

Dokumente

a) Orthodox-Anglikanischer Dialog

1. The Dublin Agreed Statement

Method and Approach

1 In our discussions since the adoption of the Moscow Agreed Statement, and especially during the last four years, our Joint Commission has endeavoured to keep constantly in mind the essential link that exists between theology and sanctification through prayer, between doctrine and the daily life of the Christian community. Keenly aware how dangerous it is to discuss the Christian faith in an abstract manner, we have sought always to understand how theological principles are expressed in the living experience of the people of God.

I THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH

Approaches to the Mystery

2 We live in a deeply divided world. We are aware that Christian disunity, as well as being contrary to the will of God and a sin against the very nature of the Church, has often contributed towards the divisions of the world. We know that the Church is entrusted with a message of reconciliation. This drives us to seek unity amongst ourselves, in order to contribute to the healing of the divisions of humankind, as well as to stand together as Christians who face difficulties and pressures, and who witness to Christ's truth in a hostile or indifferent world. We know the temptation for Christian communities to avoid this challenge. But Christ has poured out his Spirit on his people, to transform them ›into his likeness from one degree of glory to another‹ (2 Cor. 3.18), and to incorporate them in his mission of love and reconciliation to the world (2 Cor. 5.18; John 20.21).

3 The mystery of the Church cannot be defined or fully described. But the steadfast joy of people who discover new life and salvation in Christ through the Church reminds us that the Church itself is a lived experience. The Church is sent into the world as a sign, instrument and first-fruits of the Kingdom of God. The New Testament speaks about it primarily in images, such as the following:

4 (a) The Church is ›the body of Christ‹ (1 Cor. 12.27). The head is Christ (Eph. 1.22; Col. 1.18), and his members are those who in faith respond to the gospel (Rom. 10.17), are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (Matt. 28.19), and are united with Christ and with each other through participation in the Eucharist (1 Cor. 10.16–17). Through this union they are being conformed to his true humanity, filled with

his divinity, and made ›partakers of the divine nature‹ (2 Pet. 1.4) (θεῶσις). In its totality the Church incorporates both living and departed in the communion of the saints.

5 (b) The Church is the messianic gathering, the gathering in Christ of all nations into the people of God (Matt. 8.11; Gal. 3.8), and, as the new Israel, completes the special sign of God's grace given in the election of the ancient people of Israel as God's chosen and beloved (Gal. 3.8; Rev. 21.2–3).

6 (c) The Church is the holy temple of God, indwelt by his Spirit (1 Cor. 3.16; Eph. 2.22). It is a spiritual house, a royal priesthood appointed to declare to the world the wonderful deeds of him who called them out of darkness into light (1 Pet. 2.5–9).

7 (d) The New Testament also speaks of the Church as Christ's bride, whom he presents to himself ›without spot or wrinkle or any such thing‹ (Eph. 5.27; cf. 2 Cor. 11.2). In this connection Scripture looks forward to the consummation of history as ›the marriage of the Lamb‹, when the bride will be prepared to meet her bridegroom in glory (Rev. 19.6–8).

The Marks of the Church

8 In the Creed we proclaim the Church to be one, holy, catholic and apostolic.

(a) The Church is one, because there is a ›one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all‹ (Eph. 4.5), and it participates in the life of the Holy Trinity, one God in three persons. The unity of the Church is expressed in common faith and in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit; it takes concrete and visible form as the Church, gathered round the bishop in the common celebration of the Holy Eucharist, proclaims Christ's death till he comes (1 Cor. 11.26). The unity of Christians with Christ in baptism is a unity of love and mutual respect which transcends all human division, of race, social status and sex (Gal. 3.28). This unity in Christ is God's gift to the world by which men and women may learn to live in unity with one another, accepting one another as Christ has accepted them.

9 Nevertheless, we find ourselves in an abnormal situation. We are a disrupted Christian people seeking to restore our unity. Our divisions do not destroy but they damage the basic unity we have in Christ, and our disunity impedes our mission to the world as well as our relationships with each other. Anglicans are accustomed to seeing our divisions as within the Church: they do not believe that they alone are the one true Church, but they believe that they belong to it. Orthodox, however, believe that the Orthodox Church is the one true Church of Christ, which as his Body is not and cannot be divided. But at the same time they see Anglicans as brothers and sisters in Christ who are seeking with them the union of all Christians in the one Church.

10 (b) The Church is holy (1 Cor. 3.17) because its members are in Christ, the head, who is holy and who lives in them (Eph. 3.17). The Church's holiness can be obscured but cannot be destroyed by the sins of its members. Christ's holiness is shown, not in drawing apart from outcasts and sinners but in calling them (Mark 2.15–17), and most fully in his becoming sin for us in order to deliver us from sin (2 Cor. 5.21). For through

his life, death and resurrection he overcomes, redeems and sanctifies the world, and by his justifying grace transforms forgiven sinners into ›a holy people‹ (1 Pet. 2.9). The Church's holiness springs from the action of God's Holy Spirit whom Christ sends to purify his people, to draw them into the reality of his risen life, and to conform them to his compassion and love for the world.

11 The pursuit of holiness challenges the world and may bring Christians into conflict with it, as they carry on Christ's spiritual warfare with the powers of evil. In this they are following the saints of the Church who have shared in Christ's rejection and sufferings (Col. 1.24), ›in honour and dishonour, in ill repute and good repute‹ (2 Cor. 6.8).

12 (c) The Church is catholic because by word and life it maintains and bears witness to the fullness of the faith, and because people of all nations and conditions are called to participate in it. Catholicity stands in contrast to schism and heresy. If Christians cease to love each other or to respect church order they are in danger of schism. If they depart from the essentials of the apostolic faith they become guilty of heresy. The catholicity of the Church is shown in the multiplicity of particular local churches, each of which, being in eucharistic communion with all the other local churches, manifests in its own place and time the one catholic Church. These local churches, in faithful response to their own particular missionary situation, have developed a wide diversity in their life. As long as their witness to the one faith remains unimpaired, such diversity is to be seen, not as a deficiency or cause for division, but as a mark of the fullness of the one Spirit who distributes to each according to his will (1 Cor. 12.11).

13 At each local Eucharist, celebrated within the catholic Church, Christ is present in his wholeness, and so each local celebration actualizes and gives visible expression to the Church's catholicity.¹ Communion in the Eucharist is also the outward manifestation of the common faith and the Christian love which binds together all the local churches in the one catholic Church. Their communion is likewise expressed in the constant contact and communication between the bishop and members of different local churches through meetings in council, exchange of letters, mutual visits, and prayer for each other.

14 (d) The Church is apostolic because it is built on the foundation of the apostles (Eph. 2.20; Rev. 21.14) who are the primary and authoritative witnesses to the crucified and risen Lord. Their authority lies in the fact that they were sent by Jesus Christ, who was himself sent by the Father (Matt. 28.19–20; John 20.21). Christ gave them the Holy Spirit, who maintains the apostolic word as a living force within the Church, evoking faith and discipleship. The Church's apostolicity is manifested chiefly in three ways:

15 (i) The Church maintains the apostolic tradition by its preaching and teaching and by a constantly renewed understanding and living of Scripture. By critical discernment it rejects inauthentic ways of thought and life.²

¹ See the Moscow Agreed Statement Section VI, ›The Church as the Eucharistic Community‹.

² See the Moscow Agreed Statement Section III, ›Scripture and Tradition‹.

16 (ii) The Church in each generation participates in the apostolic mission to the world. The Church is ›not of the world‹ (John 17.14), but it is in, with and for human society. Its mission is to save and transform society by the power of the Holy Spirit. This mission includes preaching, teaching, worship, diakonia, testimony against injustice; also the hidden life of prayer, and martyrdom.

17 (iii) The apostolicity of the Church is manifested in a particular way through the succession of bishops. This succession is a sign of the unbroken continuity of apostolic tradition and life. Through prayer and the laying on of hands, the bishop receives the Holy Spirit, who bestows on him a *charisma* giving him the grace and responsibility to uphold and testify to the authority of the apostolic word (2 Tim. 1.6). The local bishop can only perform his ministry: (1) in unity with his brother bishops, especially when meeting synodically; (2) in unity with his flock, both clergy and laity. In exercising the ministry of oversight he should pay heed to the prophetic and other gifts which Christ gives his people (Rom. 12.6–8; Eph. 4.11–12).

Communion and Intercommunion

18 (a) The several Provinces of the Anglican Communion have their own synodical regulations governing eucharistic hospitality and relationships of reciprocal intercommunion and Full Communion with other churches. There are some instances where the pastoral concern for individuals is uppermost. There are others where there have been specific joint Declarations of Intent to work together locally or nationally to seek unity (such as that between members of Local Ecumenical Projects in England or between Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists in South Africa). There are still others where unity of faith, ministry and sacraments is accompanied by growth in conciliarity and common mission. From all of these it is clear that there has been a considerable development in ecumenical and inter-church relations in recent years, which has resulted in Anglicans sharing in the Eucharist with members of other churches on special ecumenical occasions, in times of special need, or on a more regular basis.

19 Anglicans have come to recognize different stages in which churches stand in a progressively closer relationship to each other, with a corresponding and consequent degree of eucharistic sharing which is viewed as both ›a proper manifestation of such unity in Christ as they already share‹ and as ›creative of even greater unity‹.³ However, ›for a Church officially to authorise Intercommunion (whether »Reciprocal« or »Limited«) as a *means* to unity, or for an individual to practise it, where there is already some agreement in faith and commitment to unity, is not to deny that a more complete expression, such as Full Communion or Organic Union, is also a goal to be sought‹.⁴

20 (b) For the Orthodox, ›communion‹ involves a mystical and sanctifying unity created by the Body and Blood of Christ, which makes them ›one body and one blood

³ Intercommunion: A Scottish Episcopalian Approach (1969), p. 10.

⁴ The Anglican Consultative Council (=ACC) Study paper on ›Full Communion‹ (1981), p. 7.

(σύσσωμοι καὶ σύννομοι) with Christ,⁵ and therefore they can have no differences of faith. There can be ›communion‹ only between local churches which have a unity of faith, ministry, and sacraments. For this reason the concept of ›Intercommunion‹ has no place in Orthodox ecclesiology.

Wider Leadership within the Church

21 (a) Throughout the history of the Church, from the New Testament onwards, there can be seen varying patterns of wider leadership. Anglicans often refer to these as levels of ›primacy‹, whereas Orthodox generally prefer to speak about an order of ›seniority‹ (πρεσβεῖα). Despite differences in the outward forms in which this wider leadership is expressed, there is fundamental agreement between the way in which Anglicans understand ›primacy‹ and the way in which Orthodox understand ›seniority‹.

22 (b) In the New Testament there are certain persons within the Church who are vested with special authority, such as Peter, Paul, James and John, but none of these acts in isolation. The entire New Testament points to the independence or autonomy of local churches, which live together in unity, yet with no single church possessing permanent pre-eminence. Following the adoption of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire, an order of seniority became established, involving five great sees in the following sequence: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem (see the canons of the Ecumenical Councils, especially Canon 2 of Constantinople [381] and Canon 28 of Chalcedon [451]). Both the apostolic foundation of sees and the civil status of cities as centres of communication influenced the development of this order of seniority.

23 (c) This wider leadership, whether described as ›seniority‹ or ›primacy‹, is to be understood in terms not of coercion but of pastoral service. Jesus warned his apostles, both by word and by example, to exercise their authority not by lording it over the flock but by being servants of all (Mark 10.42–45; John 13.12–17); and the same warning was repeated to those who succeeded the apostles in the oversight of the Church (1 Pet. 5.1–4). Since in practice this teaching has often been forgotten, it is good that the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission has called attention to it, noting that ›truly to lead is to serve and not to dominate others‹, and that the bishop has his authority in order to serve his flock as its shepherd.⁶ This is to be kept in mind whenever the word ›honour‹ is applied to a bishop, as in the phrase ›seniority of honour‹ (πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς).

24 (d) Wider leadership exists at various levels:

(i) There is first the seniority of the bishop who presides over a group of diocesan bishops. Such seniority is held in modern Orthodox practice by the patriarch within each patriarchate, or by the presiding archbishop or metropolitan within each autocephalous or

⁵ PG 33, 1100 A 7, or PG 96, 1409 D 8, 9.

⁶ Authority in the Church II, 5 and 17, in: The Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (= ARCIC), pp. 83 and 89.

autonomous Church; in Anglican practice, by the archbishop or presiding bishop within each province of the Anglican Communion.

(ii) Secondly, there exist various different forms of seniority on the universal level, such as that of the Pope within the Roman Catholic Church (and throughout the whole Christian Church prior to the schism); that of the Ecumenical Patriarch within the Orthodox Church; and that of the Archbishop of Canterbury within the worldwide Anglican Communion.

25 (e) It is the purpose of wider leadership to strengthen unity and to give brotherly help to the bishops of the local churches in the exercise of their common ministry which exists to safeguard scriptural truth whenever it is threatened, to promote right teaching and living, and to further the Church's mission to the world. This the bishop who has seniority does chiefly in two ways:

(i) He encourages Christian fellowship and collaboration by initiating procedures which will lead to the summoning of a council or synod, and presiding over it.

(ii) In certain situations, when appeals are made to him from the decisions of a diocesan bishop or a group of bishops, he initiates procedures whereby these decisions may be reviewed.

But the bishop who has seniority does not have the right to intervene arbitrarily in the affairs of a diocese other than his own.⁷

26 (f) In exercising his ministry the bishop who has seniority should respect the proper authority and freedom of each diocese or local church. He should always act in collegiality with his brother bishops; equally he should take account of the gifts of understanding and discernment entrusted to the whole people of God, clergy and laity together.

27 (g) The Ecumenical Councils ascribe a position of special seniority, within the wider leadership of the universal Church, not only to the See of Rome but also to that of Constantinople; and this fact needs to be taken into account in any Christian reunion.⁸ The ecumenical Patriarch does not, however, claim universal jurisdiction over the other Churches, such as is ascribed to the Pope by the First and also the Second Vatican Council; and Orthodox see any such claim as contrary to the meaning of seniority, as this was understood in the early centuries of the Church.

28 The Anglican Churches of the British Isles, since their separation from the See of Rome, have developed into an international communion; and within this communion a position of seniority has come to be ascribed to the ancient See of Canterbury. But this seniority is understood as a ministry of service and support to the other Anglican Churches, not as a form of domination over them; and, like the Ecumenical Patriarch, the Archbishop of Canterbury makes no claim to a primacy of universal jurisdiction. Thus, even though the seniority ascribed to the Archbishop of Canterbury is not identical with that given to the Ecumenical Patriarch, the Anglican Communion has developed on the

⁷ The statement in *Authority in the Church II*, 20 (ibid. p. 90) requires further elucidation.

⁸ In this connection we would wish to qualify what is said in the ARCIC report *Authority in the Church I*, 23 (ibid. p. 64).

Orthodox rather than the Roman Catholic pattern, as a fellowship of self-governing national or regional Churches.

29 (h) According to Roman Catholic teaching the primacy of the Pope is closely linked to his infallibility. Both Orthodox and Anglicans consider that infallibility is not the property of any particular person within the Church.⁹ It is significant that the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission has stated clearly: ›This is a term applicable unconditionally only to God, and ... to use it of a human being, even in highly restricted circumstances, can produce many misunderstandings‹.¹⁰

30 Anglicans and Orthodox are both firmly convinced that the Holy Spirit will guide the Church into all truth and ›the powers of death shall not prevail against it‹ (Matt. 16.18). We believe that all bishops are empowered by the Holy Spirit to bear witness to the truth; but if the doctrine of infallibility means that it is possible to guarantee by external criteria that certain statements of a particular bishop are safeguarded from error, we cannot accept this. Equally no such guarantee can be given concerning the statements of an episcopal assembly, since the ecumenicity of a council is manifested through its acceptance by the body of the Church.

Witness, Evangelism and Service

31 God bears witness to himself by his revelation in creation (Rom. 1.19–20; Acts 14.17), through the patriarchs and prophets and finally through his Son Jesus Christ (Heb. 1.1–2), who is ›the faithful and true witness‹ (Rev. 3.14). Christ is also the true Servant, who turned upside down our ideas of leadership by becoming ›the servant of all‹¹¹ and by serving mankind in his obedient and sacrificial ministry, suffering and death. God's revelation of himself in Christ necessarily involved conflict with evil, which brought him to the cross. So God's highest service to mankind — the bringing of salvation in Christ — is at the same time his profoundest witness to himself in and through Christ's sacrifice on the cross. Christ is witness (μάρτυς) as well as teacher, healer and saviour. The primary movement of witness and service is therefore from God to the world, and it includes his affirmation of the sanctity of life, his testimony against all that is evil, and also his call to all mankind to ›repent, and believe in the gospel‹ (Mark 1.15).

32 This movement is continued in the Church, the Body of Christ, when in the power of the Holy Spirit it responds to God's call and offers itself in witness and service to the world. The Church's witness and evangelism call men to hear the good news and to receive the saving grace of Christ. The apostolic Church exists by mission as fire exists by burning. Mission is not merely one of many items of business for the Church or for a department of the Church. The members of the Church are to be judged not least by what they do to reach unbelievers. The evangelizing of one person by another is the responsibility of lay people and clergy alike. The Church's mission also includes its service of

⁹ See the Moscow Agreed Statement IV para. 17–18.

¹⁰ Authority in the Church II, 32 (op. cit. p. 97).

¹¹ *Polycarp*, Letter to the Philippians, 5:2; cf. Mark 10.45.

mankind, which brings the healing, forgiveness, love and compassion of Christ to people in need, people in conflict and people in the grip of sin and evil.

33 Witness, evangelism, service, worship and sacrifice belong together, for these are different sides of the same reality. So testimony in the name of Jesus rightly given is also a service to one's neighbour; ministry rightly performed in the name of Christ constitutes a witness to Jesus. Worship (λειτουργία) involves service of the people (its ancient meaning), when we worship Christ by ministering to him in the sick, the prisoner and the needy (Matt. 25.37–40). Where the Church is not at liberty to organize developed social and philanthropic programmes of its own or to take part in those organized jointly with others, its witness is carried out through worship, prayer and personal ministry. The Church can bear witness not only in word and deed but also in silence. Lives dedicated to service proclaim the gospel. Sacrificial self-giving, suffering and death may result from testimony to the truth of the gospel — or from testimony against injustice, which is also testimony to the truth of God's concern for the poor and the oppressed.

34 Evangelism involves the Church in social action which can be an authentic witness to the gospel and should not be separated from it or contrasted with it. The Church should not engage in a social programme that becomes an end in itself, for ›man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God‹ (Matt. 4.4). The spirit in which Christians act is different from that of humanism or secularism. It is informed by a sense of God's grace, of sin and the need for repentance and by an eschatological perspective. Nevertheless Christians are right to be involved in the life of the world and in the wider struggle for justice, freedom and peace, and for the removal of everything which threatens the sacred gift of life to all mankind.

35 The Church's witness and service minister to people's deepest spiritual, physical and social needs. But in carrying out this mission the Church's stance should be one of continual vigilance, as it lives ›in the world‹, but is ›not of the world‹ (John 17.11–16) and as it seeks to be faithful to Christ the true witness and servant.

II FAITH IN THE TRINITY, PRAYER AND HOLINESS

Participation in the grace of the Holy Trinity

36 Trinitarian doctrine presupposes participation in the grace of the Holy Trinity. The doctrine One God in Trinity is not an abstract philosophical formula. It originates in the personal and corporate experience of the grace of the Triune God which has been and is communicated to us in Jesus Christ. This experience is not to be understood in a merely subjective way. It is rooted in the historic fact of the incarnation and God's revelation of himself in Christ. Doctrine is the attempt to express this revelation in such a way as both to safeguard it from misunderstanding and to enable others to share in it. The formulation of doctrine, which is based on the Scriptures and on a tradition of careful theological reflection, should in no way be seen as an independent intellectual exercise. Ultimately, as St Gregory the Theologian (of Nazianzus) says, ›It is impossible to express God and yet

more impossible to conceive him¹².¹² Thus doctrinal formulae should in no way detract from the mystery of God which is handed down in the Church from the apostles by the Fathers. It is not the doctrine of the Trinity but the One God in Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, that constitutes the object of Christian worship and faith. Although we may sometimes speak separately of God the Father, sometimes of God the Son and sometimes of God the Holy Spirit, it is always understood that there is no division of one person from another, but all and each reveal in unity the grace and glory of the one Godhead.

37 Christians participate in the grace of the Holy Trinity as members of the Christian community. It is the Church which is filled by the Holy Spirit and it is precisely for this reason that every human person has the possibility of becoming a partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1.4). The Holy Spirit praying in us heals and renews us at the centre of our being, that is to say in our hearts. The healing character of the grace of the Holy Trinity in the life of the individual believer and of the Church has important implications for the whole life of contemporary society.

Prayer

38 Christian prayer to God is always offered to the Holy Trinity. It is usually addressed to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit, although it is also addressed to the Son and sometimes to the Holy Spirit. Although prayer is at one level a human activity, at a deeper level it is the activity in us of God the Holy Spirit, who dwells in our hearts by faith. As St Paul says in Romans 8.26–27: ›Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words.‹ So prayer becomes ›... a possibility by the boundless excellence of the grace of God.‹¹³

39 Common to East and West alike is the experience of the Holy Spirit praying in us of which St Paul speaks in Galatians 4.6–7: ›God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying ›Abba! Father!‹. So through God you are no longer a slave but a son, and if a son then an heir.‹ This prayer is described in the Christian tradition in a variety of ways. In Greek patristic writings it is often spoken of as ›prayer of the mind‹ (νοεῖν προσευχή) where ›mind‹ is not understood as ›intellect‹ (in the modern sense) but rather as what St Paul calls ›the heart‹. Very similar descriptions of the same experience of prayer are to be found in early Latin authors like St John Cassian, St Gregory of Tours and St Patrick.¹⁴

¹² Theological Orations II, 4.

¹³ Origen, *PG* 11, 416A.

¹⁴ St John Cassian, *Collations* X, 10.

St Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks* V, 10.

St Patrick, who writes in his ›Confession‹, chapter 25:

›And another time I saw him praying in me and I was as it were within my body and I heard above me, that is above my inner man, and there he was praying earnestly with groans, and while this was going on I was in amazement and I was wondering and I was considering who it could be who was praying in me but at the end of the prayer he spoke to the effect that it was the Spirit, and at that I woke.‹

40 In the Eastern Church one of the traditional forms of this prayer is the ›Jesus Prayer‹. But prayer of the heart can take other forms, which equally lead to the same experience of the glory of Christ seen and declared by the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, fathers and all the saints.

41 Prayer of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the individual Christian is inseparable from the common liturgical prayer of the Christian community. It is particularly related to the grace given in Baptism, Chrismation (Confirmation) and Eucharist and, generally, to the whole sacramental life of the Church and to common prayer and the reading of Scripture. Both common liturgical prayer and personal prayer are informed and shaped by the Church's faith in God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

42 Prayer, both corporate and individual, is an integral part of the life of all Christians. The contemplative and active aspects of Christian life should always be held together, although in the life of each Christian one way or other may predominate at different times, and in the life of some Christians one or the other may predominate throughout their life. For all Christians progress in prayer and obedience involves readiness to take up the cross, and commitment to a disciplined life, whose purpose is their own personal growth in holiness and their more effective witness and service in the Church and in society at large.

Holiness

43 The fruit of the Spirit praying in us is holiness, and at the heart of holiness is love for God and neighbour. God's love works in us to produce holiness, restoring in us the image of God and making us and all things whole. In this life, Christians experience a tension between the call to holiness and the power of sin, the struggle between ›flesh‹ and Spirit (Gal. 5.17) which requires continual repentance and the assurance of God's forgiveness. God's call to holiness is also a call to work for justice, so that the Church's prayer for the coming of God's reign on earth as in heaven requires of Christians that they co-operate with God in the world. God's love for the world, embodied in Jesus Christ, works through the Holy Spirit to transfigure all things into the new creation, and we are to make manifest that love in the life of the world.

The *Filioque*

44 Further discussions on the *Filioque* led to the reaffirmation by both Anglicans and Orthodox of the agreement reached in Moscow in 1976 that this phrase should not be included in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.¹⁵ Certain Anglican Churches have already acted upon this recommendation, whilst others are still considering it.

45 From the theological point of view the Orthodox stated that the doctrine of the *Filioque* is unacceptable, although as expressed by Augustine, it is capable of an Orthodox interpretation. According to the Orthodox understanding the Son cannot be considered a

Translation in R. P. C. Hanson, *The Life and Writings of The Historical Saint Patrick* (New York 1983), p. 94.

¹⁵ Moscow Agreed Statement, Section V 19–21.

cause or co-cause of the existence of the Holy Spirit. In spite of this we find in certain Fathers, for example St Maximus the Confessor (7th cent.),¹⁶ as explained by Anastasius the Librarian (9th cent.),¹⁷ the opinion that the *Filioque*, as used in early Latin theology, can be understood in an Orthodox way. According to this interpretation a distinction should be made between two senses of procession, one by which the Father causes the existence of the Spirit (ἐκπόρευσις) and the other by which the Spirit shines forth from the Father and the Son (ἐκφάνσις). This second sense of procession must be clearly differentiated from the later Western use of the *Filioque* which observed no such distinction but rather confused ›cause of existence‹ with ›communication of essence‹ (ἐκπόρευσις) with (ἐκφάνσις). Some Orthodox theologians, while affirming that the doctrine of the *Filioque* is unacceptable for the Orthodox Church, at the same time, having in mind the position of Professor Bolotov (1854–1900) and his followers, regard the *Filioque* as a ›theologoumenon‹ in the West.¹⁸

46 On the Anglican side it was pointed out that the *Filioque* was not to be regarded as a dogma which would have to be accepted by all Christians. It was emphasized, however, that the following points are important for a correct understanding of its intention:

(a) although the Western tradition has spoken from time to time of the Son as a ›cause‹ (causa) of the Spirit, this language has not met with favour and has fallen into disuse;

(b) the Western tradition has continued to maintain that the Father is the sole ›fount of deity‹ (fons deitatis/πηγή Θεότητος) at the same time as it has associated the Son with the Father as the ›principle‹ (principium) of the Spirit;

(c) the Western tradition, in speaking of the Father and the Son as ›one principle‹, has not meant to imply that the Spirit proceeds from some undifferentiated divine essence (οὐσία), as opposed to the persons (ὑποστάσεις) of the Father and the Son.

The Anglicans on the Commission put on record that they do not wish to defend the use of the term ›cause‹ in this context.¹⁹

¹⁶ *St Maximus the Confessor*, Letter to Marinos, PG 91, 133 D–136 B, PG 90, 672 CD.

¹⁷ *Migne*, PL 129, 560 D–561 A.

¹⁸ See Archpriest Liveriy Voronov, *The Filioque in the Ecumenical Perspective*, in: *The Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* 5 (1982), pp. 66–68; Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Discussions (= AOJDD).313: L. Voronov, on the Theses of Bolotov; and AOJDD.283: a translation, taken from Professor V.V. Bolotov's book ›On the Question of the Filioque‹ (published in 1914), of his ›Theses on the Filioque‹ together with a passage (pp. 30–36) defining terms, which include Bolotov's own definition of a theologoumenon as follows:

›But I may be asked what I mean by Θεολογούμενον. In essence it is also a theological opinion, but only the opinion of those who for every catholic are more than just theologians: they are the theological opinions of the holy fathers of the one undivided church; they are the opinions of those men, among whom are those who are fittingly called ›ecumenical doctors‹. Θεολογούμενα I rate highly, but I do not in any case exaggerate their significance, and I think that I ›quite sharply‹ distinguish them from dogmas. The content of a dogma is truth: the content of a Θεολογούμενον is only what is probable. The realm of a dogma is necessaria, the realm of a Θεολογούμενον is dubia: In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas!‹

¹⁹ For an outline of traditional Anglican views see AOJDD.213, ›The Filioque in Ecumenical Perspective: a preliminary Anglican response‹, by Professor Eugene Fairweather.

III WORSHIP AND TRADITION

Paradosis — Tradition

47 Looked at from outside, the two Churches appear to be very different in their attitude to tradition, the Anglicans allowing a great variety of attitude and teaching, the Orthodox being strongly attached to the definitions and the structures of the tradition, especially to those established in the Ecumenical Councils and by the Church Fathers.

48 Nevertheless within the freedom existing in the Anglican Communion there is a commitment and responsibility to the tradition, and a conviction that there are elements in the tradition, for instance the historic Creeds and the Chalcedonian definition, of permanent validity. On the Orthodox side, there exists freedom and understanding of tradition as the constant action of the Holy Spirit in the Church, an unceasing presence of the revelation of the Word of God through the Holy Spirit, ever present, here and now. Tradition is always open, ready to embrace the present and accept the future.

49 The Anglicans share this understanding of tradition. Tradition, with Scripture as the normative factor within it (see Moscow Agreed Statement, Section III), is that which maintains our Christian identity, which develops and nurtures our Christian obedience, and makes our Christian witness effective in the power of the Holy Spirit.

50 The tradition of the Church flows from the Father's gift of his Son ›for the life of the world‹, through the sojourning of the Holy Spirit in the world to be a constant witness to the truth (John 15.26). The Church draws its life and being from this same movement of the Father's love; that is to say, the Church too lives ›for the life of the world‹. Its tradition is the living force and inexhaustible source of its mission to the world.

51 The presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church enables the whole body of the faithful, the *pleroma* of the Church, to be enriched and strengthened in facing the problems of our time, both within the Church and outside it. There is a variety of gifts of the Spirit which work together for the building up of the Christian people for their work of witness and service in the world for the common good. Both Anglicans and Orthodox see in their fidelity to tradition a mutual bond, and a strong incentive to closer co-operation in witness and service to the world.

52 One aspect of the dynamic nature of tradition is to be seen in the way in which the Church assimilates and sanctifies certain elements of the cultures of the various societies in which the Church lives. The Fathers of the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, exercised a careful discrimination in their use of material from the society around them. The Church at the present time needs to exercise a similar discrimination, remaining true to the mind (φρόνημα) of the Fathers and facing the new questions with which our century confronts us.

Worship and the Maintenance of the Faith

53 Faith and worship are inseparable. Dogmas are not abstract ideas existing in and for themselves, but revealed and saving truths and realities intended to bring mankind into communion with God. Through the liturgical life of the Church creation comes to share in this saving reality. Thus in worship the Church becomes what she really is: body, fellowship, communion in Christ. She maintains the true faith and is maintained in the true faith by the action and work of the Holy Spirit.

54 The great affirmations of Christian doctrine have their liturgical formulation and expression; all the saving truths of the faith are doxologically and liturgically appropriated. The Catholic Faith is this, that we worship God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Trinity consubstantial and undivided.

55 Liturgy is the action by which the community celebrates the events which created it, sustain it, and give it its future. In both Churches corporate and personal worship are inseparable. It is only as members of the worshipping Church that we can make a true confession of the faith. For example, in the Orthodox Liturgy the Creed is introduced with the words: ›Let us love one another so that with one mind we may confess‹. Moreover, because of the nature of man and more especially the incarnation of the Word, the tradition of Christian worship is outward as well as inward, involving bodily gestures and material signs and objects as well as spiritual attitudes.

56 The liturgical life of the Church is the very heart of tradition. The Church in the celebration of its Liturgy recalls the mighty acts of God in the past, experiences them as present and living realities, and anticipates the coming of the Lord in glory. In the presence of the risen Christ we receive the promise of the coming Kingdom. Liturgical time is no cold and lifeless representation of past events, nor simply an historical record. In it Christ himself is living in his Church. Liturgical time is time transfigured through liturgical act, for it is time animated by ›the fervour of faith full of the Holy Spirit‹ (Liturgy of St John Chrysostom). Thus by worship we live in the new time of the Kingdom. That implies two things: first, the entrance of the Lord of glory into our history as the Saviour of the world, and second, our entrance into the eternal Kingdom of the Holy Trinity by grace.

57 Liturgy and all Christian worship are rooted in salvation history. Salvation history with all its mighty events in both the Old and New Covenants is confessed, celebrated and appropriated by means of the liturgical year. The centre of that year, as of salvation history itself, is the saving person and work of Jesus present in the power of the Holy Spirit.

58 In the Eucharist we become partakers of the Lord's Supper. The Eucharist is anamnesis and participation in the death and resurrection of Christ, liturgically affirmed and realized in the annual celebration of the Paschal mystery. This is renewed every week in the feast of the Lord's Day and in every celebration of the Holy Eucharist. The fact of the resurrection of Christ is the basis of Christian faith and worship, since as St Paul says: ›If Christ has not been raised ... your faith is in vain‹ (1 Cor. 15.14).

59 The significance of the resurrection is liturgically experienced and expressed in the preparatory season of Lent and in the season which follows, from Easter through the Ascension to Pentecost. In the coming of the Paraclete, the whole mystery of Christ is realized: the Holy Spirit takes the things of Christ and shows them to us, making them real in every age; the Paraclete is thus the constant source of life in the tradition of the Church.

60 The Church baptizes her members into the death and resurrection of her Lord, bringing them from the state of sin and death into membership of his body and participation in his eternal life. The centrality of the Easter solemnity has made Easter the supreme occasion for the administration of the rites of Christian initiation.

61 As in the divine economy of salvation, the atonement achieved by the death and resurrection of Christ presupposes the incarnation and the incarnate life of Christ, so in the Christian year, the feast of Easter presupposes the feasts of the Nativity and the Epiphany and the other feasts related to the life of our Saviour. Thus we have the yearly cycle of the feasts of our Lord. In the West the season of Advent prepares Christians to celebrate Christ's coming as Saviour, and reminds them of his future coming in judgement and glory.

62 Finally the liturgical year includes the feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and of the Saints, witnessing thus to the dogmatic truth that Christ the head of the Church remains always united with the members of his body and that there is no separation between the militant and triumphant Church. >The Lord is wonderful in his Saints<, and in the communion of the saints we see again the power of the resurrection in the life and tradition of the Church destroying death and transfiguring time.

63 Anglicans and Orthodox hold that the liturgy and all worship are essentially for the expression, maintenance and communication of the true faith. Liturgical texts are thus fundamental doctrinal standards for both. Both recognize the possibility of the Church making liturgical revisions according to the necessity of the times, and with a view to the salvation of the people of God. They differ only in their estimation of the need for such revisions in the present situation, this difference reflecting their diverse historical experiences and situations.

64 In both Anglican and Orthodox traditions, prayers and devotions in the family are understood as an extension of the corporate worship of the Church. From New Testament times onwards the Christian family has been considered to be a household church. The rite of marriage, a sign or image of the spiritual union between Christ and his Church, initiates a relationship within which children may be nurtured and where the faith is taught, lived, and communicated to others.

65 The traditions of both Churches are rich in a variety of family devotions and customs which include the use of parts of the Divine Office, reverence of icons, use of crosses and pictures, grace at meals, Bible reading, as well as blessings of events and turning points of family life. Both Anglican and Orthodox members are convinced of the importance of the family and the household church as a vehicle of the tradition of the Church and wish to explore this further.

The Communion of Saints and the Departed

66 All prayer is ultimately addressed to the Triune God. We pray to God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit. The Church is united in a single movement of worship with the Church in heaven, with the blessed Virgin Mary, ›with angels and archangels, and all the company of heaven‹. The Orthodox also pray to the Blessed Virgin Mary and Theotokos and the saints as friends and living images of Christ.

67 Those who believe and are baptized form one body in Christ, and are members one of another, united by the Holy Spirit. Within the Body each member suffers and rejoices with the others, and in each member the Holy Spirit intercedes for the whole. These relationships are changed but not broken by death. ›He is not God of the dead, but of the living‹ (Matt. 22.32), for all live in and to him. This is the meaning of the communion of saints.

68 God is ›the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob‹ (Exod. 3.6), ›the Lord of hosts‹ (Isa. 6.3), ›the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ‹ (Rom. 15.6). Our God is not an abstract idea, but the God of persons, revealing himself in and to particular men and women. Union with God therefore involves us in a personal relationship with all who belong to him through the grace of the Holy Spirit who both unites and diversifies: and this personal relationship, which is not broken by death, is precisely the communion of saints.

69 Our experience of the communion of saints finds its fullest expression in the Eucharist, in which the whole body of Christ realizes its unity in the Holy Spirit. We see this in ancient eucharistic prayers of East and West, which commemorate the saints and intercede for the departed as well as for the living.

70 ›Christ is risen from the dead trampling down death by death ...‹. By virtue of Christ's cross and resurrection, death is no longer an impassable barrier. It is this sense of our continuing union in the risen Christ that forms for all Orthodox the basis of prayer for the dead and the invocation of the saints. Mainly as a result of the abuses of the medieval West, and the consequent Reformation in the sixteenth century, Anglicans rejected much of the practice and teaching of the Church of that time. The cult of the saints and prayer for the departed were criticized on the grounds of the all-sufficiency of Christ's redeeming work. Today there is a variety of practice among Anglicans on these matters. All remain careful in the language which they use in prayer for the departed, being anxious not to return to the errors of the Western Middle Ages. But all affirm our union with the departed in the risen Christ.

71 God's love is present everywhere and is offered to everybody, but not everyone accepts it. According to some Fathers, even those in hell are not deprived of the love of God but by their own free choice they experience as torment what the saints experience as joy. The light of God's glory is also the fire of judgement. God's wrath is no other than his love; how we experience that love, in this life and after death, depends on our attitude. The Orthodox Church in the prayers of Pentecost, believing that Christ has the keys of death and hell (Rev. 1.18), and hoping that the love of God will find a response in the

souls even of some who are in hell, prays for their salvation, although their ultimate destiny remains a mystery (Matt. 25.31–46 as understood by the Fathers).²⁰

72 ›... from one degree of glory to another‹ (2 Cor. 3.18): for the righteous, in the view of the Orthodox and also of many Anglicans, further progress and growth in the love of God will continue for ever. After death, this progress is to be thought of in terms of healing rather than satisfaction or retribution. Other Anglicans think of perfection in Christ as an immediate gift in the life to come. As Anglicans and Orthodox we are agreed in rejecting any doctrine of purgatory which suggests that the departed through their sufferings are making ›satisfaction‹ or ›expiation‹ for their sins. The traditional practice of the Church in praying for the faithful departed is to be understood as an expression of the unity between the Church militant and the Church triumphant, and of the love which one bears to the other.

73 Prayers for the departed are therefore to be seen, not in juridical terms, but as an expression of mutual love and solidarity in Christ: ›we pray for them because we still hold them in our love‹ (Catechism of the Episcopal Church, USA).

74 The prayers of the saints on our behalf are likewise to be understood as an expression of mutual love and shared life in the Holy Spirit. Such a term as ›treasury of merits‹ is foreign to both our traditions. ›There is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus‹ (1 Tim. 2.5): the intercession of the saints for us is always in and through this unique mediation of Christ. The saints reign with Christ (cf. Luke 22.29–30): Christ is the King, and the saints share in his kingly rule.

75 The Blessed Virgin Mary played a unique role in the economy of salvation by virtue of the fact that she was chosen to be Mother of Christ our God. Her intercession is not autonomous, but presupposes Christ's intercession and is based upon the saving work of the incarnate Word.

76 The Orthodox practice of commemorating the saints of the Old Testament powerfully affirms the way in which the whole history of salvation is made present in the liturgy of the Church.

77 All Anglican liturgies refer to the communion of saints by thanking God for that communion and for the lives and examples of particular saints, and some refer to the saints' prayers for us, but very few contain invocations addressed directly to saints.

78 Much of the language in which we speak of the saints and the departed is derived from the life of prayer and piety. Many of the Church's affirmations concerning the communion of saints are in hymnography and iconography. At the same time there is an appropriate doctrinal reserve which reflects the mystery of our relationship with the departed. It is in God alone that we have communion with them.

²⁰ Eg. PG 57–58, 717 ff.

Icons

79 In the incarnation human nature, body as well as soul, was assumed into the life of the Word of God; and in the renewed creation, which this incarnation has effected, the whole material world is sanctified, and the destructive opposition of matter and spirit overcome.

80 In the Orthodox tradition the depiction and use of icons has a christological foundation. The icon is understood as an important means whereby we confess and appropriate the mystery of the incarnation.

81 Anglicans have in the past felt serious difficulties about this question. For example a committee of the Lambeth Conference in 1888 said: ›It would be difficult for us to enter more intimate relations with that (sc. Orthodox) Church as long as it retains the use of icons.‹ These difficulties are part of a larger history of the West. The decrees of the Seventh Ecumenical Council were not properly understood in the West owing to the unfortunate translation of the Greek word προσκύνησις (veneration) by the Latin word *adoratio* (worship). The subsequent uncontrolled development of visual imagery later in the Middle Ages in the West led to strong reactions, above all at the time of the Reformation. The Reformers understood the prohibition of idolatry in the Ten Commandments as applying to the practices of their own day. They sought to purify and simplify the worship of the Church, in order that glory might be given to God alone. In particular they rejected the worship of images.

82 Anglicans however did not reject all use of bodily gestures and images in the worship of the Church. The Book of Common Prayer retains, for example, the use of the sign of the cross in Baptism, and the giving of a ring in marriage. In the controversies in the century following the Reformation, Anglicans constantly appealed to the words of St Paul, ›All things should be done decently and in order‹ (1 Cor. 14.40). In his exposition of the Church Catechism, *The Practice of Divine Love*, Bishop Thomas Ken (1637–1711) prays, ›give me grace to pay a religious, suitable veneration to all sacred persons or places or things which are thine by solemn dedication and separated for the uses of divine love, and the communications of thy grace, or which may promote the decency and order of the worship, or the edification of faithful people‹. In fact a distinctive Anglican tradition of religious art developed. During the last hundred years increasing contact with the Orthodox Churches and a fuller knowledge of their tradition have brought new light to this question.

83 In the light of the present discussion the Anglicans do not find any cause for disagreement in the doctrine as stated by St John of Damascus: ›In times past, God, without body and form could in no way be represented. But now since God has appeared in flesh and lived among men, I can depict that which is visible of God. I do not venerate matter, but I venerate the creator of matter, who became matter for me, who condescended to live in matter, and who through matter accomplished my salvation; and I do not cease to respect the matter through which my salvation is accomplished.‹²¹

²¹ On Holy Icons I, PG 94, 1245 B.

84 By the incarnation of the Word who is the image of the Father (2 Cor. 4.4; Col. 1.15; Heb. 1.3) the image of God in every man is restored and the material world itself sanctified and again made capable of mediating the divine beauty. Icons are used as a means of expressing, as far as it can be expressed, the glory of God seen in the face of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 4.6), and in the faces of his friends. Icons are words in painting, referring to the history of salvation and its manifestation in specific persons. Icons have always been understood as a visible gospel, as a testimony to the great things given to us by God the Word incarnate. In the Council of 860 it was stated that ›all that is uttered in words written in syllables is also proclaimed in the language of colours‹. From this perspective icons and Scripture are linked through an inner relationship; both coexist in the Church and proclaim the same truths. ›Just as in the Bible we listen to the word of Christ and are sanctified ... in the same way through the painted icons we behold the representation of his human form ... and are likewise sanctified‹ (St John of Damascus).²²

85 An icon is a means of entering into contact with the person or event it represents. It is not an end in itself. In the words of St Basil: ›The honour shown to the icon passes to the prototype‹.²³ It guides us to a vision of the divine Kingdom where past, present and future are one. It makes vivid our faith in the communion of the saints. In the definition of the Seventh Ecumenical Council we read: ›The more frequently they (sc. icons) are seen, the more those who behold them are aroused to remember and desire the prototypes and to give them greeting and the veneration of honour; not indeed true worship which, according to our faith, is due to God alone.‹²⁴

86 Just as Scripture is understood within the community of faith, so too the icon is understood within the same community of faith and worship. It is an essentially liturgical form of art. In response to the faith and prayer of the believers, God, through the icon, bestows his sanctifying and healing grace. Thus the icon serves to promote the communication of the gospel and hence its making and use must always be controlled by theological criteria. It is not a random decoration, but an integral part of the Church's life and worship. In this respect its place in the Church's worship can be compared with the place of music and chant and with the faithful preaching of the word of God.

87 In our time, when visual imagery plays a more and more important part in people's lives, the tradition of icons has acquired a startling relevance. It presents the Church with a new possibility of proclaiming the gospel in a society in which language is often devalued.

Epilogue

88 At this point in our work, after twelve years of discussion, we feel it right to attempt a summary of the progress that, as Anglicans and Orthodox, we have been able to

²² On Holy Icons III, PG 94, 1333 D.

²³ On Holy Spirit 18, PG 32, 149 C8 f.

²⁴ *Mansi*, Concilia XIII, 482.

achieve with God's help. We note in particular the following points over which we agree or disagree, or which we see as requiring further exploration:

I The Knowledge of God

89 Here we have discovered a difference in terminology, but no difference in fundamental belief. The normal Orthodox ways of speaking about the essence and energies of God, and about ›divinization‹ (Θέωσις), are not employed by most Anglicans, but Anglicans do not reject the underlying doctrine which this language expresses.²⁵

II Scripture and Tradition

90 (a) We agree in our basic understanding of the inspiration and authority of Scripture, and we agree more particularly that the Church gives attention to the results of scholarly research concerning the Bible. But we have not attempted to state in detail how critical methods of historical research are to be applied to the Bible, for we see this as a task outside the scope of a commission such as our own. We have noted a minor difference over the distinction which both Churches make between the canonical books of the Old Testament and the deuterocanonical books: the Orthodox Church has not pronounced officially on the nature of the distinction, as is done in the Articles of the Church of England.²⁶

91 (b) We agree likewise in our view of the fundamental relationship between Scripture and tradition: they are not two sources, but correlative. We agree that the Church cannot define dogmas which are not grounded both in Scripture and in tradition. We agree that the ›mind‹ (φρόνημα) of the Fathers is of lasting importance for our understanding of the Christian faith.

92 We agree that tradition is to be seen in dynamic terms, as the constant action of the Holy Spirit in the Church; and therefore both our delegations accept that there exist freedom and variety within the one tradition of the Church. But we have not yet attempted to state in detail what are the limits of that freedom and variety in regard to every specific point of doctrine.²⁷

²⁵ Moscow Agreed Statement para. 1–3.

²⁶ Moscow Agreed Statement para. 4–8.

²⁷ Moscow Agreed Statement para. 9–12; Dublin Agreed Statement para. 47–52.

III The Holy Trinity

93 (a) We agree in affirming that prayer and sanctification are founded upon the grace of the Holy Trinity.²⁸

94 (b) We agree that the original form of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed referred to the origin of the Holy Spirit from the Father. For this reason, and because the *Filioque* was introduced into the Creed without the authority of an Ecumenical Council and without due regard to catholic consent, the Anglicans agree with the Orthodox that the *Filioque* should not be included in the Creed.²⁹

95 (c) We have discussed how far the doctrine implied by the *Filioque* (as distinguished from the inclusion of the *Filioque* in the Creed) is acceptable to our two churches. Here we have failed to reach full agreement. The Anglican delegates regard the *Filioque* as a valid theological statement, though not as a dogma. The Orthodox delegates regard the doctrine of the *Filioque* as unacceptable, but they note that according to some Eastern Fathers, the use of the *Filioque* in early Latin theology can be understood in an Orthodox way.³⁰

IV The Church

96 (a) We agree in our fundamental understanding of the Church as one, holy, catholic and apostolic.³¹

97 (b) Despite differences in the outward forms of wider leadership within our two Communion, there is fundamental agreement between the way in which Anglicans understand ›primacy‹ and the way in which Orthodox understand ›seniority‹. We agree more particularly that all levels of wider leadership within the Church are to be envisaged in terms not of coercion but of pastoral service.³²

98 (c) We agree in our basic understanding of witness, evangelism and service within the Church. More especially we affirm that missionary witness to unbelievers, and sacrificial service to those in need, are the shared responsibility of all church members, clergy and lay people alike.³³

99 (d) But while we agree that the Church is one, holy, catholic and apostolic, we are not agreed on the account to be given of the sinfulness and division which is to be observed in the life of Christian communities. For Anglicans, because the Church under Christ is the community where God's grace is at work, healing and transforming sinful

²⁸ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 36–43.

²⁹ Moscow Agreed Statement para. 19–21.

³⁰ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 44–46.

³¹ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 2–17.

³² Dublin Agreed Statement para. 21–30.

³³ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 31–35.

men and women; and because grace in the Church is mediated through those who are themselves undergoing such transformation, the struggle between grace and sin is to be seen as characteristic of, rather than accidental to, the Church on earth. Orthodox, while agreeing that the human members of the Church on earth are sinful, do not believe that sinfulness should be ascribed to the Church as the body of Christ indwelt by the Holy Spirit.

100 (e) As regards the first of the four marks of the Church, its oneness, we disagree in our view of the relationship between the Church's basic unity and the present state of division between Christians. The Anglican members see our divisions as existing within the Church while the Orthodox members believe that the Orthodox Church is the one true Church of Christ, which as his Body is not and cannot be divided.³⁴

101 (f) With this is linked a further disagreement, concerning communion and intercommunion. The Anglican tradition accepts as legitimate, in certain situations, the use of intercommunion as a means towards the attainment of full organic unity. The Orthodox reject the notion of intercommunion, and believe that there can be communion only between local churches that have a unity of faith, ministry and sacraments.³⁵

102 (g) As regards the fourth of the four marks of the Church, its apostolicity, we agree that this is manifested in a particular way through the succession of bishops and that this succession is a sign of the unbroken continuity of apostolic tradition and life.³⁶ But we have not so far discussed what is the attitude of our two Churches towards such communities as have not preserved the succession of bishops in an outward and visible form. Nor have we discussed the Orthodox view of the validity of Anglican ordinations.

103 (h) We have failed to reach agreement concerning the possibility, or otherwise, of the ordination of women to the priesthood. The Orthodox affirm that such ordination is impossible, since it is contrary to Scripture and tradition. With this some Anglicans agree, while others believe that it is possible, and even desirable at the present moment, to ordain women as priests.³⁷ There are, however, many related issues that we have not so far examined in any detail, particularly the following: how we are to understand the distinction within humanity between man and woman; what is meant by sacramental priesthood, and how this is related to the unique high priesthood of Christ and to the royal priesthood of all the baptized; what, apart from the sacramental priesthood, are the other forms of ministry within the Church.

³⁴ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 8–9.

³⁵ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 18–20.

³⁶ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 14–17.

³⁷ Dublin Agreed Statement Appendix 2.

V Councils

104 (a) We agree that the Ecumenical Councils provide an authoritative interpretation of Scripture in order to safeguard the salvation of the People of God.

105 (b) We differ, however, in our understanding of the relative importance of the Councils. While the Anglican members lay greater emphasis upon the first four Councils, and less upon the fifth, sixth and seventh, applying to conciliar decisions the concept of an ›order‹ or ›hierarchy of truths‹, the Orthodox members find this concept to be in conflict with the unity of the faith as a whole.

106 (c) We are agreed in considering that infallibility is not the property of any particular person in the Church. But we consider that the implications of the terms ›infallible‹ and ›indefectible‹ need to be further explored.

107 (d) We are agreed that the ecumenicity of Councils is manifested through their acceptance by the Church. But we feel that further discussion is needed of the processes whereby the teaching of Councils is recognized and accepted.³⁸

VI Faith and Worship, Church and Eucharist

108 (a) We are agreed about the integral link between faith and worship, between the tradition of the Church and its liturgical life. We are agreed in our general understanding of baptism, although we have not discussed this in detail. We are agreed in describing the Eucharist as an *anamnesis* and participation in the death and resurrection of Christ.³⁹

109 (b) We are agreed in regarding the Church as a eucharistic community: the Eucharist actualizes the Church. In each local eucharistic celebration the visible unity and catholicity of the Church is fully manifested. The question of the relationship between the celebrant and his bishop and that among bishops themselves requires further study.⁴⁰

110 (c) We are agreed in attaching cardinal importance to the action of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist, as also throughout the entire life of the Church. In the Orthodox eucharistic liturgy this is an invocation (ἐπίκλησις) of the Holy Spirit; in some Anglican liturgies there is no such explicit *epiclesis*, but all Anglicans are agreed that the operation of the Holy Spirit is essential to the Eucharist.⁴¹

111 (d) We are agreed that through the consecratory prayer, addressed to the Father, the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of the glorified Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit in such a way that the faithful people of God receiving Christ may feed upon him in the sacrament.⁴² But we have not yet discussed in detail what is the nature of

³⁸ Moscow Agreed Statement para. 13–18; Dublin Agreed Statement para. 29–30.

³⁹ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 53–65.

⁴⁰ Moscow Agreed Statement para. 22–27.

⁴¹ Moscow Agreed Statement para. 29–32.

⁴² Moscow Agreed Statement para. 25–26.

the ineffable change effected through the consecratory prayer, nor have we considered how far the Eucharist may be regarded as a sacrifice.⁴³

112 (e) We have reached basic agreement on the communion of saints and the departed. All of us believe that the communion of the Holy Spirit joins in unity the members of the Body, whether living or departed, and this unity is expressed in prayer and thanksgiving. There remains, however, a certain difference here between Orthodoxy and Anglicanism, since in most Anglican Churches, requests to the saints to pray for us are not made, and also prayers for the faithful departed, though common, are by no means universal; and some Anglicans believe that only thanksgiving for the departed is appropriate. Moreover, not all Anglicans agree with the Orthodox Patristic understanding of endless progress after death.⁴⁴

113 (f) In regard to icons we have found that notwithstanding past Anglican objections and despite differences in liturgical practice, there is no serious disagreement here between Anglicanism and Orthodoxy. It is true that Anglicans do not believe that the veneration of icons, as practised in the East, can be required of all Christians. But Anglicans agree that the theology of the icon is founded upon, and intended to safeguard, the doctrine of the incarnation. They also accept that it is legitimate to regard the icon, not merely as a decoration, but as a means of entering into relationship with the person or event it represents; and to hold that in response to the faith and prayer of the believers, God through the icon, bestows his sanctifying grace. We have not yet adequately discussed the difference between two- and three-dimensional images.⁴⁵

114 None of the points of disagreement mentioned above is to be regarded as insoluble, but each is to be regarded as a challenge to this Commission, or to some similar body to be appointed in the future by our two Churches, to advance more deeply in its understanding of the truth. Anglicans and Orthodox alike, we are called to ›reach out towards that which lies ahead, pressing forward to win the prize which is God's call to the life above, in Christ Jesus‹ (Phil. 3.13–14).

⁴³ Moscow Agreed Statement para. 22 refers to the Bucharest Statement of 1935 on the Eucharist, which is printed with an introduction on pp. 92–93 of ›Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue: Moscow Agreed Statement‹ (SPCK 1977). However we have not discussed it in detail, nor, acting as a Joint Commission, have we as yet expressed our agreement or otherwise with the six points that it contains.

⁴⁴ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 66–78.

⁴⁵ Dublin Agreed Statement para. 79–87; Moscow Agreed Statement para. 15.

Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission

Anglican Participants 1984

The Revd Canon A. M. Allchin, *Church of England*
 The Revd Roger Beckwith, *Church of England*
 The Revd Colin Davey (Secretary), *Church of England*
 The Revd Professor Eugene Fairweather, *Anglican Church of Canada*
 The Revd Dr John Gaden, *Anglican Church of Australia*
 Mr Kiranga Gatimu, *Church of the Province of Kenya*
 The Revd Professor W. B. Green, *The Episcopal Church in the USA*
 The Rt Revd Richard Hanson, *Church of England*
 The Rt Revd Henry Hill (Co-Chairman), *Anglican Church of Canada*
 The Revd Canon John McNab, *Church of the Province of the West Indies*
 The Revd Dr William A. Norgren, *The Episcopal Church in the USA*
 The Revd Professor Oliver O'Donovan, *Church of England*
 The Revd John Riches, *The Episcopal Church of Scotland*
 The Rt Revd Richard Rutt, *Church of England*
 The Revd Dr John M. Sentamu, *Church of Uganda*
 The Rt Revd Dr Maxwell Thomas, *Anglican Church of Australia*
 The Revd Canon Hugh Wybrew, *Church of England*

Not Present at 1984 Meeting

The Rt Revd Samir Kafity, *Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and the Middle East*
 The Revd Luke Pato, *Church of the Province of Southern Africa*
 The Rt Revd Robert E. Terwilliger, *The Episcopal Church in the USA*

Other Anglican Participants 1977–83

The Right Revd R. A. K. Runcie 1977–78 (Co-Chairman), *Church of England*
 The Revd Canon M. J. D. Carmichael 1977–81, *The Church of the Province of South Africa*
 The Rt Revd V. Cornish 1981, *Anglican Church of Australia*
 The Revd Canon Edward Every 1977–80, *The Episcopal Church of Jerusalem and the Middle East*
 The Revd Dr Edward Hardy 1977–80, *The Episcopal Church in the USA*
 The Rt Revd Mark Santer 1977–82, *Church of England*
 The Rt Revd Graham Leonard 1977–80, *Church of England*
 The Revd Dr John Mbiti 1980–81, *Church of the Province of Kenya*
 The Rt Revd Graham Delbridge 1977–78, *Anglican Church of Australia*
 The Revd Dr Richard Norris 1977, *The Episcopal Church in the USA*
 The Rt Revd Jonathan Sherman 1977, *The Episcopal Church in the USA*

Consultants

Dr Paul Anderson 1977, *The Episcopal Church in the USA*
 The Revd John de Satgé 1977, *Church of England*

Orthodox Participants 1984

Ecumenical Patriarchate

The Most Revd Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain (Co-Chairman)
The Rt Revd Bishop Aristarchos of Zenoupolis

Patriarchate of Antioch

The Rt Revd Bishop Gabriel

Patriarchate of Jerusalem

The Most Revd Metropolitan Basil of Caesarea
Professor George Galitis

Patriarchate of Moscow

The Most Revd Archbishop Basil of Brussels and All Belgium
The Very Revd Professor Livery Voronov

Patriarchate of Romania

The Very Revd Archimandrite Nifon Mihaita

Patriarchate of Bulgaria

The Very Revd Professor Nikolay Chivarov

Church of Cyprus

The Most Revd Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Kition

Church of Greece

Professor Constantine Scouteris

Church of Poland

Mr Nikolaj Kozlowski

Church of Finland

Hieromonk Ambrosius

Orthodox Consultant

The Rt Revd Bishop Kallistos of Diocleia

Orthodox Secretariat

The Very Revd Dr George Dragas (Secretary)
Dr Andreas Tillyrides
The Very Revd Archimandrite Athanasios Theocharous

Not present at 1984 meeting

Patriarchate of Alexandria

The Most Revd Metropolitan Petros of Aksum

Patriarchate of Antioch

The Very Revd Archimandrite Gregory Saliby

Patriarchate of Serbia

Professor Stojan Gosevic

Patriarchate of Romania

Professor Nikolai Chitescu

Church of Greece

The Very Revd Professor John Romanides

Church of Finland

The Most Revd Metropolitan John of Helsinki

Other Orthodox Participants 1977–83*Eucumenical Patriarchate*The Most Revd Archbishop Athenagoras of Thyateira and Great Britain
1977–78 (Co-Chairman)The Most Revd Archbishop Stylianos, Archbishop of Australia
1977–78

The Rt Revd Gregory of Tropaeon 1977–78

Patriarchate of Alexandria

The Most Revd Metropolitan Dionysios of Memphis 1981–82

Patriarchate of Moscow

The Most Revd Archbishop Vladimir of Dmitrov 1982

Patriarchate of Serbia

The Very Revd Professor G. Gardashevich 1981

Patriarchate of Romania

Mr Nicolae Mihaitza 1977

Deacon Dr Petru Y. David 1978

The Revd Silviu-Petre Pufulete 1980–81

Orthodox Consultant

Mr Nicholas Lossky 1977

Orthodox Secretariat

The Very Revd Archimandrite Meletios 1977

The Rt Revd Bishop Timothy of Melitoupolis 1980–82

The Very Revd Archimandrite Symeon Lash 1982–83