

Theological Animism and Orthodox Pneumatology

An Orthodox Perspective Prompted by the Provocative Paper of Professor Chung Hyun Kyung at the 7th General Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Canberra

by George D. Martzelos, Thessaloniki

Introduction

In the history of the General Assemblies of the World Council of Churches there has perhaps never been a more provocative paper than that given by the South Korean Presbyterian Professor Chung Hyun Kyung during the last General Assembly in Canberra (1991).¹ Her paper truly upset not only the Orthodox participants and Roman Catholic observers but also the vast majority of Protestants, and provoked a storm of objections and sharp criticism precisely because of its pantheistic and animistic character. Some even did not hesitate to accuse her of »syncretism« and »paganism«.²

Be that as it may, it is a fact that, through Professor Chung's paper, the breach which already existed within the framework of the W.C.C. between classical and contextual theology became clear in all its dimensions. Here precisely of course emerges the problem of what role Orthodox theology should play in the post-Canberra Ecumenical Movement.

We are of the opinion that, however challenging and upsetting the views of Professor Chung are, the Orthodox should not be content with a sterile and barren negative criticism and confrontation. Rather, based on the Orthodox biblical and patristic tradition, which is always relevant and contemporary, we should exercise a fruitful and creative criticism, in order to contribute to the overcoming of the problems which this paper brought to the ecumenical scene. Indeed, we believe that the greatest value of this paper lies in the fact that, by means of its challenging positions, it caused a problematic situation to which fruitful and creative answers can be given mainly by Orthodox theology.

¹ Her paper (»Come, Holy Spirit — Renew the Whole Creation«) see in: Signs of the Spirit (Official Report — Seventh Assembly: Canberra, Australia, 7-20 February 1991), Geneva 1991, p. 37 ff.

² See: Συνοπτικό Χρονικό της Ζ' Γενικής Συνελεύσεως του ΠΣΕ (Καμπέρρα, 7-20 Φεβρουαρίου 1991), *Enimerosis* (Δελτίον Οικουμενικής Έπικαιρότητας) 7 (1991), 2-3, p. 5. G. Tsetsis, Χρονικό καί Συνοπτική Άποτίμηση της Ζ' Γενικής Συνελεύσεως του ΠΣΕ (Καμπέρρα, 7-20 Φεβρουαρίου 1991), in: 'Η Ζ' Γενική Συνέλευση του Παγκοσμίου Συμβουλίου Έκκλησιών (Καμπέρρα, Φεβρουάριος 1991): Χρονικό-Κείμενα-Άξιολογήσεις, Κατερini 1992, p. 20 f. *Metropolitan of Myra Chrysostomos*, Γιατί άνησυχούμε;, op. cit., p. 158; *Metropolitan of Demetrias Christodoulos*, Παγκόσμιο Συμβούλιο Έκκλησιών ή λésχη θρησκευομένων ανθρώπων;, op. cit., p. 176 f. See also S. Harakas, Πρέπει νά παραμείνει Έλληνας ό Θεός;, op. cit., p. 199.

More specifically, Professor Chung's attempt to project the work of the Holy Spirit on the basis of animistic and pantheistic images, depictions, and conceptions of the people mainly from North-Eastern Asia is not to be seen only as a point of controversy; it could under certain conditions even constitute an essential point of contact with Orthodox Pneumatology.

A. Pneumatology and Pantheistic Animism according to Chung Hyung Kyung

Let us first, very briefly, however, review what the nature of the animistic and pantheistic depictions used by the South Korean Professor to present the work of the Holy Spirit in the world are and what consequences these images have on her Pneumatology.

First of all, as she herself admitted, her image of the Holy Spirit is not related to her specialization in the field of systematic theology, it emerges rather from her cultural background, from an esoteric feeling deeply rooted within the collective subconscious of her people, which developed during the age-old course of their spirituality.³ Specifically, she attempted to present the work of the Holy Spirit by means of the image of the divinity *Kwan-In*, honored in the popular religiosity of the women of Eastern Asia as a divinity of compassion and wisdom.⁴ This divinity, as a luminous being, as *Bodhisatwa*, as she says, can enter whenever she wills, into a state of Nirvana. She avoids doing this, though. Because she prefers to suffer along with all other suffering beings, she remains in this world in order that the world may come to know illumination.⁵ Her co-suffering wisdom heals all forms of life and enables them to swim to the opposite shores of *Nirvana*. She constantly waits for that time when the whole Universe, people, trees, birds, mountains, wind and water will be illuminated. Then all will be able to enter the state of Nirvana together, and live together in one community in eternal wisdom and compassion.⁶

This scenario, according to the South Korean Professor, embodies three basic changes of direction which are demanded on the part of human beings and which constitute for her the deepest meaning of repentance or, as she says otherwise, the Holy Spirit's »political economy of life.«⁷

First of all, a passing from anthropocentrism to zoo-centrism is necessitated. In the traditional Christian faith and in Western thought, she remarks, the human being, and especially the male human being, is seen as the center of the created world; as fit by nature to control and rule over Creation. This conception, however, is completely foreign to many Asian peoples and to the ancestors of the Australian natives.⁸ For us, Chung stres-

³ See: Come Holy Spirit — Renew the Whole Creation, in: Signs of the Spirit (Official Report — Seventh Assembly: Canberra, Australia, 7–20 February 1991), Geneva 1991, p. 46.

⁴ See op. cit.

⁵ See op. cit.

⁶ See op. cit.

⁷ See op. cit., p. 42 f., 46.

⁸ See op. cit., p. 43.

ses, the earth is not an inanimate, dead object. It is alive and full of creative energy. It is the primordial source of life, a place inspired and immersed in God. Because of this, nature is »sacred, purposeful and full of meaning«. Human beings are merely a small part of Creation and are not placed above the rest of Creation. For this precise reason the inhabitants of the Philippines see the earth as their mother, they call her *Ina*, the name of a major divinity, from which comes life, and which means in the Tagalog language, »mother.«⁹

The second change of direction must be actualized, according to Professor Chung, by the passing from the principle of *dualism* to the principle of *interconnection*. According to her view, »in the beginning there was a relationship«. The motive of God for the Creation of the world was His very desire to develop a relationship with the world. The world, then, was created »and it was good«, because all members of Creation found themselves in a correct relationship amongst themselves; no exploitation or dissension then existed. However, when, in the name of science, philosophy, and religion the principle of dualism between God and Creation, transcendent and immanent entered into the world, we began to conceive of the other members of the Creation as objects separated from ourselves and thus our culture ultimately was driven to dissension. The removal of this dissension is induced by the passing from the principle of dualism to the principle of interconnection and it is absolutely necessary, for only then can the power of the Holy Spirit work as a life-giving force.¹⁰

To render this comprehensible, the South Korean Professor resorted to a clearly animistic depiction which was borrowed from the cultural traditions of the people of North-East Asia, to which she herself belongs. For us, she stated, the vital force of Creation is called *Ki*. For us *Ki* is the breath of life. *Ki* presides in a harmonious relationship between the heavens, the earth, and human beings. When any dissension or division occurs, *Ki*, that is to say the breath of life, cannot flow properly and this leads to catastrophe and the sickness of all living beings. Consequently, renewal for us, Chung emphasizes, means that the wall of separation and dissension is destroyed in order that *Ki* may breathe and flow harmoniously throughout all Creation.¹¹

The third change of direction is actualized, according to Professor Chung, by the passing from the culture of death to the culture of life. The culture of death is for her the patriarchal culture of domination above others, while the culture of life is the disposition to suffer along with others, something which translates to a continual struggle for justice, peace, and a healthy environment, which is essentially a movement for life itself.¹²

These three changes of direction which compose, according to Chung, the Holy Spirit's »political economy of life« are completely embodied, as we have said, in agreement with the popular religiosity of the women of Eastern Asia by the divinity of compassion and wisdom, *Kwan-In*.

⁹ See op. cit., p. 43 f.

¹⁰ See op. cit., p. 44.

¹¹ See op. cit., p. 44 f.

¹² See op. cit., p. 45.

Having as a background to her thought this animistic and pantheistic image of the Holy Spirit the South Korean Professor at the beginning of her paper urged the audience to listen for the cry of the Holy Spirit which is found within Creation and which suffers along with it.¹³ To this end she evoked the spirits of the dead within history who suffered or were killed, as well as the »spirits« of elements of the irrational world, such as the earth, air, water, and organisms of the sea which are violated and destroyed or which constitute the field where bloody conflicts take place.¹⁴ She stressed especially that in Korea, but everywhere else as well, there exist many spirits of the dead which are full of a feeling of rage, frustration, bitterness, and misery, in one word of the Korean language, full of *Han*, who seek the opportunity to re-establish justice. For this reason she considers it a basic obligation that living human beings should listen to these spirits and participate in their work for the re-establishment of justice¹⁵. These spirits, full of *Han*, constitute, according to Professor Chung, the »agents of the Holy Spirit«, for through them the Holy Spirit proclaims its compassion and wisdom on life. She maintained that if we do not listen to the cry of these spirits we cannot discern the voice of the Holy Spirit, because for us the spirits of all our ancestors are »the tangible and visible icons of the Holy Spirit«. Through them we can experience the specific living presence of the Holy Spirit amongst us.¹⁶ And this is because the Spirit of God is with us already from the moment of creation, as a life-giving force, as the breath of life.¹⁷ We, she says, experience the life-giving Spirit of God in the struggle of our people for emancipation, in the spirits' cry for life, and in the beauty hidden within Creation. The Spirit of God teaches us through the »survival wisdom of the poor«, through the screaming of the *Han*-ridden spirits of our people and through the blessing and curses of nature. Only when we hear this cry for life and see the signs of emancipation, then, we are in the position to recognize the work of the Holy Spirit within the suffering Creation.¹⁸

The impression made on anyone who reads or hears these views of Chung Hyun Kyung is that they do not have to do with a pure Christian Pneumatology, but, rather, with a pantheistic animism of East Asian persuasion merely clothed by certain elements of Christian Pneumatology and theology. It is indeed sad that while the South Korean Professor attempted to employ depictions and images from the collective religio-cultural consciousness of her own cultural background in order to present and render understandable the work of the Holy Spirit, she unfortunately seemed so dependent on these depictions and images, so as to ultimately lead herself into a Pneumatology with an intense animistic and pantheistic character; a Pneumatology which has only a slight and superficial relation with the classical Pneumatology of the various Christian confessions and especially with Orthodox Pneumatology. It is perhaps not totally amiss to maintain that her Pneumatology, as outlined by the positions of her paper, essentially may be re-

¹³ See op. cit., p. 38.

¹⁴ See op. cit., p. 38 f.

¹⁵ See op. cit., p. 39.

¹⁶ See op. cit.

¹⁷ See op. cit., p. 40.

¹⁸ See op. cit., p. 40 f.

duced to a pantheistic animism with a Christian tone to it or, in other words, a theological animism which is totally foreign to biblical theology and revelation.

B. The Contextual Pneumatology of Chung Hyun Kyung and Orthodox Pneumatology

The problem placed before us after this brief summary and evaluation of the pneumatological views of Professor Chung is the following: what relation can her animistic and pantheistic views possibly have to Orthodox Pneumatology and what generally could be the contribution of Orthodox theology to the bridging of this specific contextual Pneumatology with classical and especially biblical Pneumatology?

In the first place, we must stress that the use of contextual depictions and images in order to render dogmatic truths understandable to people of a different cultural background often is not only legitimate but necessary. This is a foundational missionary and pedagogic principle which is deeply rooted in the Church's history and life. The use of these contextual depictions and images, however, must be limited only to the morphology of the dogma, thus leaving it untouched and unfalsified in its essence. Exactly this frame of mind was maintained by the Apostles as well as the Fathers of the Church; even though they used figurative images and terminologies from the contextual cultural background of the Greek world, these were limited exclusively to the morphological level and did not alter the meaning of Divine Revelation. On the contrary, not only did they express it faithfully, but in most cases they guarded it also from heretical distortion. Characteristic examples are the characterization of the Son of God by John the Evangelist with the stoic or philonic term »Logos«¹⁹ as well as the use by the Apostle Paul of stoic perceptions of the poets Aratos and Pseudo-Epimenedes in his homily of the Areopagus in order to emphasize the omnipresence of God and His relation to mankind²⁰, or even the use by the Fathers of Nicaea of the term »homoousios«, in order to express the relationship *par-excellence* between the Father and the Son despite the fact that this term was closely connected with the Neoplatonic conception of »emanation«.²¹

On the other hand, the use of animistic and pantheistic images and depictions by Professor Chung in order to present descriptively the work of the Holy Spirit in the world, not only does not faithfully express the biblical teaching on this subject but it, in fact, completely falsifies it.

This is especially evident, first of all, in that precisely because of her animistic presuppositions, she presents Pneumatology in her paper as completely unrelated to Triadology

¹⁹ See John 1:1; 1:14. See S. C. Agouridis, Χρόνος και αἰωνιότης (Ἑσχατολογία και μυστικοπάθεια) ἐν τῇ θεολογικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου, Thessaloniki 1964, p. 12 f. By the same author, Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Καινὴν Διαθήκην, Athens 1971, p. 164 f.

²⁰ See Acts 17:28. See also V. C. Joannidis, Ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος καὶ οἱ Στωικοὶ φιλόσοφοι (Αἱ ἰδέαι αὐτῶν περὶ θεοῦ προορισμοῦ καὶ περὶ ἀνθρωπίνης ἐλευθερίας), Athens 1957, p. 177 f. P. K. Christou, »Ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος καὶ τὸ τετράστιχον τοῦ Ἐπιμενίδου«, in: Θεολογικά Μελετήματα 1 (Ἀρχαὶ τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Γραμματείας), Thessaloniki 1973, p. 79 f.

²¹ See indicative examples in: Plotinus, Enneades 4,4,28; 4,7,10; Porphyry, Περὶ ἀποχῆς ἐμψύχων 1,19.

and Christology, which is utterly unacceptable especially from an Orthodox point of view. In only two instances did she totally incidentally speak of Christ in her paper.²² In one instance she actually referred to him in an animistic way, where along with the other spirits of the irrational creation and of the dead, she invoked also the spirit of Christ, whom she called »our brother«.²³

Contrary to this, in Orthodox Theology, Pneumatology, as stressed also in the common statement set forth by the Orthodox and the Non-Chalcedonians at Canberra, is not understood autonomously and independent of Triadology and Christology. The Holy Spirit, as much in the Holy Bible as in the Fathers of the Church, is inseparable from the Father and Son not only before and outside of time, but also within time in Divine Economy.²⁴ Indeed, the Fathers, especially in referring to the cosmological and salvific work of the Holy Spirit, stress that the actions of the Holy Spirit are in common with those of the other two persons of the Holy Trinity and they are manifested in Creation and in history once they take an intra-trinitarian downwards course, a descent »from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit«.²⁵ This constitutes the basic patristic teaching that the Holy Spirit acts in Divine Economy in common with the Father and the Son, but that each person of the Holy Trinity accomplishes a different work in the manifestation of their common action. The Father, who constitutes the intra-trinitarian source of divine action acts as a preliminary cause, the Son as a creative cause, creatively carrying out the will of the Father, and the Holy Spirit as a perfective cause, fulfilling the creative work of the Son.²⁶

It is a pity and truly, a tragic irony that the belief in the Holy Trinity was set forth as a necessary basis and presupposition for the participation of the different confessions in the W.C.C. during the Third General Assembly in New Delhi (1961) but that this basis was not adhered to in praxis with Chung's paper which purported to be on a clearly trinitarian

²² See: Come Holy Spirit — Renew the Whole Creation, in: Signs of the Spirit (Official Report — Seventh Assembly: Canberra, Australia, 7–20 February 1991), p. 39; 46.

²³ See op. cit., p. 39. See also *E. Clapsis*, «Τί τό Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις»: Ἱεραποστολικές ἐπιπτώσεις τῆς Ζ' Γενικῆς Συνελεύσεως τοῦ ΠΣΕ, in: Ἡ Ζ' Γενική Συνέλευση τοῦ Παγκοσμίου Συμβουλίου Ἐκκλησιῶν (Καμπέρρα, Φεβρουάριος 1991): Χρονικό-Κείμενα-Ἀξιολογήσεις, Katerini 1992, p. 243.

²⁴ See »Reflections of Orthodox Participants«, in: Signs of the Spirit, (Official Report — Seventh Assembly: Canberra, Australia; 7–20 February 1991), Geneva 1991, p. 281. »Σκέψεις τῶν Ὁρθοδόξων Συνέδρων«, *Enimerosis* 7 (1991), 2–3, p. 15. »Σκέψεις τῶν Ὁρθοδόξων Συνέδρων: Δήλωση τῶν Ὁρθοδόξων καί μὴ Χαλκηδονίαν Ὁρθοδόξων στήν Ζ' Γενική Συνέλευση τοῦ ΠΣΕ«, in: Ἡ Ζ' Γενική Συνέλευση τοῦ Παγκοσμίου Συμβουλίου Ἐκκλησιῶν (Καμπέρρα, Φεβρουάριος 1991): Χρονικό-Κείμενα-Ἀξιολογήσεις, Katerini 1992, p. 81. See also the outcome of the committee of Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Non-Chalcedonian churches which met on November 25 — December 4, 1989 at the Orthodox Academy of Crete: »Ἐλθέ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, ἀνακαίνισον πᾶσαν τήν κτίσιν — Μιά Ὁρθόδοξη θεώρηση«, *Apostolos Barnabas* 51 (1990) 153.

²⁵ See examples in *Athanasios the Great*, Epistula ad Serapionem I, 28–31: PG 26, 596C — 601A; 3, 5: PG 26, 633B. *Basil the Great*, Adversus Eunomium 3, 4: PG 29, 664C — 665A; Liber de spiritu sancto 38: PG 32, 136B. *Gregory of Nyssa*, Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei: PG 45, 125C — 129C; Adversus Macedonianos de spiritu sancto 13: PG 45, 1317B. See also *G. D. Martzelos*, Οὐσία καὶ ἐνέργεια τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν Μέγαν Βασίλειον. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστοριοδογματικὴν διερεύνησιν τῆς περὶ οὐσίας καὶ ἐνεργειῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ διδασκαλίας τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας, Thessaloniki 1984, p. 109 f.

²⁶ See *Basil the Great*, Liber de spiritu sancto 38: PG 32, 136BC. *Gregory of Nyssa*, Ad Ablatium quod non sint tres dei: PG 45, 125C — 128C. *Gregory Palamas*, Confessio fidei, in: Tomus Synodicus III: PG 151, 765A — 766A. See *G. D. Martzelos*, Οὐσία καὶ ἐνέργεια τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν Μέγαν Βασίλειον, p. 110 f.; *N. A. Matsoukas*, Δογματικὴ καὶ Συμβολικὴ Θεολογία Β' (Ἐκθεσις τῆς ὀρθόδοξης πίστεως σὲ ἀντιπαράθεσιν μὲ τὴ διυτικὴ Χριστιανοσύνη), Thessaloniki 1985, p. 95.

theme: the Holy Spirit. For this reason, and rightly so, not only the Orthodox but even certain Protestants protested. Indeed, the Orthodox especially in the common statement that they set forth at Canberra along with the Non-Chalcedonians vigorously expressed their concern over the deviation which occurred regarding the triadological basis of the W.C.C. with the paper of the South Korean Professor, and invoking the constitutional Base Article of the W.C.C. they emphasized that »Should the WCC not direct its future work along these lines, it would be in danger of ceasing to be an instrument aiming at the restoration of Christian unity and in that case it would tend to become a forum for an exchange of opinions without any specific Christian theological basis«. Analogous points of view were formulated on the part of some Protestants also, agreeing on this point totally with the assessment of the Orthodox. Indeed, the Lutheran »Society of Internal and External Mission«, centered in Neuendettelsau, Germany, expressing its concern and the views of many other Protestant confessions in a letter written to the Orthodox participants of the General Assembly in Canberra, indicated the violation of the constitutional Base Article of the W.C.C. which occurred with Professor Chung's paper and stressed emphatically that Pneumatology may in no way be separated from Christology and Triadology.

Apart from this point which, as we have seen, is especially basic to Orthodox theology, it must be made absolutely clear that the invocation of the spirits of the dead and the elements of the irrational creation that occurred at the beginning of Professor Chung's paper is purely animistic and cannot have anything to do with Christianity. For this reason, and rightly so, the Orthodox in the common statement along with the Non-Chalcedonians which they gave at Canberra, perceived the invocation of those spirits as a tending dangerously towards a substitution of the Holy Spirit with »a 'private' spirit, the spirit of the world or other spirits«, something which is totally contrary to biblical and patristic tradition. As was characteristically emphasized, »Our tradition is rich in respect for local and national cultures, but we find it impossible to invoke the spirits of 'earth, air, water and sea creatures'«. On this point, we must add, the Lutheran Evangelicals also agree fully: in the aforementioned letter sent to the Orthodox Assembly members at Canberra they stressed word for word: »We see in the present enthusiastic Pneumatology of the W.C.C. a disturbing deviation from the Christian faith, a faith based on Divine Revelation. For us the invocation of the spirits of the earth, air, waters, and seas is unacceptable«.

This invocation, of course, follows from the South Korean Professor's zoo-centric conception in which the Holy Spirit, as a life-giving force is found within Creation. For this reason, furthermore, as she said, the earth is not dead, rather, it is full of vital and creative energy; it is a place inspired and immersed in God. Such a conception, however, which confuses the Holy Spirit with the spirits of the dead and the supposed spirits of the irrational creation leads inevitably from zoo-centrism to a clearly pantheistic animism. Despite all this, we believe that this conception constitutes a positive point of connection with Orthodox Pneumatology. The fact is that, in contrast to classical Protestant theology, mainly interested in the salvific role of the Holy Spirit in history, the Presbyterian Professor in question specifically projected in her paper the cosmological role of the Holy Spirit, seeing its salvific role as an expansion and completion of its cosmological role.

As is well known, the Fathers of the Church stress emphatically that the work of the Holy Spirit is not only salvific and sanctifying. For the Fathers of the Church the Holy Spirit also takes active part in the work of creation, though always, as we have said, in common with the Father and the Son. Furthermore, the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit is not, for them, unrelated to the work of creation, for this sanctifying work is in fact nothing else than a renewal of Creation, a leading of Creation to a higher level of existence: from the level of being (εἶναι) to the level of well-being (εὖ εἶναι).

On a purely cosmological level the participation of the Holy Spirit in the work of creation, according to the Church Fathers, consists in the aesthetic perfection as well as in the vivification of the logical and irrational creation. For this reason the Fathers often characterize the Holy Spirit not only as »perfective cause«²⁷ but also as »vivificative«²⁸, »granter of life«²⁹, or »life providing power«³⁰. This sanctifying role as well as the aesthetic perfection and vivification of Creation constitute the most important expression of the perfective role of the Holy Spirit within Creation.

Consequently, not only for the Presbyterian Professor but also for the Fathers of the Church, the Holy Spirit as a life giving and sanctifying force is omnipresent within all logical and irrational creation. In the thought of the Fathers, however, there exist two basic distinctions of utmost importance which preserve Patristic Pneumatology from the danger of pantheism and animism: this is the distinction between *essence* and *energies* of God and the distinction between *created* and *uncreated*. Unfortunately, these two distinctions play no role, not even a slight one, within the theological thought of our South Korean Professor and precisely because of this her Pneumatology slips towards pantheistic animism. If she would embrace these distinctions, even in a contextual form, she could easily speak of the true presence of the Holy Spirit within Creation, without seeming to confuse it with the spirits of the dead and supposed spirits of the irrational creation. And this is because this presence of the Holy Spirit in Creation would be a presence only in the Holy Spirit's *energies*, which does not allow for the correlation of the Holy Spirit's *essence* with created reality.

Of course these distinctions of the essence and energies of the Holy Spirit, indissolubly connected to each other, seem to clash with the intense anti-dualism of Professor Chung, for which reason she rejects, as we have seen, the ontological dualism between God and Creation, transcendent and immanent, proposing rather the passing from the principle of dualism to the principle of interconnection.

According to Orthodox theology, however, the ontological dualism between God and the world, created and uncreated, is not dialectically opposed to the existence of a rela-

²⁷ See *Basil the Great*, Liber de spiritu sancto 38: PG 32, 136AB. See also *Gregory of Nyssa*, Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei: PG 45, 125C; 128C. *Gregory Palamas*, Confessio fidei, in: Tomus synodicus III: PG 151, 766A.

²⁸ See *Athanasios the Great*, Epistola ad Serapionem I, 23: PG 26, 584BC. *Basil the Great*, Adversus Eunomium 3,6: PG 29 668C; Liber de spiritu sancto 56: PG 32, 173A. »The Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople«, in *John Karmiris*, Τὰ δογματικά καὶ συμβολικά μνημεῖα τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, vol. I, Athens ²1960, p. 77. *John Damascene*, Expositio accurata fidei orthodoxae 1,8: PG 94, 821B.

²⁹ See *Basil the Great*, Liber de spiritu sancto 22: PG 32, 108B.

³⁰ See *Basil the Great*, Epistola CV: PG 32, 513B.

tionship between them. On the contrary, this ontological dualism is inconceivable without the relationship in God's energies between God and the world, created and uncreated. Furthermore, in agreement with biblical and patristic tradition, the created world came into being out of »non-existence« and remains in existence due to the relationship continually fostered by God with it by means of His energies.³¹ It must be comprehended by the South Korean Professor that the distinction between essence and energies of God, regardless of the form which this may take within her contextual manner of thought and problematic, is the only correct principle with which the discord and dialectic antithesis which she assumes to exist between ontological dualism and the relationship of God with the world is overcome. Besides this, the distinction between essence and energies of God could also in fact preserve Professor Chung from her slipping into pantheistic animism, without endangering at all the relationship of God with the world. Indeed, especially the patristic teaching that the Holy Spirit abounds with its presence and energies in the entire Creation could *mutatis mutandis* correspond in a way to the East Asian pantheistic and animistic presuppositions of the Presbyterian Professor and constitute an important contact point for Orthodox Pneumatology with her contextual Pneumatology. The only thing is that for Orthodox Pneumatology the Creation is not full of spirits but rather full of the energies of the Holy Spirit. This basic patristic teaching is that which Orthodox theological teaching has to offer as most proximate to the pantheistic and animistic depictions of the South Korean Professor taken from the accumulated religio-cultural consciousness of her people and generally to those of all Christians of East Asia who have a common cultural background with her. If the spirits which were mentioned in Professor Chung's paper, as well as those of the cultural tradition of the Christians of Eastern Asia, are understood, on their part, as the energies of the Holy Spirit in Orthodox theology, then indeed the pantheistic and animistic character of the above contextual Pneumatology not only would be discarded, but also could present an even more important common point with Orthodox Pneumatology. We must however stress that in such a case except for the distinction between essence and energies of God the distinction between created and uncreated would also have to play a definitive role. In other words, if these spirits could be understood within the context of the contextual Pneumatology of Professor Chung as energies of the Holy Spirit, it necessarily must be accepted that they cannot be created, rather they must be uncreated. If this could be understood on her part, she could truly see, as we perceive it, Orthodox Pneumatology as constituting the most suitable Pneumatology for the people of Eastern Asia, with their animistic and pantheistic cultural background.

³¹ See G. Florovsky, The Idea of Creation in Christian Philosophy, *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, 8, 3 (1949) 53 ff. By the same author, The Concept of Creation in Saint Athanasius, *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962) 36 ff. G. D. Martzelos, Οὐσία καὶ ἐνέργεια τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν Μέγαν Βασίλειον, p. 14 ff., 89 ff.

Conclusion

After all that has been said, we assume that we have made it clear that even if the Pneumatology of the Presbyterian Professor Chung Hyun Kyung, as presented in her paper at the General Assembly of the W.C.C. at Canberra, is purely contextual with an intense animistic and pantheistic character, despite this, she unwittingly presented certain points of contact with Orthodox Pneumatology. For example, we observed the fact that she stresses, along with the salvific, the cosmological role of the Holy Spirit, as well as its omnipresence as a life-giving force within Creation. These points, however, were unfortunately understood on the part of the Presbyterian Professor as based on her pantheistic and animistic presuppositions. The only way for these points to be rid of their pantheistic and animistic character and to thus approach at least the biblical conception of the work of the Holy Spirit, is for them to be understood on the basis of the presuppositions of Orthodox patristic Pneumatology which we have above outlined. Only then may we view a bridging of the gap presented at Canberra between classical and this specific contextual Pneumatology. Otherwise this contextual Pneumatology will remain as a foreign body within the commonly accepted triadological framework of the W.C.C.