such, are in Orthodox divine service not only an essential for the sanctification of the faithful by the grace of the Holy Ghost but that these ceremonies and rituals in their main and essential parts are to be traced back to the Apostles, have a divine foundation and therefore cannot be replaced or still less abolished by man, for God who ordains all ordained that in them and through them grace would operate in His Church.
PROBLEMS ARISING OUT OF THE ANGLICAN FORMULATIONS

Extracts from a paper

By Professor A. I. Ivanov
Moscow Theological Academy

On the basis of this short review of the contents and analysis of the formulation of the Thirty-Nine Articles we reach the conclusion that these writings of the Church of England cannot be recognized as an adequate expression of the doctrine confessed by the Orthodox Eastern Church.

The contents of the Articles are distinguished by extreme incompleteness and vagueness. Drawn up on the example of continental Protestant Confessions the Articles, however, depart from that firm tone that characterizes the opinions expressed in those works. Aiming at uniting people of different points of view, the authors of the Thirty-Nine Articles tried to reach their aim by adopting a conciliatory attitude in the sphere of belief itself and by vague ambiguous formulations. An altogether different attitude was adopted by the Orthodox Church. The main task which the Orthodox Church set itself in establishing its creeds was to find a strictly applicable verbal formula for the expression of one point or other of the Christian faith which had become a matter of dispute. Hence clarity, precision and completeness in the setting-out of dogma are the outstanding qualities of Orthodox Church statements on belief. We must approach the Anglican formularies with the same strict demands—collating them with Orthodox definitions of this or that dogma of belief.

In this respect the Thirty-Nine Articles that have been the object of our examination may be placed in four groups.

The first group consists of Articles whose content fully supports Orthodox doctrine and calls for no objection or comment. In this group we have Articles I, III, IV, VII, VIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVIII, XXIV, XXVI and XXX.

In the second group we place Articles which, while from the Orthodox point of view are not free from certain shortcomings, in their formulation contain nothing that could be considered to be in discord with the doctrine of the Orthodox Church. Thus we have Articles II, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII.

In the third group we shall have to include Articles whose formulation is quite vague permitting various interpretations. These Articles are: VI, XVII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXIII, XXV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXIX and XXXXI. As we have pointed out, English theologians, especially in recent years, have put no little effort into bringing the ideas that concur with the doctrine of the Oecumenical Church into harmony with the ambiguous formulation of these Articles. However unless corrections are made these Articles can hardly be acceptable to Orthodox understanding.

In the fourth group we have to place two Articles Nos. V and XXII which bluntly state a doctrine that contradicts Orthodox doctrine and which will have to be changed.

The last eight Articles (XXXII–XXXIX) possess no dogmatic character and this, despite the departure of some of them (XXXII, XXXVII) from the practice of the Orthodox Church, there need be no difference of opinion on them.
MINUTES OF THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS

Monday, 16th July, 1956

At 10 a.m. the English Delegation were conducted into a large hall attached to the hotel where the conferences were to be held. The Russian Orthodox Delegation were standing in a group in the right hand corner, and tables were set out in the shape of three sides of a square. Cameras and photographic lights were abundant.

The proceedings began with embraces of the bishops with the Metropolitan Nikolai, who then went to the centre of the tables and introduced the members of the Russian Delegation one by one. Afterwards the bishops took their seats at the top table, the Metropolitan in the centre with the Archbishop of York on his right. Next to the Archbishop of York was the Bishop of Derby and then the Bishop of Oxford; next to the Metropolitan, Bishop Michael of Smolensk and then Bishop Sergii of Staraya Russa. In front of the Metropolitan was an Orthodox crucifix on a small white cloth with a Bible—the new Russian edition—in front.

The Russian Orthodox then sang Our Father, the Anglicans being invited to join with them spiritually, after which the Metropolitan Nikolai and the Archbishop of York gave blessings. The proceedings then began.

Metropolitan Nikolai said: "Your Grace. In our church service there is a prayer which begins in Slavonic 'Here the grace of the Holy Spirit has brought us to-day.' To-day the grace of the Holy Spirit has brought us together. With these words I want to begin. We have sat down at this table to continue brotherly discussions not only in the name of fraternal relations and friendly conversation, but we want to explain how we believe, how we express our faith and the truths of our faith: more than this—to find points of rapprochement. To you and us the great words of our Lord Jesus Christ that 'all may be one' are very dear. I believe—

and you share this belief—that the Holy Spirit has gathered us together, that He will direct us, and that the blessing of God will make the conversations fruitful. I declare the first session open."

It was necessary, he continued, to deal with questions of order and arrangement. The Russians would put forward their view and then hear those of the Anglicans. Six working days were proposed and to this there was no opposition: some would be in the morning and some in the afternoon. After each discussion the readers of papers would make a résumé.

The two Russian secretaries were Professor Uspensky and Docent Sarychev. The typists would make copies of everything discussed and submit them to the secretaries for corrections in style and content according to the agreement of each speaker, so as to avoid inaccuracy. He expressed the wish that the résumés should be agreed by the secretaries and adopted by the conference at the beginning of the following session. To this there was no opposition and the secretaries were therefore charged with this task. (The Anglican secretaries were the Revd. J. Findlow and Canon H. M. Waddams.)

Both sides, he said, understood that the discussions had a purely advisory character. The conference was not taking decisions, for the authorities of each Church were alone competent to do this. Therefore the agreed résumé would not have a definitive character but an advisory one. The authorities of both Churches would later examine the reports. He hoped that in the near future definite authoritative decisions would be taken on these matters.

He completely accepted the Anglican proposals for hours: 10 a.m.–1 p.m. and 2 p.m.–3 p.m. when discussions started in the morning, and 3 p.m.–6 p.m. when they started in the afternoon. Also that Dr. Anderson would read a short paper after Bishop Michael. The question of sightseeing would be dealt with by the secretary of the relevant department. He suggested that the chairmanship should alternate between himself and the Archbishop of York.
The Archbishop of York suggested a rearrangement of the order of papers in the interests of theological coherence and this was accepted by the Metropolitan.

Bishop Michael then read his paper on *The Relations of the Russian Orthodox Church with the Church of England*.

Dr. Paul Anderson then read his paper on the same subject.

The Bishop of Oxford was then asked to read his paper on *The Doctrine of the Church*, and he prefaced it by saying that it was a very simple treatment of the nature of the Church and that many of the points which were briefly mentioned needed further discussion. He hoped his Anglican colleagues would add to what he said and where necessary correct it. He then read the paper.

Professor Pariisky then read a summary of his two papers, one *The Orthodox Idea of the Church* and the other *The Role of the Laity in the Life of the Church*.

[Just before Professor Pariisky began the Metropolitan Nikolai begged permission to leave in order to meet a delegation from the Patriarchate of Antioch: he yielded the chair to Bishop Michael.]

After Professor Pariisky's paper there was a break during which refreshments were provided (at 12.40).

The conference resumed at 1.45 p.m. under the chairmanship of Bishop Michael.

The Archbishop of York said that he wanted to draw attention to the biggest difference between the Orthodox and Anglican papers on the Church. The Orthodox paper seemed to say that the Holy Catholic Apostolic Orthodox Church in the world cannot be divided. The Bishop of Oxford's paper said that the unity of the Church has in fact been broken—there were parts of the Church which were divided from one another. The Bishop of Oxford wrote 'there is at present schism within the true Church of Christ.' It was in keeping with Anglican thought in general, that both the Anglican and Orthodox Churches were parts of the Holy Catholic Church mentioned in the ecumenical creeds, though separated from one another. He wanted to ask what the holy Orthodox theologians thought of this Anglican conception, in particular whether members of the holy Roman Church and Anglican Church were considered to be members of the Church as defined in the *Oe*cumeneical Creed.

Professor Georgievsky referred to Article XIX and asked how the error of various Churches was conceived.

Canon Waddams suggested that this point be left until later, and this was agreed. He went on to ask whether the Orthodox Church held that the Orthodox Church is the one true Church of Christ. If so what were the relations of other Churches to it?

Father Vetelev said he thought the Archbishop of York's query could be phrased—Do we consider the Orthodox and Anglican Churches are one Church? The moment of division of the Churches came in 1654 when the Churches were in fact divided from one another in communion: then in the sixteenth century came Protestantism. This seemed to come as a departure from the Roman Church. We did not have full unity and it was indeed the object of this meeting to seek means of unity.

Bishop Michael said the question might be phrased—Are members of the Roman and Anglican Churches members of the true Church of Christ? Is the Orthodox Church the only true Church in the meaning of the ecumenical creeds?

Professor Pariisky said that three elements entered into the comprehension of the Church—teaching, hierarchy and Sacraments. It was not clear if these elements appeared sufficiently in the Anglican Church. He could never bring himself to say of a body of people who confessed Christ, believed in the Holy Trinity, spread Christ's teaching and did many other excellent things that such a body is torn away from the body of Christ. The question was tied up with that of salvation. Personally he thought that tens of millions of believers who had not known the teaching of the Russian Orthodox Church could not be separated from salvation. God wanted all to be saved. A well-known Anglican had said in Leningrad in 1913 that the Russian Church had kept
the Faith unchanged, and gave praise to God. He believed that the Orthodox Church had all that was needed for salvation. It was possible that the Anglican Church had made less of its possibilities in some respects, particularly in regard to the Sacraments and the hierarchy.

Canon Waddams said that he understood that no Oecumenical Council had adopted a definition of the Church. Was this so and, if so, did it mean that there was no binding definition of the Church for the Orthodox as a whole?

Father Ruzhitsky referred to Article XIX saying that certain Churches had erred. He asked whether it was the opinion of the Anglican Church that the Russian Orthodox Church had erred.

The Bishop of Oxford said that there was nothing about the Russian Church and went on to explain the standing of the Thirty-Nine Articles and their provenance. He pointed out that the change in the oath which the clergy were required to take did not mean assent to all their details.

Father Ruzhitsky observed that the Article did not charge the Church of Constantinople with error. It might therefore be assumed that it had maintained the true faith. The Russians had received their faith from Constantinople and it might be assumed that they too had preserved it. Unity of Christians could only be based on the unity of the Eucharist and he hoped that this would come.

Dr. Owen Chadwick wished to draw attention to the use of the past tense in Article XIX—'have erred.' There was a time in the third century when the Patriarch of Antioch was Sabellian. In the fifth century the Patriarch of Alexandria was monophysite. These errors were then or later repudiated by those Churches. The assertion of the Article was not that the sees were now in a state of error such as to put them outside the Church. It was that in the past their individual hierarchs from time to time had to be corrected.

Bishop Michael wished to ask a question about the Bishop of Oxford's statement that Parliament did not accept certain things. It would seem that the Church Assembly had some responsibility in matters of faith and was the competent authority in ecclesiastical matters. What were the exceptions referred to?

The Bishop of Derby said this referred to the rejection by Parliament of the revised Prayer Books presented in 1927 and 1928. This was an important clash between Church and State. The proposed Prayer Book added permitted devotions and would have enriched the Liturgy and brought it nearer to the Orthodox. The bishops did not accept the decision of Parliament and gave permission for the book to be used. There were technical breaches of the law but they were acquiesced in by both Church and State.

In answer to a question from Father Ruzhitsky the Bishop said that there were many Anglicans in the House of Commons. The Book was rejected by the votes of those who did not belong to the Church of England.

The Archbishop of York said that he would like to hear from the holy Orthodox theologians more expressions of opinion about the ecclesiastical status of bodies outside the holy Orthodox Church.

Father Vitaly said that our Lord Jesus Christ wanted to see and founded on earth one Church. The Oecumenical Councils were extraordinary appearances in the life of the Church and only met from time to time according to need. During the periods that they met there was no need to define the Church since those who did not accept its teaching were clearly cut off from it. There was no debate on the subject. But there was plenty of evidence in the period of the undivided Church to give guidance, and it was a happy thing that we were all at one here. The ancient Church taught the great importance of purity of doctrine, succession of the hierarchy and maintenance of the Sacraments. A local Church having within it these elements properly maintained was a true Church. The Orthodox Church had changed nothing and introduced nothing new.

Professor Osipov referred to the quotation by Dr. Anderson that our divisions did not go up to Heaven. All Christians
confess Christ, the Trinity and a whole collection of other essential and valuable truths. The Orthodox would never dare say they were the only ones who believe in Jesus Christ. When they considered these partitions between Christians they did so together and their minds worked on very similar lines. There seemed to have been additions in some cases due to temporary political circumstances, but they were used to thinking of Church bases as standing above temporal things and being absolute and eternal. It was Doctrine, the Ministry and Sacraments that formed the real basis.

Canon Waddams said that in their approach Orthodox and Anglicans were very near each other. The Bishops of the Lambeth Conferences had stated these three things (doctrine, ministry and sacraments) as the basis of all attempts to regain Christian unity, and they had added to them Holy Scripture in what was called the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

Professor Osipov said he completely agreed about the addition of Holy Scripture as that was his own subject. The four points of the Lambeth Quadrilateral allowed a sufficiently clear answer to the question of the Archbishop of York.

Bishop Michael, in closing the session, drew attention to the unity running through the discussions.

The session closed with a hymn, sung by the Russians, and a blessing.

Tuesday, 17th July, 1956

The Archbishop of York took the chair at 10 a.m. and the meeting began with the Our Father. It was stated that on the Russian Orthodox side two guests were present, Archimandrite Antonii of the Bulgarian Church in Moscow and Professor Troitsky, Professor of Canon Law in Belgrade. The Archbishop welcomed their presence.

Professor Osipov then read a paper on Holy Scripture. Bishop Sergii then read a summary of a paper on Holy Tradition.

The Archbishop of York said that the conference had heard two papers which gave foundation for the discussion and that he had undertaken to begin the discussion. He would speak of the Holy Scriptures and Holy Tradition from the point of view of the Church of England.

He took first the questions about Anglican beliefs which came at the end of Professor Osipov's paper. The Professor was satisfied as to the belief of the Church of England in respect of three things. He then mentioned five things which required greater precision. He would speak of these.

The first was the conception of inspiration held in the Church of England. They believed that the Holy Scriptures, like the person of Christ, had two natures. The Holy Scriptures had a divine nature and a human nature. The divine nature was the Holy Spirit inspiring the writers; the human nature was the real humanity of the writers in their variety. The humanity of the writers was not overridden by the Holy Ghost. All the books of the Bible revealed divine truth but there were many forms in which divine truth could be revealed. Those forms included history, law, moral teaching; they also included drama, poetry and myth. Anglicans believed that the Bible contained all these forms and all were used by the Holy Ghost to reveal divine truth. If sometimes they said that a book of the Bible did not contain literal history it did not mean that they denied that divine truth was conveyed by it.

The second question was whether the Church of England was ready to accept the same list of uncanonical books as the Orthodox Church. In the paper of Professor Osipov there was a misunderstanding. The Book of the Wisdom of Solomon and the Book of Jesus Son of Sirach were two distinct books in the Anglican list. Of course they accepted both: . . . It seemed that there was hardly any difference between the lists and a small difference might be due to misunderstanding.

The third question was the question of Anglican belief about these books. Both Churches agreed that these books
were not of supreme authority for doctrine. But the Orthodox asked whether Anglicans held them to be 'an obligatory part of the Holy Bible.' It was true that in England many Bibles had been printed without these books. But these books had had a place in all the lectionaries issued by the Church's authority. It was true to say that they had a secure place in the practice of the Church of England.

The fourth point concerned the text of the LXX. Here too the Church of England had made no official decree on the matter, but the Church of England in using the New Testament presupposed the inspiration of the text of the Septuagint because the New Testament quoted its text very often. We could not try to understand the New Testament without the text of the LXX which the Apostles quote. Therefore without question Anglicans esteemed both the Hebrew text and the text of the LXX as gifts of the Holy Ghost in the service of the apostolic faith.

The fifth dealt with the belief of the Church of England concerning the Textus Receptus. Here too the Church of England had defined nothing. It affirmed the inspiration of Scripture but had made no decision about different texts. In our churches there had for long been the King James Bible and this was based on the Textus Receptus. Anglican scholars believed that the study of manuscripts could give texts more pure and more primitive than the Textus Receptus. Anglicans would say that the Holy Ghost had used the Textus Receptus through many centuries for the edification of the Church. In this sense the Textus Receptus was part of Tradition. But tradition was living and moving, as Professor Osipov had said. Anglicans believed that the modern study of manuscripts of the Bible was itself the work of the Holy Ghost. These studies were among the glories of the Church of England and were due to the presence of the Holy Ghost within her. So while Anglicans esteemed the Textus Receptus, they esteemed modern studies in the text of the Bible.

"Now I come to some questions concerning Holy Tradition. At the time of the Reformation the Western Church was full of many false traditions. These traditions were contrary to Holy Scripture. It was necessary for the Church of England to protest against many false traditions. The Church of England therefore concentrated especially on the authority of Holy Scripture. But the Church of England does not neglect Tradition. It possesses Tradition in the following ways.

"There are the Creeds. There is the Liturgy. There are the rites of Holy Baptism and Confirmation. There is the form of consecrating bishops, and the forms of ordaining priests and deacons. All these are Holy Tradition constantly living in the Church of England. The faithful hear the Holy Scriptures read in the Liturgy; they hear the Holy Scriptures in the other rites of the Church, and therefore they do not know the Holy Scriptures in a vacuum. They know them in Tradition, present to help them to understand the Scriptures. As for the history of the Church and the lives of the saints these are not contained in official documents, but the preacher in the sermon would from time to time speak to the people about these things, and the preacher will know what is and what is not congruous with Holy Scripture. We do not speak much of Holy Tradition in the Church of England but it is present all the time. It is our guide to understand Holy Scripture aright."

[At this point there was a short break in the session.]

The Archbishop of York on resumption presented the résumé of the previous day's discussions. Several members of the conference made various points, and after small amendments had been made the résumé was agreed.

The Revd. H. A. Williams said: "Professor Osipov has said in his paper that the Biblical writers were preserved by the Holy Spirit from error. Very few Anglicans would take this view. Most would agree that with the truth contained in Holy Scripture there are errors, not only of historical fact, but of morals and doctrine. Most Anglicans do not regard the Bible as containing doctrinal information, but rather as a record of historical events, sometimes reported accurately and sometimes inaccurately, in which the Biblical writers were
inspired to discern the activity of God. But this discernment of God’s activity had to be accomplished by human means, and hence was liable to error. It is in connection with this view of the Bible that the sacred texts are not regarded as free from historical and literary criticism. As far as historical and literary criticism are concerned the sacred text of the Bible is treated in exactly the same way as that of any other ancient writings. This at first looked as if it would involve great loss, but in practice Anglicans have found that the Bible speaks to them of God more profoundly than before.”

Professor Osipov explained that he had not intended to imply a development of Tradition: in his view such a thing could not happen. On the basis of what the Archbishop of York had said he could reach the following conclusions:

1. The canon of Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments is one for both Churches.
2. The uncanonical books were received by both Churches, not as inspired by God, but as useful and instructive.
3. In the Russian Orthodox Church the uncanonical books were an obligatory part of the Bible, but in the Church of England in the first half of the twentieth century they had been received into the Church texts.
4. Both Churches approach the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the LXX in ecclesiastical practice and in theology on the same basis.
5. The understanding of inspiration in both Churches is slightly different. In this respect the Orthodox Church did not admit so great a human element as the Anglicans and it could not agree that the human qualities of the writers could have caused error. It was quite foreign to the Orthodox to think of myth in connection with the Bible.
6. While the Orthodox Church used new theological and scientific studies and new discoveries in textual criticism it held to the Textus Receptus, and, while the Church of England had also used this text for many years, it now admits other texts also.

The Revd. F. J. Taylor commented on the last speaker’s remarks about the uncanonical books and pointed out that the Church of England had not changed its view on these books, which had always been received. He quoted from Article VI pointing out that they had been accepted since the time of the Reformation, though not used “to establish any doctrine.

Professor Ivanov recognized the valuable work which had been done by Anglican scholars on the various texts of the Bible, but could not recognize that the work of private persons could be accepted as that of the Holy Spirit. He referred especially to Nestlé’s text of the New Testament, pointing out a number of cases where he thought it unsatisfactory. He said that the Textus Receptus, besides being sanctified by centuries of use, was based on many more manuscripts and for that reason was accepted as authoritative by the Orthodox Church, while taking into account recent discoveries.

Dr. Owen Chadwick said that Bishop Sergii had spoken of Tradition as creative. “I think it is true to say that Anglicans are frightened of Holy Tradition because of such language. We have sprung from a Western Church which was in error and claiming that these errors were true Tradition. If we are faithful to the true Gospel we are bound to be a little frightened about the claims for Tradition. Bishop Sergii safeguarded himself completely on a later page from the suggestion that Tradition might teach something outside altogether the original revelation. He said it must agree with the Holy Scriptures. He said that it must go back to the apostolic age. He said that it must be recognized by every one. This idea of tradition we are not frightened of, but it is for us here a very important question—how do we know that the tradition is apostolic? Is it enough that the Church to-day should tell me that there have always been seven sacraments? Or must not historical enquiry also play its part? If it is enough that the present Church should tell me, then I should still be in errors of Rome. There must be therefore historical enquiry as to which traditions are
true traditions. This appears to us an absolute necessity if the Church is not to go astray, and what applies to the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary must apply also to the text of the Scriptures. If what the present Church teaches is enough we are still in error.

"Are we not being faithful in the matter to the Fathers of the Church? Did not S. Clement of Alexandria, S. Athanasius, S. Basil the Great, S. John Chrysostom all appeal to true philosophy and reasonable enquiry in their preaching and teaching of the faith?"

Father Vitalii Borovoy said that it was impossible to make a demand that everything must be found in Scripture, since it would result in the loss of a number of things which the Church of England accepted. He referred to the tradition of the Assumption and read a passage from S. John Damascene, in which was quoted the words of a fifth century Bishop of Jerusalem, Juvenal, claiming that the tradition was ancient. He asked whether this ought not to be believed and said that the tradition was certainly worthy of respect.

Professor Osipov returned to the subject of the texts of Scripture and emphasized the need for a conservative approach to the subject. Orthodox theologians considered the omission of any part of the Bible dangerous. Discussion and study could take place but the valuable content of the Bible must be kept in its entirety.

Bishop Sergii said that in calling Tradition creative he meant it in an educative sense, creating good Christians. It was not possible to make all tradition go back to the Apostles. The presence of tradition in the Church of England did not solve the question of the similarity or differences between the traditions in the respective Churches. He asked if the Church of England accepted Orthodox Tradition and considered it equally significant to Holy Scripture?

[There was an interval from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m.]

On resumption The Bishop of Oxford said that he wished to refer to the Dormition of the Blessed Virgin Mary as it was a good illustration of the general problem of tradition as Angilcans saw it. It was a tradition which was not recorded before the fifth century. It was difficult to believe that if such an important event in the life of such an important person had actually occurred, there would not be some trace of it in records of the earliest centuries. It was difficult to take this tradition seriously enough to make it part of the basis of belief about the Virgin Mary.

Father Borovoy made a distinction between historical and dogmatic in the matter of Tradition. The Orthodox Church always accepted the discoveries of historical fact. He referred again to the quotation which he had read from S. John Damascene, and maintained that this was sufficient evidence on which to accept the tradition of the Assumption.

He pointed out that the canon of Holy Scripture itself was certified by Tradition, and that without this there would be no certain canon to use. Holy Scripture was based on the authority of something else and proceeded from the Church, that is from her tradition. Tradition in regard to the Dormition is based on the authority of the Fathers and is consequently deserving of reverence on the part of all Christians.

Professor N. D. Uspensky said that the question as to the nature of Tradition had not been properly put. Tradition was set forth and carried forward in unwritten form; that is its nature and it is undoubted that it has existed since the first century. S. Basil the Great said that things transmitted verbally had the same value as those transmitted in writing. The speaker then made reference to customs like the sign of the cross and turning to the east, pointing out that S. John Chrysostom spoke of them as the traditions of the Church.

The criterion of Holy Tradition was not to be found in its historical character but in recognition by the Church. The reverence of the Orthodox for the Mother of God led them to give great heed to such words as those of S. John Damascene. Tradition should not be confused with private opinion; it is a treasure of all the Church and had the same value for salvation as Holy Scripture.

The Archbishop of York said: "Before the interval this
morning I was asked whether Anglicans accepted holy Orthodox Tradition and also whether Anglican preachers are guided by the Fathers or follow private opinions. In 1571 there was issued a canon on preaching. This summarizes the Anglican view of Scripture and tradition in a few words. The preacher should teach what is contained in the Holy Scriptures and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected from the same. There is a high regard for the ancient Fathers, but also a check in the appeal to Holy Scripture. Let me give some illustrations of how an Anglican would use the tradition of the Fathers.

"The Fathers are important for showing the right interpretation of passages of Scripture, for example the words of Christ; 'This is my body.' How are these words to be understood? We value the tradition of the ancient Church that those words mean the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. Again, tradition in the Fathers shows many valuable customs, e.g., to kneel or stand in prayer, to turn to the east in the credo. These customs are not founded upon Holy Scripture but are not forbidden in Holy Scripture. They are part of valuable tradition, and if a Christian or Church rebels against these traditions he is in danger of being wilful and selfish. This part of tradition is the work of the Holy Ghost in the Church, and it is when a man lives and believes and prays within these customs of the Church he has the mind of the Church. On the other hand it is dangerous when it is claimed that Tradition contains as historical facts things which are not in the Scriptures. Take the case of the Holy Virgin. We believe there must be devotion to Holy Mary. This devotion has sanction in Holy Scripture. There are the words of the Archangel: 'Hail Mary, full of grace;' and the words of Mary: 'all generations shall call me blessed.' The Church has nowhere defined the character of devotion to Mary, but we Anglicans share in the belief of the ancient Church that devotion is due to her. That is a part of Tradition. It is a shame when the Holy Virgin is neglected, but the historical facts requisite for salvation are those contained in Scripture and the Creeds; and when S. John of Damascus quotes an earlier Father that the Apostles believed in an event of the dormition, we hold that this is not tradition but opinion. The Church of Rome has treated many opinions as if they were traditions. Tradition says that the Holy Virgin has an honourable place. To claim that there is a known event of the Dormition is to intrude opinion within tradition. We value tradition but we want always to be sure what tradition really is."

Canon Waddams said that it seemed to him that, like the Scriptures, Tradition could be divided into three classes—canonical tradition, uncanonical but acceptable tradition, and apocryphal tradition which must be rejected. It was impossible to say of all the traditions of any one Church at any particular time that they were all part of true tradition. Could it not be said that the revelation of God is transmitted through the Holy Scriptures and Holy Tradition, and that Holy Scripture is completed, explained, interpreted and understood in the Holy Tradition? On the other hand, as previous conferences between Orthodox and Anglicans had agreed, nothing contained in tradition is contrary to the Scriptures. Though these two may be intellectually distinguished they cannot be separated from each other in the life of the Church.

The Archbishop of York then adjourned the session, remarking that the questions under discussion would certainly arise in the considerations of the following session.

The sessions concluded with a blessing from Bishop Michael and the Archbishop of York.

Thursday, 19th July, 1956

Bishop Michael took the chair at 3 p.m. and made a proposal that, at the request of the Metropolitan Nikolai, the following morning session should begin at 11 a.m. in order to provide an opportunity for a formal reception in the conference of visiting Metropolitans to take place first at 10 a.m. This was agreed.
Father A. A. Vetelev then read a paper on Dogma, Theologoumena and Opinion and the Formulation of Dogma.

Dr. Chadwick asked permission not to read his paper at length. He said: "It had a very short point and I understand that the principal contention of it was recognized in Father Vetelev’s papers. My contention was that dogma is in its substance immutable, that its expression in language may vary with the associations and circumstances of language, as Father Vetelev recognized with words like phusis and ousia. If circumstances may affect the understanding of the language of dogma, there may come to be disagreement between Churches, though there is no difference in reality in the essential penetration of the dogma. I personally think that the case of the filioque is one of these, but I gave one other example in my paper, the schism of the three chapters in the sixth century. Both sides in that controversy were seeking to maintain the truth of the Council of Chalcedon."

Canon Waddams wished to make three points instead of reading his paper Doctrine and Opinion, which had been circulated. First, both sides were agreed that there was a distinction between dogma and theologoumena, the first of which alone was binding. Secondly, he thought it important that an attempt should be made to state clearly where dogma ended and theologoumena began, so that it was possible to know whether any particular opinion was binding or not. Third, if the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils alone are binding as dogma, as a number of Orthodox writers hold, the question remains whether the Anglican and Orthodox Churches do in fact both hold the faith of these Councils. In this connection it is not primarily a matter of formal adherence, which is a secondary question, but whether in fact the essentials of the faith, expressed in those Councils are received by the Churches in question.

Father Vetelev criticized Dr. Chadwick’s and Canon Waddams’s papers. He agreed that the being of God in Himself could not be comprehended in human speech, but he thought it wrong to speak of ‘men co-operating’ with God when they formulate doctrine. Assuming that this referred to dogma, such formulation could only be done by an Ecumenical Council working under the will of the Holy Spirit on the basis of Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers. With regard to the dispute of the Three Chapters he thought that there was a change of judgment from one Council to the other.

With regard to Canon Waddams’s paper he criticized a statement quoted from Dr. Quick, and also the idea that dogma could be formulated in hymns and prayers. He thought the important question was whether the Anglicans accepted the seven Ecumenical Councils. He would answer that doctrine precedes faith. What was necessary was that there should be a deep and interior agreement and not simply an external one. He drew the following conclusions from the papers:

(a) that the Church of England put faith on the first plane as an interior religious striving and that dogma was relegated to a secondary place;
(b) that dogma as such is not defined in its essence and significance;
(c) that the connection of dogma with the Ecumenical Councils was not clear.

He thought that the question asked about the frontier between dogma and opinion showed that the Anglicans were not sure what dogma was.

Canon Waddams pointed out that Father Vetelev’s first two objections were based on a misunderstanding of the meaning of the passages to which he referred. As to being uncertain about the Ecumenical Councils his point had simply been, as Father Vetelev himself had said, that it was more important to discover whether the faith of the two Churches was the same than to rely on any documentary recognition or otherwise of the number of Councils. Finally, his point about the frontiers of dogma and opinion had been intended as a question to the Orthodox, to discover from
true that there has been a variety of view within the Church of England. We have found the faith sufficiently defined in Holy Scripture and the Ecumenical Creeds. We have also had the faith expressed in the Liturgy. It has never come to us to define our attitude concerning the seven Councils. There have been Anglican theologians who have appealed to the seven Councils. Other Anglican theologians have appealed only to four Councils. This is because the four Councils deal sufficiently with the great question of belief in the Incarnation. The fifth Council deals with technical explanations unfamiliar in the West. The sixth Council deals with monophyseism problems which we have never had to trouble us in England. The seventh Council deals with a question which in the West has come to have a totally different aspect. I hope this makes clear our attitude to the Councils. The faith of the Councils is the same faith as the faith of the Scripture and the Creeds. The Historical reasons explain the concentration of the Church of England upon some and not others. I believe myself that there is too much variety of theological opinion within the Church of England; for example there are some opinions of the sacrament of a Calvinistic kind, and these may disappear. Thus, as the Church of England realizes its own orthodoxy more and more fully, certain opinions within it will disappear. Yet we believe that it would be a great mistake to drive out varieties of opinion. Varieties of opinion are necessary to the intellectual life of the Church, and by that intellectual life the Church can help the problem of belief in the modern world. It is our hope that by friendship with the holy Orthodox Church the Church of England will learn to make more clear its orthodoxy in several matters. At the same time we hope that the holy Orthodox Church may discover from us that variety of theological opinion is necessary if the Church is to help people in their problems of belief.”

Father Ruzhitsky welcomed the statement of the Archbishop of York especially the possibility of some of the differences in the Church of England disappearing.
The Bishop of Derby said: "The Archbishop of York at the end of his remarks expressed the opinion and hope that the divergencies between different schools of thought in the Church of England might disappear and be resolved in unity. There are two ways in which he might be right: in hoping that differences would disappear and in thinking that they will disappear. Or he might be right in one and not in the other. It is very difficult to predict the future or to form a judgment with any confidence as to what is happening in the Church of England. There have been times when parties in the Church of England have degenerated into partisanship. In official counsels of the Church of England at the present time, and among the more informed and intelligent men of our Church, there is a reaction against partisanship and a readiness on the part of members of different schools to learn from one another. Many individuals try in their own minds to combine the truths for which different schools of thought are contending, and yet I sometimes wonder whether there are not real special values and truths, represented in a confused way by some of the extremists, which have not always succeeded in obtaining official recognition. There are quarters in which some extremist opinions develop which may one day explode. I wish to say very shortly one thing. The school of the tradition known as 'Evangelical' has not succeeded in recent years in making its voice sufficiently heard. It has been too quiescent and too ready to allow itself to be bowed out of court. I do not belong to that school of thought myself but I do not believe that it is at present playing its full part in the counsels of the Church of England.

There are those in the Church of England who would wish for a more radically critical approach to the whole question of dogmatic authority than has yet emerged in our discussion. They would regard the distinction between dogma, theologoumena and private opinion as being a matter of degree rather than of kind. It is not possible, they think, to draw sharp distinctions between these classes. They shade off into one another. Authority can be recognized at its maxi-

mum in the acceptance of the decrees and formulations of the Ecumenical Councils, yet they are authoritative, or rather their statements are authoritative, not because the Council said so, but because the Church accepted them. They would wish to emphasize that it is the diffused mind of the Church, including the mind of the laity, which by accepting and endorsing the judgment of the Council gives it its authority, and I had always understood that to be the point of view of the Orthodox Church. Those for whom I am speaking at the moment would acknowledge some measure of authority in any widely accepted theological opinion, and yet would wish to recognize behind and above all ecclesiastical authority the supreme authority of the Word of God.

"I would like to say about divergent schools of thought in the Church of England that there is a distinction between unity and unanimity. And yet I cannot forget that the Gospel sets forth our Lord as praying for unity in the truth. And, further, S. Paul desires that his converts should all speak the same thing and be of the same mind. Unity in belief is the true ideal and there must be a sufficient unity of belief to justify continuance of Church fellowship. But I believe at present that the different schools of thought in the Church of England have distinctive things to contribute to the understanding of the truth, and a premature elimination of differences might well be impoverishing."

The Revd. H. A. Williams said: "I think that in allowing differences of opinion the Church of England safeguards itself against idolatry. Idolatry consists in giving absolute value to what is less than God and the statements of men about God are not equivalent to God Himself. Hence they cannot have the absolute authority which belongs only to God Himself. The Bishop of Derby has just said that our Lord Jesus Christ prayed that we might be one in the truth. Christ did not define the truth as doctrinal propositions, but He said that He was the truth. He prayed therefore that we might be one in our worship of Himself and in our appropriation of His life."
The Revd. F. J. Taylor said: "The Bishop of Derby spoke about groups in the Church of England and among them he named Evangelicals. As I have been brought up in that group myself I feel it right to say something. I would myself prefer to use the word 'tradition' rather than 'group.' Because of the history of the sixteenth century, to which the Archbishop of York referred, there have been since that time different emphases or traditions in the Church of England, that is, different ways of understanding and expressing the Gospel in the life of the Church. These ways are not necessarily in conflict, but rather complementary. For example, the Evangelicals have been specially concerned to emphasize the importance of the Bible as the final authority for faith and morals, for the source of preaching, and for personal devotional use. They have been anxious to see the Bible in the hands of every one and read daily as a devotional practice. They have emphasized the importance of preaching at the Liturgy, and outside the Church to the indifferent and unbelievers. It has been their special business to undertake the spread of the Christian Gospel in heathen lands in Africa, Asia and elsewhere. They have also been concerned to encourage the corporate praying of the faithful outside the limits of the Liturgy for the work and mission of the Church. But they would not claim that they alone have practised these things. It has been a particular emphasis which they have contributed so that, in union with other traditions, the whole Church may learn to grow into the fullness of Christ. It should also be added that the Evangelical tradition in the Church of England, like other traditions, has existed within a common framework of Church life. The Archbishop of York referred to our possession of the Scriptures and the Ecumenical Creeds. In addition we have all had a common ministry, a common liturgy, and the Thirty-Nine Articles setting forth the position of the Church of England in relation to certain matters of importance in the Western Church. Evangelicals have all been baptized with the same rite and also been confirmed with the same rite by bishops, and so have lived their life in common in the parishes and dioceses of the one Church."

Professor Parisky said that our meeting was part of the straight and narrow path which went to the kingdom of God. The Orthodox Church preserved all the truths of the ancient undivided Church. The Orthodox Church preserved that teaching without loss or gain, as was recognized by Mr. W. J. Birkbeck. They were very happy to have this meeting; we were united in our belief in the Holy Trinity. He who believed in the Holy Trinity was a Christian, and we warmly desired that the Lord would give us the spirit of wisdom and judgment. We knew that the Lord had left to His Church a helpful guide—the Holy Spirit who leads us into all truth. That is the way we look when we come to discuss differences. We had come to work with the idea of unity and to make that unity real among Christians who believed in the Holy Trinity because the Holy Trinity is unity in love.

The Bishop of Oxford said: "The Anglicans received with the deepest appreciation the spirit of Professor Parisky's words. I was intending to raise a point connected with what he said. I think that when Anglican theologians use the word 'dogma,' it usually points in their minds to two dogmas in particular, namely the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. There are two reasons for that: one is that these dogmas are fundamental to the whole of Christian belief, and the other that it is those dogmas which have in fact been defined by the Church. It is for those reasons that the word 'dogma' as used by Anglicans is usually or often restricted to those two particular doctrines. It is worth while to say that those two dogmas are stated in the creeds which our Church accepts and they are embodied at every point in our Liturgy, including every form of service in our Church. I think it would not be so natural for us to speak of a 'dogma' of the Atonement or even of 'dogmas' about the Sacrament. This is partly because they have not been formally defined by the Church at any time. That does not mean that there is no teaching about these doctrines in our formularies and Liturgy. There is much teaching about Baptism and the Eucharist, for
example, in the Prayer Book and the Articles. By the fact that these doctrines have not been defined in specific terms by the Church we would hold that it would not be right to impose a very strictly defined doctrine of them on the members of the Church. I wonder whether that way of looking at dogma and teaching is intelligible to the Orthodox Church. I might put the question very sharply if I said—Does the Orthodox Church hold that there are any dogmas in addition to those defined by the seven Councils?"

Father Borovoy said: "We know the conditions in the Church of England and the circumstances leading to variety of opinions. Russian Orthodox theologians have always studied with great interest and sympathy the development of English faith which has brought it closer to the ancient catholicity and thereby closer to the Orthodox Church. Many points in Canon Waddams’s paper gave me great satisfaction. I also prepared a paper on the Creeds and, although we belong to different confessions and different Churches, between places in my paper and places in that of Canon Waddams I find an extraordinary closeness and drawing together, and this gives me great joy. Canon Waddams refers to Khomiakov and his teaching, citing from the same field as I. He also referred to other English teaching of the eighteenth century the common opinion of which was in complete accord with the teaching of the undivided Church as expressed in the Ecumenical Councils, even the seventh. As far as I have understood Canon Waddams he himself has a positive attitude in principle to the seven Ecumenical Councils. But at the very end of his paper he expresses an idea which gives me concern, saying that persons occupying official positions in the Church could have ideas which might come to be heretical but continue to hold their official positions. For the Orthodox that is not comprehensible. Variety of opinions we can understand and we freely criticize any opinions even within the same Church. When we find references in the holy Fathers it is not necessary to accept their point of view even though we view it with esteem. But there could not be a difference in dogma within the Church. Therefore all the Ecumenical Councils must be accepted as constituting a general definition of an object of faith. And so in welcoming Canon Waddams’s paper with joy, and sharing his opinion, I am not convinced that it is the point of view of the Church of England. What do other Anglicans think? This confusion in my mind can also constitute an answer to the Bishop of Oxford."

The session was adjourned with the blessing at 6.20 p.m.

Friday, 20th July, 1956

The Archbishop of York took the chair at 10 a.m. and began by welcoming as guests the Metropolitan of Tyre and Sidon, the Metropolitan Basil of Seriopolis and Bishop Palladii of Lutsk.

The résumé for Tuesday was then read.

Professor Osipov said he wished to raise a point about the use of the word 'tradition' in England. In the Russian Orthodox Church different words were used for Holy Tradition and for other traditions, whereas in England only one word was used for both. He therefore asked whether it could be clearly stated whether the Anglican Church makes a difference between the two kinds of tradition.

The Archbishop of York: "The Professor has just made a new and interesting contribution to the discussion, but what he said now was not said on Tuesday. We are now concerned with the summary of what was said on Tuesday. If what was said on Tuesday was incomplete and inadequate, then it was so, and our record must not go beyond it. It is not in order now to add new elements to Tuesday’s discussion. I want to ask—Is the Orthodox delegation satisfied with the draft as an adequate representation of what was said on Tuesday—modest though it was, as a contribution to the matter?"

The résumé was adopted.

Father Borovoy then read his paper on Creeds and Councils.

The Archbishop of York: "We are very grateful for this
paper. There is very much agreement with it on the part of Anglicans. It also shows great understanding of the Anglican attitude.”

Bishop Michael wished to refer to the question raised by Professor Osipov with regard to terminology. He referred to the resolution of the Anglican-Orthodox conference at Bucharest and quoted the statement of Tradition included in it (p. 198 *Lambeth Occasional Reports*). His question was whether this statement could be considered as the official position of the Church of England. A positive answer would give great satisfaction.

The Archbishop of York: “The statement at Bucharest is not in any way a formal pronouncement of the Church of England, but was made by a group of typical Anglicans under the leadership of Bishop Hicks of Lincoln, and it can be taken as a position which Anglican theologians do not find it difficult to accept. It is likely that in future conferences Anglican theologians would agree to a similar formulation. I hope that this is reassuring enough.”

Canon Waddams added that the report containing the statement had been received by the Synods of the Church of England as consonant with the teaching of the Church of England.

The Bishop of Derby said that, so far as he remembered, it was received as a permissible interpretation, but not as the only way of interpreting the position.

Father Borovoy said that his quotation had been taken from the translation of the report of the conference appearing in Russian, and these documents were translated at the Moscow Patriarchate when the report was sent from England. They conformed to the original.

The Bishop of Derby: “I have had the advantage of reading Docent Nechayev’s paper *The Filioque Clause*, but my own was written in ignorance of it. I greatly appreciate the historical scholarship of his paper. As yesterday, as papers have been circulated already in both languages, I propose to dispense with reading mine in full. I should like to put before you in a few brief paragraphs the main points of the paper. What I wanted to emphasize was:

1. That it is freely admitted by us that, as history makes plain, the *filioque* is an interpolation, irregularly put into the text of the Creed and devoid of any canonical authorization.

2. We Anglicans do not understand the *filioque* as implying any idea at all of two first principles of being in the Godhead. There is only one fount of Godhead—God the eternal Father. We understand the *filioque* as meaning only that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, and this is a form not unknown in the Orthodox Church as a *theologoumenon*.

3. We accept the prohibition by the Council of Chalcedon of an addition to the Ο Ecumenical Creed, and we agree that at ουκομένικες assemblies at which Eastern and Western Christians join together in common worship or the Liturgy, the Creed ought to be recited without the *filioque* clause.

4. We hope however that our own Church may be forgiven if, in view of twelve hundred years of traditional use in the West of the disputed clause, we continue to recite in our own Liturgy the Creed in the form to which we are accustomed, and we hope that it will be recognized that the additional clause is understood by us in a wholly orthodox sense.”

Father Nechayev said that the question of the *filioque* constituted one of the main difficulties in interconfessional discussions, and that the new stage was to seek for mutual understanding. The Russian Orthodox Church had its own centuries old tradition which was unchanging. The question was how the problem could be resolved so as no longer to be a hindrance to communion among believers. He wished to make four points:

1. The definition of the procession of the Holy Spirit completely contains the truth on this point which is necessary for salvation. Any other teaching with regard
to God the Holy Spirit alters this fact. The Orthodox especially stress the single source of the Holy Spirit in the Godhead.

2. There is consequently a conflict between Western and Eastern tradition on this point. The Western Church followed a dialectical deviation of dogmatic teaching.

3. Alongside this teaching the Orthodox Church knows two kinds of opinion about the immanent relation of the second and third Persons of the Trinity. One speaks of the procession from the Father through the Son. The other limits these relations only to the procession of the Holy Spirit into the world and has the formula that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father. Neither of these is binding but the second conforms more to the Gospels.

4. There are two aspects: (a) condemnation of Roman Catholic teaching and (b) the canonical aspects of irregularity. Both these must be put right as essential conditions for communion with the Orthodox Church on the part of any non-Orthodox communion. He went on to say that he considered the exclusion of the *filioque* essential under any circumstances, because it restores the original text of the Creed which is obligatory in the East. He thought the half-way position proposed by some previous Anglican-Orthodox conferences not good in principle. This would seem to provide one method for the clergy and another for the laity who were out of touch with one another. He referred to the Bonn Conference of 1875 and said it was much more difficult to understand events, as the Old Catholics had agreed with the Orthodox but had done nothing about it. The omission of the *filioque* is a symbol of the purity of Orthodox theology and to isolate its theological interpretation is impossible.

**The Bishop of Derby:** “If it is admitted that the introduction of the *filioque* into the Creed was unauthorized and irregular, why does the Church of England not want to drop the clause? We say that it is capable of being understood in an orthodox way. We think it harmless if we use those words in our worship, but undoubtedly it was wrong to put them in, and therefore there is a logical case for saying they ought to be cut out. But does it not illustrate admirably the conservatism of Churches? I think that in one of the two papers before us the point is made that the Orthodox must be very careful not to disturb their conservative lay people. There is a conservatism also in the Church of England, though I think it is perhaps not so stubborn as Orthodox conservatism. I think it possible that under the guidance of God’s Holy Spirit, if in the end divided Christendom is brought into unity, there might be the grace of God be sufficient humility on the part of the Western Church to make it possible for it to be convinced by the Orthodox that the *filioque* ought to be abandoned. But this is a personal judgment as to what might come about by the activity of the Holy Spirit acting upon men of sin. It is not an expectation as to what is likely to happen within any foreseeable time. The question is whether, in view of the conservatism of Churches, there might not be some interim agreement whereby the Church of England could continue to use its traditional form of the Creed while admitting that the bringing of it in was a mistake, but that also it was capable of being defended from the point of view of a *theologoumenon* in the Orthodox Church.”

**Professor Osipov** said that his theological conscience would find it difficult to accept one use for the Church of England in its external relations and another for internal use. Second, there cannot be two formulae in such an important matter as the Creed, one interpretation here and another there. The Russian Church had in the course of its history had to make changes in the interests of truth, as in the seventeenth century. They did it in spite of immense difficulties and the result was the schism of the Old Believers.

**The Archbishop of York:** “I should like to explain how the *filioque* has been valuable in the peculiar circumstances of the West. When S. Augustine and others valued the phrase they were not of course introducing a second *aitia,* they were
I was suggesting that if a time ever came when the Western Church was convinced and gave it up, that would be the work of the Holy Spirit. At the same time we should not defend the _filioque_ at all if we thought it in conflict with the truth. I should like to endorse all that the Archbishop of York has said about the part which the _filioque_ has played in the West in preserving the true faith."

Professor Ivanov referred to the statement by Bishop Michael about relations between the two Churches since the eighteenth century. It was a great joy to him that the Anglicans had recognized the Orthodox point of view regarding the _filioque_ and agreed that it had been improperly added. He was very interested in what Anglican priests taught their people on the subject. The statement of the Anglican theologians came very near the Orthodox position in the matter, and he thought that the position should be explained to Anglican believers so that a movement should begin which would eventually remove it from the Creed.

The Revd. F. J. Taylor: "I should like to ask the Orthodox delegation if they can agree that there are two questions involved in the problem of the _filioque_: the question of heresy and the question of uncanonical action by part of the Church. First the question of heresy. Although the use of the word _filioque_ might have had a heretical result, can it not be agreed in the light of the teaching of S. John Damascene, which we have accepted, and of the explanations of the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Derby, that the use of this word in the Creed and teaching of the Church of England has not had an heretical intention or result? In fact it has served to preserve amongst us an orthodox understanding of the person and work of the Holy Spirit. That, I think, is the answer to the question put to us here as to what the pastors and theologians of the Church teach their faithful. They have not in fact said that this is a mistaken word and then proceeded to defend its use, but have expounded the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father through the Son.

Father Ruzhitsky said that the Russian Orthodox Church held very stubbornly to the faith, and took the view that conservatism must be based on the Apostolic Church. The _filioque_ did not have apostolic authority. He quoted S. Paul in I Corinthians I\(^{10}\) and asked why the _filioque_ should be defended.

The Bishop of Derby: "The Rector has misunderstood one point. I was not arguing that the Holy Spirit had inspired the Roman Church to introduce the _filioque_ into the Creed.
The second question concerns uncanonical action. It is there that we have agreed that the word *filioque* has been irregularly introduced into the Creed, but in view of more than a thousand years of history, it is not possible easily or quickly to remove the word either from the Creed or from our exposition of it. But if it could be agreed that there has been neither heretical intention nor result in the use of the word, it ought to be possible to regard its introduction into the Creed as understandable in the circumstances and until the circumstances are sufficiently changed, that it cannot be removed."

**Bishop Michael** said that one of the leading ideas of the Church of England was the struggle against the false practices of the Roman Papacy. We should not discuss all these errors but simply note that the introduction of the *filioque* is one of the most glaring of them. The Orthodox East had also had to struggle against heresies but they had not done so by introducing departures from the truth. He thought there was a considerable danger of a division appearing between the clergy and laity of the Church of England, and this was confirmed by reading Craig on *Preaching in a Scientific Age*. He would like an answer to the questions put by Father Borovoy.

**The Archbishop of York**: "I must first briefly answer Bishop Michael's question. He asks what do the priests of the Church of England teach the people concerning the *filioque*. The fact is that very little teaching is given to the people concerning the metaphysical aspects of the faith. It is our custom to show the people that the dogma of the Holy Trinity is revealed in the Holy Scriptures and it is our custom to emphasize the unity of the Three in One. The teacher would usually do this with the aid of analogies. Sometimes he would use analogies which were used by S. Augustine, sometimes like those used by the Cappadocian Fathers. But we give very little teaching concerning the dogma of the Holy Trinity in its metaphysical aspect, since the people do not understand these things. We lead them to uphold the Holy Trinity. Concerning the Holy Spirit we teach on these lines: we emphasize the fact that He is a co-eternal person of the Holy Trinity: we emphasize that He is to be worshipped and glorified with the Father and the Son. For the rest we dwell upon the mission and work of the Holy Spirit in history, and our people for the most part know a lot about the Holy Spirit's mission and work. They know nothing about the metaphysical aspect of the doctrine, but we have by what we teach guarded them from heresies."

**Father Vetelev** said that to use the *filioque* was to accept two origins of the Godhead: it was to put the Holy Spirit on a lower level than the Son. He quoted S. John 15 and S. John 14 stating that the Holy Spirit proceeded exclusively from the Father both in His creative activity and ontologically.

**Father Borovoy** asked whether the Anglicans accepted the Creed without the *filioque* as the sole correct statement of the true teaching of the universal Church. Did they also accept the statements of the Ecumenical Councils as essential and obligatory for every Church which wanted to assert its continuity from the ancient undivided Church?

**The Archbishop of York**: "It is unquestioned that the Church of England accepts the Nicene Creed as the authoritative statement of the Faith. The Church of England recites the Creed with the *filioque*, but if you ask what was the Creed in its original form, it will give the right answer."

"Does the Church of England accept the doctrinal formulations of the seven Ecumenical Councils? Here I must admit that the Church of England is hesitant, but you, Father Borovoy, in your paper, section XVI, give a very fair and accurate account of the nature of our hesitancy. The Church of England believes it to be sufficient to insist upon the Holy Scriptures and the Ecumenical Creed. Some of the Ecumenical Councils and their formulations deal with the matter in a way very remote from the history of the West: for example, the monothelite controversy dealt with by the sixth Council discusses the matter in a manner totally different from all discussion there has ever been in the West. The Church of England, of course, rejects monothelitism and all
the implications of monophysitism; but if we of the Church of England were to make our repudiation of monothelitism more explicit, we should need to do this in terms which fit our historical situation. I doubt if it would help the orthodoxy of our laity if we quoted to them the sixth Ecumenical Council."

Father Ruzhitsky asked what answer he should give if asked how many Councils the Anglicans accepted.

The Archbishop of York: "You would have to reply in two or three sentences. No more brief answer would suffice. You would have to say that the Church of England has nowhere defined which Councils it accepts. You would have to add a second sentence, that some Anglican theologians had appealed to seven. You would then have to add a third, that some Anglican theologians had appealed to four. Then to add a fourth, that the Church of England believed the Scriptures and the Ecumenical Creeds to be a sufficient statement of the Faith. Finally, if your pupil has patience to hear more, tell him that some of the contents of the fifth, sixth and seventh Councils do not fit the historical situation of the West. I am very sorry that no more brief answer is possible, and no doubt this is due to sin!"

Father Ruzhitsky said he would like to know how many the Archbishop of York recognized.

The Archbishop of York: "In my personal opinion I accept the first four as being undoubtedly congruous with the faith of the homoeousion: the fifth deals with a technicality of which I have insufficient knowledge: the sixth I accept but would need to expound in a totally different manner in England: the seventh I accept so far as I understand it."

Father Nekhayev asked whether the procession of the Holy Spirit was a subject taught in the schools?

Dr. Chadwick: "The historical situation is plainly explained to all students. They are made aware that only the original text of the Creed has ecumenical authority. The question of whether there are two principles or one in the Godhead is hardly discussed, simply for the reason that it is obvious to every pupil that there is only one."

The Archbishop of York: "The question is asked whether the doctrine of the procession is studied in English theological schools. The answer is that it is, and that we require pupils to have accurate information about the doctrine and the controversy; but far more time is given to questions concerning the mission and work of the Holy Spirit in Christ and in the Church in history. There are two fine books in English on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit: Dr. H. B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament and The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church."

The session was adjourned at 3 p.m. with the singing of a hymn and the blessing.

Saturday, 21st July, 1936.

Bishop Michael took the chair at 6 p.m.

Father Ruzhitsky read part of his paper on The Orthodox Church's Teaching on the Sacraments, their Nature and Number.

The Revd. H. A. Williams: "As my paper on The Sacraments, their Nature and Number has already been circulated I intend to give only a very short summary of its contents, singling out special points for emphasis. First—the theological background of the doctrine of the Sacraments. "God is the creator of the material universe and He has a permanent place for it in His eternal purpose. That was shown when in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary God took manhood to Himself. In the language of Article II: 'Godhead and manhood were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man.' In the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead and His ascension into heaven we see the manhood thus assumed taken up into the eternal world and this manhood included the body of Jesus Christ. The elements of the material universe were thus shown capable of being the perfect vehicle of God's power and the expression of His glory. This is the background of the doctrine of the Sacraments. In them God conveys Himself to mankind by means of the elements of the material world just as He conveyed Himself to mankind in
the manhood of the eternal Son which He took to Himself for ever. Ultimately at the last day, as S. Paul says, Christ will fill all things. But in anticipation of the complete divine indwelling Christ has given us the Sacraments. He has singled out certain material things and certain material actions in which and by which He has promised to give Himself to men. Ultimately when the purpose of God is completely fulfilled, all things will be gathered up in Christ, things in heaven and things on earth, as S. Paul says. The Sacraments are an anticipation of this ultimate state of affairs.

"Of the Sacraments the Church of England singles out two for special honour, Baptism and Holy Communion. This is because, as Article XXV explains, the visible signs or ceremonies for these two Sacraments were ordained by Christ Himself. Christ did not Himself specify any material act for the other five although they clearly have apostolic authority. The liturgical practice of the Church indicates its belief. In the liturgical practice of the Church of England Confirmation, Penance, Holy Orders, Matrimony and Unction are clearly treated as Sacraments. The Book of Common Prayer provides forms for administering the first four of these, and the Convocation of Canterbury in 1935 approved a form for the administration of Unction. In the forms of administration the sacramental principle is maintained. God is spoken of as giving His grace to the recipient by means of the outward material action. This is made absolutely clear by the words used. To take an example from Ordination, the Bishop laying his hands on the head of the candidate says 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest (or bishop) in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands.' The laying on of hands is here described as the means by which the appropriate grace is conferred.

"One final point: the material universe is capable of bearing God because it first freely offered itself to Him. This it did when Jesus Christ offered Himself to the Father on the cross. So the imprint of Christ, crucified and risen, lies upon each of the seven Sacraments and gives them their effective power."

[Here there was a short intermission.]

The Bishop of Derby: "I should like to make three points, I hope quite briefly. I have been a little surprised at the use of terms both by the Orthodox and the Anglicans. I have been accustomed to recognize the Eastern practice of anointing with Chrism those just baptized as a kind of Orthodox equivalent of the Western rite of Confirmation by the laying on of hands as practised in the Church of England. I have been surprised that on former occasions the Archbishop of York, your newly-made doctor of theology, used the term Chrism of the Anglican rite despite the fact that we do not anoint people, and I have been no less surprised to find in the papers by Orthodox scholars the use of the word 'Confirmation' rather than 'Chrism,' and the justification of it from Scripture, just as a simple-minded Anglican might justify his practice by reference to the laying on of hands at Samaria with no reference to Chrism. That is the first point.

"The second point is a graver one. I have been surprised to find in both the Orthodox papers the use of the word 'transubstantiation.' I have been familiar with the doctrine of a change in the elements at consecration."

Father Nechayev intervened to say that this was not quite an exact translation.

The Bishop of Derby: "Maybe the difference will not be serious. After they are consecrated they are invested with a sacramental character so as to become what they were not before, namely outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual reality of our Lord's body and blood. But do the Orthodox accept the Western medieval philosophy of substance and accidents, and do they express the change in the elements by affirming that the metaphysical substance has been abolished and replaced by the metaphysical substance of Christ's body and blood, the accidents of bread and wine remaining unchanged? I am led to hope that there is a nuance of meaning that avoids this Roman Catholic con-
clusion. If so the use of the word transubstantiation is challenging and puzzling to Anglicans.

"Thirdly I notice that in both Orthodox papersunction is described as Extreme Unction. This also seems to us to be Roman Catholic terminology. In late Western usage the phrase Extreme Unction grew up. It is held that at first it meant the last of a series of anointings. In the West and the East at Baptism, in the West at Confirmation, there might be an anointing, and again at Ordination, and lastly when a man fell sick. But as time went on the phrase Extreme Unction came to mean in Latin unctio in extremis, an anointing in preparation for death. We should defend unction for the sick in the hope and prayer that God might use anointing as a means of bringing healing and peace, but we should not regard anointing simply as preparation for death, which in practice it seems to have become in the Roman Church, and the phrase Extreme Unction tends to carry this meaning."

PROFESSOR OSIPOV said he would like to speak on the third point. What the Bishop of Derby had referred to as Extreme Unction was a reference to unction with oil not in extremis. What he had said accorded perfectly with Orthodox teaching.

CANON WADDAMS referred to the word translated 'transubstantiation' and pointed out that this was a wrong translation. In support of this he read an account of an interview between the Metropolitan Philaret and Bishop Young of the American Church in which the former forcibly rejected 'transubstantiation' as a proper translation of the Russian word used.

FATHER RUIZHITSKY said that the paper of Father Williams was very interesting from a philosophical point of view. The paper seemed to him to suggest that the interpretation of the Sacraments did not depend on the teaching of the Church for its exposition. Father Williams went on to deal with the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer and seemed to imply that the Church of England had no teaching on the Sacraments. For example, he said that no Anglican would consider Article IV as having the same authority as statements on the resurrection in the Creeds.

MINUTES OF THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS

THE REV. H. A. WILLIAMS: "What I said was that no Anglican would regard the Articles as anything like as authoritative as the statements in the Creed."

FATHER RUIZHITSKY went on to speak of the philosophical part of the paper. He found some of it not comprehensible. Father Williams said that the body of Jesus Christ was worthy of permanent presence in heaven, and since he said it is in heaven only therefore cannot be in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

He said that nothing of Christ's humanity was left behind when He went to heaven. That is a purely human manner of thinking, not merely rationalistic but a materialistic type of thinking with no basis in Scripture or Tradition. We know that our Lord said 'Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world,' that is, in the wholeness of His Godmanhood. From our point of view there can be no limitation for the continuance with us of our Lord in His complete Godmanhood.

In the Eucharist itself there is His body and blood. Here is a matter which is not possible for your intelligence to grasp but only our faith. What did Father Williams mean by 'material things'? There are not two Christs but one by the process of making flesh to be divine. He went on to refer to S. Luke 24 and to the appearances of Jesus Christ after His resurrection in the breaking of bread at Emmaus and behind closed doors to His disciples. Unquestionably the flesh was changed after the Resurrection. He quoted Westcott and Gore on the subject of the post-Resurrection body and concluded by saying that Father Williams's paper was an expression of personal views rather than an exposition of the teaching of the Church.

BISHOP MICHAEL said that the translation of the paper in Russian had been received from England and the English text was not available. This might explain some of the insufficiencies.

THE REVD. H. A. WILLIAMS: "So far as I understand him, I agree with everything Father Ruzhitsky says except his interpretation of my paper."
THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: “I think it would be good if we tried to clarify certain points of difference and agreement between our Churches concerning the Sacraments. There are two questions which I should like discussed in turn. The first concerns Chrism and Confirmation. The holy Orthodox Church administers Chrism in oil to infants. The Church of England administers Confirmation by the laying on of hands to people already baptized who are rather older. Both Churches apply a similar doctrine to their practice. Both Churches believe the gifts of the Holy Ghost are given in the rite. I want to ask whether the Orthodox are dissatisfied with the Anglican manner of administering Confirmation by the laying on of hands. I noticed in the paper that was read an appeal was made to Acts 8. In that passage the laying on of hands is mentioned and not anointing with oil, and further there was at least some interval between the Samaritans being baptized and the Samaritans receiving Confirmation. What then is the attitude of the Orthodox towards Anglican practice?”

FATHER RUIZHTSKY asked that further points which he wished to make should be added to the proceedings of the conference without being read. This was agreed.

He went on to say that even if the Orthodox Church wanted to alter its practice, namely to separate Chrism from Baptism, it could not do so. In the Church of England children could not communicate before the age of Confirmation, whereas Christ said of children ‘Of such is the kingdom of heaven.’ Further in the New Testament one read of the Baptism of people ‘and all their house.’ From his own experience he said that there was never so deep an experience of the Eucharist as in childhood. Ancient practice had both Baptism and Chrism together, and he could not consider that Anglican practice was based on sufficient grounds.

BISHOP MICHAEL said that the Orthodox Church had in mind the provision of the fullness of the holy gifts for children. But as regards the practice of Confirmation, the sufficient reply to the Archbishop of York was that the Orthodox Church had established the practice of taking Roman Catholics who came into the Orthodox Church, after their rejection of the errors of Roman Catholicism, without requiring Chrism. Consequently Confirmation was taken to be already in existence in such a case.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: “That answer pleases us very much. Now I should like to ask a question about the Eucharist. It is rather difficult for us to understand what is the similarity and the difference between the Orthodox and Roman Catholic teaching. Perhaps this would help to clarify it. In what way, if any, are the Orthodox dissatisfied with the teaching of S. Thomas Aquinas on Transubstantiation?”

MR. YASTREBOV said that Roman Catholic teaching in regard to the Sacrament of the Eucharist was in harmony with Orthodox teaching. The Orthodox objected to their ritual practices such as the use of unleavened bread. Also in their rite they omitted the prayer for the Holy Spirit.

FATHER RUIZHTSKY referred to Article XXVIII giving reasons for rejecting Transubstantiation. The teaching of the Church of England does not conform to the teaching of the Orthodox Church in the matter of the Eucharist. Nothing was required on the subject of the real presence.

THE REVD. F. J. TAYLOR: “I should like to answer Father Ruzhtsky by reminding him that in the Catechism of the Book of Common Prayer which is widely used for the instruction of the young, especially for Confirmation, this question and answer is included. ‘Q. What is the inward part, or thing signified? A. The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.’ In addition in the Liturgy itself there comes the prayer: ‘Grant us so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body and our souls washed through his most precious blood.’ The priest in administering the Sacrament uses the words: ‘The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee,’ and also ‘The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee.’”
FATHER RUZHITSKY asked why then was the text of Article XXVIII not altered?

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: "Spiritual does not mean unreal. It means that we receive the Body and Blood of Christ as Christ is ascended and glorified, not as Christ was in the days of His flesh when He stood with the Jews at Capernaum."

FATHER NECHAYEV said that the Archbishop of York had asked about their attitude towards S. Thomas Aquinas. He would like to correct a wrong impression, as Mr. Yastrebov had not fully understood the question. They recognized that the Body and Blood of Christ were present on the altars of the Roman Catholic Church but they did not accept S. Thomas Aquinas at all. His division of things into categories was artificial and these categories brought into the understanding of the Eucharist something unknown to the Fathers. They accepted the point of view of S. John Damascene. As regards the manner in which the holy gifts were sanctified, how it was performed, their theological minds could not give a specific formulation. They accepted the teaching as given in the Liturgy and based on the New Testament and the Fathers to the effect that one received the true Body and Blood of the Lord which is the source of life and communion between God and man.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: "I am very grateful for that statement. It is a statement which an Anglican theologian might have made. The matter is so important that we need to be very clear indeed. In the ancient Fathers there is no one particular philosophical interpretation given concerning the real presence. It is the same in the Church of England and I am glad to hear that it is the same in the holy Orthodox Church. But the word 'transubstantiation' is one that gives trouble. The word 'transubstantiation' is used in Father Ruzhitsky's paper, indeed it is sometimes used in English translation of Russian writers. If the term means the reality of the real presence then we can accept it. Perhaps if we had only Eastern theology to consider we might accept it, but in the West the term 'transubstantiation' has come to be connected with one particular scholastic philosophy. It is this that the Anglican Articles repudiate, and it is this that the Church of England cannot accept. So if you would avoid the word and find other words to express your faith in the real presence, you will be making your meaning clear to Anglicans and avoiding misunderstanding. It is so important that neither of us should confuse belief in the real presence with a particular philosophical explanation of it."

PROFESSOR OSTROV said that the Russian Orthodox Church in its dogmatic theology always and everywhere gave preference to the Greek term metousiosis rather than to the Latin.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: "When you translate the Greek word into English always avoid the Latin term which is misleading."

FATHER NECHAYEV referred to the two terms 'transubstantiation' and 'presence.' There were long arguments in the Middle Ages and besides the use of the Thomistic term the Lutherans had taught consubstantiation, that Christ was present in, with and under the elements. The Russians did not speak of the matter in this way but used a Russian word which could be translated 'change.' Thus they taught the communion of the true Body and true Blood.

BISHOP MICHAEL then presented to the conference the résumé of the previous day's session. This was agreed.

The session was adjourned with a hymn and the blessing at 9 p.m.

Monday, 23rd July, 1956

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK took the chair at 10 a.m. and said: "It is alas the last day of the conference and it is going to be a very busy day. It is necessary to finish in time to let the secretaries do a great deal of hard work. In consultation with Bishop Michael I suggest this way of spending our time. We will first spend half an hour continuing the discussion on the Sacraments from yesterday. Then from 10.30 a.m. until
we will discuss the papers on *Customs and Rites and Ceremonies*. At 12 we will have a very short interval for drinks. Then till 1 p.m. we will discuss the communiqué to the Press and the résumés of the conference.”

This was agreed.

“Now,” the Archbishop continued, “concerning the Sacraments Mr. Taylor has some things to say from the Anglican point of view.”

Professor Uspensky suggested that speakers should immediately make contact with the secretaries for the correction of their speeches so that the record of the conference could be completed in time for the Anglican delegation to be given copies.

The Archbishop of York: “I am very grateful for that suggestion. The secretaries have served us wonderfully by hard work. I am specially grateful for what Professor Uspensky has suggested.”

The Revd. F. J. Taylor: “I think it important that the Orthodox should understand that Anglican teaching makes a clear distinction between Baptism and Holy Communion on the one hand and all other sacramental rites. In Article XXV and in the Catechism, widely used for teaching the faithful, especially the young, these two rites alone are called Sacraments in the strict sense. There are at least three reasons on which this distinction is based:

1. The desire of the Church of England to be faithful to the most primitive tradition of all which is contained in Scripture. In Scripture it is these two rites alone which are explicitly ordered by our Saviour Christ. The elements of water and of bread and wine are used because He so directed them to be used and added His promise of grace to the right use of these elements. Therefore they are called Sacraments of the Gospel.

2. These two Sacraments alone are generally necessary for salvation as the Catechism states. This phrase does not mean as a general rule though there are exceptions, but necessary for the salvation of everybody at all times. Other rites are for special purposes.

3. The number of the Sacraments has never been fixed authoritatively either by primitive tradition or by decision of an Ecumenical Council. The number has been differently reckoned in the Church at different times. It was not authoritatively defined in the Roman Church until the sixteenth century or in the Orthodox Church until the seventeenth century. In these circumstances it seems more in keeping with primitive tradition to give that pre-eminence to the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist which Scripture clearly gives to them. This is done by limiting the word Sacrament in its strict sense to these two rites. This teaching is both authoritative as based on the definitions quoted and widely received in the Church of England.

“So far as the other rites are concerned, commonly called Sacraments, to quote Article XXV, it should be said:

1. Their outward and visible signs were not ordained by Christ Himself. Even if these visible signs can be traced back to the Apostles, the authority of the Apostles is not so great as that of our Saviour Christ.

2. Most Anglicans would agree to call these rites sacramental rites through which an inward and spiritual grace is given. These rites are needed in certain circumstances for certain purposes, e.g., ordination or marriage.

3. The phrase in Article XXV which suggests that some of these five rites have grown from the ‘corrupt following of the Apostles’ is an unfortunate one and may be misleading. What it means is that in the sixteenth century the Church of England was faced with grave corruptions in the use of these rites and had to undertake a serious work of reformation. The use of penance at that time was teaching people to regard sin lightly as easily forgiven; in Confirmation the apostolic practice of laying on of hands of which the New Testament gives evidence had been exchanged for anointing with Chrim, for which there is no certain evidence in this primitive tradition: in the rite of Ordination, an unbalanced
emphasis on the function of the priest to offer the sacrifice of the Mass had displaced his function as minister of the Word of God and pastor to the people. Article XXV bears witness to the effort of the Church of England to recover the decent and godly order of the Fathers in these as in other matters."

The Bishop of Oxford: "I should like to make a general point which may help to explain some aspects of our teaching about the Sacraments. The writings of the Fathers of the first eight centuries have always been much studied in England, especially at Oxford and Cambridge. Most English scholars would hold that in the first eight centuries a great deal of development of thought and practice took place in the Church. For instance different Liturgies developed in different parts of the Church. There was a greater variety of liturgical forms in the first four centuries than there was later on. Again, the language used by the earlier Fathers in describing the consecration of the Eucharist is less precise than that used by the later Fathers. The earlier Fathers do not say explicitly that a change takes place. S. Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century is the first to assert that the bread and wine are changed, and even the later Fathers use a number of different words to describe the change, metaballein, metapoein, metastoicheion. Another instance of development is the doctrine and practice of Penance. In the early days Christians did penance only for very grave sins. The penance was public and people were excluded from Communion for a long time while they were doing penance. Penance was regarded as a remedy or a penalty for grave sins. For the smaller sins there was no penance at all. Later on the system of private confession and private penance came in.

"I mention these instances to illustrate some of the results of our study of the Fathers. We find in them a greater variety of teaching and practice than perhaps the scholars of the Orthodox Church would find. We do not necessarily think that all the later developments are wrong or bad. But the general point I have tried to make may help to explain to our Orthodox friends why on the one hand we respect the authority of the Fathers and why on the other hand our teaching and practice concerning the Sacraments is less precise and strict than that of the Orthodox Church. We claim in these matters a certain amount of liberty as a particular local Church, and we think that liberty of this kind existed in primitive times."

Professor A. A. Osipov, in reply to the Bishop of Oxford, said that he recognized that there were differences of approach in the Fathers. But that was no reason for ignoring them. They treated different aspects of the same problem and where they were definite they ought to be followed.

Father Ruzhitsky said that Father Taylor had only recognized two Sacraments. What was the point of securing recognition of the consecration of Archbishop Parker if the Sacrament of Orders did not exist? The Orthodox cannot recognize the other five Sacraments as being on a lower plane, only described as sacramental rites.

Father Nechayev said that he would like to consider the view of Father Taylor a personal one. There was already a large literature on the subject and there did not seem much point in prolonging the discussion now.

The Archbishop of York: "The discussion is about the definition given in two different languages and in two ecclesiastical situations about great mysteries. The Article in question is using the word Sacrament in the sense of a rite with its sign and meaning both appointed by Christ Himself as necessary to salvation. Baptism and the Eucharist fulfil this definition. The English theology of the time was not familiar with the Greek word mustlerion and its significance. The Orthodox Church, on the other hand, uses the word mustlerion of rites in which grace is conveyed to the believer in the life of the Church. In the Church of England the same seven musteria exist and are used: Baptism is administered, Confirmation is administered with the gifts of the Holy Ghost, there are the Holy Orders of Bishop, Priest and
Deacon, there is absolution of sinners, there is marriage with
the blessing of Holy Church, there is the anointing of the
sick. These exist and are used and revered. But the use
of the word 'Sacrament' in the Article is conditioned by the
necessity of emphasizing the two Sacraments which are
dominical. On the question of Holy Orders the conference
of both English and Orthodox theologians in London in 1931
discussed the matter, and the Orthodox said that they were
satisfied that the Church of England believed Holy Orders to
be a musterion. I hope that this will clarify the matter a
little.

"In the last stage we have a paper on Anglican formularies
and I will then make some comments on it about these same
questions."

Professor Ivanov said that the statements made by the
Anglicans seemed a step backwards and quoted from the
report of the 1931 Conference and that of 1935 at Bucharest.

The Revd. F. J. Taylor: "May I say that my statement
was based on the statement of 1931?"

The Archbishop of York to Professor Ivanov: "We all
agree with what you are reading."

Professor Ivanov said that he wanted to emphasize that
these conferences recognized all these Sacraments to be
Sacraments and not merely rites and that in all these grace
was given and not merely blessing.

The Revd. F. J. Taylor: "I agree with what Professor
Ivanov says. My statement was an attempt to explain why
the Church of England makes a distinction between the two
and the five. I was not making a backward step from those
erlier statements."

The Archbishop of York: "This has been a valuable
discussion. I think we should go on to the papers on Rites in
the Orthodox Church and Customs. We will take the
Orthodox paper first."

Docent Georgievsky said that he did not intend to read
his paper. He wished to make some points however. From
the Orthodox point of view the manner of service and the
rites were not to be considered as simply external affairs but
as founded on the Holy Scriptures. Some of them certainly
can be considered as changeable though the unity in faith
and doctrine remains unchangeable.

The Revd. F. J. Taylor: "It is well known that there is
a great difference between our two Churches in ways of cele-
brating Sacraments and other holy rites and in devotional
practices and customs. It is these things which most affect
the ordinary worshipper who holds very tenaciously to what
he has always been accustomed to do and see and dislikes
changes or strange and unfamiliar customs.

"Until I came to Russia a few days ago I had never lived
in an Orthodox country or come face to face with the Ortho-
dox in this way. I may therefore easily misunderstand or
misinterpret Orthodox customs and usages. I ask pardon
now if this should happen as I should in no way wish to give
offence or wound the feelings of the faithful.

"There is a distinction between customs and usages based
on an œcumenical canon and so binding on the whole Church,
and local usages which every Church is free to accept or
reject so long as they do not conflict with œcumenical practice.
Differences in consecrating the Eucharist were tolerated in
the undivided Church: so differences of lesser importance
which have grown up since our divisions cannot in themselves
be regarded as obstacles to the restoration of Communion.

"The difference of our history and the isolation of our two
Churches from each other for so long makes differences of
custom inevitable and considerable in number. These differ-
ences have a great deal of justification. It is right for you to
be Russian Christians and for us to be English Christians, each
of us expressing our faith in ways that show that it is no mere
foreign importation. Different customs may hold us apart in
practice through lack of understanding and mutual sympathy
when there is no adequate theological or canonical reason for
our separation. To find understanding at this level demands
time, sympathetic understanding of unfamiliar customs and
great patience."
"Let me name three Orthodox customs which cause difficulties for many Anglicans. I shall try to do this in charity, but it would not be fair to conceal from the Orthodox that these customs give rise to serious theological scruples in the minds of many Anglicans. These customs are (i) the use of ikons, (ii) invocation of the Saints, (iii) the cultus of the Blessed Virgin. These customs were deliberately discarded by the Church of England in the Reformation epoch because in their Western form at that time they seemed to be corrupting the faith of the Church.

"We think it necessary to distinguish between the sign—Bible, Sacrament or Ikon—and the divine life it signifies. So S. John of Damascus speaks of the Ikon as a channel of divine grace. All religious objects and sacramental means or channels are subordinate to Christ Himself: they must witness to His sovereignty and not usurp His unique place. The many warnings against idolatry from the beginning to the end of the Bible must be kept in mind.

"The invocation of Saints is a custom which does not appear to have the authority of Holy Scripture. If prayers are addressed to Saints for their direct help, this seems to conflict with the unique function of our Saviour Christ, as the only mediator between God and man. Invocations which seek the prayers of the departed on our behalf in the same way as we ask the prayers of the faithful who are living members of the Church, are in a different category.

"The emphasis of the cultus of the Blessed Virgin is a different emphasis from the Biblical and primitive tradition. It is possible to trace its growth in subsequent centuries. The Church of England desires to be true to the primitive tradition and to maintain that reserve with which Scripture itself, as the Apostolic tradition, speaks of the Blessed Virgin. To ascribe unlimited glory and unlimited devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary is to use language which should only be used of the Incarnate Son of God, and seems to blur the distinction between the divine redeemer and a created being, even when we may give to her the title Theotokos.

"I do not believe these difficulties are insuperable. Anglicans would wish to be assured that these Orthodox customs do not lead to superstition and idolatry: or detract from the apostolic confession that salvation is in the name of Christ alone.

"I ask pardon if I have in any way unintentionally wounded the feelings of our Orthodox brothers."

DOCENT GEORGEVIKS said that the lack of personal acquaintance of Mr. Taylor with the Orthodox Church undoubtedly explained some points in his paper. It was absurd to suppose that the Orthodox offered idolatrous worship to ikons: moreover their attitude to the Blessed Virgin was based on the conviction that to omit it would take away from the special honour due only to her Son. Referring to various Biblical texts, he pointed out the necessity of invoking the prayers of the Saints, and said that Scripture gave ample evidence to show that the prayers of the Saints would have special power with God. This is based on their conviction of the mercy of God although He knows all our wants before we ask.

PROFESSOR OSEPOV referred to honour paid to the relics of saints and quoted 2 Kings 13 when the bones of Elisha brought a dead man to life again.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK: "I want to say something about the Saints. In the Church of England from the time of the Reformation there has been a great fear of two things. One of these things was a doctrine of purgatory both scholastic and materialistic in form. The other fear has been of a devotion to Holy Mary of a kind so exaggerated that it has seemed to supersede the place of the Son of God. Much Roman Catholic teaching has had this appearance and has seemed to lack the supreme glory of Christ which the Orthodox believe in. In consequence of these two fears there came about in England a great neglect of the Communion of Saints. Prayers on behalf of the departed were banished from the public services. But there has been in England a progressive recovery of concern for the Communion of Saints. For example, in all modern revisions of the Liturgy explicit
prayers on behalf of the departed have been included. Another instance is that in every modern revision of the Church Calendar more Saints have been added and provision made for the keeping of their feasts. To-day there are many Anglicans who are ready to pray on behalf of the departed and to glorify Holy Mary and the Saints so long as it is clear that Christ is the one mediator. The face of Christ in the transfiguration shone as the sun. The Saints shine not as the sun but with the reflected glory of Christ. We in England much prefer the Orthodox attitude to the Saints to the Roman Catholic attitude. It seems to us that you glorify the Saints as members of the one Christian family in heaven and on earth. The family is one: it is filled with the glory of Christ and in this belief we give glory to the Saints. It is in this way that we can come together. We can learn from you more about the one family of the living and departed Saints in Christ. You will patiently learn from us of our care for the unique glory of Christ who shines as the sun.

Docent Sarychev said that the statement of the Archbishop explained much of what had been said about Church of England teaching. He criticized certain aspects of the paper of the Revd. F. J. Taylor especially in regard to the honour due to the Theotokos. The faith of a Christian was incomplete without due place being given to the Holy Mother.

Bishop Michael: “The tendencies appearing in the Church of England more recently as described by the Archbishop of York give considerable gratification. The very fact of the rise of these tendencies reduce in considerable measure the sharpness of those charges of suspicion and doubt which Anglicans have expressed about the Orthodox.

“In the measure of the development of these tendencies there can be achieved a true understanding of the teaching of the holy Fathers in its completeness, an authentic understanding and not a partial understanding which is in part tendentious. There seemed to him to be a parallel in what is happening in this matter with what has happened with regard to the attitude to the Textus Receptus.

“

“The question of devotion to icons and Saints was given very clear and definite evidence of the understanding of the attitude of the Orthodox on the part of the Anglicans in that our honoured guests, headed by the Archbishop of York, not infrequently gave witness, certainly not for diplomatic reasons but from inner conviction, to their true reverence to the Saints in the broad sense by bowing to the relics of S. Sergius, placing their foreheads on the holy relics and also the relics of S. Alexius as well as to many deeply revered icons in churches.”

The Archbishop of York: “I am sorry that the beautiful speech which we have just heard must be the end of the theological part of our conference. After our brief refreshment we shall have to give the rest of the time this morning to technical matters. Unfortunately there is still one theological paper which we have not had time to discuss. This is the paper of Professor Ivanov, Problems arising out of the Anglican Formulations. In his paper he deals with questions concerning the Thirty-Nine Articles. I wish to pay a tribute to the learning and understanding shown in his paper. Of course his paper will have a place in the full record of the conference. I wish to ask that I may be allowed to write a very brief comment on one or two points which could also be included in the record of the conference.”

This was agreed.

On resuming after an interval the résumé for Saturday was adopted.

It was agreed that the résumé of the morning’s discussions should be agreed between the secretaries with the approval of the heads of the delegations.

As regards the general communiqué it was agreed that the Russian and English texts need not be identical so long as there was no difference of importance and that each should be approved by the head of the other delegation.

The Archbishop of York expressed the thanks of the conference to the secretaries and to the interpreters.

The Bishop of Derby: “I want to express our gratitude
to the two chairmen. The Archbishop of York, with his mellow wisdom, has given us great leadership. If wisdom matures with age the Archbishop should, by the time he is as old as I am, be a very wise man. For already he is wiser than I was at his age and wiser than I am now.

“We are very fortunate in the fact that the Metropolitan Nikolai left as his representative Bishop Michael of Smolensk. The Anglicans have learned to love him and to appreciate his friendship very much. The diocese of Smolensk and the diocese of Derby hope one day to be in intercommunion, not of course before that proceeding is approved by the Patriarch of Moscow and the Archbishop of Canterbury. It would be wrong to make a long speech, but this short speech is the expression of our heartfelt gratitude to the Bishops, our chairmen.”

Prayer was then sung by the Orthodox and said by the Archbishop of York followed by the blessing from both chairmen. The conference finally adjourned at 1 p.m.